

There is no doubt that during wartime the government expands in size and scope. And this of course is a great danger. And after war, the government rarely shrinks to its original size. It grows. It may shrink a little, but inevitably the size of the government grows and there is a tremendous incentive to increase the size and scope of government during wartime. This is a danger because when government gets bigger, the individual has to get smaller; therefore, it diminishes personal individual liberty.

So these are the costs that we cannot ignore. We have the costs of the war. We have the cost of potential loss of life, but there is a tremendous economic cost that even the best economists could not calculate what this war may cost us.

War should always be fought as the very, very last resort. It should never be done casually, and it should be done only when absolutely necessary. And when it is, I believe it should be fought to be won. It should be a declared war. It should be a war not fought under U.N. resolutions or for U.N. resolutions, but for the sovereignty and the safety and the security of this country. Under those conditions, it is explicit in our Constitution that only those wars that are fought in that manner should be declared by the Congress. And that is something that concerns me a whole lot because we have not declared a war outright since 1945; and if you look carefully, we have not won very many since then and wars tend to linger.

We are lingering in Korea. That is a mess over there. We have been there for 58 years, have spent hundreds of billions of dollars, and we are still messed up because we went in there under U.N. resolutions and we did not fight to victory. The same with Persian Gulf War I. We went in there without a declaration of war. We went in there under the U.N., and we are still there and who knows how long we will be there. So there are a lot of costs, hidden costs and some are overt. But the greatest threat, the greatest cost to war is the threat to individual liberty. So I just caution my colleagues that we should move much more cautiously and hope and pray for peace.

INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the gentleman from the State of Utah, we bring good news. The good news is Colorado has got snow, and we are almost back to average. We are having a great year out there in Colorado.

I saw in one of the Eastern press papers lately that the Rocky Mountains, in our ski areas out there, are suffering because of our lack of snow and we

have had great snow out there. That is the good news that I bring to you.

I want to bring another piece of good news to my colleagues that happened to the State of Colorado. In Colorado we have an area called the Four Corners. It is the only area of the country where four States touch in one spot, down near Cortez or Durango, Colorado, to give you a vicinity earmark so you know where I am talking about. The United States Navy, I had the privilege of being invited by the United States Navy to go to the Pascagoula, Mississippi shipyard. I have never been to a shipyard. In Colorado we do not have a lot of Naval presence. But the Navy decided to name one of their new ships after the national park down in the Four Corners. And the name of that national park is Mesa Verde, mesa verde meaning "green table."

It is a beautiful area. It is the only national park in the Nation that protects man-made objects, not objects just of nature. So to have a ship named in honor of that park, and I got to go down to the keel ceremony, Northrup Grumman is the builder of it, and I got to meet a lot of their employees down there. Great people. I had a great trip and I considered it to be a great privilege to be involved in the keel ceremony. So we in Colorado are proud about that, and of course we are proud of our members that serve in our military forces.

There a number of subjects that I want to visit about this evening, all dealing, of course, with the international situation that we face today.

First of all, let me talk about the success we had over the weekend. I notice we have had a lot of criticism of late of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, a lot of criticism of the Central Intelligence Agency, a lot of criticism of the President of the United States, President Bush, and what I would call the A-Squad Team down there, criticism of the A-Squad Team that nothing is happening with terrorism, that for some reason terrorism has been forgotten.

I can tell you we had a great victory over the weekend, in fact, a huge victory over the weekend. I think I can quote my colleague, the gentleman from the State of Florida (Mr. GOSS), who said this was like freeing Paris in World War II. That is how significant it was. And that is that we were able to arrest, right below bin Laden, our second-highest target, Mohammed.

Now this Mohammed guy is a bad guy. And to get our hands on him, and we were even more fortunate, we also thought we had arrested one of his bodyguards. In fact, it turned out that this so-called bodyguard was not a bodyguard in fact, but was in fact a financier for the al Qaeda network. So we really hit a bull's-eye over the weekend.

Now I find it very interesting that some commentators come out and say, oh, my gosh, we have arrested one of their top guys. This means more terrorist attacks. I do not know what we

take out of a comment like. That because we go and arrest one of the lead terrorists in the world, one of the key people involved in September 11, one of the most horrific murderers in the world, that because we arrested him that that could perhaps mean we will have an uptake in terror activity, and their remarks are as if maybe we should not have arrested him, that we have might have offended some of his colleagues that intend to do harm to the United States or to the allies of the United States.

And then tonight, of course, comes up the subject of how do you question a suspect like that? And I hear some people out there saying, oh, my gosh, it is torture to deprive him of sleep. Keep in mind what this individual knows, and keep in mind on the one hand what the individual knows and on the other hand the public good. What this individual knows, I suspect is he knows of different attack schemes, different timing of attack schemes, different methods that they are going to attack the United States or its allies. And over here on the public good we have riding this issue, one, hundreds, thousands, tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands, maybe millions of lives are dependent on whether or not we can get this information and take a preemptive strike, stop this terror strike before it occurs. And today I hear commentation on the fact that, my gosh, you better not deprive this suspect of his sleep. That is torture.

And I say to myself, What do you mean? This guy, this suspect who we know is one of the lead architects, if not the lead architect, of the September 11, you are going to say we are torturing him because we deprive him of sleep to get answers out of him, to get information out of him in hopes of preventing another September 11 or even a larger attack? Of course it brings up the debate of torture. At what point in time should torture be allowed or should it be allowed? And I think you have got to weigh that out. Think about it, and I know a lot of people, right when you use the word torture, it is a word that if you ask 100 people, do they have a positive or negative feeling about the word torture. Out of 100 people you will get 100 people who will say they have a negative feeling about the word. So right off the bat you are on the defensive side.

