

percent of Iraq's annual imports. Under the U.N. oil for food program, Russia's total trade with Iraq was somewhere between \$530 million and \$1 billion for the 6 months ending in December 2001. According to the Russian Ambassador to Iraq, Vladimir Titorenko, new contracts worth another \$200 million under the U.N. oil for food program are to be signed over in the next 3 months. Soviet-era debt, someplace between \$7- and \$9-billion was generated by arms sales to Iraq during the 1980 to 1988 Iran-Iraq war. Our soldiers will have to face many of these weapons on the battlefield in the coming days.

Russia's LUKoil negotiated a \$4 billion, 23-year contract in 1997 to rehabilitate the 15-billion-barrel West Qurna field in southern Iraq. Work on the oilfield was expected to commence upon cancellation of U.N. sanctions on Iraq. The deal is currently on hold, obviously.

In October of 2001, Salvneft, a Russian-Belarus company, negotiated a \$52 million service contract to drill at the Tuba field in southern Iraq. In April of 2001, a Russian company received a service contract to drill in the Saddam, Kirkuk, and Bai Hassan fields to rehabilitate the fields and reduce water incursion.

A future \$40 billion Iraqi-Russian economic agreement, reportedly signed in 2002, would allow for extensive oil exploration opportunities throughout western Iraq. The proposal calls for 67 new projects over a 10-year time frame to explore and further develop fields in southern Iraq and the Western Desert, including the Suba, Luhais and the West Qurna and Rumaila projects. Additional projects added to the deal include second phase construction of a pipeline running from southern to northern Iraq, and extensive drilling and gas projects. Work on these projects would commence on cancellation of sanctions.

One Russian company over the past few years has signed contracts worth \$18 million to repair gas stations in Iraq. The former Soviet Union was the premier supplier of Iraqi arms. From 1981 to 2001, Russia supplied Iraq with 50 percent of its arms.

It is important, Mr. Speaker, for us to understand who our friends are in the world and how they make their decisions. The negotiations over this U.N. resolution has been, I think, a certain lesson on this topic. It is one that will not easily or not quickly, I hope, be forgotten. The challenges ahead of us are great, but make no mistake. If Saddam Hussein were to succeed in developing, in keeping these weapons of mass destruction, the chemical weapons, the biologic catastrophes that could come from the biological weapons and certainly his efforts over the years to try to develop atomic weapons, if that were to be let go undone, it would be tremendously difficult to deal with the other problems that the free world is facing in Iran, in North Korea, let alone the rogue nations with ty-

rants as dictators that might decide, well, Iraq got away with it and they were able to do great bargaining for themselves. If we develop these weapons, then we are going to be in better shape to threaten, coerce, blackmail, if you will, for better deals for our country.

The challenge ahead is great. The technology and the ability of many of these countries to develop these kind of devastating weapons is now available, almost on the Internet. So I think today it is so important that we strongly support our military troops, that we thank the 30 to 50 countries that have decided, according to Secretary Powell, to support us in this effort. Maybe this is the beginning, but the United States has taken on this responsibility. In past actions through World War I, World War II, all of our wars, the Korean War, even Vietnam, they were all for good humanitarian reasons, to make sure that freedom and justice and the rights of people were helped throughout the world. That is part of what we are going to be going after in the next few days, to try to make sure that not only these weapons in Iraq are disassembled and destroyed, but that we keep other countries from making the same effort and having the same threat on our liberty and freedom.

REPORT ON UNITED STATES PARTICIPATION IN THE UNITED NATIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Michigan) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit herewith a report prepared by my Administration on the participation of the United States in the United Nations and its affiliated agencies during the calendar year 2001. The report is required by the United Nations Participation Act (Public Law 264, 79th Congress).

GEORGE W. BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 19, 2003.

CONGRESSIONAL DUTIES IN CONNECTION WITH CIRCUMSTANCES SURROUNDING IRAQ

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to come to the floor this evening to continue a very important discussion that deals with our duties and responsibilities in connection with the circumstances surrounding Iraq.

I begin with a review of the duties that we have. First I pray for our sol-

diers whose roles are pretty well defined, and I would like to point out that we in the Congress have a duty as well, a constitutional duty, that requires under the Constitution that we alone can decide war. And why is that? Because of Article I, section 8. It is important for us to note that this duty is nondelegable. We cannot pass it off. We cannot turn it back. It can only be done by us. So the question of who decides becomes very important.

