

UNITED STATES IS NOT ACTING
ALONE

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. Madam Speaker, I cannot resist responding to the previous speaker's comments.

I am appalled frankly by some of the statements that were made from that podium just a few short minutes ago. The United States of America is not acting alone. The United States of America has not failed in diplomacy. It is the United States of America by the use of force through the United States of America and its allies, including the British, the Spaniards, the Italians and many other countries on the European continent, that have forced Saddam Hussein to come up with the weapons that he has come up with so far for destruction.

The United Nations has tried unsuccessfully, unsuccessfully year after year after year after year, through inspections, through economic sanctions, through criticism, through 16 or 18 separate resolutions, and yet the fine lady stands up in front of this House and says that the way we need to start this is with discussions.

What has been happening the last 12 years? I will tell you what has been happening the last 12 years. Saddam Hussein has been very methodically building up his arsenal, and I intend later this evening to go over not just a broad allegation that he has got additional weapons of mass destruction, not just an additional, not just a broad allegation that he has utilized these weapons of mass destruction because we know, in fact, he has. He has gassed his own citizens. He used them in his attack against Iran. He had prepared to use them when he occupied Kuwait.

What did he do these last 15 years, 12 years? That is exactly what he has done. He has very methodically, as I said, built up an arsenal. And now we have some people in our own Chambers that stand up and say, we ought to go talk more. We ought to start the inspection process and eventually kind of ramp it up a little.

Where have they been? With all due respect to my colleagues, when does this end? When are we going to say enough is enough?

I hope this evening I am able to present you with some remarks, with some convincing evidence, persuasive remarks that will show you just how evil this guy is.

It is amazing to me as I look out at the worldwide press, I do not think by the way the worldwide population, but as I look at the worldwide press, their media is slanted towards building up the good character of Saddam Hussein and destroying the good character of George W. Bush and America. What my colleague failed to mention in her previous statements here is she blames

the United States for problems with our allies. Let me tell you, take a look on the our allies. We have good, strong, solid allies out there and we have good relationships with many of our allies out there, but the fact is we also are a leader. We are the strongest Nation in the world. We are not going around boasting about it, but sometimes it falls upon the shoulders of the strongest person to pull that wagon up the hill. You know, if you have horses on a team and you are trying to get that wagon up the hill and you have some weak horses, at some point you have got to replace them with strong horses. That is not to say anything bad about the weak horses. It may be, in fact, that those horses were not built to pull a wagon up the hill. That is what we have happening here.

We have the French who for political reasons because they do not have much of a military, who for political reasons have decided to advance their causes by being the worst critic of the United States, by being the worst critic, you find very few words in the rhetoric on the fine island of France, and I say island because they are isolating themselves within the European continent, you find from their fine words horrible criticism of the United States of America.

You never hear the French leaders talk about what the United States does for the world. Do you know if you take a look we have no reason to apologize for this country. This country feeds more hungry people than any other country in the world. This country educates more people and educates them to a higher level than any other country in the world. This country exports, it overflows with freedom compared with any other country in the world. This country produces the greatest inventions known to man in the greatest quantity of any other country in the world. This country allows more private property rights than any other country in the world. Our Constitution allows more rights for our judicial system than any other country in the world.

We have the best medicine. Some of the best medicine ever known to mankind is developed in this country. Open heart surgery. You take a look at what you have. Root canals. You take a look at it. It is the United States of America. And yet we have Members of our own body up here apologizing and condemning our own country for perceived shortfalls. And what is their source? What do they use as their source? They use as their source the spokesman for the French. They use as their source the spokesman for the Germans.

Why do they not use as a source the Americans who have been able to realize the dream that only America offers and that America on many occasions has gone to battle throughout the world to give other countries the opportunity so that they too can enjoy the life we have enjoyed.

If you want to apologize for being a leader, if you want to apologize for

being strong militarily, if you want to apologize for taking tougher action against Saddam Hussein, then move aside, then move aside, because the majority of the people in this Nation want this Nation to prevail when it comes to freedom. They want the United States of America to prevail when other countries need our assistance. They want this country to prevail, to stop the spread of weapons of mass destruction.