So I am asking some of my colleagues tonight to not draw a rapid conclusion, but put in your own mind to what extent should we be allowed to use different methods, and what type of methods should we be allowed to use on a suspect we know probably has information that if we do not get that information in a timely fashion could very easily result in the deaths of hundreds of thousands, perhaps even more, a more significant amount, even one, of innocent human beings out there that could be the victims of this kind of terrorist strike.

□ 2000

I can tell my colleagues that I would be interested for my colleagues to hear what they have to say. I am not going to carry the debate on tonight other than to tell my colleagues that I think the United States and its allies are perfectly obviously within international law and obviously within the national interests of this country to deprive a suspect of his sleep, to deprive a suspect of certain other privileges that he might enjoy as a prisoner, to see if, in exchange, we can get information from him to avoid a future attack on the United States.

It does amaze me, there is a group of people out there that protested globalization, and before that protest, they were out there protesting global warming. Now they have joined up in some of the protests. They are just professional protestors looking for a place to go and now we are going to see it.

The day after we make the arrest, now we are seeing some of these people pop up and saying, oh, my gosh, the United States is treating this suspect badly. Of course, they do not know how we are treating this suspect, but just to get the word out, they are just arousing people about it. On a commentary I heard tonight, well, they are depriving him of sleep. Give me a break. Look at the reality of the situation we are playing.

This is not a nice guy's game. This is not Mr. Nice Person. This is about human life. This is about mass destruction. This is about innocent people. This is about unprovoked attacks upon innocent people. This is about a group of individuals who are very sick in their means to reach an end. This is about people who become the victims of that means to reach an end, and if that does not broaden the parameter of what my colleagues think we ought to be entitled to do to solicit information from an individual, then I do question whether or not you have a place at the table to debate.

I want to move from that and, of course, talk about the subject at hand. I do not usually like to stand in front of my colleagues and read, and I especially do not like to read a commentary that is of much length, but I would ask my colleagues just to bear with me this evening. I want to read about two pages of content of what I think sums up very well the situation we face in Iraq, and after I discuss that, I then want to go through some of the points.

I have met with some peace protestors. Let us just say protestors. I am not sure peace is the accurate description, but protestors. I have met with people on different sides of the issue, and several questions have been asked of me by these individuals, and I thought this would probably be an appropriate forum to discuss some of those questions, which were legitimate questions, and by the way, the right to protest is very legitimate in our government. In fact, it is part of the

checks and balances. So I thought I would go through some of those and give my responses to those under the current situation that we have.

Let me first of all, though, begin by reading this commentary, and I hope my colleagues bear with me. I hope they listen to the words because we know in the history of the world that history tends to repeat itself. Not exactly. History does not repeat itself exactly, but history is a good barometer of the weather, and we all know our barometer does not give us the exact weather pattern, but most of the time what the barometer says is the kind of weather we see. It is the same with history. A good study of history gives us a good study of the future, not an exact study of the future, but a good study of the future.

I think this article of a little history, much of this history before many of us were even born is worth considering. Again, bear with me.

The author of this is Alister Cook of Britain: "I promised to lay off topic A—Iraq—until the Security Council makes a judgment on the inspectors' report and I shall keep that promise.

"But I must tell you that throughout the past fortnight, I've listened to everybody involved in or looking on to a monotonous din of words, like a tide crashing and receding on a beach—making a great noise and saying the same thing over and over. And this ordeal triggered a nightmare, a daymare, if you like.

"Through the ceaseless tide I heard a voice, a very English voice of an old man—Prime Minister Chamberlain saying: 'I believe it is peace for our time.'" I believe it is peace for our time—"a sentence that prompted a huge cheer, first from a listening street crowd and then from the House of Commons and next day from every newspaper in the land.

"There was a move to urge Mr. Chamberlain should receive the Nobel Peace Prize.

"In Parliament, there was one unfamiliar old grumbler to growl out: 'I believe we have suffered a total and unmitigated defeat.'" One voice, one lone voice in the House of Commons. I think we have suffered a total and unmitigated defeat.

"He was, in view of the general sentiment, very properly booed down.

"This scene concluded in the autumn of 1938 the British prime minister's effectual signing away of most of Czechoslovakia to Hitler."

So we are leaving the transcript for a moment.

It was when Hitler demanded that Czechoslovakia be signed over to him, and it was Chamberlain who said it is a time for peace and they adopted the doctrine of appeasement, give him Czechoslovakia and people cheered, cheered, and they booed the one dissenting voice which was the gentleman of which I just spoke. Let me go back to the text now.

"The rest of it, within months, Hitler walked in and conquered.

"'Oh dear,' said Mr. Chamberlain, thunderstruck. 'He has betrayed my trust,'" speaking of Hitler. Chamberlain said, "He has betrayed my trust."

"During the last fortnight a simple but startling thought occurred to me—every single official, diplomat, president, prime minister involved in the Iraq debate was in 1938 a toddler, most of them unborn. So the dreadful scene I've just drawn will not have been remembered by most listeners.

"Hitler had started betraying our trust not 12 years, but only two years before, when he broke the First World War peace treaty by occupying the demilitarized zone of the Rhineland.

"Only half his troops carried one reload of ammunition because Hitler knew that the French morale was too low to confront any war just then, and 10 million of 11 million British voters had signed a so-called peace ballot." Ten million of 11 million British voters had signed the peace ballot.

