



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 107th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 148

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 9, 2002

No. 132—Part II

House of Representatives

□ 1945

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

Therefore, firm in my beliefs, buoyed by the input from my constituents, and strong in my faith in the principles and ideals of America, I will vote for the Spratt-Moran substitute resolution.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON).

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker this is the most important vote I will have cast in my 20 years in Congress. I was here to cast my vote to go to war against Iraq in 1991. That was a definable conflict involving an aggressor who had to be stopped by the international community. America provided the leadership both to develop the coalition effort and provided the military power needed to win the war decisively.

Now we face a far greater threat: the threat of a government dedicated to methodical, committed development, production, and stockpiling of chemical and biological weapons, and ultimately to the development of a small transportable nuclear weapon. This threat is spearheaded by Iraq, but not posed by Iraq alone. I firmly believe that if we fail to develop an international response to turn back this new threat of far more mobile and potent weapons, the cost will be extraordinary in the sacrifice of innocent lives and the crippling effect on the world's economy and on the stability of governments throughout the world.

We cannot allow nations, as a matter of their public policy, to develop chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons that can be delivered in lethal amounts all around the world. Whether it be de-

livery through terrorist organizations such as al Qaeda or hard-to-detect drones with sprayer nozzles, there are now the means to deliver these weapons of mass destruction into the very hearts of our cities and towns. The attack of September 11 was only the most vivid and terrible demonstration of the power of hate to deliver death and destruction of incredible dimensions by stealth means.

Make no mistake, for 4 years, ever since the arms inspectors left Iraq when they were prevented from doing their job, Iraq has been increasing its research, development, and production of chemical and biological weapons despite their international agreements not to do so. I believe the evidence on this matter is clear and convincing and that there is sufficient evidence of an accelerated effort to develop nuclear weapons to make action the only realistic course.

We and the international community must act, not only to stop Iraq, but to demonstrate to other nations that are starting down the same path as Iraq that are developing chemical and biological arsenals that the international community will not tolerate such a development because it poses such an extraordinary threat to all nations' economies, governments, and the very fabric of human communities.

I will vote "yes" on this resolution, and commend the President, Secretary Powell, and Secretary Rumsfeld for working to unify the international community in the face of this new and unprecedented threat. I firmly believe, as the President has said, that war is neither imminent nor unavoidable. But I believe that the passage of this resolution will make an effective peaceful multilateral response more likely because it represents the depth of our commitment to the goal of Iraqi disarmament and the elimination of the threat of chemical and biological weapons in tandem with the power of ter-

rorist organizations and the stealthy delivery systems so clearly under development in Iraq.

Failure to act as we have for 4 years is no longer an option. We must prevent the accumulation of chemical and biological weapons and the development of increasingly stealthy means of delivery before these weapons are used against us and others.

I thank the Speaker for this opportunity to be heard on this historic occasion.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL), my friend and colleague who serves on the Committee on Ways and Means and is a leader in the Massachusetts delegation.

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor of the House to carry out one of the most important responsibilities that an elected Member of this institution has, to vote on a resolution authorizing the use of military force. It is a profound responsibility and one that I take most seriously.

Even Mr. Lincoln, as a Member of this House, wrestled with the issue of war-making powers when in 1848, in a letter to his law partner, William Herndon, voiced concern that Congress should not give unlimited powers to the executive. I share Mr. Lincoln's views on this important subject.

Everyone in this Chamber agrees that Saddam Hussein is a threat to his own people, his neighbors, and the entire civilized world. He is a tyrant intent on developing weapons of mass destruction and the means to deliver them. His many atrocities have been catalogued in this House and the Senate during this important debate, and his dictatorial regime is held in contempt around the globe. That is why

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H7413

any attempt to disarm or to replace him, and I support both, should be done with the support of our friends and allies in the international community.

Unilateralism and the doctrine of preemption are dangerous precedents that the United States may be setting. Such action is contrary to our country's core values and principles. Efforts to neutralize Iraq's chemical, biological, and nuclear threat should be done with the support of an international coalition and in accordance with international law. In my opinion and the opinion of many allies around the world, there are many compelling alternatives to acting alone and the immediate use of force as the first option. Here is one.

It is my belief that we need a new unambiguous resolution from the United Nations Security Council calling for the immediate and unfettered weapons inspectors to be allowed into Iraq. This new resolution should be unconditional, have clear time tables, and must exclude the unreasonable 1998 language that restricts inspectors from visiting Saddam Hussein's presidential palaces. Nothing should be off limits. It will hold Iraq permanently accountable to the international community. Saddam Hussein will have only two stark choices. He can accept robust inspections and begin to disarm or pay serious consequences, and I urge the United Nations to act immediately.

In preparation for this debate, Mr. Speaker, I have had an opportunity to talk and listen to many people about the merits of this resolution. I went to my constituents in Massachusetts, colleagues in Washington, and officials of administrations past and present. And each time I came away with more questions than answers. Important and timely questions about the wider implications of a unilateral war with Iraq should be answered.

The administration must tell the American people in clear and concise terms what impact a unilateral strike against Iraq would have on the already tenuous situation in the Middle East. In 1990 Saddam Hussein launched 39 SCUD missiles into the heart of Israel. Does anyone doubt that he would do it again? Twelve years ago the State of Israel showed restraint in the face of such attacks; but as we debate this resolution this evening, the Israeli Government has indicated it will defend itself against any Iraqi initiative.

What does this mean for the security of the region? Any attempt to restore the peace process between the Israelis and the Palestinians would be lost in the short term. What about Iran, Syria, and Libya, who are all engaged in active programs to develop weapons of mass destruction and the means to deliver them? How do we respond to a unilateral, preemptive American strike against Iraq?

We should not minimize the far-reaching implications of a first strike and a new doctrine of preemption. Indeed, it may have unintended con-

sequences in other parts of the world, in conflicts between India and Pakistan, China and Taiwan, Russia and Georgia. On the verge of this historic vote, these questions need to be answered before we reach a decision to send our young Americans into harm's way.

Mr. Speaker, if we suddenly turn our attention to a unilateral war with Iraq, what are the implications for the ongoing war on terrorism? Since the attacks of September 11, we have waged a war on terrorism with the support of friends and allies around the globe. I have supported President Bush and commended his leadership time and again for his war on terrorism. But will the United States continue to receive the same level of support and cooperation from countries that do not support a unilateral preemptive strike on Iraq?

Ironically, there is one aspect of this debate where there are definitive answers, and I ask this tonight: How much is this war going to cost the American people? The Congressional Budget Office has estimated that the incremental cost of deploying a force to the Persian Gulf would be between \$9 billion and \$13 billion. Prosecuting a war would cost between \$6 billion and \$9 billion a month. After hostilities end, and we do not know how long they are going to last, the cost to return our troops home would range between \$5 billion and \$7 billion. If, as President Bush insisted, we intend to rebuild Iraq, the costs to the American taxpayer will rise exponentially.

In the Gulf War with the support of an international coalition, the costs of the war was shared by our friends and allies. This will not be the case with unilateral action. The burden conceivably will rise to \$200 billion, and it will not be ours alone if we do this with the support of the Security Council.

Mr. Speaker, I have not been persuaded that unilateralism and the doctrine of preemption is the best course of action against Iraq. From my perspective, a preferable course of action is to enlist the support of the international community and demand a strict review by U.N. inspectors. We should take the diplomatic and political route before bringing this Nation to war, and I plan to vote against this resolution.

I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. THURMAN), a distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

Mr. Speaker, this is the most important vote that I ever will cast in this House. Deciding when to send our troops into harm's way is never easy and must not be made without serious consideration.

My father was a career Air Force sergeant and B-52 tail gunner, and I re-

member worrying every time he left for a flight that he would not return. So I have some idea of what is going through the hearts and the minds of the families of our troops. And growing up on military bases, I personally knew the people willing to put their lives on the line to protect our great Nation. I see my late father in all of them, and I remain committed to making sure if we have to send our troops into battle that they will have all the support and resources they need.

Threat from international terrorism is real. The threat from weapons of mass destruction is real. That is why it was so important to stress that we have moved away from unilateral action. My colleagues and I stood strong on our principles and got the administration to agree to the changes in the Iraq resolution. We felt that these changes were necessary to protect our Nation and the world from Saddam Hussein and ensure that military force would be used as a last resort.

On Monday President Bush told the Nation and the world that approving this resolution does not mean that military action is imminent or unavoidable. He has asked Congress to authorize the use of America's military, if it proves necessary. The American people are taking him at his word. We in Congress are taking him at his word. I hope that military action will not be necessary, but I am prepared to support our troops if all other efforts fail.

This resolution does not indicate abandonment but rather, I believe, an extension of the fight against terrorists. We will continue to improve homeland security and to find terrorist organizations wherever they may hide. This resolution retains the constitutional power of Congress in defense and foreign affairs. It does not justify unilateral military action by any country anywhere.

□ 2000

It is limited to Iraq, a nation that has made promises and then deliberately refused to live up to them.

This resolution retains the constitutional power in defense and foreign affairs. This is not the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution. We will be kept informed and can, if necessary, restrain any abuse of power.

It also seeks to compel the entire international community to back efforts to compel Iraq to comply with the world's will as expressed in various U.N. resolutions. International support is vital. It will show the world that this is not a dispute between the United States and Iraq. It is not a dispute between American and Arab. It is not a dispute between cultures. If conflict occurs, the blame rests solely with Saddam Hussein, who first invaded Kuwait and then refused to accept the consequences of his actions.

We have the best-trained and best-equipped Armed Forces in the world. I have no doubt that they will do whatever is asked of them and that they will succeed.

But war is not cheap, in blood or treasure. Sacrifices will be made by our troops and their families. But the rest of us will have to shoulder our fair share of the burden. We will have to pay for this action, just as my parents paid for World War II and my grandparents paid for World War I, because we must not pass the cost of this war on to our children and our grandchildren. Our country needs to be prepared for the cost of the war, in both human life and limited government resources.

I have promised our troops that they will not go wanting. I now promise the rest of America that I will not forget your needs. Each of us knows what needs those are, because we hear about them from people every day.

We must provide for our common defense abroad or else we will never be secure at home. But we will not lose sight of our priorities at home. We will prevail. We will execute our constitutional duty to provide for the common defense, and we will provide for the general welfare at home.

I, therefore, will support the resolution on final passage.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), a voice for justice that we have heard for many, many years, a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, 3 weeks before election seems to be an odd time to be authorizing war. It is especially odd when President Bush himself said at the United Nations that Iraq represents a "grave and gathering threat," not an imminent threat. For a month, this debate has frozen off the front pages Social Security, prescription drugs, rising unemployment, growing deficits, robbery of pension accounts, corporate abuses and the inaction of this Congress itself.

The generals have not weighed in either. Retired General Norman Schwartzkopf, who headed the Persian Gulf War campaign, called on President Bush "not to go it alone." Retired General Wesley Clark, who headed up the Balkans campaign, called on President Bush "not to go it alone." Former National Security Adviser Brent Scowcroft said an attack on Iraq without addressing the problems of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict "could turn the whole region into a cauldron, and thus destroy the war on terrorism."

Last weekend, Israel's Chief of Military Intelligence, speaking on television, disputed contentions that Iraq is 18 months away from nuclear capability. He concluded Iraq's time frame was more like 4 years, and he said Iran's nuclear threat was as great as Iraq's.

Yes, Congress, on behalf of the American people must decide whether the United States incursion now into Iraq will make our country more secure and

whether it will make that region more stable. On both counts, my conclusion is no.

It will not make America safer, because unilateral military action without broad international support will isolate America further. It will thrust us into the position of becoming a common enemy in a volatile region where anti-western terrorism grows with each passing year.

It will not make the region more stable either. The Bush approach will yield more terrorism and instability, not less.

We should insist on rigorous inspections in concert with our allies and enforce all U.N. resolutions relating to the Middle East.

Indeed, if the politics of the oil regimes and lethal force had been successful over the past 25 years, America's citizens would not be the victims of escalating terrorist violence at home and abroad.

Since 1975, more American diplomats and military personnel have been killed or taken hostage as a result of Middle Eastern tumult than in the first 187 years of our Nation's history, and it worsens with each decade. After 9/11, 13,025 additional names of civilians here at home were added to that growing list.

Look more deeply at the roots of the rising levels of hatred and terrorism toward our people. Even if Iraq were able to serve as an instrument of global terrorism, the causes of that terrorism will not disappear with the demise of Saddam Hussein. The enemy has many fresh faces. They spring daily from the growing resentment of western influence over an Islamic world that is awakening to its own political destiny. America must not wed itself to the past but to the rising aspirations of subjugated people; and we must do it in concert with our friends, both inside the Arab world and outside it.

What propels the violence? A deep and powerful undercurrent moving people to violence in that region. It is the unresolved Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

The other major destabilizing force is America's utter and dangerous dependence on imported oil, whose purchases undergird repressive regimes. We must address both.

Think about it. Modern terrorism dawned in our homeland in June, 1968, with the assassination of Robert F. Kennedy. The unresolved Israeli-Palestinian conflict lay at the basis of that tragic loss. His disgruntled assassin, a Jordanian Arab, revealed in his diary that loss of his homeland in East Jerusalem lay at the root of his discontent. Sirhan Sirhan is one such face.

The intifada now proceeding in the West Bank and Gaza proves the lingering tragedy of the Holy Land resists peaceful resolution until today, and its irresolution instructs the street and produces sacred rage.

Now, let us look at oil, the one word the President left out of his address in Cincinnati. As the 1970s proceeded,

America's economic security became to be shaped more and more by events abroad. Thrust into two deep recessions due to the Arab oil embargoes as petroleum prices shot through the roof, our economy faltered. And the current recession, too, has been triggered by rising oil prices.

Meanwhile, America, rather than becoming energy independent at home, sinks deeper into foreign oil dependence, from the undemocratic regimes of Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and Iraq, to also include the state-owned monopolies of Nigeria and Venezuela and Mexico. While our military enforces the no-fly zones over Iraq, we import 8 percent of our oil from her. America has become more and more hostage to the oil regimes, with our future intertwined with the politics that Islamic fundamentalism breeds in the Muslim world.

Al Qaeda, led by Osama bin Laden, a Saudi national, is but the latest face of international terrorism. Al Qaeda's goal is expulsion of western influence in the Gulf and the creation of a religious, unified Islamic caliphate.

Mohammed Atta grew up in the undemocratic oil regimes of Saudi Arabia where 17 of the 19 hijackers originated.

By contrast, the goal of Saddam Hussein and his Baath Party has been control of the vast oil deposits in Iraq and access to waterborne shipping in the Persian Gulf. Hussein has been a fairly predictable foe. In the 1990s, he conventionally invaded Kuwait; and the raw truth is he never got what he expected, which was access through Kuwait to the Gulf.

When Iraq invaded Kuwait in 1990, the dispute not only involved Iraq's belief that Kuwait was part of its historic territory, but essentially the struggle involved who within OPEC would control that oil. Is defending oil reserves worthy of one more American life?

Before launching another war, Congress must vote to place our priorities where they belong, security here at home and a valued partner in the global community of nations.

Please vote for the Spratt-Skelton resolution and no on the Hastert-Gephardt resolution.

Three weeks before election seems an odd time to be authorizing war.

It is especially odd when President Bush himself said at the United Nations that Iraq represents a "grave and gathering threat," not an "imminent threat." For a month, this debate has frozen off the front pages Social Security, prescription drugs, rising unemployment, growing deficits, robbery of pension accounts, corporate abuses and the inaction of this Congress.

The generals have not weighed in either. Retired General Norman Schwartzkopf, who headed the Persian Gulf War campaign, called on President Bush "not to go it alone." Retired General Wesley Clark, who headed up the Balkans campaign, called on President Bush "not to go it alone." Former National Security Adviser Brent Scowcroft said an attack on Iraq without addressing the problems of the Israeli-

Palestinian conflict "could turn the whole region into a cauldron and thus destroy the war on terrorism."

In Cincinnati, President Bush said Iraq is seeking nuclear capability. He did not say Iraq had such a capability. And never has Saddam Hussein risked his regime's annihilation, which would be a certainty if he exhibits any adventurism.

The Philadelphia Inquirer reported yesterday (Tuesday) that a Central Intelligence Agency report, which was released last Friday, concluded that it could take Iraq until the last half of this decade to produce a nuclear weapon, unless it could acquire bomb grade uranium or plutonium on the black market.

Intelligence sources confirm chemical capabilities have been substantially reduced as a result of inspectors and Iraq's armed forces are 40% of their strength prior to the Gulf War.

The President claimed Iraq had acquired smooth aluminum tubes for its secret nuclear weapons program. But analysts at the Energy and State Departments concluded that the Iraqis probably wanted the tubes to make conventional artillery pieces. On chemical and biological weapons, all the evidence indicates the inspection regime of the 1980s worked and that civilized nations are effective in dismantling rogue states' arsenals when they join in common cause.

Last weekend, Israel's chief of military intelligence, speaking on television, disputed contentions that Iraq is 18 months away from nuclear capability. He concluded Iraq's time frame was more like four years, and he said Iran's nuclear threat was as great as Iraq's. I daresay Israel's chief of military intelligence is not the type of person who would engage in self-delusion.

Yet, Congress, on behalf of the American people, must decide: whether U.S. military incursion now into Iraq will make our country more secure, whether it will make that region more stable.

On both counts, my conclusion is "No."

It won't make America safer because unilateral military action, without broad international support, will isolate America further. It will thrust us into the position of becoming a "common enemy" in a volatile region where anti-Western terrorism grows with each passing year.

It won't make the region more stable, either. The Bush approach will yield more terrorism and instability, not less. We should insist on rigorous inspections in concert with our allies and enforce all U.N. resolutions relating to the Middle East. Indeed, if the politics of the oil regimes and lethal force had been successful over the past 25 years, America's citizens would not be the victims of escalating terrorist violence at home and abroad. Since 1975, more American diplomats and military personnel have been killed or taken hostage abroad as a result of Middle Eastern tumult than in the first 187 years of our nation's history. And it worsens with each decade. After 9/11, 3025 additional names of civilians here at home were added to that growing list.

Look more deeply at the roots of the rising levels of hatred and terrorism toward our people. Even if Iraq were able to serve as an instrument of global terrorism, the causes of that terrorism would not disappear with the demise of Saddam Hussein. Terrorists are being molded every day.

Look at the enemy. It is not conventional. It is not faceless. The enemy has many fresh

faces. They spring daily from the growing resentment of Western influence over an Islamic world that is awakening to its own political destiny. America must not wed itself to the past but to the rising aspirations of subjugated people, and we must do so in concert with our friends both inside the Arab world and outside it.

What propels the violence?

A deep and powerful undercurrent moving people to violence in that region is the unresolved Palestinian-Israeli conflict. The other major destabilizing force is America's utter and dangerous dependence on imported oil whose purchases undergird repressive regimes. We must address both.

Think about it. Modern terrorism dawned in our homeland in June 1968, with the assassination of Robert F. Kennedy. The unresolved Israel-Palestinian conflict lay at the basis of that tragic loss. His disgruntled assassin, a Jordanian Arab, revealed in this diary that loss of his homeland in East Jerusalem lay at the root of his discontent. Sirhan Sirhan is one such face.

The intifada now proceeding in the West Bank and Gaza proves the lingering tragedy of the Holy Land resists peaceful resolution event until today and its irresolution instructs the street and produces sacred rage.

Now, let's look at oil . . . the one word the President left out of his address in Cincinnati. As the 1970's proceeded, America's economic security came to be shaped by events abroad. Thrust into two deep recessions due to Arab oil embargoes as petroleum prices shot through the roof, our economy faltered. The current recession too has been triggered by rising oil prices.

In 1980, Jimmy Carter lost his bid for reelection because economic conditions at home so deteriorated. Carter had dubbed Arab oil price manipulation as the "moral equivalent of war." He had launched a major effort to restore America's energy independence.

Ronald Reagan and George Bush were elected in a campaign that highlighted the "misery index," the combination of unemployment and interest rates exploding over 20 percent.

By the 1980's, OPEC's cartel had realized that it lost revenue when America caught economic pneumonia. So OPEC learned something it practices to this very day: how to dance a clever pirouette of price manipulation rather than outright price gouging.

Meanwhile, America, rather than becoming energy independent at home, sinks deeper into foreign oil dependence—from the undemocratic regimes of Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, and Iraq to also include the state-owned monopolies of Nigeria and Venezuela and Mexico. While our military enforces the no-fly zone over Iraq, we import 8% of our oil from her.

America has become more and more an economic hostage to the oil regimes, with our future intertwined with the politics that Islamic fundamentalism breeds in the Muslim world.

America's ill-fraught alliances with unpopular Middle East regimes was vividly revealed in 1979 when Iran, though not an oil state, fell despite the fact the U.S. and our CIA had supported its Shah and his secret police, purportedly to assure regional stability. It produced exactly the opposite—a revolution.

Recall 1983, in the thick of Lebanon's civil war, when suicide bombers attacked the U.S. Marine compound in Beirut, killing 241 Ameri-

cans. They were caught in the crossfire of that civil war. From that point forward, U.S. casualties escalated every year, as more and more U.S. citizens were killed abroad and at home. If you travel to Lebanon today, our U.S. embassy is built like a bunker, underground. This is happening to U.S. facilities around the world.

Here is our nation's capital—barricades, concrete barriers, truck-bomb checks have become commonplace. A citizen can no longer drive down Pennsylvania Avenue in front of the White House. It is blocked off. We now have red, orange, yellow warning lights across the land. It is harder for our people to access their institutions of government. Block by block, our freedom is being circumscribed. In 1993, at the World Trade Center, six people died and one thousand were injured here at home in a bombing masterminded by a Pakistani trained in Afghanistan. In 1996, a truck bomb killed 19 Americans in Saudi Arabia at Khobar Towers, a residence for American military personnel. Last week a Green Beret was killed in Manila by a terrorist bomb, and yesterday in Kuwait two U.S. military personnel were fired upon—one died. Dozens of such tragedies now happen each year, and the body count mounts.

Al Qaeda, led by Osama bin Laden, a Saudi national, is but the latest face of international terrorism. Al Qaeda's goal is expulsion of Western influence in the Gulf and the creation of a religious, unified Islamic caliphate. But Al Qaeda and Osama are not Iraqi.

Mohammed Atta grew up in the undemocratic oil regimes of Saudi Arabia where 17 of 19 hijackers originated. They believed in the religious fundamentalism of the Wahhabi sect, but not its economic imperative that holds power through billions earned from vast oil reserves. Despite oil wealth, the king has become less and less able to control the disgruntled in that society, who resent the secular nature of the religious kingdom.

By contrast, the goal of Saddam Hussein and his Baath Party has been control of the vast oil deposits in Iraq and access to waterborne shipping in the Persian Gulf. Hussein has been a fairly predictable foe. In 1990, he conventionally invaded Kuwait. The raw truth is he received his early encouragement and support from the first Reagan-Bush Administration, in the early 1980s. That administration engaged Saddam Hussein and provided him with resources, and credits to depose Iran's Ayatollah Khomeini, who had just deposed the CIA-supported Shah in 1979. Through his U.S. contacts, Hussein assumed Iraq's quid pro quo would be access to the Persian Gulf on Bubiyan Island. Kuwait, however, never agreed.