On this past Monday, the President of the United States said he has decided that he will begin this war, and that this is a matter that did not require him to consult with Congress, that there was no debate in the Congress, that it was a matter that he has been telling us in innumerable ways on innumerable occasions precisely what he was going to do, and that Saddam Hussein's time has run out, and there are no more options, and that negotiations are futile, and that the United Nations can do what they want, that everybody has to decide in the family of nations, that they are either with us or against us, and that it does not matter whether the inspection regime required by the United Nations has been concluded or not.

□ 2000

It does not matter whether the United Nations approves or disapproves. He has decided what he will do, and he is going to do it. Why war? And why now? A war could be justified only if our national security is threatened. There has not been the case made that that is the present circumstance, and it of course has to be weighed very carefully against the death and the destruction not only that we put in our own military's path but also the innocent people in another country who will likely be killed in the course of this activity. And of course none of this has been debated by the Congress. But what about the tactics of the 43rd President of the United States? He has repeated on more than one occasion that war is the last resort. "My last resort," when everyone knows that it is his first objective. How can he be declaring that war is the last resort, that he has exhausted negotiation when actually he is short-circuiting the whole process?

And then we have the coalition, the fig leaf coalition of the willing, which bears not that much analysis. Who they are and why they are there speaks generally for itself. And then of course we have the central issue here that there is no compelling evidence that Iraq is a current threat to our national security. None. We waited for the grainy photos of the Secretary of State when he was supposed to have conclusively made the case. We have waited for the Secretary of Defense when he was supposed to have conclusively made the case. We waited for the President and the Vice President when they were supposed to have made the case. It was the Vice President who first announced early on that Iraq had nuclear

weapons. That turned out to be incorrect; and we have heard little of it, nothing of it since.

Then we had the assertion again by the Vice President of the United States that Iraq was linked to the tragedy of the attack on the United States on September 11. That has never been proven, and little has been made of that so far. Then of course it was asserted that our intelligence linked Iraq to al Qaeda. Not so. That has not happened either. So what we have here is a sorry compendium of misunderstandings, inaccuracies, and public relations gambits that do not do the most democratic government and the most powerful Nation on the planet any credit.

So the President has determined to unleash the dogs of war. He has set the clock ticking toward an unprecedented barrage of destruction that will be dropped upon a nation of 20 million people, a city of 6 million people within that country; and all of us who hold human life precious should watch this clock run down as we lurch toward an unnecessary war that the President seems determined to start.

So for the brave young men and women of our armed services who will be headed into harm's way, we offer them our support and our prayers for their safe return. But we also must be faithful to our duty, a duty entrusted exclusively to the Congress by our Founding Fathers, and that is the solemn duty to decide after thorough consideration amongst us whether or not this great Nation should go to war. So the Constitution's framers emphatically entrusted the decision to the Congress alone. This is not some recently determined statement of constitutional theory. Our Founding Fathers, as we review the debates that they had in writing the Constitution, were adamant that the executive not play a role, although once war began, the executive is the Commander in Chief to implement that decision. And those men who came together over 215 years ago were so intent on excluding the President that they rejected an offer to share the power to declare war between the Congress and the executive. This was debated centuries ago.

I know that some believe that the Congress properly authorized a war against Iraq and a resolution in October, but that is not the case. We have not yet performed our duty. We did enact a resolution that generally authorized the President to fight terrorism and to seek enforcement of previous United Nations resolutions on Iraq, but in reality that resolution bucked the constitutionality conferred on the Congress to the President. It let the President decide to choose when and where and against whom to start a war. It dodged the decision and sought to delegate an authority that is exclusively our own, an authority that cannot be delegated.

The administration argues that legal precedence allowed the Congress to

provide an authorization of war that is functionally equivalent to the now rarely used formal declaration of war, which entirely misses the point. It is not the format which is at issue. It is who really decides, and it was clear at that time in the beginning from the congressional debate, from the executive branch statements and from the resolution itself that the diplomatic route would be pursued first by going through the U.N., subsequently in response to a broad national consensus the United States spearheaded with the passage of resolution 1441 that imposed a new inspection regime. The United Nations Security Council went along with the United States, and it was clear last fall that the decision of whether to declare war was being put off at that time unmistakably, and in the months since then it has become increasingly clear that the decision to go to war would turn on two crucial assessments. First, there would be an assessment of the results of the inspection team that was there checking to find out if there were weapons that could be destructive weapons or chemical or biological materials that would be in violation of the terms that had been imposed upon Iraq.

