United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 107th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 148 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 9, 2002 No. 132

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 9, 2002.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHNNY ISAKSON to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Reverend Robert A. Thrift, St. Bernice Baptist Church, Terre Haute, Indiana, offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, it is indeed a privilege to share in the opening ceremony of a daily session of the Congress of the United States of America.

Yet it is an awesome privilege to come confidently into Your presence to ask for help in times like these.

We give You praise and thanksgiving for who You are, what You are like, and all You have done for us individually and collectively.

Thank You for the heritage we have as one Nation under God. Forgive us in departing from You. May we return and remain true to that heritage.

For the Members of Congress we pray that wisdom would enter each heart, that understanding would be their delight and that discretion would guard and guide them in all their deliberations.

We bring these petitions and praise You because the kingdom, all power, and all glory truly belong to You.

In Thy name, Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. INSLEE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will receive 10 one-minute speeches on each side after the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. KERNS) is recognized for 1 minute.

WELCOMING THE REVEREND ROBERT A. THRIFT

(Mr. KERNS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KERNS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to welcome Robert A. Thrift from St. Bernice, Indiana, as our guest chaplain.

Reverend Thrift has been pastor of St. Bernice Baptist Church for 8 years. He has four wonderful children: Paul, Janie, Ann, Carrie; and seven beautiful grandchildren: Mason, Tyler, Paige, Carson, Claire, Courtney, and Cole. His son Paul and grandson Carson are, in fact, with us today.

Reverend Thrift graduated from Houston Baptist University where he received his BA. He is also a graduate of Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary. He has been a pastor both in Texas where he was born and in Indiana where he resides with his family.

Reverend Thrift has always helped those who are less fortunate. He has assisted juveniles who had drug problems and alcohol problems, and he also spends his time giving comfort to those who have been hospitalized.

Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor for all of Indiana and myself to have Reverend Thrift present the prayer today in the United States House of Representatives.

CHILD ABDUCTION PREVENTION

(Mr. LAMPSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House passed H.R. 5422, the Child Abduction Prevention Act. As the founder of the Congressional Caucus on Missing and Exploited Children, I would like to thank my colleagues for coming together to pass this important piece of legislation.

The provisions of a bill that I introduced, the Secret Service Child Protection Act, were included in the bill. Many people do not know this, but the Secret Service does more than protect the President. They help find missing kids. I wanted to make sure that they are able to continue assisting investigators, and I worked hard to have the Secret Service bill included in this overarching bill. The Secret Service is a key player in the effort to reunite families and to protect children.

The U.S. Secret Service provides resources, expertise, and other assistance to local law enforcement agencies and to the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children in cases involving missing and exploited children. However, even though the partnership is strong, there was a clear need to provide explicit statutory jurisdiction to the Secret Service to continue this forensic and investigative support upon

Printed on recycled paper.

request from local law enforcement or the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children. The bill that we passed on Monday will do just that.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for working together so that we may hopefully help prevent further abduction and exploitation of children across America.

EXHAUST ALL OUR OPTIONS BEFORE WAR

(Mr. INSLEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, this week I will vote against a unilateral, ill-timed, go-it-alone war on another nation.

We do not owe Saddam Hussein any more time. We do not owe him anything. But we do owe our soldiers and our Marines, our sons and our daughters, every effort to try every means before war; and it is clear that we have not yet exhausted all of our options before opening the door to war.

We will not allow the pain of last September to spread a cloud of fear that would shroud our judgment, our sense of international justice; and we must not be distracted from the war on terrorism in which we are already engaged.

We will equal the power of our Armed Forces with the force of our principles; and one of those principles is that America should lead an international coalition, not just go it alone. This is the American way.

THE ECONOMY

(Ms. SOLIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, the war debate this week is one that deserves our careful attention, but our economy does, too.

While Republicans in Congress focus on drumming up support for a preemptive strike on Iraq, our economy is faltering. The statistics tell the story, and they are staggering.

The number of Americans without health insurance rose by 1.4 million last year. It is up to 41 million now. The poverty rate rose last year for the first time since 1992. Twenty-one percent of Hispanic families are now living in poverty, and more than 2 million jobs have been lost under President Bush.

I understand that because in my own district unemployment rates are as high as 11 percent. Utility bills and the price of gasoline are increasing. Thousands of hardworking men and women have seen their retirement savings evaporate before our eyes.

Congressional Republicans are ignoring these problems. Democrats understand that we need to take charge of our economy now. Let us do it before we adjourn. Let us raise the minimum wage, and we need to pass a Medicare prescription drug benefit that lowers drug prices and covers all seniors. We need to extend unemployment benefits for those people that have lost their jobs and are now seeking some relief from our government. Let us do the right thing before we adjourn. Let us help working families.

REMARKS MADE DURING IRAQ DEBATE

(Mr. WU asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) made remarks at 10:30 last night which I think are deserving of being brought back to this House in the light of day. He said, Today a novel case is being made that the best defense is a good offense, but is this a power that the Framers of the Constitution meant to pass down to their posterity when they sought to secure for us the blessings of liberty? I think not.

Then he went on to quote from the founding of our country, the very beginning, the Minutemen facing the British and the Commander John Parker, Do not fire lest fired upon, but if they mean to have a war, let it begin here.

It is a notion that is as least as old as Saint Augustus' war thesis, and it finds agreement with the Minutemen and the Framers of the Constitution. We should not turn our back today on the millennia of wisdom by proposing to send America's beautiful sons and daughters into harm's way for what might be.

These words spoken late last night deserve consideration by this body and this Nation.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER A MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 4546, BOB STUMP NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2003

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 7(c)(1) of rule XXII, I hereby notify the House of my intention to offer a motion to instruct conferees on the national defense authorization bill which has been in conference since July 26, 2002.

The form of the motion is as follows:

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 4546 be instructed to agree to the provisions contained in section 641 of the Senate amendment (relating to payment of retired pay and compensation to disabled military retirees).

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will now put the question on motions to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed on Monday, October 7, in the order in which that motion was entertained.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 5542, by the yeas and nays;
H.J. Res. 113, by the yeas and nays;
H.R. 3580, by the yeas and nays;
H.R. 5557, by the yeas and nays.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first such vote in this series.

BLACK LUNG CONSOLIDATION OF ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSIBILITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 5542, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5542, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 404, nays 0, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 448]

YEAS—404

Abercrombie	Capps	Etheridge
Ackerman	Capuano	Evans
Aderholt	Cardin	Everett
Allen	Carson (IN)	Farr
Armey	Carson (OK)	Fattah
Baca	Castle	Ferguson
Bachus	Chabot	Filner
Baird	Chambliss	Flake
Baker	Clay	Fletcher
Baldacci	Clayton	Foley
Baldwin	Clement	Forbes
Ballenger	Clyburn	Ford
Barcia	Coble	Fossella
Barr	Collins	Frank
Barrett	Combest	Frelinghuysen
Bartlett	Condit	Frost
Barton	Costello	Gallegly
Bass	Cox	Ganske
Becerra	Coyne	Gekas
Bentsen	Cramer	Gephardt
Bereuter	Crane	Gibbons
Berkley	Crenshaw	Gilchrest
Berman	Crowley	Gillmor
Berry	Cubin	Gilman
Biggert	Culberson	Gonzalez
Bilirakis	Cunningham	Goode
Bishop	Davis (CA)	Goodlatte
Blumenauer	Davis (FL)	Goss
Blunt	Davis (IL)	Graham
Boehlert	Davis, Jo Ann	Granger
Boehner	Davis, Tom	Graves
Bonilla	Deal	Green (TX)
Bonior	DeFazio	Green (WI)
Boozman	DeGette	Greenwood
Borski	Delahunt	Grucci
Boswell	DeLauro	Gutierrez
Boucher	DeLay	Gutknecht
Boyd	DeMint	Hall (TX)
Brady (PA)	Deutsch	Hansen
Brady (TX)	Dicks	Harman
Brown (FL)	Dingell	Hart
Brown (OH)	Dooley	Hastings (FL)
Brown (SC)	Doyle	Hastings (WA)
Bryant	Dreier	Hayes
Burr	Duncan	Hayworth
Burton	Dunn	Hefley
Buyer	Edwards	Herger
Callahan	Ehlers	Hill
Calvert	Emerson	Hilliard
Camp	Engel	Hinchey
Cantor	English	Hinojosa
Capito	Eshoo	Hobson

Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kerns
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Lynch
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller, Dan
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Miller, Jeff
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Saxton
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins (OK)
Watson (CA)
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—27

Akin
Andrews
Blagojevich
Bono
Cannon
Conyers
Cooksey
Cummings
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Doolittle
Ehrlich
Gordon
Hilleary
Houghton
Istook
Kaptur
LaFalce
Lofgren
Manzullo
Mascara
Quinn
Roukema
Sawyer
Sessions
Stump
Young (AK)

□ 1036

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic votes on each additional motion to suspend the rules on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF PATSY T. MINK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 113, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 113, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 410, nays 0, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 449]

YEAS—410

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Allen
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Boozman
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frank
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grucci
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Harman
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hill
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kerns
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Lynch
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller, Dan
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Miller, Jeff
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiberi
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins (OK)
Watson (CA)
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—21

Andrews
Blagojevich
Bono
Cooksey
Diaz-Balart
Ehrlich
Herger
Hilleary
Houghton
Istook
LaFalce
Leach
Lofgren
Manzullo
Mascara

Quinn
Roukema
Stump
Tiahrt
Wicker
Young (AK)

□ 1045

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the joint resolution, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the joint resolution was amended so as to read: ''Joint resolution recognizing the contributions of Patsy Takemoto Mink.''

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1045

MEDICAL DEVICE USER FEE AND MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2002

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 3580, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3580, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 406, nays 3, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 450]

YEAS—406

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Allen
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Boozman
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frank
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grucci
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Harman
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kerns
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Lynch
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller, Dan
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Miller, Jeff
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins (OK)
Watson (CA)
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (FL)

NAYS—3

Flake
Paul
Sensenbrenner

NOT VOTING—22

Andrews
Armey
Blagojevich
Bono
Cooksey
Cox
Davis, Tom
Diaz-Balart
Ehrlich
Hilleary
Houghton
Istook
LaFalce
Larson (CT)
Lofgren
Manzullo
Mascara
McKinney
Quinn
Roukema
Stump
Young (AK)

□ 1054

So (two-thirds have voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 450, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained for the first two votes on October 9, 2002.

Had I been present, I would have voted in favor of H.R. 3580, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to make improvements in the regulation of medical devices, and also in favor of H.J. Res. 113, recognizing the contributions of Patsy T. Mink.

ARMED FORCES TAX FAIRNESS ACT OF 2002

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 5557.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5557, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 412, nays 0, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 451]

YEAS—412

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Boozman
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers

Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frank
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grucci
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Harman
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kerns
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Lynch
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller, Dan
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Miller, Jeff
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins (OK)
Watson (CA)
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—19

Armey
Blagojevich
Bono
Cooksey
Davis, Tom
Diaz-Balart
Ehrlich
Hilleary
Houghton
Istook
LaFalce
Lofgren
Manzullo
Mascara
Quinn
Roukema
Stump
Velazquez
Young (AK)

□ 1104

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANAITON

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, please excuse my absence from the votes this morning. Had I been present I would have voted: "Yes" on H.R. 5557 (rollcall 451); "yes" on H.R. 3580 (rollcall 450); "yes" on H.J. Res. 113 (rollcall 449); and "yes" on H.R. 5542 (rollcall 448).

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE AGAINST IRAQ RESOLUTION OF 2002

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 574, proceedings will now resume on the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 114) to authorize the use of United States Armed Forces against Iraq.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. When proceedings were postponed on the legislative day of Tuesday, October 8, 2002, 5 hours 50½ minutes of debate remained on the joint resolution, as amended.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) has 1 hour 47 minutes remaining, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) has 1 hour 42½ minutes remaining, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) has 1 hour 21 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) has 60 minutes remaining.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. GOSS. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. GOSS. Would the Speaker explain the rotation in the time allotments just announced?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will first recognize the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS). The Chair will then recognize whoever is ready to yield time, and then continue in the same order.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS).

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), a member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and I and the other Members quite often get in very emotional debates, each believing in their position. I think that is the case with the subject that we are breaching now. I would hope to bring some light as far as to why my feelings are as strong as they are.

New York, the Pentagon, Pennsylvania, over 3,000 men, women, and children dying, that is horrific and remains a bitter taste in all Americans' lives. But imagine New York, Chicago, or Los Angeles like Nagasaki or Hiroshima. Think of the pain and the agony that we would go through. Imagine millions of Americans dying with ebola, with smallpox, anthrax, or even nerve gas, which would render generations genetically with problems.

Is it possible? Yes. Is it probable? Yes. As a member on the Committee on Intelligence, I would say it is highly probable if we wait and do nothing.

Fact: In 1981, the Israelis destroyed a nuclear plant in Iraq ready to develop weapons-grade plutonium. In 1990, right in my hometown in San Diego, Iraqis were caught with nuclear triggers on their way to Iraq.

Fact: In 2002, a small amount of weapons-grade plutonium was intercepted heading for Iraq.

Fact: Saddam Hussein does have chemical and biological weapons, and even today he denies that. We know 100 percent that he has them, and he is working towards nuclear weapons.

Saddam Hussein has been expanding the delivery systems, including pilotless aircraft. Guess what is in range of those pilotless aircraft: Turkey, Saudi Arabia, Israel, where thousands of Americans and other citizens of other nations reside.

Saddam Hussein is dispersing, as we speak, and it is not just his capability with chemical and biological weapons, but he is dispersing those weapons of mass destruction to other terrorist groups.

Saddam really does not care for al Qaeda, but they have a common goal, and that is to hurt the United States.

It is a fact that Saddam pays $700 for a Palestinian that is wounded; and he pays $1,500 for a Palestinian that is wounded in a terrorist attack; and Saddam Hussein pays $25,000 to the family of someone that straps a bomb on themselves and blows up men, women, and children. Americans have been killed in Israel from suicide bombers.

Mr. Speaker, my eyes tear even 30 years later from friends that I saw die in combat. This is no simple thing. My

mother was rushed to a hospital when she learned that I was shot down.

I know the horrors brought on the men and women that we will ask to go to war, but I also know the heartache and the pain of the families that are left behind. I would say to my colleagues, do we want to subject them to the horrors of war in our own country?

That is why I have this resolve. I think it is highly probable that terrorists would act against the U.S. if we do not act; and I ask my colleagues, do not let it happen.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN).

(Mr. CALLAHAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, in doing so, I cannot minimize the gravity of its ultimate outcome—the potential deployment of American Service men and women to engage in war against our enemy. There is no more solemn responsibility, or burden, for a Member of Congress than acting to put our troops in harm's way.

I am supporting this resolution because I believe President Bush has made a solid case for acting to remove weapons of mass destruction from Iraq. He has taken the appropriate steps to achieve United Nations' support through a new Security Council resolution, and I remain hopeful this initiative will be successful. However, it is imperative that Congress give consensus to our commander in chief as he navigates through difficult diplomatic channels, and so we must give this measure a strong, favorable vote.

During my service here, I have joined my colleagues too many times to send our military personnel to war—from the gulf war to Bosnia to Afghanistan. Despite reservations, I have supported former Presidents Bush and Clinton because it is their constitutional role to make decisions involving war. We must all be nonpartisan on these issues and not support only the President of our party. To act in a partisan manner damages our Nation's credibility abroad and harms the reputation of Congress.

This will be one of my final votes in the House and it does not get any easier to act on matters of war. This vote late in my 18-year career will be one of the hardest. I am confident it is the right vote.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me first say that I know I speak for all of my colleagues across the political aisle in paying tribute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), one of the true military heroes serving currently in the Congress of the United States.

Here is a man who participated in battles, knows the tragedy of war, but also understands that while war is horrible, appeasement brings far greater tragedies.

□ 1115

Before yielding to one of our most distinguished Members, I would like to pay tribute to every colleague yesterday who participated in this debate. The debate, Mr. Speaker, took place in a dignified, statesman-like, serious manner as befits the topic; and I want to pay tribute to every single Republican and Democratic colleague who took part in yesterday's debate, and I know today's debate will be similar in tone and tenor.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), my dear friend and one of the most distinguished Members of this body and one of the leaders on the Democratic side.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the ranking member of the Committee on International Relations, for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday, today and tomorrow the Members of this House consider our most solemn constitutional obligation, a resolution that authorizes our Commander in Chief to use our Nation's Armed Forces. We do not savor this awesome responsibility, but we will not shrink from it either. The seriousness of this occasion dictates that we debate today not as Democrats, not as Republicans, but as Americans, Americans of conscience and principle who love their country and who are committed to the security of this Nation and its people.

This resolution in my view does not sound the drumbeat of war. Rather, it provides Saddam Hussein with his last chance for peace. I will support it. The resolution reflects the concerns and judgment of Members of this House from both sides of the aisle. It supports our diplomatic efforts, limits and defines the scope of authorization and requires the President to notify Congress before using force and to consult with Congress throughout the process.

Saddam Hussein's malevolence and expansionist designs are not in dispute. He used mustard gas and attacked civilians during his 8-year war with Iran. He attacked Kurdish villages in northern Iraq with chemical weapons. He invaded Kuwait before an international coalition repulsed him. He fired missiles at Saudi Arabia and Israel. He attempted to assassinate our own President, former President George Bush. And he has and continues to savage and enslave his own people.

Saddam Hussein is a vanquished tyrant who owes his existence to the fact that the international community did not effect his ouster in 1991. In hindsight, the cause of peace and regional stability, as well as the well-being of the Iraqi people who toil under his boot, dictated that result. Yet, like the long line of aggressors who pockmark history, Hussein has preyed on international irresolution. He disdains and refuses to submit to weapons inspections.

He continues his efforts to develop and acquire weapons of mass destruction, and he sponsors international terrorism. Saddam Hussein continues to be an unacceptable threat whose duplicity requires action, action now. Reverting to a failed inspection regime would permit hope to ignore history. Hussein is in no position to negotiate. He must provide unrestricted access to all Iraqi sites with no single compensation acceptable. And if he refuses, he must realize the consequences and realize as well that he is solely responsible for those consequences.

The United States must continue to seek the widest support for a tough inspection regime that ensures Hussein is disarmed. Unilateral action carries tremendous risk. Yet we know that international vacillation has often emboldened tyrants and compounded bloodshed and instability. In just the last decade, a halting, indecisive United Nations bore witness to genocide in the former Yugoslavia and tragically did little to stop it.

The reign of terror perpetuated by Slobodan Milosovic blazed until NATO extinguished it. Thus, in the face of tyranny, we must not allow our commitment to secure the imprimatur and participation of the international community to become the sine qua non of American policy.

The risk of inaction today in my opinion poses previously unfathomed dangers for tomorrow. The proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and the most virulent strain of terrorism which targets innocents and glories in suicidal mass murder could render national inaction a virtual death sentence to far too many.

Let there be no mistake, the United States must continue to be a leading proponent of multilateral institutions and the peaceful resolutions of disputes. However, in the absence of international unity in confronting Hussein and his criminal regime, we must not be frozen into inaction in the face of a clear and present danger.

Let me add, with all due respect to my colleagues who have expressed their sincere concern that this resolution authorizes the President to use Armed Forces preemptively, that I see a clear distinction here. We have had an ongoing engagement in Iraq since that nation agreed to terminate its hostility towards its neighbors in 1991.

Our pilots who have been fired on by Iraqi military can attest that our engagement continues. Thus, I do not agree that we are setting a possibly dangerous precedent.

Mr. Speaker, we have given and should continue to give diplomacy and international coalition-building efforts every opportunity. Saddam Hussein has chosen to ignore his obligations and to continue his dangerous designs. If he fails to seize this last chance for peace, then he will bear sole responsibility for his own destruction.

Mr. Speaker, we have no quarrel with the Iraqi people. Our purpose is not territorial acquisition. Our purpose is the protection and security of our people, and the promotion of peace, stability and the rule of law in Iraq, the Middle East and the international community. We must not shrink from this responsibility.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD), a member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

(Mr. LaHOOD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, before I begin my prepared statement, I just wanted to say a word about the extraordinary leadership that we have on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence from our chairman. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) is an extraordinary chairman. He has done so much. He has done a great job for our committee and for America since 9–11, and he deserves an awful lot of praise for the work he has done with the administration for all the Members of this House in really just doing an extraordinary job as chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.J. Res. 114, a bipartisan resolution that authorizes the use of our Armed Forces against Iraq. I want to take a moment to applaud the President and his team for continuing to work to garner international support to bring Iraq into compliance with U.N. resolutions, for continuing to update the Congress on the situation in Iraq, and for continuing to work with Members on both sides of the aisle in formulating the resolution we are discussing today.

We do not take lightly what we are voting on here today. The decision to authorize the potential use of our Nation's Armed Forces is very difficult. However, this resolution is not a rush to war. Our immediate goal is to allow weapons inspectors complete and unrestricted accesses to determine Iraq's compliance with disarmament requirements. This resolution explicitly expresses support for the President's ongoing efforts to work with the U.N. Security Council to quickly and decisively act to ensure Iraqi compliance with all Security Council resolutions. However, the resolution also provides for the authorization of the use of military force that may be needed to protect U.S. national security and enforce Security Council resolutions if diplomatic efforts alone are no longer effective. Congress will be kept informed.

Saddam Hussein knew what was required to end the Persian Gulf War: destroying all existing weapons of mass destruction, discontinuing any development of these weapons, and allow United Nations' weapons inspectors unrestricted access so compliance with these demands could be ensured. Iraq has failed to comply with each and every U.N. resolution and has continued to stockpile and develop weapons that are a threat to not only its neighbors in the Middle East, but also the entire world.

Iraq's history of violations, combined with its present policy of working to acquire weapons while continuing to restrict U.N. access, led to a future where the United States and the United Nations must be able to commit whatever resources are necessary to ensure Iraqi disarmament.

I am proud to serve on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and have had the opportunity to carefully study the ongoing weapons activity in Iraq. And I am convinced that this resolution is needed to allow us to use every option at our disposal to deal with Iraq. We know what Iraq is capable of, and we know that Saddam Hussein is striving to expand that capability. The people of Iraq are not safe. American military personnel who serve in the Persian Gulf are not safe. And, in fact, the world is not safe if Iraq does not begin to comply with U.S. and U.N. resolutions and disarmament demands.

I believe it is important for the Iraqi people to know that the United States and the United Nations will not allow the continued development and buildup of the stockpile of weapons in their country. Saddam Hussein has turned these terrible weapons against his own people who continue to suffer repression at the hands of this dictator's persistent and willful violations of his international obligations.

I am pleased that this is a bipartisan resolution. The security of the United States and the security of the world rise above partisan points of view. This resolution shows Iraq that we are united in its condemnation of its continued flagrant violation of all U.N. resolution, and in our determination to achieve Iraqi disarmament.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the President for his ongoing efforts to work with the international community and the Congress. And I want to thank my colleagues for this opportunity to use this to thoroughly discuss this resolution, which is one of the most significant pieces of legislation many of us will ever vote on during our time in Congress. Most importantly, I want to thank the men and women who serve in our Nation's Armed Forces, continually working to achieve and maintain peace, in the Persian Gulf region and around the world. And they deserve our devoted and unrestrained thanks for the wonderful, wonderful service that they provide to our country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support this bipartisan resolution.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to, first of all, commend both sides on this very important issue and the manner in which this discussion has moved forward for close to 12 hours. From about 1 p.m. to 1 a.m. on yesterday we had all views expressed, and that is really what makes this a great House, and that is what makes this a great country. That is what makes me proud and privileged to be a part of this institution.

□ 1130

I would like to certainly commend the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) who has conducted himself with tremendous leadership, a true gentleman from Illinois who has shown his leadership in so many capacities. During the 14 years I have been in Congress, this is certainly one of the most important issues that I have been involved in, and it will be a very important vote.

I would also like to commend the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), because all of us feel proud of what he has done to make our Nation a stronger place, and it is great to have heroes in our body.

Also, let me commend again the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) who continues his eloquence, his vision. He is one of the most expressive persons that I know in the House, and, for that, this place is a better place.

Let me say that I would like to briefly share with my colleagues a front page article in today's Washington Post which states that unprovoked by a U.S. military campaign, Saddam Hussein is ''unlikely to initiate a chemical or biological attack against the United States.'' This was contained in a report provided by intelligence agencies to senators last week. If a U.S.-led attack could not be stopped, Saddam might launch a chemical/biological counterattack, the analysts forewarned.

The report said that Saddam might decide that the extreme step of assisting Islamic terrorism in conducting a war, in conducting a weapons of mass destruction attack against the United States would be his last chance to exact vengeance by taking a large number of victims with him.

This appears to suggest that an attack on Iraq could trigger the very thing that our President has said that he is trying to prevent, the use of chemical or biological weapons by Hussein.

In view of this report, the policy of a preemptive strike is troublesome. Haste in attacking Iraq would place untold numbers of people in harm's way.

In Ecclesiastes it says that there is a season for all things; there is a time to laugh and a time to cry, a time to plan and a time to pluck up that which has been planted, a time of peace and a time of war. The question before us is whether this is a time for peace or a time for war. The question is whether we can continue to use diplomacy, whether we have exhausted all means to try to have peace, whether we have maximized the use of the United Nations and other international agencies.

Let us give peace a chance. Let us try to get our inspectors in, identify weapons of mass destruction, have them destroyed and then move forward.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) a very key leader in our Democratic Caucus, a person who has served her people in Connecticut so well, a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, the responsibility for authorizing the use of America's military weighs heavily on all of us today, and I have no doubt that we each rise knowing that the Constitution and the Nation now call on each of us and no one else.

Nearly all assembled today, including myself, voted to authorize force and empower our war on terrorism. Our response was immediate and unified. The Taliban government had to fall. Al Qaeda had to be confronted in Afghanistan and all across the globe, and we carried into battle the full moral authority of a world stirred to action.

I oppose the resolution today reluctantly because I fully anticipate that we will need to act against Iraq before very long. I have no illusions about Saddam Hussein. Saddam Hussein and his regime threaten the safety of our country and his neighbors, many of whom are our allies. He has invaded and occupied neighboring countries and launched deadly missiles at civilian populations. This is a regime that has used and intends to use chemical and biological weapons and has done its best to develop a nuclear weapons program.

This is a murderous regime that has slaughtered its own people. Saddam Hussein is a war criminal who should be on trial, along with Slobodan Milosevic in The Hague.

I rise in opposition reluctantly but no less certain of the importance of a no vote. Because of the nature of this regime and because of the war on terrorism, we must marshal the moral authority and strategic resources that can end this grave threat and secure America's long-term interests. This resolution does not meet that historic requirement, in my view.

While it is an improvement over the original proposal, it represents a nod to the U.N., our allies and our long-term interests but requires almost nothing before America goes to war. It does not require that we seek to operate under a U.N. resolution or to seek unfettered U.N. inspection or to build broad support from allies before America goes to war. In doing so, we weaken our moral authority, our military effectiveness and our ability to keep events under control afterwards.

And if we go it alone against Iraq, as this resolution permits, I am concerned that our efforts will lack the legitimacy that an operation of this magnitude requires. I am concerned that the United States will have to carry the full burden of renewal and policing Iraq, which will surely be high.

Without U.N. sanction, I believe this action could increase instability in the region and indeed throughout the world. It could very well undermine the war on terrorism, alienating countries the United States will need to achieve the broader objective of uncovering and dismantling al Qaeda cells across the world.

I support the Spratt substitute because I believe it fully accepts the goal of eliminating weapons of mass destruction from Iraq. It accounts for Saddam Hussein's record of deceit, of lying to the world and forestalling the inspection process by anticipating the use of force, but the Spratt substitute rightly considers force something that is multiplied in effectiveness when the right stage is set.

It requires the President to certify that the U.N. Security Council has not acted or acted insufficiently to achieve Iraqi disarmament. The substitute requires that he certify that unilateral force is the only option, that military force is necessary to make Iraq comply and that the United States is forming as broad-based a coalition as possible.

Having taken every possible diplomatic action, it requires the President to certify that military action in Iraq will not interfere with the broader war on terrorism.

The Spratt substitute takes the responsible course of action, exhausting diplomatic efforts and building an international coalition first, while acknowledging that military action may be inevitable. I believe this path both ensures that we will be able to continue our success in the war on terrorism in the long term without compromising our safety in the short term.

Mr. Speaker, the President has asked that we pass the resolution to send the message to the U.N. I hope we pass the Spratt substitute so that we can send a message that our war on terrorism will not be compromised, and I hope that a no vote will urge the President to act with the force of nations to achieve our noble and our essential goals.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Science and a member of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

(Mr. BOEHLERT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, what is the rush? That question was asked of me Monday evening following the President's speech. It was asked of me last week and the week before and the week before. As a matter of fact, it was first posed to me by a thoughtful questioner at a League of Women Voters candidates forum in Cortland, New York, some 7 weeks ago.