"It stated no conditions, elaborated no terms, it simply counted the number of Britons who were 'for peace.'

"The slogan of this movement was 'Against war and fascism'—chanted at the time by every Labour man and Liberal and many moderate Conservatives—a slogan that now sounds as imbecilic as 'against hospitals and disease.'

"In blunter words a majority of Britons would do anything, absolutely anything, to get rid of Hitler except fight him."

Let me repeat that paragraph. "In blunter words a majority of Britons would do anything, absolutely anything, to get rid of Hitler except fight him.

"At that time the word 'pre-emptive' had not been invented, though today it's a catchword.

"After all, the Rhineland was what it said it was—part of Germany. So to march in and throw Hitler out would have been pre-emptive—wouldn't it?

"Nobody did anything and Hitler looked forward with confidence to gobbling up the rest of Western Europe country by country—'course by course,' as growler Churchill put it.

"I bring up Munich and the mid-30s because I was fully grown, on the verge of 30, and knew we were indeed living in the age of anxiety.

"And so many of the arguments mounted against each other today, in the last fortnight, are exactly," exactly "what we heard in the House of Commons debate and read in the French press.

"The French especially," and please note this sentence that I am pulling out of here. "The French especially urged, after every Hitler invasion," negotiate, negotiate, negotiate.

"They negotiated so successfully as to have their whole country defeated and occupied.

"But, as one famous French leftist said: 'We did anyway manage to make them declare Paris an open city—no bombs on us!'

"In Britain the general response to every Hitler advance was disarmament and collective security."

Collective security, keep in mind, have my colleagues heard that buzz word lately? "Collective security meant to leave every crisis to the League of Nations. It would put down aggressors, even though, like the United Nations, it had no army, navy or air force.

"The League of Nations had its chance to prove itself when Mussolini invaded and conquered Ethiopia.

"The League didn't have any shot to fire. But still the cry was chanted in the House of Commons—the League and collective security is the only true guarantee of peace.

"But after the Rhineland, the maverick Churchill decided there was no collectivity in collective security and started a highly unpopular campaign for rearmament by Britain, warning against the general belief that Hitler had already built an enormous mechanized army and superior air force.

"But he's not used them, he's not used them—people protested."

Keep in mind this and let me reemphasize this sentence. "But he's not used them, he's not used them—people protested.

"Still for two years before the outbreak of the Second War, you could read the debates in the House of Commons and now shiver at the famous Labour men—Major Attlee was one of them—who voted against rearmament and still went on pointing to the League of Nations as the saviour.

"Now, this memory of mine may be totally irrelevant to the present crisis. It haunts me.

"I have to say I have written elsewhere with much conviction that most historical analogies are false because, however strikingly similar a new situation may be to an old one, there's usually one element that is different and it turns out to be the crucial one.

"It may well be so here. All I know is that all the voices of the '30s are echoing through 2003."

There is a history to the League of Nations. Many, many years ago, there was a concept that the world could live in peace. They could hold hands. The war was not necessary. I saw tonight on TV a lady, she says, if we do not get rid of war, in the next few years, war will get rid of us. That is a great quote. Tell me how it is done, and back then, I mean people throughout the history of mankind have tried to figure out how do we avoid conflict. We try and figure out how to avoid conflict every day on the streets of our communities with our police officers. How do we avoid conflict?

But we face up to the fact that there be circumstances where conflict is inevitable. We face up to the fact that in certain circumstances, violence is necessary. I am sure that wakes up a lot of my colleagues. Violence is necessary? Of course, if we have a bank robbery in process and the bank robber walks out

and shoots somebody, how do my colleagues think we stop him? A police officer stops him, hopefully peacefully, but if the police officer does not, our society gives the right to our local police officer. I do not care if it is a town of 200 people or if it is a town in New York City. We give a right to our local police officers to act with violence, to stop because we look at the larger public good. What is the larger public good?

For the League of Nations, people thought, and I think with good merit, hey, let us try this concept of the League of Nations. It will be collective security. We will act as a body, and what happened after World War I, the Germans signed on to an agreement. They would not use poison gas anymore, we promise. So the nations said all right, well, we need to have inspections; we want to come over and check out your country to make sure you are not having these gases anymore, that these gases are not being produced. So Germany says, okay, they sign the agreement.

Pretty soon, no inspections. Pretty soon, no cooperation. So what do they do? They turn it over to the League of Nations, say, okay, you are our collective security. In theory we have collective security. Go in and solve it. What does the League of Nations do? They issue resolutions. They have great talk. The French, as usual, say negotiate, negotiate, negotiate. Guess what happens? League of Nations becomes a paper tiger. The League of Nations cannot do it, and in some circumstances, we can look at exactly at the United Nations.

Keep in mind the make-up of the United Nations. The United Nations has 189 different countries. How many of those countries supported U.S. policy and what percentage of the time have they ever supported U.S. policy? I mean, the United Nations is an outfit that just appointed Libya, Libya. Remember Libya? All of those people that want peace and believe in human rights, which all of us believe in but are real strong advocates of human rights, Libya ought to come right up at the top of their radar one of the most abusive countries of human rights.

□ 2015

Guess what the United Nations just did? They named Libya head of the Human Rights Commission at the United Nations.

My point here is this: we see in the 1930s the way that they dealt with Hitler. They appeased him. They said he will never use those weapons on us. The French said negotiate, negotiate, negotiate. We face a similar situation today, a similar situation if we do not do something with Iraq. And let me just say that, with credit to a man I think is a very brave and a strong leader, President Bush, as well as DICK CHENEY, Dr. Condoleezza Rice, and Colin Powell, these people are very focused on the future of this country.