When Iraq invaded Kuwait in 1990, the dispute not only involved Iraq's belief that Kuwait was part of its historic territory. Iraq also surmised that Kuwait was asking too low a price for oil sold to the West. Yes, America went to war to defend Kuwait's border. But essentially the struggle involved who within OPEC would control that oil. Subsequent to the Persian Gulf War, America began stationing more and more troops in Saudi Arabia, ostensibly to guard the oil flow out of the Persian Gulf. Is defending oil reserves worthy of one more life?

Of course, these forces also conveniently offered some threat to unwelcome enemies of the Saudi regime, at home and abroad. Anti-

western resentment in the region continues to rise. In 2000, our destroyer USS *Cole* was suicide bombed in Yemen harbor guarding the oil flows. Thirteen U.S. service members were killed and 39 wounded.

Over the last quarter century, it is interesting to reflect upon the intimate connection between the George Bush family, oil, and the shaping of foreign policy towards the Middle East. During the 1950s and 1960s, George Herbert Walker Bush, an oilman from Midland, Texas sought international exploration and investments as Texas oil wells were depleted prior to seeking office. In the 1960s and early 1970s, George Herbert Walker Bush served in the U.S. House, Senate, U.S. Ambassador to China, and was appointed head of the CIA in 1976 and served until March 1977.

Simultaneous with George Herbert Walker Bush's service in the CIA, Syria sent troops to Lebanon to stem the civil war, the Iranian Revolution gained steam, and Egyptian President Anwar Sadat traveled to Jerusalem and became the first Arab leader to recognize Israel.

George Herbert Walker Bush served as Vice President from 1981 to 1989 and as President from 1989 until 1993. During this period, the U.S. was drawn more directly into a central role in Middle East security.

In 1990, with the invasion of Kuwait by Iraq, President George Herbert Walker Bush fashioned a U.S.-led coalition of nations to push Saddam Hussein out of Kuwait. More than 400,000 U.S. troops were involved in that war. One hundred forty Americans died in that war, thousands have sustained war injuries and tens of thousands of Iraqis died.

With each succeeding decade, wars involving terrorism and America escalated. Now George Bush's son is serving as President and a second war resolution is being contemplated. It is fair to say that the Bush view of the Middle East literally has dominated U.S. policy for 75 percent of the past two decades.

9/11 was but the latest chapter in the expanding violence.

It is also important to inquire as to what private oil interests in the Middle East are held, or were held, by key officials in the current Bush Administration and how that might influence their views of U.S. "vital interests."

In the past, according to the Arabian Peninsula and Gulf Studies Project (supported by the Kuwait Foundation for the Advancement of Sciences). George W. Bush sat on the board of Harken Oil of Grand Prairie, Texas, as a private citizen, and held major oil company involvement in Bahrain both professionally and personally.

Halliburton, the firm that hired Vice-President DICK CHENEY as its CEO subsequent to the Persian Gulf War, had previously operated in Iraq. During the early 1980's, Vice-President CHANEY served as U.S. Secretary of Defense and Donald Rumsfeld as one of his Assistant Secretaries of Defense.

Newspaper reports now indicate that during that same period, biological and chemical germ samples were transferred to Iraq from the government of the United States through the Center for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) to several Iraqi sites that U.N. weapons inspectors determined were part of Saddam Hussein's biological weapons program. Indeed, the U.S. government provided agricul-

tural credits to Iraq to finance these transactions and the purchase of large amounts of fertilizer and chemicals to be used in Iraq's protracted war with Iran.

Congressional records and CDC documents for that period show Iraq ordered the samples, and claimed them for legitimate medical research. The CDC and a biological sample company called the American Type Culture Collection sent strains of several germs. The transfers were made in the 1980's.

Included among these strains: anthrax, the bacteria that make botulinum toxin, and the germs that cause gas gangrene. Iraq also got samples of other deadly pathogens, including the West Nile virus. Senator ROBERT BYRD has questioned Secretary Rumsfeld, as President Reagan's envoy to the Middle East at that time, inquiring about how contacts were made with Iraq to transfer chemical and biological agents from the U.S. to Iraq as its launched its attacks on Iran.

Before launching another war, this one unilaterally, Congress must vote to place U.S. priorities where they belong—security here at home and a valued partner in the global community of nations.

Three policy prescriptions deserve greater weight.

First, inspection now, rigorous and full, in league with the world community.

Second, America must restore energy independence here at home. If we could land a man on the moon in 10 years, surely we can gather ourselves to master this scientific imperative. No longer should oil become a proxy for America's foreign policy. Our economic relations should not reward dictatorships.

Third, the U.S. must regain momentum to find a solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. President Bush should dispatch former U.S. Senators George Mitchell and Warren Rudman to the Middle East as ambassadors without portfolio to exercise their considerable talents.

In closing, let me re-emphasize:

What is the "imminent threat" to the United States that justifies going to war now?

Where is the hard evidence of the new threat?

With unilateral action, how will the United States avoid being viewed in the Islamic world as a "common enemy?"

What specific threat justifies abandoning 50 years of strategic policy in favor of a unilateral policy of pre-emption?

Who would succeed Saddam Hussein in power in Iraq? How would a partitioned Iraq be a stabilizing force?

Does the United States want to engage in nation building in Afghanistan and Iraq simultaneously?

Who will pay for this nation building?

When will the United States wean itself from its dangerous dependence on foreign oil, which takes money from our people and distorts our foreign policy?

Why should the U.S. military be asked to serve as an occupying force in Afghanistan and Iraq?

What makes Iraq's threat to the United States so much more serious today that it was four months ago or even two years ago?

In closing, let not America be perceived as the "bully on the block" in the most oil-rich re-

gion of the world, where not one democratic state exists. Vote for energy security. Vote for stability. Vote for energy independence. Vote for resolving the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Vote for Spratt-Skelton. Vote "no" on the Hastert-Gephardt resolution.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY).

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the kind gentleman for his leadership on human rights and on safety throughout the world.

You have to ask yourself at a serious time like this, was not 9/11 enough? Was not 9/11 enough to spur America's resolve to defend our own country?

I support this resolution because the first responsibility of our government is to defend American citizens. The government of Iraq, like our terrorist nations, presents a grave threat to the safety, to the security, to the well-being of every American that hears this debate tonight.

We are in the early stages of what is likely to be a very long war against terrorism. In his September 20th, 2001, address to a Joint Session of Congress here in this Chamber, President Bush vowed that America would not rest until we had rooted out terrorism around the world. He said the countries harboring terrorists would be treated as terrorist nations themselves; that the coming war would be a long one, to be measured in years, rather than months.

The Afghanistan campaign is the first step in putting that pledge into action, and much remains to be done. Does anyone seriously believe that terrorism began and ended in Afghanistan?

Disarming Iraq and its support for state-sponsored terrorism is the next logical step to secure peace for our families and for this world. As we were reminded again this afternoon with the released audiotape of bin Laden's second in command predicting yet more terrorist attacks on America, the question is not if America will be attacked again here at home, but when and by whom.

Instead of crashing airplanes into our downtown office buildings or into our Pentagon, the terrorists of the future will turn to dangerous chemical and biological weapons, attempts to poison our air and water, disrupt our energy supply, our economy, our electronic commerce, destroy the jobs we rely upon each day.

Yes, they will direct these weapons of terrible destruction toward America, because standing as the world's lone superpower means standing as the world's biggest target. Our homeland,

our communities, our schools, our neighborhoods and millions of American lives are at risk as we speak tonight.

It is clear to me we are going to fight this war on terrorism in one of two ways: either overseas at its source, or here at home when it lands in our neighborhoods. I choose overseas at its source.

America's security at home depends upon largely our strength in the world. Terrorism expands according to our willingness to tolerate it. For too long the world has turned a blind eye to terrorism, afraid to confront it; and terrorism has flourished because the actions of our world leaders never matched their harsh words.

Well, that is all over now. That all changed September 11. That all changed with President Bush.

For the sake of our homeland, we must mean what we say. For the sake of our children, we must follow through on our vow to end terrorism. If the United Nations efforts should fail, if Saddam Hussein chooses to continue to arm himself and harbor terrorists, then America must act. Words alone are not enough. And when we send U.S. troops overseas, it must be to win and to return home as planned.

Our first President said there is nothing so likely to produce peace as to be well-prepared to meet an enemy. We know the enemy, we know the difficulty, we know the duty, and we know the strength of America's military men and women.

The resolution before the House tonight is not a question of the President's persuasiveness. It is a question of Congress' resolve to whip this terrible war on terrorism.

We know where the President stands. The question is, where does Congress stand, and do we stand with him? I do, and I am proud to do so. Make it clear, our resolve is not for war today; it is for peace tomorrow.

□ 2015

Our resolve is not for security for America alone, but for security for the world, a world free of fear from horror, from the incredible weapons of mass destruction, from all of that terrorism spawns.

All I seek and all Americans seek is a simple request: when our families leave our homes each morning, that they return home safely each night. Was not 9-11 enough for America to act to protect our citizens? It is.

Mr. FALOMAVEGA. Mr. Speaker, I gladly yield 5½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ROTHMAN), a distinguished member of the House Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, on September 11, 2001, America's view of the world changed. On that day, many Americans learned, for the first time, that there were people in the world

who hated America so much that they would cross the oceans to come here to kill thousands of American men, women, and children, even if it meant they would die themselves.

In considering the resolution before us, I have weighed all of the pros and cons, all the risks of action and the risks of inaction, with September 11 very much in my mind. I believe that any close question on matters of national security must now be resolved in favor of erring on the side of being proactive and not reactive in protecting our people and our homeland.

I have spent a tremendous amount of time and study over the past several months on what to do about Saddam Hussein. I have engaged in dialogue with many of my constituents, spoken with experts on every side of this issue, and read literally thousands of pages of analysis. I can delineate as well as any opponent of this resolution all of the possible and considerable risks associated with military action against Saddam Hussein. However, in the end, I conclude, beyond any reasonable doubt, that America must join forces with our allies, hopefully under the express authorization of the United Nations, but that we must take action to prevent Saddam Hussein from using his weapons of mass destruction against us.

Now, especially in the light and shadow of September 11, there is a new immediacy and power to Saddam Hussein's long-standing and often-stated threats against America.

For years, Saddam Hussein has been a well-known patron and financier of some of the world's most lethal anti-American terrorists and terrorist organizations. Now, al Qaeda has joined them. After being driven from Afghanistan, al Qaeda has now sought and received safe haven from Saddam Hussein. Saddam is now training al Qaeda in bomb-making and the manufacture and delivery of poisonous and deadly gases.

We know that for years al Qaeda has been trying to get their hands on chemical, biological, or nuclear weapons to use against America and Americans. The thought of Saddam Hussein now infecting willing al Qaeda "martyrs" with his smallpox virus and sending them into America's major cities, causing hundreds of thousands of Americans to die of smallpox, is truly terrifying. The thought of Saddam Hussein sending these same al Qaeda martyrs to America to spray chemical or biological poisons over America's reservoirs or in our most populated cities is a thought so horrifying, yet so real a possibility, that I cannot, in good conscience, especially after the surprise attack of September 11, permit this to happen.

I, therefore, endorse this resolution. I do so, however, with a heavy heart. I do so yet with no reasonable doubt that preventing Saddam Hussein from using his weapons of mass destruction against us is necessary now if we are to avoid another 9-11 or worse.

Mr. Speaker, I pray that military action is not necessary and that alone, passage of this resolution will result in Saddam Hussein's compliance with all existing U.N. resolutions to disarm and to permit unconditional inspections. But in the end, that is Saddam Hussein's choice.

Mr. Speaker, as we pass this resolution, let us pray for the safety of all Americans, including the brave men and women in our military, law enforcement, and all other branches of our government who are today protecting us here at home and in countries around the world and who will be called upon to do so tomorrow or in the days ahead. God bless them and God bless America.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD).

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, tonight we discuss giving the President the authority to use military force against Iraq. As the Congressman from the first district of Kentucky, I have the privilege of representing the fine men and women of Fort Campbell, Kentucky, home of the 101st Airborne, Air Assault Division, the 5th Special Forces Group, and the 160th Special Operations Aviation Regiment, better known as the Night Stalkers.

These soldiers were among the first to engage the Taliban in Afghanistan and, unfortunately, the first to suffer casualties.

If we go to war with Iraq, they will again be the tip of the spear thrusting at our enemies, and they will again, sadly, be among the first to suffer casualties. Hopefully, that will not occur.

When I vote later this week, I may be putting my friends and neighbors on the frontline of combat. It is not a decision that any of us takes lightly. Therefore, after much deliberation, I have reluctantly concluded that Saddam Hussein has proven himself to be a threat that we cannot ignore.

For 11 years Saddam Hussein has defied U.N. resolution after resolution, while continuing his drive to acquire weapons of mass destruction. For years, he hindered and toyed with U.N. weapons inspectors in defiance of the cease-fire that ended the Gulf War. He has consorted with terrorists who are willing and eager to target innocent civilians in their war of hatred against the civilized world. He controls biological and chemical weapons, and we know he is trying to develop nuclear capability as well.

We are the world's only remaining superpower; yet a small band of terrorists were able to cause unprecedented death and destruction here in America. We cannot wait for another attack to take more American lives before finally deciding to act.

Another dead American man, woman, or child, struck down in their home or workplace by terrorist violence, would be an indictment of this Congress's failure to act while we had the chance.

I firmly believe that granting the President the authority he needs to continue to combat the menace of Saddam's regime is the best way to preserve peace, and I firmly believe that granting the President the authority he needs to combat the menace of Saddam's regime is the best way to help the Iraqi people.

Our allies in the U.N., many of whom have explored reestablishing beneficial economic ties with Saddam Hussein's regime, are unlikely to take the necessary steps or approve our taking those steps to end Saddam's threat unless the U.S. leads the way.

Since the President's speech to the United Nations, we have witnessed the rest of the civilized world awakening from its slumber and stealing itself for this necessary confrontation with Saddam Hussein. By uniting behind our President, we can send the world an indication of our resolve. If we show our allies that we consider the threat worth risking the lives of our soldiers, I believe our allies will support us in our endeavor.

Mr. Speaker, my hometown newspaper recently noted that 60 million people died in World War II to teach the world that allowing tyranny to go unchecked was wrong. Let us not make that same mistake with Saddam Hussein.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS), a person who is a senior member of the Committee on Armed Services and has worked for persons in uniform for many years.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution.

I believe that taking action against Iraq at this time will take vital resources away from an even more pressing and dangerous threat: the war on al Qaeda. And this action, including the occupation and stabilization of the nation after the invasion, could drain our military resources for over a decade.

I do believe that Saddam Hussein and his possession and development of weapons of mass destruction does pose a threat to our Nation. But we already have a policy that is containing the threat and positions us well if we have to move forcefully.

I think our greater responsibility is to assess threats to our national security and then decide how to deal with them. I believe we have an even greater challenge that we must not divert precious resources from the global war on terrorism.

The greatest danger facing our Nation comes from al Qaeda, the terrorist network that perpetrated the acts of September 11. And while a year has passed and we have prosecuted a successful war against al Qaeda in Afghanistan, the infrastructure of terror, however, remains in place. Our forces are still searching for bin Laden and his followers, and while these people remain at large, our Nation still focuses on the possibility of attacks from this

group on an even larger scale than September 11.

I am deeply concerned that prosecuting a war on Iraq will divert precious resources from this war. A campaign against Saddam Hussein could tie up 200,000 military personnel. Diverting these forces and the assets that will be needed to support them will stretch our military perilously thin. To do this while we are conducting an intense worldwide anti-terror operations is unwise. I believe it puts the lives of American citizens at risk. It will keep us from exerting the full range of military options we need to neutralize terrorist cells and to interrupt planned terrorist operations. And it could continue to weigh down our military for a number of years.

It has been estimated that we will need up to 50,000 to remain behind for a period of years to help guarantee as much as can be possibly done for the civility of Iraq.

□ 2030

No one knows how long this will take or what type of resources we will need. Add to this the potential for conflict between ethnic and political rivals in Iraq, and we could be entering a quagmire that we may not be able to get out of. The administration has not clearly outlined our exit strategy, and this is another thing that bothers my constituents.

The war that the administration is entering into is a war on terror. Yet the case has not been made that links Iraq to support to al-Qaeda. The evidence to this point is sketchy, at best. In fact, the evidence really suggests that Iraq is a greatly weakened nation and that the threat posed by it has been deterred or reduced by the U.S. presence in the Gulf and the enforcement of the no-fly zones.

The strategy of containment has kept Iraq at bay. It has worked and continues to work. We can continue this policy as well as allow the U.N. weapons inspectors to go in to do their jobs. If all of this ends in the conclusion that Iraq is in violation of U.N. resolutions and is near a real nuclear weapons capability, we can reevaluate our options. Until then, we should continue with the present policy.

I think we have a great responsibility to our men and women who are going to fight this war and to the people who have, time and time again, come before this body and talked about how their sons or daughters and relatives have served in the Persian Gulf War and suffered from, let us say, Agent Orange disability. Because those that saw combat went over to the Persian Gulf healthy and came back ill. Many of them still suffer from the illnesses, the causes of which we still do not know.

Before we send these young men and women off to war and expose them not only to the hazards of conflict but to a lifetime of dealing with the physical and emotional costs of combat, we must do everything to achieve our goals without resorting to force.

In the case of Iraq, we can do this. If not, we face losing the war we must win, the fight against al Qaeda.

Mr. FALCONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH), a distinguished member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, there is no more important thing that this Congress does, and, in fact, this country does, than protect our national security.

For many years, the most significant threat to us as a Nation was ballistic missiles from the former Soviet Union. That threat does not exist today; and, in fact, we are living in a new world.

I think what the President has acknowledged, and is trying to lead the American people and this Congress to an understanding of, is that the greatest threat to this country today is the threat of weapons of mass destruction by both terrorist states and terrorists.

That is the unthinkable, weapons of mass destruction against our homeland. What could that mean? It is the unthinkable. We do not want to think about it, but it is a potential reality. Had a nuclear weapon been on one of the planes that hit the World Trade Center, it would not have been 4,000 people who died. I think it is impossible for any of us to really feel or really understand what it means for 4,000 people to die in an instant. It literally would have meant at least 4 million people dying in an instant, and many more dying subsequent to that.

This is not an unthinkable possibility. The reality is we live in a world where to build a nuclear weapon takes about 7 pounds of enriched uranium, not much larger than a softball. In fact, it can be carried without detriment to a carrier of it. The technology to build the weapon, unfortunately, is not that sophisticated today.

One of the issues in terms of Iraq that is worth pointing out, in 1981, when the Israelis blew up the Iraqi military nuclear reactor, in 1981, they were 6 months away from having a nuclear weapon. That was over 20 years ago. If we think about a sense of how much the world and technology has changed in 20 years, personal computers did not exist 20 years ago when that nuclear reactor was blown up. Obviously, technology has gone a long way from that point; as well, the effort of the Iraqis to acquire those weapons since that period of time and in the approximately 4 years that there have been no weapons inspectors at all in Iraq.

When the weapons inspectors left 4 years ago, about 4 years ago, 4 years and a short period of time, in the public domain we have the information that the Iraqis had smallpox and anthrax at that time, and we know they have used it against their own citizens and other countries.

What does it mean? What is the issue? Iraq is not the only country in the world that has weapons of mass destruction. Why are we addressing this

issue? Why am I supporting the resolution of use of force against Iraq? I think there is a policy that the President has articulated that it is just not enough that they have the weapons, but, really, the intent to use them.

Clearly, Iraq does not have the ability to send ballistic missiles to the United States. We understand that. But they do have the ability today to attack us with biological and chemical weapons, today. We do not know how far off they are from nuclear weapons, but 20 years ago they were 6 months away. We know they are aggressively trying to seek those weapons today.

I think we need to acknowledge this is really a change in policy, but a change in policy for this country that is needed in terms of weapons of mass destruction in the 21st century. The downside of not stopping these weapons is, in fact, the unthinkable.

One of the things we do not talk about often is, once the sort of code of both equipment and delivery of these weapons is broken, why would a country, why would Iraq, have one nuclear weapon? Would they not have five, 10, or for that matter, 15, to be able to use in terrorist ways?

We talk about the fact they have the ability today to build a weapon. The only restriction potentially is their lack of material, of enriched uranium, 7 pounds of enriched uranium. Effectively, we have no way of stopping that from entering the United States today. We acknowledge that, effectively, we cannot.

We have thousands of pounds of cocaine, and our war on drugs, as effective as it is, it literally lets in thousands of pounds of cocaine a year into the United States.

I urge my colleagues, I urge the country to support this effort. We have a country that literally wants to kill us. They do not want to kill the French. They do not want to kill the Swedish. The action is directed at us.

This is an issue, as I started this evening, of national security, national defense, national survival for the United States of America. I urge the adoption of the resolution.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me say to all the Members on this side who will be coming up, because of the large number of Members who would like to speak, we are asking if their remarks can be contained in the 5 minutes, because from this point on we will be unable to yield extra time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA), who is a new Member, but his mark has been made in agriculture and science.

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

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I come before this Chamber with a heavy heart, because I know that I am making one of the most difficult decisions in my life.

Like my colleagues in Congress and every American, I have debated whether unilateral military action in Iraq is the best thing to do. I have carefully weighed and considered all options. I pray to God that I am making the right decision.

I have not been able to sleep. I think about the mothers and fathers I have met who have asked me, how long will this war last? How many lives will be lost? Could our children be drafted? How many of those children will come back with deformities, with cancer or mental illness?

I think about our many sons and daughters that will be affected by our decision. I wonder how many will not make it home to their parents.

I think about the many veterans that already have served our Nation but still have not received access to the benefits of our country that has promised them that.

I think about the innocent Iraqi children who will be caught in the cross-fire.

I think about how this war could make us more suspicious of others based on the color of their skin.

I have talked to bishops, clergy, community leaders. All of my constituents have written and voiced their concern about the war. Is the price we will pay in lives worth the security we might gain by eliminating only one of countless threats? In our Nation's history, we have never fired the first shot, so why now?

One thing is clear: We must exhaust every alternative before we send our sons and daughters into harm's way. We all want to keep our families and our Nation safe from terrorists and weapons of mass destruction, but I also want to make sure that I can look into my children's eyes and tell them that we have done everything we can to avoid a war.

War should also be the last resort, not the first option. I do not believe the President has made the case clear to the American people that now is the best time, or that unilateral action is the best option.

That is why I will vote in favor of the Spratt substitute. The Spratt substitute supports the President's proposal for intrusive weapons inspections and still gives the President the power to use our military if Iraq refuses to comply.

Let me be clear: I support the President in his efforts to protect and defend this Nation, but we must do so with the support of the United Nations and the international community.

The Spratt amendment says that the President has to get congressional approval before he unilaterally invades Iraq. Does that not make sense? Should the President come to Congress before he leads this Nation into war? That is what our Constitution demands.

Like the rest of the Nation, I am concerned that Saddam Hussein could transfer weapons of mass destruction to terrorist organizations, but we must

not act in haste and not without the support of the United Nations and the world community. That is why I reluctantly will vote against H.R. 114.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make one thing clear: Do not confuse my vote against the resolution as a vote against our troops. As a veteran, as a Congressman, as a patriotic American, I stand 100 percent for our troops. I remember how our brave men and women were treated when they returned home from Vietnam. They were treated with scorn and hate. We must not repeat our mistakes of the past. Regardless of what we think of the war, we must all support our soldiers, and we should protect their lives by winning support of our allies.