But the second assessment and the ultimate judgment would require weighing the implications of the inspection results and other information about what threat Iraq poses to the United States against the full costs of casualties, of the economic costs, the diplomatic fallout, and the increased terrorism in this country that could result from going to war. Clearly these are not exclusive military judgments reserved for a Commander in Chief. They are precisely the kind of complex national policy judgments that the Founding Fathers conferred very deliberately on the Congress in matters of war and peace. Yet in the present circumstances, the Congress has abdicated any role in that all-important decision. Rather, the entire world has been riveted on whether the American President would decide to declare war. The President has boldly told journalists and Members of Congress alike that it is his decision and his decision alone. This is a perversion of the Constitution of the United States. Even if one argues that the Congress properly exercises constitutional duties and that the President thereby has all the necessary authority to start a war, a fundamental question yet remains: Why war now? The Bush war would have disastrous far-ranging consequences for many years for every American citizen. War is about devastation, destruction, and death.

The American people are not blood thirsty. We want war only if our country is in imminent danger. Otherwise, a war is human and economic costs and moral costs are too great. It robs us of resources urgently needed by America's working families and those less fortunate. Even in terms of national security, an all out war would rob

Americans of hundreds of billions of dollars needed for the first line of defense, which is homeland security on which we have made far too little progress since the tragedy of September 11.

As the President repeats his unverified mantra of threats to national security, cities across this land are laying off police officers, firemen, emergency medical service teams, and the so-called first responders to any new terrorist because this administration's "first response" to empty city treasuries have been, briefly, too bad, tough. This is not a partisan spat nor a Washington insiders policy dispute.

The citizens' crusade to stop an immoral war in Iraq has been nothing less than a noble struggle for our Nation's soul, and that struggle has not been particularly successful nor has it been a failure, because all across the Nation, there have been demonstrations, marches, protests, rallies; and I can tell you in the great State of Michigan there have only in the last few days been demonstrations in Detroit and Lansing and Grand Rapids and Traverse City and many other places throughout our state.

So we must commit ourselves to this cause with the same dedication and urgency in which many of us, most of us, strove to stop segregation and to end the Vietnam War, another conflict which finally brought our government to its senses. For the President to repeatedly insist that for him war is a last resort is contradicted by his actions which reveal that war is really his first choice and has been all along. His attempts to make it palatable by badgering, bullying, coercing, bribing countries into a so-called coalition of the willing has been a mere fig leaf transparent to the entire world.

The President has failed to present compelling evidence that Iraq currently is a threat to our national security. One rationale after another has been disproved. The President, the Vice President, the Secretary of Defense have presented a kaleidoscope of ever-changing rationale as they tried to nimbly stay one jump ahead of various truth squads at the United Nations, among skeptical Members of Congress, and among the media and even of its own intelligence agencies, particularly the Central Intelligence Agency.

□ 2015

Americans have borne the burden of war when attacked or actually threatened with great resilience, but America cannot in good conscience start a war so costly in blood and life and treasure on the basis of circumstantial evidence and speculation that sometime in the unspecified future, Iraq may present an actual threat to the United States, because this war against Iraq is a war that will devastate a country of 20 million or 26 million and cause damages that will take decades to undo; a war that will see many American casualties and that could fracture our fragile

economy; a war that will destabilize the Middle East and likely beyond; a war that will swell the ranks of terrorist recruits all over the world; a war that will weaken our fight against terrorism at home and abroad, and that will cost hundreds of billions of dollars desperately needed for programs in all of our cities; a war that will set a terrible precedent in a world of growing numbers of nuclear states, where atomic energy supplies can be bought at bazaars, on street corners, in a number of places in the world already, in a world where nations are anxious to get their hands on these ingredients and will do anything to get them, and some, I regret to report, are succeeding.

For any country to launch a preventive war against opponents that are deemed a possible future threat is an improper exercise of the power of war in this country, a war not really wanted by the American people and not desired by many of our military commanders on a personal level, and certainly not among our allies.

Worst of all, it is a war that, as the Central Intelligence Agency admits, will only make it more likely that Saddam Hussein will unleash whatever unconventional weapons he does have against our troops, against Israel and our other allies.

There is no evidence that Saddam seeks to commit suicide. We deterred him from using weapons of mass destruction during Desert Storm. If he faces destruction, however, he may well seek to play the role of Sampson.

Last weekend, several of the Nation's leading papers seemed to suddenly discover all of these grave costs of war in Iraq, in which article after article noted with an air of sudden reportorial discovery that the war would drastically increase the likelihood of Saddam Hussein's use of weapons of mass destruction, and that it would almost certainly escalate dramatically the number of terrorist attacks that could happen in the United States; that many U.S. military commanders fear that it would undermine the real war against terrorism; that there could be extensive casualties among innocent Iraqi civilians who have a great deal of reason to be opposed to Saddam Hussein; and that even following a quick military victory against Saddam Hussein, if there is to be one, we would be mired in an Iraqi quicksand of tribal feuds and guerrilla warfare for decades.