That team down there wants this country to be strong, not necessarily military, but they want this country to have a beautiful, positive future. They want peace as much as anybody wants peace. But they also know that we have to have security; that under some circumstances, no matter how deeply we desire security and peace, we cannot get it because there are people out there who wish us ill will. No matter how good we are to them.

So let us bring this back to the present situation in Iraq, and that is what I want to move on to next, to talk specifically about what our situation is in Iraq. And I want to bring up some of the questions that were asked of me by some of these people who are protesting the United States actively enforcing the U.N. resolutions and saying that Saddam Hussein cannot continue down his path of production and storage of weapons of mass destruction.

So let us start. I have often said that Saddam Hussein is like a cancer, and I think that is a good comparison. Now, there are a lot of different ways people deal with cancer. Some people will say to the doctor, when the doctor first gives them the diagnosis of cancer, they say let us go in and cut it out now, Doctor. I want to go to the hospital today, I want to go in chemotherapy today, I want to go into surgery today, I want to do whatever is necessary to aggressively and preemptively take out that cancer if we can possibly do it.

Other people take the attitude that this just cannot be happening to me. I am going to go home and go to sleep, and tomorrow I am going to wake up and find out it was a bad dream. Other people say, Doc, I do not think we need to take that kind of radical approach and attack the cancer. I think we have to be a little gentler about our approach. What I want to do, Doctor, is to go home and pray about it. Now, do not get me wrong. Prayer is, in my own personal belief and opinion, a very strong medicine. But a lot of times we need more than prayers. The prayer is kind of a supplement that we have.

Other people ignore it completely. They say, Doctor, I do not believe you. I do not believe cancer is that kind of threat. I think you have overstated the health problem for me, and I will go down my own path.

The other day I saw a cartoon that illustrates, I think very well, exactly what I am saying about the situation with Iraq, or what this Nation is saying about the situation with Iraq, and thank goodness what the President and the executive branch believe about Iraq. I refer my colleagues here to my left. Here is the doctor. We can see the patient is named "The World," and growing out of his back is a growth, and it is the face of Saddam Hussein. And the doctor says, "It's cancer. But I am sure it will go away if you leave it alone."

That is what I am saying here. We have a cancer. Now, I know nobody

wants to go to war. The previous speaker up here on the floor, the doctor, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL), he said we do not want to go to war because it impacts our economy. Of course it impacts our economy. But even that is insignificant compared to the biggest impact that all of us face. In fact, most of us in these Chambers have some member of our family right now serving in the Armed Services, whether it is in the support service in the United States or whether it is on the front line in Kuwait or waiting in the harbor in Turkey to deploy into Iraq, if that becomes necessary. We all have a lot invested in this situation.

None of us wants to see a conflict. But the fact is none of us really want to go through the pain of chemotherapy. None of us really want to go through maybe losing a foot to cancer. The fact is it is not going to go away. We have to act aggressively. And the United States has always reserved the right to act in its own national interest, and the only way the United States can do that is to act boldly and decisively. We are dealing with nothing less than a very horrible cancer; and it is a cancer that if we do not do something about it today, we know where it will be in a few years when we go back to the doctor's office, so to speak.

If we do not act, we will have a North Korea on our hands. People say, why do you not deal with North Korea? We are dealing with North Korea. That is a big problem. The situation is we should have dealt with North Korea about 8 years ago. How did we deal with North Korea? Just the same as Europe dealt with Hitler in 1938. We appeased North Korea. We offered North Korea a payment. We offered them free oil. All they had to do was raise their right hand and say they would not use the oil for military purposes. We helped them build nuclear reactors, and all they had to do was raise their right hand and say they would not use it for military purposes, but for the generation of electricity. That is how we dealt with the threat in North Korea. And look what has happened; now it is the biggest threat.

I think all of us in this House representing the people of this fine Nation have an inherent obligation to the next generation behind us. It is an inherent obligation to the next generation behind us to make sure that we deliver to them a country that is strong and secure. President Bush knows his numbers have dropped in the polls. Does anyone think Churchill did not recognize that he was booted in the House of Commons when he suggested they not appease Hitler? Sometimes it is a lonely world out there doing the right thing. But that is what is required of leadership.

The fact is we have an obligation to get rid of this cancer. The other fact is we are not going to get rid of it by saying let us not go to war; let us just look the other way. Let us just go back to the United Nations, which has been

dealing completely with defeat, completely ineffectually for the last 12 years to try to get this cancer, to get this guy to disarm.

Saddam is not going to disarm. The disarmament, by the way, that we have seen up to this point in time, is ironically, in large part, the very weapons that he has denied he has. And the only reason that that has occurred to this point is because of the military might that the United States has put right on his border, the United States and its allies. And I want to speak for a moment about that too, in a second. The United States and its allies. Does anyone think Saddam Hussein would be doing this if we did not have military forces all around his country? Does anyone think he would be cooperating because the United Nations called him on the phone and said, "Saddam, we want you to cooperate. We want you to disarm. This is the United Nations calling, and we want you to disarm, Saddam." Does anyone think he is cooperating because of that? Of course not. He is cooperating because he is looking down the barrel of a gun, and that gun happens to be our gun. We are bound and determined to disarm that regime.