My answer to him then was the same answer I give to everyone now. There is no rush. The President is prudent, measured and firm in dealing with a decade of defiance, deception and bad faith on the part of Saddam Hussein, who has repeatedly ignored U.N. resolutions and turned his back on agreements that he himself embraced. There is widespread agreement with the President. The time for denying, deceiving and delay is over.

Iraq has a chemical and biological weapons capability which can be launched at a moment's notice and is in the process of acquiring a nuclear capability. From my vantage point as chairman of the Committee on Science, I am familiar with the havoc that can be wreaked with chemical and biological weapons; and as a senior member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, I am most familiar with the evidence that Saddam Hussein has an accelerated program to acquire a nuclear capability.

The case has been made. The question is, what do we do about it?

In my view, the President is going about it in the correct way. He is not some rogue cowboy from Texas, acting as the Lone Ranger, but a thoughtful, international leader, rising to the occasion with calm and reason and resolve.

The case has indeed been made, and it is up to us to respond. The President went to the United Nations and in a very orderly, methodical way outlined the evidence to that body and to the international community.

The President has repeatedly consulted with the Congress, not just with a few leaders, but all of us. There have been meetings at the White House. Just yesterday, for example, I started my day at 7:30 at the Pentagon with a briefing by the Secretary of Defense and his top people, followed by a return to Capitol Hill for several hours of meetings with the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, followed by a luncheon meeting with a group of us with Condoleeza Rice, the National Security Adviser.

The Congress is involved. It has been presented the evidence, and the President is engaging the American people with a thoughtful, sober, analytical presentation. And I have to confess great disappointment because if my colleagues turned on the television set Monday night, on the three national channels they found their usual programming, not to be interrupted by something so minor as the President of the United States addressing the world on one of the most serious subjects of the moment.

I think overlooked in that speech to the American people Monday night was this fact, and the speech made it abundantly clear. Approving this resolution does not mean that immediate action is imminent or unavoidable. I am comforted by the fact that the President has advisers like Colin Powell and Dick Cheney and Don Rumsfeld and Condoleeza Rice. They are going about this in the correct way, and I urge support for the Commander-in-Chief.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN), the ranking member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence Subcommittee on Terrorism and Homeland Security.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time, and I rise in support of this resolution.

The threat from Iraq is very real and increasingly dangerous. Saddam Hussein's belligerent intentions, and his

possession and ongoing development of weapons of mass destruction to fulfill those intentions, make him a clear and present danger to the United States and the world.

Particularly worrisome is the evidence of Iraq's UAV capability. Iraq's ability to use uninhabited aerial vehicles to deliver biological and chemical weapons far outside its national borders represents a qualitative increase in the danger it poses. History demonstrates Saddam Hussein's willingness to use such weapons against unarmed civilians, including his own people; and it demonstrates his unhesitating instincts to invade his neighbors, Iran and Kuwait, and to attack Israel.

That he appears to quote Director Tenet's recent letter, ''to be drawing a line short of conducting terrorist attacks'' does not persuade me that he will not. He is impulsive, irrational, vicious and cruel. Unchecked, he will only grow stronger as he develops capability to match his disdain for America and his Middle East neighbors.

History shows that had Israel not destroyed Iraq's nuclear reactor in 1981, Saddam Hussein would now have nuclear capability, but he did not cease his nuclear ambitions. Had coalition military forces not swept through Iraq in 1991, he would have possessed nuclear weapons by 1993.

□ 1145

The CIA now reports that Iraq is 1 year away from a functional nuclear device once it acquires fissile material. Waiting 1 hour, 1 day, 1 month in such an environment, as some suggest, is too risky.

The resolution we are considering is greatly improved from the draft the administration proposed, and I commend Leader GEPHARDT for negotiating these improvements. This resolution narrows the scope of action to the threats to national security posed by Iraq and enforcing compliance with U.N. resolutions.

This resolution stresses a strong preference for peaceful and diplomatic action, authorizing the use of force only if peaceful options have failed.

This resolution requires the President to comply with the War Powers Act and report regularly to Congress should military action become necessary, as well as after the use of force is completed.

This resolution addresses post-disarmament Iraq and the role of the United States and the international community in rebuilding.

And of crucial importance, this resolution requires the President to certify to Congress that action in Iraq will not dilute our ability to wage the war on terrorism.

Removing WMD from Iraq is an important priority, but it cannot replace our counterterrorism efforts at home and abroad. We must ensure we do not divert attention from protecting our homeland, beginning with the creation of a Department of Homeland Security.

We must also strengthen and expand programs and policies aimed at stopping the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their components.

Sentiment in my district is high, both in favor and in opposition to this resolution. I thank my constituents for sharing their views with me. I have listened carefully, learned as much as I could; and now it is time to lead. Like all my colleagues, I fervently hope that the U.S. will not need to use force, but the best chance to avoid military action is to show the U.N. and Iraq that we will not flinch from it.

Giving diplomatic efforts every chance is the right policy, and this resolution gives diplomacy its maximum chance to succeed.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK), a member of the Committee on Appropriations, who has done a great job not only regarding foreign operations, but also for her State of Michigan.

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, the 435 who serve in this body, and the 100 in the other body, will shortly cast the most important vote of our career, should we send our young men and women to war. It is a decision not to be taken lightly, and I highly respect both sides of the argument. But I stand here today with a heavy heart because I am not able to support the resolution before us.

September 11, 2001, the most dastardly deed ever imagined on a people was committed in this country. The terrorist threat is alive and well. It ought to be the number one priority of this country, of this President, to root out terrorism, to make sure we bring the culprit who planned, organized, and attacked our Nation to justice. We have not done that. Nothing should divert us from that.

There has been no intelligence, no information given to this Member, and I might add my ranking member on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, that would say Saddam Hussein is an imminent threat to America at this time. No information to the highest ranking Democrat on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Does he have weapons? Can he harm? Yes, he can. The President went to the United Nations and spoke before 189 nations of the world not long ago, and the U.N. Security Council, which is composed of many countries, China, Russia, Germany, France and others, whose responsibility it is to act. And if a unilateral strike were necessary right now, do any of us believe that China, Russia, France, Germany, who are also a part of this world, would join with the United States? They have chosen not to do so. Therefore, that leaves the United States alone.

Yes, we are the most powerful. Yes, this is a great country, and we want to remain that. I am very concerned that a unilateral first strike will upset the global economy, will upset the world. And what about the other 20-plus countries that have weapons of mass destruction? Can China then attack Taiwan? Can India then attack Pakistan? North Korea? South Korea? Where does it stop?

The United States is the leader in the world, and we must show that leadership; and we do that by multilaterally acting with our allies, working together so we do not have the loss of 50,000, so that we will not have to spend $200 billion-plus of taxpayers' money, and so that we can then use it for health care and housing and prescription drugs.

Mr. Speaker, I implore the American citizens to look at the issue and to get to their Congressperson and Senator. Yes, we have to disarm Saddam Hussein. Yes, we have to go after the weapons of mass destruction. But we are the leaders of the free world, and we have no allies with us on this first strike.

We ought to ask some questions here. What will be the consequences in the Middle East when America makes this first strike? What will be the cost to the world? How many lives will be lost? What resources are we going to pledge as we strike and then as we rebuild that part of the world? What will happen with Iran and Saudi Arabia? Will they sit idly by?

If we pass this resolution in October and not go to war until February or March, what will happen in the interim to American businesses all over the world? Will they be safe?

I urge my colleagues to look at some of these questions. There is no plan. Attack and then what? We have not been given a plan for striking nor a plan for exiting. I think that is wrong. And as Members of Congress who have pledged to represent over 600,000 people apiece, we owe our constituents that answer, these very same constituents whose sons and daughters will be on the front line risking their lives in a war where there has not yet been proven to be an imminent threat to our country.

Mr. Speaker, over the next several hours I ask my constituents to please listen to the comments of our colleagues. And, again, I respect both sides; but I think my constituents sent this Member here to represent and to report to them, and what I am reporting today is that there is no information, no intelligence presented that either this Member or our ranking member on our Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence that Saddam Hussein is an imminent threat to our country today.

Let the U.N. process work. Go in with unfettered inspections, and then let us make an intelligent response. Then multilaterally put the coalition together that we have to have to rid Iraq of weapons of mass destruction. But then also invest in America to save our health care institutions, to build new

schools. I am telling my colleagues, and America, to rise up, to speak out. The time is now.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA), a member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about what will be the most difficult vote many of us will ever cast. The decision to authorize our President to use force is never an easy one. Leadership is never easy. Like many people in my district, I struggled with this decision. Just as I do not believe any of my constituents wants to go to war, I do not believe any person in this Chamber wants to go to war. But there are those in this world who may leave us no choice. They have already declared war on America. That is where we find ourselves today.

Much has changed in our country since the attacks of September 11. We have awakened to a world in which the threats that existed before only outside of our borders are now very real inside of them. None of us will ever forget that day, the horror, and then explaining to our children how the most powerful Nation in the world, in a matter of seconds, became one of its most vulnerable.

On September 11 we lost over 3,000 people. They were ordinary Americans going about the business of their lives when they became victims of the global war that terrorists have launched against America. They were not the first victims. Throughout the 1990s, al Qaeda and other terrorist organizations attacked our Nation. We did not heed the warning signs. We see these warning signs in Iraq now.

Saddam Hussein has already used weapons of mass destruction against his own people and the people of Iran. He has systematically thwarted every attempt by the United Nations to conduct thorough inspections of his chemical, biological and nuclear arms-making capabilities. He has ignored a decade-plus of U.N. resolutions.

The question now is how long do we wait? Do we wait for a dictator who has shown no limits in his willingness to flaunt international law, to killing innocent people? Do we wait to give al Qaeda or some other terrorist group a weapon of mass destruction that Saddam Hussein has provided to them?

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that Saddam Hussein is a threat to our Nation and to the peace of this planet. He is a rogue leader seeking the world's deadliest weapons, and there is little doubt he will use them for his own evil purposes. Now is the time for the U.S. to lead, to demonstrate real leadership at the United Nations, to demonstrate our conviction and resolve to the dissidents in Iraq that we stand with them.

By exercising leadership in the world community, we will send a powerful message to Saddam and terrorists that peace-loving nations and peace-loving people will not stand by silently as they threaten the values that we stand for. In times of crisis, America has always led. Now is the time for the President, for this Congress, and for America to once again show leadership in a dangerous world.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise not as a Democrat, but as an American who shares the belief with President Bush that, once and for all, the time has come to end the threat of Saddam Hussein and his weapons of mass destruction. For that reason, I intend to support the authorization of military force against Iraq, even as I hope and pray for peace.

Saddam Hussein has been responsible for the murder and deaths of hundreds of thousands of men, women, and children. How many more people, how many more innocent victims must die at his hands before the world finally says enough is enough?

Saddam Hussein has built chemical and biological weapons. He has pursued the ultimate weapon of terror, a nuclear bomb. How many more weapons of mass destruction must he build before the world finally says enough is enough?

There comes a time when a tyrant's repeated disdain for the rules of civilized society makes it necessary for society to protect itself. I say that time is now.

Some of my colleagues in Congress say, in good faith, let us continue to try diplomacy with Saddam Hussein, and I respect their right to that view. Eleven years ago, I too had hoped diplomacy would have worked, in that case to stop Saddam Hussein from his unprovoked aggression against his neighbor, Kuwait. The Arab League tried diplomacy and failed. The European Community tried diplomacy and failed. The United Nations tried diplomacy and failed. And for 11 long years since, the world community, acting through the United Nations, has tried to use diplomacy to convince Saddam Hussein to destroy his weapons of mass destruction.

□ 1200

Once again, the world community and diplomacy have failed.

Is that failure the fault of the United States, the United Nations? Absolutely not. The fault lies squarely with one person and one person alone, Saddam Hussein. He is the guilty one, not us.

The reality is that Saddam Hussein is a terrorist of historic proportions who has gassed his own citizens and killed his own neighbors. Now with his weapons of mass destruction he is a genuine threat to his declared enemy, the United States. Nothing, absolutely nothing Saddam Hussein has done since his invasion of Kuwait would suggest that his disrespect for the rules of civilized society has changed one iota. If anything, that disrespect has grown as he has arrogantly ignored U.N. resolution after resolution, year after year.

Do I hope for peace without war? Fervently so. Because I represent 40,000 soldiers in my district who may be sent off to that war, and I represent their families. Yet, sadly, 11 years of his actions suggest Saddam Hussein has no respect for the principles of diplomacy and peace.

The responsibility to only use war as a last resort does not negate the profound obligation of the President and Congress to protect American citizens from weapons of mass destruction. The United States as the one superpower in the world has an abiding responsibility to ensure that the terrorist attacks of September 11 do not become a prelude for biological, chemical or nuclear terrorism either here or anywhere in the world.

I respect President Bush, as I do his father, for standing up to the menace of Saddam Hussein. I applaud the President's recent challenge to the United Nations. The interest of our Nation and all nations will be served if the U.N. enforces its resolutions against Saddam Hussein and Iraq. But if the U.N. does not take decisive action, the threat posed by Saddam Hussein and Iraq does not go away.

Tigers do not change their stripes, and Saddam Hussein has not changed his. Not in 11 years, and not now. He was a brutal dictator, a dangerous dictator over 11 years ago; and he is a brutal, dangerous dictator today. The reality is diplomacy has failed and delay could be dangerous. The time to act is now.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK), a member of the Committee on Appropriations, and a teacher for over 50 years. This is the gentlewoman's last term, and we appreciate her service to our country.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

As a woman of peace, I am compelled to rise in opposition to this resolution. I oppose this resolution as someone who loves this country very deeply. Perhaps one would have had to have grown up under segregation in the deep South, as I did, to truly appreciate how much this Nation means to me and how honored I am to serve my country in Congress.

As one of the most senior Members of Congress, few have seen what I have seen in this Nation's history. I remember clearly the Japanese preemptive attack, or first strike, against the United States that plunged us into World War II. We called it a sneak attack and an act of cowardice. They called it a preemptive attack against a foreign enemy that threatened their interests.

I also remember clearly when we went to war in South Korea, and after

50 years we are still in Korea. Since I have been in Congress these past 10 years, I have supported every Defense authorization and Defense appropriations bill, every one of them. I feel very strongly that we need a strong national defense, and we need to be prepared, and indeed we are.

We are the strongest Nation in the world, and number two is not even close to us. I believe that our Nation sets the standard for the world. What we do and how we do it has a huge impact on the actions and things that other nations do. I also believe that we need a strong Presidency. I felt that way under President Clinton, and I feel that way under President Bush. However, we must use our power very carefully. We must set standards for other nations and promote our security, our interests and our goals. A strong chief executive should not be an all-powerful chief executive; strong, but not all-powerful.

It is for these reasons I oppose this resolution.

Are we in imminent danger of attack? The claims of proof are lacking. The media has reported today that the consensus of all relevant U.S. military intelligence agencies is that Saddam Hussein is unlikely to initiate an attack upon us. In fact, the relevant U.S. intelligence agencies have concluded that the major threat to the United States is not a first strike but the weapons of mass destruction against our invading troops.

Is Saddam Hussein an enemy? Yes, he is. Is Saddam Hussein interested in military conquests? Unquestionably. Do we need to take action against him to dismantle any existing weapons and prevent the construction of others? Emphatically yes. But is he an imminent threat to the United States? The answer is, no. Such a serious threat that we have no choice but to immediately attack him? The President simply has not even come close to proving his case on that to me, representing over 600,000 people, or to the American people, nor have those who are promoting this war.

Under such shaky justifications when we have other options, why are we in such a hurry to start a war? Why are there so many people beating the drums of war? My answer to this resolution is that we do not have clear evidence, we do not have a demonstrated imminent threat, and so we do not have a compelling reason to pass this resolution.

As I said, I believe in a strong chief executive, but I also believe in a strong constitutional government. Only Congress has the authority under the Constitution to declare war. This resolution authorizes the use of force immediately regardless of our efforts to gain the support and assent of the other nations that share the world with us. I am certainly not willing to approve this blank check to give such power to any President, whether he be Democrat or Republican.

As a leading member of the international community, the United States must live and get along with and set example for the other nations of the world. If we claim the right to attack other nations on our own, what would we do when other nations claim that same right and then act upon it? The world is filled with nations that already have weapons of mass destruction and that already have hate and fear their neighbors. How would we contain the preemptive attacks by other countries that would be justified by our own actions? Such attacks could even be directed against us.

Finally, I believe we should fully and aggressively utilize every diplomatic option available to us. We have worked with the United Nations in the past, and we can do it again.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the world of President William McKinley. The real and imminent threat to our Nation is from terrorism, not from other nations.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following for the RECORD.

ANALYSTS DISCOUNT ATTACK BY IRAQ COUNTERATTACK IS CALLED POSSIBLE

(By Dana Priest)

Unprovoked by a U.S. military campaign, Iraqi President Saddam Hussein is unlikely to initiate a chemical or biological attack against the United States, intelligence agencies concluded in a classified report given to select senators last week.

However, the report added, ''should Saddam conclude that a US-led attack could no longer be deterred,'' he might launch a chemical-biological counterattack. Hussein might ''decide that the extreme step of assisting Islamist terrorists in conducting a WMD [weapons of mass destruction] attack against the United States would be his last chance to exact vengeance by taking a large number of victims with him.''

The assessment was first made in a classified National Intelligence Estimate, which includes the analysis and opinions of all relevant U.S. intelligence agencies, that was given to the Senate intelligence committee last week. A declassified ''white paper'' on Iraq was released days later. At the urging of the committee, which is controlled by Democrats, additional portions of the classified intelligence report were declassified by the CIA Monday and released last night.

With lawmakers poised to vote this week on a resolution giving President Bush authority to attack Iraq, the new intelligence report offers grist both for supporters and critics of the administration's policy. The CIA assessment appears to suggest that an attack on Iraq could provoke the very thing the president has said he is trying to forestall; the use of chemical or biological weapons by Hussein.

But the CIA also declassified other elements of analysis that seem to back up the president's assertion that Iraq has active ties to al Qaeda—a growing feature of the administration's case for considering military action.

Among the intelligence assessments linking Iraq with al Qaeda is ''credible reporting'' that the group's ''leaders sought contacts in Iraq who could help them acquire WMD capabilities,'' according to a letter to senators from CIA Director George J. Tenet.

Tenet added: ''Iraq's increasing support to extremist Palestinians, coupled with growing indications of a relationship'' with al Qaeda ''suggest Baghdad's links to terrorists will increase, even absent U.S. military action.''

In his speech to the nation Monday night, Bush said: ''Iraq could decide on any given day to provide a biological or chemical weapon to a terrorist group or individual terrorists. Alliance with terrorists could allow the Iraqi regime to attack America without leaving any fingerprints.''

The letter's release shed light on a behind-the-scenes battle over Iraq-related intelligence. The CIA's detailed, unvarnished view of the threat posed by Iraq is central, say many lawmakers, to how they will vote on the matter. Yet an increasing number of intelligence officials, including former and current intelligence agency employees, are concerned the agency is tailoring its public stance to fit the administration's views.

The CIA works for the president, but its role is to provide him with information untainted by political agendas.

Caught in the tug of war over intelligence, say former intelligence officials familiar with current CIA intelligence and analysis on Iraq, has been the CIA's rank and file, and to some extent, Tenet.

''There is a tremendous amount of pressure on the CIA to substantiate positions that have already been adopted by the administration,'' said Vincent Cannistraro, former head of counterterrorism at the CIA.

Tenet last night released a statement that was meant to dispel assertions that the letter contained new information that would undercut the case Bush made in his speech.

''There is no inconsistency between our view of Saddam's growing threat and the view as expressed by the President in this speech,'' the statement read. ''Although we think the chances of Saddam initiating a WMD attack at this moment are low—in part because it would constitute an admission that he possesses WMD—there is no question that the likelihood of Saddam using WMD against the United States or our allies in the region for blackmail, deterrence, or otherwise grows as his arsenal continues to build.''

In explaining why the items in the letter were not also released before, Tenet said he did not want to provide ''Saddam a blueprint of our intelligence capabilities and shortcomings, or with insight into our expectations of how he will and will not act.''

Still, he noted, the agency could nevertheless declassify further information not previously disclosed. Included in his letter were snippets of an Oct. 2 closed-door session.

Included in that was questioning by Sen. Carl M. Levin (D-Mich.), in which he asked an unnamed intelligence official whether it ''is likely that [Hussein] would initiate an attack using a weapon of mass destruction?

The official answered: ''. . . in the foreseeable future, given the conditions we understand now, the likelihood I think would be low.''

Levin asked: ''If we initiate an attack and he thought he was in extremis . . . what's the likelihood in response to our attack that he would use chemical or biological weapons?''

The answer came: ''Pretty high, in my view.''

In his letter, Tenet responded to senators' questions about Iraq's connections to al Qaeda. ''We have sold reporting of senior level contacts between Iraq and Al Quada going back a decade,'' Tenet wrote. ''Credible information'' also indicates that Iraq and al Qaeda ''have discussed safe haven and reciprocal non-aggression.''

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire about the division of time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). The gentleman from Illinois

(Mr. HYDE) has 1 hour 47 minutes remaining; the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) has 1 hour 25 minutes remaining; the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) has 1 hour 2 minutes remaining; and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) has 44½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), a member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

(Mr. BURR of North Carolina asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) for not only his leadership as chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence but also for the gentleman's leadership in the debate on this issue on this floor.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution, but I want to take a moment to thank my colleagues who seek a peaceful solution to this crisis. I, too, would prefer peace to war.

As Thomas Jefferson wrote to Andrew Jackson in 1806, ''Always a friend to peace, and believing it to promote the happiness and prosperity of mankind, I am ever unwilling that it should be disturbed, as long as the rights and interests of the Nation can be preserved.''

Jefferson went on to say in this letter, when our rights and interests are threatened, ''we must meet our duty and convince the world that we are just friends and brave enemies.''

Mr. Speaker, the rights and the interests of our Nation are threatened today. Voting to send our military into battle, even potential battle, is among the hardest things we will do as Members of Congress. It is not a duty to take lightly. However, I have come to the realization that there are times when such votes are necessary. This is one of those times.

The threat to our Nation from Saddam Hussein's weapons programs and his growing ties to the networks of international terror cannot be underestimated and should not be ignored. Willful blindness to this threat will not make it go away.

In a little more than a decade, we have sent our Armed Forces to war on behalf of the Kuwaitis, the Saudis, the Somalis, the Bosnians, and the Kosovars. Some in our military made the ultimate sacrifice.

It may soon prove necessary to send our troops to war on behalf and in defense of the American people. I cannot in good conscience ignore the dangers posed by Iraq to my constituents, including the servicemen and women who call North Carolina home. Inaction on our part may very well be more costly to our Nation than action. The threat is real.

As a member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, I have heard testimony from countless officials on the status of our Nation's preparation for chemical and biological attacks. I know firsthand the need to eliminate this threat while we continue with our preparation.

As a member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, I have reviewed the evidence of Iraqi's weapons programs and its increasing ties to international terror. I have participated in countless hearings on the terror threat and the state of the war against terrorism. I have seen, heard and read things that keep me awake at night.

Iraq brings the dangers of chemical and biological weapons, their use, and international terrorism together in one clear, defined threat. Addressing this threat is mandated by our duty to protect our Nation's rights and interests.

The reason for my support of this resolution, Mr. Speaker, is simple. No matter how well we protect our borders, increase our military spending and strengthen our intelligence community, we cannot secure our homeland without eliminating the threat Saddam Hussein's weapons present to America and to the world. We must find them. We must destroy them. We must be prepared to take action when the international community will not, and we must fulfill our duty.

I will conclude with President Jefferson's letter to John Adams in September 1821. ''The flames kindled on the 4th of July, 1776, have spread over too much of the globe to be extinguished by the feeble engine of despotism; on the contrary, they will consume these engines and all who work them.''

One wonders what President Jefferson would say about the weapons available to our enemies on this day at this time. Today, the bright flames of July 4th find themselves in struggle with the dark fires of September 11. Those fires, lit by the enemies of freedom, cannot be allowed to prevail. Will we allow them to advance, possibly in the ashes of a nuclear holocaust, or will we extinguish them before they gain a foothold? Those dark fires may not have been lit in Baghdad, but they are certainly fanned from that city.

It is time to extinguish those fires. The evidence is clear, the cause is just, and timing is of the essence. We must give our President the tools he needs to protect our Nation, our interests, and our citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BOSWELL).

□ 1215

(Mr. BOSWELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), for yielding me this time, and the chairman of our committee. We have had an interesting several months together and not all fun; but it is a very, very serious thing.

I would like to start off my comments by saying that this Member, although I am a veteran, as many are here, I am not a hawk, I am not a dove. I am a concerned American who wants our country and our people to be safe. I have had some of those sleepless nights. I think of the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM). I think of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON), the price he paid. I think of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD) and the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) and many others who have served and know something as well as I what it is like to face war. It is not a good thing.

I am a member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and I have tried to prepare myself with knowledge and information, and some things I am convinced of and I would share with you today. I am convinced that Saddam Hussein has weapons of mass destruction. I am convinced that he has the chemical and biological and he wants very badly to have the nuclear; and given a chance, he will have them. I am convinced that he would use them. He is a despot. No question about it in my mind. But he would not only use them, I think he would make them available to others if they came to buy or he would even give them to them.

So I am very concerned about this, and I have had my sleepless nights. It almost reminds me of some of the times going into a major operation when I was in Vietnam. It was pretty hard to sleep when we knew that lives would be lost that next day and we might have to write the letters to the next of kin, the moms, the dads and the husbands, the spouses about how their son paid the supreme sacrifice that day.

I served 20 years, served a couple of tours over in NATO. I know something about the international relationship that needs to be there as we go into this world that we live in today. It is a very, very serious matter, and I have no quarrel with those that have spoken just as the last speaker. I respect that. But I am concerned about the tomorrow for my children and my grandchildren.

I know that when I went to Vietnam, I settled my family there in a little farm there in southern Iowa the night before I was to leave. My little daughter, who now has a teen-age child, came out to the yard where my wife and I were sitting and having kind of a quiet moment as the sun was going on. She said, Daddy don't go. So I said, Sweetheart, I'm a soldier. I have to go. She said, Please don't go. I am afraid. Think about this, your own child: I am afraid you may not come back. So I tried to give her assurance as I had the first time I had gone that I would come back. Lucky for me, I did; but everybody did not come back. So I understand that this is one of the most serious things we deal with.

I had the occasion to get invited over to the White House 2 weeks ago tomorrow with several of my colleagues. Some of my colleagues might be listening. And I was one of the four or five that the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS), a few were there and others to have dialogue with the President. And I said to the President I think that he is right, that the U.N. ought to lead on this. That is their charter and their responsibility. But they might not. If he really believes hard facts that Saddam has had his finger on the trigger or he may have, we have to deal with this, but let us have the American people behind this.

I will give a contrast. When we sent our troops off to Desert Storm, the communities were behind the troops when they left, when they were there, and they brought them back. By contrast I said, Mr. President, I went to Vietnam twice. The American people were not behind us. It was pretty tough to go and give everything we had to fulfill the commitment that we were given, the mission to give all we had and not have the American people behind us. And they were not.

And I said, Mr. President, remember how we left Vietnam? We were thrown out. I remember the scene, people falling off the helicopters trying to get out of the embassy. But what did we bring back? We brought back 56,000 body bags, and some of us have put people in those body bags and carried them back to the collection point. But the American people were not with us.

So if he commits our troops, have good cause, have his facts straight and tell the American people. He has been doing that. I think there has been a constant stream, Mr. Speaker, going over to the White House to talk about this; and I think that his speech and the other things he has done, his trip to the United Nations, he is making the efforts to do what is right, and I hope he is being straightforward and honest about it. I accept his statement that he said to us, to me, ''The last thing I want to do is to send our troops into harm's way.''

I am accepting that and I am also saying to the President that it is up to him in his position as leader, President, Commander in Chief, that he keep the American people informed that they understand and that they know that this country is doing this because we want to preserve it safely for our future, for our children, my grandchildren, my teen-age grandchild. Cindy who was so worried about her dad going, of course, is concerned about her son and others across this country.

If he is the person we think he is, then we have to be ready to tell him do not do it or the consequences will be severe, and that is what has brought me from this point today from undecided and walking the floor to say that I will support this resolution. It is a hard decision, but it is one we have to make. And I am proud to have served with the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), as I see him on the floor now, and the others I have mentioned. But our country is a precious thing, and we have to save it for the future; and this is our moment to deal with this now.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ). She is the ranking member on the Committee on Small Business, a spokesperson for women and minority businesses.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to House Joint Resolution 114. This so-called compromise resolution on Iraq is not compromise at all, but a blank check to give President Bush unprecedented power to launch preemptive war on Iraq. There is no justification for such an action, and the case that the administration has made is suspect at best. Even though we are engaged in a war on terrorism, here we are today, no mention of Osama bin Laden, no mention of how this resolution accomplishes the goal we all stood unified on 1 year ago.