Would the gentlewoman or some of my other colleagues here, it would be interesting to pull out our comments about what you thought about Saddam Hussein when he invaded Kuwait. I would be very interested to see what your comments were about the French when they went down to the Ivory Coast last year, by the way, without the authorization of the United Nations, without even going to the United Nations to say they were going to the Ivory Coast with their military and the overthrow they did on the Ivory Coast. Where were my good colleagues when the French did that?

How can you stand up here on the podium and defend the French? The French are our allies somewhat. Keep in mind they are the ones that did not help us when we asked for overflight rights on our actions with Libya. Keep in mind, too, to my good colleague from the other State, keep in mind who built that military facility in Iraq. It was the French. Remember the one that the Israelites took out in a bombing raid, a very daring bombing raid about 15 or 20 years ago? That was built by the French.

I am amazed that Members of this body will stand up and act as if the United States of America is the black sheep, as if the United States of America should be shunned instead of talking about the great things this country has done, instead of talking about the bravery of 250,000 troops over there and a couple other hundred thousand throughout the world and all the troops at home that are supplying those troops over there, their dedication and their patriotism, to talk about a threat that is an imminent threat.

And do not kid yourselves, Saddam Hussein and his regime, it is a cancer, and you can go to the doctor and you can tell the doctor, Doc, I do not want to hear this announcement. I do not want to hear your prognosis that I have cancer. That is not what I want to hear, Doc. Let us start from the beginning and see if you can leave out the cancer part of it when you give your prognosis to me.

The doctor says to you, look, you can couch it any way you want. You can paint it any way you want. You can blame all your neighbors. You can have your neighbors blame you, but the fact is there is cancer out there and you better deal with it, because if you do not deal with it all you are doing is not eliminating the problem, you are passing the problem on to the next generation.

Do not all of us wish, even the gentlewoman who just spoke, do not all of us wish that we would have resolved this issue in 1990 or the first Persian Gulf War when we had the opportunity? And what stopped us from resolving the issue, from destroying that regime or taking out that regime in 1990 when we had the opportunity? What stopped us? It was not George Bush, Sr., that stopped us. It was the United Nations that said do not go into Baghdad. Stay out of Baghdad. Leave Saddam Hussein in power. And now look what we did. We have passed it to another generation.

I happen to be in the generation that it was passed to. And as a Member of that generation, I do not want to see it passed to the next generation. I want us to face up to this problem and our President has done a darn good job.

Remember, this country retains its sovereignty, despite what Annan says over at the United Nations, despite what he says, the sovereignty of the United States remains with the United States.

□ 1945

We have never shifted our sovereignty to the United Nations, and I want to speak a little more about the United Nations here in a moment, but the United States did not need to go to the United Nations. The French did not go to the United Nations for their recent action on the Ivory Coast. We were not required to go to the United Nations. In fact, many of my constituents have said why did we even go to the United Nations? Why did we not just go out take care of the problem and move on?

The fact is that our President, George W. Bush, who has been unfortunately roundly criticized by some of my colleagues, it was his decision to take this to the United Nations. It is George W. Bush, who I happen to think is doing a remarkable job in his leadership, he is our Commander in Chief. He is the one who has led the pursuit of every diplomatic and reasonable, he has got to be reasonable, but every diplomatic channel.

While my good colleagues were enjoying the weekend, where was our Commander in Chief? He was on the telephone talking to China. He was on the telephone talking to Japan. He was on the telephone talking to Russia. He wants this resolved diplomatically, but at least he has got enough guts that if it is not resolved diplomatically, he will resolve it militarily.

Thank goodness we have got the team that we have down there at that White House. Everybody in this Chamber, in my opinion, would take a second seat to a Condoleezza Rice. Everybody in this Chamber, with due respect to my colleagues, I include myself there, would take a second seat to Dick Cheney, our Vice President. Everybody in this Chamber would take a second seat to Colin Powell. Everybody in this Chamber would take a second seat to Donald Rumsfeld.

Yet, many in this Chamber think they know it all. I am not being overly critical. I am just trying to say after these remarks that I hear condemning the United States, maybe not condemning the United States, but saying that we have led the worst diplomatic disaster in history, oh my gosh, it is clear there is not an in-depth study of history in those kind of remarks.