Acting alone will increase our economic burden and leave us with few resources to rebuild Iraq. It would raise the question about the legitimacy of our action in the eyes of the world. It would create more instability in the region and turn a mere threat into our worst nightmare.

Mr. Speaker, has the Bush administration answered all of our questions? What will happen if we go to war and Saddam Hussein uses chemical or biological weapons against our troops?

Our troops must have the equipment and resources they need to fight the war. Do we know what Saddam will throw at us? That is why we must provide them with all possible protection and treatment and benefits they need.

When our children come back to us sick with cancer, horribly disfigured, we must not turn our backs on them or their families.

What will happen with this regime? We must make sure that a new Iraq is democratic and respects human rights. A post-Saddam Iraq must be a beacon of hope to the Arab world and not a tool of American foreign policy.

What effect will this have on our war on terrorism? Would going to war with Iraq add fuel to the fire of the war on terrorism?

What effects would this have on our economy? The Bush administration tries to paint a rosy picture of the state of our economy, but we have gone from a record surplus to crippling deficits. My constituents are concerned about their savings, their jobs, prescription drugs, Social Security, the schools. How will this war affect them?

The President must not forget the economic problems of the American people. I am placing my trust, and our country is placing its trust, in this President to heed these concerns.

I know the President's resolution will likely pass this body with little effort. I oppose it because more of our men and women will die if we go to war. I pray to God that I have made the right decision.

□ 2045

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY), a member of the Committee on Financial Services.

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

Mr. Speaker, over the last few weeks my constituents in St. Louis have made their opinions clear to me regarding the President's positions regarding Iraq, and I hear great opposition to war against Iraq. I hear mothers, fathers, seniors, college students and veterans opposing any action in the region. Their voices are black, white, Asian and Hispanic. And while the reasons for their opposition vary, the one common question they all seem to have is this: How does this conflict serve America's best interest?

I, along with many Americans, believe that the state of our sagging domestic economy has to be considered our Nation's greatest concern at this time. In the past year and a half this country has experienced increasing unemployment, growing national debt, tumbling economic growth, and a floundering stock market which has lost all consumer confidence.

Despite all this, our domestic issues have been pushed aside as we debate a possible preemptive attack against Iraq. Important issues like education, Social Security, unemployment, and affordable health care have been almost completely ignored by this diversion. Another question my constituents frequently ask is this: How will this war affect our young men and women serving in the Armed Forces?

When one looks at the make-up of our Armed Forces, African Americans make up more than 25 percent of the U.S. Army and over 38 percent of our Marine Corps. And since African Americans comprise more than 50 percent of my district, my constituents are justifiably concerned that instead of making their lives more secure, this war will likely expose them to even greater dangers.

Mr. Speaker, if my constituents are any gauge of the American public's concern regarding possible military action against Iraq, then I hope all Americans will contact their elected officials here in Congress at 202-225-3121 and voice their opposition to this resolution.

Neither my constituents nor I have forgotten September 11. We are still asking questions about the magnitude of this country's loss, but debating unprovoked unilateral action against a country whose ties to terrorism are suspect at best is not providing any answers. I for one believe that our military's top priority should be fighting al Qaeda and finishing the war against terrorism that we started in Afghanistan. Those who support this resolution have not yet come close to proving to me that Iraq represents a big enough military threat to take our focus off of bin Laden.

In addition, the stability of the Middle East is in danger. Jordan, Saudi Arabia, and Egypt would be subject to extreme internal pressure and unrest that would disrupt and threaten American interests in the region.

The concerns of my constituents echos voices heard more than 200 years ago. The men and women who founded our country imagined a Nation based on liberty and republican principals. One of these principals was that no country had the unilateral right to attack another without just cause. And President George Washington went so far as to suggest that America should keep its hands out of most foreign affairs. Washington stated, "The great rule of conduct for us in regards to foreign nations is in extending our commercial relation to have as little political connection as possible."

It appears that now, 200 years later, we have strayed quite far from our Founding Fathers' vision. And I cannot in good faith subject my constituents to this military conflict. I urge my fellow Members of Congress to also vote against this resolution.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), a member of the Committee on Government Reform.

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution, and I am opposed not because I do not believe that we need to protect our national security. I am not in opposition because Saddam Hussein does not need to be checkmated and stopped. And I am not opposed because I do not recognize the need for a strong military, and I am not in opposition because this resolution has been put forth by President Bush.

However, I am opposed because after all of the information I have seen and after all I have heard, neither am I or a majority of residents of my district, the Seventh Congressional District of Illinois, convinced that the war is our only and most immediate option. We are not convinced that every diplomatic action has been exhausted. Therefore, I am not convinced that this resolution would prevent us, the United States of America, from acting without agreement and involvement of the international community.

I oppose a unilateral first-strike action by the United States without a clearly demonstrated and imminent threat of attack against the United States. We are now asked to vote on a resolution which will likely culminate in a war with Iraq, a war which may involve the entire Mid East region.

As the American people are attempting to make sense of this complex situation, no one doubts the evil of the current Iraqi regime. No one doubts the eventuality that the United States would prevail in armed conflict with Iraq.

What then are the central issues which confront us? One, is there an immediate threat to the United States? In my judgment the answer is no. We have not received evidence of immediate danger. We have not received evidence that Iraq has the means to at-

tack the United States, and we have not received evidence that the danger is greater today than it was last year or the year before.

Two, will the use of military force against Iraq reduce or prevent the spread or use of weapons of mass destruction? In my judgment, the answer is no. All evidence is that Iraq does not possess nuclear weapons today. The use of chemical or biological weapons or the passage of such weapons to terrorist groups would be nothing less than suicide for the current Iraqi leadership. However, as the CIA reports have indicated, faced with invasion and certain destruction, there would be nothing for the Iraqi regime to lose by using or transferring any such weapons they may still possess. Other states in the region which fear they could be attacked next could be moved to rash action.

Finally, three, have we exhausted all nonmilitary options to secure the elimination of all weapons of mass destruction in Iraq in accordance with United Nations resolutions? In my judgment, the answer is no. We have not exhausted the potential for a collective action with our allies. We have not yet exhausted the potential for inspections and for a strict embargo on technologies which could be used for weapons of mass destruction. The use of armed force should be a last resort to be used only when all other options have failed.

In my judgment that commitment to the peaceful solution of problems and conflict is an important part of what our democracy should stand for, and that does not necessitate or demand invasion or an attack on Iraq at this time.

I was at church on Sunday and the pastor reminded us of Paul as he talked about our problems with Saddam Hussein. He reminded us that as Paul instructed the Philippians on how to deal with conflict, at one point he wrote to the Philippians, "Brethren, I count myself not to have apprehended, but this one thing I do, forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before. I press forth towards the mark for the prize of the high calling of Jesus Christ."

I trust, Mr. Speaker, that as we press forward, I trust that we will press forward towards the mark of a high calling, that we will take the high road, that we will take the road that leads to peace and not to war, the road that lets us walk by faith and not alone by sight or might. Let us, Mr. Speaker, walk by the Golden Rule. Let us do unto others as we would have them do unto us. Let us walk the road that leads to life and not to death and destruction. Let us walk the road to peace.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution, which authorizes the President of the United States to use armed forces of the United States against Iraq, and I am opposed to H.J. Res. 114, not because I don't believe we need to protect our national security, I am

not in opposition because Saddam Hussein does not need to be checkmated and stopped, I am not opposed because I don't recognize the need for a strong military, and I am not in opposition because this resolution has been put forth by President Bush.

However, I am opposed because after all the information that I have seen and after all that I have heard, neither am I, or a majority of the residents of my district, the 7th Congressional District of Illinois, convinced that war is our only and most immediate option. We are not convinced that every diplomatic action has been exhausted. Therefore, I am not convinced that this resolution will prevent us, the United States of America from acting without agreement and involvement of the international community. I oppose a unilateral first strike action by the United States without a clearly demonstrated and imminent threat of attack against the United States.

We are now being asked to vote on a resolution which will likely culminate in war with Iraq—a war which may involve the entire Mid-east region.

The American people are attempting to make sense of this complex situation. No one doubts the evil of the current Iraqi regime. No one doubts that eventually the United States would prevail in armed conflict with Iraq. What then are the central issues which confront.

(1) Is there an immediate threat to the United States?

In my judgment the answer is NO. We have not received evidence of immediate danger. We have not received evidence that Iraq has the means to attack the United States. We have not received evidence that the danger is greater today than it was last year or the year before.

(2) Will the use of military force against Iraq reduce or prevent the spread or use of Weapons of Mass Destruction?

In my judgment the answer is NO. All evidence is that Iraq does not possess nuclear weapons today. The use of chemical or biological weapons, or the passing of such weapons to terrorist groups would be nothing less than suicide for the current Iraqi leadership. As the CIA report has indicated we know that when backed up against the wall people sometimes lash out blindly and without careful thought.

(3) Have we exhausted all non-military options to secure the elimination of Weapons of Mass Destruction in Iraq in accordance with United Nations resolutions?

In my judgment, the answer is no. We have not exhausted the potential for collective action with our allies. We have not yet exhausted the potential for inspections and for a strict embargo on technologies which could be used for Weapons of Mass Destruction. The use of armed force should be a last resort, to be used only when all other options have failed. In my judgment, that commitment to the peaceful solution of problems and conflicts is an important part of what our Democracy should stand for, and that does not necessitate or demand invasion or an attack on Iraq at this time.

I was at church on Sunday and the pastor reminded us of Paul as he talked about our problems with Saddam Hussein. He reminded us that as Paul instructed the Philippians on how to deal with conflict—

Phillipians 3-13-14

Paul wrote to the Phillipians—

“Brethren, I count myself not to have apprehended, but this one thing I do, forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before.

I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Jesus Christ.”

I trust, Mr. Speaker, that as we press forward, I trust that we will press forward toward the mark of the high calling toward the high road, the road which leads to peace and not to war, the road that lets us walk by faith and not alone by sight or might. Let us, walk by the Golden Rule—let us do unto others as we would have them do unto us. Let us walk the road that leads to life and not to death and destruction. Let us walk the road that leads to peace. I urge a no vote on this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a “no” vote on this resolution.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND), a member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the Subcommittee on Energy and Health.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, all of us agree that Saddam Hussein is a bloodthirsty dictator and must be contained. But before we send young Americans into the deserts of Iraq, all diplomatic possibilities to avert war must be exhausted, and they have not been.

In times like these amid all of the swirling difference of opinion, what we need more than anything else is a good dose of common sense. Just today the Columbus Dispatch offered an editorial opinion which presents a commonsense approach to the challenge we face. I would like to share that editorial as a commonsense message from Ohio, the Heartland of America.

The editorial begins, “In his speech on Monday, President Bush made an excellent case for renewed United Nations weapons inspections in Iraq. He did not, however, make a case for war. Though the President continues to paint Iraq as an imminent threat to peace, he offered no new evidence to back that assessment. Iraq appears to be neither more nor less a threat than it was in 1998 when the last U.N. weapons inspectors left the country; nor does it appear to be a bigger threat than Iran, Libya or North Korea, all of whom are developing long-range missiles and weapons of mass destruction and are hostile to the United States.

The speech was a hodgepodge of half-plausible justifications for war with the President hoping that if he strings together enough weak arguments, they will somehow add up to a strong one. For example, the President failed to demonstrate any significant link between Iraqi dictator Saddam Hussein and the al Qaeda terrorism network. The truth is it would be far easier to demonstrate links between Iran and al Qaeda or Saudi Arabia and al Qaeda. But President Bush is not proposing military action against those states whose support for terrorism and terrorist organizations is practically overt. In fact, less than a day after the President's speech, CIA Director

George Tenet told Congress that Saddam apparently has a policy of not supporting terrorism against the United States.

The backhanded admission came as Tenet warned that Saddam might change his mind if he believes the United States is serious about attacking Iraq.

Next, the President cited the 11-year history of Iraqi attempts to deceive U.N. weapons inspectors as proof that inspectors have failed. But have they? For 11 years Saddam has not fielded a nuclear weapon, nor has he deployed any chemical or biological weapons. This suggests that in spite of Iraqi attempts to thwart inspectors, inspections have thwarted Saddam's ability to build the weapons he seeks.

The President also points out that removing Saddam from power would be a blessing to the people from Iraq who have endured his totalitarian boot on their necks for decades. This is true. Saddam idolizes Soviet dictator Josef Stalin and certainly will be skewered on an adjacent spit in hell. But if removing oppressive regimes justifies war, the United States is in for a long, long battle against half of the world that is ruled by bloodthirsty dictators.

The weaknesses of the President's arguments only heighten suspicions that the proposed attack on Iraq is intended to divert attention from the so-so progress of the genuine war on terrorism and the sputtering economy. Still, President Bush is correct to demand that the inspectors resume and that inspectors have unimpeded access to all Iraqi sites including the so-called presidential palaces. All diplomatic means now should be deployed to achieve that end.

□ 2100

As it stands, Iraq has agreed to re-admitting the inspectors, and the United Nations is preparing to send them in.

Sure, the United States and the United Nations have been down this road with Saddam before. But, last time, neither Washington nor the world community chose to do anything significant about it. There is time to give peaceful processes one more try. If, as many expect, Saddam intends to block the new inspections, the United States and the United Nations will have all the justifications they need for stronger measures; and at that point the President would have little problem in enlisting the support of the American people and the aid of the international community.

This concludes the editorial. And, Mr. Speaker, I stand today in support of the Spratt amendment because I cannot support H.J. Res. 114. We may have to eventually use military force to disarm Saddam Hussein, but this resolution is too open, too far-reaching. It is wrong. It should be rejected.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE)

be granted an additional 60 minutes, and that he be permitted to control the time and yield to other Members of our body.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYES). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from American Samoa?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), the second longest serving Democrat in the House and ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. CONYERS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) for yielding me this time, and I am proud to be a part of this discussion tonight.

Passage of a resolution authorizing the President to commence war at a time and place of his choosing would set a dangerous precedent and risk unnecessary death. The proposal of this resolution has already been called a grand diversion of America's political focus as elections approach. Worse, it would create a grand diversion of our already depleted resources, those that are so desperately needed for the pressing problems at home.

The American people are not bloodthirsty. We never want to go to war unless we have been convinced that it is absolutely necessary. That is as true of Americans whether in Maine or West Virginia or Texas or Michigan, whether they are black, brown or white, young or old, rich or poor. The mail and phone calls I have received have been overwhelmingly opposed to a preemptive attack against Iraq.

Is war necessary now? We keep coming back to one stubborn irrefutable fact: There is no imminent threat to our national security. The President has not made the case. Senators and Congressmen have emerged from countless briefings with the same question: Where is the beef? There is no compelling evidence that Iraq's capability and intentions regarding weapons of mass destruction threaten the U.S. now, nor has any member of the Bush administration, the Congress, the intelligence community shown evidence linking the al Qaeda attacks last year on New York and the Pentagon with either Saddam Hussein or Iraqi terrorists. Indeed, if President Bush had such proof of Iraq's complicity, he would need no further authorization to retaliate. That is the law. He could do so under the resolution we passed only 3 days after al Qaeda's infamous attacks.

What is it we do now about Iraq? We know Saddam is a ruthless ruler who will try to maintain power at all costs and who seeks to expand his weapons of

destruction. We have known that for some time. We do know that Iraq has some biological and chemical weapons, but none with a range to reach the United States.

Therefore, the President paints two scenarios:

The first is that Iraq would launch biological or chemical weapons against Israel, Arab allies, or our deployed forces. But during the Gulf War, Saddam did not do so. Why not? Because he knew he would be destroyed in retaliation, and we were not then threatening his destruction as President Bush is now doing. Thus, attacking Iraq will increase rather than decrease the likelihood of Saddam Hussein's launching whatever weapons he may have.

Now, under the administration's second scenario, Iraq would give weapons of destruction to al Qaeda, who might bring them to our shores. But that scenario, too, is not credible.

Perhaps the most significant intelligence assessment we have was revealed publicly only last night and has been raised repeatedly on the floor during this debate. The Central Intelligence Agency states that Iraq is unlikely to initiate chemical or biological attacks against the United States, and goes on to warn that "Should Saddam conclude that a U.S.-led attack could no longer be deterred, he might decide the extreme step of assisting Islamist terrorists in conducting a weapons of mass destruction attack against the United States would be his last chance to exact vengeance by taking a number of victims with him."

Passage of a resolution authorizing the President to commence war at a time and place of his choosing would set dangerous precedents and risk unnecessary death. The proposal of this resolution has already created a "grand diversion" of America's political focus as elections approach, and worse, it would create a "grand diversion" of our already depleted resources, so desperately needed for pressing problems at home.

The American people are not bloodthirsty. We never want to go to war, unless we have been convinced that it is absolutely necessary. That is as true of Americans whether in Maine, West Virginia, Texas or Michigan—whether they are black, brown or white; young or old, rich or poor. The mail and phone calls I receive have been overwhelmingly opposed to a pre-emptive attack against Iraq.

Is war necessary now? We keep coming back to one stubborn irrefutable fact: There is no imminent threat to our national security. The President has not made the case. Senators and Congressmen have emerged from countless briefings with the same question: "Where's the beef?" There is no compelling evidence that Iraq's capability and intentions regarding weapons of mass destruction threaten the U.S. now. Nor has any member of the Bush Administration, the Congress or the intelligence community shown evidence linking the Al Qaeda attacks last year on New York City, and the Pentagon with either Saddam Hussein or Iraqi terrorists. Indeed, if President Bush had such proof of Iraq's complicity, he would need no further authorization to retaliate. He

could do so under the resolution we passed only three days after Al Qaeda's infamous attacks.

What is it that we do now about Iraq? We know Saddam is a ruthless ruler who will try to maintain power at all costs and who seeks to expand his weapons of destruction. We have known that for some time. We do know that Iraq has some biological and chemical weapons, but none with range to reach the U.S. Therefore, President Bush paints two scenarios:

The first is that Iraq would launch biological or chemical weapons against Israel, Arab allies or our deployed forces. But during the Gulf War, Saddam did not do so. Why not? Because he knew he would be destroyed in retaliation, and we were not then threatening his destruction, as President Bush is now doing. Thus, attacking Iraq will increase rather than decrease the likelihood of Saddam Hussein's launching whatever weapons he does have.

Under the Administration's second scenario, Iraq would give weapons of destruction to Al Qaeda, who might bring them to our shores. But that scenario, too, is not credible. Perhaps the most significant intelligence assessment we have is one revealed publicly only last night. The CIA states that Iraq is unlikely to initiate chemical or biological attack against the U.S., and goes on to warn that, and I quote:

Should Saddam conclude that a U.S.-led attack could no longer be deterred, [Hussein might] decide that the extreme step of assisting Islamist terrorist in conducting a [weapons of mass destruction] attack against the United States would be his last chance to exact vengeance by taking a number of victims with him.

In other words, the CIA warns that an attack on Iraq could well provoke the very tragedy the President claims he is trying to forestall—Saddam's use of chemical or biological weapons.

President Bush and his supporters now cite some "evidence of contacts between Al Qaeda representatives and Baghdad." So what? We have had high level contracts with North Korea, Afghanistan when the Taliban ruled it, and other ruthless despots. That did not mean we were allies. The intelligence community has confirmed that Al Qaeda and Saddam's secular Baathist regime are enemies. As a religious fanatic, Bin Laden has been waging underground war against the secular governments of Iraq, Egypt, Syria and the military rulers of other Arabic countries. Saddam would be very unlikely to give such dangerous weapons to a group of radical terrorists who might see fit to turn them against Iraq.

We are fairly certain that Iraq currently has no nuclear weapons. Even with the best luck in obtaining enriched uranium or plutonium, the official intelligence estimate is that Iraq will not have them for some time. If Iraq must produce its own fissile material, it would take three to five years, according to those estimates. In a futile effort to mirror the prudent approach of President Kennedy during the Cuban Missile Crisis, President Bush recently released satellite photographs of buildings, as evidence that Saddam has resumed a nuclear weapons development. This is hardly headline news. We knew that he had resumed them.

Another thing we know is that:

Iraq's vast oil reserves have been a major tool in the Administration's pressuring other countries to support our rush to war against their better judgment; and

Those oil reserves will be controlled and allocated by the U.S. if we install or bless a new regime in Baghdad.

These implications are explored in an excellent Washington Post article, which I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD immediately following remarks. Let me read just two paragraphs here:

A U.S.-led ouster of Iraqi President Saddam Hussein could open up a bonanza for American oil companies long banished from Iraq, scuttling oil deals between Baghdad and Russia, France and other countries, and reshuffling world petroleum markets, according to industry officials and leaders of the Iraqi opposition.

Although senior Bush administration officials say that they have not begun to focus on the issues involving oil and Iraq, American and foreign oil companies have already begun maneuvering for a stake in the country's huge proven reserves of 112 billion barrels of crude oil, the largest in the world outside Saudi Arabia.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a discernible and disconcerting rhythm to the Administration's arguments. Every time one of their claims has been rebutted, they have reverted to the mantra that, after September 11, 2001, the whole world has changed. Indeed it has. But they cannot wave that new international landscape like a magic wand in order to transform Iraq into an imminent threat to the United States when it is not.

Moreover, discussing whether Iraq presents such a threat only deals with half of the equation before us. What are all the costs of war? While Iraq poses no imminent threat to us, unleashing war against Iraq would pose many terrible threats to America.

It would dilute our fight against Al Qaeda terrorists. That is why families of the victims of "9/11" have angrily told me and some of you that they oppose a pre-emptive war precisely because it would undermine our war on terrorism. Administration assurances that war against Iraq would not dilute our war on terrorism are pleasing, but cannot change the facts. Space satellites, aircraft, ships and special forces simply cannot be in two places at the same time.

America's attacking Iraq alone would ignite a firestorm of anti-American fervor in the Middle East and Muslim world and breed thousands of new potential terrorists.

As we see in Afghanistan, there would be chaos and inter-ethnic conflict following Saddam's departure. A post-war agreement among them to cooperate peacefully in a new political structure would not be self-executing. Iraq would hardly become overnight a shining "model democracy" for the Middle East. We would need a U.S. peacekeeping force and nation-building efforts there for years. Our soldiers and aid workers could be targets for retribution and terrorism.

America has never been an aggressor nation. If we violate the U.N. Charter and unilaterally assault another country when it is not yet a matter of necessary self-defense, then we will set a dangerous precedent, paving the way for any other nation that chooses to do so, too, including those with nuclear weapons such as India and Pakistan and China.

We will trigger an arms-race of nations accelerating and expanding their efforts to de-

velop weapons of destruction, so that they can deter "pre-emptive" hostile action by the U.S. Do we really want to open this Pandora's box?

Mr. Speaker, of all the consequences I fear, perhaps the most tragic is that war, plus the need to rebuild Iraq, would cost billions of dollars badly needed at home. For millions of Americans, the biggest threat to their security is the lack of decent wage jobs, health insurance or affordable housing for their families. Senior citizens having to choose between buying enough food and buying prescription drugs is an imminent threat. Unemployment reaching 6 million people is an imminent threat to America's well-being. Forty-one million American without health insurance is an imminent threat.

The huge cost of war and nation building, which will increase our deficit, along with the impact of the likely sharp rise in oil prices, will deal a double-barreled blow to our currently fragile economy.