Not only has the case not been made to the American people, we have not made the case to the international community, and we cannot go it alone. We cannot act unilaterally. We must work closely with the United Nations and other countries in the global community. Without them we cannot move towards a new, more peaceful world.

We need to be mindful that we were able to act quickly and decisively during the Gulf War because we stood as a world community. Today we stand alone. Is Saddam Hussein evil? Absolutely. But we have not been shown that there is an imminent threat compelling us to act. We know what an imminent threat looks like. We saw it during the Cuban Missile Crisis, in the buildup to the Six-Day War in the Middle East, and when Iraqi tanks poised on the border with Kuwait in 1990. By contrast, the evidence here looks more like the Gulf of Tonkin.

War is our last resort, not our first option. The United States must exhaust all diplomatic channels before waging another war. The President needs to work closely with the international community to demand completely unfettered inspections of Iraq's weapons of mass destruction programs. With continued pressure from the world's only superpower, we can pressure the Iraqi Government to allow United Nations inspectors in so we can know exactly what Saddam Hussein has in his weapons arsenal before we act. At this time we do not have such firm information, only the past record of the Iraqi regime. If we did have this information and if this government consults with, rather than dictates to, our allies and the international community, only then could we act against the threat that Iraq poses.

We do need to act, but we do not need to rush into war. War is one answer, but it is not the only answer. Will war solve the Iraqi problem and wipe out terrorism in the world as we know it? Maybe, but probably not. Our actions may simply spur greater resentment against our increasingly imperial power, producing an endless stream of new enemies finding new and terrifying ways to attack us.

What we must do at this critical juncture in our Nation's history is to affirm American values of peace, justice, and democracy. These values are what brought this country to the preeminent position as the ''indispensable Nation,'' and they are the reason why we embody the hopes and aspirations of people around the world. We must not let them down. We demonstrate our peaceful intent by pursuing diplomatic means to pressure the Iraqi regime. We may pursue justice by seeking an indictment of Saddam Hussein for war crimes in the International Criminal Court, and we must affirm our democratic values by consulting allies and working with the United Nations to resolve this crisis. But the enumeration of Iraq's past crimes, concerns over preemption and our place in the world, pale when compared to the reality of sending our young men and women into harm's way. We know that some of them will die.

Before we vote to send them to war, we must be able to look in the eyes of the mothers and fathers whose sons and daughters have died for us and tell them that their sacrifice was worth it. I cannot do that today in good conscience, and that is why I will vote ''no.''

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS), chairman of the Subcommittee on Human Intelligence, Analysis and Counterintelligence of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

(Mr. CHAMBLISS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support President Bush and this resolution to authorize the use of force to defend the national security of the United States against the continuing threat posed by Iraq. It is important to note that the thrust of the resolution is to remove the capability from Saddam Hussein to deliver weapons of mass destruction. The oppressive regime of Iraqi dictator Saddam Hussein is a clear and present danger to international peace and stability, particularly to the United States. The threat to the national security of the United States is real.

For 11 years Saddam has systematically violated United Nations Security Council resolutions. We know that Iraq is aggressively pursuing the development of weapons of mass destruction, supporting international terrorism, including harboring terrorists and repressing minorities within Iraq.

However, I am most troubled by the Iraqi regime's persistent efforts to acquire biological, chemical, and nuclear

weapons, as well as long-range missiles. In a report released by the CIA last week, the intelligence community confirmed that since U.N. inspections ended in 1998, Iraq has continued its determined efforts to maintain a chemical weapons capability, invested heavily in developing biological weapons, rebuilt missile facilities, and is working to build unmanned aerial vehicles as a lethal means to deliver biological and chemical agents. Moreover, it is clear that Saddam Hussein is intent on acquiring nuclear weapons. Experts believe that if the Iraq regime can get its hands on highly enriched uranium, it is very likely that Iraq could build a nuclear weapon in less than a year. This is a threat we cannot allow to mature.

□ 1230

Iraq's obstruction of U.N. inspectors and extensive efforts to hide its mass destruction efforts seem to make it obvious that the current regime cannot be trusted. Let there be no mistake about it. As the number one target of Saddam Hussein's wrath, there is no question as to who these dangerous weapons would be used against; that is, the United States and our friends. The cost of inaction will be paid for with the blood of innocent Americans.

In addition to the fact that our military is targeted almost daily by the Iraqi military in the no-fly zones, the Iraqi regime has engaged in despicable acts. They attempted to assassinate former President George Bush and the Emir of Kuwait and have offered rewards to the families of suicide bombers. Not only does Iraq harbor international terrorist organizations such as al Qaeda, Abu Nidal and the MEK, the Iraqi regime has direct links to international terrorist groups and continues to provide support, training and resources to terrorists.

President Bush has demonstrated unambiguous and forceful leadership in addressing the Iraqi threat. He has clearly explained the threat the current Iraqi dictator poses in the world and made a very strong case for the need for a regime change in Iraq. The President stated his case before the United Nations and has reached out to an international coalition of partners who share our concerns about the current regime in Iraq.

The American people can show by support of this resolution that we stand 100 percent behind the President of the United States to remove the capability of delivery of weapons of mass destruction from Saddam Hussein. I urge support of this resolution.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my distinguished friend from California, a Vietnam decorated veteran, the Top Gun.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago I was unable to finish my discussion. I hate not being in control. But I would like to finish it at this time.

Mr. Speaker, if you take every emotion you have ever felt, of love, anger, hate, it swells up in a person. If you can imagine what it is like to see a friend or friends go down in flames, and even more know how that is going to affect the families, this vote rips my heart out.

But, yet, being on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on Armed Services, I would tell my friends that disagree, I believe with every fiber in my heart that it is necessary to give the President the flexibility to stop not only terrorists but Saddam Hussein, because I believe that threat will reach the shores of the United States.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Technical and Tactical Intelligence of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, today the Members of this body are called to face an awesome challenge and a very perplexing dilemma. We must decide whether or not to authorize the President to use the Armed Forces of the United States as he determines to be necessary and appropriate to defend the national security of the United States against the continuing threat posed by Iraq and enforce all relevant United Nations Security Council resolutions regarding Iraq.

The measure requires that before military action is begun or as soon thereafter as feasible, but not later than 48 hours, the President must report to Congress that all diplomatic efforts to protect the security of the United States against the threat posed by Iraq or to enforce all relevant U.N. resolutions regarding Iraq have been exhausted.

The resolution also requires that the President must report to the Congress that military action against Iraq is consistent with our continued actions against international terrorists, including those responsible for 9/11.

The resolution states that it is consistent with the War Powers Act and constitutes specific authorization within the meaning of the War Powers Act.

It states that Congress supports the President's efforts to strictly enforce through the United Nations Security Council all relevant Security Council resolutions applicable to Iraq and encourages him in those efforts, supports his efforts to obtain prompt and decisive action by the Security Council to ensure that Iraq abandons its strategy of delay, evasion, noncompliance and promptly and strictly complies with all of the relevant Security Council resolutions.

It requires the President at least once every 60 days to report to the Congress on the matters relevant to this resolution, including the use of force and on efforts to support Iraq's transition to democracy after Saddam Hussein is gone.

I intend to support the resolution. It is a fact, Mr. Speaker, that Saddam Hussein has produced thousands of tons of chemical agents and used them against Iran and 40 Iraqi villages. He has rebuilt facilities that were used to manufacture chemical and biological weapons in violation of the truce that ended the Persian Gulf War. He possesses ballistic missiles with a range great enough to strike Saudi Arabia, Israel, Turkey and other nations in the region, where more than 135,000 American civilians and service personnel now live and work.

He has a fleet of manned and unmanned aerial vehicles that could be used to disperse chemical and biological weapons across broad areas. It would not take sophisticated delivery systems to deliver these chemical and biological agents to harm the 135,000 Americans I have cited.

We do not know the extent of his nuclear weapons development since he threw out the inspectors 4 years ago, but we do know he was just months away from success; and in spite of U.N. prohibitions, he has continued his quest. He has had 4 years of unrestricted freedom to pursue his nasty goals.

We know that, as good as our intelligence community is, 9/11 and numerous inquiries thereafter have proven that our intelligence community is not perfect. We need unfettered, unrestricted international inspections to get accurate information on compliance or noncompliance.

History is replete with evidence that, without a show of force, Saddam will not respond. I believe that empowering the President to use Armed Forces to assure that Saddam has no weapons of mass destruction to threaten the lives of American civilians and service members and innocent neighbors or to give terrorists, this will give Secretary Powell the strength that he needs to get a strong U.N. resolution.

When he goes to the Security Council, he needs to be carrying a big stick, speaking with unquestioned resolve of the Congress and the American people.

I do not take lightly the risks that our sons and daughters will be sent into harm's way. I do not take lightly the unprecedented probability of unilateral action by the United States, but we live in a new and different and dangerous time, and the threat of weapons of mass destruction demand that we take unprecedented actions to protect America, her people and civilized nations from the death and destruction of a Saddam Hussein.

Mr. Speaker, I support the adoption of the resolution. I support the Spratt substitute, but there must be verification, there must be inspections; and the time to assure the safety of Americans, and the safety of the world, is now.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5¾ minutes to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. MCKINNEY), the ranking member on the Subcommittee on

Human Rights of the Committee on International Relations.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I share the same revulsion that many others have toward Saddam Hussein. We all know that he is brutal and that his regime has terrorized the Iraqi people and the peoples of nearby countries.

But there was a time not so long ago when, despite all of this, we chose to allow him to be our friend. There was a time when we supplied him with chemical weapons and other military technology.

If our Nation really cared about Iraq's neighbors, we would never have supplied him the military arsenal that we did. And if we really cared about his people, we would have done something to alleviate the suffering of the Kurds, who for years have been brutalized by the Iraqi military. If we cared about the Iraqi people, we would have done something to lift the burdens imposed on them by U.N. sanctions, which to date have claimed in excess of an estimated 500,000 Iraqi children. But the truth is we did not really care about any of that suffering. Madeline Albright even said that the price of 500,000 dead Iraqi children was worth it.

Now, however, we claim to care.

Now, Saddam Hussein has just become another name on a long list of other tyrants who we once aided and abetted but now oppose.

But what to do? In the past, other tyrants we have grown tired of were assassinated, like Jonas Savimbi; or charged with war crimes, like Slobodan Milosevic; or forced from power through U.S.-backed uprisings, like Mobutu Sese Seko.

President Bush is confronted with the ''what to do question.'' He appears to be choosing war to get rid of this tyrant; and, of course, he has to justify it. That is the public relations part of the equation.

The words ''Gulf of Tonkin'' have echoed around Washington this last month, with many people concerned that the Bush Administration is now manufacturing an international crisis in order to launch a preemptive military strike against Saddam Hussein.

In 1964, there were some courageous Members of this House who knew that the Gulf of Tonkin incident was a political ruse being used by the Johnson administration in order to justify the United States going to war in Vietnam. For their courage to speak out and resist, they suffered a tidal wave of public ridicule. But we now know that they were right and that the Vietnam War was a monumental mistake that cost the lives of some 60,000 brave young Americans and hundreds of thousands of Vietnamese.

And, still, we have many Americans and Vietnamese who suffer the health effects of Agent Orange and other toxins faced on the battlefield. And all across the American and European landscape today, veterans still suffer from Gulf War Syndrome and exposure to depleted uranium.

Will we let this President create yet another generation of veterans to whom we have broken our promise? I see too many of these veterans sleeping on our streets. The President can see them, too, if he would just look. They sleep on the sidewalks, the benches and the heating vents just across the street from the White House. And, sadly, one of the first things our President did after he declared this war on terrorism was to deprive our young men and women who are now fighting on the front lines of their high deployment overtime pay. He does not even want to pay them.

Mr. Speaker, do we give this President the green light to go to war with Iraq based on evidence which many weapons experts believe to be exaggerated? Are we now turning a blind eye to another Gulf of Tonkin-type incident? Should we not trust the legal and diplomatic means of the United Nations?

Do we give the President the green light to go to war in Iraq because it has refused to comply with U.N. Security Council weapons inspections resolutions? At the same time, Israel refuses to comply with U.N. resolutions with respect to the occupied territories. Do we have different standards for different countries?

Mr. Speaker, the Cuban missile crisis and the Gulf of Tonkin, if they taught us anything, they taught us the dangers of choosing the military option over diplomatic and legal alternatives.

The current terrorist crisis confronting our Nation is so much bigger and more complicated than this call for war on Iraq. Should we miscalculate our military actions in Iraq, we could cause many American servicemen and women to lose their lives. Needless to say, we could also cause untold numbers of Iraqis to be killed or injured. Worse still, instead of solving the current threat of terrorism against us, going to war in Iraq might well make things far worse for us, both at home and abroad.

I hope and pray that we choose our options carefully; and, for that reason, I will be voting no on this resolution to go to war in Iraq.

□ 1245

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM).

(Mr. LATHAM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of our national security and in support of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker I rise today to join my colleagues that are in support of this resolution.

Last year there were two very significant events in my life—one was the birth of my first grandchild, Emerson Ann. The second was the September 11th attack on our Nation. both of these events had a deep impact on me personally.

I want for Emerson Ann what every parent wants for their children, and what every grandparent wants for their grandchildren, an environment where she is able to grow up secure and safe, living the experience of freedom upon which our Nation was founded. September 11th reminded us that in order to protect freedom we must not turn a blind eye to the real dangers around the World in hopes that they will not affect us.

After numerous briefings on Iraq and the activities of its leader—Saddam Hussein—there is no doubt in my mind that he is clear and present danger to the United States and freedom loving people around the World.

The evidence mounts with each passing day. Many analysts believe that Iraq may be, or become, a breeding ground and source of support for terrorism. Iraq retains its arsenal of chemical and biological weapons, and there is strong evidence that it is also developing nuclear weapons. There is no way of knowing for sure the extent of Iraq's plans or capabilities, since U.N. weapons. There is no way of knowing for sure the extent of Iraq's plans or capabilities, since U.N. weapons inspectors were forced out of the country in 1998, and since Iraq's current government seems committed to hiding weapons of mass destruction, delaying the return of inspectors, and making inspection efforts ineffective.

Saddam Hussein governs his country by de facto dictatorship, and has a long history of human rights abuses against his own people. And, based on the actions of Iraq's current government under Hussein, it would be shortsighted and naïve to assume that Iraq's intentions through his actions are benign.

I believe that a regime change in Iraq is in the best interest of the United States and our allies. And, I believe that, as we have done throughout our history, the United States must one again display our leadership in the fight against terrorism throughout the World and eliminate the threat to security imposed by Iraq.

While this resolution authorizes military action, I will hold out hope that it will be used only as a last resort.

History has taught us that freedom is not free.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. EVERETT), a distinguished member of the committee.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, when I was elected to the United States House of Representatives, I took an oath to protect and defend the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic. Fortunately, in my 10 years in Congress, we have had few opportunities to vote on authorizing the use of military force to protect our country from these enemies. Authorization of military force is one of the most solemn decisions that we can make as Members of Congress, and it is a decision that must be made only after thoughtful and prayerful consideration.

Our Nation now faces a clear and present danger from the regime of Iraqi President Saddam Hussein. Saddam has been without international supervision; and I have received information, both from public and from classified hearings, that suggests that the Iraqi regime could be merely months

away from attaining the necessary resources to complete his mission of developing nuclear weapons.

Saddam has made it clear that he will do whatever is necessary to prohibit inspections of his compounds for the purpose of determining the extent to which he has stockpiled the necessary components to produce these weapons. He has the technology and the know-how to build such a device. All that he lacks is materials. The Intelligence community says that Iraq is 3 to 5 years away from developing a nuclear device if it has to produce its own nuclear bomb material, and months away if it acquires this material from outside sources. The problem is, we do not know when the clock started on either scenario.

Additionally, Saddam's government has repeatedly violated the 1991 ceasefire agreement that ended the Persian Gulf War and Iraq's obligation to unconditionally disarm its weapons of mass destruction. Not only does Saddam Hussein continue to halt the will of the international community with regard to inspections, he continues to shoot at coalition aircraft patrolling the northern and southern no-fly zones daily.

For us not to recognize the clear and present danger that the Iraqi regime of Saddam Hussein represents to our country would be tragically wrong. We must protect and defend our Nation against this madman and his ability to destroy tens of thousands of Americans.

The resolution authorizing the use of military force that we are considering today gives the President the flexibility and authority he needs to protect the American people while, at the same time, preserving the prerogatives of Congress.

The findings at the beginning of this resolution offer more than enough evidence of Saddam Hussein's crimes. The authorization in section 3 has been appropriately modified in a bipartisan manner. It authorizes the use of military force as the President determines necessary and appropriate to: ''(1), defend the national security of the United States against the continuing threat posed by Iraq; and (2), enforce all relevant United Nations Security Council resolutions regarding Iraq.''

The resolution also requires a timely ''presidential determination'' that all means short of war have been exhausted, and that acting pursuant to this authorization is consistent with ongoing activities in the war against terrorism.

Finally, this resolution contains reporting requirements to ensure that Congress and the American people are fully apprised on all matters relevant to this resolution and that both are full partners in an effort to rid the United States of the Iraqi threat.

Mr. Speaker, September 11 changed our country and the world forever. For all of these reasons, I intend to vote in favor of the resolution and encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), a member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

(Mr. ROEMER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), for yielding me this time.

I want to begin by quoting General William Sherman in the Civil War who simply stated, ''War is hell.'' And I can also say, having visited the Pentagon the night of the attacks on September 11 and visiting New York City at Ground Zero just a few days after the attacks, that terrorism is hell; and the pain and agony that that has inflicted on our country, on men and women and children and families, has been excruciating. And this resolution that we debate in this Chamber today and will vote on tomorrow is one of the most difficult, heart-stabbing, gut-wrenching votes that one can cast.

My first vote as a freshman was on the Persian Gulf War, which had something to do with Saddam Hussein invading Kuwait, and now one of my last votes will be on war. And in between, we have had votes on Somalia and Kosovo and Bosnia, and we have had a vote to declare war on terrorism. These are difficult, excruciating votes that I think every Member in this body takes extremely seriously.

I will vote in favor of the President's resolution for three reasons. One is because of the chemical and biological and nuclear threat that Saddam Hussein poses with these weapons. I have to say that I do not think the administration has made the case with connections to al Qaeda, nor have they made the case with connections to 9–11. But I think in a compelling and convincing fashion, we must, in post-9–11 concern, be very aware of how these weapons can be used against the United States, even in America, against our allies in the region, and all over the world.

When airplanes filled with people and gasoline can be commandeered and flown into our buildings in America, we can only imagine what can be done, not just with a vial of smallpox that Saddam Hussein or some other terrorist group may have, but we are talking about a few hundred metric tons of chemical weapons that Iraq possesses. We are talking about, and I quote from a declassified CIA report: ''Baghdad has begun renewed production of chemical warfare agents, probably including mustard, sarin, cyclosarin, and VX.'' It goes on to say, ''Saddam probably has stocked a few hundred metric tons of CW agents.'' Finally, ''All key aspects: research and development, production, and weaponization, of Iraq's offensive BW program are active and most elements are larger and more advanced than they were before the Gulf War.''

Mr. Speaker, this is a compelling concern, this is a present danger, this is grave and growing.

Now, I think that is the evidence that we are voting on today. I think that is the reason for our resolution going forward.

Secondly, I am voting for this because this resolution has gone in a more positive direction from when the Bush administration first introduced it. It is narrowed in scope to Iraq instead of broadly applying to the region. It applies to try to put together diplomatic and multilateral efforts. These, Mr. President, should be exhaustive before we engage in war in Baghdad or in Iraq. I think this resolution has moved in a positive direction in terms of engagement and consultation with Congress and the War Powers Act. So that is the second reason I intend to vote for this.

Mr. Speaker, thirdly, 15 days after Desert Storm ended in 1991, the U.N. started passing one of its 16 resolutions to say we must look into Iraq and inspect the sites where they are developing these weapons. That has been ignored for the past 10 years. Not only has it been ignored, but Saddam Hussein said, you will not look, you will not investigate, you will not inspect these compounds, presidential palaces, so-called compounds, some of which are 12.5 square miles. The city of D.C. is 67 square miles. That is a fifth of the size of our Nation's Capital of one compound that Saddam Hussein does not want our inspectors or the world community anywhere near.

Mr. Speaker, the Democrats said in their policy platform of the year 2000, we did not talk about preemptive strikes; we talked about forward engagement as part of our foreign policy to try to stop, whether it be in the environment or in war, bad things from happening. Let us exhaust our diplomatic means, but let us use the force of war and the threat of war with Saddam Hussein to open up these compounds and these presidential palaces and have the world look at these sites and rid Iraq of the weapons of mass destruction.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES), a member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Benefits of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time on this very important issue that we debate.

There are many things that make me proud to be an American. One of them is to be here today to be able to debate this issue. As my previous colleague stated when he quoted a general that said that war is hell, take it from somebody that has been there. Thirty-five years ago, I found myself half a world away in a place called Vietnam. I can tell my colleagues that war is hell. There are a lot of us here today that have had that same experience, but are taking different positions on this resolution. Some of my colleagues have asked why, when they hear my

friend and colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), talk about his experience and his favoring in support of the resolution.

I will tell my colleagues that I intend to vote against this resolution. I intend to do so because in meetings I have held in my district, mothers and fathers and veterans come to me and tell me, please, do not let us get back into a war without exhausting all other avenues. I think every one of us in this House brings our own experiences as we represent our constituents. Every one of us here wrestles with a very tough decision as to whether or not to go forward with a resolution on war. Every one of us understands that we are a nation of laws, that we lead the world by example, that we have a great respect for process and to protect the rights of everyone.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I reluctantly today rise in opposition against this resolution, because I think that the President has not made a case as to why Iraq and why attack Saddam Hussein. As a member of the Committee on Intelligence, I have asked consistently the questions to those that have come before us with information, I have asked the question of what is the connection between 9–11 and Iraq and Saddam Hussein. None.

□ 1300

What is the connection between Iraq and Saddam Hussein and al Qaeda? Very little, if any.

As to the weapons of mass destruction, the delivery systems and all of these things, we have clearly heard that there is a lot of speculation about those capabilities.

Last week, I was part of a group of colleagues that met with a retired general that was in charge of this conflicted area of our world. He was asking the same question that we were: Why Iraq, and why Saddam Hussein?

In fact, when we asked him to list in priority order a war against Iraq and Saddam Hussein, he listed it as his seventh priority. When we asked him, what would you do in our situation, he was as perplexed as we are being in this situation.

September 11 changed things. I concede that. More than that, for me personally being a first-time grandfather changed things as well. I bring to this position and to this decision the experience that I brought as a Member of Congress.

My staff asked me, Congressman, what are you going to say to the troops? Because I have taken the opportunity to go out and visit our troops in Afghanistan three times since Easter. I know the conditions they are living in, and I know the conditions they are fighting in. Those are similar to the same conditions of some 35 years ago. War is hell, and we ought to exhaust every single possible remedy before going to war, before subjecting our troops, our men and women in uniform, to those kinds of consequences.

So I tell my staff, I will tell the troops the same thing that I will tell the American people on the floor of Congress, that I oppose this resolution because I think that the case has not been made. I do not take giving my support for war lightly, as neither do my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. But each one of us has to wrestle with his or her own conscience.

I want to make sure that my granddaughter, Amelia, maybe 35 years from now, can look and say, my grandfather made his decision on the information that he had. He opposed the resolution because he did not think it was the right thing to do.

But I will tell the Members this: When and if the President makes a decision to commit troops, when and if the President commits us to a war, I intend to be there. Because my experience in coming to this Congress, my experience of some 35 years ago, returning from Vietnam and seeing all the protests and seeing all the signs and seeing all the things that they were calling us, was very divisive.

So it is inherent upon us to do what our conscience dictates on this issue today. I oppose it reluctantly under those circumstances, but I will support whatever decision our President and our country makes.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), the former Governor and a member of our committee and the chairman of our Subcommittee on Technical and Tactical Intelligence.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence not only for yielding to me but for the extraordinary work he does for this country on a day-in-and-day-out basis in a very difficult circumstance right now.

The vote on the resolution to authorize the use of force to disarm Saddam Hussein is one of the most important decisions we will ever have to make as Members of the House of Representatives. Every Member of Congress wants to do what is right, not only for America but for the entire world.

Today I speak both as the Representative of the people of Delaware and as a member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. Like many, I have been traveling throughout my State over the past few weeks, and Iraq is on everyone's minds. Individuals have crossed the street to give me their opinions, and seniors have approached me at our annual beach day event.

I have received many personal letters, e-mails, and phone calls from people who have taken the time to sit down and really think about this very difficult issue. They know Saddam Hussein is a tyrannical dictator and would like to see him go. They hope war can be avoided but also want to support the President.

They want to know if immediate military action is necessary and if the risks to our young men and women in uniform are necessary; how will other nations respond if the United States decides to enter the conflict without United Nations' support; what could be the effect on the stability of the Middle East and the fate of the Iraqi people.

I share many of their concerns. That is why I have tried to gather as much information as possible by reading reports, attending briefings, and talking with other Members of Congress. Here is what I have learned: the security of our Nation is at risk.

For the past several months, I have participated in intelligence hearings on the September 11 terrorist attacks and have studied the hatred some nations and groups have toward America. Saddam Hussein is encouraging and promoting this hatred by openly praising the attacks on the United States. The Director of Central Intelligence recently published an unclassified summary of the evidence against Saddam Hussein, and it is substantial.

We know that Iraq has continued building weapons of mass destruction, energized its missile program, and is investing in biological weapons. Saddam Hussein is determined to get weapons-grade material to develop nuclear weapons. Its biological weapons program is larger and more advanced than before the Gulf War. Iraq also is attempting to build unmanned vehicles, UAVs, to possibly deliver biological warfare agents. All of this has been done in flagrant violation of the U.N. Security Council resolutions.

Some may react to this evidence by saying that, in the past, other countries have had similar arsenals and the United States did not get involved. But as President Bush has told us and as Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld reiterated yesterday in a meeting, Saddam Hussein's Iraq is different. This is a ruthless dictator whose record is despicable. He has waged war against his neighbors and on his own people. He has brutalized and tortured his own citizens, harbored terrorist networks, engaged in terrorist acts, lied, cheated, and defied the will of the international community.

Mr. Speaker, I have examined this information and some of the more specific classified reports. The bottom line is, we do not want to get caught off guard. We must take all precautions to avoid a catastrophic event similar to September 11.

In recent meetings, the National Security Adviser, Dr. Condoleezza Rice, rightly called this coercive diplomacy. It is my hope that through forceful diplomacy, backed by clear resolve, we can avoid war. Unfortunately, Saddam Hussein's history of deception makes a new attempt to disarm him difficult. Additionally, our goal to disarm him must also be connected to a plan to end his regime, should he refuse to disarm.

For all these reasons, I would encourage all of us to support this resolution as the best resolution to make this happen.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY).

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, when it comes to Iraq, it is time for the United States of America to state forcefully and without equivocation: Enough is enough. Either Saddam Hussein yields to the resolutions of the United Nations, providing for completely unrestricted inspection and disarmament, or the United States and other nations will use military force against his government to enforce his compliance.

This is terribly, terribly serious business, Mr. Speaker, potentially one of life and death for those that will be involved in prosecuting this action. Therefore, I, like so many others, have expressed the view that this vote is one of the most important votes that I will ever cast in this Chamber on behalf of the people of North Dakota.

I reached the conclusion that the resolution authorizing the President to use force should pass, and I do that based upon the following undeniable and uncontroverted facts:

First, Saddam Hussein is a uniquely evil and threatening leader. His past is absolutely replete with nonstop belligerence and aggression, as well as atrocities.

Two, he has been determined to have developed weapons of mass destruction, biological and chemical. He continues to seek nuclear capacity and is believed to be within mere months of having that capacity, in the event he could get his hands on the requisite materials.

Three, he now continues to produce weapons of mass destruction, having effectively completely thwarted the inspection and disarmament requirements of the United Nations; and he has made it increasingly difficult to detect his production facilities, even as he continues to add to his arsenals.

Four, he is harboring and has well-developed relationships with terrorists, including senior al Qaeda operatives.

Five, he certainly has demonstrated that he is not above using weapons of mass destruction. Indeed, he has used them on his own people.

Now, under these terrible circumstances, I have concluded that doing nothing is simply not acceptable for the United States of America. We need to act, and determining exactly how to act is the question before this Chamber.