Where is the United Nations? I want to talk a little bit about the United Nations. I want to talk a little bit about the French and Germans, and I want to answer some of the questions, and most of all, I want to read an article that I think is right on point.

I actually went through it the other night, but many people asked that I go through it again, and I look forward to that, but first of all, let me talk about the United Nations. Let us face it. Let us take a look at what the United Nations is all about.

It has 191 member representatives in it, 191, and not being critical of the other 190, but if we take a look at that pool, just by the nature of our culture, just by the nature of the environments that we grew up in, just by the nature of our traditions in our particular countries, just by the nature of the governments that are within our country, we are different people. There are inherent conflicts.

There are a lot of things that we can do together, and I am one of those people that, while I think the United Nations is a paper tiger when it comes to military action, I think the United Nations has a proper place in our society. What is a proper role for the United Nations to play?

Let us start out, I think the United Nations can be kind of the centralizing authority to give us the help and the distribution we need to assist countries that have starving populations. For example, when we have a problem in Ethiopia, I bet the United Nations can help us with that problem. When we have a problem in Somalia, after they drag our soldiers through the streets, we cannot call on the United Nations. They do not have that capability. We have overestimated, we have exaggerated the role of the United Nations and its capability to carry anything on of substance, even in a diplomatic forum, with the exception of some very specific duties, and let me give my colleagues another example.

The President covered it very well in his State of the Union Address. We have a horrible plague of AIDS throughout the world. We need to conquer that disease. The United Nations is a good institution to lead that battle. The United Nations is a good institution to help with resources for advice on farming, to provide agricultural resources and so on.

But do my colleagues not understand, the United Nations, not because it is inherently evil or incompetent or incapable, but the United Nations, just by the fact of its structure, just by the way it is built, just by the way it is

built, is not designed to be able to go into a country of mass destructions and face them down. The United Nations does not have the capability because of its membership to face them down. We cannot get that membership all put together.

Take a look at the United Nations. One of the biggest problems in the world that we spend a lot of time and resources on is human rights. This country leads the world in human rights, but what does the United Nations do? One of the countries that is one of the worst abusers of human rights and makes list after list year after year is Libya. What do they do at the United Nations? They name the Libya representative as the head of the Human Rights Commission. That is why they are ineffective when it comes to this type of international geopolitical action. We should understand that their role needs to be more targeted towards the things of which I spoke.

Let me say just a couple of words about the French and the Germans. I think the French are the shining example of hypocrisy. Let me quote from a recent Wall Street Journal editorial: But before we move on to war, says the editorial, let us pause to honor the grandeur of French hypocrisy on "the unilateral" use of military force. France seldom bothered to ask the United Nations or anyone else when it concludes its own interests are at stake. When a failed coup in the Ivory Coast last fall, and many of my colleagues probably do not even realize this, many of my colleagues probably could not identify with, and I am not being derogatory, but could not identify where the Ivory Coast is, but last fall the French sent troops down to the Ivory Coast because they had a failed coup, and let me go back to the quote: When a failed coup in the Ivory Coast last fall blossomed into a rebellion that threatened civil war, France never did get around to asking for a Security Council resolution. President Jacques Chirac also forgot to ask George W. Bush for his permission. Rather, he dispatched hundreds and eventually thousands of paratroopers and French legionnaires to contain the violence, to protect French citizens and to prevent the rebels from overrunning the country.

I would ask my good colleague, who had just previously spoken, would my colleague call the French's action on the Ivory Coast, would my colleague give them the same criticism she has just given the United States of America, that it is the lead example of the most horribly failed diplomacy or whatever the quote was? The French act when it is in their own interest. How ironic that they criticize the United States when the United States and its allies act in our interests, and I keep saying the United States and its allies.

With the worldwide media now, it is almost laughed off the table by my colleague who spoke before me. She says,

well, these little countries, these little countries in Europe that are allied with the United States, I forget exactly what she said, but the effect of it was, does not mean much. Look at the big players. Let me tell my colleagues, those little countries in Europe mean a lot to us, and those little countries in Europe, they happen to think they are pretty important to this. After all, their continent is pretty important.

