

COMMUNICATION FROM THE ATTENDING PHYSICIAN OF THE CONGRESS

The Speaker pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Attending Physician of the Congress of the United States:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, March 6, 2003.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a grand jury subpoena for documents and testimony issued by the Superior Court for the District of Columbia.

After consulting with the Office of General Counsel, I will make the determinations required by Rule VIII.

Sincerely,

Dr. JOHN EISOLD,
Attending Physician.

MAKING THE CASE AGAINST IRAQ

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

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to cover two points. One will cover recent rulings in the FCC regarding the 1996 Telecommunications Act, and the other is we are going to talk about our foreign policy with Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, in 1996 the Telecommunications Act was heralded as a grand attempt to move the telecom markets toward competition. I was a conferee on that bill. It was a great compromise between the House and the Senate. That bill was greatly heralded by many people, but 7 years later the Act's intent has been overrun by the FCC's recent decision that has effectively blocked competition and created disincentives for investment by maintaining the UNE-P status quo.

□ 1415

It is not only the intent of the act that is being circumvented. More tangibly, the already-fragile telecom industry has suffered another financial setback. In response to the FCC's decision, many of Wall Street's analysts have made their voices heard on the negative effects that the decision will have on the economy, including Morgan Stanley, Goldman Sachs, Lehman Brothers and others.

An analogy of the FCC's decision would be to allow McDonald's, or Burger King, a competitor, to come into their restaurants and use their entire facilities. You bring your meat, you fry it up, you bring your own drinks, you use it all, you use their advertising, you use their building, you use their drive-up window, you use their cash registers, and you are in competition with the McDonald's or Burger King franchise?

No one in America would ever allow a competitor to do such a thing. But

that is what is happening in the telecommunications industry. What incentive is there at all to allow investment, if that in fact is what is going to occur?

As a matter of public policy, the FCC's decision simply makes no sense. On one hand, the commission deregulates broadband, and on the other hand it complicates and multiplies regulation on UNE-P.

Last year, this body passed the Tauzin-Dingell broadband legislation, 273 to 157. I think we could argue that the will of the Congress had an impact on how the FCC views broadband. Do we now pass another bill to show the FCC that further regulation on UNE-P offers no help to the Nation's economy? Mr. Speaker, if that is what it takes, then I say, let us do it.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services has joined us here for this Special Order on behalf of the Republican leadership.

There were some what I call the voices of dissent that came to the floor, the voice of dissent with regard to war. I call it the sounds of freedom. One was asking, please give peace a chance. The other one was saying I am concerned about the long-term damage to our alliances if we do not follow what Germany, Russia, China, and France are asking for. The other says we just need to continue our diplomacy and we should follow the lead of the French. That was the voice of dissent that came here to the floor today.

I would say to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), to those voices out there that say give peace a chance, it is easy to say that when you sit in freedom, and peace is truly the consequence of freedom. America represents freedom, and we export hope and opportunity; and Iraq and some of the sub-national terrorist organizations that represent tyranny, they export fear and terror.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HUNTER. If the gentleman would yield on that point, I agree with the gentleman that the folks who express their dissent and have been expressing their dissent in government, basically giving the other side of the debate, are providing a public service by doing that. But I think there are a few observations that are important here.

There have been people demonstrating worldwide in large numbers, hundreds of thousands of people, against the prospect of war with Iraq. I do not think any of those people demonstrated when the Kurdish babies were laid low by the gas attacks with poison gas that Saddam Hussein spread over their villages.

I do not think any of those folks demonstrated when he gassed Iranians by the tens of thousands, or when he executed his own people, cut off their ears and did the myriad of reprehensible acts that have now been ascribed to him, both in closed-door sessions by

our intelligence officers and in open sessions by various human rights agencies.

So I think it is always important to set the record straight, or to come into these debates with a full understanding of where they come from. And I think one of the most honest talk shows that was ever devised for television was "Crossfire," where the conservative would say "from the right," and the liberal would say "from the left."

But it is obvious that the people who are demonstrating by the hundreds of thousands, some of them well-meaning people, also include lots of people who are not necessarily demonstrating because they have a great love of mankind, or that they are special peace people or have a special care about humanity, because, if they did, they would have been demonstrating when Saddam Hussein gassed those Kurdish babies by the hundreds. They were not demonstrating there, so that did not bother them.

It did not bother them because it was not destabilizing. I think a lot of folks do not like the idea that war in itself is something unsure, it is destabilizing, that it potentially affects the cost of gasoline in your automobile, it potentially affects your community, it may affect relatives who may have to go off to war. So it is something that brings about a feeling of unsettlement.