It would have been far more useful to their readers if the media had discovered the costly side of this war ledger months earlier. Instead, like the administration, most of the media focused overwhelmingly over the question of whether it would be preferable to prevent Saddam's use of armaments and remove his regime, as if there were no competing costs on the other side of this ledger that had to be carefully balanced and weighed in deciding whether this would be an action that would result in a net plus for America.

Now, there may be still time for the President to avoid starting the wrong

war in the wrong place at the wrong time. There is still time, admittedly precious little, for the American people to speak out against the war that so few of them seem to support.

We should remember the warning of General Anthony Zinni, the Marine Commandant and head of the U.S. Central Command which guards the Middle East, who reminded us that military commanders know the full horrors of war and hesitate to plunge ahead until the national interest is clearly at stake.

On the other hand, the Marine Commandant warned, those who have never worn a uniform or have never seen combat are often the quickest to beat the drums of war.

So the administration will condemn whoever utters them as unpatriotic and partisan, just as the Johnson White House condemned Martin Luther King, Jr.'s questioning of Vietnam. The Bush team has already spread that slander in order to stop the erosion of support for the war as the public learns the truth. Are the military veterans and retired generals opposed to this war unpatriotic? Are the families of those who were killed on September 11 in New York and Pennsylvania who oppose this war partisan? That is outrageous.

I know many of my colleagues in good faith have been convinced that Iraq is a threat to us now, and they are entitled to their opinion, but they have been the target of a Niagara of propaganda, especially with the Vice President of the United States' early insistence that Saddam was involved in the September 11 attacks on the United States, and that he had nuclear weapons, both of these assertions which have long been disavowed by our Intelligence Community, our spy organizations. There have been many other assertions and premises used by the administration to market their product, in the revealing phrase of the White House Chief of Staff, which have crumbled under close scrutiny in the White House Chief of Staff's revealing terms.

So, I would ask this administration to reconsider their view and to ask themselves, almost the entire world is against this war. Every major city in the United States has gone on record in opposition to this war. The United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, the Pope, almost every major Protestant denomination, the American labor movement, the AFL-CIO, 13 million people, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People have all gone on record against this war.

Leading retired U.S. military commanders, such as General Zinni, General Schwarzkopf in his original views, have voiced opposition to this war. Numerous Active Duty generals have told reporters off the record of their serious concerns about a war at this time against Iraq. General Scowcroft, an adviser to President George Herbert Walker Bush's administration, is

against the war. And all of this opposition has arisen before the war has started, before a war has started, an unprecedented phenomenon in our history.

In view of these facts then, it is perhaps just possible that there is something amiss with the President's premises, something unconnected in his logic and his rejection of further efforts to resolve these issues peacefully.

I urge my colleagues to reflect upon these circumstances and join me in continuing to press and urge and pray for our President to find another way to follow the path of peace, for blessed are the peacemakers.

I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), my friend and colleague for many years, even before he became a Member of Congress.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much. I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) for his steadfastness and his many years of understanding, that sometimes you might have to give out, but you never give up, and even though it appears to be the last minute, right down to the wire, here the gentleman is continuing to speak to the American people, trying to help all of us see the light and see the way. So I thank the gentleman for this opportunity to join with him.

On October 10, 2002, this Congress voted to give the President of the United States broad powers, which he has taken as the right to engage in a unilateral first strike war against Iraq without a clearly demonstrated and imminent threat of attack on the United States.

Our oath of office as Members of Congress, our constitutional charge, the mandate laid upon us by the people does not permit us to delegate the responsibility of engaging the awesome military power of the United States. Our oath of office does not permit us to delegate our responsibilities in placing our fighting men and women on the field of battle.

The Constitution places the power to declare war squarely and solely in the Congress. This issue arises far above partisan politics. President Abraham Lincoln put our Congressional responsibility this way: "We cannot escape history. We of this Congress and this administration will be remembered in spite of ourselves. No personal significance or insignificance can spare one or another of us. The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down in honor or dishonor to the last generation."

I opposed that resolution, and I remain opposed, because after all of the information I have seen, and after all I have heard, neither I nor a majority of the residents of my district, the Seventh Congressional District of Illinois, are convinced that the war is our only, our best and our most immediate option. We are not convinced that every diplomatic action has been exhausted.

In fact, diplomacy and inspections have not exhausted their ultimate potential.

I was not convinced, and I am still not convinced, that the resolution would properly guide us to act cooperatively and legally, through the United Nations, with the agreement and the involvement of the international community.