Let me tell my colleagues, if we want to go just by geographical size and by population size, let us take a look in that order of the allies that I speak of when I say the United States of America, that the worldwide media has largely ignored as a coalition of the willing. Start off with the United States of America. Put on to it Great Britain. Put on to that the Spanish, Spain. Put on to that the Italians. Then we start talking about Hungary. We can start talking about Poland. We can start talking about many other countries.

In fact, I think the coalition that will be put together for this action, if Saddam Hussein does not unilaterally disarm, I think that coalition will come very close or, in fact, exceed the size of the coalition for the first Persian Gulf War. This is not, as my colleague said, and I did write this down, the U.S. against the world. What a misstatement. That is a misstatement. It is not the United States against the world. It is the United States for the world, and a big part of the world is with the United States of America.

In the United States of America we can take any example we want in history, no country in history has ever gone beyond its borders, as the United States has, for other countries. We can take a look at World War I. We can take a look at World War II. We can take a look at the Persian gulf. We can take a look anytime there is a disaster in the world, what kind of relief do we see? United States of America.

When people are starving and we are allowed to get aid in there, what do we see on those bags of flour? United States of America. We have got an awful lot to be proud of, and frankly, we can be proud of our President and this administration. He is our Commander in Chief, and I can tell my colleagues frankly, over the weekend I listened to people like Sean Penn, a movie actor. I listened to Neil Young, big time singer in my generation. I listened to one of my favorite actresses, Julia Roberts. These are very talented actors, and I am appalled that all of the sudden they think they have doctorates in foreign policy, and they think that the President should take second seat to them.

I looked at one of the papers today, the New York Times perhaps or maybe it was the Wall Street Journal, full page ad from people who call themselves writers, "We are against the war." Those people have not spent a fraction of the time that even my colleagues here on the floor have spent on

what we are dealing with here, and I hope they are paying attention this evening. I am sure they are not, but I sure wish some of them were paying attention this evening to explain away just exactly what Iraq is going to do with these weapons of mass destruction.

We elected our President, and President after President we put confidence in our administration and our leadership. They know a lot more than we know. My colleagues know a lot more than their constituents generally, simply not because we are brighter but because we have had classified briefings, because it is our job to know more. It is the President's job to know a little more about these foreign issues than some of our good actors that come out of Hollywood who stand up there on a stage and condemn this country, a country that has given them all the privileges that they enjoy. Tell me that Sean Penn could go anywhere else in the world and fulfill the American dream. We have got to act as a team here.

In regards to the Germans, I mean the French are getting a lot of political hay out of this. Jacques Chirac, his popularity polls have gone through the roof. He is able to dance on the stage without paying the band. He is able to enjoy the fruits, as he has for a long time, of the labor that the United States of America has put out there.

The French really are not a significant military power anymore. Where they have their power is in the Security Council. That is why they want to go through there because they have a veto, and frankly, I just came from Paris, I just came from visiting NATO meetings, and by going out and talking on the street, a lot of people in Germany and a lot of people in France, they think terrorism, the big threat is the United States. They do not see it as such a big issue, and I understand that if the French want to stand out of the battle, as they often do when the going gets tough, the French do not want to play. I can understand that. That is their nature. That is their character. I can understand that.

The Germans, a little different story, but I can still understand that, but there is a big difference between standing aside, stepping out of the fight, and standing aside and cheering on the opposition. That should not happen.

A lot of people want to do everything they can to get rid of Saddam Hussein except fight him. Everybody wants to think they can sweet talk Saddam out of his regime. It is not going to happen.

I hope that Saddam Hussein takes the chance, the last chance that is now being given to him by the United States of America and its coalition, and I hope that he disarms, but I kind of doubt that he will. I think it is possible he may go into exile, but the fact is it is the United States of America that has forced the United Nations to do something about it, and the United Nations in November accepted. They

adopted 1141 that did something about it, but when it came time to call in the chips, the United Nations, because in my opinion of the makeup of the United Nations, could not stand up and carry its own weight, and at that point, once again, the United States and the allies that can carry the weight need to step in.