What then should we do at this time? We should face the many clear and present dangers that threaten us here at home; we should seek peaceful resolution of our differences with Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD an article from the Washington Post from Sunday, September 15, 2002.

[From The Washington Post, Sept. 15, 2002]

IN IRAQI WAR SCENARIO, OIL IS KEY ISSUE

(By Dan Morgan and David B. Ottaway)

A U.S.-led ouster of Iraqi President Saddam Hussein could open a bonanza for American oil companies long banished from Iraq, scuttling oil deals between Baghdad and Russia, France and other countries, and reshuffling world petroleum markets, according to industry officials and leaders of the Iraqi opposition.

Although senior Bush administration officials say they have not begun to focus on the issues involving oil and Iraq, American and foreign oil companies have already begun maneuvering for a stake in the country's huge proven reserves of 112 billion barrels of crude oil, the largest in the world outside Saudi Arabia.

The importance of Iraq's oil has made it potentially one of the administration's biggest bargaining chips in negotiations to win backing from the U.N. Security Council and Western allies for President Bush's call for tough international action against Hussein. All five permanent members of the Security Council—the United States, Britain, France, Russia and China—have international oil companies with major stakes in a change of leadership in Baghdad.

"It's pretty straightforward," said former CIA director R. James Woolsey, who has been one of the leading advocates of forcing Hussein from power. "France and Russia have oil companies and interests in Iraq. They should be told that if they are of assistance in moving Iraq toward decent government, we'll do the best we can to ensure that the new government and American companies work closely with them.

But he added: "If they throw in their lot with Saddam, it will be difficult to the point of impossible to persuade the new Iraqi government to work with them."

Indeed, the mere prospect of a new Iraqi government has fanned concerns by non-American oil companies that they will be excluded by the United States, which almost certainly would be the dominant foreign power in Iraq in the aftermath of Hussein's fall. Representatives of many foreign oil concerns have been meeting with leaders of the Iraqi opposition to make their case for a fu-

ture stake and to sound them out about their intentions.

Since the Persian Gulf War in 1991, companies from more than dozen nations, including France, Russia, China, India, Italy, Vietnam and Algeria, have either reached or sought to reach agreements in principle to develop Iraqi oil fields, refurbish existing facilities or explore undeveloped tracts. Most of the deals are on hold until the lifting of U.N. sanctions.

But Iraqi opposition officials made clear in interviews last week that they will not be bound by any of the deals.

"We will review all these agreements, definitely," said Faisal Qaragholi, a petroleum engineer who directs the London office of the Iraqi National Congress (INC), an umbrella organization of opposition groups that is backed by the United States. "Our oil policies should be decided by a government in Iraq elected by the people."

Ahmed Chalabi, the INC leader, went even further, saying he favored the creation of a U.S.-led consortium to develop Iraq's oil fields, which have deteriorated under more than a decade of sanctions. "American companies will have a big shot at Iraq," Chalabi said.

The INC, however, said it has not taken a formal position on the structure of Iraq's oil industry in event of a change of leadership.

While the Bush administration's campaign against Hussein is presenting vast possibilities for multi-national oil giants, it poses major risks and uncertainties for the global oil market, according to industry analysts.

Access to Iraqi oil and profits will depend on the nature and intentions of a new government. Whether Iraq remains a member of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries, for example, or seeks an independent role, free of the OPEC cartel's quotas, will have an impact on oil prices and the flow of investments to competitors such as Russia, Venezuela and Angola.

While Russian oil companies such as Lukoil have a major financial interest in developing Iraqi fields, the low prices that could result from a flood of Iraqi oil into world markets could set back Russian government efforts to attract foreign investment in its untapped domestic fields. That is because low world oil prices could make costly ventures to unlock Siberia's oil treasures far less appealing.

Bush and Vice President Cheney have worked in the oil business and have longstanding ties to the industry. But despite the buzz about the future of Iraqi oil among oil companies, the administration, preoccupied with military planning and making the case about Hussein's potential threat, has yet to take up the issue in a substantive way, according to U.S. officials.

The Future of Iraq Group, a task force set up at the State Department, does not have oil on its list of issues, a department spokesman said last week. An official with the National Security Council declined to say whether oil had been discussed during consultations on Iraq that Bush has had over the past several weeks with Russian President Vladimir Putin and Western leaders.

On Friday, a State Department delegation concluded a three-day visit to Moscow in connection with Iraq. In early October, U.S. and Russian officials are to hold an energy summit in Houston, at which more than 100 Russian and American energy companies are expected.

Rep. Curt Weldon (R-Pa.) said Bush is keenly aware of Russia's economic interests in Iraq, stemming from a \$7 billion to \$8 billion debt that Iraq ran up with Moscow before the Gulf War. Weldon, who has cultivated close ties to Putin and Russian parliamentarians, said he believed the Russian

leader will support U.S. action in Iraq if he can get private assurances from Bush that Russia "will be made whole" financially.

Officials of the Iraqi National Congress said last week that the INC's Washington director, Entifadh K. Qanbar, met with Russian Embassy officials here last month and urged Moscow to begin a dialogue with opponents of Hussein's government.

But even with such groundwork, the chances of a tidy transition in the oil sector appear highly problematic. Rival ethnic groups in Iraq's north are already squabbling over the giant Kirkuk oil field, which Arabs, Kurds and minority Turkmen tribesmen are eyeing in the event of Hussein's fall.

Although the volumes have dwindled in recent months, the United States was importing nearly 1 million barrels of Iraqi oil a day at the start of the year. Even so, American oil companies have been banished from direct involvement in Iraq since the late 1980s, when relations soured between Washington and Baghdad.

Hussein in the 1990s turned to non-American companies to repair fields damaged in the Gulf War and Iraq's earlier war against Iran, and to tap undeveloped reserves, but U.S. government studies say the results have been disappointing.

While Russia's Lukoil negotiated a \$4 billion deal in 1997 to develop the 15-billion-barrel West Qurna field in southern Iraq, Lukoil had not commenced work because of U.N. sanctions. Iraq has threatened to void the agreement unless work began immediately.

Last October, the Russian oil services company Slavneft reportedly signed a \$52 million service contract to drill at the Tuba field, also in southern Iraq. A proposed \$40 billion Iraqi-Russian economic agreement also reportedly includes opportunities for Russian companies to explore for oil in Iraq's western desert.

The French company Total Fina Elf has negotiated for rights to develop the huge Majnoon field, near the Iranian border, which may contain up to 30 billion barrels of oil. But in July 2001, Iraq announced it would no longer give French firms priority in the award of such contracts because of its decision to abide by the sanctions.

Officials of several major firms said they were taking care to avoid playing any role in the debate in Washington over how to proceed on Iraq. "There's no real upside for American oil companies to take a very aggressive stance at this stage. There'll be plenty of time in the future," said James Lucier, an oil analyst with Prudential Securities.

But with the end of sanctions that likely would come with Hussein's ouster, companies such as ExxonMobil and ChevronTexaco would almost assuredly play a role, industry officials said. "There's not an oil company out there that wouldn't be interested in Iraq," one analyst said.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER), a member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and a strong fighter for the environment.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution to grant unilateral authority to the President of the United States for a preemptive strike on Iraq. I cannot believe that the Members of this body are ceding our constitutional authority to this President. And they can give me all the fancy whereases and phrases, and put on the fig leaves, and write all the report language they want, but this is a blank

check. This is a Gulf of Tonkin resolution. This is a violation not only of our Constitution but will lead to a violation of the United Nations Charter.

Wake up, my colleagues. Why would anyone vote to do that? That is not our constitutional responsibility. And when we vote on this resolution, will America be more safe? No, I think America will be less safe. We will dilute the war against terrorism. The destabilization of the area will lead to the increased probability of terrorists getting nuclear weapons, say, in Pakistan. The al Qaeda are probably cheering the passage of this resolution. Now is their chance to get more weapons.

We should not risk American lives. We should be working with the United Nations. We should get the inspectors in there. We should disarm Saddam Hussein. And if they cannot do their work, if the U.N. authorizes force, we will be a much stronger and efficient force working with the United Nations.

Imminent threat. There is an imminent threat. I will tell my colleagues what the imminent threat is, it is our failing economy and the rising unemployment. It is kids not getting a quality education. It is 401(k)s that are down to zero. It is corporate theft. It is the obscene cost of prescription drugs. That is the imminent threat to America, Mr. Speaker. That is what we ought to be working on here.

I have heard all my colleagues on the other side of this issue calling us appeasers, those who are going to vote against this resolution. We are wishful thinkers. We have our eyes closed. We sit on our hands. And, of course, that phrase, the risk of inaction is greater than the risk of action.

No one on this side, Mr. Speaker, is suggesting inaction. Making peace is hard work. Just ask Martin Luther King, Jr. Ask Ghandi. Ask Norman Mandela. They were not appeasers. They were not inactive. They were peacemakers. And they changed the history of this world.

So let us not hear talk of appeasement. Let us not hear talk that we favor inaction. We want action for peace in this world, and we want the United States to be part of that action.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, there is a whiff of Vietnam in the air. I had a constituent call me and say, "You know, if you enjoyed Vietnam, you are really going to love Iraq." The mail is running 10 to 1 against this war. Protests have already begun around the Nation and around the world.

I say to the President, of course through the Speaker, that you came to office as a uniter, not a divider. Yet we are going round the road of division in this Nation. You can see it, you can smell it, you can hear it, and we are going to hear more.

Let us not go down this road, Mr. President. Rethink this policy. A country divided over war is not a country that is going to make any progress. Let us have a rethinking of this resolution. Let us not vote for a preemptive uni-

lateral strike. Let us work through the United Nations. Let us become a peace-making Nation. Let us vote "no" on this resolution.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD), a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, like my colleagues of both parties and in both Chambers and as the wife of a Vietnam veteran, the national debate on whether or not to go to war with Iraq and under what circumstances has weighed heavily on my mind and my heart. For, clearly, sending the young men and women of our Armed Forces into harm's way is one of the most serious and far-reaching decisions a Member of Congress will ever have to make.

Like all Americans, I take pride in the fact that we are a peaceful Nation but one that will defend itself if needed against real and imminent dangers. Like all Americans, I take very seriously our responsibilities as the world's global superpower and realize how our words and actions can have huge repercussions throughout the world.

For that reason, I attended meetings and studied the materials provided us. I have listened to the administration, my constituents, my colleagues on both sides of the issue, both sides of the aisle, and both sides of the Congress; and I remain deeply concerned about our march to war without a supportive coalition or a clear and moral justification.

Before making a final decision on my vote, I also asked myself, as a wife and mother, what would I want our Nation's leaders to do before sending my son, my daughter, any loved one to war? While I support our President's efforts to keep our Nation and our world safe, I firmly believe the President has not made the case for granting him far-reaching power to declare preemptive and unilateral war against Iraq.

There is no question that Saddam Hussein is a dangerous and unconscionable dictator with little regard for human life, and there is no question that he must be disarmed and removed from power. The facts presented thus far, however, do not support the premise that Saddam Hussein is an immediate danger to our country.

It is for that reason that I believe it is in the best interest of our Nation and our American troops to make every possible effort now to prevent war by exhausting diplomatic efforts, by giving the U.N. weapons inspectors the resources and opportunity to perform their work, and by establishing a U.N. Security Council multilateral coalition to use force, if necessary.

□ 2115

If that fails, the President can then bring his case to Congress on the need for a unilateral preemptive strike against Iraq. At this time, however, a blank check authorization for military force is not acceptable.

I cannot, therefore, in good conscience support the administration's request for a near *carte blanche* authority to wage war when the case to do so has not been justified.

I will, however, support the resolutions of my colleagues, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

The Lee resolution urges Congress to work with the United Nations using all peaceful means possible to resolve the issue of Iraqi weapons of mass destruction.

The Spratt resolution includes similar requirements with regards to the United Nations but also authorizes the use of force if the U.N. efforts fail. The Spratt resolution brings responsibility and accountability to our effort to protect our country from Saddam Hussein, and it makes the administration and the Congress partners in any military action against Iraq.

The Spratt proposal honors our Nation's fundamental system of checks and balances. It makes it possible for me to say to my constituents and our Nation's sons and daughters, including my stepson who proudly serves in the U.S. Army, I did everything in my power to keep you from harm's way.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT), a member of the Committee on the Judiciary and a constitutional expert.

(Mr. WATT of North Carolina asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Article I of the United States Constitution states that the Congress shall have power to declare war. Article II of the Constitution provides that the President shall be the Commander-in-Chief. Over the years, these provisions of the Constitution have been the subject of a virtually endless tug of war between the legislative branch and the executive branch, as well as the subject of virtually endless debate among constitutional scholars.

In general I believe, and many constitutional scholars agree, that these two provisions reserve to Congress the sole authority to declare war when there is time for Congress to make a deliberative determination to invade another country and allow the President, as Commander-in-Chief to engage the United States in war only in response to an attack upon the United States or its citizens or in the event of direct and imminent threat of such an attack.

I believe the resolution before us today crosses the line, delegating to the President the authority our Constitution gives solely to Congress. While we most certainly may delegate our authority, to do so would, in my opinion, be an abdication of our responsibility as Members of Congress.

If, as the President asserted in his speech to the American people, an imminent threat exists, it seems to me

that this resolution is unnecessary. There is ample precedent for the President to act under those circumstances without a declaration of war or of authorization from Congress. No such imminent threat has been shown to exist.

Of course, Saddam Hussein is a thug and probably all the other things he has been called in the course of this debate. That, however, does not mean that Iraq poses any imminent threat that would justify the President proceeding to war without authorization from Congress.

Further, nothing the President said in his speech and nothing I have seen apart from his speech has led me to conclude that we should be delegating to the President the authority the Constitution gives to Congress, certainly not in the one-step manner in which the resolution we are considering would do. Nor do I believe that refusing to give that authority over to the President places the United States in any imminent danger.

If the President and the United States fail in their efforts to have Iraq comply with U.N. resolutions and if the President fails in his efforts to mobilize a coalition of nations in support of the United States, I believe that would be the appropriate time for the Congress to consider the advisability of declaring war.

This resolution, instead, requires us to make that decision today by delegating the decision to the President without the authority to bring it back to us. To do so now, in fact, would put us ahead of the President since he insisted in his speech that he had not yet decided whether war is necessary.

Unfortunately, despite the President's assurance, the contents of the President's speech left me with the sinking feeling that giving him a blank check to invade Iraq without seeking further authorization from Congress will virtually assure war. In my opinion, war should always be the last resort and in this case will almost certainly increase, not decrease, the risk of biological, chemical, or other terrorist retaliations. In fact, that is exactly what the CIA told Senator LEVIN in testimony in the Senate.

We are called upon, as Members of Congress and as citizens of the world, to ask ourselves today, where and when would it end? The risks are too great to proceed to war without a satisfactory answer to that question and without pursuing every conceivable peaceful option short of war.

For these reasons, I will vote against the resolution; and I encourage my colleagues to vote against it, too.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE).

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman who attended the same alma mater I attended in Cleveland Heights, Ohio, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I have to admit to a great deal of confusion tonight. A num-

ber of my colleagues are convinced that war is the only action; some believe it should never be an option; and most, I think, join with me and think that it should be an issue of last resort.

Like most of my colleagues, I have received volumes of mail from my constituents, and their opinions mirror the confusion which exists in this body tonight.

What troubles me is I have heard members of my party indicate in the press that the issue of war with Iraq has sucked the air out of Democratic message; and, sadly, I have heard Members on the other side of the aisle complain of the same thing.

The thought that this issue where we are talking about certain casualties, Iraqi, American, and those of our coalition partners, that those would be used for an advantage by either side in midterm elections is repugnant to me and the people I represent in Ohio.

When I have an 84-year-old Republican grandmother in Ashtabula, Ohio, grab my arm and say, Congressman, we have never attacked another sovereign country in our history without first being attacked, I am moved.

When I hear former Prime Minister Netanyahu tell our Committee on Government Reform that Israel has dealt with terrorists like Saddam Hussein since 1948, and if you do not get him, he will get you, I am moved as well.

At the end of it all, I will say that I have concluded if we were on the floor of this House on September 10, 2001, and we knew what we know today, every Member in this body, Republican and Democrat, would do whatever it took to protect the people of this Republic, and we should do that tonight.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), a member of the Committee on Appropriations and an environmentalist.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight on the issue of war with Iraq. I rise not only as a House Member from California, but as a father and about-to-be grandfather, and as a person who in his youth responded to a call for action by serving in the United States Peace Corps.

I have to ask myself in casting the votes before us, what is the best way to achieve peace in Iraq, not only for its own diverse ethnic people living in Iraq, but also for the people in the rest of the world?

The House leadership has adopted a closed rule on the debate so only three resolutions can be voted on. I think the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) has the preferred alternative because it speaks to the issue of putting all our efforts into working with the world community through the United Nations Security Council to get inspectors into Iraq. We should let that process run its course before determining that it will fail.

The Lee resolution calls upon the United States to “work through the United Nations to seek to resolve the matter of insuring that Iraq is not developing weapons of mass destruction through mechanisms such as resumption of weapons inspectors, negotiation, inquiry, mediation, regional arrangements and other peaceful means.”

The President has done a good job in making the point that the U.N. Security Council must resolve the Iraq violation of U.N. resolutions. He should have stopped there, using all of the power of the President of the United States, the State Department, the Commerce Department, and the Department of Defense to help the U.N. inspectors into Iraq but not to threaten war. Why? Because, first, according to the U.N. Charter, only the U.N. Security Council has the power to enforce U.N. resolutions.

I find it ironic that the President who seems to be committed to holding Iraq accountable to the U.N. is requesting an authorization that circumvents the Security Council and runs counter to the authority of the U.N. Charter.

Second, the people’s House should not give a blank check to declare war to the President of the United States. According to Article I Section 8 of the Constitution, Congress is given the power to declare war. The President is asking Congress to abrogate its constitutional responsibility. The President’s resolution authorizes him to use force as he determines to be necessary. This is not the responsibility of the President. The President is the Commander-in-Chief. He shall execute as determined by Congress.

The Constitution clearly makes a separation of powers to stop the President from going on foreign adventures without the express consent of the American people.

Third, I think leaping into war before we get all of the facts could threaten world security, especially our own. Think about it. Striking preemptively without gathering sufficient intelligence will put U.S. troops in harm’s way. We need U.N. inspectors in Iraq to gather information.

How will the U.S. military carry out surgical strikes of Iraq weapons depots and laboratories if it does not know where these facilities are? We need to know how many weapons Iraq has and what types of weapons. Striking before knowing creates an unintended consequence which could further threaten the world.

□ 2130

A preemptive strike will set an extremely damaging precedent to the future of international affairs. The U.S. will entirely lose its moral authority on preventing conflict. What will we say if Russia moves to attack Georgia, if China invades Taiwan, if India or Pakistan makes a decisive move into Kashmir? Lastly, a unilateral attack could alienate the U.S. from the rest of the world community including our

traditional allies, our allies in the region, and our new allies in the war against terrorism. Far from strengthening the U.N., a unilateral strike before the U.N. acts will undermine the international body and lead the world to believe that the U.S. views the U.N. as a rubber stamp at best.

A unilateral attack makes it less likely that the rest of the international community will support the U.S. in postconflict reconstruction of Iraq. The U.S. will bear most of the costs if not all the costs of the war and postwar, and remember the Persian Gulf War cost approximately \$70 billion. Our allies paid all but \$7 billion, which the U.S. took responsibility for. This new war against Iraq is estimated to cost between 100 and \$200 billion. If we go it alone, the U.S. will have to pay it all. What will happen to other priorities? What will happen to Social Security, to Medicare, to education? Will we have enough resources to spend on our domestic priorities?

Last, let us not forget that the power we have as Members of Congress is to cast these important votes from the consent of the people. My constituents have responded 5,000 to 24, approximately two to one.

If one has to vote, let us vote on the side of peace before we vote on the side of war.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. RIVERS), a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce and a spokesperson for women.

Ms. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the resolution before us. There is a saying in the practice of law that tough cases make bad law. I believe that that is also true in the creation of laws and history tells us that when we are frightened and angry we are also more likely to make bad law.

I believe we are poised today to approve some very bad law and tread on some very important principles as we do it. While I share the concerns raised by many of my colleagues regarding the lack of substance in the administration’s arguments, I am most concerned about the damage this proposal would do to our Constitution. James Madison wrote: “In no part of the Constitution is more wisdom to be found than in the clause which confides the question of war or peace to the legislature and not to the executive department . . . The trust and the temptation would be too great for any one man.”

The Founding Fathers were explicit that the awesome power to commit the United States people and resources to waging of war should lie not with a single individual but rather in the collective judgment of the Congress. It was the hope of the Founders that reserving this decision to Congress would in fact make it harder to move the country to war. I applaud that sentiment. Historians note that Congress exclusively possesses the constitutional power to initiate war, whether declared

or undeclared, public or private, perfect or imperfect, de jure or defacto, with the only exception being the President’s power to respond self-defensively to sudden direct attack upon the United States. There is no constitutionally recognized authorized use of force.

In the book “War, Foreign Affairs and Constitutional Power,” Abraham Sofaer points out that the Constitution says Congress shall declare war, and it seems unreasonable to contend that the President was given the power to make undeclared war. He concludes that nothing in the framing or ratification debates gives the President as Commander in Chief an undefined reservoir of power to use the military in situations unauthorized by Congress.

The U.S. Constitution requires the expressed declaration of war by Congress to execute any military operations in Iraq. Authorizing military action is our job, not the President’s. We, not he, must determine when and if the fearsome power of our country should be turned to war. I understand the political and military risks associated with sending Americans into harm’s way, but fear of public reaction does not justify the dereliction of Congress’s constitutional duty. Similarly, the fact that many Presidents and Congresses over the years have engaged in the unconstitutional transfer of war powers does not make our obligation any less binding. Congress is not free to amend the Constitution through avoidance of its duties, and a President is not free to take constitutional power through adverse possession.

The Congressional Research Service points out that the power to commence even limited acts of war against another nation belongs exclusively to Congress. We may not shirk this responsibility. We may not abdicate it, and we may not pretend it does not exist. We must meet our constitutional obligation to decide if or when America will go to war, whether our sons and daughters should be put in harm’s way, and whether the country’s purse should be opened to pay a bill as high as \$200 billion. This decision cannot be handed over to the President. If the Founding Fathers had wanted that, they would have explicitly provided so in the Constitution. They did not.

Should the United States go to war with Iraq? I do not believe the case has been made to do so. Can the Congress leave it to the President to decide whether or not we should attack Iraq? Any such transfer of congressional authority to the President is forbidden by the Constitution and would move us toward an upset of the delicate balance of powers between the Congress and the United States.

I urge my colleagues to exercise great care as we consider these questions. Tough cases can make for very bad law. Let us not let them make us trample very good laws that have existed since the dawn of the Republic. Vote “no.”

Mr. FALCOMA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. SANDLIN), a senior member of the House Committee on Financial Services.

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

Mr. Speaker, we are poised today on the brink of armed conflict, not knowing what the future may hold but confident in our position and in our resolve. We sincerely pray that war is not necessary. We realize that it may be. These closing hours and minutes of the 107th Congress may be our last chance for true and meaningful debate and deliberation. Can we as a reasonable people, supported by the international community, avoid the horrors of war, the stench of death, or rather does the protection of our country and the belief of the unalienable rights of all people, does common human decency require us to press forward in the face of certain American casualties?