And, yes, the world will be safer. And, yes, it is in the national interest of the United States. And, yes, it is in the interest of the United Nations. But who is going to act? It appears more and more every day that the United States and its willing coalition are going to be the ones that have to step forward and carry the heavy weight on this job. Not uncommon for this country. This country carried the heavy weight in World War I. We carried the weight in World War II. This country carried the heavy weight in Vietnam, in my opinion; and in the Persian Gulf this country carried the heavy weight. We do not mind. I do not think it is fair. I think we should have burden-sharing. But the fact is we are a great country, and as a leader we are expected to lead. Sometimes that is required.

Now, let me just leave here a moment and talk a moment about the allies and this willing coalition. I talked to somebody today who says the United States is going to go it alone. I said, the United States is not going to do this alone. In fact, I believe that the United States will have a larger coalition if we have to go to war. The United States under the leadership of our President and that leadership team we have got down there, will have put together a larger coalition than we had in Persian Gulf War Number One. That is right, that is what I said, a larger coalition this time than we had last time.

Now, by reading the international media, by looking at the protester signs out there on the street, one would think America and Europe have split the sheets forever. There is a big split in Europe. We have a lot of countries in Europe that support the United States. We have a lot of countries in Europe that believe that of the entire world

the United States is the bus they want to get on, the United States offers the most hope in the future, and the United States is who they are willing to stand by in the foxhole.

Now, sure, we may have a country like Poland or Hungary that does not have a lot to offer militarily. But they do not care. They would go out there with a rubberband and stand next to us. That is how gutsy some of those people are. We have some major European powers that are supporting the United States. Take a look at Spain. Take a look at Italy. Of course, Great Britain has always been a long-time ally. Well, maybe not always, a few hundred years ago. But as of late, the last hundred years or so.

Talk about Tony Blair. There is a guy that has guts. There is a guy whose photo ought to be hung in the Profiles in Courage hallway. Because he knows, by their own history, by the history that Churchill defined, by saying the doctrine of appeasement, give them what they want and they will go away, or as the doctor would say, wait long enough and it will go away. Tony Blair, President Bush, DICK CHENEY, Condoleezza Rice, and Colin Powell know that it will not go away. We all know this danger is not going to go away.

We have an opportunity today to do something about Iraq. We have that opportunity so that we are not dealing with a second North Korea here in just a few short years.

Let me move on.

Mr. Speaker, can I get a time check, very briefly?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) has 29 minutes remaining.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned earlier in my comments about some of the questions that have been asked of me by some of the people that are participating in these protests, and I thought it would be appropriate to go through some of these that I can recall being asked one by one. Because, I think I said earlier, these are legitimate areas of debate. They are legitimate questions.

Now, I am not sure in my discussions with these people whether they wanted to hear what I had to say. I think they had predetermined their thoughts. But nonetheless, they asked the questions; so let us go through the questions.

First question: Does Iraq pose a threat to our security?

I would bet that 10 years ago, 15 years ago, before North Korea began the construction of their nuclear facilities, I bet there were a lot of people that said, why do we have American forces in North Korea? Do they pose a threat to our security? Today, especially the younger generation of South Korea, people are again asking the question, does North Korea pose a threat to our security? Take a look at it.

Does Iraq pose a threat to our security? Maybe not today, although I happen to think that they can. I will tell

my colleagues why I think today they pose a threat to our security. In my opinion, if Saddam Hussein can develop a nuclear or biological or chemical weapon and put it on a missile, his number one target would be Jerusalem or Tel Aviv. He will hit Israel with that weapon. And that has a significant impact on the security of the United States of America because, in my opinion, Israel will retaliate, a massive retaliation; and we could easily have the next nuclear war in the Middle East, all started because of the fact that some in this country, when we had an opportunity to disarm a madman, to disarm Saddam Hussein's regime, insisted we look the other way; that we thought as the French thought with Hitler, you can negotiate, negotiate and negotiate.

Iraq is a threat today. And for those of who do not think it is a threat today, mark my word, just as I mentioned in the poster I had up here earlier of the cancer, mark my word, it will come back to haunt maybe not our generation, because many of us will be out of office here in a few years, but it will be back to haunt our children. And every one of us owe it not only to the children but to the children of the people we represent to make sure that even if we do not think it is a threat today, and we know it will be a threat, we have got the opportunity to fix it today. There is a problem, and we can fix it today.

□ 2030

Next question: Are we rushing to war? Boy, do I hear that. Why do we rush into war? Bush wants to take us into war.

Mr. Speaker, we are not rushing to war. Look at what we have dealt with, and let me just show Members. Again, referring to the poster, these are the United Nations resolutions from 1990 to 2003: 678, 687, 707, 949, 1060, 1134, 1154, 1205. Members get the message. Every one of these resolutions had very intense debate and was directed to Iraq over a 12-year period of time to disarm. Every one of these resolutions was like a League of Nations' attempt to hold hands, talk peacefully, and that this guy would listen to the international community.

I often hear comments he just cares about the sovereignty of his country, or this is all about oil. If Saddam Hussein cared about the people, about the people that he rules over, and it is not a democracy. In his last race, he had no "no" votes against him in the country. If he cared about those people, he would disarm and become a member of the international community. He would use those oil reserves for the benefit of his people. He could make Iraq one of the wealthiest countries the world has ever known. He could provide his citizens with freedom, with schools, with the finest universities, with the finest things that money can buy. But that is not his intent. He has no intent of listening to the international community.

Those people who are saying we are rushing into war, where have they been the last 12 years. We have tried economic sanctions. We have tried resolution after resolution after resolution. We have moved our forces to their borders and demanded that he disarm, and now he is throwing out a couple of pebbles every once in a while to pretend like he is disarming. The fact is, we should have taken care of this in the Persian Gulf War, number one. We should have gone into Baghdad and switched that regime to a regime that cared about the people of Iraq. Why could we not do? Because we listened to the community of the United Nations which said, wait a minute, free Kuwait, leave Saddam Hussein alone. He will not be a threat anymore. After all, he has promised us that he is going to get rid of those weapons of mass destruction.

