

□ 1615

This week on the front page of no less a publication than the Wall Street Journal, President Bush's top economic adviser, Lawrence Lindsey, estimated that the cost of waging this war in which this Nation is about to embark may rise as high as \$200 billion. That is "billion" with a "B". That is billions that take away the hopes and dreams of so many of us for the opportunities that this country could afford. That is \$200 billion with a "B" that could be available to ensure a life of dignity for many older Americans; and provide economic security, healthcare, prescription drugs, and strengthen Social Security for our baby boomers. That is billion with a "B" that will not be available to assure the educational hopes and opportunities of a generation of young Americans. It is billions with a "B" that will be spent on war in Iraq, instead of being spent to address our many other types of security needs here at home.

The \$200 billion estimate, as high as it is, may be misleadingly low. We do not know whether this includes the prolonged occupation of Iraq and all of the associated costs, which Vice President CHENEY has admitted are an essential part of this war; the rebuilding of Iraq, installing a new regime, wherever that might come from, as well as, of course, the much higher prices all of us can expect to pay as a result of increases in the price of oil.

According to the same Wall Street Journal article, other Administration economists say their main fear is that an Iraq war could lead to a sustained spike in [oil] prices.

This estimate also does not include the cost of the war widening if, for example one of our few allies decides to become involved, and as a result other oil suppliers no longer supply that oil and there is additional regional conflict.

"Whatever the bottom line," the Wall Street Journal reports, "the war's cost would be significant enough to make it harder", much harder, "for the Bush Administration to climb out of the budget deficit hole," which, I would add, grows deeper and deeper.

So I would urge our colleagues to review this resolution very closely, offer their ideas, informed by their constituencies, and seek to work with President Bush to bring us together in favor of effective international arms inspection, instead of leading us into a war that cannot be justified based on present evidence.

#### QUESTIONS ABOUT THE NEED FOR WAR WITH IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PLATTS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague, the gentleman from Texas

(Mr. DOGGETT), to place on the record this evening information important to the American people.

One of the questions I have on this resolution that President Bush has sent up to the Congress, the joint resolution to authorize the use of United States Armed Forces against Iraq, is the first question of why now, 7 weeks before an election?

Just about a week ago, the President properly appeared before the United Nations, and he talked about the grave and gathering danger of what was occurring inside Iraq relative to Iraq's development of nuclear weapons and biological and chemical weapons. But the President did not say an imminent danger. In other words, 7 weeks before an election in this country, why does a grave and gathering danger require us to take precipitous action against another nation state? I would ask the President if action is not imminent, why now? Why now are we faced with this resolution, 7 weeks before congressional elections? It is very, very curious timing.

One of the other questions I would ask the President is who is the enemy? Now, we know who caused the carnage over New York and Pennsylvania and at the Pentagon, and we know al Qaeda is a Middle Eastern-based terrorist network, but their base is not Iraq. So I would say, what is the connection between al Qaeda, where our attention should be focused, and Iraq?

I have gone to every single briefing here in the Capitol this week trying to get the evidence from the CIA, the Defense Intelligence Agency, former ambassadors from that region, weapons inspectors that have gone into Iraq in prior years. They have established no connection between al Qaeda and Iraq. So, who is the enemy? Who is the enemy, Mr. President, and why are you trying to pass this resolution at this point?

Our forces are engaged in many places on the globe, certainly keeping order in the Balkans. But now we have the Afghanistan situation facing us with terrible, terrible disruption inside that country, with terrorists coming back, the Taliban, the leftovers, creating difficulties in that region of the world. And I think it is very important to recognize that moving into Iraq will be a significant military undertaking.

Who is the enemy? Who is the enemy? We are not saying that Saddam Hussein and that despotic regime functions in a way that we consider acceptable on the face of the Earth. But what is the justification for now?

Let me mention also, is it just a coincidence that in Iraq, which holds the second largest supply of the world's oil reserves, is there any possibility that in the resolution the President has sent us where he talks about defending the national security interests of the United States and restoring international peace and security in the region, that it might have anything to do with the oil that sits underground in that particular country?

We know that about 2 years ago in October one of our destroyers, the U.S.S. Cole, was suicide-bombed in Yemen Harbor, and we know that we are extended in that part of the world to protect the oil lanes that are supplying this country every day.

I say to myself when I look at the President's plan for energy that he sent up here earlier this year, what a disappointment to me as an American, a 21st-century American, that he has us wed to oil as the future, a diminishing resource.

We should be moving to a carbohydrate future, not a hydrocarbon future in this country. We should be moving toward a hydrogen future, not a petroleum future. We should be moving to a photovoltaic future, to a fuel cell future, not a petroleum future. So both domestic policy and the flawed energy document released and our foreign policy are totally tied together in this wedding of oil and politics that has been the heritage of this country for the last 70 years.

It is time to change. America wants to move on. In fact, if we removed oil as a proxy for our foreign policy, what a different world this would be.

I think it is important to remind the American people that the current recession that we are in, causing significant damage across this country, including in districts like mine, was triggered by rising oil prices. Lots has happened since that occurred; but nonetheless, look at what you spend at the gas pump and watch international events and how they are tied to oil.

I would just say that it is time for America to change. I look forward to future debates on this resolution and the future direction for this country that is domestically independent and at peace in the world.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. BERKLEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. BROWN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### ESTABLISHING THE TRUTH ABOUT IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) is recognized for 5 minutes.