I believe that we should support the President as he builds an international consensus to reinstitute completely unfettered inspections, or to use force in the event it is not forthcoming. In dealing with Saddam Hussein, I believe our only hope of enlisting the cooperation of his government is if he knows for an absolute certainty there will be terrible consequences if he does not comply.

Therefore, in looking at the resolutions before this body, I think we can only conclude that the President needs the authorization to act if he is to have any hope of enlisting the cooperation from Saddam Hussein. A two-vote alternative in my view sends a mixed signal: Go try and enlist his cooperation, and we will evaluate what to do if you do not succeed.

The administration has made it very, very clear, and I have heard the President express this personally, that the use of force would be his absolute last wish. I believe, therefore, we need to give him the resolution and the authority from this body that, first, seek disarmament and under terms that are unlike any other imposed upon Iraq any time, anywhere, by any person; and in the event that is not forthcoming, there shall be force to insist on his cooperation, or to replace the regime and obtain cooperation from a new government.

I understand, Mr. Speaker, the difficulty of this decision. But, again, the facts are clear, and doing nothing is not acceptable. I urge adoption of the resolution.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KLECZKA), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, a leader on health issues.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, although we all know this war resolution will pass, I nevertheless must question the wisdom and morality of an unprovoked attack on another foreign nation. The guiding principle of our foreign policy for over 50 years has been one of containment and deterrence. This is the same strategy that kept the former Soviet Union in check, a power whose possession of weapons of mass destruction had been proven and not speculated, and in fact led to its downfall.

The administration asserts that this time-tested policy is not sufficient to deal with this, yes, dangerous but small, economically weakened Middle Eastern nation. Instead, they support a new policy of a unilateral preemptive attack against Iraq, citing the unproven possibility that Saddam Hussein might be a risk to the security of the United States.

The long-term effects of this go-it-alone, shoot-first policy will be to lose the high moral ground we have exercised in the past to deter other nations from attacking militarily when they felt their security was at stake. The next time Pakistani and Indian troops mass at their borders with both nations' fingers on nuclear triggers, what moral authority will we have to prevent a potential catastrophe? They would justifiably ignore our pleas for diplomatic or negotiated approaches and instead simply follow our lead.

The administration continues to assert that Iraq is an urgent threat to our national security and that we are at risk of an Iraqi surprise attack. But the resolution before us offers no substantiation of these allegations, speaking only of hunches, probabilities, and suspicions. That is not sufficient justification to start a war.

Further, there is reference to the 9/11 terrorism we suffered and the assertion that members of al Qaeda are in Iraq. After extensive investigation, our intelligence community could find no link between the Iraqi regime and the plot that led to last year's deadly terrorist attacks.

□ 1315

Also it has become reported that al Qaeda members are in Iran, Pakistan and Saudi Arabia. Do we attack them next?

The resolution further asserts also without any evidence that there is a great risk that Iraq could launch a surprise attack on the United States with weapons of mass destruction. It is fact that Saddam does not possess a delivery system that has the throw power of 8,000 miles or anything even close. And if there is such a great risk that he has and will use biological and chemical weapons against us, why did he not do so in the Gulf War? The answer is because he knew that our response would be strong, swift, and fatal. Hussein is not a martyr; he is a survivalist.

Similarly, the evidence does not show that Iraq has any nuclear capabilities. General Wesley Clark, former commander of NATO forces in Europe, contends that ''despite all the talk of 'loose nukes,' Saddam does not have any,'' or the highly enriched uranium or plutonium to enable him to construct them.

Air Force General Richard B. Myers, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, recently concurred, admitting that the consensus is that Saddam Hussein ''does not have a nuclear weapon, but he wants one.''

One of the goals of the President is to force a regime change in Iraq. Who are we to dictate to another country that their leadership must be changed? What would be our reaction if another country demanded or threatened to remove President Bush? All of us, Republicans and Democrats alike and each and every American, would be infuriated by such an inference and rise up against them. Changes in regimes must come from within.

The result of voting for this resolution will be to give the President a blank check with broad authority to use our Armed Forces to unilaterally attack Iraq. He merely has to tell us why he believes that continued diplomatic efforts will fail and does not have to give that information to Congress until 48 hours after he has begun the war.

The more meaningful provision would be to provide for a two-step process where after all diplomatic efforts have failed, the President would come back to Congress and make the case that military force is now necessary.

Our colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), has that provision in his alternative and it deserves our careful consideration. Let us

make no mistake about it, Hussein is a brutal dictator who has flagrantly defied the will of the world community. But the case has simply not been made either by this resolution or by the administration that there is a clear and present danger to the security of the United States which would warrant this Nation embarking on its first unprovoked preemptive attack in our 226-year history.

The President must continue to work together with our allies in the U.N. Security Council to ensure that the Iraqi regime is disarmed. Mr. Speaker, war should always be the last resort and not the first. For all these reasons, I cannot support this resolution and must vote ''no.''

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GALLEGLY), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Europe of the Committee on International Relations.

(Mr. GALLEGLY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support today of H.J. Res. 114. I want to commend the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) and House leadership for working in a bipartisan manner with the White House to develop what I believe is a very strong, but balanced, resolution.

Last week by a strong vote the Committee on International Relations passed this resolution. As part of its responsibility to carry out its role in helping shape United States foreign policy toward Iraq, our chairman, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), and our ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), deserve a great deal of credit for their efforts in guiding this effort through the committee process.

September 11 has tragically taught us the price of not acting when faced with a clear and present danger, and there should be no doubt today we face a clear and present danger in the form of weapons of mass destruction in the possession of Saddam Hussein. We know after the 1991 liberation of Kuwait, Iraq unequivocally agreed to eliminate its nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons programs and agreed to allow international weapons inspectors to ensure that be accomplished.

But as we all know, Iraq has willfully and in direct violation of its own agreement and those of the United Nations Security Council thwarted over and over again the efforts of the inspectors to find and destroy those weapons. This can only mean one thing, Mr. Speaker. Saddam intends to hold on to these weapons and use them at the appropriate time and in the manner he deems necessary.

As early as 1998, U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan in a letter to the Security Council stated, ''No one can doubt or dispute that Iraq's refusal to honor its commitments under Security Council resolutions regarding its weapons of mass destruction constituted a threat.''

These words remain even more true today in light of the scourge of global terrorism. Today the threat to the national security of the United States and to international peace and security continues to grow. It is especially serious because we know that Saddam Hussein supports terrorist organizations such as al Qaeda and could very well be working with these agents at this very moment providing them with the expertise to use chemical and biological weapons against the United States and others.

In 1991 in the aftermath of the Iraq invasion of Kuwait, I led a group of our colleagues in the House in introducing a resolution authorizing then-President Bush the use of all necessary means to force Iraq from Kuwait. There were dissenters who felt we should not go to war, but in the end there is no question we were proven right. In 1998 I strongly supported the House resolution which declared Iraq to be in breach of its international obligations, and we urged the President to take appropriate actions to bring Iraq into compliance.

However, at that time significant penalties for noncompliance were not invoked, and so here we are again today, confronting the same issue without an inch of change in Saddam's attitude or actions.

Today we are faced with the same proposition and very similar arguments on both sides; but with the passage of this resolution, we will again provide the President the authority he may need to take the appropriate actions necessary to protect the national security of this great Nation.

Mr. Speaker, this time around we must have an absolute commitment to not allow Saddam Hussein to have chemical or biological weapons anymore. But the enforcement of Security Council resolutions this time must include significant penalty for noncompliance which are immediate and automatic. The resolution we are debating today is forceful in that it again gives the President the authority to use whatever means, including force, to rid Iraq of its weapons of mass destruction. But this resolution is balanced in that it encourages the President to pursue diplomatic avenues to achieve international support of enforcing U.N. mandates and provide for an important role in the Congress.

I believe the gravity of this issue mandates that we act now to give the President the tools he should have to deal with this significant threat. The potential terror of weapons of mass destruction in the hands of a madman to the world must be addressed, and it must be addressed decisively and now.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the support of this resolution.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN).

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, it should be stated at the outset that not one Member of this body wants war. We all want peace. The decision whether to send American soldiers into battle is the most agonizing vote we will cast in Congress. It is a choice between confronting the horrors of war versus allowing a potentially devastating attack on our homeland, one that could kill tens of thousands of Americans.

But make no mistake, the threat posed by Saddam Hussein also ultimately threatens world peace and stability. It is for this reason that we must consider the resolution before us today, allowing the President to take unilateral military action to disarm Iraq in the interest of long-term peace.

First, I believe we must consider this issue in the context of the post-September 11 world. Our enemies and their supporters have demonstrated their willingness to strike at us in covert and highly-destructive ways. As a result of briefings I have received from military experts, former weapons inspectors and colleagues in the intelligence community, I am convinced that Iraq does indeed possess weapons of mass destruction.

First, chemical and biological threats. Saddam Hussein has VX nerve gas, mustard gas, and anthrax. These toxins are deadly and could kill thousands.

Second, we know that Saddam has a growing fleet of manned and unmanned aerial vehicles, UAVs, that could be used to disburse chemical and biological weapons across broad areas. Intelligence data suggests that Iraq may be exploring ways of using these UAVs for missions targeting the United States.

Third, as we learned from last fall's anthrax attacks, sophisticated delivery systems are not required. For chemical and biological attacks, all that is required is a small container and one willing adversary.

Next consider the nuclear threat. Iraq can develop nuclear capabilities in 1 to 2 years. We know that Iraq has already experimented with dirty bombs. There is nothing to suggest that they have discontinued this program. With enriched uranium and subsequently an atomic bomb, Iraq could use nuclear blackmail to conquer other countries in the region and threaten U.S. national security.

Now, some people that say that our focus should be on the war against terrorism. In my view, the Iraqi threat is part and parcel of the war against terrorism. There is ample evidence of al Qaeda and Iraqi contacts in the development of chemical and biological weapons. Additionally, Saddam has harbored known terrorists such as Abu Nidal, who, prior to his mysterious death, was connected to at least 90 attacks throughout the world.

Iraq poses a threat to the Persian Gulf and the Middle East as well as

110,000 United States American troops and civilians.

As a representative from the Washington, D.C. suburbs, I am particularly concerned about the threat to our homeland and the Washington metropolitan region. We learned on September 11 that the D.C. area is indeed a terrorist target, and a prime target.

Now, many ask why is Iraq unique? Other countries have weapons of mass destruction and hostile intentions. This is true. But none have the unique history of Iraq. I submit to you some of Iraq's prior aggressions and violations:

First, Saddam's invasion of Iran.

Second, Saddam's invasion of Kuwait.

Third, Saddam's use of chemical and biological weaponry against his own people as well as his enemies.

Fourth, Saddam has continued to obstruct U.N. weapons inspections. We cannot continue to ignore these violations. And in his most recent gambit, he tells us yes, we will accept inspections, but you can not inspect my palaces, some of which are as big as small cities. This is unacceptable.

I believe that actions speak louder than words and that past is prologue. In Saddam Hussein we are dealing with a shrewd and diabolical aggressor who must be thwarted.

However, despite all of this, what we want is inspections and disarmament, not war. I agree with those who believe war should be our last option. Thus, we must consider the viability of diplomatic measures. Although Saddam has defied 16 U.N. resolutions over the past decade, the President has asked the United Nations to pass another resolution requiring complete, unconditional inspections of all sites. The U.N. can do this.

To those who can say we only act multilaterally with our allies, I say yes, and I hope they will support us in the United Nations Security Council. Unfortunately, some of our allies are willing to appease Saddam Hussein.

Winston Churchill said, ''An appeaser is one who would feed a crocodile, hoping it will eat him last.''

Like a crocodile, the longer Saddam Hussein is left unchecked, the stronger and hungrier he will get.

This resolution sends Saddam Hussein the type of clear message aggressors understand, that we will no longer stand idly by while he threatens U.S. interests and American lives. Disarm or bear the consequences of your actions.

Many of my colleagues believe that this resolution will start war. However, as the President said about the resolution now before us during his speech 2 days ago, ''Approving this resolution does not mean that military action is imminent or unavoidable. The resolution will tell the United Nations and all nations that America speaks with one voice, and it is determined to make the demands of the civilized world mean something.''

Thus, I believe this resolution can be used to apply maximum leverage on the United Nations to step up to the plate and avoid war.

As provided in an amendment I introduced to this resolution, I urged the President to give the United Nations a reasonable opportunity to pass and implement a new resolution for unfettered and unconditional weapons inspections.

□ 1330

If the President takes his prudent approach, allowing a reasonable opportunity for the U.N. to act, it would demonstrate our desire for international support and cooperation and a peaceful resolution to the Iraqi problem. I believe our patience could garner further support.

Finally, should military force be necessary, I believe nation building is a requirement. Some of my colleagues across the aisle have opposed nation building. I am pleased to see the President say we must have nation building if we implement a military action.

Finally, this end game strategy is as important as military action if we are to achieve our long-term goal of peace in the region. In the final analysis, we all want peace, we all want a diplomatic solution or a multinational military effort. If we can achieve these things, fine.

However, being a world leader means more than just waving flags and saying that we are the greatest country in the world and waiting for others to be willing to act. Sometimes we have to make difficult decisions and sacrifices in order to stand for principles and against aggression. Sometimes the willingness to fight a war avoids the necessity to fight.

I support this bipartisan resolution, and I urge my colleagues to do so.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), ranking Democrat on the Committee on Energy and Commerce, longest serving Democrat in the House.

(Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the resolution now before the Congress. I supported the father of the current President on his resolution and was one of the few Democrats who did. I was right. There was a strong, present imperative by this country and by the nations of the world. It made sense, it was good, and it was something which was accepted and followed by the people of the world.

There is no evidence that our allies in Europe support the efforts that are described by the President to be made by the United States. The people and the countries in the area do not support this undertaking; and, overwhelmingly, the American people oppose this kind of effort, an effort intelligently, wisely and necessary to be made to achieve the purposes of everybody, that is, elimination of weapons of mass destruction from within the country of Iraq.

Mr. Saddam Hussein has no friends in the world. Everybody fears him and most despise him, but the President has chosen the wrong course. He has given us a request for a blank check. There has been inadequate or no discussion with our allies and friends. There has not been sufficient discussion with the Congress or the people of the United States, and the countries in the area are troubled because they feel that they do not understand what it is the United States intends to do, when, how or why.

We are embarking upon a unique and new doctrine. We will engage in a unilateral preemptive strike, if the early pronouncements of the administration are to be believed, and our purpose there is the removal of Saddam Hussein, obviously a desirable change. But, more recently, the President has said our purpose now is to disarm Mr. Hussein and Iraq of their weapons of mass destruction. I am not clear what course it is that the President has in mind, but I am convinced that proceeding into this situation without allies, without bases, without proper and adequate logistic support is an act of great folly. It poses enormous risks to the troops that we would be sending, and it poses enormous risk to this country and to our foreign policy.

Not only is it novel and dangerous to talk about preemptive strikes, but it is something which need not be done. A proper exercise of leadership in the U.N. will cause that institution to follow the United States; and I would urge us, as the remaining superpower, to exercise leadership and have enough confidence in ourselves and our capacity to lead to proceed to embark upon that course. I do not see this resolution before us as being a device which stimulates or encourages that. Perhaps the President would exercise that kind of leadership. I see no evidence that such, however, is to be the case.

I was here during the time of the missile crisis, and I remember that the President at that time observed that the worst course to be taken was a preemptive war. Our policy succeeded. We forced the missiles out. And when the matter was discussed in the United Nations, our ambassador there, Mr. Stevenson, showed them a photograph of what was transpiring and that the Soviets had moved missiles into Cuba. The world accepted, approved and followed the United States.

We have not seen that the people of the world are convinced that we have made the case that Mr. Saddam Hussein would embark immediately or at a time of risk to the United States on the use of weapons of mass destruction. Perhaps he would, and I do not trust him, but I would note to my colleagues that there is a sensible way of achieving the following and the support of the people of the world.

George Herbert Walker Bush chose it, and I supported him. He went around the world and he assembled not just the countries in the area, not just our

allies, but the whole world. And but for the fact that we pulled out too soon, the matter would have been disposed of completely and satisfactorily then.

We have not taken the steps that are necessary to assure either that the nations of the world, our friends and allies in Europe or the nations in the area would support this undertaking. I am not a dove, and I am not a hawk. I am a very sensible Polish American, and it is my view that the game here is to win, and we best win by using the resources of the United Nations and the following of the whole world as we assemble a coalition to disarm or dispose of Saddam Hussein. To take some other course is to accept foolish risks, including the risk of failure.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the resolution now before the Congress. I supported the father of the current president on his resolution and was one of the few Democrats who did. I was right. There was a strong, present imperative by this country and by the nations of the world. It made sense, it was good, and it was something which was accepted and followed by the people of the world.

There is no evidence that our allies in Europe support the efforts that are described by the President to be made by the United States. The people and the countries in the area do not support this undertaking; and, overwhelmingly, the American people oppose this kind of effort, because it is not made intelligently, wisely and in ways necessary to achieve its purpose. The basic purpose is the elimination of weapons of mass destruction from within the country of Iraq.

Mr. Saddam Hussein has no friends in the world. People fear him and most despise him. But the President has chosen the wrong course. He has given us a request for a blank check. There has been inadequate or no discussion with our allies and fiends. There has not been sufficient discussion with the Congress or the people of the Untied States, and the countries in the area are troubled because they feel that they do not understand what it is the United States intends to do, when, how or why.

We are embarking on a unique and new doctrine. We propose to engage in a unilateral preemptive strike, if the early pronouncements of the administration are to be believed. Our purpose there is the removal of Saddam Hussein, obviously a desirable change, but again done unilaterally—a great strategic and tactical error. More recently, the President has said that our purpose now is to disarm Mr. Hussein and Iraq of their weapons of mass destruction. I am not clear what course it is that the President has in mind, but I am convinced that proceeding into this situation without allies, without bases, without proper and adequate logistical support is risky, indeed, it is an act of great folly. It poses enormous risks to the troops that we would be sending, and it poses enormous risk to this country, to the success of the undertaking, and to our foreign policy.

Not only is it novel and dangerous to talk about preemptive strikes, but it is something which need not be done. A proper exercise of leadership in the U.N. will cause that institution and its members to follow the United States. I would urge us, as the remaining superpower, to exercise leadership and have enough confidence in ourselves, and in our capacity to lead, to embark upon that wiser and more propitious course. I do not see this resolution before us as being a device which stimulates or encourages other nations to follow the United States. Perhaps the President would exercise that kind of leadership. He certainly should. I would support him in that. I see no evidence that such, however, is to be the case.

I was here during the time of the missile crisis, and I remember that President Kennedy at that time observed that the worst course to be taken was a preemptive war. His policies succeeded. We forced the missiles out, peace was maintained, and when the matter was discussed in the United Nations, our ambassador there, Mr. Stevenson, showed them a photograph of what was transpiring and that the Soviets had moved missiles into Cuba. The world accepted, approved and followed the United States.

We have not seen that the people of the world are convinced that we have made the case that Mr. Saddam Hussein would embark immediately or at some early time to use weapons of mass destruction. I do not trust him, and he might, but losing to him in this matter would make such use of weapons of mass destruction more certain. I would note to my colleagues that there is a sensible way of achieving the following of the world and the support of the nations of the world.

President George Herbert Walker Bush chose it, and I supported him. That President went around the world and assembled not just the countries in the Middle East, not just our allies, but the whole world. And but for the fact that we pulled out too soon, the matter would have been disposed of completely and satisfactorily then.

We have not taken the steps that are necessary to assure either that the nations of the world, our friends and allies in Europe, or the friendly nations in the Middle East will support this undertaking. I am not a dove, and I am not a hawk. I am very sensible Polish American, and it is my view that the game here is to win. And we best win by using the resources of the United Nations and the following of the whole world as we assemble a coalition to disarm or dispose of Saddam Hussein. To take some other course is to accept foolish risks, including the risk of failure. Let us do it right. If we do, we will win.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I insert into the RECORD, a letter I sent the President outlining my views and questions to be addressed before we embark on this risky endeavor.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 5, 2002.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In recent weeks there has been much debate, public and private, over the possibility of a United States military campaign against Iraq. I agree with the notion that Saddam Hussein is an evil man who continues to pose a serious threat to the stability of the Middle East. However, as one who voted in favor of authorizing the use of force prior to the Persian Gulf War in 1991, and supported George H. W. Bush through the duration of that conflict, I write to express my deep reservations over launching an attack against Iraq. Without a clear purpose or strategy, I question whether you have established that waging a war at this time would be advantageous to the United States.

Mr. President, most of the world agrees that Saddam Hussein is a menace to the region, the international community, and the Iraqi people. Iraq refuses to comply with its obligations regarding weapons of mass destruction (WMD), nor does it observe U.N.-imposed no-flight zones. Saddam Hussein's Iraq has rejected its neighbors calls for reconciliation, repeatedly threatened to attack Kuwait, failed to account for 600 missing Kuwaiti citizens and as recently as last year conducted raids into Saudi Arabian territory.

Saddam Hussein's repressive policies have resulted in the deaths of countless Iraqi citizens. While defying the international community, Saddam Hussein has manipulated public opinion by blaming the United States and the United Nations for the intense hardships faced by the people of Iraq. The UN has repeatedly found that the Iraqi government supports massive and systematic human rights abuses, and has demonstrated in act and deed that it would rather manipulate the suffering of innocent civilians for propaganda effect result than take full advantage of humanitarian relief efforts, such as the oil-for-food program.

That being said, there is great concern in the United States and around the globe over the possibility of the U.S. launching a unilateral, sustained military operation against Iraq. To date, the United States has not clearly stated its rationale for attacking Iraq, nor have we answered questions pertaining to the possible consequences of opting for military confrontation. This has triggered intense criticism of U.S. policy vis-a-vis Iraq at home and abroad. Without outlining the objectives and rationale for an attack or obtaining the necessary domestic and international support, a U.S. military campaign would be unwise. Accordingly, I firmly believe the Administration must meet the following conditions pertaining to Iraq in order to justify and guarantee the success of a military campaign:

(1) The Bush Administration must consult and obtain approval from Congress before launching a sustained attack of Iraq.

Congress must be provided with any and all facts justifying the need for military action, and must be offered a clear explanation as to the goals of a military campaign, including an exit strategy. The Administration must also explain to Congress why military action against the Iraqi regime is vital to the security of the United States, and why it is necessary now.

The Administration must make a clear and convincing case that Iraq has weapons of mass destruction—biological, chemical, or nuclear—and the means to deliver such agents. The Administration must explain why it believes Iraq will employ these kinds of weapons in imminent attacks on other nations.

(2) Any sustained military campaign must have the support of the international community.

We must first be certain that our nation's traditional allies in Europe and elsewhere support a military operation against Iraq.

The Administration must secure the support of our regional allies, and gain access to military bases in those nations bordering Iraq which are vital to the success of a military operation.

The United States must have the support of, and/or be able to coordinate with, the armed forces of our regional and other allies necessary to guarantee success militarily and diplomatically.

The matter of Iraq must be fully debated by the United Nations. An attack on Iraq must have the support of the U.N., and must be carried out under U.N. auspices.

(3) The Administration must formulate and explain its strategy for port-way Iraq. The

U.S. must answer questions as to how it will assist in reconstituting a united Iraq, maintain Iraqi territorial integrity, and build a peaceful government and stable society that does not pose a threat to the U.S., our allies, or the region.

(4) Congress and the American people must be informed of the anticipated cost of opting for military action, both in lives and dollars. The Administration must fully explain the cost of waging a war in Iraq, economically, militarily, and diplomatically. It must demonstrate that the considerable cost of a military endeavor justify an attack on Iraq.

Again, I would caution against unilaterally unleashing U.S. military might on Iraq until a compelling case is made to the American people, Congress, and the international community. Needless to say, we must also have clear objectives in the short and long term, less we risk suffering unintended consequences.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN D. DINGELL,
Member of Congress.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the blue sky times of the past peace have clearly clouded over, and we have now come to realize that as Americans that our part of the world is not sheltered from global storms either. Our country was hit a terrible blow on September 11, one that was delivered by depraved men, not by Mother Nature, and unlike the forces of nature, the destructive power of man can and must be stopped before it surges and reaches our shores again. It is time we go straight to the eye and dismantle the elements from which the storm of brutal, repressive tyranny and oppression radiate.

Saddam Hussein, Osama bin Laden and their radical ilk are at the epicenter of terrorist activity in the Middle East. Nobody doubts that. It is not debatable. President Bush, Prime Minister Blair and others have made convincing cases about the threats the despotic Iraqi regime poses to world peace and stability today, today, as well as tomorrow. The list of offenses is long, and it has been much discussed.

Briefly, Iraq has not lived up to the terms of peace it agreed to at the end of the Gulf War. So we are in a continuation of the Gulf War. It has illegally sold oil and fired missiles repeatedly at U.S. aircraft in no-fly zones. I am sorry that CNN does not run every night the aerial combat that goes on in the no-fly zones. The Iraqis are trying to kill our troops over there who are enforcing the sanctions the Iraqi regime agreed to. The policemen we put there, with their agreement, they are trying to take out.

Iraq has expanded its weapons of mass destruction capabilities against its pledge not to. It still has deadly chemical weapons hidden throughout the country, and it has tried to develop nuclear devices as well.

It is certain that Iraq has ties to many Islamic terror groups in the region, including al Qaeda. Evidence supports Iraq's involvement in the first and probably the second World Trade Center bombing.

The ultimate goal of an Iraq invasion is clear. It is the removal of weaponry and the Saddam Hussein regime. Saddam Hussein, as we all know, is aggressive, he is a rogue leader, he ruthlessly crushes his political dissent. He ignores the most basic tenets of human dignity and uses fear and brutality to stay in power. He has not been truthful. There is no reason for anyone to believe him.

He is known from our intelligence sources to be a master of deceit and deception in word and in deed. He would not be missed by his friends in that region, and no one, no one is defending him in this body that I have heard yet.

Debate now, followed by unlimited inspection and full, effective enforcement of the sanctions are the best way to achieve his removal and reduction of weapons of mass destruction and the threat they represent. Now is not the time to sit back and observe the storm.

As the chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, I can attest to the evilness of Saddam Hussein. There is no doubt. I can attest to the capabilities of his dreadful arsenal of weaponry and the inventory that that danger will grow geometrically the longer we wait to disable him. Those are undeniable realities that we have to live with and deal with.

We know about him. What about us? What are we going to do about it? That is what this debate really is, the how and the when of dealing with something we have to deal with.

President Bush asked in this resolution that we give him flexibility and support to handle this in the most effective way with the least risk to our troops, the least risk to further dangers for the people of this great Nation and our allies and friends around the world.

We should support our President. I will support him with my vote; and I hope others will, too.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), the Chairman of the Committee on International Relations, for the purposes of control.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) will control the remainder of the gentleman's time.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KANJORSKI).

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, today I rise with a heavy heart because the decision to go to war is the greatest vote a Member of Congress can make. I take my sworn constitutional duty in this matter very seriously. Accordingly, I have conducted a thorough analysis of this situation since the President indicated discussions several months ago about the possible need for American military action in Iraq. The examination and analysis has resulted in my conclusion to support this resolution.

Ultimately, we must do what is right for the security of our Nation. Before the United States agrees to commit troops abroad, we must first determine that Iraq represents an imminent and serious threat to the American interests.

We have known for some time that Iraq possesses biological and chemical weapons of mass destruction and material, an unacceptable breach of its international obligations. Additionally, Iraq seeks to produce nuclear weapons. Moreover, we have evidence that Iraq has worked to build the delivery systems and now has the capacity to deliver these weapons all over the world.

After considerable deliberations, I have, therefore, determined that a convincing case has been made that Iraq presents an imminent threat to our national security. Without question, we know that we cannot trust Saddam Hussein. Other nations might have the same deadly capacities as Iraq, but none has a leader like Saddam Hussein, who is a vicious and dangerous man.

At this critical junction, we must, therefore, act quickly to safeguard our national security and the security of our allies. If we do not, millions may die. Let us err on the side of national security.

□ 1345

Further, we have before us a well-crafted compromise resolution to authorize the use of force against Iraq. This resolution imposes some appropriate checks on the President's authority to use force against Iraq. It also represents a reasonable compromise between what the President had initially requested and what the Congress felt was wise to allow. After all, under our Constitution, only Congress has the power to declare war.

We must additionally consider the consequences of military intervention for our diplomatic relations with other nations. In my mind, the President has made a convincing case to Congress about the need for such action in this instance. His administration in recent weeks has made progress in educating the rest of the world about the need for such action. Furthermore, the resolution before us today prioritizes U.S. diplomatic efforts in the United Nations for resolving this escalating situation. As a result, it is my hope we will resolve the situation through diplomatic means. But should those efforts fail, we must and we need to ensure that the President has the tools he needs to protect our national security.