□ 2030

In fact, it has led us to pursue risky unilateral actions in defiance of international law and the United Nations charter.

As the American people are attempting to make sense of this complex situation, it is the duty of the Congress to ask some hard questions. One, is there an immediate threat to the United States? In my judgment, the answer is no. We have not received evidence of immediate danger. We have not received evidence that Iraq has the means to attack the United States, and we have not received evidence that the danger is greater today than it was last year.

Will the use of military force against Iraq reduce or prevent the spread or use of weapons of mass destruction? All evidence is that Iraq does not possess nuclear weapons today. The use of chemical or biological weapons or the passage of such weapons to terrorist groups would be nothing less than suicide for the current Iraqi leadership.

So I join with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) in hoping that some way there is some resolve, that there is some sliver of chance, some reaction that might lead us out of this chaos and confusion into a peaceful existence, with the United States of America leading the way.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his thoughtfulness, and I am deeply grateful for him joining me tonight.

It is a pleasure to recognize the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS), who has worked in civil rights activity, and is a man of great thoughtfulness and perseverance.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for presiding over this Special Order on Iraq. We cannot say too much at this point about America's preemptive strike on Iraq. We are the greatest Nation that ever existed in the history of the world. We are the richest; we are the most powerful. We are also the most democratic. Never have so many people enjoyed democracy and never have so many people had an opportunity to help make decisions. We should not throw away our opportunity to help make this decision. We should not assume that it is all over, that decisions have been made and we cannot stop the war at this point. Or if the war should occur in the next few hours or the next few days, we should not assume that we cannot shorten it, we cannot do the best for our soldiers. The best thing to do for our soldiers is to bring them home safely, to get them out of conflict's way.

War is hell. War is hell. The question is, Do we have to plunge into hell in order to accomplish what we are seeking to accomplish?

I want to go back to where I was last fall when we considered the President's resolution, the resolution authorizing the President to go to war. At that time I said that I still believe that every step we take toward a war with Iraq makes us less safe, not more safe. If we get involved and obsessed with Iraq, it is a bottomless pit that makes us very much more unsafe than we were before. I said at that time that there are other situations existing in the world which we should spend more time on and take care of before we plunge into any kind of long-range involvement with Iraq, and I still say the same is true.

Most people have not bothered to observe the situation closely in Pakistan. Pakistan seems to be off the radar completely, off the agenda. Nobody talks about it. Pakistan is a nation of 180 million people. Most of them are Muslims. Officially they are a Muslim nation. They see themselves as a Muslim nation. Pakistan already has the nuclear bomb. They have nuclear weapons because we trained the Pakistani scientists in this country, and they now have nuclear weapons. They have nuclear weapons. A Muslim nation has nuclear weapons.

Pakistan has always had a positive relationship with the United States, but it has always been a strained relationship. Pakistan has always supported us throughout the entire Cold War. Pakistan supported us against the Russians in Afghanistan. There is a long history of Pakistan's loyalty to the United States.

Yet Pakistan has always been treated like a second-class partner. Pakistan has never been rewarded for its loyalty. When the Cold War was over, we just pulled out. The Afghanistan war, they were very much involved with, and after it was over, we just picked up and left. We have never given them the kind of aid economically that we should have provided. We have never offered them a Marshall Plan. We, at this point in history, even after al Qaeda, and Pakistan has now played a major role in al Qaeda, in the pursuit of al Qaeda and Osama bin Laden, they played a major role. But after all the negotiations of how we are going to go about doing this and what the alliance means, we have ended up giving Pakistan only \$300 million in aid. Mr. Speaker, \$300 million in aid to Pakistan, already fighting with us against Osama bin Laden, on the border of Afghanistan. On the border of Afghanistan, in great harm, harm's way, \$300 million.

Now we are discussing packages with Turkey for \$6 billion, just to let our troops pass through to go to Iraq. What do we think the Pakistanis think when they look at that?

Here is why I ask the question: What do you think the Pakistanis think? Be-

cause the other element in this is that this Pakistani Government, who has always been our friend, also teeters on the edge of dissolution. The Pakistani situation is very, very tenuous. They have a President who took over as a result of a military coup, but this same President was part of the military that helped us in Afghanistan. This same President presides over a Pakistani secret service intelligence agency. They are the ones who created the Taliban. They created the Taliban as a way of conquering Afghanistan. They are very close to the Taliban.

So when we had the invasion of Afghanistan, there are elements of Pakistan's military and Pakistan's intelligence services who are very unhappy about it, and as Muslims also do not like the idea of Muslims fighting Muslims.