□ 2000

Madam Speaker, I want to read a letter, and I spoke to this the other evening; but let me, first, Madam Speaker, get a time check.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BLACKBURN). The gentleman from Colorado has approximately 35 minutes remaining.

Mr. MCINNIS. I understand I have 35 minutes remaining, and I will yield back 10 minutes; so in my remaining 25 minutes let me begin by reading a letter, and I am quoting from Alistair Cooke. And as I mentioned the other night, I do not like to read from somebody else's script. I like to pull in quotes, and I hope I give credit to the quotes that are out there, but this is a very moving article.

We all know that history is a good study. It does not tell us exactly what will happen in the future, but any good history teacher will tell us that the failure to understand past history will certainly be a significant handicap to any kind of understanding of how to prepare for the future. There is no crystal ball out there that tells us about the future, but history gives us an advantage. This article, I think, reflects very accurately some history that I hope all of us will think about.

Let me read this, and I will quote throughout the article. I will leave the article periodically to make a comment, but I will tell my colleagues when I do that.

Mr. Cooke: "I promised to lay off topic A, Iraq, until the Security Council makes a judgment on the inspector's 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 monstrous 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 over. And this ordeal triggered a nightmare, a daymare, if you like. Throughout the ceaseless tide I heard a voice."

This is Mr. Cooke talking about his dream. He heard a voice. "I heard a voice, a very English voice of an old man, Prime Minister Chamberlain, saying: '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 that 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.' 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 leaving the text for a minute, in 1938, Chamberlain signed over Czechoslovakia to Hitler, much like Saddam Hussein. Give him what he wants. Appease him. Back down to what is good for the world. Back down in your own interest. But you need to cover that. A politician cannot back away without giving it some kind of cover, and Prime Minister Chamberlain said, "I believe it is peace for our time."

Now, going back to the script again, let me start: "This scene concluded in the autumn of 1938 the British Prime Minister's effectual signing away of most of Czechoslovakia to Hitler. The rest of it, within months, Hitler walked in and conquered. "Oh dear," said Mr. Chamberlain, thunderstruck, "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 many listeners.

"Hitler had started betraying our trust not 12 years but only 2 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 French morale was too low to confront any war just then, and 10 million of the 11 million British soldiers had signed a so-called peace ballot. It stated no conditions, it elaborated no terms, it simply counted the numbers 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."

And let me leave the script here. This is probably the most important paragraph of what I am reading, or one of the most important:

"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 preemptive 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 preemptive, 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 the 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 what we heard in the House of Commons debates and read in the French press.

"The French especially urged, after every Hitler invasion, 'negotiation, negotiation.'"

Let me leave the text. Let me repeat this paragraph. The French especially urged, after every Hitler invasion, every time Hitler invaded a country, the French would stand up and say negotiate, negotiate.

"They negotiated so successfully as to have their entire 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 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."

Some comparison. I leave the text. Some comparison to the United Nations.

"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 a superior air force.

"But he's not used them, he's not used them, people protested. Still, for 2 years before the outbreak of the Second World 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 savior.

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

Take a look at the history of the League of Nations. Take a look at what happened in 1938, when Churchill had to stand up and tried to convince the people that these weapons were being developed. Take a look at 1938 and see if you do not think you are seeing a replay when the French stood up every time Hitler invaded a country and said, negotiate, negotiate.

Well, now let us just move from that and let us just show some of the facts that I want to present. People have said, including the previous speaker, that, well, we need to start these negotiations. We need to be patient. We need to work through this. This is 13 years. Every resolution here, 678, 687, 707, clear down to 1284, every one of these resolutions Iraq has violated. Every one of these resolutions the U.N. stood up as if this was the last resolution because it was going to resolve it.

You know, if you signed a contract with somebody and you had this many contracts with an individual, and that individual broke every contract, every one of those you had with them, do you think that would give you a little history as to the next contract and how effective it might be?