Further, if we must use force against Iraq, it is imperative that we not leave a vacuum of power so that one dangerous regime replaces another dangerous regime. If we fail in the second part of our mission in Iraq, we will not have accomplished much.

If we ultimately pursue military action, we must therefore commit this Congress and the American people to provide assistance, as we did after the war in Europe. Consequently, I am pleased that the President has expressed his support for rebuilding Iraq's economy and creating institutions of liberty in a unified Iraq at peace with its neighbors.

Mr. Speaker, Congress must act swiftly to pass this resolution so that the United States can fully protect the national security of the American people. The resolution now before us represents a reasonable compromise between the desires of the administration and the goals of Congress to protect the American people. We should, as a result, support this resolution and support the President as he upholds the duties he was sworn to do.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DOYLE), a member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce dealing with trade energy and air quality.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, we will all have to cast one of the most difficult votes of our careers. I know this will be the most difficult vote I will have to cast in the 8 years that I have had the privilege of representing the people of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. It is a vote that I have given much thought to because, Mr. Speaker, we are talking about the possibility of sending America's sons and daughters to war; and that is something that we must never take lightly.

Now, all of us here in the Congress have been to many briefings. I have talked to the Director of the CIA, the DIA, the National Security Adviser. We have heard from many people from the administration, all of us, I believe, in an effort to get the facts, to seek the truth, to help us make a decision that we think is in the best interest of our country.

And I want to say at the beginning that I think we are going to reach different conclusions tomorrow. There are basically three different ways we can vote tomorrow, and I do not question anyone's vote tomorrow. I think everyone in the House is a patriot and will vote in a manner which they think is the best way for our country to proceed. I want to say that up front.

But we do have three choices and we are confronted with some realities. I think all of us would agree that Iraq poses a threat. They have biological and chemical weapons. We know that. We know they have designs on reconstituting their nuclear arsenal. They are not there yet. They may not be there for a year or so. But we know they have intentions to do that. So we agree there is a threat. Some of us would observe that the threat is equal to or certainly no greater than the threats posed by many other countries, Iran, North Korea, China, Syria. But I think we all agree that it is in the interest of the United States and the world community that Iraq be disarmed.

So the question is what is the best way to do that, and tomorrow we are going to have three choices. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) would have us do this exclusively through the United Nations; that we would just work through the U.N. to try to effect disarmament of Iraq. The President's resolution gives broad authority to the President to do whatever he sees fit to disarm Iraq and protect this country. And then there is a third alternative, the Spratt amendment, which seeks to limit the broad authority given to the President, but nothing to the point that it ties the President's hands.

I really believe, in looking at all three proposals, that the Spratt amendment makes the most sense. First of all, it makes it clear that the primary aim that we have is disarming Iraq from all weapons of mass destruction. It keeps the Congress engaged.

Whatever happened to keeping the Congress engaged in what goes on in our country? I have watched trade agreements where we have abdicated our responsibilities in trade agreements to the executive branch, no oversight with these fast track agreements. And now we are talking about maybe sending our sons and daughters to war; and the Congress is ready to, once again, just abdicate its oversight to the executive branch. I think we need to be engaged, and the Spratt amendment allows us to be engaged.

The Spratt amendment commends the President for taking the case against Iraq to the United Nations. It encourages him to persist in his efforts to obtain Security Council approval. And it calls on him to seek and also for the Security Council to approve a new resolution mandating tougher rounds of arms inspections. We think this is an important first step that thinks that the first order of business should be to get compliance through the Security Council first.

It also authorizes the use of force if sanctioned by the Security Council. If Iraq resists the weapons inspectors and the new rounds of inspections fail, then the Security Council is going to have to confront the use of military force against Iraq. And if they authorize such force, as they did in 1990, the President does not need any further approval from Congress. He need not come back to us.

But if the Security Council does not adopt the new resolution, or if the President considers its resolution too weak to wipe out Iraq's weapons of mass destruction, then the President can seek, on an expedited basis, an up-or-down vote by the Congress to use military force to eliminate Iraq's weapons of mass destruction.

Now, we ask that the President certify that he has sought a new resolution from the Security Council and that it has either failed to pass that resolution or it is insufficient; that military force is necessary to make Iraq comply; that the U.S. is forming as broad based a coalition as it can; and that military action against Iraq will not interfere with the war on terrorism.

Security Council approval is in the interest of the United States in the long term, because it is going to help persuade neighboring countries, especially countries like Saudi Arabia and Turkey, to grant us basing and overflight rights and other means of support. It allows moderate Arab and Muslim states to support the U.S. action, deflecting the resentment an attack on Iraq by the U.S. alone would generate in the Arab and Muslim populations, and it enhances the chances of postwar successes. Allies with us on the takeoff are far more likely to be with us after the conflict.

Mr. Speaker, this is something we need to think through. What is a post-Saddam Iraq going to look like? How many years and how many troops will we have to station there? Mr. Speaker, I think the answer is simple. In the last few speeches, the President has made it clear by saying he will not attack Iraq without first attempting to build an international coalition of support from our allies. And I appreciate that because I think that is the right way to go.

The Spratt amendment deals with Iraq in the right way by providing for a more thorough and narrowly focused process that I believe increases significantly our chances of success in this delicate and difficult situation.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to support the Spratt resolution. I think it is the right way to go. I intend to vote against the President's resolution.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA).

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time to speak, and I rise today with a heavy heart over one of the most difficult decisions that we as elected officials are called upon to make. It is literally a decision of life or death.

As a mother who has raised nine children, I cannot help but think about this issue on a personal basis. Can I or can any parent look into the eyes of an 18-year-old boy and with a clear mind and clear conscience say that we have exhausted every other option before sending him into the perils of conflict? Are we certain that the strongest possible case has been made that the threat posed by Iraq rises to the level of risking the lives of tens of thousands of our young citizens? Can we say to that young man with sufficient moral certainty that the time must be now, and that we can afford to work no longer on an alternative to war?

Mr. Speaker, the world is watching us today as we show how the world's last remaining superpower sees fit to use its great influence. We are looked to as we set an example for the world. Are we a Nation that will work within the world community, or will we go it alone? Are we willing to exhaust every possible chance for a peaceful resolution, or are we ready now to commit to war? Have we made the strongest case for action that we can make to the world? And do we honestly have a plan for a post-war Iraq?

This great struggle against evil is not a Christian struggle, a Jewish

struggle, or a Muslim struggle. It is a common struggle among people of all faiths. But as a Nation of Christians, Jews, Muslims and Hindus, and as a Member who represents a district of all of these faiths, we should look toward the common thread of all our beliefs that it is our responsibility to win this struggle through peace, through negotiation, through coalition building, and as an international, not unilateral, effort.

As the world's last superpower, I believe that we must have a better plan for our Nation and for the world for a post-war Iraq. We must reassure those neighbors in the Middle East that we are committed first to peace and stability and second to regime change. And we must not give our friends and foes in the region more reason to distrust our sincerity and desire for peace by ignoring the world community's role in addressing this problem.

I commend our President for his commitment to protecting our national security and his honest heartfelt desire to do what he thinks is right to make our world safe for democracy and safe for future generations. I know that in his heart he will continue to do what is right. But I believe as a Nation we owe it to ourselves and to those of other nations who would fall victim to the horror of this war to make sure that every other option has been exhausted before we take this final and irrevocable step of authorizing full-scale military action.

I will follow my conscience and vote against House Joint Resolution 114.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON).

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Speaker, this debate is occurring at an auspicious anniversary in our Nation's history. Forty years ago this month, our Nation stood at the brink of nuclear annihilation. Offensive nuclear weapons were being placed 90 miles from Miami. A dictator stood ready to launch a missile strike against this Nation. And the United States, while supported by the world community, stood alone in confronting the menace.

Mr. Speaker, there are ominous parallels to the missiles of October 1962 and the Iraqi threat of 2002. While we debate this resolution, I believe it is illuminating to go remember what President Kennedy faced 40 Octobers ago. President Kennedy did not want to go to war. He knew what war meant. But he also knew the dangers of inaction far outweighed the risk of action.

We are faced with a similar situation today. A tyrant is building a nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons capability designed only for offensive use.

□ 1400

International mediation is preferred, but not an absolute method of engagement. The threat is real, and inaction on our part today will put us at greater risk tomorrow.

This resolution is not a blank check to go to war. It is not defiant of the world community to pass this resolution. No one wants to go to war and see lives lost. No one wants our blood and treasures spent in far-off lands. But just as President Kennedy acted with threat of force of our military to end a threat 40 years ago, we must not remove this option from President Bush today. I urge support of this bipartisan resolution.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), a leader in the battle against this resolution, and a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, today, we must speak not with one voice, but as one democracy—giving voice to the millions of Americans increasingly concerned with an Administration's deliberate choice to make the terrible weapon of war a predominant instrument in its foreign policy.

Among the more than three thousand communications I have received from my neighbors in Central Texas concerned with this rush to inflame a region that is as volatile as the oil it holds, is that of Bill Hilgers, a World War II veteran with 30 bombing missions over Germany and a Purple Heart. He writes, ''No one can foresee the potential damage [to] our troops or citizens. . . . We stake our future on an unprecedented breach of our moral principles . . . and our past commitment to peace. [W]e should . . . use every diplomatic strategy . . . to see that Iraq's weapons are destroyed before [using] military force.''

A more recent veteran, General Norman Schwarzkopf, writing of the Gulf War, was more direct: ''I am certain that had we taken all of Iraq, we would have been like the dinosaur in the tar pit.'' [''It Doesn't Take a Hero, Bantam Books, 1992, page 498]

The house-to-house urban warfare that would likely result from a land invasion would endanger our soldiers, detract from our ongoing war on terrorism, and expose our families to terrorism for years to come, in what to many in that part of the world would perceive as a war on Islam.

Many Americans are asking, ''how best do we protect our families?'' And, ''do they know something in Washington that we do not know?''

From our briefings in Congress, we do know something about which the public is uncertain and fearful. We have been shown no evidence that Iraq is connected to 9/11. We have been shown no evidence that Iraq poses an imminent threat to the security of American families today. From Central Intelligence Agency reports, secret until very recently and finally released, we know that terrorism, not Iraq, is the real threat. The CIA has concluded that an American invasion of Iraq is more likely to drive our enemies together against us and certainly more likely to make Saddam Hussein use any weapons of mass destruction that he may possess.

How do we make our families safe at this time? Certainly, through a military second to none, yes. Through effective law enforcement here at home, yes. But arms alone are insufficient protection, as the tragedy of September 11 demonstrated all too well.

True security means working together with nations, large and small. It means that we must be wise enough to rely on America's other strengths to rid the world of Iraq's danger, rather than unilaterally imposing our will by force that will only unite our enemies while dividing our natural allies.

Overreliance on packing the biggest gun and on having the fastest draw, will not make us safer. Rather, it is a formula for international anarchy. A quick draw may eliminate the occasional villain, but only at the cost of destabilizing the world, disrupting the hope for international law and order, and, ultimately endangering each of our families.

President Bush has correctly said, I would not trust Saddam Hussein with one American life. What fool would trust him? But that is not our choice today. Nor is it a choice between ''war'' and ''doing nothing,'' or between ''war'' and ''appeasement.''

The better choice today is for effective, comprehensive, international inspections and the disarmament of Iraq of any weapons of mass destruction that we believe it possesses. The better choice is to follow the prudent, indeed the conservative approach, a firm policy of containment that kept the threat to American families at bay.

Abandoning that successful policy, a policy which Ronald Reagan used against another ''evil empire,'' abandoning that policy which avoided nuclear Armageddon, abandoning that policy which we used successfully against Muammar Qadhafi—that abandonment will place America on a truly perilous path.

Containment and disarmament may not end all wars, but they are clearly superior to the new ''first-strike'' formula that risks wars without end.

America has the might and right to defend itself against imminent threats to its security, even unilaterally. If in fact the quality of the President's evidence matched the quality of his oratory, I would be ''ready to roll.'' The President does not need us to consent to saber rattle, but let him return to Congress if he has any clear evidence, not yet provided, to show us it is time to let the saber strike.

With this daily talk of war overshadowing all our hopes and dreams for this country and world, I would address my final remarks to those who are struggling with how to respond. Continue to thoughtfully, respectfully but forcefully voice your opposition. Do not lose hope. Petition for peace. Pray for peace. Do not give up on peace. Let us work together for an America that remains, indeed, a beacon for the world, that joins with its allies in ensuring the collective security of families here and around the globe.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. RAMSTAD).

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, decisions involving war and peace are by far the most difficult and agonizing as they potentially involve putting America's sons and daughters in harm's way. That is why I focused heavily on the Iraq resolution for weeks, attending every possible briefing from the CIA, National Security Council, Joint Chiefs, and the State Department. I have examined the classified data made available by our intelligence officials.

I have also listened to the people of Minnesota. I realize there are people of goodwill and good conscience who will disagree with my conclusion.

My fundamental principles approaching this resolution are several:

First, the highest responsibility of the Federal Government is to keep the American people safe.

Second, the greatest danger to our national security is terrorists with weapons of mass destruction.

Third, diplomacy should always be exhausted and proven unworkable prior to the use of force.

Fourth, war should always be the last option.

Consistent with these beliefs, my oath of office, and my conscience, and based on all of the briefings and classified data I have seen, I have decided to vote for this bipartisan resolution for several reasons.

First, Saddam Hussein's weapons of mass destruction and links to terrorists pose a clear and present danger to our national security.

Second, this resolution is the last best chance for a peaceful outcome with Iraq, because diplomacy not backed by the threat of force will not work with Saddam Hussein.

Third, this resolution puts maximum pressure on the United Nations to enforce its own resolutions and on Saddam Hussein to comply.

Fourth, this resolution requires the President to exhaust all possible diplomatic efforts and certify that diplomacy is unworkable prior to the use of force.

I am hopeful that diplomacy backed by the threat of force will work to get the United Nations weapons inspectors back into Iraq to disarm Saddam Hussein's weapons of mass destruction. As history has taught us, diplomacy without the threat of force does not work with dictators.

Since September 11, the world has changed. Protecting our national security now means preventing terrorists from getting weapons of mass destruction. Our highest duty is to assure that no weapons of mass destruction are used to harm the people of the United States.

The overwhelming evidence is that Iraq continues to possess and develop a significant chemical and biological weapons capability and is actively developing a nuclear weapons capability. Moreover, declassified intelligence reports document ties between al Qaeda and the Iraqi government, including the presence of senior members of al Qaeda in Baghdad. We also know from high-ranking terrorist prisoners at Guantanamo Bay that Iraq has provided training to al Qaeda in developing chemical and biological weapons.

In conclusion, I believe the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) summed it up best when he said, ''Iraq presents a problem after September 11 that it did not before, and we should deal with it diplomatically if we can, militarily if we must. And I think this resolution does that.''

Like the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), I believe this resolution will strengthen our diplomatic efforts to disarm Saddam Hussein and enhance the prospect of a peaceful outcome.

I ask all Members to vote their conscience, as I will in supporting this resolution.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM), a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce and a spokesperson for children.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, we live in a dangerous world. We always have. But every day, the greatest democracy on earth wakes. All of us from Minnesota, we get up every day. We take our children to school. We go to work. We enjoy the hope, opportunity and freedom of this great Nation. We know that our democracy provides hope and opportunity not only for our own families here in America but for nations around the world.

Nevertheless, we do live in a dangerous world. We always have. I am 48 years old. There has never been a time in my life when the United States was not targeted by another country or countries with nuclear weapons, or when another nation has not had the capacity to attack us with chemical and biological weapons. How many nations today have the capacity to strike us within our borders? How many actually have targeted us today?

The world is filled with dangers, and Saddam Hussein and his regime pose a real danger to America, to the global community. Osama bin Laden and al Qaeda remain free and continue to pose a real danger to America. The anonymous assassin who 1 year ago murdered five Americans with anthrax remains free and is a real danger. How many other rogue states, terrorist organizations, drug cartels or pandemics pose a real security threat to the United States, our citizens and the millions of people around the world? If Saddam Hussein is today's threat, who or what is the next?

Today, I rise in opposition to this resolution because I do not believe we should provide a blank check to this administration to unilaterally attack Saddam Hussein. The world looks to America to promote freedom and justice, not alone but in concert with the global community. In the past decades, we have had models of this success. Let us build again a global coalition.

In 1991, the senior President Bush collectively and carefully assembled a broad coalition against Iraq, unified in purpose and in action. We succeeded, and we brought freedom back to the Kuwaiti people.

After September 11, President Bush tapped the collective will of the international body to respond to terrorism around the world; and with the support of our allies, we rid Afghanistan of the Taliban. We sent operatives of the al Qaeda network scrambling, and we restored freedom to the Afghani people.

But, today, the President seeks to engage the American people in another conflict, void of broad-based international support and lacking a cohesive international voice. Today, some of our allies are beginning to move forward, begrudgingly, to join us, spurred more by a threat of a weakened relationship with the United States than by an immediate threat of Saddam Hussein.

□ 1415

While I believe Saddam is a threat, I do not believe we should take offensive military action, the first strike, without broad-based international coalition support. I ask why are we not standing side by side with our neighbors in the region, Saudi Arabia, Turkey, Jordan, Egypt, our allies around Europe and around the world? The United States possesses the intelligence capacity to assess potential threats to our security. A diplomatic corps capable of diffusing tensions and a potent military force prepared to take appropriate action if necessary. Why have been unable to convince our closest allies to join us in this military undertaking against Iraq? This is a question that the families in my district have been asking me. This is a question that no one in this administration has been able to answer.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, we live in a dangerous world; and I want to be very clear if Iraq possesses an immediate threat to the American people, the President has all the authority he needs to take military action to protect our Nation without this resolution. The brave men and women of our Armed Forces must not be sent into harm's way alone. America's duty is to build a coalition of allies, seize the moral high ground, and act as part of a community of nations against Saddam's regime. When this administration convinces our allies in the region and around the world the need for joint military action, then the President will have my full support to take every action necessary to eliminate the danger in Iraq.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN).

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, there is no question that Iraq's President, Saddam Hussein, is a dangerous individual. Under his control Iraq has violated United Nations resolutions on the development of weapons of mass destruction. Iraq possesses significant quantities of chemical and biological weapons and is attempting to develop nuclear and radiological weapons all in contravention of the U.N. resolutions.

Iraq has shown a disposition to use weapons of mass destruction when the regime used chemical weapons against its own citizens. Iraq has had 4 years to rebuild its weapons of mass destruction program without U.N. oversight or inspection. The current regime has also supported terrorism. It is in the interest of the United States to take action against Iraq to enforce the U.N. resolutions, mandating that Iraq destroy its weapons of mass destruction. The preferred course for the United States is to pursue that action through the United Nations. The use of force should be a matter of last resort if all other diplomatic means prove ineffective.

I support President Bush's efforts to secure a resolution in the United Nations Security Council along with a time schedule for enforcement. I also support President Bush's stated intent that force should only be used as a matter of last resort and that it is in the best interest of our Nation to avoid the use of force.

The question before Congress is how we should best address the threat posed by Saddam Hussein as he seeks to strengthen his arsenal of weapons of mass destruction. We all agree that the United States must exercise leadership at this critical time in world history. It is unfortunate that H.J. Res. 114 goes well beyond the President's statements. Under the resolution the President could take unilateral military action against Iraq without seeking the support of the United Nations. The President could also take unilateral military action against Iraq to enforce U.N. resolutions unrelated to weapons of mass destruction. The President has indicated that he will use his authority more narrowly but that it is useful to have broader legislative authority. However, the Congress has the responsibility under the War Powers Act to be very cautious on the authorization of the use of force.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS) and I presented a substitute resolution to the Committee on Rules. That resolution was originally proposed by Senators BIDEN and LUGAR of the Committee on Foreign Relations. It would have limited the use of force to the specific threat against our Nation. Unfortunately, the Republican leadership in the House refused to allow that resolution to be considered. The only other option on the use of force to the President's resolution is the substitute resolution offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT). That resolution allows the President to use force if authorized by the United Nations to eliminate Iraq's weapons of mass destruction. If the United Nations does not approve a resolution authorizing force, then the President could seek an immediate vote of Congress if he still believed the use of force by the United States is necessary.

Mr. Speaker, I shall support the Spratt substitute resolution because when compared to the President's resolution, I believe it most closely reflects the proper authorization from Congress. It is important that we speak as a united country in our determination to eliminate Iraq's weapons of mass destruction. I urge the President to follow the path he has announced in seeking U.N. action, limiting our forces to the elimination of weapons of mass destruction and working with the international community.

I have grave concerns about the consequences of unilateral preemptive military attack by the United States. Such a course of action could endanger our global coalition against terrorism, particularly from our moderate Arab allies. It also may increase terrorism activities around the world. The United States could also set a dangerous precedent in international law which could be invoked, for example, by India against Pakistan, Russia against Georgia, or China against Taiwan. In addition, we must not overlook the massive cost and effort that the United States would have to undertake in a post-Saddam Hussein regime. The United States will need the help of its allies as it attempts to transition Iraq from a dictatorship to a democracy which has the full respect of religious freedom and minority rights of the Kurds, Shiites, and Sunnis.

Ultimately, Mr. Speaker, by working through the United Nations we create an international coalition that will be critical in any future military campaign against Iraq or in any effort to stabilize and rebuild Iraq.

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH), someone who has a great deal of experience in leadership in the area of antiterrorism, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism and Homeland Security.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding me this time and for that nice introduction.

Mr. Speaker, soon each Member of Congress will vote on a historic resolution to authorize the President to use military force against Saddam Hussein. This is not a declaration of war, and war is not inevitable. Saddam Hussein may yet yield to international pressure and reveal his weapons of mass destruction and destroy them, or the Iraqi people might still install a new regime.

No President wants to send our sons and daughters into combat, but a President should be able to take action he deems necessary to respond to terrorist threats and protect American lives. I know that given all the facts, President Bush will make the right decision.

Saddam Hussein is a dangerous man with dangerous weapons, weapons of mass destruction. His regime has stockpiled large amounts of chemical and biological weapons and is attempting to acquire nuclear weapons, has repeatedly violated United Nations Security Council resolutions, has repeatedly fired missiles at U.S. aircraft, has aided known terrorist organizations, and has openly praised the attacks of September 11, 2001, which killed 3,000 people.

Mr. Speaker, hoping that Saddam Hussein will not use his weapons or wishing that his threat to world peace will go away is not a responsible policy and certainly not a guarantee of success. Hope is not a strategy. Mr. Speaker, evil must be confronted and condemned. Either it will destroy itself or it must be neutralized. Avoiding the task only makes the future more dangerous and difficult. We should always pray for peace, but if the use of force becomes necessary, we must pray for victory.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU), a person who exemplifies the struggle and fight for human rights, a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I was at home this weekend; and on Saturday morning at my very first town hall meeting, the first speaker or questioner got up and said, You know, I don't understand all this talk about Iraq in Washington, D.C. I have been out of work for over a year. I work in high tech. I have been looking hard and I have not been able to find a job, and all I hear about in Washington is this talk of war in Iraq. What are you going to do about the economy?

I gave the man the best answer I could, the things that I have been trying to do, some of which have been passed, some of which have not. This Congress owes that Oregonian that answer about that economy, and this government ultimately owes that Oregonian an answer also.

But we are here today on the most serious of topics, whether to send American men and women to war, and I oppose the resolution to grant the President's unilateral authority to go to war. Make no mistake about it, I would not hesitate to use force if there were sufficient evidence of an imminent threat to the United States, our allies, or our military forces; but in all the briefings that I have attended, in all of my study and research, I have not found sufficient evidence of an imminent threat to us, our allies, or our military. And if there were, the main resolution that we are considering delegates so much war-making power to

one person, I believe that if the Founders of this Republic were to read this resolution, they would tremble at the thought that one individual ever in America would have such terrible power in his or her hands no matter how much we trust that person or no matter how much we like that person. That is not the American way, to put so much unilateral power into one person's hands.

The gentleman from South Carolina's (Mr. SPRATT) resolution is a much better solution to this problem. It requires the President to take all steps and then to come back after exhausting diplomatic and other means.

I want to also seriously address the new first-strike doctrine which is being advocated by this administration. It is not a preemption doctrine because preemption assumes that there is an imminent danger and that is what we are preempting. This doctrine allows for first strikes even absent imminent danger.

Where will we draw the line? Will we strike next at the other nations of the Axis of Evil? What about Pakistan with a nuclear capacity and known ties to terrorists? Where will other countries draw the line? There are at least half a dozen hot spots around the world where conflicts could be of a conventional or a nuclear nature.

For over 200 years we have rarely been the first to shoot. For over 200 years American Presidents have taken a united America to war. Lincoln, Wilson, Roosevelt, Kennedy, they all made their public case that war was necessary and that there was an imminent threat. The exceptions: President Madison, President Johnson. I do not think that we want to fall into the historic situations in which those two Presidents ultimately found themselves. This first-strike doctrine puts us on the edge of a terrible, terrible precipice.

The vote on this resolution is a foregone conclusion. I think it is a foregone conclusion that we will be at war in January. We are fighting against the second war, the third war, the fourth war, the fifth war. We are trying to cut that chain of wars off as soon as we can. But make no mistake about it, with this first strike, with this first war, we will lose the high moral ground that has taken Americans 200 years to build. We will no longer be in a position through moral suasion or otherwise to be an example to the world, for democracy, human rights, and the rule of law. We will not be able to have others stay their hand by the example of us staying ours.

From the Lexington Green to Fort Sumpter, from the submarine campaign in the north Atlantic before our entry into World War I to the Cuban Missile Crisis, American Presidents have been restrained in their use of power.

□ 1430

Let not the innocent 3,000 of September 11 die in vain. If we lash out, if we strike blindly, if we start a series of wars because of September 11, we will have given Osama bin Laden what he wanted. Let us stop as soon as we can.

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, obviously, we are in the midst of a great and historic debate. In fulfilling the pledge that the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE) made yesterday, I ask unanimous consent that the time for debate on this resolution be extended for 4 hours, to be equally divided between the majority and the minority.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. This is in accordance with the agreement set prior to the beginning of the debate, and I appreciate the cooperation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield 1 hour of my time to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), and that he be allowed to control that time and yield it to others.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it is my great honor to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY), a Member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution.

Americans are a peace-loving people. While we desire a diplomatic resolution to the Iraqi crisis, we must be prepared to support the President if military force becomes necessary.

Saddam Hussein is a dangerous and unpredictable despot who has committed genocide, including the use of chemical weapons to slaughter his own people. It is estimated that Saddam has butchered over 200,000 of his own citizens in the past decade. He led his country into an 8-year war with Iran, a disastrous conflict with the U.S.-led coalition in 1991, and is open about his financial and technical support for Hamas and Islamic Jihad.

Saddam has always overestimated his military capabilities and underestimated the resolve of the civilized world. He surrounds himself with ''yes men'' who reinforce his ego and ambition and fail to warn him of the consequences of his actions. This makes Saddam an immediate threat to America who can neither be trusted nor dealt with rationally, in spite of the testimonials provided by two Members of Congress who recently visited Iraq.

We cannot wait for Saddam to develop a nuclear device and the missiles to threaten our troops, allies, and our own territory.

We cannot ask what will happen if we act, but, rather, what will happen if we do not. We must not only remove Saddam's weapons of mass destruction, but Saddam himself.

We cannot wait for Saddam to arm terrorist groups with weapons of mass destruction, nor can we allow him to use these weapons to blackmail his neighbors. He has proven himself to be a menace to the stability of the entire Gulf region.

In Afghanistan, U.S. forces worked with the anti-Taliban opposition to free the country. We also reversed an impending famine in that country. The U.S. is working with the new Afghan government to build the foundation for a civilized society that respects human rights and international law. No less should be expected for the people of Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot allow the world to be tormented by terrorists or tyrants. The problem is the regime. The problem is Saddam. We know who the enemy is, we know what he does, and we know what we must now do.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY), a member of the Committee on International Relations.

Ms. BERKLEY. I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this resolution.

Iraq, under the tyrannical dictatorship of Saddam Hussein, has been in violation of 16 different United Nations' resolutions over the past decade, resolutions passed to ensure that Iraq dismantle its chemical, biological and nuclear weapons programs and destroy any remaining weapons of mass destruction.

Ensuring compliance with these U.N. resolutions, which represent the will of the international community, is essential. Iraq has demonstrated its willingness to use these horrific weapons in battle and against its own people.

One particularly gruesome example occurred in the late 1980s when Saddam Hussein unleashed deadly chemical gas attacks over entire villages in Iraq, killing thousands of innocent men, women and children, so he could experiment, experiment, with finding the most efficient ways to spread nerve, blister and mustard gas.

Given Saddam Hussein's 11-year record of defying and misleading the international community, I believe the United States, our allies and the United Nations are justified in their efforts to rid Iraq of biological and chemical weapons.