Two questions face the American people: Is Iraq's threat imminent? Is an unprecedented first strike the proper course to take? On a positive note, the President has indicated that approval of the resolution does not mean war is imminent or unavoidable. Additionally the U.S. has indicated support for a three-pronged resolution: number one, Iraq must reveal and destroy all weapons of mass destruction under U.N. supervision; two, witnesses must be allowed to be interviewed outside of Iraq; and, thirdly, any site the U.N. wants to inspect must be open without delay, without preclearance, without restriction, without exception. These are reasonable and rational rules that are required to maintain international peace. Absent Iraqi compliance, it appears necessary to vest in the President the flexibility and authority to protect the American public and international community by military action if necessary.

But there is also a responsibility to exhaust all other options prior to risking the lives of young American sons and daughters. That is why we must use the most powerful military weapon that we have, diplomacy. That is why we must use all resources at our disposal to encourage the international community to pressure Hussein into compliance. But if all reasonable efforts fail, we must answer our duty to ensure the security of our country and those that we represent.

Certainly questions remain. It is particularly important to have a clear goal, a clear plan, and a clear exit strategy when American lives are at risk. Additionally, the President must address the issue of sacrifice. There is no short-term solution to the long-term problem, and there will be a cost to be paid in dollars and in American lives lost.

Presently, another cost is being assessed, the cost of waiting, the cost of allowing Saddam Hussein to build an international killing force, the cost of

world instability. As the President has indicated, the riskiest of all options is to wait.

So let us exhaust all diplomatic efforts. Let us make every reasonable effort to avoid conflict. But at the end of the day we may be called on to make a tremendous sacrifice by using our might to preserve what is right. Our cause is clearly just. Our responsibility is clear. We will have to walk by faith and not by sight, trusting that in the end we will choose the right course.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS), a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

(Ms. SOLIS asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, there is no matter that comes before this Congress that is more serious than whether or not our Nation should enter into war. The implications of such a decision are so profound and will have worldwide impact. It could jeopardize U.S. relations with countries around the world. It would escalate the vulnerability of our Nation to a biological and chemical attack. And, of course, its most painful and lasting impact would be on the many American families who watch their sons and daughters go to war only to never see them again and maybe even return with lifetime illnesses.

This is not a decision that I take lightly. I recognize the gravity of it. And this is why I remain concerned about the timing of this resolution of the President's effort to send troops into Iraq. I do not doubt that Saddam Hussein is a menace to the United States and to the world and even to his own people. I echo concerns that we must ensure greater security for our people here at home and abroad. But I cannot support authorizing our President to send troops in harm's way without the support of our allies and concrete compelling evidence of imminent or nuclear threats that demand military action. We must eliminate weapons of mass destruction and the threat they pose to our Nation and others around the world. But unilateral military action against Iraq or any other foreign nation is not the most effective short-term strategy to accomplish this goal.

Over 90 percent of the calls that I received in my own district tell me that they are opposed to this war. They ask, What is the rush, Congresswoman? Why is it that we have to take action so immediate? They want to know why we cannot wait for the support of the U.N. and our allies. Some of these calls have come from my very own veterans in my district, many who have already made the ultimate sacrifices through their families, many of them who look like me and speak Spanish and are of Hispanic decent. They understand the extreme price of war and caution against using force without first gathering ally

support and using diplomatic means to find peace. They also recognize the implications that a war would have on our community, and I represent a largely Hispanic community.

Our military is a volunteer force. Most often it is the people of low-income families that answer that call to duty to serve our Nation. The young men and women on the frontlines would disproportionately be Latino, African American, and people of color. These communities will lose so much if the U.S. attacks Iraq.

I am concerned about the price of the war. It has been estimated that the cost of this war against Iraq would be between 100 and \$200 billion. How is the U.S. going to pay for this war? We are always told that we cannot afford a prescription drug benefit plan, that we cannot extend unemployment insurance to workers laid off after the wake of September 11. We need to think about these costs before we rush into a war, and we should exhaust tough, rigorous U.N. inspections before going into war. We should seek support from the U.N. Security Council. As the first President Bush's advisers of Operation Desert Storm have warned, by attacking Iraq we give Saddam Hussein both the excuse and the incentive to use the biological and chemical weapons that he already has.

I oppose this resolution and urge my colleagues to give serious consideration on this crucial matter.

Mr. FALCOMA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), my good friend.

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

□ 2145

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, for 2 days Members have marched to the floor to offer their support for or opposition to this resolution, good Americans every one. Soon the hours of debate will come to an end. The House Chamber has echoed with the sentiments of almost every Member. Yet, many questions remain unanswered.

To be sure, there is one thing we all agree upon: Saddam Hussein is a tyrant, is a threat. He is the epitome of malevolence. Plato must have had visions of Hussein, a Hussein character, when he described evil in *The Allegory of the Cave*.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD *The Allegory of the Cave* from Plato's Republic.

The material referred to is as follows:

[From Plato's Republic]

THE ALLEGORY OF THE CAVE

And now, I said, let me show in a figure how far our nature is enlightened or unenlightened. Behold! human beings living in an underground den, which has a mouth open towards the light and reaching all along the den; here they have been from their childhood, and have their legs and necks chained so that they cannot move, and can only see before them, being prevented by the chains from turning round their heads.

Above and behind them a fire is blazing at a distance, and between the fire and the prisoners there is a raised way; and you will see, if you look, a low wall built along the way, like the screen which marionette players have in front of them, over which they show the puppets.

I see, he said.

And do you see, I said, men passing along the wall carrying all sorts of vessels, and statutes and figures of animals made of wood and stone and various materials, which appear over the wall? Some of them are talking, other silent.

You have shown me a strange image, and they are strange prisoners.

Like ourselves, I replied; and they see only their own shadows, or the shadows of one another, which the fire throws on the opposite wall of the cave?

True, he said; how could they see anything but the shadows if they were never allowed to move their heads?

And of the objects which are being carried in like manner they would only see the shadows?

Yes, he said.

And if they were able to converse with one another, would they not suppose that they were naming what was actually before them? And suppose further that the prison had an echo which came from the other side, would they not be sure to fancy, when one of the passers-by spoke that the voice which they heard came from the passing shadow?

No question, he replied.

To them, I said, the truth would be literally nothing but the shadows of the images.

That is certain.

And now look again, and see what will naturally follow if the prisoners are released and disabused of their error. At first, when any of them is liberated and compelled suddenly to stand up and turn his neck round and walk and look towards the light, he will suffer sharp pains; the glare will distress him, and he will be unable to see the realities of which in his former state he had seen the shadows; and then conceive some one saying to him, that what he saw before was an illusion, but that now, when he is approaching nearer to being and his eye is turned towards more real existence, he has a clearer vision, what will be his reply?

And you may further imagine that his instructor is pointing and when to the objects as they pass and requiring him to name them, will he not be perplexed? Will he not fancy that the shadows which he formerly saw are truer than the objects which are now shown to him? Far truer. And if he is compelled to look straight at the light, will he not have a pain in his eyes which will make him turn away to take refuge in the objects of vision which he can see, and which he will conceive to be in reality clearer than the things which are now being shown to him?

True, he said.

And suppose once more, that he is reluctantly dragged up a steep and rugged ascent, and held fast until he is forced into the presence of the sun himself, is he not likely to be pained and irritated? When he approaches the light his eyes will be dazzled, and he will not be able to see anything at all of what are now called realities?

Not all in a moment, he said.

He will require to grow accustomed to the sight of the upper world. And first he will see the shadows best, next the reflections of men and other objects in the water, and then the objects themselves; then he will gaze upon the light of the moon and the stars and the spangled heaven; and he will see the sky and the stars by night better than the sun or the light of the sun by day?

Certainly.

Last of all he will be able to see the sun, and not mere reflections of him in the water, but he will see him in his own proper place, and not in another; and he will contemplate him as he is.

Certainly.

He will then proceed to argue that this is he who gives the season and the years, and is the guardian of all that is in the visible world, and in a certain way the cause of all things which he and his fellows have been accustomed to behold?

Clearly, he said, he would first see the sun and then reason about it.

And when he remembered his old habitation, and the wisdom of the den and his fellow-prisoners, do you not suppose that he would felicitate himself on the change, and pity them?

Certainly, he would.

And if they were in the habit of conferring honors among themselves on those who were quickest to observe the passing shadows and to remark which of them went before, and which followed after, and which were together; and who were therefore best able to draw conclusions as to the future, do you think that he would care for such honors and glories, or envy the possessors of them? Would he not say with Homer, Better to be the poor servant of a poor master, and to endure anything, rather than think as they do and live after their manner?

Yes, he said, I think that he would rather suffer anything than entertain these false notions and live in this miserable manner.

Imagine once more, I said, such a one coming suddenly out of the sun to be replaced in his old situation; would he not be certain to have his eyes full of darkness?

To be sure, he said.

And if there were a contest, and he had to compete in measuring the shadows with the prisoners who had never moved out of the den, while his sight was still weak, and before his eyes had become steady (and the time which would be needed to acquire this new habit of sight might be very considerable), would he not be ridiculous? Men would say of him that up he went and down he came without his eyes; and that it was better not even to think of ascending; and if any one tried to loose another and lead him up to the light, let them only catch the offender, and they would put him to death.

No question, he said.

This entire allegory, I said, you may now append, dear Glaucon, to the previous argument; the prison-house is the world of sight, the light of the fire is the sun, and you will not misapprehend me if you interpret the journey upwards to be the ascent of the soul into the intellectual world according to my poor belief, which, at your desire, I have expressed, whether rightly or wrongly God knows. But, whether true or false, my opinion is that in the world of knowledge the idea of good appears last of all, and is seen only with an effort; and, when seen, is also inferred to be the universal author of all things beautiful and right, parent of light and of the lord of light in this visible world, and the immediate source of reason and truth in the intellectual; and that this is the power upon which he who would act rationally either in public or private life must have his eye fixed.

I agree, he said, as far as I am able to understand you.

Moreover, I said, you must not wonder that those who attain to this beautiful vision are unwilling to descend to human affairs; for their souls are ever hastening into the upper world where they desire to dwell; which desire of theirs is very natural, if our allegory may be trusted.

Yes, very natural.

And is there anything surprising in one who passes from divine contemplations to

the evil state of man, when they returned to the den they would see much worse than those who had never left it himself in a ridiculous manner; if, while his eyes are blinking and before he has become accustomed to the surrounding darkness, he is compelled to fight in courts of law, or in other places, about the images or the shadows of images of justice, and is endeavoring to meet the conceptions of those who have never yet seen absolute justice?

Anything but surprising, he replied.

Any one who has common sense will remember that the bewilderments of the eyes are of two kinds, and arise from two causes, either from coming out of the light or from going into the light, which is true of the mind's eye, quite as much as of the bodily eye; and he who remembers this when he sees any one whose vision is perplexed and weak, will not be too ready to laugh; he will first ask whether that soul of man has come out of the brighter life, and is unable to see because unaccustomed to the dark, or having turned from darkness to the day is dazzled by excess of light. And he will count the one happy in his condition and state of being, and he will pity the other; or, if he has a mind to laugh at the soul which comes from below into the light, there will be more reason in this than in the laugh which greets him who returns from above out of the light into the den.

That, he said, is a very just distinction.

But then, if I am right, certain professors of education must be wrong when they say that they can put a knowledge into the soul which was not there before, like sight into blind eyes?

They undoubtedly say this, he replied.

Whereas, our argument shows that the power and capacity of learning exists in the soul already; and that just as the eye was unable to turn from darkness to light without the whole body, so too the instrument of knowledge can only by the movement of the whole soul be turned from the world of becoming into that of being, and learn by degrees to endure the sight of being, and of the brightest and best of being, or in other words, of the good.

Very true.

And must there not be some art which will effect conversion in the easiest and quickest manner; not implanting the faculty of sight, for that exists already, but has been turned in the wrong direction, and is looking away from the truth?

Yes, he said, such an art may be presumed.

And whereas the other so-called virtues of the soul seem to be akin to bodily qualities, for even when they are not originally innate they can be implanted later by habit and exercise, the virtue of wisdom more than anything else contains a divine element which always remains, and by this conversation is rendered useful and profitable; or, on the other hand, hurtful and useless. Did you never observe the narrow intelligence flashing from the keen eye of a clever rogue, how eager he is, how clearly his paltry soul sees the way to this end; he is the reverse of blind, but his keen eye-sight is forced into the service of evil, and he is mischievous in proportion to his cleverness?

Very true, he said.

But what if there had been a circumcision of such natures in the days of their youth; and they had been severed from those sensual pleasures, such as eating and drinking, which, like leaden weights, were attached to them at their birth, and which drag them down and turn the vision of their souls upon the things that are below, if, I say, they had been released from these impediments and turned in the opposite direction, the very same faculty in them would have seen the truth as keenly as they see what their eyes are turned to now.

Very likely.

Yes I said; and there is another thing which is likely, or Neither rather a necessary inference from what has preceded, that neither the uneducated and uninformed of the truth, nor yet those who never make an end of their education, will be able educated ministers of State; nor the former, because they have no single aim of duty which is the rule of all their actions, private as well as public; nor the latter, because they will not act at all except upon compulsion, fancying that they are already dwelling apart in the islands of the blest.

Very true, he replied.

Them, I said, the business of us who are the founders of the State will be to compel the best minds to attain that knowledge which we have already shown to be the greatest of all, they must continue to ascend until they arrive at the good; but when they have ascended and seen enough we must not allow them to do as they do now.

What do you mean?

I mean that they remain in the upper world: but this must not be allowed; they must be made to descend again among the prisoners in the den, and partake of their labors and honors, whether they are worth having or not.

But is not this unjust? he said; ought we to give them a worse life, when they might have a better?

You have again forgotten, my friend, I said, the intention of the legislator, who did not aim at making any one class in the State happy above the rest; the happiness was to be in the whole State, and he held the citizens together by persuasion and necessity, making them benefactors of the State, and therefore benefactors of one another; to this end he created them, not to please themselves, but to be his instruments in binding up the State.

True, he said, I had forgotten.

Observe, Glaucon, that there will be no injustice in compelling our philosophers to have a care and providence of others; we shall explain to them that in other States, men of their class are not obliged to share in the toils of politics: and this is reasonable, for they grow up at their own sweet will, and the government would rather not have them. Being self-taught, they cannot be expected to show any gratitude for a culture which they have never received. But we have brought you into the world to be rulers of the hive, kings of yourselves and of the other citizens, and have educated you far better and more perfectly than they have been educated, and you are better able to share in the double duty. That is why each of you, when his turn comes, must go down to the general underground abode, and get the habit of seeing in the dark. When you have acquired the habit, you will see ten thousand times better than the inhabitants of the den, and you will know what the several images are, and what they represent, because you have seen the beautiful and just and good in their truth. And thus our State, which is also yours will be a reality, and not a dream only, and will be administered in a spirit unlike that of other States, in which men fight with one another about shadows only and are distracted in the struggle for power, which in their eyes is a great good. Whereas the truth is that the State in which the rulers are most reluctant to govern is always the best and most quietly governed, and the State in which they are most eager, the worst.

Quite true, he replied.

And will our pupils, when they hear this, refuse to take their turn at the toils of State, when they are allowed to spend the greater part of their time with one another in the heavenly light?

Impossible, he answered; for they are just men, and the commands which we impose

upon them are just; there can be no doubt that every one of them will take office as a stern necessity, and not after the fashion of our present rulers of State.

Yes, my friend, I said; and there lies the point. You must contrive for your future rulers another and a better life than that of a ruler, and then you may have a well-ordered State; for only in the State which offers this, will they rule who are truly rich, not in silver and gold, but in virtue and wisdom, which are the true blessings of life. Whereas if they go to the administration of public affairs, poor and hungering after their own private advantage, thinking that hence they are to snatch the chief good, order there can never be; for they will be fighting about office, and the civil and domestic broils which thus arise will be the ruin of the rulers themselves and of the whole State.

Most true, he replied.

And the only life which looks down upon the life of political ambition is that of true philosophy. Do you know of any other?

Indeed, I do not, he said.

And those who govern ought not to be lovers of the task? For, if they are, there will be rival lovers, and they will fight.

No question.

Who then are those whom we shall compel to be guardians? Surely they will be the men who are wisest about affairs of the state.

ENDNOTES

If you understand this first distinction, the much more difficult division of the intelligible world will make more sense. Think over this carefully: the visible world, that is, the world you see, has two kinds of visible objects in it. The first kind are shadows and reflections, that is, objects you see but aren't really there but derive from the second type of visible objects, that is, those that you see and are really there. The relation of the visible world to the intelligible world is identical to the relation of the world of reflections to the world of visible things that are real.

The lower region of the intelligible world corresponds to the upper region in the same way the lower region of the visible world corresponds to the upper region. Think of it this way: the lower region deals only with objects of thought (that are, in part, derived from visible objects), which is why it is part of the intelligible world. There have to be certain first principles (such as the existence of numbers or other mathematical postulates) that are just simply taken without question: these are hypotheses. These first principles, however, derive from other first principles; the higher region of the intelligible world encompasses these first principles.

So you can see that the lower region derives from the higher region in that the thinking in the lower region derives from the first principles that make up the higher region, just as the mirror reflects a solid object. When one begins to think about first principles (such as, how can you prove that numbers exist at all?) and derives more first principles from them until you reach the one master, first principle upon which all thought is based, you are operating in this higher sphere in intellection. Plato's line is also a hierarchy: the things at the top (first principles) have more truth and more existence; the things at the bottom (the reflections) have almost no truth and barely exist at all.

He wrote: "Did you never observe the narrow intelligence flashing from the keen eye of a clever rogue? How eager he is. How clearly his paltry soul sees the way to his end. He is the reverse of blind, but his keen eyesight is forced into the service of evil, and he is mis-

chievous in proportion to his cleverness."

What a perfect description of Saddam Hussein in that allegory for all of us, distinguishing from falsehoods and reality of the cave, the shadows against the wall, the light behind us, like a puppeteer.

The record of this murderous regime has been outlined forcefully in this body and by our Commander-in-Chief. Saddam has used weapons of mass destruction against his own people, he waged war with Iran, he invaded Kuwait, and he even murdered his own people in the northern part of Iraq.

Two cities stand out in the northern part of Iraq in 1988, Halabja and Goktapa. We all, each and every one of us, need to read the stories from both of those towns of innocent people who were massacred, massacred.

The helicopters came over the day before in May, Mr. Speaker, taking pictures of the villages. People did not know what they were doing. Then, 2 days later, the same helicopters showed up and they dropped out of the sky mustard gases, lethal, lethal gases which left animals and plants and human beings dead. They did not need sophisticated state-of-the-art technology to deliver these gases.

Nothing like it was seen since the Holocaust, nothing came close. We need to think about this and who perpetuated these deaths.

For the last 11 years, he has defied the will of the entire planet, as expressed in the resolutions which we have heard over and over the last 2 days. Indeed, I know of no thinking person who argues against the profound necessity of eliminating Saddam's weapons technology.

But while we can all agree on the menace he poses and unite in the desire to live in a world where he is not a factor, there are still critically important lingering questions, questions about the process, about the timing and, ultimately, the unilateral nature of preemptive war that we seem to be accepting for the first time in the history of this great country.

Is the relative sudden frenzy to eliminate Saddam clouding the strategic vision of those who are most vociferous in the support of his ouster? My inquiry stems not from any kind of partisan agenda but out of a genuine confusion as to why key issues have not fully been discussed and debated.

We spend millions of dollars every day for 10 years protecting the no-fly zones in the north and south. The American people have a right to know what these actions will cost us. They have every right to know.

If we endorse this historic shift in our strategy that abandons our reliance on deterrence and arms control as the pillars of national security, will we open a Pandora's box of preemptive action throughout the world? What is our response when it comes?

If this is our Nation's new policy, then what is to prevent India from attacking Pakistan, or Russia from attacking the state of Georgia? If they do, what will we say? After war, then what? What happens on day three, as Thomas Friedman wrote?

After the intervention, how will the situation likely evolve? We have yet to hear any discussion on this. Surely in this great deliberative body we should give pause to this critical issue. Surely the administration must address this most comprehensively.

Let us remember, this is not a game of chess. These are our sons, these are our daughters who will execute this mission, many of whom may not return. Full debate is essential. Anything less is an abdication of the oath we all took together.

We also need to make absolutely certain that whatever is done in Iraq does not negatively impact the broader war that we authorized 12 months ago, the war on terrorism.

That said, a great many people predict that the Congress will pass the resolution, the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 114, with an overwhelming majority. I do not dispute this, nor do I declare my opposition, but Congress must ensure that, through this process, no matter the duration, we are involved as explicitly as possible under article 1, Section 8. We must ensure that we constantly ask the appropriate questions and demand the pertinent answers.

I do believe that it is imperative that the United States speaks with one voice to Saddam Hussein. There can be no ambiguity in our resolve to protect and defend this greatest of all democracies and the families that make it great.

We all love America, not some more than others. When we leave this week, we must remember this: None of us love America more than anyone else in this room.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SIMMONS).

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

Mr. Speaker, I am a Vietnam veteran. I served 18 months in uniform in that country. As someone who has seen the ugly face of war, I do not embrace it as a policy choice, nor is it my first choice, but as a choice we sometimes have to make.

I believe that preparation for war and a demonstration of national will to engage in war can be a way to avoid war, and I also believe that diplomacy without the threat of military action can be a hollow exercise in extreme cases. Right now, we are faced with an extreme case.

There is no doubt that Saddam Hussein is a menace. Our intelligence tells the story of brutality, savagery, patterns of aggression, deception, and defiance. It shows the danger that Saddam Hussein poses to our country, to his re-

gion, and to the world. His ouster could bring peace and stability, and it could also inflame further violence and instability. How we do what we do in this case is as important as what we do.

In dealing with the issue, I have asked myself a question: Does Iraq's intent and capability to use weapons of mass destruction pose a clear and present danger to the United States, to our allies, or to Israel? And based on a reading and hearing of information available to me, I believe that the danger to the United States is clear. Whether or not it is present is less certain.

For the continental United States, the danger may be 6 months away or it may be 6 years away, depending on a number of variables. For Israel, for some of our troops abroad, for our NATO ally Turkey, the danger is certainly clear and present.

Given this assessment, diplomacy and multilateral action are still reasonable options to use against Hussein, and they should be encouraged. That is why I intend to vote for the Spratt amendment, which maintains substantial focus on diplomacy and multilateral action.

My decision to support this amendment is not an easy one, but the stakes in this situation are very high. Over the past year, the intelligence community and committees of this Congress have tried to connect the dots on the vicious attack that took place on September 11, and the challenge for us today is to connect the dots once again but before another and potentially more lethal attack.

There are risks and consequences if we act; there are risks and consequences if we do not act. I lost friends in the Vietnam War, and I am reminded of that every time I go down to the Wall. But I lost neighbors on September 11, and I am reminded of that every time I see the World Trade Center.

On balance, I feel the greatest risk is through inaction, which is why, if the Spratt amendment fails on the floor tomorrow, I intend to vote for the bipartisan resolution.