The present government is very anxious. The President and the top officials go nowhere except with top security. They are very aware of the fact that they are in jeopardy. In other words, a coup could take place at any moment in Pakistan, and if a coup takes place and the right wing there, the people who are pro-Osama bin Laden, win, they have the nuclear bomb. Osama will have the nuclear bomb. It is just that dangerous.

Why do I talk about a coup on the eve of attacking Iraq? Because there is a fanatical element involved here which will be triggered at the invasion of Iraq all over the Muslim world. There is a fanatical element which the Pakistani Government may just not be able to contend with. We are in danger of having a coup take place and the nuclear bomb is the worst thing that could happen, nuclear bombs put in position where Osama bin Laden could get them.

I need not talk about the other critical situation in the world: North Korea. That is on the radar screen. People talk about that. We have in North Korea a dictator less known than Saddam Hussein. We do not even understand the machinations of this man's mind and the whole regime that he has managed to perpetuate all of these years. But people who have been there say that the population is fanatically behind him.

This is a population extremely intelligent; they have mastered modern technology. They have some of the best rockets in the world, and they are going on to fashion their own nuclear industry. They already have, they say, a couple of bombs and they are going to start making more. At the same time, they cannot grow enough food to feed their people. What kinds of monsters are these, and what kind of situation do we have when they have the technological confidence that great, but they are not able to feed the people? The people in charge do not even care enough to feed the people, obviously. That is another problem.

So we have those dangers in the world; and as we get obsessed with Iraq

and involved with Iraq, which is a problem, Saddam Hussein is a monster. Saddam Hussein is a threat to world order. But Saddam Hussein is not an immediate threat to the United States and probably not an immediate threat to any country because he knows if he attacks anyone in surrounding Arab countries, he will have the whole world come down on him again.

Saddam Hussein, I have no case to make for. The man finances suicide bombers in Palestine. The big question is why? Why did we let him continue to sell oil all over the world so that he could finance suicide bombers in Palestine and continue building his arms industry? Where does he get the money from to continue to build up his arms industry? We talk about weapons of mass destruction. He has a big army. He has a big army with conventional weapons. The money to buy those weapons and to keep that army going has continued to flow, despite the fact that we have sanctions imposed on Iraq. Why did we not enforce the sanctions? What oil barons did we bow to to let them make a profit by not enforcing the sanctions? Why did we not, if France was trafficking in oil and Russia was trafficking, why did we not come down on our partners and really make the sanctions stick? They have never stuck. He has continued to get money, as much as he wants, to do what he wants to do.

People say, well, we are responsible for a lot of deaths of children in Iraq. No. That is ridiculous. He has the money. He does not spend it for the nutrition of children; he does not spend it for medicine. He spends it on building up his weapons and his power, and we let him do it. Why do we have to go all the way to a war, mobilizing 300,000 American troops, when we did not bother to do what we could have done on the seas? We control the sea lanes. We could have stopped the oil from being sold and transmitted all over the world, but we did not.

So there are other solutions, is what I am saying. Why do we have to go into hell? War is hell. If we did not know it was hell, if our imaginations did not tell us that, reading the "Iliad" did not tell us, when I read the "Iliad," I wondered why Homer went to such great lengths to talk about how the spear was plunged in mightily and the blood flowed like rivers, and he had four great descriptions of the horror of war. Well, in those days they did not have any movies. He did not have Spielberg to show him in "Saving Private Ryan." If he did not read the "Iliad," if he did not read any books and could not have his imagination telling him why war is hell, if he did not believe in Nikita Khrushchev and the defense of Stalin-grad, the facts of history, then we can see Steven Spielberg. It is right there on the screen in "Saving Private Ryan."

Our boys landed at Normandy under those conditions. It is not an exaggeration. War is hell. War was hell in a lot

of other places too. War was hell at Gettysburg. The greatest number of American lives lost was lost in the Civil War; 600,000, at Gettysburg, thousands died, the largest number came from New York. But they died; they died for a noble cause at Gettysburg. They died for a noble cause at Normandy. They died for a noble cause in Korea. The North Koreans came brutally down on the South Koreans, and within days they wiped out the city of Seoul, a brutal onslaught. Millions of people died in the Korean War before the United States forces got involved.

Our armed services and our military might can be put to good use. I like to think of myself as a follower of Martin Luther King. But I am not a pacifist in the sense that I think military force is necessary. There are times that military force is necessary. Thank God we have force. Our professional soldiers are the best in the world. My brother was a sergeant major in the Army for 20, 26 years. We have a very professional group of people now that run the military, and they are determined to do a good job for our Nation. We cannot fault them for the decisions that were made.