Just this week, a new CIA report exposed Saddam's vigorous concealment record as further proof that he has no intention whatsoever of honoring his U.N. commitments by giving up his ever-expanding stockpile of weapons of mass destruction.

Month by month, Saddam Hussein increases his arsenal of chemical and biological weapons, while he aggressively works to build nuclear capacity. The CIA now believes that Iraq could make a nuclear weapon within a year if it manages to obtain weapons-grade material from abroad.

The CIA further reports that Saddam is intent on acquiring nuclear weapons, and Iraq's expanding international trade provides growing access to the necessary materials.

Given these developments, we simply cannot wait any longer.

September 11 taught us that there are those who would use any means to harm Americans. I am increasingly concerned about weapons of mass destruction being transferred from Iraq to terrorists like Osama bin Laden's al Qaeda network, bent on destroying Americans, or being used by Saddam himself against his neighbors, our allies, or against the United States.

The United States should seek to achieve our objective with as little risk to Americans and Iraqi civilians as possible. However, we must act to permanently disarm Saddam Hussein, because the cost in lives and misery if we do not act will be incalculable.

Before any action is taken, the President is right in seeking approval of Congress, and I commend him for that. The more information the American people have, the stronger our Nation will be.

Further, it is important that we continue to make every effort to marshal international support. I would prefer to work in concert with the United Nations. Saddam Hussein is, after all, a threat to international security. But, in the final analysis, my responsibility is to protect my constituents and protect the national security of our Nation, so I will be voting in favor of this resolution.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL), a member of the Committee on Resources and a great addition to this House.

(Mr. UDALL of New Mexico asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, the House is engaged in a great and serious debate on an issue of incredible importance; and, given the strong arguments on both sides, we may have missed the fact that we actually agree on many points.

We all agree with the President that Saddam Hussein is a brutal dictator. We all agree with the President that both Iraq and the world would be better off without him. We all agree with the President that Iraq must be rid of its weapons of mass destruction. So, as the President said on Monday night, we all agree on the goal. The issue is how best to achieve it.

Right now, we have two choices. We can vote for the resolution before us, or we can vote against it. If we vote for it we are, in effect, granting the President unprecedented authority to launch a unilateral, preemptive strike against Iraq.

Much has been made of the fact that the resolution is not the blank check originally submitted by the President, that concessions have been made, that under the current resolution the President is required to exhaust all diplomatic measures before launching an attack on Iraq, that the President is required to give Congress prior notice of such an attack.

Rhetoric and semantics aside, this is still a blank check. The President alone makes the final determination of exhaustion of diplomatic remedies. This resolution simply adds a step to the process. It will not have an impact on the final decision. It will not give Congress a greater role in the decision making. Notice to Congress is a mere formality.

Sadly, proper deference has not been given to the authority vested in the Congress by the Constitution to exercise the power to declare war. The Founders must have believed, as I do now, that the power to wage war is too awesome a power to vest in the executive. War is too dangerous and too important a matter to be left to the discretion of one man or woman.

This war would be especially dangerous. We would be acting alone, not only without allies but also with the hostile condemnation of the rest of the Arab world. We would undermine the war against terrorism and, indeed, increase the risk of future terrorist attacks against our own country. We would undermine the authority and mission of the United Nations, our best hope for a peaceful solution.

It is dangerous to go forward without knowing how long this war will take; without knowing how many lives will be lost, military and civilian; how much it will cost; how much of a drain it will be on our already dangerously weak economy; how long it will take to rebuild a devastated Iraq; and whether Iraq will ever be a viable democracy.

So, before we vote, we must ask, why now? Why the rush? There is too much danger lurking in the unknown and the untried. With the election only weeks away, there is too much of the taint of political expediency to gain the trust of our international friends.

I cannot support this resolution. I will support the United Nations leading an international coalition to disarm Iraq. At the very least, we should give the U.N. a chance before we embark on the dangerous path this resolution takes us.

I will vote against H.J. Res. 114.

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it is my great honor to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER), a Member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Wisconsin for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the resolution granting President Bush the authority he seeks to take decisive action against Saddam Hussein. Clearly, this decision is one of the most sobering I have had to make during my time in public service. It is a decision that no Member of Congress considers lightly. It is also one that I take confidently and with great moral clarity.

The President's critics urge dealing with this threat through diplomatic and U.N. efforts, but passage of this resolution is the only way Saddam will take those ongoing efforts at the U.N. seriously. It is, in fact, the only hope for those continuing efforts.

Many of those same critics say that our government should have connected the dots and better understood the terrorist threat before September 11. Well, that is exactly what we are doing here now, connecting the dots and better understanding a closely-related threat.

Saddam Hussein has proved time and again that his totalitarian regime threatens America, our allies and even his own people. He is a known exporter of terrorism. He causes regional instability. He actively pursues weapons of mass destruction. He has proven he is willing to use them. So inaction, or the mere return to the old frustrated U.N. resolutions, is clearly the riskiest path of all.

My constant prayers are for the members of our Armed Forces around the world as they embark on their missions. May God bless them, and may God bless America.

□ 1445

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA).

(Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I just returned this morning from a 16-hour flight from my district, hoping very much that I would be able to participate in some small way in this most important debate now pending before this body.

In the course of the weekend, I had the opportunity of participating in the dedication of the opening of the construction of the brand-new U.S. Army Reserve Center that we are establishing in my district for the purpose of accommodating some 450 of our men and women in military uniform; also, in essence, sharing with my people the historical aspects of our participation in our unit as part of the famous 100th battalion 442nd infantry Army Reserve organization out of the State of Hawaii. I did this, in observing these men and women in uniform, as I reflected on the fact that in a couple of days I would be here before my colleagues expressing my opinion of what we should do in the aftermath of the President asking us to make a decision on this important issue.

As a member of the Committee on International Relations, Mr. Speaker, I voted in favor, in support of the proposed resolution now under consideration by this body. In principle, House Joint Resolution 114 embodies our Nation's efforts to work with our allies and work with the United Nations Security Council and the United Nations General Assembly to seriously consider the demands and the dangers that are now posed by the current regime ruled by dictator Saddam Hussein.

I am happy to observe that our President's initial rhetoric on this most serious matter is now more realistically applied. The fact is that our President must come to the Congress not just to consult, but must come to the Congress to justify himself on whether or not we should commit our men and women in military uniform and put them in harm's way. I am sure my colleagues need not be reminded of the wisdom of how the Founding Fathers established our system of government as plainly written, clearly written in the Constitution, where, this power in this most serious matter, is given to the Congress and not to the President, the power to declare war.

I think another matter that also needs to be restated in the aspects of how our government functions, Congress also is given the important responsibility of raising an Army and a Navy, not the President. I think it shows quite well how our Founding Fathers said, we do not want another emperor or another king; we want to make sure that there is a checks and balance system. I think this is how we came out with such an excellent way of proceeding to make sure that this kind of authority or power is not given exclusively just to the President.

When our Secretary of State Powell appeared before our Committee on International Relations, I asked Secretary Powell some questions that were very dear to my heart. I asked, ''Secretary Powell, if and when our Nation should ever declare war, are we going to go there to win and nothing less? Secretary Powell, I don't want another Vietnam War. I don't want to hear another bunch of half-baked plans and objectives being done by some bureaucrats in the Pentagon, and then a policy where the enemy soldiers can shoot at you, but you can't shoot back.'' Secretary Powell's response was, ''Yes, if we are going to go to war, we are going to go to win.''

I also asked Secretary Powell, ''Are we going to be working with the Security Council and the United Nations?'' Again he responded and said, ''Yes, exactly. This is our objective as far as the administration is concerned.''

I also asked Secretary Powell, ''Will our Nation take up the responsibility as well to provide for some millions of Iraqi refugees who will be fleeing from these horrible consequences of war which, I believe, will also cause serious economic and social conditions to the surrounding Arab countries in the Middle East?'' And he said, ''Yes, we will also have to take up that responsibility.''

Mr. Speaker, as we consider this matter now before us, I am reminded of an incident that occurred years ago in the Middle East where a terrorist bombing of the U.S. Marine barracks in Beirut, Lebanon, where hundreds of Marines were needlessly killed as a result of that incident. At that time our Secretary of Defense, Casper Weinberger, was literally tortured by this incident. As a result, he proposed six principles or criteria or tests that I think our Nation must answer positively before our Nation should commit its sons and daughters to war. I want to share these six principles with my colleagues here this afternoon.

Test number one, ''Commit only if our allies and our vital interests are at stake. Number two, if we commit, do so with all of the resources necessary to win. Number three, go in only with clear political and military objectives. Number four, be ready to change the commitment if the objectives change, since war is rarely standstill. Number five, only take on commitments that gain the support of the American people and the Congress. And, number six, commit U.S. forces only as a last resort.''

Mr. Speaker, I want to share with my colleagues a statement made by a general some 2,500 years ago named General Sun Tzu. He said, ''The art of war is of vital importance to the State. It is a matter of life and death, a road either to safety or to ruin. Hence, under no circumstances can it be neglected.''

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK), ranking member on the Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Ways and Means, but known as the fierce fighter for Medicare and Medicaid.

(Mr. STARK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution. I am deeply troubled that lives may be lost without a meaningful attempt to bring Iraq into compliance with U.N. resolutions through careful and cautious diplomacy.

The bottom line is that I do not trust the President and his advisors.

Make no mistake. We are voting on a resolution that grants total authority to a President who wants to invade a sovereign nation without any specific act of provocation. This would authorize the United States to act as the aggressor for the first time in our history. And it sets a precedent for our Nation or any nation to exercise brute force anywhere in the world without regard to international law or international consensus. Congress must not walk in lockstep behind a President who has been so callous as to proceed without reservation as if the war is of no real consequence.

Mr. Speaker, 3 years ago, in December, Molly Ivins, an observer of Texas politics wrote, ''For an upper-class white boy, Bush comes on way too hard, at a guess, to make up for being an upper-class white boy. Somebody,'' she wrote, ''should be worrying about how all this could affect his handling of future encounters with some Saddam Hussein.'' Pretty prophetic, Ms. Ivins.

Let us not forget that our President, our Commander in Chief, has no experience or knowledge of war. In fact, he admits that he was at best ambivalent about the Vietnam War. He skirted his own military service and then failed to serve out his time in the National Guard; and he reported years later that, at the height of the conflict in 1968, he did not notice any ''heavy stuff'' going on.

So we have a President who thinks foreign territory is the opponent's dugout and Kashmir is a sweater. What is most unconscionable is that there is not a shred of evidence to justify the certain loss of life. Do the generalized threats and half-truths of this administration give any one of us in Congress the confidence to tell a mother or father or family that the loss of their child or loved one was in the name of a just cause? Is the President's need for revenge for the threat once posed to his father enough to justify the death of any American? I submit the answer to these questions is no.

Aside from the wisdom of going to war as Bush wants, I am troubled by who pays for his capricious adventure into world domination. The Administration admits to a cost of around $200 billion. Now, wealthy individuals will not pay; they have big tax cuts already. Corporations will not pay; they will just continue to cook the books and move overseas and send their contributions to the Republicans. Rich kids will not pay; their daddies will get them deferments as Big George did for George W.

Well, then, who will pay? School kids will pay. There will be no money to keep them from being left behind, way behind. Seniors will pay. They will pay big time as the Republicans privatize Social Security and continue to rob the trust fund to pay for this capricious war. Medicare will be curtailed and drugs will be more unaffordable, and there will not be any money for a drug benefit because Bush will spend it on a war. Working folks will pay through loss of jobs, job security, and bargaining rights. And our grandchildren will pay, through the degradation of our air and water quality, and the entire Nation will pay as Bush continues to destroy civil rights, women's rights, and religious freedom in a rush to phoney patriotism and to courting the messianic Pharisees of the religious right.

The questions before the Members of this House and to all Americans are immense, but there are clear answers. America is not currently confronted by a genuine, proven, imminent threat from Iraq. The call for war is wrong.

What greatly saddens me at this point in our history is my fear that this entire spectacle has not been planned for the well-being of the world, but for the short-term political interests of our President.

Now, I am also greatly disturbed that many Democratic leaders have also put political calculation above the President's accountability to truth and reason by supporting this resolution.

But I conclude that the only answer is to vote ''no'' on the resolution before us.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The Chair would remind the Member that it is not in order to refer to the President in personal terms. Although remarks in debate may include criticism of the President's official actions or policies, they may not include criticism on a personal level.

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Chair for that reminder. I think it is an important reminder, especially when we are debating such serious matters here.

It is my honor, Mr. Speaker, to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY), a member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

(Mr. TERRY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution. In dealing with Iraq, we must act in the best interests of our national security. Based on the evidence against Saddam Hussein, we no longer wonder if he has weapons of mass destruction or if he will use them, but when.

Defectors have reported the existence of mobile germ warfare laboratories. Dump trucks purchased through the U.N. humanitarian aid program have been converted into military vehicles. Saddam Hussein is an expert in dual technologies. Computers used in hospitals can also generate designs for nuclear weapons. Saddam imports dual-use technologies and then diverts them to military use.

□ 1500

His regime is founded upon the hatred of America and Israel, his loathing for freedom and liberty, and his fear for democracy. Saddam is driven by the fantasy to triumph over the free world. We must implement a long-term solution to neutralize this threat that Saddam poses to America, to the free world, and to his own people.

Military action is not the desired means of resolving the Iraqi situation. I do not take lightly the prospect of sending our young Americans to war. Force, however, may be an eventuality for which we must prepare. This resolution permits the use of force to prevent a ruthless dictator from using deadly weapons of mass destruction.

Without regard to U.N. resolutions or international law he has sought, obtained, and used weapons of mass destruction even on his own people. Unless the U.N. resolutions are backed by action, he will brazenly frustrate similar attempts to inspect and disarm his arsenal. Military consequences are the only way to stop Saddam Hussein's games and force legitimate inspections.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOLDEN).

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from New York, for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to offer my support for the resolution before us and to offer my support for our President.

There is no task that any of us faces that is more serious than making the decision to commit our military to danger abroad. Mr. Speaker, I do not take this task lightly, but with the decision that currently faces us, I feel we have no choice.

Above all, it is our responsibility as Members of Congress to work with the President to protect our citizens from danger. While it is my hope that continued diplomatic efforts ultimately prove this resolution unnecessary, history has shown that we should not and cannot take that chance.

As our esteemed colleague, the chairman of the Committee on International Relations, reminded us yesterday, 66 years ago another brutal dictator terrorized his own people, instigated religious and ethnic persecution on a massive scale, and declared his aggressive intent against his neighbors. The world still bears the scars from the mistake of ignoring the threat of evil posed by Adolph Hitler.

History has shown that Saddam Hussein, too, is a brutal dictator and he needs to be held in check. We know what he has done to the Kurds. We know what he has done to his own people. We cannot turn our backs as the threat of Saddam Hussein continues to plague our Nation and the world.

Iraq's use and its continued development of weapons of mass destruction, as well as its connections with terrorist organizations that wish to do the United States harm, demand that we act prudently to protect our citizens from danger.

While it is necessary for us to make the preparations to go to war, we should not be going at it alone. I encourage President Bush to work hard for the passage of a U.N. resolution acknowledging the threat that Iraq poses to the world. The United States does not suffer alone from the threat that Saddam poses. We should not go at it alone in combatting that threat either. Just as we did during the Gulf War, this administration should work to build a multinational coalition to share the burden of any possible military action against Iraq.

In conclusion, let me reiterate my support for this resolution.

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU), a member of the Committee on Appropriations and vice-chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the resolution, a resolution which I believe will send a clear and an unmistakable message to our own citizens, our allies, and our enemies, as well, that Congress stands behind our President in defense of America's national security interests.

Mr. Speaker, there is no more serious an issue for Congress to debate than the question of authorizing the use of America's Armed Forces. We are a peaceful Nation, preferring instead to rely on diplomacy in our relations with other countries.

On the question of Iraq in particular, the United States and the United Nations have been exceedingly patient, working steadily to integrate Iraq into the community of law-abiding nations, but to date we have failed. In the decades since Desert Storm, Iraq has chosen a very different path. Iraq has worked to develop weapons of mass destruction, including chemical and biological agents; and Saddam Hussein has repeatedly ignored U.N. resolutions demanding that he disarm. He has refused to allow weapons inspectors access to potential sites. Thus, the threat of obtaining stocks of these terrible weapons continues to grow.

Most troubling of all, Saddam Hussein has shown, has demonstrated, his willingness to use such horrible weapons against other nations and against his own people. Only when military action is imminent does the Iraqi regime begin to discuss allowing inspectors to return, but the restrictions they wish to place on these inspectors would effectively render their mission useless and, instead, simply delay action and allow a covert weapons program to begin to bear terrifying results.

If we wait until Iraq succeeds in achieving these goals, we will have waited too long.

The resolution we are debating today encourages a diplomatic solution to the threat that Iraq poses to our national security. The President has called on the U.N. to act effectively to enforce Iraq's disarmament and ensure full compliance with Security Council resolutions. But if the U.N. cannot act effectively, this resolution will provide the President with full support to use all appropriate means.

Mr. Speaker, neither I nor any Member of this body want to see a renewed conflict in Iraq. We must be prepared to act give the President flexibility that he needs to respond to this gathering threat to protect American lives and address the threat to global peace.

I urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation and a fighter for the people of her district.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I stand before the Members today, one of three African Americans sent to the United States Congress 10 years ago, the first time in 129 years that Florida sent an African American to Congress from the great State of Florida; the scene of the crime of the 2000 Presidential election, where thousands of African American votes were not counted, over 27,000 thrown out in my district, with the Supreme

Court selecting the President in a 5–4 decision.

Many of my colleagues say that the President is the only person elected by all of the people. Did I miss something? This President was selected by the Supreme Court, and that fateful decision was over 600 days ago. Now this President, who runs our country without a mandate, has pushed us to the brink of war.

The President is asking Congress to give him a blank check. I say today to the President, his account has come back overdrawn. This blank check gives him too much power: a blank check that forces Congress to waive its constitutional duties to declare war, a blank check that lets the President declare war and not consult Congress until 48 hours after the attack begins. Let me repeat that, a blank check that lets the President declare war and not even consult with Congress until 48 hours after the attack has begun.

Not only has the President given us an economic deficit, but there is a deficit in his argument. Why Iraq, and why today?

In the 10 years that I served in Congress, this is the most serious vote I will take. I have to say, the resolution on Iraq the White House drafted is intentionally misleading. It misleads the American people, the international community and, yes, the United States Congress.

This is a sad day, almost as sad as it was 627 days ago when the Supreme Court selected George W. Bush as the President. The White House talks about dictators, but we have not done anything to correct what has happened right here in the United States. It amazes me that we question other governments when in our country we did not have a fair election.

I recently traveled to Russia, China, and South Korea; and I believe it would be unfortunate to damage the goodwill our Nation was receiving after September 11. But there is a song, ''You are on your own.'' Mr. Speaker, we are on our own with this. No one in the international community is behind us.

I have not seen any information demonstrating that Iraq poses a threat to our country any more than it did 10 years ago, and certainly I do not have reason to believe we should attack unilaterally without the support of the U.N. In fact, recent poll numbers suggest that many Americans do not support the way that the President is handling the situation and, indeed, the way Congress handles the situation. They think we are spending too much time talking about Iraq and not discussing problems like health care, education and, yes, their pensions.

Many also say they do not want the United States to act without support by allies and, by a 2 to 1 margin, do not want the United States to act before the U.N. weapons inspectors have had an opportunity to enter Iraq and conduct further investigations.

Although the administration is attempting to convince the American public otherwise, they have not shown any evidence of a connection between 9/11 and Iraq. Iraq's government is not a democracy, but neither are many other countries on the State Department terrorist list.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, it is in the hands of my colleagues. I do believe that there is good and evil in the world, and what we are about to do here in the next couple of days will tilt it in a negative direction. I do hope that I am wrong, but I do believe what we will do here today will not only affect our children, but our children's children will pay for what we are about to do.

May God have mercy on America, and God bless America.

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of this great debate, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW), a member of the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution.

No person of common sense wants war. Rational people agree that war should be the last resort. But there is a real, dangerous, and deadly threat posed by Iraq; and we must face this challenge head on or suffer the consequences of inaction.

Saddam Hussein ignores repeated demands to stop accumulating weapons of mass destruction. These are not our demands, they are the demands of the world.

In an ideal world, Saddam Hussein would disarm immediately. In an ideal world, Saddam Hussein would stop manufacturing, stockpiling, and pursuing weapons of mass destruction. In an ideal world, Saddam Hussein would tell us what happened to Captain Scott Speicher, a young man, a Navy pilot from my hometown of Jacksonville, who was the first man shot down behind enemy lines during the Gulf War. In an ideal world, Iraq would honor the 16 United Nations resolutions that he has thumbed his nose at for the last 11 years.

But we do not live in an ideal world. The reality demands that we act. We must act because the danger is grave and growing. We must act because Saddam Hussein is a man with no moral limits. He is uniquely evil, and the only ruler in power today, and the only one since Hitler, to commit a campaign of chemical genocide against his own people.

We must act because the worst thing we could do is turn our heads and pretend that Saddam Hussein does not exist. We must not allow this dictator to arm himself with nuclear capabilities and position himself further as the world's bully, blackmailing those within his nuclear grasp, blindsiding regional stability, and threatening our national security through his dealings with terrorists.

There is nothing desirable about breaching the bounds of civility to forge peace. Even so, I believe there are situations that cause a nation to rise with certainty and defend itself.

I urge my colleagues to send a clear message to Saddam Hussein: disarm, or face the consequences. There is no middle ground.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution because I believe that the threat of force is required if we are to have any hope of disarming Saddam Hussein and removing the threat that he presents to our Nation and to the world.

Just about everybody agrees that Saddam Hussein does in fact pose a threat. The debate seems to be about how large that threat is, how imminent it is, and how much it is directed at us. I think the evidence makes it clear that we face a threat.

I am sympathetic to those who would like to wish away that threat because of the hard choice that we have to face when we realize that we do have a threat against us, but it does not change the facts. Saddam Hussein has a long history of trying to develop the most deadly weapons possible: chemical, biological, and nuclear. He was first thwarted in 1981 by Israel, then in 1991 by the Gulf War, and now all evidence points to the fact that he is trying to develop those weapons again. That makes him a threat right off the bat.

Plus he has a proven propensity for violence, a proven propensity to use those weapons. As bad as we think Iran and North Korea are, and the Soviet Union was, none of those countries have ever used chemical weapons. They drew the line; Saddam Hussein did not. He crossed over it, and he used chemical weapons against his own people.

He also has clearly expressed his disdain for the United States of America ever since the Gulf War, so clearly he is a threat to us.

□ 1515

The presence of international terrorism changes the nature of this threat. Many have said we have not proven a link to 9–11, we have not proven a link between Saddam Hussein and al Qaeda, but there is ample evidence that some degree of connection is there. And there is certainly ample reason that tells us that Saddam Hussein coming together with the international terrorists who oppose us is quite likely and quite possible; and that makes the threats both imminent and to the U.S. because terrorism would enable Saddam Hussein to deliver these weapons through means other than having to develop an intercontinental missile. He could deliver them in any manner of different ways and has shown a certain willingness towards violence against the U.S.

We face a threat. We cannot wish away that threat because of consequences of acknowledging it. We face

that threat, and we must stand up to it, and the threat of force against him is necessary to meet it.

Now, I want to deal with the preemptive argument because many have said we are becoming a rogue nation by doing this. And I regret what the President has said about a policy of preemptive strike because I think it has muddied the waters. We do not have to violate international law to go to war with Saddam Hussein. We are in an armistice with Saddam Hussein and Iraq. We went to war with them in 1991. That war was only ended by an armistice, an armistice which everyone knows Saddam Hussein is in violation of. We are clearly within the bounds of international law to use force to enforce that armistice. We do not have to get into a debate about first strikes and preemptive action. We are clearly within the bounds of the international law.

It has also been said that we should work multilaterally. I completely agree that we should. Again, I regret the approach the President took earlier this year when stories were leaked about how he could do it without congressional approval. He did not want to go to the U.N. He wanted to do it unilaterally. I think that was a mistake. I think he should have learned from his father's example when Iraq invaded Kuwait. The first thing the first George Bush did was to call the U.N. and say let us work together. We should have taken that approach, but now we are.

It has been said, How can we give this power to the President who wants to go right over our heads and totally ignore Congress? We are here talking about it. He is not going over our heads. He is asking us for that support. So that too is not an issue.

We should act multilaterally. We are. It is my profound hope that we will not go to war, that Saddam Hussein faced with this threat will allow for the disarmament to happen. But absent this threat, rest assured he will not react in the way that we want him to.

I also regret that politics has been brought into this. During the time when we were trying to deal with the crises in Kosovo and Bosnia and even Iraq in 1998, I was deeply angered by Republican colleagues who attacked the President's character as he tried to deal with this threat.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LINDER). The gentleman will suspend.

The Chair requests the doormen in the gallery to take care of that cellphone noise and remove it. Will the Sergeant at Arms find that and have it removed from the gallery?

The gentleman will continue.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the criticisms of President Clinton were that in trying to deal with Saddam Hussein, when he finally so thwarted the U.N. inspectors that they were forced to leave because they could not do their job, criticism was that the President was ''wagging the dog,'' he was dealing with his personal problems. We undercut our own President at a time when he needed us most. And now when I see Democrats doing the same thing by questioning the President's motives at a time when we need to come together as a country, I similarly destain that partisanship.

There is plenty of room to disagree here about whether or not we should go to war. We do not need to question the personal motives of our President now any more than we should have back in 1998 when it was Republicans doing it to Democrats instead of Democrats doing it to Republicans.

Lastly, I would like to deal with the issue of how this affects the people of Iraq. There has been much criticism of the sanctions regime on Iraq, much criticism of the effect that has had on the Iraqi people. Ironically, that criticism has come from some of the same people who now criticize our threat to use force against Iraq. I think the criticism was this is harming the Iraqi people and doing nothing to Saddam Hussein.

So if we do not threaten to use force and back it up if necessary to disarm Saddam Hussein and remove that threat, what are we left with? Do we simply remove the economic sanctions and say it is okay for Saddam Hussein to make a mockery of international law, to make a mockery of the same multilateralism that we claim to support, to continue to develop weapons of mass destruction that threaten us and the world and simply say we will do nothing?

I fully admit this is a hard choice. Going to war is not easy, but we cannot wish away the threat and pretend somehow this is simply motivated by personal motivations of the President. There is a clear threat here we must deal with. I hope the threat of force deals with it; but if the threat does not, we must follow through in order to protect ourselves and protect the world.

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. FLETCHER), a veteran of the U.S. Air Force, someone who understands the dangers of war very well.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, before 9–11 the threat of terrorists and those states that harbored them was unfortunately not taken as seriously.

In the 1990's, terrorists bombed the World Trade Center, two American embassies, an American barracks, and the USS *Cole*. We took only limited action then, but now we cannot let the deaths of nearly 3,000 Americans on September 11 be in vain. We vowed after that to do our best to rid the world of terrorists and fear.

Over the past 12 years, the United Nations has issued numerous warnings about the blatant defiance of Iraq. Additionally, we know that Saddam Hussein's brutal regime has used biological and chemical weapons against even his own citizens. Hussein has violated the Oil for Food Program, diverting uncounted millions to fund a military buildup and develop weapons of mass destruction, all the while allowing a reported 1 million children to die of starvation.

The oppressed citizens of Iraq are not our enemy, only the evil regime of Saddam Hussein. This resolution is a grave, but necessary, step in confronting the danger of his regime. It does not inevitably lead us to war. It encourages the United Nations to live up to its true purpose.

President John F. Kennedy described courage as ''doing what is right even in the face of unrelenting pressure.'' The time has come for the U.N. to take decisive action, but we cannot let the U.N.'s inaction keep us from defending our national security.

President Bush is effectively building an international coalition, but for those countries afraid or unwilling to join our coalition, this resolution encourages them to help in our effort to preserve peace and democracy.

A few weeks after September 11, I personally visited Ground Zero. I will never forget the smouldering rubble where innocent thousands lost their lives. There I spoke with the New York City firefighter who lost so many of his heroic colleagues. And before I departed, he passionately challenged me, saying, ''Don't you ever let them forget what happened here.''

I now have the honor to speak on behalf of that brave firefighter and challenge this Congress. We must not forget those who lost their lives on 9–11, and we must overwhelmingly support this resolution to defend our freedom.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), a leading member of the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on the Budget.

(Mr. PRICE of North Carolina asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the substitute resolution offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) and in opposition to the Hastert-Gephardt resolution.

The Spratt-Allen-Price-Snyder-Clyburn-Matsui-Larson-Moran-Reyes-Levin resolution recognizes the danger posed by Iraq's possession and development of weapons of mass destruction, and it recognizes the need to enforce United Nations resolutions providing for the destruction of these weapons and of the capacity to produce them.