Speaking of those weapons of mass destruction, there is a question that says: What weapons does he really have? These people say to me, I do not want you telling me what weapons he has. We cannot trust you on what weapons you think Saddam Hussein has. We want a verifiable source that tells us weapons, Saddam Hussein. What is a better source than Saddam Hussein himself.

This is what Saddam Hussein says he has: 2,8500 tons of mustard gas. Mustard gas will shrivel a population up into a pile of ashes. Sarin nerve gas, 795 tons. A thumbnail full of sarin gas can wipe out a subway. VX nerve gas, 3.9 tons, a deadly gas. Tabun nerve agent, 210 tons; anthrax 25,000 tons. Remember the envelopes we got here in the Nation's capital here last year, little drops of powder, not tons, not pounds, not ounces, fractions of ounces in a little envelope, and look what it did. It killed people in this country. He has got 25,000 tons of it. Uranium, 400 tons; plutonium, 6 grams.

He is the one that told us what weapons of mass destruction he has. He is the one that has not brought those weapons forward to show us in good faith, in keeping with the resolutions that he himself signed, that the United Nations themselves, resolution after resolution after resolution, put forward for him to get rid of.

What is the next question I am often asked? Will attacking Iraq yield more terrorism in retaliation? I actually have had people come up to me and say we should not go after Saddam Hussein because some of the people will get mad at us and they will carry out further terror strikes against this country. I am in disbelief. I said to this person over the weekend, whose name was John, John, you are telling me that in our community, we should say to a police officer before you arrest a suspect, we need to determine whether that suspect's family or friends will be mad at us and they might commit more crimes if we arrest the criminal? You name for me, John, one city in this country, one community in this country, one village

in this country, that instructs its police officers before they make an arrest to determine whether or not making that arrest will result in members of the suspect's family or friends of the suspect will commit more crimes against the community, therefore, you should not arrest him.

That is not how we do it in our communities, and we cannot do it that way on an international basis. They showed that they will do whatever they can to destroy America. They showed that when they ran their boat into the USS *Cole*. These people will do anything they can through any method to destroy us, and they take special enjoyment in doing this when we assist them, when we, through the doctrine of appeasement or our own citizens, say they are harmless. Give them what they want.

It happened in 1938 in Hitler, it has happened throughout history, and it is going to happen here.

Next question. Should the United States seek permission from the United Nations? I think the United Nations is an institution that has a proper place in society. I think where the United Nations serves most effectively is in nation-building. What I mean by that, in Ethiopia, for example, where they have massive starvation, I think the United Nations is an appropriate agency to go in and teach people how to farm and assist these economies. I think the United Nations has a place in our worldwide fight against AIDS, which is a horrible disease every country faces. The United Nations has a delivery system, not necessarily the most effective delivery system, but they have a place there.

But does the United Nations, which really does not have an Army or Navy or Air Force, can the United Nations be depended upon to go to battle when battle is necessary. It did not happen in the Cold War. They did not take sides in the Cold War. In the Korean War, they issued a resolution that had the United States do it for them. With Iraq, they knew they had to face up to Iraq, and the way they handled it, they, time and time again, issued resolution, resolution, resolution. Keep in mind what I was talking about in 1938 what they talked about there. Every British citizen thought something had to be done about Hitler. They were willing to do anything to get rid of Hitler except fight him. That is what it said in that article that I read.

Next question. Should the United States act unilaterally? First of all, the United States is not going to have to act unilaterally. The coalition that we have built will exceed the coalition that we had in the first Persian Gulf War. We will have at our side many countries, and many European countries will be standing at our side. So the United States will not have to act unilaterally. It will not be necessary, and the United States is not acting unilaterally.

Will it become necessary for the United States to act without the

United Nations? That may be necessary. We are not about to let the United Nations sit by as a paper tiger and look the other direction as this cancer spreads. We do not want to see a repeat of history of 1938 where the League of Nations turned the other way and hoped Hitler would be a good boy and go on and modify his behavior to become a part of the world community. We may have to act without the United Nations, but it is not because we did not give the United Nations every chance. For 12 years, the United Nations has had an opportunity to resolve this, and they have not done it.

I notice with some humor that they constantly refer to the second resolution that they are debating right now and will vote on shortly. Where did they come up with the idea second resolution? Try 17th or 18th resolution. Try 12th year. We have given the United Nations every opportunity to disarm. Do you think the United Nations would have put forces on these borders if it had not been for the leadership of this President and the leadership of the United States Congress? The answer is, no.

Should the United States act preemptively? Of course we need to act preemptively. When it meets certain standards, the United Nations needs to reach out. We cannot defend this country against terrorism completely. We cannot do it. We cannot put a glass bubble over our country. It is like trying to protect your camp when somebody is on the top of the mountain taking sniper shots. At some point, you have to reach out and attack the sniper.

In the United States, we cannot wait for terrorists to come to the United States and commit an act of terrorism before we are authorized to go after them. We have to reach out and get them. That is what we are doing throughout the world. We have every right to act preemptively, just as every community in this Nation allows their police officers to act preemptively, allows their police officers to go out, and if there is a crime in progress, and there are certain standards that police officer can meet, that officer has the right to act preemptively. We do not say to our police officers the first shot, the criminal gets the first shot, and we should not say to the world community that the terrorist or Saddam Hussein or North Korea gets the first shot. Our country is not going to allow these countries to take the first shot if we can avoid it. We always retain the right to preempt.