The problem is at the top; and the White House and the decision-making here in Washington, it is all wrong and dangerously off course. We are at a pivotal moment in American history, and instead of going one way with our military might and our wealth and our power, and our influence, most people in the world love us. I do not believe Americans are hated by ordinary people anywhere in large numbers.

□ 2045

They think we are as close to heaven as we are ever going to get here on Earth in terms of our way of life, including the political institutions, as well as the supermarkets and the joys of life and so forth.

I would like to conclude with a little piece of poetry here. We have faced difficulties for a long time, since the beginning of the country, of various kinds. We have always overcome those difficulties. Thank God we had Thomas Jefferson to help us get off to a good start. Thank God we had Abraham Lincoln at a critical moment when our Nation was about to fall apart. There is no reason to believe that we will not overcome this time.

All of the Members of Congress and all of our constituents should not throw up our hands in despair and give up. Let us keep talking. Let us keep trying to arouse the public to understand that this is a war we do not need. By going into preemptive war, using our wealth and military power in the wrong way, we are going to set history against us. Instead of guiding history and being the force and civilization which carries mankind to wonders never dreamed of before, we will become the enemy, with a lot of people sniping at our heels, and finally they will put together coalitions and bring

down the great American empire. Rome fell because it was arrogant and thought that it could go on and on throwing its power around.

We have at various times in history been delivered from this kind of arrogance and these kinds of mistakes. There was a man who wrote to Thomas Jefferson early in the history of the country who saw what happened when the Constitution was generated. It was always a miracle to him how these savage men, these people in the wilderness, could come together and put together a magnificent government.

His neighbor wrote and said that there was an angel over America. There is an angel in the whirlwind taking care of us. I think we ought to remember that as we go into this difficult, very bloody war. War is bloody, it is not what Good Morning America has been showing us. War is hell. We would like the angels in the whirlwind to come out and deliver us.

Some time ago, I think it was February 28, I do not remember what the occasion was, I wrote Angel in the Whirlwind, actually as a result of a quote that President Bush had made in his inaugural address.

Angel in the Whirlwind,
Tell us where you've been;
Come steer us through the storm,
Halt all this public sin.

Angel in the Whirlwind
Blow forth great truths;
All men are born equal,
Some men die great;
Profiles in courage
Never come too late.

Lincoln in the whirlwind
Blew powerful justice down;
Emancipation Proclamation,
Magnificent declaration,
Plain ordinary sensation,
Transformed to noble creation.

Sailors in the whirlwind
Forsake all ease,
Typhoons still lurk near,
Patriots must not fear.

Angel in the whirlwind,
Jefferson at your side,
Ships ashore at Normandy,
In every boat you ride,
Protect our future fate,
Martin King's posterity
Is waiting at the gate.

Angel in the whirlwind
Wrestle with the terror;
Tornado twisted greed;
Volcanoes belching
Ashes of indifference;
Human kind's highest hope
Strangling on a golden rope;
Merciful empire
That might've been,
Critically infected now
By the virus of public sin;
Giant graves reserved for midget men.

Merciful empire that might have been, or we
could still be the merciful empire that
saves civilization.

Angel in the whirlwind
Stay to save the brave and free,
Bring back judicial integrity,
Point us toward eternity,
Come steer us through new storms
Angel in the whirlwind.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr.

OWENS) for his powerful, intellectual, and passionate discourse. It has helped this discussion immeasurably.

I am pleased to yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), my colleague on the Committee on the Judiciary in the House of Representatives. From the time she entered the Congress, the gentlewoman from Houston, Texas, has worked at my side on numerous issues and causes, a dear friend of mine.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, the distinguished gentleman, for having the wisdom to be on the floor of the House in the absence of the acceptance by the leadership of the charge that should be taken up; that is, to be debating the question of war.

I think it should be noted, though everyone is aware of the continuing leadership that the gentleman has given to a myriad of issues fairly, evenhandedly, and seeking justice, that the gentleman rose to the floor at the time that the clock ticked off or ticked out for the threat or the admonishment or the instruction, direction, or directive that was given to Saddam Hussein to leave Iraq and Baghdad in 48 hours; and, of course, the Nation knows that that ended tonight at 8 p.m.

It is appropriate that we are on the floor, because we are filling in the gap of really what the Congress should be doing at this moment; that is, a somber, decided, and deliberative debate on the constitutional question of whether or not this Congress will declare war against Iraq.

Through the course of our interaction, we have pressed the issue of not whether one is for or against this war, but whether or not this Congress has the sole responsibility to declare war.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, and, frankly, with respect to this debate, I do not believe we should be silenced on this issue. I will tell the gentleman why; because even as America is hovering and preparing for the worst, the Constitution is being shredded. It is being ignored, and it is being taken lightly, because it is clear that the Founding Fathers wrote this document to respect the three branches of government, to recognize that we are strong as a democracy if those three branches are interrelated.