It authorizes the President to utilize armed forces to protect and support arms inspectors and to undertake enforcement actions under U.N. auspices. It does not, however, give the President open-ended authorization to use force unilaterally or preemptively. For that he would have to come to Congress for a specific vote after other means had been exhausted.

As the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) has testified, ''A second vote is not an imposition on the

President's powers. It is the age-old system of checks and balances and one way Congress can say that we prefer for any action against Iraq to have the sanction of the Security Council and the support of a broadbased coalition.''

An up-or-down congressional vote on a resolution authorizing force is a blunt instrument at best. And regardless of which resolution passes, the President and Congress and the country will still face critical decisions down the road. The Iraqi threat, as grave as it is, must be assessed in the context of other antiterrorist and diplomatic objectives. After all, the war against al Qaeda is hardly won. It is critical, as the Spratt resolution states, that action against Iraq not imperil international cooperation in the fight against terrorism or displace related diplomatic endeavors such as pursuit of an Israeli-Palestinian settlement.

Moreover, a complex of policies is either already in place or is envisioned in the resolutions before us: a regime of coercive inspections; U.N. enforcement of the mandate to disarm; readiness for a devastating response to any aggressive Iraqi military action; no-fly zones; intense surveillance; a tight embargo on strategic and dual-use materials. Could these policies contain, deter, and ultimately disarm Iraq, making a military invasion unnecessary and enabling us to attend to other equally important antiterrorist priorities?

We cannot answer that question now. But should we not know that answer before we authorize a massive military invasion which surely represents an extreme option?

We should not make this congressional vote any blunter an instrument than it needs to be. We are being asked to line up behind an open-ended resolution that has been improved by hortatory language but still authorizes the President to invade unilaterally or preemptively under circumstances, weeks or months hence, that we cannot possibly foresee. This, we are told, will help the administration influence the U.N. Security Council and apply maximum pressure on Iraq. Now, that is not a negligible argument; but it does not do justice to our duty, as members of a coordinate branch of government, to help set national policy.

Our job is to provide a responsible and rational guide to policy, should compliance and enforcement fail. The open-ended resolution requested by the President would represent an abdication of that responsibility.

The Spratt resolution with its required second vote would give us the means to exercise our constitutional role more fully and with better command of the facts. And, no less than the Hastert-Gephardt resolution, it would serve notice now of our resolve to see United Nations resolutions upheld and Iraq disarmed.

Our concern about granting open-ended authority to make war should be heightened as we consider the administration's recently enunciated ''doctrine'' of the right of one country to take preemptive or even preventative military action against hostile states.

This doctrine goes far beyond the recognized right of anticipatory self-defense.

A unilateral attack on Iraq would be difficult to justify under existing standards, for even the Bush administration has not consistently argued that the threat to the U.S. from Iraq is imminent. But we must ask how this new doctrine would play out as other nations eagerly adopt it and act on it for their own purposes.

As former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger recently stated, ''It cannot be either in the American national interest or in the world's interest to develop principles that grant every nation an unfettered right of preemption against its own definition of threats to its security.''

Mr. Speaker, the question before us is not whether but how best to address the threats posed by Iraq's weapons programs and its continued defiance of the world community.

A purely military response, particularly one taken unilaterally or preemptively, would have costs and risks that should lead us to regard it as a last resort. We must deal with the threat in ways that do not compromise our broader war on terrorism and that maintain the support and engagement of our allies.

The Spratt substitute resolution keeps these priorities straight. It upholds Congress' role in authorizing military operations, not indiscriminately, but under specific conditions for specific purposes. It is vastly preferable to the open-ended Hastert-Gephardt resolution, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS), a veteran of the National Guard and a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution to give the President of the United States the authority to exercise his sworn duty to protect the people of this Nation.

There is no question that Saddam Hussein is a threat to the United States and other parts of the world. He has used weapons of mass destruction against his own people, killing and maiming thousands upon thousands of innocents, including women and children. He has deceived weapons inspectors and violated the conditions of the 1991 cease-fire agreement with the United Nations. He has continued to stockpile chemical and biological weapons, and recent intelligence tells us he is much closer than we previously thought possible to developing and constructing a usable nuclear weapon.

Over the past few years, we have learned many painful lessons regarding the Middle East and terrorism: the Marine barracks in Beirut; the airmen we lost in the bombing of the Khobar Towers in Saudi; the foreign service personnel we lost in Tanzania and Kenya; and then the sailors weapon lost in Yemen; and, finally, Mr. Speaker, the people we lost in New York and in D.C.

□ 1530

Intelligence tells us that Saddam Hussein has massive stockpiles of weapons and he has missiles, the capability of delivering those weapons.

Our President does not easily want to go to war. He has even stated this repeatedly on many occasions, but it is a difficult situation that he is in and we are in, Mr. Speaker. But this resolution demonstrates the resolve of the American people to force Saddam Hussein to comply with U.N. regulations which, until now, he has flagrantly abused.

This resolution will send a clear message to the Middle East, to the oppressive dictator, the Butcher of Baghdad, and to the rest of the world that we will not live in fear; that we will not tolerate terrorism; and that we will use the force necessary to protect our people, our freedoms and our way of life from those who seek only to destroy such.

It goes without saying this President has sworn to do a duty. We must give him the power and the necessary authorization to do so.

I strongly support this resolution and ask my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, today we are debating whether or not to support the President of the United States in his efforts to exercise his sworn duty to protect the nation.

That there is a gathering threat to America from the dictator Saddam Hussein goes without saying, but let me reiterate some of the past actions that demonstrate that threat.

Saddam Hussein invaded neighboring Kuwait without provocation. He has used weapons of mass destruction against his own people, killing and maiming thousands upon thousands of innocents, including women and children. In 1993. Saddam sent a Land Cruiser loaded with 400 pounds of explosives into Kuwait to attempt to assassinate former President George Bush. He has deceived weapons inspectors and violated the conditions of the 1991 Cease-fire agreement with the United Nations. He has continued to stockpile chemical and biological weapons, and recent intelligence tells us, is much closer than we previously thought possible to developing and constructing a usable nuclear weapon.

Over the past 12 years we have learned many painful lessons regarding the Middle East and terrorism. Our citizens have been attacked and killed repeatedly. The 1996 bombing of the Khobar Towers by Saudi dissidents funded and organized by Iranian Leadership killed 19 of our servicemen and women. In 1998, the coordinated bombing of American embassies in Tanzania and Kenya killed 224 people, including 12 Americans. In 2000, 17 American Sailors were killed in the Port of Yemen when terrorists bombed the USS *Cole.*

And our nation still reels from the effects of September 11, 2001 when thousands of our countrymen were tragically lost to us in devastating attacks.

And yet, as painful as each of these incidents has been, nothing can compare to the

destructive and deadly capability of Saddam Hussein's arsenal of terror. Imagine for a moment the complete destruction of a city the size of Atlanta, with its entire population of 4.1 million people suddenly silenced in a nuclear blast. Imagine New York City and its 19 million residents dead from the effects of Sarin or VX Nerve gas. Imagine Washington, DC and its half million residents, sick or dying from Anthrax, Botulism, or one of the other deadly biological agents in Saddam's arsenal.

And can there be any doubt that he would fully use such weapons in American if given the chance. If you doubt it, I ask you to consider the Kurds who opposed Saddam and the horrid fate they met at his bloody hands.

Our President does not eagerly anticipate war. He is not bent on sending young men and women into harm's way. He has even stated repeatedly his desire to avoid a conflict. But this resolution demonstrates the resolve of the American people to force Saddam Hussein to comply with UN Resolutions which, until now he has flagrantly disregarded. Without the teeth provided by this resolution, nothing will change. This resolution will send a clear message to the Middle East; to the oppressive dictator—the Butcher of Baghdad; and to the rest of the world that we will not live in fear, that we will not tolerate terrorism, and that we will use the force necessary to protect our people, our freedoms, and our way of life from those who seek only to destroy.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution before us today is not about whether we will go to war against Iraq, it is about whether we will take the necessary precautions to protect American citizens from a cruel dictator, and while doing so, remove the yoke of oppression from the necks of the people of Iraq. It is about empowering the President to do the job he has sworn to do. It is about enforcing the United Nations mandates against a nation that has repeatedly disregarded them. It is about assuring our safety, security, and freedom. And it is a necessary tool to ensure the disarmament of Iraq and the removal of Saddam Hussein and his regime of terror.

I support this resolution and urge my colleagues to pass it.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN), a member of the House Committee on Resources and a leader in health care, and she has brought attention to the U.S. Virgin Islands.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I must preface my remarks by reminding my colleagues that as the representative of the people of the Virgin Islands, who serve in some of the highest per capita numbers in our Armed Forces, I do not get to directly influence this decision because I am not allowed to cast a vote on the resolution we are debating today.

Nevertheless, I rise because it is important that I speak on behalf of my constituents on this critical issue which affects them, as it does all Americans, despite the fact that neither do we vote for our Commander-in-Chief.

Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today with a heavy heart, preferring that I could do so having sufficient information to justify the President's request so that I could support it. Instead, I must come to express my opposition to H.J. Res. 114 which would, in effect, preauthorize the use of unlimited military force against Iraq and invest this awesome authority in one person, the President of the United States.

As many of my colleagues before me have stated, the decision that is ours by the authority bestowed upon us as Members of Congress by the writers of the Constitution, the Founders of this great country, to send our brave young men and women to war is the most solemn and serious choice we are ever called on to make.

I hold to the principle that war should be a last resort. This resolution makes it the first resort.

The President is asking for authority to wage a preemptive strike. I have attended many briefings, and, to date, nothing has been forthcoming to justify such an action at this time. The case has yet to be made that Iraq poses an imminent threat to our safety and national security.

In adopting H.J. Res. 114 without amendment, we would be setting a dangerous precedent, embarking upon a course which could allow nations to determine, without international support, who among their neighbors pose a threat to their national security and, upon that assertion, wage a first strike offensive attack, plunging the world once again into the dangerous era of unilateral preemptive use of force by nations. We should not be charting such a course.

While most Americans share the President's view, as do I, that Saddam Hussein is a dangerous man and the world would be better off without his brand of tyranny, we are gravely concerned about the repercussions of such a war if we have to fight it alone. The American people are concerned that, absent the endorsement of the U.N. Security Council, a unilateral first strike by us would lead to more terror at home and a wider war in the Middle East.

So, Mr. Speaker, taking heed of the reluctance and the concerns of my constituents and the American public at large, I also join with those who hold that we must exhaust all diplomatic efforts and fully utilize all options available to us through the United Nations first as proposed in the Lee amendment.

Mr. Speaker, the Spratt-Moran amendment, which I also support, which closely mirrors the statement of principles adopted by the Congressional Black Caucus, authorizes the President to use military force pursuant to a new U.N. Security Council resolution that mandates the elimination of weapons of mass destruction and ballistic missiles. The Spratt-Moran amendment would also provide that if the Security Council does not adopt such a resolution, the President should seek authorization from Congress to use military force.

This threat of force included in the Spratt-Moran amendment clearly gives the Secretary of State and the administration the clout they need and they seek to pressure Iraq into full compliance.

Mr. Speaker, I remember one of our colleagues lamenting the possibility immediately after September 11 that the Constitution would be the first casualty of the war on terrorism. It has unfortunately been gravely wounded, but the mortal blow would come should we forfeit our constitutional authority to declare war and grant unlimited authority to the President at any time, and under whatever circumstances he sees fit, to take this country into war and too many of our young people to an untimely death.

To relinquish such an important constitutional authority sets another dangerous precedent that could endanger other provisions of the body of laws that has guided this Nation so well for over 226 years.

Finally, this yet-to-be-justified war would not only commit thousands of lives but would also commit resources that this country needs to improve and save the lives of people right here at home. This proposed war, which again we have not been convinced we need to undertake now, will undermine the war against terrorism, our homeland security and further threaten the very fabric of our society.

Mr. Speaker, let us not take action that would undermine the constitutional authority of the Congress. Vote no on H.J. Res. 114 and support both the Lee and Spratt-Moran amendment.

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAN MILLER), a member of the Committee on Appropriations and Committee on Government Reform.

(Mr. DAN MILLER of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAN MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, a little over a year ago, this country saw evil demonstrated as we had never imagined possible. Last year's attacks on our Nation showed us all too well the immorality of evil persons who are determined to attack us, our way of life and the freedom we cherish. We must act to ensure that no such attack ever occurs again, and it is today more imperative than ever that Iraq's weapons programs be brought to light, halted and terminated. The consequences of not acting to prevent Iraq from continuing its weapons development are simply too great to be ignored.

For over a decade, Saddam Hussein and the Iraqi regime has defied and deceived the international community. In its blatant and deliberate violation of international will and its development of weapons of mass destruction, Iraq has continued to pose a real and significant threat to the security of its

neighbors and the entire Persian Gulf region, the national security of the United States and, indeed, the security of the civilized world.

Saddam Hussein is a ruthless and evil dictator of a regime that has again and again showed no respect for international norms and the rule of law or respect for human life, just like the terrorists responsible for the murder of 3,000 innocent Americans last year. As such, Saddam Hussein is as much a terrorist and a threat to our Nation as those directly responsible for last September's heinous acts.

What we know about Saddam Hussein and the Iraqi regime is unquestionably troubling, and, as President Bush said, what we do not know is even more so. His continued research and development of chemical weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, the extent of which is unknown due to his flagrant violation of international mandates, is a tremendous threat to the security of this Nation and must be stopped.

The power to declare war and authorize the use of military force is one of the most significant powers the Constitution gives this body. It is a responsibility that every Member of Congress takes seriously, and there is no more difficult decision that we can make than to choose to send our military into action. Ensuring the security of this Nation and the safety of the citizens is a responsibility that we all take seriously, and I provide my support to President Bush as he makes the tough decisions ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this resolution to provide the President authorization to use the United States Armed Forces against Iraq.

A little over a year ago, this country saw evil demonstrated as we had never before imagined. Last year's attacks on our nation showed us all too well the immorality of evil persons who are determined to attack us, our way of life, and the freedom that we cherish. We must act to ensure that no such attack ever occurs again, and it is today more imperative than ever that Iraq's weapons programs be brought to light, halted, and terminated. The consequences of not acting to prevent Iraq from continuing its weapons development are simply too great to be ignored.

For over a decade now, Saddam Hussein and the Iraqi regime has defied and deceived the international community. In its blatant and deliberate violation of international will and its development of weapons of mass destruction, Iraq has continued to pose a real and significant threat to the security of its neighbors and the entire Persian Gulf region, the national security of the United States, and indeed the security of the civilized world.

When Iraq accepted the provisions of the United Nations Security Council Resolution 687 in 1991, it unconditionally accepted the inspection, destruction, and removal of its weapons of mass destruction and missile programs under international supervision. Unfortunately, however, the United Nations Special Commission's (UNSCOM) inspectors were repeatedly impeded and prevented from carrying out their mission, and were ultimately banned from Iraq in October 1998. Since then, Iraq has indisputably been in breach of its obligations, and its weapons of mass destruction programs have gone completely unchecked.

Saddam Hussein is an evil person who cannot be trusted. Under his leadership, the Iraqi regime has had a repeated history of aggression against its neighbors, repression of its people, and hostility toward the international community and the United States of America. The facts speak for themselves:

When Iraq invaded its neighbor Iran in 1980, the ensuing eight year war saw over one million casualties;

Just ten years later, Iraq's brutal invasion of Kuwait in August 1990 was followed by the detention and use of foreign nationals as human shields, the torture of Kuwaiti citizens and coalition servicemen including Americans;

A year after the close of the Persian Gulf War, the Iraqi regime plotted a foiled assassination attempt on President George H. W. Bush during his visit to Kuwait in 1993; and

International coalition warplanes patrolling and enforcing the UN designated "no-fly zones" over Iraq—zones agreed to by the Iraqi regime—have continuously and repeatedly come under attack from Iraqi anti-aircraft installations.

But most troubling is Iraq's capability and capacity to use weapons of mass destruction:

45,000 Iranians were killed when Iraq used chemical weapons during the Iran-Iraq War;

5,000 Kurdish civilians were killed and another 7,000 injured when Saddam Hussein used chemical weapons on his own people in 1988; and

Iraq again threatened to use chemical weapons against international coalition forces during the Persian Gulf War.

Saddam Hussein is a ruthless and evil dictator of a regime that has again and again shown no respect for international norms and the rule of law, or respect for human life—just like those terrorists responsible for the murder of 3,000 innocent Americans last year. As such, Suddam Hussein is as much a terrorist and a threat to our nation as those directly responsible for last September's heinous acts.

What we know about Saddam Hussein and the Iraqi regime is unquestionably troubling, and as President Bush said, what we don't know is even more so. His continued research and development of chemical weapons and other weapons of mass destruction—the extent of which is unknown due to his flagrant violation of international mandates—is a tremendous threat to the security of this nation and must be stopped.

The power to declare war and authorize the use of military force is one of the most significant powers the Constitution gives this body. It is a responsibility that every Member of Congress takes very seriously, and there is no more difficult decision that we can make than to choose to send our military into action. Ensuing the security of this nation and the safety of her citizens is also a responsibility that I and the other members of this body take very seriously, and that is why I will vote in support of this resolution. I know that President Bush shares this concern for the security of this nation, and I have the utmost confidence that he will continue to demonstrate the leadership necessary to protect this nation, just as he has in our war on terrorism.

I urge passage of this resolution, to give the President the necessary flexibility to provide for the security of this great nation by authorizing the use of force against Iraq.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY), a member of the House Committee on Education and the Workforce and a real reformer.

(Mr. TIERNEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, as the previous colleague just said, the decision of whether or not to send our young men and women to danger and to possibly kill or harm others is certainly the most solemn and serious decision the Members of Congress will have to make.

There was no ambiguity between Congress and the President with respect to our response to the events of September 11, 2001, but now the issue is how to deal with a nation under control of an undeniably dangerous and treacherous individual, Saddam Hussein.

The administration seeks to go it alone, seeks a resolution that would allow the President alone to decide and determine whether or not it is necessary to attack Iraq. It also seeks authorization to act for reasons beyond Iraq's failure to disarm after inspections. I believe there is a better way, a way recommended by other past commanders and present, names like Admiral Clark, Zinni and others. We should work within the international framework to create a consensus to impose inspections and disarmament and authorize the United States to participate in that U.N. Security Council effort to enforce those inspections and disarmament.

That resolution should also say that if efforts are honestly and diligently pursued and they prove unsuccessful, then the administration should return to Congress for the determination of what appropriate action the United States, and other countries choosing to act with it, should then take.

If Iraq were attacking the United States now, Congress would undoubtedly act with the same speed it did on September 14, 2001. If Iraq were doing that, we would act, but it is not attacking the United States at this point in time.

The administration presents the case that, as the world's remaining superpower, it is justified in using its global military superiority to preempt perceived threats before they occur. We all know that America always knows that it can act to prevent disaster, but elevation of that unilateral preemptive policy to a new norm would mean that any militarily stronger nation may perceive a not-yet-established imminent threat and act preemptively. That would conjure up thoughts of India and Pakistan, Russia and Chechnya, and China and Taiwan.

This would turn decades of international law and norms on their head, years in which the United States was a leader in establishing international entities and laws, just so that nations

would not act presumptuously and attack others, and instead we set up an international system within which differences could be resolved without preemptive attacks being the first resort.

The administration says that Hussein is bad, and no one disagrees, nor do we disagree with the notion that the U.N. resolutions must be enforced by the U.N. Security Council action. The administration, though, asserts that the United States must act peremptorily and right now because Iraq is an imminent threat, but the truth be told, it has not met the burden of proof with respect for that claim.

Yes, Iraq has biological and chemical weapons and has had them for some time. Yes, they may have been trying unsuccessfully to get nuclear capabilities, but we have stopped them from doing that. In fact, the inspections were successful in inhibiting those attempts, and Iraq does not have nuclear capability nor does it have the means to deliver weapons of mass destruction against the United States.

We have kept those materials from Iraq and from terrorists. And the irony is that, while the administration cavalierly talks about a $100 to $200 billion cost of attack and rebuilding Iraq, it fails to come to this body and push for legislation that would be far less costly under the Nunn-Lugar cooperative threat reduction to safeguard weapons of mass destruction materials from getting into the hands of terrorists or Iraq or anyone else; and that simply is the path we should take.

There is currently insufficient evidence of Iraq's complicity with terrorists, and today we learned through declassified CIA reports that Iraq is not likely to use biological/chemical weapons against the United States unless we send people in and provoke it in that region, and a number of reports so indicate.

Given the absence of a direct threat to the United States and the absence of an imminent threat to the United States, we should proceed, but first, the United States, as a founder and a leader of the Security Council, should lead the international council to enforce inspection and disarmament, and we should seek further to get rid of weapons of mass destruction throughout that Middle East region and not stop with just Iraq. We should also use our diplomatic efforts to do that for every country, particularly in that region.

We should also use the time that we would have by going the international route to disclose fully to the United States the cost of action, if it is necessary, in people and in treasuries. As the senior Senator from Massachusetts said, what casualties would there be if we fight in the desert or if we fight door to door in the city or biological/chemical weapons are used on our troops? What will happen with Iraqi civilian victims and what are our intentions to minimize those victims' problems? What about the sacrifice in terms of our economy? What will people be asked to forego in terms of education and health care and prescription drugs and infrastructure and getting people back to work? What about our plans for reoccupying and restabilizing Iraq?

Mr. Speaker, as I close, if we go it alone, how will we deal with maintaining the cooperation of other nations, especially Arab and Muslim countries, and our number one threat of terrorism, should we lose our leadership? Countries look to us for that.

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. JEFF MILLER), a member of the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. JEFF MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, no Member of this body ever wants to put our men and women in harm's way in a war, a war that will undoubtedly cost lives and inflict anxiety on the families of the loved ones who are in harm's way.

My community hosts the Navy's future force in schoolhouses, in the Air Force's current command and wing commands and special operation units. It is these brave men and women who will fight this war.

□ 1545

These are the men and women who will put their lives on the line for us and defend freedom.

I do not question the need for this action. I do not question the risk that is presented. But I do not wish for this war. I wish with all my soul that this monster could be removed from power without firing a single shot. I wish the people of Iraq would rise up and put their lives on the line, as our military personnel will. I wish we did not have to send America's sons and daughters to liberate their sons and daughters from a man who murders his own people. I wish our European partners would see the threat as we do. I wish they would use their tools to unite a common response to Iraq rather than sow the seeds of division seen in the parliaments and personal political campaigns of our allies. But most of all, we see that the world is content to ride our backs to prosperity and to freedom, a weight that we have carried before and, apparently, will carry again.

Mr. Speaker, I know this task must be carried out by the United States of America. We must face this continued threat of terrorism head on, alone, or with our friends. And this position is no different than our position in the past. As leaders of the free world, we have always walked point. Mr. Speaker, we must trust our values, protect our freedom, and let liberty be our guide. This strategy has served us well over the past 200 years, and I can think of no reason to turn our back on it today.

I support the President of the United States, and I support this resolution.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH), a person who has proposed a peace committee; a person who has been a strong advocate against this resolution

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding me this time and for his leadership and his work with all of us here.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday students held a peace rally on the west front of the Capitol. It may have been the first rally on the Capitol grounds in opposition to war with Iraq I attended, and I heard representatives of America's youth asking questions. Why? Why war against the people of Iraq? Why assert military power, which threatens innocent civilians? Why war to settle differences? Why separate our Nation from the world community? Why not give peaceful resolution a chance?

I looked into the eyes of our youth. I looked at their fresh faces, faces hopeful and optimistic yet challenging, asking why. Soon the voices of our youth will be heard across this Nation, and we should pay them heed. They will be heard on campuses, in town halls, and many marches. They will be raised to challenge and to confront senseless violence, mindless war, the death of innocents, the destruction of villages to save villages.

Voices will be lifted up in urgency because the future knows when the place it needs to build could be destroyed. The future knows and is skeptical about promises of peace that are wrapped in fire and brimstone. Our young people opposing war represent a message from the future America, the America that can be, and with the upwardly-spiraling aspirations of millions of Americans of all ages, the America that will be.

The future America works to make nonviolence an organizing principle in our society. The future America works to make war archaic. It is a Nation that lives courageously in peace, working to settle differences at home and abroad, without killing. The future America comprehends the world as an interconnected whole. It understands that changes in transportation, communication, and trades have made people throughout the world neighbors.

The future America believes that each person is sacred, that each person makes a difference, that each choice we make affects others, that an injury to one person is an injury to all, that justice ought to be international, and that vengeance is reserved to the Lord. It is an America where human rights and workers' rights and environmental quality principles are within the arc of the human covenant. It is a Nation where each life is given an opportunity to unfold, where all have access to health care, to higher education, to jobs, and to a secure retirement; where quality of life matters, where people build families, build communities, build an American community of our dreams; where our highest aspirations

light the way to a better Nation and to a better world.

The future America is a Nation which works to sustain life on Earth. It champions protection of the global environment. It works with all nations to abolish nuclear weapons, chemical weapons, and biological weapons. It is a Nation which preserves the heavens for the restless human soul, and it rejects putting weapons in space because it knows that the kingdom that will come from the stars should bring eternal peace and not war. While some voices clamor for war, a future America looks for deeper unity of all people worldwide and seeks not empire but harmony.

So to you, young America protesting this war, I sing a hymn of praise. Because while some may want to send you marching off to fight yesterday's wars, you are advancing from the future, reminding us that our Nation has a higher calling, reminding us of an America that can be, reminding us that there has to be a better way, reminding us to find that better way, joining with us to make straight the path of democracy.

This is a time for caution as we would face war; but it is also a cause for joy, because the same revelry that sounds a battle cry and clangs the toxins of war brings forth legions of others enlisted in a holy cause to relight the lamp of freedom in our own land. So come forth young and old, prepare for America's future.

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), a member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. GOODLATTE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

On the eve of potential military action abroad, I am reminded of President Reagan's speech before the British House of Commons when he said, ''If history teaches anything, it teaches self-delusion in the face of unpleasant facts is folly.'' Reagan was speaking to a people who knew well the ravages of war and the terrible price of appeasement.

Churchill called World War II the unnecessary war. He did not mean that it was unnecessary to rise to the occasion and defeat Nazism, he meant that had we taken early notice of Hitler's clearly stated intentions rather than naively drifting through the 1930s, a world war may not have been necessary. Weary of conflict, some of the allies adopted a policy of peace at any price, but no peace that a freedom-loving people could tolerate.

While the circumstances are different, there are lessons to be drawn from the annals of history. Just because we ignore evil does not mean that it ceases to exist. Appeasement invites aggression. Dictators, tyrants and megalomaniacs should not be trusted.

Saddam Hussein has used weapons of bioterror against his own countrymen. He has committed genocide, killing between 50,000 and 100,000 people in northern Iraq. His regime is responsible for widespread human rights abuses, including imprisonment, executions, torture and rape. Just in the past 12 years, he has invaded Kuwait, he has launched ballistic missiles at Israel, Saudi Arabia, Bahrain, and previously at Iran.

Following the Gulf War, he arrogantly defied the international community, violating sanctions and continued in the development of weapons of mass destruction while evading international inspectors. His regime has violated 16 U.N. resolutions devoid of consequences.

Most ominously, in the wake of the September 11 terrorists' attacks, Saddam has quantifiable links to known terrorists. Iraq and al Qaeda have had high-level contacts stretching back a decade.

We know based on intelligence reports and satellite photos that Saddam is acquiring weapons of mass destruction. He possesses stockpiles of biological and chemical weapons, and he is aggressively seeking nuclear weapons. Every weapon he possesses is a violation of the Gulf War truce. A crazed man in possession of these instruments of death is a frightening prospect, indeed.

Had Saddam possessed nuclear capabilities at the time of the Gulf War, we may not have gone into Kuwait. Should he acquire nuclear capabilities, his aggressions would be virtually unchecked. Deterrence can no longer be relied upon.

President Bush was accurate to characterize Saddam as a grave and gathering danger. The President challenged the U.N., calling into question their relevance should they leave unchecked Saddam's blatant disregard for their authority. He consulted Congress and made a case to the American people. The President should continue to push for a U.N. resolution with uncompromising and immediate requirements for the Iraqi regime, thereby rejecting the tried course of empty diplomacy, fruitless inspections, and failed containment.

Americans looked on in horror as the events of September 11 unfolded. At the end of the day, the skyline of one of our greatest cities was forever changed; the Pentagon, a symbol of America's military might, was still smoldering; and a previously indistinguishable field in western Pennsylvania had suddenly and terribly become an unmarked grave for America's newest heroes.