A vote for the bipartisan resolution is not a vote for war, it is a vote for will. It is a statement of national unity that says to Saddam Hussein, you are a menace and a bully to your own people and to your neighbors. You must disarm. You have exhausted our patience. We will join the United Nations and the world community and work with them against you in this cause, but, at the 11th hour, we will be prepared to act.

We cannot wait for the smoking gun. A gun smokes only after it has been fired, and that may be too late for another American city, our troops abroad, a NATO ally, or Israel. When it comes to weapons of mass destruction, we must connect the dots before the next attack, not after it has occurred.

□ 2200

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Cali-

fornia (Mrs. CAPPS), a member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

(Mrs. CAPPS asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the resolution. There is no question that Saddam Hussein is a villain and a menace to his own people and to the rest of the world. He is a terrible dictator who has used chemical weapons in his own country and on other nations. He has likely biological weapons and is certainly seeking nuclear weapons. He has invaded his neighbors and defied the international community. He has worked to destabilize the Middle East in support of terrorism. We can all agree he is a threat to international peace and security. His own people and the rest of the world would be better off if he were not in power.

Mr. Speaker, it appears that the United States is going to use military force to reduce or eliminate this threat. It seems likely that the brave men and women of our Armed Forces will be sent to the region to disarm his regime and possibly remove Hussein from power. If that happens, I will support our country men as they do their duty and obey the orders of the Commander in Chief. But tomorrow, I will vote against the resolution authorizing the use of force now.

This is a hard decision. It is one of the most important votes that I cast. It is a vote of conscience for me, as I trust it is for all Members. And my conscience leads me to vote "no." After careful consideration, I have determined that the resolution before us does not advance our national security. The bottom line is that it authorizes the President to launch a unilateral preemptive attack if he so chooses. Our national security is not served by such an attack.

Mr. Speaker, I do not oppose the use of force in all circumstances. I voted to support military operations in Kosovo, and I stood on this floor and supported the President in the operations in Afghanistan. But I think an authorization to use force against Iraq before we have explored all of our options is premature and potentially dangerous.

First of all, international support, especially from the U.N., is critical. It allows us to share the risks and costs of our operations. It lends our efforts legitimacy. Recently, the United Nations has regained its focus on Iraq. It is on the verge of restarting inspections and international support for a stricter inspection regime is growing. The return of the inspectors should be our top priority. They can determine the extent of the threat Iraq represents, and their findings can help us build international support to check the Iraqi regime.

I will be supporting an alternative that continues those efforts. This alternative will only authorize force as a part of U.N. efforts to disarm Iraq. A unilateral preemptive attack on Iraq without U.N. support may undermine

the multilateral war against global terror. It could drive a wedge between us and those allies whose support we need.

In addition, with or without international support, we will have to be committed to rebuilding Iraq or we may be left with a state that is just as dangerous as the current one or worse we could be dealing with a chaotic civil war where we are not sure who has what kind of weapons. Unfortunately, the administration has shown little interest in addressing this important issue. This is consistent with its lack of attention to post-Taliban Afghanistan. Both are troubling.

And a preemptive, unilateral strike on Iraq may lead to uprisings in the Middle East. Friendly regimes could be threatened by extremists who will openly support terrorism. And key moderate Islamic nations, like Egypt, Jordan, and the nuclear-armed Pakistan, could be destabilized.

A U.S. attack would certainly further inflame the cycle of violence between Israel and the Palestinians. And I cannot imagine the consequences if Iraq were to attack Israel and Israel were to respond as Prime Minister Sharon has declared it would.

An attack on Iraq could lead to the use of the very weapons we want to destroy. In an attempt to survive, Saddam Hussein may use all the weapons at his disposal against our servicemen and women.

Finally, a preemptive attack on Iraq turns 50 years of national security policy on its head. We have struggled for 5 decades to help build a world in which nations do not attack one another without specific provocation. In the face of an imminent threat to the U.S., with an obvious provocation, a preemptive attack might be justified. But I have not seen convincing evidence that Saddam Hussein is an immediate threat.

There is still time to try to resolve the situation using other tools of statecraft, such as diplomacy. The United States would win a war against Iraq. But that does not necessarily mean it is a war that should be waged at this time. At some point it may be necessary to use force. We may have to place our men and women in our Armed Forces in harm's way, but that should be the last resort, only after we have explored all other means and after other measures have failed.

For now I do not think the case has been made that force is the only option left to us. It is premature to launch a unilateral preemptive attack, and it would be premature for us to authorize one. I oppose this resolution, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

Mr. Speaker, I have chosen to remain silent and our side has held their debate because we want to allow full time for those opposed to have their word; but sometimes as you listen to a series of words you begin to see a pattern. And I think the American people, Mr.

Speaker, need to also hear maybe some of the realities that are not being mentioned.

This is not the beginning of a new war. In fact, President Herbert Bush, President Clinton, and now President George W. Bush have all, in fact, had to make strikes in Iraq to contain this evil dictator. In fact, President Clinton has made probably the largest strikes since the Gulf War during his administration. And at that time I do not believe that we heard in this body something about new preemptive acts of war. In fact, what we understood was we had a dictator who continued to use his remaining force and the ill-gotten revenues that he is getting from his clandestine selling of oil from outside the food program to, in fact, intimidate his neighbors and rebuild his weapons of mass destruction.

So as much as I certainly want to yield as much time to my colleagues who oppose this, I think the American people, Mr. Speaker, must understand that this is by no means a new war. The President is not asking for a new war. In fact, what he is asking for is a recognition that after 11-plus years of a war which has not ended because this dictator has not met his responsibilities, responsibilities he agreed with the United Nations to keep, that in fact the President has said, our President now has said, I must in fact have the tools to be able to go further to get the compliance. And I would hope that all of us in this body would very much understand the historic context in which I say the war has never ended.

We are only asking to continue a direction that President Herbert Bush started, President Clinton continued, and now President George W. Bush has on his desk; and we hold him responsible for our safety.

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ), a member of the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, today we are debating whether and under what considerations we will consider sending our young men and women into battle. That is an awesome responsibility, and I have given it much thought. I rise to offer my support of the Spratt substitute. It is a balanced, very careful approach to a serious problem.

I stand before you as a father, as a husband, as an American, and as an elected representative of the people who live in the 20th Congressional District of Texas. Since the terrible attacks of September 11, we, as a Nation, have felt a new vulnerability; and we set out on a war against terrorism to safeguard our future.

During this past year, I have listened to my constituents' concerns, sharing their fears and consoling those shaken by disruptions and the issue of security in our Nation. I offered my full support

to the fight against terrorism, and I will continue to do so. We must not lose sense of the purpose, but we also must not lose our perspective. In recent months as the administration has begun to call for a war against Iraq, I have spoken with parents, brothers and sisters; and I have read heartfelt letters of young and old, and I have met with American men and women in uniform who proudly serve this Nation.

As I visited churches and restaurants, shops and homes throughout the San Antonio, South Texas region, I have heard patriotic voices, yet voices filled with concern about the war we are today asked to authorize. As the administration has tried to make its case for the unilateral war against Iraq, I have had many questions. I am troubled because many of these questions remain unanswered, even as we debate whether or how to put American troops in harm's way.

We have also heard mixed messages when we heard the Secretary call for a cut of 23,000 in the Army while at the same time we have heard our generals indicate that we need 40,000 in the Army, 20,000 in the Air Force and 8,000 Marines. Those mixed messages have not been helpful. But we also do not get the answers to our questions, questions such as, Who will pay for this war? We should have a tax bill on this House floor to pay for this war. What are our mission goals and our exit strategy?

The other reality is that there has been no dialogue and no real thrust in that with terrorism, also, it is a fight of ideology and ideas. One thing we are clear about is we know that Saddam Hussein and the government he controls brutally, Iraq, are without question a danger not only to the United States but also to the world community. We know that Saddam Hussein has gone to great lengths to seek, develop, and then conceal weapons of mass destruction. I believe I join my colleagues here today in stating that we must end Saddam Hussein's quest for these terrible weapons.

The issue before us is how we do so. It is crucial that we as representatives of the people translate the concerns about the execution of war against Iraq into a concrete plan to ensure the congressional representatives have a role in the decision to send our troops into harm's way.

The administration seeks a blank check from the Congress to authorize the use of force broadly. But the administration's proposal does not encourage multilateral cooperation and also does not anticipate further congressional input. The approach offered by the Spratt substitute offers a better option. We are today the world's greatest superpower; our military might and economic power reach around the globe. Our democracy is an example to which other nations aspire. We are a diverse Nation united by our love of liberty, our thirst for freedom, and our belief in justice and the rule of law.

That status as a world superpower brings with it great responsibilities. Yes, we have the power to go it alone, but I feel very strongly that the power to do exactly that would be the wrong thing to do. In the case of Iraq, I believe going it alone under the circumstances we now face is not the best approach. First, by working with the United Nations, we will act not only on our own behalf, but on behalf of the world community.

Let me ask that you support the substitute, the Spratt substitute, because it is also the best military option, because that would allow us an opportunity to seek out those biological and chemical weapons before our soldiers go in. And if they have to go in, at least we will identify those areas where they might be able to be hiding, and there is no doubt that that would be the best way to go at it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, our decision to authorize the President to commit American men and women to overseas military action is the most difficult decision a Member of Congress will ever face.

Since September 11, 2001, when more than 100 of my constituents were killed in the terror attacks on our country, I have felt a new urgency to address the dangers to our national security that exist both here in the United States and abroad. Our government must act to secure our boarders and airways, protect nuclear power plants, safeguard our food and water supplies and more.

□ 2215

We must face up to the very real possibility of a biological, chemical or even nuclear attack upon our country and take whatever action is necessary to prevent it.

I have spent a great deal of time, as have my colleagues, in recent weeks in classified briefings, with military and intelligence experts; and I have also paid close attention to the very real concerns of my constituents and even my family. We are living in a world far more dangerous today than we have ever known, and I have concluded that we must not wait for another terrorist attack before giving the President the authority to take the necessary action to protect our children and our grandchildren.

Throughout world history, inaction against tyrants has proven to be an ineffective strategy for averting catastrophe. We have every reason to believe that Saddam Hussein is continuing to build up his arsenal of weapons of mass destruction. He continues to defy the civilized world and United Nations Security Council resolutions ordering him to disarm. He has shown through brutality toward his own people his

willingness to use these terrible weapons against innocent people.

Therefore, I have concluded that Saddam Hussein poses a serious danger to United States national security. We must stand up to this threat first by pursuing to the fullest all possible diplomatic means and then, only if we must, by the use of force.

As a strong believer in the United Nations, I have a long record of support for a robust United States role in the United Nations, and I believe that strong United States leadership in the United Nations is critical to achieve peace in the world.

But the United Nations must act. The crisis before us provides an important opportunity for the U.N. Security Council to show that there are consequences to ignoring the will of the international community. Failure to enforce the relevant resolutions will hurt the U.N.'s effectiveness as an organization, diminishing a potent force for stability around the world. And if all else fails, if we must pursue military action, I hope and I pray that the mission is successful and short and that it will pave the way to a better day for Iraq and the region and result in greater security for Americans here at home.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5½ minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN), a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, as I take the floor this evening I am humbled by the task at hand and the paths that have led us to this point.

When I arrived in Congress last year, I never imagined that we would witness cruel attacks on our own soil, that we would lead a war against terrorism across the globe or that we would contemplate returning to Iraq to address the ongoing threat of Saddam Hussein, all in less than 2 years. Yet, we did not choose these circumstances. Instead, they found us; and it is our responsibility to act in a careful and appropriate manner to protect the United States, its people, its allies and our ideals.

Authorizing the use of military force is one of the most important decisions Congress can make; and as a member of the House Committee on Armed Services, I do not take it lightly.

Last month, I held a listening tour in Rhode Island to understand my constituents' concerns about military action in Iraq. I spent many hours being briefed in the Committee on Armed Services and in the White House by senior administration officials and other experts. From these conversations, I have grown increasingly alarmed by the widening body of evidence that Saddam Hussein poses a grave and expanding threat to the security of the United States.

His development of biological and chemical weapons, as well as his pur-

suit of nuclear capabilities, flaunts United Nations resolutions and threatens the stability of the region. His oppression of the Iraqi people, including his use of chemical weapons against civilians, strikes at the very core of our belief in protecting human rights. He has also made it clear that he will take action to harm us and our allies, even firing on aircraft and enforcing the Iraqi's no-fly zone 2,500 times since 1991.

While it may be difficult to imagine what horrors this tyrant is planning over 6,000 miles away, I am convinced that the threat is very real.

The question, therefore, becomes how best to deal with this danger. I have heard overwhelming concerns from constituents that the United States could endanger the international coalition against terror if we act against Iraq, if we act particularly unilaterally. Equally important, I share the concern that we will damage our moral authority as the world's sole remaining superpower if we do not proceed responsibly.

For this reason, we must engage the global community in our efforts to neutralize the threat of Saddam Hussein. Cooperation with the United Nations and our allies is critical, and I hope that we are collectively able to develop a strong mandate for the disarmament of Iraq.

In his speech Monday night, President Bush pledged to engage the U.N. Security Council in drafting a new resolution; and I fully expect him to pursue this strategy, not only to establish broader support and deeper confidence for our mission but also to protect the integrity of the United States. If new weapons inspections do not achieve total disarmament, we must not rule out using military action to force compliance with U.N. resolutions, eradicate Iraq's destructive capabilities and protect the American people.

Again, such action must be taken in conjunction with other Nations. President Bush stated that we would act with our allies at our side, and we must hold him to his promise. We cannot ignore that unilateral action against Iraq could have dangerous ramifications on the region and America's own efforts in the war on terrorism. Furthermore, the international coalition would also be essential in promoting a new government in Iraq, an effort that should be undertaken as seriously as the Marshall Plan.

Tomorrow, I will vote for the Spratt amendment, which would require cooperation with the United Nations to the greatest extent possible. In contemplating a preemptive attack against another nation, it is our responsibility to work with our friends and allies and rally them to our cause. If the Spratt amendment is unsuccessful, I cannot support the underlying resolution until we first go to the U.N. Security Council and attempt to get a vote authorizing the use of force. Though that vote may ultimately fail,

the United States has been instrumental in shaping the guidelines and agreements that have fostered peace and cooperation throughout the world, and we must demonstrate our continued commitment to these goals.

The threat posed by Saddam Hussein is too great for us to remain inactive. We cannot sit idly by while the pieces of another September 11 fall into place. We cannot risk a single American life waiting for the promises from a madman.

We now have the opportunity to improve the safety of our citizens and the stability of the Middle East. However, there is a right way and a wrong way of approaching this complicated issue. Just as a prosecutor must lay out the facts to establish guilt, we must make our case before the world community.

I urge support for the Spratt amendment.

As I take the floor this afternoon, I am humbled by the task at hand and the path that has led us to this point. When I arrived in Congress last year, I never imagined that we would witness cruel attacks on our soil, that we would lead a war against terrorism across the globe, or that we would contemplate returning to Iraq to address the ongoing threat of Saddam Hussein—all in less than two years. Yet we did not choose these circumstances; instead, they found us, and it is our responsibility to act in a careful and appropriate manner to protect the United States, its people, its allies, and its ideals.

Authorizing the use of military force is one of the most important decisions Congress can make, and, as a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I do not take it lightly. Last month, I held a listening tour in Rhode Island to understand my constituents' concerns about military action in Iraq. I have spent many hours being briefed in the Armed Services Committee and at the White House by Administration officials and other experts. From these conversations, I have grown increasingly alarmed by the widening body of evidence that Saddam Hussein poses a grave and expanding threat to the security of the United States. His development of biological and chemical weapons, as well as his pursuit of nuclear capabilities, flaunts United Nations resolutions and threatens the stability of the region. His oppression of the Iraqi people, including his use of chemical weapons against civilians, strikes at the very core of our belief in protecting human rights. He has also made it clear that he will take action to harm us and our allies, firing on aircraft enforcing the Iraqi no-fly zones 2,500 times since 1991. And while it may be difficult for some to imagine what horrors this tyrant is planning over 6,000 miles away, I am convinced that the threat is real.

The question therefore becomes how best to deal with this danger. I have heard overwhelming concern from my constituents that the United States could endanger the international coalition against terror if we act unilaterally against Iraq. Equally important, I share their concern that we will damage our moral authority as the world's sole remaining superpower if we do not proceed responsibly. For this reason, we must engage the global community in our efforts to neutralize the threat of Saddam Hussein. Cooperation with the United

Nations and our allies is critical, and I hope that we are collectively able to develop a strong mandate for the disarmament of Iraq. In his speech on Monday night, President Bush pledged to engage the U.N. Security Council in drafting a new resolution, and I fully expect him to pursue this strategy, not only to establish broader support and deeper confidence for our mission, but also to protect the integrity of the United States.

If new weapons inspections do not achieve total disarmament, we must not rule out using military action to force compliance with U.N. resolutions, eradicate Iraq's destructive capabilities, and protect the American people. Again, such action must be taken in conjunction with other nations. President Bush stated we would act "with allies at our side," and we must hold him to his promise. We cannot ignore that unilateral action against Iraq could have dangerous ramifications on the region and America's own efforts in the war on terrorism. Furthermore, an international coalition would also be essential in promoting a new government in Iraq—an effort that should be undertaken as seriously as the Marshall Plan. Tomorrow, I will vote for the Spratt amendment, which would require cooperation with the United Nations to the greatest extent possible. When contemplating a preemptive attack against another nation, it is our responsibility to work with our friends and allies and rally them to our cause.

If the Spratt amendment is unsuccessful, I cannot support the underlying resolution until we first go to the U.N. Security Council and attempt to get a vote authorizing the use of force. Though that vote may ultimately fail, the United States has been instrumental in shaping the guidelines and agreements that have fostered peace and cooperation throughout the world, and we must demonstrate our continued commitment to these goals.

The threat posed by Saddam Hussein is too great for us to remain inactive. We cannot sit idly by while the pieces of another September 11 fall into place. We cannot risk a single American life waiting for promises from a madman. We now have the opportunity to improve the safety of our citizens and the stability of the Middle East. However, there is a right way and a wrong way of approaching this complicated issue. Just as a prosecutor must lay out facts to establish guilt, we must make our case before the world community. This is the only approach to guarantee that our efforts to disarm Iraq will have the full force of international support and not undermine our greater war against terrorism.

I appreciate the opportunity to share in this debate and urge my colleagues to vote for the Spratt amendment.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I must once again reiterate, although it seems rude and people do want to extend and it is difficult to end before my colleagues complete their statements, I must insist that we take no more than 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TOWNS), a leading member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that this resolution ignores the political realities that are present in a tinderbox like the Middle East. It is naive to think that unilateral Amer-

ican action in the Middle East will achieve lasting security, but it is downright foolish to ignore the United Nations' potential as a partner in eliminating Saddam's chokehold on world security.

This resolution merely pays lip service to any meaningful coalition building or endorsement of U.N. findings without establishing an international coalition. We leave the fate of the Iraqi people to uncertainty and without the hope of meaningful nation building or distribution of aid. America cannot achieve this alone or on its own.

The world is watching us to see how a superpower acts which has defeated its dragons and is now confronted by malignant dictators of developing powers. Make no mistake about it, Saddam Hussein is a dictator who resorts to the most heinous of atrocities to silence his opponents.

As the world's sole superpower, we must be careful that our allies do not grow resentful of us. We need to make certain that they are included in any sort of action that we as a Nation might decide to take. That has not happened, and I must vote no on the resolution.

Let me close by saying I am concerned as anyone in this Chamber about national and international security. I served in the United States Army, but I am not convinced that we should put our young people in harm's way. We should not do that; and, therefore, I will vote no on this resolution and hope that many of my colleagues would join us. This is the wrong way to go.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL), a member of the Committee on Resources.

(Mr. UDALL of Colorado asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution.

Like many of my colleagues, I have struggled with the question of whether to give the President the broad authority to take our Nation into a full-scale war with Iraq. I have also struggled with the question of how to support the President's objectives and also keep faith with my oath to uphold the Constitution.

I continue to have grave reservations about acting unilaterally, acting without evidence of an imminent threat and acting without considering the consequences for the war on terrorism or without a commitment to rebuilding a post-war Iraq. In my opinion, the resolution we are considering today would give the President authority to act without adequately addressing these crucial questions.

Congress has a solemn responsibility to join with the President in determining whether any path to war will be short or long, who will be on that path

with us and ultimately what kind of war we intend to wage. This resolution does not allow Congress to answer these important questions. Instead, the resolution gives that power to one man, the President, and represents a dangerous erosion of congressional power and responsibility. That is why it should be defeated unless it is amended.

Absent new evidence that Saddam Hussein poses an imminent threat to our national security, I believe we should only go to war against Iraq as a part of a broad international coalition authorized by the United Nations. This is important not only to secure the peace and manage the costly and difficult nation building that must follow but also to avoid compromising our efforts to combat global terrorism, particularly in the Islamic world.

□ 2230

As a last resort, it may be necessary for American military forces to act without the support of the United Nations Security Council. But before we do so, I believe the President should come to Congress for a separate authorization. That is what the amendment I offered to the Committee on Rules called for.

My amendment was based on a resolution I introduced, House Joint Resolution 118, which would ensure that Congress, not the President, makes this awesome decision. Regrettably, my amendment was not made in order; so I am glad that tomorrow I will have the opportunity to vote for the Spratt amendment, which I believe is more consistent with the Constitution than the underlying resolution we are being asked to support.

Congress needs to know whether the United Nations is with us or on the sidelines before we launch a military invasion of Iraq on our own. Not having this information beforehand, with all of the implications it poses for our global war on terrorism, and the consequences for our security in this region, is simply irresponsible, in my view.

Do not misunderstand. I have no illusions about the duplicity of Saddam Hussein or the depths of his cruelty. Saddam Hussein is a dangerous tyrant and a threat to peace, and I fully support the goal of disarming him. I do not believe in a policy of appeasement towards Saddam Hussein. But I believe that ridding the world of Saddam Hussein is only part of the job we face. We have to remove Saddam Hussein's threat in the context of broader security goals, including crippling al Qaeda and sustaining and building the important global relationships we need for the war against terrorism and for solving other critical global problems.

My father, Morris Udall, who was serving in Congress in 1964, came to regret his support for the Gulf of Tonkin resolution when it became clear that it was being used as a substitute for the constitutional responsibility of Con-

gress to declare war. I fear that this Congress, a generation later, is poised to make a similar mistake. To avoid that, we need to reject this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution.

Like many of our colleagues, I have struggled with the question of whether to give the president the broad authority to take our nation into a full-scale war against Iraq. I have also struggled with the question of how to support the president's objectives and also keep faith with my oath to uphold the Constitution. I continue to have grave reservations about acting unilaterally, acting without evidence of an imminent threat, and acting without considering the consequences for the war on terrorism or without a commitment to rebuilding a post-war Iraq. In my opinion, the resolution we are considering today would give the president authority to act without adequately addressing these crucial questions.

Congress has a solemn responsibility to join with the president in determining whether any path to war will be short or long, who will be on that path with us, and ultimately what kind of war we intend to wage. This resolution doesn't allow Congress to answer these important questions. Instead, the resolution gives that power to one man, the president, and represents a dangerous erosion of congressional power and responsibility. That is why it should be defeated unless it is amended.

Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the president told us that voting for this resolution would not mean that war was imminent or unavoidable. Many of my colleagues draw comfort from the view that this resolution is not necessarily a call to arms. With respect, I find no such comfort. This resolution very clearly gives the president authority to take us to war.