But let us answer that question the gentleman brought up, why are we entering into this confrontation, it appears? I think one question that could be well thrown back is this: in 1991, when we had not only lots of folks in this country and around the world against us taking action against Iraq when they invaded Kuwait, we not only had lots of folks on the streets around the world, but we also had a majority of the Democrat leadership. I do not fault that Democrat leadership for having taken their position, which they have a political right to do, and taking that side of the debate. But we found afterwards, to answer those people who said give peace some time, give it a chance, give us another 10 months, 18 months, whatever, we found out that according to United Nations estimates, Saddam Hussein at the time that we defeated him in battle was 6 months away from having a nuclear weapon.

So certainly those well-meaning folks who thought that time was on our side discovered afterward, and to the surprise of everyone, conservatives, liberals, Democrats, Republicans, none of us knew how close he was to having that system. So time is not always on our side.

It is my estimate, after having conducted some closed hearings and some open hearings, eight hearings in total, it is my judgment that this country is going to have a nuclear device in about 3 years, and, along with that capability, possessing that capability, because we have allies who have nuclear devices, Britain has nuclear devices and we are not worried about them,

that country has with its present leadership, I think, the intent to use that capability against Americans, either in theater or in the American homeland.

Mr. Speaker, when you add up capability plus intent, you have a national interest; and our national interest now is to take that away from him before he has the full capability. So I think that reasonable people can differ on this subject. But the lesson of Desert Storm I was that time is not always on our side.

Mr. BUYER. Reclaiming my time, beginning with the threat, I think is probably the right place for us to start this discussion here today.

A report released on September 9, 2002, from the International Institute for Strategic Studies, an independent research organization, concludes that Saddam Hussein at that time, actually Saddam Hussein could build a nuclear bomb within months if he were able to obtain the fissile material. Iraq has stepped up its quest for nuclear weapons and has embarked on a worldwide hunt for materials to make an atomic bomb. We all know about the aluminum tubes, the dual-use material and technologies that he has been trying to obtain.

So the gentleman's comments with regard to time, it is true; and I do not know why some people are unwilling to acknowledge this individual's ambitions. Saddam Hussein has repeatedly met with his nuclear scientists over the past few years, signaling his continued interest in developing a nuclear weapons program.

With regard to chemical munitions, Iraq admits but UNSCOM cannot confirm the destruction of 6,500 chemical-weapon bombs filled with 1,000 tons of agent, over 3,000 tons of chemical warfare agents, 614 tons of precursor chemicals used to make the most toxic nerve agent, VX, 550 artillery munitions, 155 millimeter, filled with mustard and chemical warfare agent, and 31,658 empty and filled chemical weapons munitions.

Iraq continues to rebuild and expand the dual-use infrastructure that could quickly divert from chemical weapons production such as chlorine and phenol plants.

Iraq is seeking also to purchase chemical weapons, agents, precursors, and applicable production equipment and is making an effort, obviously, to hide those facilities while inspections even continue.

With regard to biological weapons, Iraq admits, but the U.N. cannot confirm, the destruction of 8,500 liters of anthrax, 2,160 kilograms of bacterial-growth media, enough to produce 26,000 liters of anthrax, 38,000 liters of botulinum toxin and 5,500 liters of aflatoxin.

Mr. HUNTER. If the gentleman would yield on that point, the facts that the gentleman is putting out are especially important because those are not guesses on our part. In fact, they are not even guesses on the part of the

United Nations or on the part of the arms inspectors. Those come from documents from the Iraqis themselves, from their own declarations and their own documents. So the 6,500 liters of anthrax, for example, which is enough anthrax to kill around 1 million folks, is something that came from their documentation, not ours. That is something that they have not turned over.

The thousands of chemical munitions that the gentleman has gone through, that comes from their documentation, not ours. So this is like the storekeeper who says here is my inventory list, and then later on he wants you to expect that somehow, without any outward manifestation or anything that could be picked up or anything that was shown to the rest of the world, all of those weapons have disappeared.

Let me just say, and this might be the time to comment on this, the easiest bet in show business is that this tiny little handful of so-called inspectors, and there are less inspectors than there are policemen in the average small town in America, the idea they are somehow going to be able to go through this massive state and discover weapons of mass destruction in these vast empty buildings that the inspectors are being shown by the Iraqi bureaucrats, the idea that that is in some way going to happen is an absolute fantasy.

So I predicted early on, before this thing ever started, on the record, that they were not going to find anything of import. These folks have had a long time to bury it. And the Iraqi bureaucrat who actually leads arms inspectors into these places, and 90 percent of them are places where they have been before, time and again, big empty buildings, and lo and behold, there is a weapon of mass destruction that somehow the maid forgot to clean up from the night before, that bureaucrat is going to be considered two things: one, the dumbest bureaucrat in Iraqi history, and, secondly, shortly thereafter, the dearest bureaucrat in Iraqi history.

So this is a state that has had an entire agency devoted to hiding things very effectively, and the idea that this little bitty corporal's guard of so-called inspectors is somehow going to find them, is like saying that this massive police force in Washington, DC., and the police force in D.C. is 10 times as big as the inspectors for all of Iraq, it is like saying that the drug lords of Washington, DC. are expected to pile all of their cocaine at an intersection on Pennsylvania Avenue at a given time. When they do not pile it up, and the Washington Post thereby concludes that there is not any cocaine in Washington, DC., you will have the equivalency to what some of the media is doing today with these reports of negative findings with respect to Iraq.

Of course, they are not going to turn over this stuff that they have spent millions of dollars hiding to this little bitty force which does not have the ability to go in and which is having ab-

solutely no success in terms of finding it.

Remember this great idea where we were going to isolate or bring out for interrogation these people in the Iraqi technical establishment, the scientists, the engineers who build this stuff? Somehow we were going to get them and the families alone outside of the country, and then they were going to tell us things, just like the ones that have come out have told us.

Now, that has not happened; and not surprisingly, while these people are under the control of Saddam Hussein, while the Iraqi guard stands there and looks them in the eye, they say, I would rather not talk unless I am accompanied by one of Mr. Hussein's officials.

□ 1430

Well, of course they say that. The safety of their lives and the lives of their children depend on them saying that.

This country has to act in the security interests of the United States. I recall, with respect to these other countries that have not come on board, that when Menachem Begin hit the Iraqi nuclear reactor site in Osirak in the 1980s, lots of countries in the world publicly deplored the act, and said this was a terrible intrusion on the Iraqi airspace. They then walked quietly into the security of their own offices and they breathed sighs of relief because that capability had been taken away.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman, is this the same nuclear reactor that was built by the French?

Mr. HUNTER. Yes. I think one French engineer was killed that way. There was one engineer working on a Saturday or Sunday at the Iraqi site. As I recall, there was one engineer killed.

My point is, the world has two faces; one face in which they, too, are deathly afraid of an emerging nuclear capability on the part of Saddam Hussein, and terrified with the present-day chemical and biological weapons capability. They do not want him to hurt them, they want us to protect them. On the other hand, those people, especially the people that Don Rumsfeld describes as those who live in the neighborhood, who have to deal with them, are going to be very reluctant to publicly say that the bully should be taken on, because the bully is going to remember what they said.

Mr. BUYER. I would say to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), since we talked about the present threat, let us spend a little time on what Saddam Hussein has done from 1991 to present.

With regard to his repression of the Iraqi people themselves, there is his refusal to admit human rights monitors; continued torture; the executions and repression of political opposition; disappearances of people in the night;

withholding of food and medicine in the food for peace program; the mass murder of Iraqi Kurds and Iraq Shi'a Muslims. He continues to support international terrorist organizations, which has been well known.

He also has refused to account for Gulf War prisoners. In his failure to account, Saddam Hussein has been unwilling to come forward on 609 cases of missing Gulf War prisoners of war and missing in action representing 14 nationalities, including one American pilot. We also have Saddam Hussein failing to return and account for a large number of Kuwaiti citizens and citizens of other countries who were detained during the Iraqi occupation.

Also, Saddam Hussein has refused to return stolen property from Kuwait, and Saddam Hussein has continued his efforts to circumvent the economic sanctions.

So for those who are saying give peace a chance, let us let the economic sanctions work, are they working, I ask the gentleman from California?

Mr. HUNTER. I think the gentleman has given an excellent representation of what this dictator does, Mr. Speaker, and what he stands for. I think that builds an excellent context in which we can try to evaluate whether or not peace would work, given a chance.

First, he is deceptive. Secondly, I think he believes his future depends on manufacturing weapons of mass destruction. Third, he is willing to take his own people through enormous discomfort and inconvenience and danger in order to achieve his own political ends.

But I would say to the gentleman that there are pieces of Saddam Hussein's activities, although maybe not the composite, but it can be fairly said, and it has been said by lots of people, are there not other dictators in the world who do the same thing, and we are not attacking them?

I would say that that is true. I would say the reason that I think we should move forward, and I think is the major justification for this massive operation, is American security. This guy is the leader who has used ballistic missiles against American troops and killed them with it. He has used poison gas against his own people in recent times. He has exhibited a willingness to kill Americans.

As a result of the background that I have seen and the facts that I have seen, it is my conclusion that if he can achieve the production of a nuclear device, that at some point he will use it on our troops in theater or on Americans. I think it is a wise decision to keep him from being able to do that.

That takes us to, I think, what I think is a very important point for policy debate. It has been a point for policy debate. We now have what I call the Pearl Harbor school emerging from the other side of this debate. Those are the people who say, by golly, we are America. We wait for our Pearl Harbors before we respond. When the enemy in-

flicts a heavy blow on us, that is when we rally; that is when we talk about the day of infamy; and that is when we go out and strike back and overwhelm the enemy, and justice prevails.

The problem with the Pearl Harbor school is that these weapons are so severe today and so dangerous and so destructive that we cannot afford to wait to have a Pearl Harbor occur before we eliminate the source. To some degree, we are carrying that out right now. September 11 killed a lot of Americans; but, arguably, the new tightening of our borders, the new security efforts we have undertaken in the American homeland should prevent some of those things from being able to happen again.

Therefore, it could be argued that there is no reason for us to be in Afghanistan going after people and disrupting terrorist groups; in fact, in some cases taking on people who personally were not involved in the event of 1995.

But what we have discovered is that we do have to do some preemption. I think this question is going to be facing us again and again in this century: Are we going to stand by and watch somebody who has demonstrated an intent to kill Americans develop high technology with which he can kill lots of Americans, and stand by and wait for him to gain that weapon and use it on us before we respond; or are we going to try to eliminate that danger before the Pearl Harbor occurs?

That is a tough thing, because Americans do not like to be the first ones to strike out. When we watch the speech of FDR after Pearl Harbor, there was no dissent in the House Chamber. That was an easy vote, that vote for war. We were all together, we had that common ground, and had that feeling that we were in the right. As Joe Lewis said, we felt that God was on our side.

Now we are faced with these terrible weapons, and we cannot afford to take the blow that will come from those systems. In a way, we are a little bit like little tiny postage stamp Israel that stood there and watched this nuclear reactor being built in Iraq. They had seen the speeches by Saddam Hussein where he made thinly veiled threats to the effect that the final recipient of the output of those nuclear reactor plants would be weapons detonating in Israel. Israel realized they were too small, too flimsy, too frail to take that massive blow, so they went out and destroyed that plant.

Unfortunately, one person was killed. He was an engineer from France who was working there over the weekend. But because of that, they saved thousands of people from being killed.

So whether we embark on this policy of preemption or not is a valid subject for a major policy debate, but I think, in many cases, the answer must be yes; and certainly in this case this person is a person who has already killed Americans with ballistic missiles as well as with conventional capability, and has tried to acquire these other capabilities.

Because of that, I think we see the intent, and when the intent is married up with the ability to do it, we are going to rue the day that we, for convenience' sake and for stability's sake and for safety's sake, we gave up an opportunity to disarm him when we had the opportunity.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, to support the gentleman's position on a preemptive strike, I think it has been clear that Saddam Hussein's efforts to circumvent the economic sanctions has proven itself very successful. Saddam has illegally imported hundreds of billions of dollars in goods, in violation of economic sanctions, and even outside of the U.N.'s oil for food program.

For example, Iraq has imported a fiberoptic communications system that supports the Iraqi military. It has diverted dual use end items obtained under the oil-for-food program for military purposes. For example, Iraq diverted U.N.-approved trucks for humanitarian relief purposes for military purposes, and has used construction equipment to rebuild weapons of mass destruction-affiliated facilities. They came to Iraq under the dual use program.

Saddam Hussein also has about \$3 billion in illegal proceeds that he is able to use with these items. He is contracting with over 75 nations around the world, and he is giving priority contracts to France, Germany, and Russia in return for their support in this very difficult time.

Does the gentleman have any comments he would like to add?

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I would just say, and I hope my colleague will excuse me, because I have to go try to do something we have both been working on, and that is talk to some folks from our Committee on the Budget and convince them we need more for defense.

But I would say, Mr. Speaker, that I think the gentleman has laid out a very well-documented case for taking action. I notice also that the gentleman is a veteran of the Gulf War. He told me about the apprehension that he and other Americans had when they heard those missiles coming in.

This is a very dangerous situation we are in. I think we have to acknowledge it every time we debate this issue. Is this dangerous? Yes, it is dangerous. The policies of doing nothing are also extremely dangerous. This is not going to be the easy century following the disassembly of the Soviet empire that we once thought it was going to be.

I think we need to have a broad military capability, the ability to make a surgical strike, to fight guerilla warfare, to take on conventional attack and armored attack, and also the ability to stop a missile attack. We live in an age of missiles, and we have to be able to stop that.

In this case, we have to have the ability to preempt and disarm an adversary whose intended goal is to destroy Americans. I know it is a difficult,

tough thing to do, and I would just ask the gentleman to comment on this a little in his remarks after I leave.

I have been impressed with this President, because if he had wavered slightly through this last process of the last 6 months or so, we would be faltering right now. But he understands his role, which is as President of the United States, and his duty to the security of the United States.

That is not a role which is to be subverted by a vote by Cameroon, for example, or some other country whose name Americans have difficulty remembering. It is an American obligation to defend Americans. He is our Commander in Chief. He staged the forces very effectively for this operation. He is willing to account for the success or failure of any military operation. He is a good commander in chief. I think he has done the right things.

I think some of the allies falling by the wayside was entirely predictable, because when good old Americans can carry the load, other countries are often willing to let us do that. That is why, when we bring 90 percent of the funding to a military operation that they ask us to do, like Bosnia, we sometimes choke a little bit but we usually do it; and usually they are willing to stand back and let us bear the brunt of those operations, because it is practical for them for their politics and economy.

But this President has kept his eye on the ball, which is to disarm Saddam Hussein. I think he is moving this mission forward in a very effective manner.

I want to thank the gentleman. I would like him to talk a little bit about Desert Storm. I have to take off, but I would like the gentleman to share with folks about Desert Storm, that the gentleman is a veteran of, and the quality and capability of the folks we have in the Armed Forces.

Mr. BUYER. I thank the gentleman from California, Mr. Speaker.

There have been over 17 resolutions before the United Nations in which Saddam Hussein continues his open defiance.

The first resolution was November 29 of 1990, that said Iraq must comply fully with Resolution 660 regarding the illegal invasion of the country of Kuwait.

The next resolution was number 686, on March 2 of 1991. It says Iraq must release prisoners detained during the Gulf War. Iraq must return Kuwaiti property seized during the Gulf War. Iraq must accept the liability from international law for damages during its illegal invasion of Kuwait. He has not done anything about that.

The next resolution, number 687 on April 3 of 1991, Iraq must unconditionally accept the destruction, removing and rendering harmless under international supervision of chemical and biological weapons, all stocks of agents, and all related subsystems and components of all research develop-

ment, support, and manufacturing facilities. This was in 1991.

Iraq must unconditionally agree not to acquire or develop nuclear weapons or nuclear weapons-usable material, or any research, development, or manufacturing facilities. It continues, recalcitrant.

Iraq must unconditionally accept the destruction, removal and rendering harmless under international supervision all ballistic missiles with a range greater than 150 kilometers. Now he is destroying missiles; this was back on April 3 of 1991. The list goes on and on under that resolution.

The next resolution out of the U.N. Security Council was number 688 on April 5 of 1991. It condemns the repression of the Iraqi civilian population, the consequences of which threaten international peace and security.

Iraq must immediately end repression of the civilian population, and Iraq must allow immediate access of international humanitarian organizations to those in need of assistance. It never happened. Those were the words of the U.N. April 5 of 1991.

The next resolution came from the U.N. Security Council, number 707, on August 15 of 1991.

□ 1445

It condemned Iraq's serious violation of resolution 687. It condemned Iraq's noncompliance with the International Atomic Energy Agency and its obligations under the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. Iraq must halt nuclear activities of all kinds until the Security Council deems Iraq in full compliance. August 15 of 1991. Never happened.

The next resolution by the U.N. Security Council, No. 715, October 11 of 1991, said Iraq must fully cooperate with the U.N. and the International Atomic Energy Agency inspectors. Never happened.

The next resolution from the U.N. Security Council, No. 949, October 15 of 1994, condemns Iraq's recent military deployments toward Kuwait. Iraq must not utilize its military or other forces in a hostile manner to threaten its neighbors or U.N. operations in Iraq. Iraq must fully cooperate with U.N. weapons inspectors and Iraq must not enhance its military capability in southern Iraq. Never happened.

The next U.N. Security Council resolution was No. 1051 on March 27, 1996. They said Iraq must report shipments of dual-use end items related to weapons of mass destruction to the U.N. and to the International Atomic Energy Agency. Iraq must fully cooperate with the U.N. and these agency inspectors and allow immediate unconditional, unrestricted access. It never happened.

The next U.N. Security Council resolution, 1060, on June 12, 1996. It deplores Iraq's refusal to allow access to U.N. inspectors and Iraq's clear violations of previous U.N. resolutions. Iraq must cooperate fully with U.N. weapons inspectors and allow immediate unconditional and unrestricted access. It never happened.

The next resolution by the U.N. Security Council was No. 1115 on June 21 of 1997. It condemns repeated refusal of Iraq authorities to allow access to U.N. inspectors which constitutes a clear and flagrant violation of U.N. resolutions 687, 707, 715 and 1061. Iraq must fully cooperate with the U.N. weapons inspectors and allow immediate, unconditional and unrestricted access. Iraq must give immediate unconditional, unrestricted access to Iraqi officials whom the U.N. inspectors want to interview. It never happened.

The next U.N. Security Council resolution was 1134 on October 23, 1997. It condemns repeated refusal of Iraqi authorities to all access to the U.N. inspectors which constitutes a flagrant violation, again, of resolutions 687, 707, 715, and 1061. It says Iraq must fully cooperate with the U.N. weapons inspectors and allow immediate unconditional, unrestricted access.

Boy, this sounds like a broken record.

Iraq must give immediate unconditional, unrestricted access to Iraqi officials whom U.N. inspectors want to interview. It never happened.

The next resolution came from the U.N. Security Council on November 12, 1997. It condemned the continued violations by Iraq of previous U.N. resolutions including the implicit threat of safety of aircraft operated by U.N. inspectors and the tampering of U.N. inspectors' monitoring equipment. It reaffirmed Iraq's responsibility to ensure the safety of U.N. inspectors, and Iraq must fully comply with U.N. inspections and allow immediate unconditional, unrestricted access. It never happened.

The next U.N. Security Council resolution was 1154 on March 2, 1998. They said Iraq must fully cooperate with the U.N. and the International Atomic Energy Agency weapons inspectors and allow immediate unconditional, unrestricted access and notes that any violation would have the severest of consequences for Iraq. That was in 1998. Do you think Iraq was scared? These words are beginning to get very, very empty if you say them over and over again.

The next resolution was 1194, September 9 of 1998. It condemned the decision by Iraq on the 5th of August 1998 to suspend cooperation with the U.N. and the International Atomic Energy Agency inspectors, which constitutes a "totally unacceptable contravention of its obligations under the U.N. resolutions 687, 707, 715, 1060, 1115, and 1154." And they said Iraq must fully cooperate with the U.N. and IAEA weapons inspectors and allow immediate unconditional, unrestricted access.

The next resolution came on the 5th of November of 1998. It was resolution 1205 of the U.N. Security Council. It condemns the decision by Iraq of 31 October 1998 to cease cooperation with

the U.N. inspectors as a flagrant violation of resolution 687 and other resolutions. And they said Iraq must immediately and completely and unconditionally cooperate with the U.N. and IAEA inspectors. It never happened.

The next resolution by the U.N. Security Council was No. 1284, December 17, 1999. It created the United Nations Monitoring, Verification and Inspection Commission to replace previous weapons inspection teams. And they said Iraq must allow this new inspection team the immediate unconditional, unrestricted access to Iraqi officials and its facilities. Iraq must fulfill its commitment to return Gulf War prisoners, this is 1999, and calls on Iraq to distribute humanitarian goods and medical supplies to its people and address the needs of vulnerable Iraqis without discrimination. It never happened.

The next resolution then was the one which is presently being discussed, 1441. This resolution was meant to be different from all of these that I just mentioned. Because this resolution was by its very nature words that were negotiated painstakingly to give a final opportunity for Iraq to comply with its disarmament obligations under all these relevant resolutions by the council.

During that same time, Congress decided it would also exercise a voice. In 1998 there was H.R. 4655, a sense of the Congress that U.S. policy is regime change and democracy for Iraq. That was during the Clinton administration, October 5 of 1998.

On December 20 of 2001, House Joint Resolution 75, Congress spoke and said Iraq is in material breach of U.N. resolutions. It passed this House by a vote of 390 to 12.

The next resolution that came from this House was on October 10, 2002, which authorized military force in Iraq and passed this House by a vote of 296 to 132. So we have had a continued decade of deception and defiance that has been noted.

The decade of deception and defiance continues. I went through this long litany. Sure, it may have taken 15 minutes, but it was 10 years of work and labor by the U.N.

The time for the U.N. in its relevancy and materiality of this present is before us. Are the words going to have meaning? The President has come forward and made that point very clear to the United Nations.

My hope is that the U.N. stands firm and gives definition to their meaning. Saddam Hussein has had a long history of complying with inspectors on a very small and technical scale, and then he continues to cheat inspectors on a very large scale. His tactical concessions are designed to buy time and ease pressure on his regime and to split the international community and to hopefully end resolve.

Since 1991 Saddam has presented no fewer than six, six full and final and complete declarations of his illegal bio-

logical weapons programs alone. Each of these has been an outward lie and has failed to account for large stockpiles of prohibited materials.

The United Nations has worked with three countries to give very good examples of cooperative disarmament. Those countries would be South Africa, Kazakhstan, and Ukraine. And there are three very basic elements of cooperation. One is a decision must be made at the highest level to disarm. Next would be you have to state your national intentions. And third is you cooperate with international efforts to verify the disarmament behavior and that it is open and it is transparent, not secretive.

Iraq with regard to its highest level, their efforts are concealment. Iraq also tasked its key institutions toward thwarting the inspectors, and instead of transparency, Iraq chooses to conceal and lie. That is very, very different from what we have seen. So the cosmetic compliance that is presently going on is nothing new.

With regards to Dr. Blix, I want to extend my thanks. He has a very difficult job to do. He is trying to make Saddam Hussein comply. Knowing that this track record that we have laid out, knowing the little games he plays, and the cheat and retreat strategy that he has, Dr. Blix has a tremendous job. But Dr. Blix was never meant there to be a detective. He was meant there to work with a country cooperatively in a transparent effort to disarm the country that was meant to comply with all of these resolutions.

So almost what has happened is that the world has placed an unrealistic expectation upon Dr. Blix. We cannot do that and should not do that to him. That is why resolution 1441, it demands nothing less than the full and immediate disarmament by Iraq. So this report that is going to be presented tomorrow is extremely important. I believe that no one can say that Iraq's cooperation has been full and immediate because the regime has submitted a false declaration, it has blocked private interviews. Only 5 of the 30 requested UNMOVIC have even taken place. They have threatened witnesses and their families with death, and they have hidden documents and concealed materials from inspectors.

The "why now" question for me is obvious. For others who perhaps do not know about all these resolutions and what has gone on, it is a good question to ask. The President has come forward with a preemptive doctrine. Some maybe do not understand what a preemptive doctrine is.

What is extremely important is after September 11 is that we have a right of self-defense. We also should be taking our defenses in doubt. What that means is you do not just say we are only going to focus on homeland security. We are going to cower in our defenses and seek the security because we feel insecure. No. You take it to where the threat is. So whether it is in Afghanistan or

whether it is in the Horn of Africa or wherever al Qaeda is trying to hide, you work cooperatively with nations; you take it to the terrorist organizations.

Likewise, with Saddam Hussein, who poses a threat to destabilize the region of the Middle East, the United States as a superpower, some people are uncomfortable with that word, but it is true. The United States is the sole remaining superpower. We have a responsibility to regional stability in the world.

Saddam Hussein has been recalcitrant to the world, and his threats will continue along with his cooperation with these terrorist organizations.

Now, I am a father, like many. My son is 17. I love Ryan. But if I said, Ryan, you know, you have got a curfew and he violated his curfew 17 times and I did nothing, and I see he is getting ready to go out tomorrow night and I said, Ryan, remember your curfew, what do you think he is going to do? He is going to come home whenever he pleases. Why? Because my words are hollow. They mean nothing. I say them, but he will not follow them because they have no meaning or definition, therefore, no consequence for the recalcitrant act. That is Saddam Hussein.

So all these resolutions that I talked about, great words. They are firm. But if the U.N. is not going to give meaning and definition to the words, who will?

□ 1500

Who will stand up and exercise the might to make right? Once again, the United States, we have seen this before. We have been there before. We are going to do it again.

I think about my comrades who find themselves on the desert floor. I remember very much what it was like. One thing I can share and to the mothers and fathers who have their loved ones who are about to be in harm's way is that not only has this Congress taken the appropriate resources to help train and equip these men and women over the last decade, this force is better than the force that I fought with in the Gulf War. I am so proud of them. When I see them, they give me chills. They represent the very best of America.

I will never forget the scene in the Indianapolis airport of a young sailor who was getting ready to be shipped off, and he has his sisters with him, his very young brother, his parents are standing there and his grandparents are also standing there, and he is standing there in a sailor's uniform. His youngest brother is holding the sailor's cap as if it were a crown, and it is a scene unlike many scenes all across the country.

Now this Congress has done its duty. It has been vigilant to make sure that this force is prepared. It will be highly lethal, it will be highly mobile, and it has very precise munitions.

With regard to the enemy for which they are about to face, I remember the

Iraqi people themselves, to include the conscripts. I interrogated many of them during the Gulf War. They do not like Saddam Hussein. Iraq is a very wealthy country, and Saddam only takes the wealth of that country to the benefit of a very few as he suppresses other tribes within Iraq. They do not like Saddam Hussein.

One of the individuals I was interrogating had, under his blouse, I saw this red and blue sort of semicircle. I could not understand exactly what it was. I asked him to undo his blouse and it was a Chicago Cubs T-shirt. He had relatives that lived in Michigan, and they were fans of the Cubs, and so he tried to track the Chicago Cubs.

One other story. In order to help bring calm and peace at the Western antiwar camp, we gave the Iraqi prisoners, over 46,000 of them, what they wanted to hear. They wanted to listen to Madonna. So we piped in Madonna music. They are more Western than one can imagine, and they do like America, and they do not like Saddam Hussein.

With regard to the leadership, I came out of the interrogation tent. My interpreter at the time was former King Fahd's grandson, Bandar, and as I come out of this tent, there is an Iraqi general officer sitting on the desert floor. He is sitting there with his legs crossed. His elbows are on his knees. His hands are in his face, and he is weeping like a child so hard that his shoulders are actually shaking. I stood there and I looked at this and behind are his army. I walked up to the gentleman, and I kicked the sole of his boot. I then ordered him to stand at attention.

Through the interpreter he tells the general man to stand up. I got really close to him, looked at him, asked if he was a general officer. He asked him and acknowledged and shook his head and said yes, and I told him then act like one. Now think about this scene. I am a United States Army captain, telling an Iraqi general officer how to act. Why? Why would a United States Army captain have to do such a thing? Because he was not a general officer because of his strategic mind and his tactics. He was a general officer because of his loyalties and relationships to Saddam Hussein.

So, with regard to "the enemy" in which we are about to face, they are not led by great military minds. So it would be no wonder why the conscripts and others will fold quickly. I also believe that he was weeping, not for his men which stood behind him, he was weeping for himself because he knew that upon repatriation, Saddam Hussein would probably execute him. That is the repression of Saddam Hussein.

The Kurds and the Shi-ites have been waiting a long time for this day. I know that in my own sense and feeling of having gone through what no differently that my ancestors have gone through for freedom and liberty in this country, I know about the con-

sequences of war. I know about the long dark shadows of horror. I know about things that are unimaginable and things one does not speak of and things that we see we just cannot believe. War is inhumane toward mankind and I cannot believe in this day and age, for all of our sophistication and technological advances, that man still yet has not found a way to resolve our differences.

The bottom line is this is not up to us. This is now up to Saddam Hussein. I still hold out the hope that there is a country out there that is willing to take him in and that we can actually move in peacefully and change the regime. That is my desire, that is my hope. It is my prayer and I know that the soldiers that are standing there feel the same way. They pray for peace, even though they are prepared for war because they are the ones that gave an oath to give their life to defend the Constitution and our very liberties and freedom.

So let me end where we started, with the voice of dissent. I acknowledge the voice of dissent as constructive to the discussion. I find what is not constructive are those in an antiwar message that would also be "un-American." Do not go out and burn the flag. Do not say and be obnoxious and do something stupid. If a person has got something that is constructive that can bring peace and tranquillity to this world, step forward and say it, but they can do so in a manner without being un-American or being disrespectful of individuals of whom have lost loved ones, or even have someone who finds themselves in harm's way in the very next few days.

I think what we should do is go find something and send it to a soldier that is in the desert. Pick it out, support the troops that are over there. Believe me, it is a very lonely place, the Saudi Arabia and Iraqi and Kuwaiti desert. Just to glance upon the American flag is something that will give a chill because it is the only thing out there that that can strike a memory of home and of loved ones.

I know that the decision that President Bush has in front of him is one that he understands the burden of the decision because he also understands the opportunity that the peace will bring, not only to the regional stability, but the opportunities and new alliances and greater heights for freedom.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MENENDEZ (during the Special Order of Mr. BUYER). Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 130) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 130

Resolved, That the following named Members be and are hereby elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT: Mrs. Jones of Ohio, Mr. Green of Texas, Ms. Roybal-Allard, Mr. Doyle.

Mr. MENENDEZ (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WAR WITH IRAQ

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, in the conduct of foreign affairs, every President deserves the benefit of the doubt.

I am standing here today in an empty Chamber because these special orders are simply the time in the House's schedule when after legislative business is concluded Members can gather or take the time to get something off their chest, and so I am here today to get something off my chest about the coming war with Iraq.

As I said, in the conduct of foreign affairs, I think every President deserves the benefit of the doubt, and on a number of occasions, I have worked with Presidents, regardless of party, on foreign policy issues. Sometimes I have honestly differed.

Iraq, in my view, is a close call. There is no doubt that Saddam Hussein is a pathological thug. We have lived with and contained other sociopaths before. Example, Joseph Stalin, whose 50-year anniversary of his death we just celebrated yesterday. It is hard to believe he has been gone 50 years, but we did not attack the Soviet Union, even though Stalin was probably one of the two greatest sociopaths of all time, the other being Hitler.

We have also seen groups like the Khmer Rouge systematically butcher their own people, and certainly, the administration has not, in any way, demonstrated or tried to demonstrate that Saddam had anything to do with the attack of September 11.

But it may very well be that we need to remove him at some point, and that point may be soon. My purpose today is not to talk about that. My purpose is to talk about what condition America will be in both at home and abroad if we take on that task, because if we do it, we have an obligation to go after Saddam in a way that does not weaken our ability to lead the world in dealing with future challenges that will certainly confront us.