We hear people say, well, Iraq is not a dangerous country. We have got Iraq contained. How contained did the world have Iraq when it gassed its own communities, the Kurds? How contained did the world have Iraq when it invaded Kuwait? Were they able to stop them? We were able to. The United States of America, leading the coalition, was able to push them back. But we could not stop the initial invasion. How about Iran, when Iraq started the war with Iran?

Take a look at these and take a look at the weapons he used. These are weapons of mass destruction. These are weapons that yesterday Saddam Hussein said he had, but today he denies he has them; and tomorrow, frankly, he will use them, in my opinion. He has the history.

Again, going back in history, again reflecting on history. Date: August 1983, mustard gas kills 100 people; October 1983, mustard gas kills 3,000 of his own people; February 1984, mustard gas kills 2,500 Iranians; March 1984, mustard gas, or Tabun, 50 to 100; March 1985, mustard gas; 1986, mustard gas; 1986, mustard gas; 1987, mustard gas; 1987, mustard gas; 1988, mustard gas and nerve agents.

This guy has got a history. This is a horrible individual we are dealing with. I am telling you, from the bottom of my heart, this is a cancer on our body. And we have different people telling us, look, do not take it off. Just ignore it; it will go away. I wish we could pray it away, I wish we could hope it away, I wish diplomatically we could negotiate it away. It did not work in 1938 with Hitler, and it is not going to work in 2003 with Saddam Hussein, in my opinion. We tried to make it work. We spared his life through the direction of the United Nations in 1990. We spared Saddam Hussein. We listened to the French; we listened to the United Nations to let his regime exist. Do not destroy his regime; he has learned his lesson. Just like Hitler, negotiate, negotiate. People said let us do anything we can except fight him. We are seeing a repeat of history.

Thank goodness we have a leadership team that understands this and is not

willing to let history repeat itself and is willing to stand up not only for the security of the United States of America but for the security of those countries that are not able, that do not have the capability of our great country and our allies to go in and stop this from occurring. We have the capability today to stop that cancer. We have the chemotherapy treatment. We think we can make this patient do a lot better. And yet members of our own family are trying to convince the patient to walk away from the doctor's office, to deny that the cancer exists, or to admit that it exists and pretend it will go away and to try to negotiate with cancer.

You cannot negotiate with cancer. You must deal with overwhelming superiority if you have got it. And if it is too late, there is not much you can do. Cancer wins the battle a lot of times. It is the same thing here. We have got the tools. We have got the capability. If we do not do it, who will? If the United States of America and its allies do not stand up to this kind of stuff, who will? Do you think the French will ever stand up? Do you think the Germans will ever stand up?

Many countries in the world will not stand up because they do not have the tools. There are a lot of people that would like to join the fight, that would stand up if they had the tools. We have it and we have an inherent obligation to the next generation to do everything we can to stop it while we can.

I am the generation that got it transferred to me. We could have stopped it in 1990. We did not do it. And I will be darned if I am going to stand by and let my generation pass on this problem of mass weapons with this horrible, horrible individual. I will be darned if I am going to stand on the sidelines and pass that to the next generation.

□ 2015

Madam Speaker, I hear some peace people say what weapons, he does not have weapons of mass destruction or he is not a danger to us. I just answered what kind of danger exists.

This is a document of weapons that Iraq has: Mustard gas, 2,850 tons; sarin nerve gas, 795 tons; VX nerve gas, 3.9 tons; tabun nerve agent, 210 tons. This is deadly stuff. Anthrax, 25,000 tons, and we all saw what a few sprinkles of anthrax dust did in the United States Capitol. Take a look at what this will do. Imagine if there were 25,000 tons.

Where did our Nation come up with this list? We did not just create it. This is a list that Saddam Hussein produced for us. This is the list that Iraq admitted they had. Today they said trust me, despite the fact that for 12 years I have broken resolution after resolution, despite the fact that I invaded Kuwait and Iran, despite the fact that I gassed by nerve agents my own citizens, the Kurds, trust me, I do not have these weapons any more.

What did the United Nations do? The United Nations is willing to sit by and say, let us trust him.

Madam Speaker, it is the end of the line. We cannot continue to let this cancer spread.