The Constitution does enunciate that the President, whoever that is, is the Commander in Chief and can deploy troops. Many will suggest that a resolution debated in October 2002, satisfied the question. It did not, because it gave more power to the President than has ever been given to any President in the United States, Democratic or Republican, meaning that actions might be able to be perpetrated without coming back to the United States Congress.

Clearly, it is well known that if the Congress does not use its power, it does not give up its power. So going back to the Constitution, whether or not it takes us 6 hours or 24 hours, it is clear

that this body could debate that question. It is not, as I said, a question of winning or losing, it is a question of the sanctity of process. A President cannot singly and should not singly take the Nation into war.

I would just use as an example, we are not a parliamentary form of government, but it is interesting that our strongest ally was quite willing to appear before the British Parliament just yesterday and engage in a very open debate on this question. Would it not appear that we could do the same?

Let me just say this, and I will yield to the distinguished gentleman. We have been characterized, those of us who have been persistent in our opposition, and frankly I believe we should remain here in these Chambers until someone recognizes the responsibilities for this Congress to debate this question. But those of us who have raised our voices have been categorized and pushed to the side.

I do not think the media understands democracy, because whenever they present the largeness of this issue, it is a singular drumbeat: We are on the way to war. I assume now after 8 p.m. they are announcing war. It is a shame on them. As they say, it is a mockery on all of our houses; because, frankly, the American people deserve better. They deserve to know the facts, and that there are lucid and intelligent perspectives on both sides of this question.

I am not asking the President to give up everything and to suggest that Saddam Hussein should be given flowers, but I am saying that war should be the last option. I believe there will be a third option. I am appreciative of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) joining me on filing legislation that again restates the proposition that the Congress has the authority to declare war, and we have filed that bill today.

But we have options, and we will be discussing this in the context of reaching out: One, convene an international tribunal, war crimes tribunal, with the United Nations Security Council and indict Saddam Hussein and his party leaders, and try him for war crimes; two, leave 50,000 troops on the border and bring home at least 200,000 of our young men and women; a vigorous, strong 50,000-person coalition, troops that are in a coalition, vigorously allowing the U.N. inspections to go forward; humanitarian aid now. Reinvigorate the Mideast peace process, fight the war against terrorism, and restore the coalition. These are key elements that could be done.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we can do something more than stand in silence. Frightening, deadening silence is appalling for this body that had the likes of the great leaders that we have known that have gone on before us.

I thank the distinguished gentleman for his leadership on this issue. I am not sure if the distinguished gentleman wants to close, but I think that more action is warranted than this Congress

seems to have decided to do or the courage to do.

I would think more of all of us that we want to have a debate, whether we vote up or down on the question. I have no interest in suggesting that the victory be mine, but only that the process be real and that we do not give up the duty of this Congress to debate the question of war.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague on the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), for her critical analysis of what we can do other than what we are about to do: that this person, Saddam Hussein, should be tried for crimes against humanity in the Hague court, the international criminal court, as Milosevic was and others; and that we could repair even at this late hour from a course that we think is disastrous. I thank the gentlewoman for joining me tonight.

THE CENTRAL ISSUE OF IRAQ

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

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague this evening, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY). He and I for some time have wanted to get together and have a discussion on the House floor with our colleagues and discuss the central issue of Iraq.

As Members know, this evening is a very important point in time in our history. Tonight at 8 o'clock the what I would consider generous offer for Saddam Hussein to take his regime and liberate the country of Iraq expired. I would expect that at any hour from here on forward that the United States and its willing coalition, and I will present to my colleagues that this willing coalition actually today exceeds, exceeds the size of the coalition of the first Persian Gulf War.

This is not the United States acting alone, in contrary to some of the previous speakers that we have heard up here. Contrary to what they are saying, this is not the United States taking on the world; this is the United States and a large part of the free world taking on the horrible regimes of people like Saddam Hussein.

Contrary to what some of the previous speakers said about standing silent, it is the United States of America, it is the United Kingdom, it is the Spanish, it is the Italians, it is the Turks, it is the Netherlands, it is the Polish, it is the Hungarians, it is the Netherlands. I could go on through 45 of those names. These people are not standing silent. They are willing to stand up to a horrible monster, and they are willing to make sure that that horrible monster does not stand down the people of his own country, nor stand down the people of the world. For that, the United States and all of its allies deserve a great deal of credit.