Finally, is North Korea a more important issue? They are all important issues, but that is the way that the question was asked to me. Of course it is an important issue; but, if we do not do something about Iraq today, Iraq will be North Korea 10 years from now. What we are doing today, if we do not stand up and deal with this today as our obligation requires us to do it, we are handing the problem over to the

next generation. Unfortunately, the problem will not be in the same proportion. The problem will have grown greatly unproportionately, and the problem that we hand over to the next generation will be much more horrific to deal with. Many, many more human lives, many more innocent human lives will be lost as a result of deferring the action on this.

We are going to have to deal even more significantly with North Korea, but it does not mean that we turn a blind eye to the next North Korea that is coming down the pike. We know who it is and where it is; and we know we can do something about it, and I am here to tell Members that we are going to do something about it. This United States Congress had enough courage several months ago to stand up and give the President of the United States, on a bipartisan basis, Democrat and Republican, give the President the authority to take this country and stop and fix the problem. We can fix it.

Let me say to Members one other question that is not on my poster, and that question is Iraq, who are they hurting? We should just leave them alone. The United States is being a bully. Why do we need to go after Iraq. Saddam Hussein is a madman, and forget the fact that women have no rights. Every woman's organization in the world ought to be standing up and ought to be walking in the streets of the world by the hundreds of thousands. Every man and woman should be protesting the way he treats women. Ask how many women ever get an opportunity of individualism or education. There is nothing in that country that is fair. But some people stand aside and say what have they ever done.

Mr. Speaker, this is what Iraq has done with its weapons of mass destruction: August 1983, mustard gas, 100 Kurds, they killed them.

October 1983, mustard gas, 3,000 Iranian Kurds, they killed them.

February, 1984, mustard gas, another 2,500 people killed.

March 50-100 Iranians killed.

1985, 3,000 Iranians killed, mustard gas.

1986, mustard gas, 8,000-10,000 killed.

1987, mustard gas, 5,000 people killed.

Time after time after time this man, this dictator, illustrates to the world that he will go and use any weapon that is necessary, not only against his enemies or perceived enemies, but his own citizens.

□ 2045

In this great country of ours, do you remember back in the war protests, I think it was Ohio State, where 14 students or maybe four, I think four students were killed by the National Guard? This country went nuts. Our own National Guard killing our own citizens, four of our own citizens? Yet some of these very people that I am sure, my age, that will remember that, that protested about that remain un-

fortunately and dishonorably silent about the horrible and egregious murders that this guy is carrying forward.

This is not an innocent country, this man. We can do more for the Iraqi people, not under an American colony. We are not trying to make Iraq an American colony. We are not going over there and saying they should adopt our democracy. But we do say one thing to the people of Iraq. We say to the people of Iraq, you will be better off. You are entitled to some individual rights. You are entitled to some enjoyment of human life. And we say to all the neighboring countries, including our friends Israel, Saudi Arabia, other countries, you are entitled to live without the threat of these weapons being rained down on your communities one day. And we say to the citizens of our own Nation, you are entitled to know that the next generation is not going to have to cure the problem that this generation ignored.

Let me say in summation, I know, and I think it is healthy that we have protests out there. I think it is. I know that some people have come out. I am amazed by some of the local city councils and communities that come out with resolutions. I do not remember a Member of Congress, I do not remember sending resolutions to some of these communities to fix their streets, but some of them have felt it sufficient to send us resolutions about not going to war with Iraq. I know there is a lot of feeling out there. But, please, take a look at what happened in 1938. Take a look at the history, more recent history, of what Saddam Hussein has done during his dictatorship of that country, the tens and probably hundreds of thousands of people. By the way, this has nothing to do with religion. We will do a little quiz here. Do you know what man in history has killed more Muslims than any other man known in history? You guessed it. Saddam Hussein. Responsible for more Muslim deaths than any other man in history.

This is a country that is a country that has a great deal of strength, built of its people, built of debate. These protests make it healthy. We have all examined this. None of us want to rush off to war. Nobody is rushing off to war. But everybody in the world must know that when the United States pulls its sword from its shield, it means business. It takes a lot for this country to do it. I think we have exercised extreme patience. For 12 years we have begged the United Nations to do something about it. For 12 years we have sat on the bench waiting for the quarterback to run a play, the United Nations. For 12 years they have done nothing but fumble and fumble and fumble. Somebody has got to step onto the field. The United States and its allies, which I want to stress again, we will exceed the number of allies we had in the first Persian Gulf War. We will go onto that field and we will do what needs to be done. And, mark my word, 15 years from now or 20 years from

now, the next generation will look back and say, thank goodness they took care of that problem because we do not know what would have happened if they had ignored it like Europe ignored Hitler in 1938.

MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFIT PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, this evening I would like to discuss the need for a prescription drug benefit for seniors. I would also like to take some time to contrast what the Democrats proposed today and essentially what the Democrats have been saying as a matter of principle, what they would like a prescription drug benefit for seniors to be like and contrast that with what President Bush has proposed in terms of a prescription drug plan. I have to say that I must stress that I do not really believe that the President's proposal is one that really provides any significant benefit or prescription drug plan to seniors. I hesitate to even discuss it as a benefit program because I do not really think that there are many people, if any, that would benefit in a significant way from it. What the Democrats proposed today is very similar to what they tried to pass in the Congress, in the House, in the last session of Congress. Basically, it is simply an extension of Medicare.