I introduced a resolution, H.J. Res. 118, which would ensure that Congress makes this awesome decision. I also submitted to the Rules Committee an amendment based on my resolution. Regrettably, my amendment was not made in order. So I am glad that I will have the opportunity to vote for the Spratt amendment, which I believe is more consistent with the Constitution than the underlying resolution we are being asked to support.

Absent new evidence that Saddam Hussein poses an imminent threat to our national security, I believe we should only go to war against Iraq as part of a broad international coalition authorized by the United Nations. This is important not only to secure the peace and manage the costly and difficult nation-building that must follow, but also to avoid compromising our efforts to combat global terrorism, particularly in the Islamic world. As a last resort, it may be necessary for American military forces to act without the support of the United Nations Security Council, but before we do so, I believe the president should come to Congress to ask for a separate authorization.

Congress needs to know whether the United Nations is with us or on the sidelines before we launch a military invasion of Iraq on our own. Not having this information beforehand, with all of the implications it poses for our global war on terror and the consequences for our security in the region, is simply irresponsible in my view.

Don't misunderstand, I have no illusions about the duplicity of Saddam Hussein or about the depths of his cruelty. Saddam Hussein is a dangerous tyrant and a threat to

peace, and I fully support the goal of disarming him. I do not believe in a policy of international amnesia toward Saddam Hussein. That's why I can't support the Lee amendment, which I believe does not adequately respond to the urgency of ending Saddam Hussein's decade of defiance and eliminating Iraq's weapons of mass destruction. The Lee amendment seems to rule out military action as a last resort, and I don't believe we can or should do that.

But I believe that ridding the world of Saddam Hussein is only part of the job we face. We have to remove Saddam Hussein's threat to the context of broader security goals, including crippling Al Qaeda and sustaining and building important global relationships we need for the war against terrorism and for solving other critical global problems.

My father was serving in Congress in 1964 when it passed the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution, which led to the eventual deployment of 500,000 American soldiers in Vietnam and the deaths of 55,000 American servicemen and women. My father came to regret his support for that resolution when it became clear that it was being used as a substitute for the constitutional responsibility of Congress to declare war. I fear that this Congress, a generation later, is poised to make a similar mistake.

To avoid that, we need to reject this resolution.

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

Mr. Speaker, we are demonstrating to our Nation and to the world what American democracy is all about, where the duly elected representatives of this body have been given an opportunity to share with each colleague their best judgment on whether the Congress supports the President's request to place the men and women of our armed services in harm's way.

I have no doubt that our President has spent countless hours, perhaps even sleepless hours, and probably even thought a thousand times over as to whether or not this was the best course of action that our country should take at this time and for him to make such an important decision that will determine whether our soldiers, sailors and airmen are going to be sent into harm's way.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad our President does not have the constitutional authority to declare war against enemy nations. I am also glad that our President does not have the authority under the provisions of our Constitution to establish our Nation's armies and navies. That is the exclusive authority that has been given specifically to the Congress of the United States. Mr. Speaker, I respect our President; but I do not worship him, nor is he a king or an emperor. He is our President and is subject to the will of the American people.

My reason for supporting this resolution is that our President is properly authorized under the terms of this proposed resolution to seek out all diplomatic options, to make sure that there is substantive participation from our allies and from other nations in the

world to confront the serious danger that is now before us and the world with the regime currently governed by the dictator Saddam Hussein.

Another critical factor in this whole debate, Mr. Speaker, is that we have not questioned the loyalty and patriotism of each of us or the integrity of each of us, of any Member of this body, especially under the climate we are now under to make a firm decision whether our Nation should commit her military forces against her enemies. I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that sometime tomorrow, if as a result of a final vote by this body that vote is not overwhelming in support of the President's proposed resolution, that common sense would dictate that our President would seriously have to reconsider his position on this matter, go back to the drawing board and try again. I would rather deal with some bruised egos in the White House and in the Congress than to end up fighting another war like Vietnam.

Again, in good faith and as a consequence of the deliberative efforts of the leadership of both sides of the aisle in this body, a proposed resolution has been offered for our consideration. But, Mr. Speaker, I make reference to my friend, the Chinese General Sun Tzu, who some 2,500 years ago made some very astute observations concerning the art of warfare, and I hope our Vice President and our leaders in the Department of Defense will take heed to General Tzu's advice.

General Tzu said, "If you know the enemy and know yourself, you need not fear the result of 100 battles. If you know yourself but not the enemy, for every victory gained, you will also suffer a defeat. But if you do not know your enemy nor yourself, you will absolutely lose in every battle."

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) and ask that he be permitted to control the rest of that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from American Samoa?

There was no objection.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I would ask for the time remaining now on the two sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) has 2 hours and 21 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) now has 24½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SAWYER).

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

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I have with me a carefully prepared floor statement. It lays out my opposition to the Hastert-Gephardt-Bush resolution,

although it is a meaningful improvement over the original proposal, and my support for the Spratt alternative. I commend it to my colleagues, and will place that statement in the RECORD for reference.

In truth, it covers ground already well covered, more eloquently and with deepest conviction, by both supporters and opponents many times in this important and serious debate. Instead, because these votes may well be my last of real import as a Member of Congress, I would like to share with colleagues a very specific thought. It is simple. We all remember the warning common from childhood: "Don't start something you cannot finish."

I do not mean to suggest that what we are doing here today is something we cannot finish. But my father said it a little bit differently, more as a matter of advice than childish threat. "Don't start anything you don't know how to finish." It is good advice about many things. And even though I will not be here to help at the finish of what we begin here today, it is good advice here nonetheless.

Now, I am not talking about war plans. I am confident that they will be well and professionally crafted; and, clearly, we should not share them with our adversaries. But I am talking about peace plans. We seem to have more trouble with them. And we need to make them very clear to adversaries and allies alike. It is a powerful tool.

For the second time in a year, we are talking about making war in order to rebuild a nation and its culture. The echo which that recalls from 40 years ago is a concern.

"Don't start anything you don't know how to finish," my father said.

It reminds me of 1991. And the events of the last year in Afghanistan are even more troubling, as rebuilding there hardly proceeds at all. And the message that sends to the oppressed people of Iraq and others whom we would make our friends throughout the Middle East, that message is a real problem.

"Don't start anything you don't know how to finish," my father said.

Because this will not be over when the bombs stop falling and the ground combat is over and the wounded are cared for and the dead are put to rest. It will not begin to be over until we have carried out a coherent and clearly stated plan for postwar Iraq. It is the single most important message we can send to the people of the region as they debate and choose a better future for themselves.

Middle East analyst Stephen Cohen has remarked, "We in the West cannot have that debate for them, but we can help create the conditions for it to happen. America's role is to show the way to incremental change, something that is not, presto, instant democracy, or fantasies that enlightened despotism will serve our interests. We cannot just go on looking at the Arab world as a giant gas station, indifferent to what

happens inside. Because gas is now leaking and all around people are throwing matches."

"Don't start anything you don't know how to finish," my father said.

It is an important lesson. It is one that we might have thought the President's own father might have said to him. Or maybe not. And that is why I say it today.

Mr. Speaker, I believe Congress would achieve near unanimity if we were voting only on the overall purpose of this resolution, which is to eliminate Saddam Hussein's control over weapons of mass destruction. On that issue we are as unified as we are in the war against terrorism that we launched with the President a year ago. I, and many others, believe that the current Iraqi regime poses a long-term threat to the community of nations through its ongoing defiance of United Nations resolutions prohibiting Iraq from developing weapons of mass destruction. But I will not support the resolution before us because it provides the President with an open-ended authority that is far too broad for the task before us.

The President is asking for authorization of force even before he determines that force is necessary and before we have exhausted our other options short of force. Instead, Congress should pass a resolution that calls on the President to obtain the support of the United Nations and our allies and authorizes him to use force if it is so sanctioned by the United Nations. This approach is embodied in the Spratt substitute amendment to be offered tomorrow, which I will support. If the United Nations fails to take sufficient action, then we can pass another resolution of force at that time. But action by the United Nations Security Council offers the best chance to reintroduce meaningful inspections into Iraq. This would be the best way to resolve the threat from Iraq peacefully and without reducing our focus on eliminating al Qaeda, which remains the foremost immediate threat to America.

Given Saddam Hussein's record of obstruction over the past eleven years, the United Nations should authorize force against Iraq if Iraq interferes with the unconditional inspection and dismantling of its weapons of mass destruction. However, I cannot support a resolution that authorizes unilateral military force in the present circumstances.

I am concerned that if the U.S. were to act alone it would damage our wide international support in the war against terrorism and al Qaeda. This war depends on the cooperation of other governments to arrest terrorist suspects, monitor terrorist financial transactions, and share intelligence. We should not risk the goodwill of the international community by acting unilaterally while multilateral options still exist.

I am also concerned that if the U.S. were to act against Iraq without the support of the United Nations Security Council, it would set a dangerous precedent for other countries who might be tempted to use military intervention against the wishes of the international community in order to end long-simmering disputes. It is important that our policy toward Iraq be guided by our long-standing commitment to the principle of collective security, which the United States helped place in the Charter of the United Nations.

Let me close by saying that I believe that Congress and the Administration should make

it crystal clear before any military action is taken that the U.S. will be committed to helping Iraq rebuild after a war. The U.S. cannot expect to make a quick exit from Iraq after a war. We would have to be committed to a substantial expenditure of time and money to revitalize Iraq, and we will need the support of our allies to succeed. Doing otherwise would risk leaving behind a dangerously unstable country in the Middle East that could be an even greater source of danger in the region than the current regime.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Ohio for his thoughtful comments. I may not agree with all of them, but the contribution that he has made in this body will be sorely missed with his departure. And I know that I share with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle in knowing that this body will be poorer for not having the kind of insight and the kind of caring that we have just heard.

I know this debate has gone on long, but some things are worth going on a little longer, and I once again would like to express my appreciation for his thoughtful comments.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to also compliment the gentleman from Ohio, who has served this House so outstandingly; and we will certainly truly miss him.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK), one of the brightest persons in the House, who serves on the Committee on Financial Services and who has patiently waited.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding me this time, and thank him as well for having undertaken this thankless, but very important, job and has done it well.

When I listened to the President's speech the other night, I found myself in agreement with much of it, but then I find myself in disagreement with his conclusion. I think the President made a pretty good case for a multilateral approach to making sure that Saddam Hussein is disarmed, but that is not what he is asking us to do.

The President is asking us to authorize a unilateral invasion of Iraq to overthrow Saddam Hussein because he is an immoral and evil ruler. I wish he were the only immoral and evil ruler in the world. Our job would be simpler.

But I do not see a rationale for a unilateral American invasion to overthrow Saddam Hussein that does not apply to a number of other governments, some of whom we are allied with. In fact, there will be a choice tomorrow for a very well-thought-out proposal that would empower the President with the full support of Congress to undertake a serious effort to get a multilateral approach, using force if necessary, to impose disarmament on Saddam Hussein. It is the resolution that will be offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

And the President said, let us have unity, let us have a large majority here. He could get, I believe, more than 90 percent, if he were willing to throw his support behind a resolution that said let us use force in a multilateral context not to overthrow this government, because we cannot be in the position of, I think, invading every government that fails to meet our moral standards, as much as I believe those moral standards to be correct ones. He, instead, will choose a more divisive path.

Why? One reason is that we are told the policy of deterrence will not work with Saddam Hussein. We are told that deterrence, which has worked with the Soviet Union and with the People's Republic of China and with North Korea and with Iran and with other nations, uniquely will not work with Iraq because of the nature of Saddam Hussein. The problem with the argument that deterrence will not work, that is the policy that says the way to keep him from using chemical and biological and, ultimately, nuclear weapons, if he gets them, and we should try to stop him from getting them, but the way to keep him from doing it is to threaten him with overwhelming retaliation.

□ 2245

The President says it does not work. But American intelligence says it does.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the Washington Post article from last Monday from which I want to read.

"Although Iraq's chemical artillery shells and warheads were deployed during the war of 1991, they were not used. U.S. officials now believe this was because the United States had repeatedly cautioned Iraq before the fighting started that use of such weapons would draw an immediate and possibly overwhelming response that would topple Hussein from power.

"One reason the Pentagon has adopted a plan to dissuade Iraqi officers from ordering the use of chemical and biological weapons is that, unlike in 1991, this deterrent has been rendered moot by the administration's decision to make removing Hussein the goal of any military action."

This is the conclusion of American military intelligence, not rebutted by the administration. It was recently reinforced by a letter released by the CIA, and the CIA said he is not likely to use the weapons because he is being deterred effectively by the threat of our force.

In a colloquy with a Senator from Michigan he was asked the question, What about his use of weapons of mass destruction? If we initiate an attack and he was an extremist or otherwise, what is the likelihood in response to our attack he would use chemical or biological weapons?

Senior intelligence witness: "Pretty high, in my view."

In other words, deterrence according to American intelligence analysis in

1991 and American intelligence analysis today works. So there is no need for this unilateral invasion.

Yes, I think it is useful for the international community to put maximum pressure on Saddam Hussein to disarm. I believe that the resolution offered by the gentleman from South Carolina is an authorization to do that.

I disagree with the President about this policy of a unilateral American invasion with us paying all of the costs and having all of the responsibility for the subsequent administration with Iraq. I disagree with it; but if one agrees with it, it is the height of irresponsibility to pretend that we can pay for it in the current situation without serious social harm.

This administration put through a major tax cut 2 years ago with the consent of Congress, over my objection and many others. Since that time, we have committed to spend on a war on Afghanistan, which I supported; reconstruction of Afghanistan, our moral obligation; significant increases to compensate the victims, both municipal and individual, of the mass murders of September 11; significant ongoing increases in expenditure of homeland security. Now add to that a war in Iraq and the subsequent responsibility to run Iraq and leave that tax cut in place. Members should understand the consequences: a deterioration in our environmental cleanup; a lack of transportation spending; indeed, a reduction of real spending for virtually every other domestic program.

Mr. Speaker, the fact that deterrence still works means that is unnecessary.

The previously referred to material is as follows:

[From The Washington Post, Sept. 30, 2002]

U.S. EFFORT AIMED AT IRAQI OFFICERS

(By Walter Pincus)

The Pentagon is preparing a campaign aimed at deterring Iraqi officers from firing chemical or biological weapons during a U.S. invasion because intelligence officials believe President Saddam Hussein has given field commanders conditional authority to use the weapons in the event of an attack, according to defense and intelligence officials.

The effort would include massive leafletting of Iraqi military positions—a tactic used by U.S. forces during the Gulf War in 1991—but also might employ covert techniques that would enable the U.S. message to reach Iraqi commanders, the officials said.

Final authority to use weapons of mass destruction has resided with Hussein. But the Iraqi president's knowledge that the United States would seek to take down Iraqi command centers and communications systems at the outset of any military strike means he has likely already given authority for firing chemical and biological weapons to his most loyal commanders in the field, the officials said. They said Hussein issued similar orders before the Gulf War.

As a result, the sources said, the Pentagon plans to appeal directly to these officers not to use the weapons. One of the biggest challenges before military planners is determining which Iraqi military units can be encouraged to defect in the event of a U.S. invasion and how to communicate with them, defense officials have said.

A British intelligence report released Tuesday by Prime Minister Tony Blair said Iraqi could deploy nerve gas and anthrax weapons on 45 minutes' notice. It also said Hussein may have already delegated authority to order use of such weapons to his youngest son, Qusai, who leads the Republican Guard—elite units that control deployed weapons for mass destruction.

The Pentagon's campaign was signaled recently by Defense Secretary Donald H. Rumsfeld. Testifying before the House Armed Services Committee, Rumsfeld said, "Wise Iraqis will not obey orders to use WMD [weapons of mass destruction].... The United States will make clear at the outset that those who are not guilty of atrocities can play a role in the new Iraq. But if WMD is used, all bets are off."

Rumsfeld added that if the order to use chemical or biological weapons were made by Hussein, "that does not necessarily mean his orders would be carried out. He might not have anything to lose, but those beneath him in the chain of command most certainly would have a great deal to lose."

A Pentagon official said Rumsfeld's comments "are at least the start of telling them where we are serious."

After the Gulf War, coalition force interrogators learned that Hussein had decided ahead of time to give commanders the go-ahead to use chemical weapons if Baghdad's communications were interrupted.

One administration source said the Iraqi president issued specific orders to use the weapons if "the allies were winning the ground war and they had crossed a line due west of the city of Al-Amarah," which is 200 miles south of Baghdad. Iraqi unit commanders were also told they should employ the weapons against Iranian forces if they crossed the border during the war and moved into Iraq's Maysan Province, where Al-Amarah is located.

Although Iraq's chemical artillery shells and warheads were deployed during the war, they were not used. U.S. officials now believe this was because the United States had repeatedly cautioned Iraq before the fighting started that use of such weapons would draw an immediate and possibly overwhelming response that would topple Hussein from power.

One reason the Pentagon has adopted a plan to dissuade Iraqi officers from ordering the use of chemical or biological weapons is that, unlike in 1991, this deterrent has been rendered moot by the administration's decision to make removing Hussein the goal of any military action.

Whether a plan to deter Iraqi commanders from employing the weapons will work is a matter of disagreement among military experts. The Republican Guard units that control the weapons are run by Hussein's most loyal officers.

They will face a short-term or a long-term problem," one former senior intelligence official said. "We may come after them when the fighting is over. But there may be a Saddam loyalist with a gun who is threatening to kill him right away if he doesn't follow orders."

Judith Yaphe, an Iraq specialist at the National Defense University, said that in 1991, according to documents found after the war, Hussein had tried to persuade his commanders to use the weapons because they would be killed anyway. Also, Hussein had placed loyalists with the commanders to enforce his wishes. "The question is, are they still there?" she said.

Richard Russell, a CIA area analyst who specialized in Iraq and is now at the National Defense University, said the effort to deter individual commanders "makes sense as an attempt." But he noted that Iraqi oper-

ational security was very good in the Gulf War and "you have to assume it is much better now."

After Iraq's invasion of Kuwait in 1990, U.S. officials talked openly of American forces making preparations for waging combat in a chemical environment. Then-Secretary of State James A. Baker III told Iraqi Foreign Minister Tariq Aziz that Hussein's government would be endangered if such weapons were used. Then-Defense Secretary Richard B. Cheney hinted that if such an attack took place against Israel, that country might respond with nuclear weapons.

In the war's aftermath, U.S. intelligence officials learned that Iraq had been deterred from using chemical weapons by the threat of massive retaliation. Iraqi artillery units armed with chemical shells were segregated from the rest of the forces and chemical munitions were never moved to Kuwait and never moved toward the front as coalition forces approached, and in some cases breached, the Iraq-Kuwait border.

C.I.A. LETTER TO SENATE ON BAGHDAD'S INTENTIONS

Following is the text of a letter dated Oct. 7 to Senator Bob Graham, Democrat of Florida and chairman of the Intelligence Committee, by George J. Tenet, director of central intelligence, about decisions to declassify material related to the debate about Iraq:

In response to your letter of 4 October 2002, we have made unclassified material available to further the Senate's forthcoming open debate on a Joint Resolution concerning Iraq.

As always, our declassification efforts seek a balance between your need for unfettered debate and our need to protect sources and methods. We have also been mindful of a shared interest in not providing to Saddam a blueprint of our intelligence capabilities and shortcomings, or with sight into our expectation of how he will and will not act. The salience of such concerns is only heightened by the possibility of hostilities between the U.S. and Iraq.

These are some of the reasons why we did not include our classified judgments on Saddam's decision-making regarding the use of weapons of mass destruction (W.M.D.) in our recent unclassified paper on Iraq's Weapons of Mass Destruction. Viewing your request with those concerns in mind, however, we can declassify the following from the paragraphs you requested:

Baghdad for now appears to be drawing a line short of conducting terrorist attacks with conventional or C.B.W. [chemical and biological weapons] against the United States.

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. Such terrorism might involve conventional means, as with Iraq's unsuccessful attempt at a terrorist offensive in 1991, or C.B.W.

Saddam might decide that the extreme step of assisting Islamist terrorists in conducting a W.M.D. attack against the United States would be his last chance to exact vengeance by taking a large number of victims with him.

Regarding the 2 October closed hearing, we can declassify the following dialogue:

Senator Levin [Carl Levin, Democrat of Michigan]: ... If (Saddam) didn't feel threatened, did not feel threatened, is it likely that he would initiate an attack using a weapon of mass destruction?

Senior Intelligence Witness: ... My judgment would be that the probability of him initiating an attack—let me put a time frame on it—in the foreseeable future, given

the conditions we understand now, the likelihood I think would be low.

Senator Levin: Now if he did initiate an attack you've ... indicated he would probably attempt clandestine attacks against us ... But what about his use of weapons of mass destruction? If we initiate an attack and he thought he was in extremis or otherwise, what's the likelihood in response to our attack that he would use chemical or biological weapons?

Senior Intelligence Witness: Pretty high, in my view.

In the above dialogue, the witness's qualifications—"in the foreseeable future, given the conditions we understand now"—were intended to underscore that the likelihood of Saddam using W.M.D. for blackmail, deterrence, or otherwise grows as his arsenal builds. Moreover, if Saddam used W.M.D., it would disprove his repeated denials that he has such weapons.

Regarding Senator Bayh's [Evan Bayh, Democrat of Indian] question of Iraqi links to al-Qa'ida. Senators could draw from the following points for unclassified discussions:

Our understanding of the relationship between Iraq and al-Qa'ida is evolving and is based on sources of varying reliability. Some of the information we have received comes from detainees, including some of high rank.

We have solid reporting of senior level contacts between Iraq and al-Qa'ida going back a decade.

Credible information indicates that Iraq and al-Qa'ida have discussed safe heaven and reciprocal nonaggression.

Since Operation Enduring Freedom, we have solid evidence of the presence in Iraq of al-Qa'ida members, including some that have been in Baghdad.

We have credible reporting that al-Qa'ida leaders sought contacts in Iraq who could help them acquire W.M.D. capabilities. The reporting also stated that Iraq has provided training to al-Qa'ida members in the areas of poisons and gases and making conventional bombs.

Iraq's increasing support to extremist Palestinians coupled with growing indications of a relationship with al-Qa'ida, suggest that Baghdad's links to terrorists will increase, even absent U.S. military action.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, in an effort to keep fairness in this body, I believe there are more speakers on the other side of the aisle, and I would like to inquire how much longer they would need in order to find a way to equalize time?

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, we would need a minimum of at least one full hour. That would be the least amount of time. It is very difficult to predict. We will not let anyone speak over 5 minutes. However, we feel an obligation to every Member who was promised the opportunity to speak. We want to live up to our obligations, but we will try to move it along as quickly as possible.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, certainly the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) had every intention in making sure that every Member got an opportunity to speak.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) has 16 minutes remaining.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield 44 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr.

PAYNE) and that he may control that time.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. ISSA. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my deep appreciation to the gentleman from California, and to the majority, for this very generous action. It is not always the norm, and I just want to express my appreciation.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and hope it will always be the norm on the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH).

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

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, as a representative of the thousands in my district who are opposed to an ill-conceived war, I rise in opposition to this resolution on the use of force against Iraq.