I do not want Members to think it is a partisan effort up here. It is bipartisan. Let me conclude my remarks with a quote, and I want Members to read this quote with me. "What if Saddam Hussein fails to comply and we fail to act, or we take some ambiguous third route which gives him yet more opportunities to develop his program of weapons of mass destruction and continue to press for the release of sanctions and continue to ignore the solemn commitments that he made. He will conclude that the international community has lost its will. He will then conclude that he can go right on and continue to build an arsenal of devastating destruction. President Bill Clinton, February 19, 1998."

Madam Speaker, let us not make it a replay of 1938. Let us stand by the President of this country and the bipartisan resolution this Congress authorized. We are a can-do country. Our allies are can-do allies, and we can get this job done.

TRIBUTE TO JOSEPH C. BEAUPREZ

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BLACKBURN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BEAUPREZ) is recognized for the remaining 10 minutes.

Mr. BEAUPREZ. Madam Speaker, I rise to call the attention of the Members of this House of Representatives to a special occasion, the 85th birthday of a great American, my father, Joe Beuprez.

Like many other Americans, my dad's greatness does not come from wealth, public acclaim, notoriety, titles, nor worldly deeds. Nonetheless, he has definitely achieved world class status in the roles in life he chose to follow, more inconspicuous, more anonymous than some, but roles of importance requiring great character, substance, faith, and conviction.

Madam Speaker, my dad was content being husband, father and faithful servant to his God. He wanted nothing more than the unqualified love of my mother, the opportunity to work very hard and have something to show for it, to set a path for his children a bit smoother and more pleasant than the one he had to follow and, most importantly, to earn an eternal place in heaven as he believes to be God's plan.

Madam Speaker, like so many of his generation, America's greatest generation, my dad's parents were immigrants. They came to America poor, with little formal education, unfamiliar with our language and our customs. She had been a weaver of fine Belgian lace. He carried her lace in a sack on foot from town to town, selling it in local markets to earn a living. Times were hard, and the First World War threatened. News of opportunity in America offered them hope.

In America my grandfather shoveled coal to furnaces, and later with a loan from a neighbor, sealed with a handshake, he bought 80 acres of land, his own piece of America, something to call his own, and so much more than that sack that he owned in Belgium.

Though he had never been a farmer, with will and determination he learned quickly. In time he expanded the farm, raised eight children, my dad being the sixth, and the one who would end up keeping the farm going as his own, and my home, too, for nearly all my life.

Dad got to eighth grade at the local Catholic school, a 3-mile walk away. The early 1930s were not the best of times, Depression days. To keep the farm going, he came home to help out his dad and older brothers, never getting any more schooling.

My mom was more fortunate, she fished ninth grade before returning full time to her own parents' farm nearby. Mom and dad got married in 1940, and this June will celebrate 63 years together, an enormous and far too unusual achievement in today's world. They raised four kids, they saw to it we all went through that same Catholic school, even though money was always in short supply when we were growing up. They wanted only the best for their kids. All of us got through high school, and off to college, too. They found a way. Used cars, patched overalls, hand-me-down clothes, lots of home-grown cooking, and sack lunches. They found a way.

Many have observed that real heroes are in short supply these days, especially for our young people to emulate. Many of us worry that role models are in far too limited supply. We all certainly learn from our own experiences, learn by doing we call it, but we are also greatly impacted as we grow and develop by those powerful mentors that influence us: Teachers, coaches, neighbors, presidents, pastors and parents.

I will confess, Madam Speaker, that it took far too long for me to realize it, but my dad was the best. I am so blessed to have had him as both dad and hero. By worldly standards, dad might not have had so much. Winston Churchill explained it very well. "We make a living by what we get. We make a life by what we give."

Dad gave so much, and has lived a wonderful, eventful, purposeful life. Allow me to simply reflect on three gifts from my dad for which I am especially grateful: First by his example, he taught me the value of hard work, of self reliance, and personal responsibility. In an age when it seems the norm to try to get along as easily as possible, dad saw differently.

Dad cherished his opportunity to work the soil of that farm and to care for his livestock. Remembering the lessons of the Depression, as well as the drought years of the early 1950s, he knew he could lose whatever he had. He knew he could not do much about the weather nor the markets, the only variable he could control was his effort