Those of you who are familiar with Medicare know that right now if you are over 65, you are eligible for a Medicare program that essentially pays most of your hospital bills and also pays for your doctor bills if you agree to pay a premium of so much a month. It is somewhere in the neighborhood of 40 or \$50 a month. What the Democrats are saying is that we would simply expand Medicare to include a new part D, similar to the existing part B that covers your hospital bills; and the principle would be very similar to what you do now with your hospital bills.

Under the Democratic proposal, beneficiary seniors would pay a premium of about \$25 a month. They would have a deductible of \$100 a year. If, for example, your prescription drug that you have to buy on January 1st or 2nd is \$100, you would have to pay that out of pocket, but then after that \$100 expenditure out of pocket, the deductible, the rest of your prescription drugs for the remainder of the year would be paid for by the Federal Government, 80 percent, and there would be a 20 percent copay or coinsurance payment.

This is exactly what you have now for part B to cover your doctor bills. Then you would pay out of pocket for your essential coinsurance, in other words, up to \$2,000. After that, if you had additional coinsurance because you had tremendous drug bills, 100 percent

of the cost of the drugs would be paid for by the Federal Government. So most importantly, essentially, what is happening here is that for most people, most of their drugs, 80 percent of their cost would be paid for by the Federal Government with a 20 percent copay.

Before I get into the specifics, because I do want to do that, I want everyone to understand how significant this is and how important it is for seniors to have something that is just like what we do now under Medicare for their doctor bills, as opposed to what the President has proposed. The President spoke today before the American Medical Association, the AMA, the association of physicians. Basically, what he said is that he would provide for seniors who are in the traditional Medicare program, which is about 85 percent of the seniors, only a couple of things in terms of a drug benefit.

First of all they would get a prescription drug discount card which he claims would reduce their cost of prescription drugs by about maybe 10 or 15 percent, although I have to say that that is strictly voluntary. There is no reason why that kind of prescription discount card would really effectuate those kinds of savings. Then he said that if your prescription drug bills are above a certain amount, a catastrophic amount, say, \$5,000 or \$6,000, the Federal Government would pay for them. But for all the seniors who do not have tremendous, catastrophic drug bills and who remain in the traditional Medicare program, the only thing that they would be able to get is the use of a drug discount card, which most of them can get today on their own.

They do not need the Federal Government to do it. In other words, there is no guaranteed benefit that you are going to get any kind of Federal benefit to pay for your prescription drugs. The President makes two exceptions to that. On the one hand he says if you are below a certain income, and he does not define at this point what that income is, but if you are a low-income senior, below a certain income, he would give a \$600-a-year subsidy to help you pay for drugs. The other option is that if you join an HMO, if you agree to join an HMO or some other kind of private insurance, not your traditional Medicare program, then you can get your prescription drugs paid for in a significant amount. It is not clear how much. Basically, it might be 50 percent, it might be 60 percent of the cost, we do not know exactly, but you have to join an HMO in order to be able to have any kind of guaranteed prescription drug plan.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I think that the way the President is going about this is very unfair, and it is not going to be helpful to most seniors. I say that because if you do not provide a guaranteed benefit under the traditional Medicare program the way the Democrats have laid out, similar to what we do now with part B for your doctor bills, then the likelihood that

most seniors are going to really benefit in any way is almost nil. I say that because we have the experience of seniors trying to join HMOs in some parts of the country, including my home State of New Jersey; and generally speaking that has been an utter failure. Most seniors, first of all, do not want to join HMOs because their choices of doctors and hospitals are severely limited. So one of the reasons why so few, less than 15 percent of seniors are in HMOs is because they want to have a choice of their doctors. They want to go to the doctor that they have been going to for years. They want to go to the hospital that is nearby. They do not want to have to be limited in what doctors or hospitals they go to. But in addition to that, there are a lot of parts of the country where there is no HMO, States, in fact, where there is no HMO available. So you do not even have the option.

Beyond that is the fact that in many States, including my own of New Jersey, and I can give you some examples, even when seniors initially joined HMOs, the HMOs eventually dropped them or they provided a prescription drug benefit initially that might have been fairly generous, maybe provided 60 percent of the cost of the coverage, but eventually increased the amount that the seniors had to pay out of pocket so much that the benefit was not even worth anything. In fact, there was a report that came out just a couple of weeks ago by Public Citizen's Congress Watch; and in that report they did a survey across the country that basically confirmed that Medicare privatization does not work for seniors. The report says that in my home State of New Jersey, nearly 80,000 of the seniors who were in an HMO in the last 2 years were dropped after basically the private HMOs concluded that it was simply not profitable to have them as part of the program.

The main thing I am trying to get across here, Mr. Speaker, is that even if you opted under the President's proposal for an HMO because that was the only way you were going to be able to get some kind of drug plan, there is no guarantee under the President's proposal what that HMO is going to provide you with in terms of a drug plan. So not only will most seniors not want to join the HMO, first of all, many seniors will not even be able to find the HMO. But even if they can find one, they lose the choice of doctors and hospitals; and even with that, there is nothing under the President's proposal that says that the HMO has to provide a specific type of prescription drug coverage or has to say that 80 percent or 60 percent of the cost is going to be paid for by the HMO. There is no guarantee. There is no benefit that is guaranteed. That is what we need. Seniors need to know that if they pay a premium, like the Democratic proposal, \$25 a month, that they have a defined deductible, \$100, that they have a defined copay, 20 percent, and the Federal Government is going to pay 80 percent of the cost.