Thousands of my constituents have spoken. Families of military personnel who reside in my district have spoken. They have all emphatically and resoundingly delivered an answer to the question of going to war with Iraq; and the answer is, no, no, and no. No against the war in Iraq. No against sending their sons and daughters to war for yet-unknown reasons. And no to the ignoring of the economic problems that still are plaguing our Nation.

The war that my constituents want us to wage is a war on poverty, a war on layoffs, a war on inadequate health care, a war on a lack of affordable housing and a war for economic opportunity and fairness.

Over the last several months, the President has been earnest in his efforts to inform the American public of what the risks are of not going to war and what they may be. But, to date, he has not convinced the people in my district why their sons and their daughters should be placed in harm's way.

If we are going to engage in an honest debate, we owe it to the American public to ask the right questions. Questions like: What will the number of military and civilian casualties be? Questions like: How long will the conflict in Iraq be expected to last? And simple questions like: Does Saddam Hussein pose a clear and present threat to the United States?

Simply citing all the atrocities committed by Saddam Hussein, and there are many atrocities that have been ignored for a decade, and calling Saddam Hussein a bad name is simply not enough.

Mr. Speaker, during this incredible moment in American history, we

should all be reminded of a quote by President James Madison, "The advancement and infusion of knowledge is the only guardian of liberty."

If we are sincere about bringing democracy to the people of Iraq, we should lead by example in every step of the way. We should lead by presenting the American public and the American people with clear, balanced and realistic information on the consequences of a war on Iraq.

Let us not insult our own citizens by ignoring the fact that all nations in the Middle East region and many of our long-standing allies around the world oppose this war. They see military action in Iraq as a glorified oil and land grab. Let us not ignore the fact that a strike against Iraq will not only have the effect of inflaming existing resentment of U.S. foreign policy and possibly provoking renewed terrorist attacks on Americans both here and abroad.

And despite the President's proclamation that America is a friend of the Iraqi people, we cannot insult the American people by ignoring the fact that U.S.-led sanctions have created a hotbed of disease and extreme poverty in Iraq, and war will only plunge the Iraqi people deeper into death and despair.

For those who are saber rattling, war mongering and unconcerned with America's place in the global community, let us not ignore the consequences that the American people will have to pay.

To this issue, some argue that a war with Iraq is worth the blood of young Americans. But as a Representative who may have to face mothers and fathers and brothers and sisters of fallen constituents, I will not disrespect and dishonor them with tough talk, tough talk that refuses to answer obvious questions, tough talk that only provides the American people with answers that do not answer, with explanations that do not explain, and conclusions that do not conclude.

While I am confident that we will win an armed conflict with Iraq, there must be a forthright discussion with the public about the impact of a war on the American people and the world in which we live.

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, with a deep appreciation for the gravity of our collective decision, I rise to oppose this resolution, not because I disagree with the goal of disarming Saddam Hussein, with force if necessary, but because I believe that this resolution is dangerously broad and counterproductive to America's greater goal of winning the war on terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, over the course of the history of our country and the Congress, relatively few issues have risen to the significance of a declaration of war. Like many of my colleagues, I

have personally anguished over this decision because I am convinced that Saddam Hussein is a threat. It is clear that he has designs to amass weapons of mass destruction with the intent to exert control over the Middle East, if not a larger region. The core of our decision lies in the best way to address this threat.

I have tried to understand all perspectives. I have attended classified and public hearings, examined evidence, studied pages of material, and sought the counsel of many. I have listened intently to those who have fought wars and those who have prevented them. I have also listened attentively to the citizens of San Diego.

Mr. Speaker, looking back on the lessons of history, it is clear no one can predict the future. Those faced with difficult decisions must make the best judgment based on the information at hand. To be sure, in the words of Secretary Rumsfeld, "We do not know what we do not know." However, that is precisely the reason that I continue to have reservations about unilateral force.

Unilateral preemptive force may indeed win the battle for Iraq but cause us to lose the war by isolating America from its many allies, turning nations against us and reinforcing the cause of those who wish us harm.

In addition to these considerations, we must consider our young men and women in uniform. Before sending them into harm's way, we must fully explore every other avenue to achieve our goals without risking their lives. I do not believe we have done that.

I applaud the efforts of many to bring Congress to a place where there is more agreement than disagreement. While we may disagree on the manner, we agree that something must be done, and we agree that Saddam Hussein is a menace, and we agree that the United States must exercise its leadership.

To be a true leader, we must convince others to follow. Hubert Humphrey once said, "Leadership in today's world requires far more than a large stock of gunboats and a hard fist at the conference table." That is precisely why we must continue to seek options to unilateral force, to work with the United Nations and the world community, and to use force only when all other options are exhausted. If we do not, how can we expect others to do likewise?

In addition, we must be clear in our goal. Again, citing the Secretary of Defense, our goal is disarmament. To achieve this, we must insist on tough new rigorous U.N. inspections. If those inspections are thwarted, we may use force, first, if sanctioned by the U.N. Security Council, and then alone if necessary.

Based on these principles, I will support the Spratt substitute because it embodies the best way to address the threat posed by Saddam. It holds the U.N. accountable, and it retains Congress' prerogative to truly be the voice of the American people.

□ 2300

Mr. Speaker, I question the notion that we must speak with one voice because it is the collection of voices that grants us our strength. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow I will vote "no" because House Joint Resolution 114 is a premature de facto declaration of war that fails to recognize the fundamental tenet that leadership involves leading, not merely acting alone. But make no mistake. A "no" vote on the resolution does not restrict the President's power to act should an imminent threat arise. He already has that authority.

To conclude, let me say to the servicemen and women, especially those living in San Diego who will be called upon to enforce this policy, my admiration and respect for you is as strong as ever and it will never waiver. Just as you always do your duty to America regardless of how you personally feel about a particular mission, so will I do my duty to give you the support you need to complete your mission and get home safely. Along with my fellow Members of the House Committee on Armed Services, I will fight vigorously to get you every tool you need to do the job right.

To my colleagues on the committee and in Congress, I hope you will take my opposition to this resolution in the spirit in which it is offered, that of doing what I feel must be done to fight and win the war on terrorism and empower diplomacy. We may disagree over the strategy of addressing the threats posed by Iraq at this time, but we are united in the greater goal to free America and the world from the threat of terrorism.

To our enemies in Iraq and elsewhere, a warning: do not confuse democracy and debate with disunity or disarray. Our voices constitute our strength, and the United States of America is united in its resolve.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), a member of the Committee on Government Reform and the Committee on Financial Services, a true leader in this government.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from New Jersey for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think any Member of this body disagrees that Saddam Hussein is a tyrant, a murderer, and a man who has started two wars. He is clearly someone who cannot be trusted or believed. The question, Mr. Speaker, is not whether we like Saddam Hussein or not. The question is whether he represents an imminent threat to the American people and whether a unilateral invasion of Iraq will do more harm than good.

Mr. Speaker, the front page of *The Washington Post* today reported that all relevant U.S. intelligence agencies now say despite what we have heard from the White House that "Saddam Hussein is unlikely to initiate a chemical or biological attack against the United States." Even more impor-

tantly, our intelligence agencies say that should Saddam conclude that a U.S.-led attack could no longer be deterred, he might at that point launch a chemical or biological counterattack. In other words, there is more danger of an attack on the United States if we launch a precipitous invasion.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know why the President feels, despite what our intelligence agencies are saying, that it is so important to pass a resolution of this magnitude this week and why it is necessary to go forward without the support of the United Nations and our major allies including those who are fighting side by side with us in the war on terrorism.

But I do feel that as a part of this process, the President is ignoring some of the most pressing economic issues affecting the well-being of ordinary Americans. There has been virtually no public discussion about the stock market's loss of trillions of dollars over the last few years and that millions of Americans have seen the retirement benefits for which they have worked their entire lives disappear. When are we going to address that issue? This country today has a \$340 billion trade deficit, and we have lost 10 percent of our manufacturing jobs in the last 4 years, 2 million decent-paying jobs. The average American worker today is working longer hours for lower wages than 25 years ago. When are we going to address that issue?

Mr. Speaker, poverty in this country is increasing and median family income is declining. Throughout this country family farmers are being driven off of the land; and veterans, the people who put their lives on the line to defend us, are unable to get the health care and other benefits they were promised because of government underfunding. When are we going to tackle these issues and many other important issues that are of such deep concern to Americans?

Mr. Speaker, in the brief time I have, let me give five reasons why I am opposed to giving the President a blank check to launch a unilateral invasion and occupation of Iraq and why I will vote against this resolution. One, I have not heard any estimates of how many young American men and women might die in such a war or how many tens of thousands of women and children in Iraq might also be killed. As a caring Nation, we should do everything we can to prevent the horrible suffering that a war will cause. War must be the last recourse in international relations, not the first. Second, I am deeply concerned about the precedent that a unilateral invasion of Iraq could establish in terms of international law and the role of the United Nations. If President Bush believes that the U.S. can go to war at any time against any nation, what moral or legal objection could our government raise if another country chose to do the same thing?

Third, the United States is now involved in a very difficult war against

international terrorism as we learned tragically on September 11. We are opposed by Osama bin Laden and religious fanatics who are prepared to engage in a kind of warfare that we have never experienced before. I agree with Brent Scowcroft, Republican former National Security Advisor for President George Bush, Sr., who stated, "An attack on Iraq at this time would seriously jeopardize, if not destroy, the global counterterrorist campaign we have undertaken."

Fourth, at a time when this country has a \$6 trillion national debt and a growing deficit, we should be clear that a war and a long-term American occupation of Iraq could be extremely expensive.

Fifth, I am concerned about the problems of so-called unintended consequences. Who will govern Iraq when Saddam Hussein is removed and what role will the U.S. play in ensuing a civil war that could develop in that country? Will moderate governments in the region who have large Islamic fundamentalist populations be overthrown and replaced by extremists? Will the bloody conflict between Israel and the Palestinian Authority be exacerbated? And these are just a few of the questions that remain unanswered.

If a unilateral American invasion of Iraq is not the best approach, what should we do? In my view, the U.S. must work with the United Nations to make certain within clearly defined timelines that the U.N. inspectors are allowed to do their jobs. These inspectors should undertake an unfettered search for Iraqi weapons of mass destruction and destroy them when found, pursuant to past U.N. resolutions. If Iraq resists inspection and elimination of stockpiled weapons, we should stand ready to assist the U.N. in forcing compliance.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. MCCRERY).

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

Mr. MCCRERY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 114.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 114, which would authorize the use of military force against Iraq.

The diplomatic and military situation in Iraq without question remains one of the most difficult security issues facing the United States and the international community. It has only been further complicated by the terrorist attacks on our country last year. Recently, the President's national security adviser said Saddam Hussein has sheltered al-Qaeda terrorists in Baghdad and helped train some in the development of chemical weapons. Also of concern is the revelation that there may have been a meeting between a senior Iraqi intelligence official and Mohammed Atta, the leader of the September 11th attacks.

The administration has stated on numerous occasions that the war on terrorism will continue to be fought against all countries that support or harbor terrorists. It appears that list must include Iraq.

Our national security depends on preventing other countries from developing weapons of mass destruction. Iraq has pursued an agenda to develop weapons of mass destruction including chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons for many years. Saddam Hussein has already demonstrated an unconscionable willingness to use chemical weapons on his own people, attacking ethnic Kurds in Northern Iraq. He also used them against Iranian troops during the Iran-Iraq War. Iraq's arsenal includes several delivery systems, including long-range missiles capable of carrying dangerous payloads to our allies in the Middle East and Europe, including U.S. military bases in Bahrain and Turkey.

The United Nations Security Council required Iraq to scrap all weapons of mass destruction and long-range missiles and to allow for weapons verification inspections. For the past four years, Iraq has prevented representatives of the United Nations from inspecting Iraq's weapon facilities. It is clear that the Iraqi government has undermined the authority of the United Nations by rebuilding many of its chemical, biological, and nuclear weapon manufacturing plants.

Iraq has a history of invading its neighbors and using any and all weapons at its disposal against its enemies. A nuclear weapon in the hands of Hussein's brutal regime would give him an unacceptable upper hand to expand control over the world's petroleum reserves and quite possibly give him the leverage he needs to expand the borders of tyranny.

Mr. Speaker, it is not an unlikely possibility that Iraq, as a state-sponsor of terrorism, would transfer weapons of mass destruction to terrorists intent on using them against the United States. September 11th showed us that America is not immune to terror attacks, and Iraq's ties to international terrorist groups are unquestioned.

I support the President's campaign against any state, including Iraq, which is found to support terrorism or seeks to develop weapons of mass destruction with the intent of attacking America or its allies. We cannot wait for a transparent threat to materialize. The longer we wait, the more we risk another unthinkable attack upon our soil. Simply put, the United States cannot ignore the threat that Iraq poses to our way of life and that of our allies.

Saddam Hussein must be held accountable for years of noncompliance with United Nations resolutions. Failure to enforce the resolutions weakens the authority of the United Nations itself and sends a message to the foes of peace that future disobedience will be objected to solely through empty threats and resolutions without teeth.

I am hopeful that diplomatic efforts may yet succeed, and believe the United States must try to work with our allies and the international community towards a peaceful solution to our present situation. Every Member of Congress weighs this decision carefully, knowing the votes we cast may place the men and women of our armed forces in harm's way. Yet if it becomes necessary, we must be certain we do not embark upon a Sicilian Expedition. Any use of force should include clear goals. If we are to enter into conflict in Iraq, we must plainly establish our objectives and follow through on a commitment to purge terror and rebuild Iraq into a strong and stable nation.

Our first priority of any use of force should be to eliminate the ability of the Hussein re-

gime to manufacture, distribute, or employ weapons of mass destruction. Hussein's goal has always been to obtain a weapon of such destructive force, that no other nation would be willing to resist his will. It would be fundamentally irresponsible to allow Iraq to obtain a weapon that could be used to deter allied forces from enforcing the internationally recognized authority of the United Nations. Saddam's arsenal of aggression and terror must be completely destroyed in order to encourage stability and prevent the proliferation of those weapons to other parts of the region. This action must be our first goal.

The second goal, is the removal of Saddam Hussein from power. Iraq has traditionally been a nation of commerce and prosperity, but Hussein hoards the resources of his country, starving her citizens into submission. His power is sustained by a 25,000-strong Republican Guard who, in return for maintaining Saddam's rule, are rewarded with Iraq's riches at the expense of her people. Hussein is not only guilty of some of the most heinous crimes against humanity, but he rules Iraq like a gangster by modeling his authority on the oppressive tyranny of Joseph Stalin and frequently and personally executes any who oppose his rule or stand in his way. We cannot continue to allow Hussein to cow the Iraqi people into living under an umbrella of terror. Hussein's sinister methodology of terror, assassination, and execution against all who oppose him must end. We must support a regime change.

Our third objective should include a plan to root out all elements of terror within Iraq and bring accountability to the war on terror within the borders of Iraq. Hussein's government has proven uncooperative and refuses to help in the identification and apprehension of those in terror networks. The Hussein regime is unable to control areas within Northern Iraq giving terrorist organizations like al-Qaeda free rein to operate within Iraq's borders. This stands in stark contrast to the other nations in the region who are working with the United States to eradicate terrorist networks.

Finally, the United States and the International Community must create a plan to rebuild Iraq and to restore a government that represents the interests of Iraqis and is dedicated to reconstructing an economy decimated by tyranny. New leadership will give the people of Iraq an opportunity to become a responsible member of the international community.

Mr. Speaker, President Bush has requested the Congress pass a resolution authorizing the use of military force to enforce the United Nations' Security Council Resolutions which Iraq continues to defy. We must defend the national security interests of the United States. We must eliminate the threat posed by Iraqi terror and we must work to restore international peace and security to Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in support of House Joint Resolution 114.

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON), a real spokesperson for justice in this country and a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution. On September 11, 2001,

our Nation changed. We were traumatized when al Qaeda terrorists attacked our Nation, killed nearly 3,000 Americans, wounded many others physically, emotionally, and spiritually; destroyed families and buildings and disrupted our economy. The President, the Congress, and the American people responded quickly, appropriately and with courage. All Americans support the war on terrorism, and they want homeland security.

However, terrorism not only changed our psyche; it changed our politics. Our politics shifted from hope to fear, and fear now clouds our thinking. September 11 and Iraq are two distinct issues. Nevertheless, President Bush is trying to take our legitimate fear following 9-11 and illegitimately link it to Iraq. The White House and some in this body have sought to link al Qaeda and September 11 to Iraq. That alleged link underscores the President's position that the Iraqi threat is imminent. However, congressional Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence members have said President Bush has presented no factual evidence proving that link. Even the President separates 9-11 from an imminent Iraqi threat, and here is the proof. President Bush sees 9-11 and Iraq as separate because just 2 weeks ago on September 24, he lowered the domestic risk of terrorist attacks from orange to yellow. He lowered it. If the Iraqi threat were imminent, would not the risk of terrorist attacks have at least remained the same, at orange, or even elevated and raised to red, a severe risk of terrorist attacks? But the President lowered it from orange to yellow.

Yes, Iraq's threat is real; and in light of 9-11, it is normal for Americans to be afraid, but the Iraqi threat is not imminent. We should not let it affect our politics over the next 3 weeks. We should not vote on the basis of fear of an imminent threat from Saddam Hussein. We must vote our hopes and not our fears. So far this debate has been about military sticks, whether, when or under what circumstances to use them. But why not try carrots too? Most Americans do not know that the United States would not lift economic sanctions on Iraq even if Saddam agreed to and fully implemented all U.N. resolutions.

In 1997 Secretary Albright said the U.S. would only lift sanctions when Saddam Hussein was gone, not when Iraq lived up to U.N. resolutions. President Clinton stated sanctions will be there until the end of time or as long as Hussein lasts. But economic sanctions are only hurting the people, making life miserable for the average Iraqi, causing an estimated 500,000 deaths, mainly women and children. The economic sanctions are not hurting Saddam Hussein. If they were, he would not be the threat that the President says he is. Insisting on a regime change before lifting economic sanctions goes beyond the legal mandate of U.N. policy and is not authorized by any U.N.

resolution. We need to lure Iraqi compliance with a meaningful economic inducement, not merely threaten them with military force. Why does the United States not offer to lift economic sanctions in an orderly and progressive way in exchange for unfettered and comprehensive inspections? Without the carrot of lifting economic sanctions in exchange for removing weapons of mass destruction, the Iraqi government has no incentive to cooperate. Offering to lift economic sanctions in exchange for unfettered inspections will gain the support within Iraq and among our allies.

Before there is any authorization for the use of armed force against Iraq, we must make sure that all peaceful means containing and eliminating Iraq's weapons of mass destruction have been exhausted, including offering positive incentives, and the U.S. should lead this initiative. This positive incentive to get Saddam Hussein to comply has not and is not currently in play. But until we make this overture and change the policy of only lifting economic sanctions after a regime change, we will not have exhausted all peaceful alternatives to force.

We are a Nation united by our Constitution and committed to the rule of law. That commitment is now challenged by an outlaw. We must bring this outlaw to justice but not become outlaws ourselves. And while our attention is focused on a military threat overseas, we are drowning at home economically. I believe we can creatively insist on a peaceful resolution to eliminate Saddam's weapons of mass destruction without an invasion and the actual use of force. Our military might is unquestioned. Our wisdom, our compassion, our commitment to a non-violent means of resolving conflict is not. By that and that alone will move us toward a genuine peace, justice and security for all.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the time. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution. I take the threat of nuclear weapons in the hands of a hostile and aggressive Iraq very seriously. On September 11 when my district was attacked, I thanked God the terrorists did not have nuclear weapons. We all want to protect this Nation. The question before us today is not whether to protect America, but how best to do so.

Saddam Hussein unquestionably poses a real danger. He has consistently shown a virulent hostility to the United States and to Israel, a willingness to invade other countries without provocation, a willingness to use chemical and biological weapons against civilian populations, a relentless drive to obtain weapons of mass destruction including nuclear weapons and the means to deliver them, and a reckless aggressiveness.

□ 2315

The conclusion is inescapable that the acquisition of nuclear weapons by Iraq would pose an intolerable threat to the United States and to world peace. That threat must be met, if at all possible, through the United Nations and in accordance with international law, but war must be the last resort, not the first option.

The resolution before us is not a compromise. It is in all important respects still very much the original draft: a blank check, like the Gulf of Tonkin resolution. We must not grant the President a blank check.

Make no mistake, this resolution grants the President the power to go to war entirely at his discretion. While the resolution pays lip service to the need for international cooperation, it does not require the President to seek it. While the resolution mentions a desire to work through the United Nations, it does not require the President to exhaust our options at the U.N. before starting a war.

The resolution requires the President to inform Congress that efforts in the U.N. and the international community have failed, but he need not do so until after he starts a war. We must grant the President the power to take prudent action to meet the threat from Iraq but only action that does not itself threaten international peace and security.

The United States should seek a U.N. resolution providing for the immediate return to Iraq of beefed-up arms inspection teams and demanding that they be afforded unfettered and unconditional access to all sites they deem necessary to accomplish their task of locating and destroying all chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons and their production facilities.

The U.N. resolution should authorize the use of military force to the extent necessary to overcome any Iraqi attempts to interfere with the inspection teams, and Congress should authorize the President to use such military force only to enable the inspection teams to do their jobs.

We might this way be able to eliminate the threat of Iraq's chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons without military conflict. But if military conflict occurred, we would be better off as part of a multilateral effort enforcing a Security Council inspection and disarmament order, with the onus on Saddam Hussein for starting the conflict, than we would as the Lone Ranger invading Iraq on our own, with most of the world looking on in disapproval.

Let me remind my colleagues: Before they were ejected from Iraq, U.N. inspectors destroyed more weapons and more weapons facilities than did the coalition forces during the Gulf War. This proven, successful course of action should be fully utilized before we risk regional conflagration.

I believe the Security Council would adopt a resolution embodying such a specific limited approach, and that,

working through the U.N. and with other nations, the U.S. could participate in successfully implementing it.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the President insists that, in addition to disarming Saddam, we must overthrow his regime. Demanding regime change is extremely dangerous. It is one thing to tell Saddam he must disarm. It is quite another to demand the end of his regime.

Faced with such a threat, which in practical terms means his death, there would be nothing to deter Saddam Hussein from deciding, like Samson in the Philistine temple, that he might as well pull the world down with him. Why should he not go down in history as an Arab hero by attacking Israel with chemical or biological weapons of perhaps devastating lethality? Israel might then feel compelled to retaliate, and no one could calculate the course of escalation from there.

But Members do not need to take my evaluation of this threat. Just yesterday, the director of the CIA, George Tenet, told the other body that "Baghdad, for now, appears to be drawing a line short of conducting terrorist attacks with conventional or chemical or biological weapons." But, he continued, if Saddam concluded the survival of his regime was threatened, "he probably would become much less constrained in adopting terrorist action."

Mr. Speaker, we must constrain the administration from pursuing this perilous course. The substitute resolution offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) grants the President the authority to use military force as part of a multilateral effort to divest Saddam of his weapons of mass destruction.

That is as far as we should go. We must draw this line, Mr. Speaker, not because we are unconcerned with our country's security, but precisely because we care so very, very much for it.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 5010, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AP- PROPRIATIONS ACT, 2003

Mr. LEWIS of California, submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 5010) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2003, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H.R. 107-732)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5010) "making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2003, and for other purposes", having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert: