

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.

My concern is that this administration has demonstrated such shortsighted arrogance that they have made it more difficult for the United States to retain its leadership ability and to see that the U.S. has the support it needs in this coming endeavor.

Now, it is obvious that President Bush and Mr. Rumsfeld and Mr. Wolfowitz and a number of others in the administration have intended to attack Saddam since the moment they took office, but if that is so, you would think that the administration would have done anything that they could do in order to build allies for the coming effort, both at home and abroad. Instead, the administration has dealt with Congress and with the international community in a my way or else approach.

At home, after September 11, the Congress in total bipartisanship fashioned an initial \$40 billion package to deal with the immediate response needs of the administration, but then when Members of the House and Senate attempted to talk to the administration about the need to do more to build up our homeland security efforts in our ports, on our borders, in our local communities. We were told, in essence, if you allocate or if you appropriate one dime more than I have asked for, I will veto it.

Again, in June, when Congress tried again to beef up our ability to protect communities and ports and other vulnerable areas from terrorist attack, the President vetoed more than a billion-and-a-half dollars in homeland security money that this House and the other body voted to provide by 90 percent margins of both political parties in both Chambers.

Now, that action by the White House, in vetoing those funds, raised doubts in Congress. Were we really willing to do everything necessary to baton down the hatches at home, to guard against retaliatory action if we are going to take on Saddam? The answer from the White House, given by its action on the veto of home security funds, was only partly.

Internationally, the signals were just as confusing. Now, I know the French do not need many excuses to go their own way in foreign affairs. They have demonstrated that from the time of Charles de Gaulle.

But look at the administration's conduct the last 2 years on four fronts. First, in the past 2 years, the administration has unilaterally announced its intention to, or its desire to blow up three international treaties: the nuclear test ban treaty, the antiballistic missile treaty, and the global warming treaty. Then after those actions, the administration professes surprise when the French and the Germans feel free to engage in a little unilateralism of their own. By example, it seems to me that, by example, the administration made it easy for France and Germany and others to go their own way because that is what we announced our free

right and intention to do on those other treaties.

□ 1515

Second, the administration added to the unraveling of NATO and the weakening of the Security Council resolve by announcing twin doctrines of American unilateralism and preemption. Now, obviously, the United States and any other sovereign nation has the right to undertake a unilateral or preemptive act to defend its own people. Obviously. But to announce it and to trumpet it to the world as a new intellectual doctrine scared the bejabbers out of many countries and gave other countries an excuse to do the same thing.

Mr. Speaker, whatever happened to Teddy Roosevelt's advice, "Speak softly and carry a big stick"? And it did not help that the administration's chest-beating on preemption came at the same time that our own officials were worried pea green about a preemptive military action that might be taken by either India or Pakistan during their escalated confrontation.

Third. The administration even let it be known that nuclear weapons were a possibility in Iraq under certain circumstances. That also added to the world's jitters. The net result of the administration's overblown rhetoric resulted in pro-American responses in public opinion polls in Europe declining by almost 20 percent. And all of that made it easier for the French and the German governments to question the Bush administration and its policy on Iraq. I think it would have been much harder for them to do so if the administration had not spent the last 2 years telling the rest of the world we were going to do everything our way or suffer the consequences.

And even if we, in the end, obtain the acquiescence of countries like Germany and France to proceed on Iraq, our past rhetoric will make it more difficult for the U.S. to have their support in the years ahead when we will be neck deep in a post-war Iraqi-American regency of dubious wisdom. So, in my view, in short, the administration, by its rhetoric, has written a textbook on how not to rally support on a controversial question.

Fourth. As a result of the unilateralist rhetoric, the administration has also raised the cost of this endeavor to U.S. taxpayers. President Bush's father was able to work the world by telephone, sort of in a dialing-for-dollars operation, in which he was able to convince other countries to pay their share for the cost of attacking Iraq in 1991. This President has brought a new wrinkle to diplomacy. He has offered to pay other countries for their share of the cost associated with this war. That really is an interesting wrinkle. Meanwhile, the administration has steadily hidden the potential range of costs and the duration of our occupation of Iraq from the American people.

Now, I have no doubt that we are going to war; and when we do, I, like every other Member of this body, will rally around the troops in the field, because they are doing their duty under the Commander in Chief and we have no choice and no desire to do anything but to support them. I know my daughter-in-law's brother is one of those patchy helicopter pilots who will be stuck with heavy duty over there. But, please, Mr. Speaker, spare us the rhetoric about how this operation is going to transform Iraq into a beacon of democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard such overblown rhetoric about how this action will unleash the forces of sweetness and democracy in Iraq, but I fully expect that the next thing we are going to hear is that we ought to replace New Hampshire with Iraq on the Presidential primary cycle.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the die is cast, and I am not going to continue to chew the same old argument. This House has already voted. But before this operation moves ahead, I want to express my dismay at the shortsighted and thoughtless manner in which the administration, through its careless and arrogant unilateralist rhetoric, has mishandled relations with the same NATO allies that we will need in the Security Council. And I would ask some of the same questions I asked on this floor before we went to war against Iraq in 1991. And I would say parenthetically that I was privileged to chair that debate for a considerable period of the time in which it occurred back then. But I want to ask some of the same questions I asked then.

Now, the administration clearly expects this war to go swiftly, and they expect it to go well. And they are probably right. I think they are, and I hope that they are. But my concern is what about afterwards. Do we really believe that we will not create thousands of new recruits for al Qaeda and other terrorist organizations in the Arab world? Do we really intend to continue the policy of benign neglect and drift that has characterized our policy toward the moribund peace process between the Israelis and the Palestinians? How long will U.S. military presence be in the Middle East after the war is over, and how do we intend to handle that presence that we do not become a hated occupying power in a radicalized region of the world?

And I would ask this: While we are focusing on Iraq, is the administration, by default, going to acquiesce in North Korea's becoming a permanent member of the nuclear club? It appears from what we see in the papers that that is very likely on the part of the administration.

And then I would ask, bringing the issue closer to home, what are we going to do to protect our own economy from the cost of both this war and its 10-year aftermath? So far the administration's answer is we are going to go to war and so we need to cut your taxes.

Can you imagine President Teddy Roosevelt or President Woodrow Wilson or FDR or Harry Truman saying we are going to go to war and your country needs you to accept a tax cut? Should we really be saying, we are going to go to war and so you should have a tax cut and your kids should pay the bill, not just for the war but for the 10 years afterwards? We are already being asked to borrow money to pay for this war, and the scuttlebutt is that the minute the war begins we are going to get a bill from the administration, a request for about \$100 billion. And Lord knows what it is going to cost in the next 10 years.

And my simple and last question would be: Should we, at the same time that we are borrowing money to pay for this war, should we also be borrowing money to take millionaires off the tax role, as the White House tax and budget request in fact is asking us to do? I would hope that the political leadership of this country would be more mature than that and more fair than that. I cannot believe that we are going to put this war on the cuff; that we are then going to proceed with tax action that will take another more than \$1 trillion out of the Federal Treasury in the next few years and then go to the American people with a straight face and say we have strengthened the economy for the long term.

I think Americans expect to do their duty in a time of crisis, and I think Americans do not expect that while we are having several hundred thousand troops abroad prepare to make the ultimate sacrifice in defense of what the President has concluded is in our national interest, I do not believe that at a time when those soldiers are doing that, that the best we can do back home is to say to everyone on the home front, folks, you are going to have to sacrifice by taking a tax cut, even though it is going to load billions and billions of dollars of debt on future taxpayers, including the kids that we say this war is being fought to help protect.

So, Mr. Speaker, this country is going to war. It is obvious. But I would hope that the next time that we do so we have not ahead of time, as the administration has done, that we have not ahead of time looked for ways to antagonize the very allies that we are going to need in this case, like we need support in the Security Council today if we are to have unity in the world when we take on Saddam. I hope we learn from this experience that if you intend to ask the support of the world in a military endeavor of this nature that you do not spend the first 2 years saying, by the way, everything we are going to do in the world, we are going to do it our way or no way. I do not think that is an intelligent or a thoughtful way to run foreign policy. And I certainly do not think that adding over \$1 trillion to our budget deficit and our national debt over the next few years is a way to run the economy

at a time when we are contemplating going to war.

□ 1530

#### HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES IN IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in the wake of so many thoughtful remarks made in this Chamber as perhaps this Congress is about to adjourn a weekend before America may again be called upon to lead the civilized world and the arsenal of democracy into battle.

We have heard from my colleagues this afternoon, many of the strategic and military and diplomatic justifications for that. They are legion. The violations of U.N. Resolution 1441 are painfully and patently obvious. The rejection by the regime of Saddam Hussein over the last 2 decades through five Presidential administrations and 17 U.N. resolutions, of one international convention after another, argue for the civilized world, for the forces of order, to rise up against the forces of disorder, as the columnist Thomas Friedman, from the New York Times, is want to say.

I rise today after having received a very thoughtful e-mail from a constituent named David in Richmond, Indiana. David is opposed to the war strongly, and he wrote to me after urging my staff to make sure that I saw the letter, not knowing that I see all my mail, but he urged me to look at a Web site, and so I did. It was not just a Web site opposed to the war, but it was mostly a Web site, [takebackthemedias.com](http://takebackthemedias.com), or some such thing, that showed very moving photographs of families in Baghdad.

Mr. Speaker, I brought a few of those photographs with me today, like this photograph of a beautiful baby boy curled up on a rug with his official travel papers of his family before him to prove his location. He looks an often lot like one of my three small children. David had me look at these pictures of families, like this beautiful young family with a boy about the age of my 11-year-old son, families on the streets of Baghdad. The argument was if as a Member of Congress, I were to look into the faces of those who may by virtue of living in Baghdad fall into harm's way, I might change my mind about the use of force.

Mr. Speaker, I must tell Members, as I told David in a phone call, when I look into these bright shining faces of families who live in Baghdad, in the region of what used to be Mesopotamia, this picture taken January 5, 2003, I am not moved away from taking action to remove this regime, I am moved closer toward it. As I said to David in a phone call late yesterday, when I look into these faces, I see an argument for re-

moving Saddam Hussein because I cannot imagine, particularly for the four young women depicted in this photograph, what it is like to live in Iraq during these last 20 years.

Mr. Speaker, that is why I rise today. It is in the hope of talking about the human rights record of this regime that I come to the floor today. We recall a great deal of focus in the 1990s on the human rights record of Slobodan Milosevic, and the world community coming together, including France and Germany, calling on the United States of America to challenge and to remove Slobodan Milosevic for one reason: Because of his record of abuse of human rights, his wanton killing of Muslims strictly out of a policy horrifically known as ethnic cleansing. President Clinton did nobly lead America into the breach with France and Germany under the color and authority of NATO and remove that barbarous dictator.

There were no U.N. resolution. There was no previous example of them attacking their neighbors or discussion of weapons of mass destruction, there was just a dictator who abused and tortured and killed his own countrymen for ethnic reasons.

So I am a bit confused when the human rights record of Saddam Hussein seems to be irrelevant to many who oppose the war. It is a record against which the record of Slobodan Milosevic pales in comparison. The United Nations Commission on Human Rights has actually said that Saddam Hussein's record on human rights is second only to that of Adolph Hitler in the 20th century, and I want to speak on some facts, things that we know about Saddam Hussein and his regime. It is about these beautiful young girls that I hope Members' hearts will attach, to think of a regime in which these young girls are forced to live is my purpose today.

First, from the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, a 1997 report, the Commission on Human Rights, reaffirming that all member states have an obligation to promote and protect human rights elaborates the following actions by Iraq that it strongly condemns:

One, the massive and extremely grave violations of human rights and international humanitarian law by the Government of Iraq, resulting in an all-pervasive, repression and oppression sustained by broad-based discrimination, and this is the U.N.'s terms, against his own people, widespread terror.

Two, suppression of freedom of thought, expression, religion, information, association, assembly and movement through fear of arrest, imprisonment and other sanctions.

Summary and arbitrary executions were also condemned by the U.N. Commission on Human Rights in 1997, including political killings, enforced or involuntary disappearances by the thousands. Without regard to due process, political opponents of Saddam Hussein, according to the U.N. Human