In the aftermath, Americans have been asking questions, some of which we may never have satisfying answers to. But today we know that a sworn enemy is pursuing weapons of mass destruction. It is incumbent upon the free world, led by the United States, to dismantle these destructive capabilities. We have before us a resolution which will authorize, if necessary, the use of America's military to enforce the demands of the U.N. Security Council.

There is no greater responsibility for us as elected officials than to provide for the common defense of our fellow countrymen. In voting for this resolution, we send a message to a tyrant that he should not rest easy; that those who would venture to strike at our Nation will encounter consequences. We send a message to the Iraqi people that the world has not forgotten them and their suffering at the hands of a madman. We send a message to the world community that we are unified as a Nation; that the President possesses the full faith and backing of this distinguished body; that we are committed to defending the liberties which are the very foundation of our Republic; and that we are steadfast in our resolve in the war on terror.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON), the conscience of the Congress on the issue of finding lost children.

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard many times over the course of yesterday and today that this is the most important vote that we will be asked to make in our service in Congress. And I, as all the rest of my colleagues, take it very seriously.

There is absolutely no doubt in my mind that Saddam Hussein poses a clear danger to the United States and to the world and he must be dealt with quickly and decisively.

□ 1600

It is my hope that this resolution will send a message to Saddam Hussein that America means business, and in return we will hear that U.N. inspectors will be granted unfettered access to any location deemed necessary with no exceptions.

I am pleased that the House leadership listened to the concerns of Members of both parties and developed a bipartisan resolution that does not give blanket approval to the President to carry this battle across the globe without consulting the American people, Congress, or our allies. I am also pleased that the President is continuing to enlist the support of other nations and that our action will not be unilateral.

The intent of Congress must be clear that this is not an endorsement of a foreign policy of preemptive strikes, but instead a resolution authorizing the President to take specific action against a specific, demonstrated threat, Saddam Hussein.

Action against Saddam Hussein is not a preemptive strike, it is a response to Saddam Hussein's blatant attacks, ranging from firing on our aircraft to the attempted assassination of

a former President. Foreign policy is not an exact science. What we as Members of Congress must do is weigh the evidence and at some point we must trust the President, Colin Powell, Condoleezza Rice and others in the administration to use this resolution as a tool, not just as a club.

After countless hours of briefings, soul searching and prayer, I am confident that this is our best course of action. I ask our President that, as I reach across this aisle to support him on this resolution, I must express in the strongest possible terms my disappointment with the President's handling of our economy. It is a disaster. Layoffs are occurring as we speak. The stock market is in a ditch, and the people of the 9th Congressional District of Texas and in this Nation are concerned for their family's future. There is a growing concern that the administration is asleep at the wheel on domestic issues.

This cannot continue. Just as I have reached across the aisle to support the President on foreign policy, I am urging the President to reach back across this aisle to help me and my colleagues address the economic problems facing this Nation, because that, too, poses a clear and present danger to the United States of America.

God bless America and all of the peoples of this world.

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN), a member of the Committee on Government Reform.

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, last night the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) gave a very fine statement on this matter.

In his remarks, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) quoted the book ''The Threatening Storm'' by Kenneth Pollack, who served as the Clinton administration's expert on Iraq. This quotation cuts to the very heart of this debate by laying out the horrific nature of Saddam Hussein.

It paints a picture that no civilized person can find acceptable: the torture of children, the rape of women, the fiendish maiming of opponents, the gassing of entire Kurdish villages to spread terror.

Mr. Speaker, these crimes are well documented. We have eyewitness accounts, news photographs and videotapes of gas attacks against the Kurdish villages. We have first-person testimony on Saddam Hussein's reign of terror within Iraq. It is estimated that Saddam Hussein has murdered more than 200,000 of his own countrymen, generals and relatives included.

Given his record of brutality, there should be no question what Saddam Hussein will do once he obtains nuclear weapons. We must face squarely the true nature of this tyrant. We must act to deal with the threat he poses.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to vote for this resolution. It is the right thing for America and humanity.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), a member of the Committee on the Judiciary and a member of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

(Ms. LOFGREN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, should Congress authorize the President to use the Armed Forces of the United States to attack Iraq? The President is asking us to pass this resolution now, but he has not yet made the case for war.

I cannot support the President's request that we authorize military force against Iraq. I make this very difficult decision for three important reasons: The United States is not acting in self-defense or from an imminent threat from Iraq, the United States should not be pursuing unilateral action without international support, and the President has not stated an exit strategy.

I believe there are times when countries must resort to war, and indeed international law recognizes the rights of nations to defend themselves. I strongly support our campaign against terrorism. But are we voting this week on a case of self-defense? It would certainly be self-defense if Iraq supported the al Qaeda attack on September 11, but the evidence of such support is lacking.

I have listened to the administration and met with top officials. I have yet to see any credible evidence that Iraq is connected with al Qaeda. The experts readily admit that there is no real connection.

I can believe that Iraq is a threat to the region and to some American interests overseas, but I do not believe the threat is imminent or must be handled with a unilateral military strike.

The President is now choosing a new and dangerous policy, the America Strikes First Doctrine, when he argues we can attack any time we feel threatened.

I am the mother of a 17-year-old son. Maybe that is why I understand when mothers ask me about Iraq. A life lost to save America is a stinging pain that will always be with a Gold Star Mother. But the knowledge that the loss was necessary to protect the home of the brave and the land of the free gives both comfort and cause.

Is America prepared to sacrifice lives when the cause is not to defend America but to start a war unilaterally without a threat? I have not heard the American people say so.

We would be having a far different debate had President Bush come to Congress leading the world community and the United Nations or NATO. As of this moment, Great Britain is the only other nation dedicated to military action with us in Iraq. When even Canada is not prepared to march by our side, we have cause to pause and reflect. The United States should be leading the world, working with the world community to resolve an international issue. We should be here, Mr. Speaker, debating a resolution because all other efforts have failed. Sadly, we are here discussing an end result with no end game in mind.

This resolution is an unwise step for America that will in the end weaken America. We are at our best when we are first among allies, standing tall for the free world. Let us be at our best when we deal with Iraq.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I will not vote to authorize the President to carry out a unilateral and costly ground war against Iraq.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, first, I would like to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) for his tremendous leadership in bringing this resolution to the floor. In addition, I would like to commend President Bush for providing courageous leadership during this time of national crisis.

As America continues to wage a world war against terrorism, the time has come to weigh the dangers of confrontation against the risks of inaction.

A year ago on September 11, the United States, our people, and our institutions were attacked. That day the war began. I respond to those of my colleagues posing the question: Where is the imminent threat? Why must we confront Iraq now? I ask simply: How many more innocent Americans must die in order for the threat to be imminent?

We face an enemy that will stop at nothing to kill Americans, including taking their own lives. This enemy could not survive without the state sponsorship it receives from Saddam Hussein, an oppressive dictator who is a sworn enemy of the United States. In order to win the war on terror, we must effect a regime change in Baghdad.

As we consider the resolution before us, we must consider two fundamental questions: Does Saddam Hussein have the desire to harm the United States of America? And does Saddam Hussein have the ability to carry out that objective?

In answering the first question, we must be mindful that he has aligned his regime with the world's most unsavory characters who continue to seek the destruction of freedom and democracy around the world. He has openly praised the attacks of September 11, attempted to assassinate a former U.S. President, and directly ordered acts of terror against innocent civilians. Our national security requires us to conclude that he aims to threaten the lives of American citizens.

Saddam Hussein is an oppressive tyrant who, with each passing day, increases his ability to terrorize the world with the most destructive weapons known to man. He currently has chemical and biological weapons and is actively pursuing a nuclear capability. The accumulation of these weapons is

transforming Saddam Hussein from a regional threat into a global menace. Whether we act to prevent him from acquiring such weapons, or act to prevent him from using them once he has them, action is required.

Although the United States is a peace-loving Nation, there will never be peace and security so long as Saddam Hussein is in power. Effecting a regime change and liberating the people of Iraq is the official policy of the United States Government. President Bush has demonstrated a willingness to pursue peace, yet he must also have the authority to present Saddam Hussein with the absolute certainty that the full force of the United States military is ready to act.

This resolution gives the President this necessary authority, and I wholeheartedly urge its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER).

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, we confront in this Chamber today a decision of utmost gravity, to authorize the President to use military force if necessary to remove the threat of chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons from the hands of Saddam Hussein.

To risk the lives of our sons and daughters for this cause burdens the hearts and minds of every Member of Congress. For the past several weeks, we have weighed this decision in the balance. People of goodwill have had their differences of opinion. We know that military action by its nature is an assumption of risk, risk to the lives and safety of our military forces, risk of outcome and duration of battle, and risk of economic and political dislocations.

In spite of these dangers, the greatest danger is to do nothing. The failure to act will leave an international outlaw undeterred and will sacrifice a freedom that President Franklin Roosevelt called fundamental, the freedom from fear.

On a clear autumn morning on September 11 we were awakened to the reality of a new and growing threat to our security. We saw all too vividly how vulnerable our Nation can be to unconventional warfare. We were forced to face the stark reality that an international terrorist organization named al Qaeda exists and is dedicated to the destruction of America and our way of life.

Our time-honored policy of security through deterrence backed by our overwhelming military superiority is no longer sufficient to protect our Nation from a weapon of mass destruction in the hands of a single terrorist on a suicide mission.

Opinions differ on the question of whether Saddam Hussein will engage in a terrorist act against our Nation or place weapons of mass destruction in the hands of terrorists, but there is no debate that the motive and the means are present; and, in my judgment, the threat is unacceptable.

Much of what we know, we have known for a long time. We know Saddam Hussein has developed biological weapons. We know that Saddam has developed chemical weapons. We know that he has used them in war and against helpless civilians, and we know that he is working feverishly to acquire nuclear weapons. We know he has launched ballistic missiles at his neighboring countries of Bahrain, Saudi Arabia, Iran and Israel; and he continues to develop missiles that can hit American bases. We know he invaded Iran in 1980, causing the deaths of over 1 million people.

□ 1615

We know he invaded Kuwait in 1990 and ordered the torture and murder of tens of thousands of civilians. We know this man and we know his works. He has the capability and he has the motive to bring great harm to our Nation. We have been at war with him for over 10 years. His hatred for the United States has no limits, and his cruelty and atrocities committed against his own people, his closest associates, and even his family leave no room to doubt his murderous nature.

For 10 years the United Nations Security Council passed resolutions to open Iraq to weapons inspectors, to disarm Saddam, to take away his weapons of mass destruction. For 10 years he has avoided, evaded, and escaped the rules we tried to use to secure the peace. Saddam Hussein is in material breach of international law.

Mr. Speaker, knowing these things to be true, to protect our homeland, to take weapons of mass destruction out of the hands of a tyrant, and to uphold the rule of law, I support the President in his request for authorization to use force, if necessary, to accomplish these goals in Iraq. Saddam Hussein is an international outlaw who is a clear and present danger to our country, and time is not on our side. To meet this threat, we will work with the United Nations, but we will not wait for the United Nations. We do not seek war, and the best way to avoid it is to be clear with our intent and be prepared to act. Saddam must have no doubt about our course. He can disarm or his days are numbered.

Some have suggested that we adopt a two-step resolution that would assure our allies that we seek U.N. approval; and if approval is denied, the President would seek a second resolution from this Congress authorizing the use of unilateral force. This could weaken our President's hand in the effort to secure Security Council support and work contrary to our very interest of securing multilateral cooperation. If the U.N. declined to act and then we had a subsequent resolution on this floor, we would be in a position that we all seek to avoid; and in addition, a two-step resolution would detract from the effort to send a clear message to Saddam to give up his weapons of mass destruction without delay.

The quest for America's security in the 21st century begins with us. The Bible tells us to whom much has been given, much is required. Our duty and our responsibility to future generations of Americans leave us no option but to act with resolve, with courage, and the will to win.

America is a special place. God has blessed us beyond measure; and while a few pursue hatred and destruction and can bring us harm, there are millions every day who seek to come to this land of promise because we stand for peace, for justice, and for democracy.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS).

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, the value of this resolution is cast in a way that its failure to be enacted by this Congress would make havoc reign in the House of Representatives. What do I mean by that? If we should fail to adopt this resolution and some new terror strike visits our land and kills more of our people, God forbid, then we will be rushing back to this floor. Remember now, if this resolution fails, we will be rushing back to this floor eager to give new powers to the President to do something about the new terror attack. That is what the value of this resolution is.

We are preparing the President, we are preparing the Congress of the United States, we are preparing the people of the United States, and more vitally we are preparing the Armed Forces of the United States in a stalwart resolution which outlines the resolve of the United States to prepare for any kind of action that might be required not just to stabilize the region in which Iraq lies but also to stabilize the entire civilized world with respect to the threat and fear of terror.

And so if we forget everything else about what the resolution may do, if we recognize that our national security is the matter that atmospheres across every single word of the resolution, then we have additional rationale for adopting the resolution. The Armed Forces always look to the Commander in Chief for guidance, for leadership, as they will within this case; but they also look to see are the people of the United States, our people, our families, our neighborhoods at home, are they backing us? Are they supporting us? This resolution crosses through all the lines of communication right to the barracks of our Armed Forces and gives indication to them that the people of the United States, the people they are sworn to serve and for whom they would risk their life and limb that they are behind their actions.

I remember as a member of the Armed Forces myself in our own company that the words of the then-Commander in Chief were very important to us as to where and what direction we should go and whether or not the whole

thing was worth it; it is to the Armed Forces once they know that this resolution will pass and will guide them, in the words of the Commander in Chief, in the interest of national security.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA), member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce and a diligent fighter for Hispanic-serving institutions to increase funding.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to House Joint Resolution 114, giving authorization for military force against Iraq. I am determined to convince my colleagues to pass the substitute amendment that will be offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT). I agree with my colleague that the resolution reported by the Committee on International Relations authorizing the use of force against Iraq is an amendment and an improvement over the original House draft; and, yes, I also agree with him that we must limit the broad authority it grants to our President.

While no one in this House believes that Saddam Hussein should be allowed to develop weapons of mass destruction, my fellow colleagues should see the need to encourage the President to persist in his efforts to obtain Security Council approval for any action taken against Iraq. The President should also be required to seek a Security Council resolution mandating a new and tougher round of arms inspection.

When the Gulf War ended, Iraq agreed to destroy all of its chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons; and, yes, Iraq should be held to that commitment. The safety of America and the world depends on Iraq's compliance with the United Nations resolutions. Because the Spratt substitute would call on the United Nations to approve the use of force, if necessary, to ensure that Iraq meets its obligations to disarm, the United Nations Security Council's approval of action in Iraq would provide several crucial benefits. It would encourage all allies to fall in line and support our efforts. It would allow moderate Arab states to use the council's approval as a guide to support our troops' presence in Iraq, consequently enhancing the chances of post-war democracy and economic success in Iraq. If Saddam Hussein's regime is toppled, a new government will have to be formed to revive Iraq's economy and bring together the various ethnic factions to form a viable government.

Nation-building should be the work of the United Nations, not the U.S. military. As I have said, U.N. approval of our efforts would improve our ties with our allies, both European and Arab, and would likely lead to a fledgling, yet strong, democracy. If the United Nations decides not to impose additional sanctions or to cooperate, then America should take unilateral action against Iraq within the guidelines of the Constitution.

Everyone in this Congress has sworn to uphold the Constitution. It was in 1787 that the founders of our country gave Congress, not the President, the power and the responsibility of declaring war and sending American troops oversees. The Spratt substitute would require the President to come to Congress and ask for the support through an expedited process after it is determined that the United Nations will not act. I think this is the appropriate manner in which to conduct such a serious endeavor as another war. We need to remind ourselves that we are not just entering and referring to a congressional resolution, we are talking about the potential loss of American troops and the lives of civilian Iraqis.

Life is too precious a gift to grant such broad powers even to our President without a thorough discourse with the United Nations or with the United States Congress. I do not question our President's authority to protect our national security. I am asking that our President work through the United Nations and consult Congress prior to engaging in what will become a serious international conflict.

In closing, over the last few weeks I have talked to many of my constituents from all walks of life: farmers, ranchers, veterans, educators, parents, students, doctors, businessmen, and businesswomen. I have listened carefully to all of their views and concerns; and as a result, I will vote against House Joint Resolution 114. I respectfully urge my colleagues to support the Spratt amendment.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER).

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution because it provides an opportunity for peace through diplomacy while preserving the President's flexibility to engage the full force of our military to protect national security. The resolution before us does not preordain a path for our President to choose. Rather, this resolution provides the President with all possible options.

Enacting the resolution does not mean that an attack is imminent. It does mean that an escalation of our current military conflict with Iraq is a real possibility. Enacting this resolution does not mean that the President will stop pursuing diplomatic and peaceful means to a solution. It does mean that there can be consequences to continued inaction by the Iraqi regime. Enacting this resolution will show the world, our traditional allies, our potential allies, the Iraqi people, and most importantly Saddam Hussein, that the United States speaks with one voice in our determination to bring peace and stability to the world.

The resolution references the continuing threat posed by Iraq. Make no mistake, this threat is real and it is growing. It is not just that Saddam Hussein has weapons of mass destruction, Mr. Speaker. He has used them. He used them against Iran. He used chemical weapons against his country's own people, the Kurds of northern Iraq. And we have to ask ourselves this question, Mr. Speaker: Since Saddam Hussein has no greater opponent than the United States and our people and since he continues to develop more and more weapons, where will he use them next?

In the aftermath of September 11, 2001, countless voices asked this question: Did we do everything we could do to prevent this tragedy? To answer that question in the world that exists today, in a world in which an enemy can inflict damage with an army of one, we must be willing to change fundamentally our security strategy by accepting that intervention is a necessary part of protecting our safety.

With the passage of this resolution, Mr. Speaker, Saddam Hussein will be able to choose his destiny. Either Saddam Hussein's regime must change the way it acts or the regime itself must change.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. LUCAS).

Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution before us. This is one of the most important votes I ever expect to cast on this House floor, and I make it after much serious thought and deliberation.

The events of the past year have affected every single person in America. Our lives will never be the same. The terrorists on September 11 tried to break the spirit of America, but they failed. The spirit of our Nation is unbreakable and unwaivering. As a Nation, we will work together to fight the war on terrorism, to preserve our own lives and the lives of our peace-loving friends all around the world.

□ 1630

During his address to the United Nations on September 12, and again on Tuesday in Cincinnati, the President outlined a powerful case as to why pursuing regime changes by military means, if necessary, in Iraq, is in the vital national interests of America and all freedom-loving people everywhere. I feel that the President provided a clear and compelling case that will lead to broad international support of our objectives.

The President told us that Iraq possesses the physical infrastructure required to build nuclear weapons and maintains stockpiles of chemical and biological agents for the purpose of killing literally thousands of people. U.N. inspectors have stated that they believe Iraq has produced as much as four times the amount of biological agents it claims to possess and has failed to account for more than three metric tons of material that could be used to produce biological weapons. Along with this threat, Iraq possesses a

force of SKUD-type missiles with ranges beyond the 94-mile limit permitted by the U.N. resolutions.

Last week, I stood with the President and congressional leadership in the White House Rose Garden in support of this resolution authorizing the use of force against Iraq, and I am proud to rise to the support of that resolution today. All the while, I fervently hope and pray that force will not be necessary. However, I strongly believe that American foreign policy, especially with regard to eradicating weapons of mass destruction and terrorism, must be a top priority.

Our actions do not come without sacrifice or consequence; and I want to personally recognize our young men and women, these brave young men and women who are currently engaged in the war on terrorism and who may be called to service in Iraq. As a parent, I know firsthand the sacrifice that military personnel and their families are making.

I was a pilot in the Air Force, and nothing made my wife Mary and me more proud than our son Lance as he served his country as an Air Force pilot in the Desert Storm conflict. We know firsthand what it is like to have a loved one in harm's way.

However, once again, America is forced to defend herself against forces that do not respect human life, freedom or the American way.

We cannot wait until Saddam Hussein or one of his terrorist allies strikes first. We cannot let another horrific event like September 11 happen again while we stand idly by.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all my colleagues to join with me in support of this important resolution.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 5011, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATION ACT, 2003

Mr. HOBSON submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 5011) making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2003, and for other purposes.

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 107–731)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5011) ''making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2003, and for other purposes,'' having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert:

That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure functions administered by the Department of Defense, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2003, and for other purposes, namely:

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY

(INCLUDING RESCISSION)

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, facilities, and real property for the Army as currently authorized by law, including personnel in the Army Corps of Engineers and other personal services necessary for the purposes of this appropriation, and for construction and operation of facilities in support of the functions of the Commander in Chief, $1,683,710,000, to remain available until September 30, 2007: Provided, That of this amount, not to exceed $163,135,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, architect and engineer services, and host nation support, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of his determination and the reasons therefor: Provided further, That of the funds appropriated for ''Military Construction, Army'' in previous Military Construction Appropriation Acts, $49,376,000 are rescinded.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVY

(INCLUDING RESCISSION)

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, naval installations, facilities, and real property for the Navy as currently authorized by law, including personnel in the Naval Facilities Engineering Command and other personal services necessary for the purposes of this appropriation, $1,305,128,000, to remain available until September 30, 2007: Provided, That of this amount, not to exceed $87,043,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of his determination and the reasons therefor: Provided further, That of the funds appropriated for ''Military Construction, Navy'' in previous Military Construction Appropriation Acts, $1,340,000 are rescinded.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

(INCLUDING RESCISSION)

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, facilities, and real property for the Air Force as currently authorized by law, $1,080,247,000, to remain available until September 30, 2007: Provided, That of this amount, not to exceed $72,283,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of his determination and the reasons therefor: Provided further, That of the funds appropriated for ''Military Construction, Air Force'' in previous Military Construction Appropriation Acts, $13,281,000 are rescinded.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, DEFENSE-WIDE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER AND RESCISSION OF FUNDS)

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, installations, facilities, and real property for activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments), as currently authorized by law, $874,645,000, to remain available until September 30, 2007: Provided, That such amounts of this appropriation as may be determined by the Secretary of Defense may be transferred to such appropriations of the Department of Defense available for military construction or family housing as he may designate, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes, and for the same time period, as the appropriation or fund to which transferred: Provided further, That of the amount appropriated, not to exceed $50,432,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of his determination and the reasons therefor: Provided further, That of the funds appropriated for ''Military Construction, Defense-wide'' in previous Military Construction Appropriation Acts, $2,976,000 are rescinded.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Army National Guard, and contributions therefor, as authorized by chapter 1803 of title 10, United States Code, and Military Construction Authorization Acts, $241,377,000, to remain available until September 30, 2007.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Air National Guard, and contributions therefor, as authorized by chapter 1803 of title 10, United States Code, and Military Construction Authorization Acts, $203,813,000, to remain available until September 30, 2007.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY RESERVE

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Army Reserve as authorized by chapter 1803 of title 10, United States Code, and Military Construction Authorization Acts, $100,554,000, to remain available until September 30, 2007.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVAL RESERVE

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the reserve components of the Navy and Marine Corps as authorized by chapter 1803 of title 10, United States Code, and Military Construction Authorization Acts, $74,921,000, to remain available until September 30, 2007.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE RESERVE

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Air Force Reserve as authorized by chapter 1803 of title 10, United States Code, and Military Construction Authorization Acts, $67,226,000, to remain available until September 30, 2007.

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM

For the United States share of the cost of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program for the acquisition and construction of military facilities and installations (including international military headquarters) and for related expenses for the collective defense of the North Atlantic Treaty Area as authorized in Military Construction Authorization Acts and section 2806 of title 10, United States Code, $167,200,000, to remain available until expended.

FAMILY HOUSING CONSTRUCTION, ARMY

(INCLUDING RESCISSION)

For expenses of family housing for the Army for construction, including acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension and alteration, as authorized by law, $280,356,000, to remain available until September 30, 2007: Provided, That of the funds appropriated for ''Family Housing Construction, Army'' in previous Military Construction Appropriation Acts, $4,920,000 are rescinded.

FAMILY HOUSING OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

For expenses of family housing for the Army for operation and maintenance, including debt payment, leasing, minor construction, principal and interest charges, and insurance premiums, as authorized by law, $1,106,007,000.

FAMILY HOUSING CONSTRUCTION, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

(INCLUDING RESCISSION)

For expenses of family housing for the Navy and Marine Corps for construction, including acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension and alteration, as authorized by law, $376,468,000, to remain available until September 30, 2007: Provided, That of the funds appropriated for ''Family Housing Construction, Navy and Marine Corps'' in previous Military Construction Appropriation Acts, $2,652,000 are rescinded.

FAMILY HOUSING OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

For expenses of family housing for the Navy and Marine Corps for operation and maintenance, including debt payment, leasing, minor construction, principal and interest charges, and insurance premiums, as authorized by law, $861,788,000.

FAMILY HOUSING CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

(INCLUDING RESCISSION)

For expenses of family housing for the Air Force for construction, including acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension and alteration, as authorized by law, $684,824,000, to remain available until September 30, 2007: Provided, That of the funds appropriated for ''Family Housing Construction, Air Force'' in previous Military Construction Appropriation Acts, $8,782,000 are rescinded.

FAMILY HOUSING OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

For expenses of family housing for the Air Force for operation and maintenance, including debt payment, leasing, minor construction, principal and interest charges, and insurance premiums, as authorized by law, $863,050,000.

FAMILY HOUSING CONSTRUCTION, DEFENSE-WIDE

For expenses of family housing for the activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments) for construction, including acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension and alteration, as authorized by law, $5,480,000, to remain available until September 30, 2007.

FAMILY HOUSING OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE

For expenses of family housing for the activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments) for operation and maintenance, leasing, and minor construction, as authorized by law, $42,395,000.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FAMILY HOUSING IMPROVEMENT FUND

For the Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund, $2,000,000, to remain available until expended, for family housing initiatives undertaken pursuant to section 2883 of title 10, United States Code, providing alternative means of acquiring and improving military family housing, and supporting facilities.

BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACCOUNT

For deposit into the Department of Defense Base Closure Account 1990 established by section 2906(a)(1) of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1991 (Public Law 101–510), $561,138,000, to remain available until expended.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 101. None of the funds appropriated in Military Construction Appropriations Acts shall be expended for payments under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract for construction, where cost estimates exceed $25,000, to be performed within the United States, except Alaska, without the specific approval in writing of the Secretary of Defense setting forth the reasons therefor.

SEC. 102. Funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for construction shall be available for hire of passenger motor vehicles.

SEC. 103. Funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for construction may be used for advances to the Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, for the construction of access roads as authorized by section 210 of title 23, United States Code, when projects authorized therein are certified as important to the national defense by the Secretary of Defense.

SEC. 104. None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be used to begin construction of new bases inside the continental United States for which specific appropriations have not been made.

SEC. 105. No part of the funds provided in Military Construction Appropriations Acts shall be used for purchase of land or land easements in excess of 100 percent of the value as determined by the Army Corps of Engineers or the Naval Facilities Engineering Command, except: (1) where there is a determination of value by a Federal court; (2) purchases negotiated by the Attorney General or his designee; (3) where the estimated value is less than $25,000; or (4) as otherwise determined by the Secretary of Defense to be in the public interest.

SEC. 106. None of the funds appropriated in Military Construction Appropriations Acts shall be used to: (1) acquire land; (2) provide for site preparation; or (3) install utilities for any family housing, except housing for which funds have been made available in annual Military Construction Appropriations Acts.

SEC. 107. None of the funds appropriated in Military Construction Appropriations Acts for minor construction may be used to transfer or relocate any activity from one base or installation to another, without prior notification to the Committees on Appropriations.

SEC. 108. No part of the funds appropriated in Military Construction Appropriations Acts may be used for the procurement of steel for any construction project or activity for which American steel producers, fabricators, and manufacturers have been denied the opportunity to compete for such steel procurement.

SEC. 109. None of the funds available to the Department of Defense for military construction or family housing during the current fiscal year may be used to pay real property taxes in any foreign nation.

SEC. 110. None of the funds appropriated in Military Construction Appropriations Acts may be used to initiate a new installation overseas without prior notification to the Committees on Appropriations.

SEC. 111. None of the funds appropriated in Military Construction Appropriations Acts may be obligated for architect and engineer contracts estimated by the Government to exceed $500,000 for projects to be accomplished in Japan, in any NATO member country, or in countries bordering the Arabian Sea, unless such contracts are awarded to United States firms or United States firms in joint venture with host nation firms.

SEC. 112. None of the funds appropriated in Military Construction Appropriations Acts for military construction in the United States territories and possessions in the Pacific and on Kwajalein Atoll, or in countries bordering the Arabian Sea, may be used to award any contract estimated by the Government to exceed $1,000,000 to a foreign contractor: Provided, That this section shall not be applicable to contract awards for which the lowest responsive and responsible bid of a United States contractor exceeds the lowest responsive and responsible bid of a foreign contractor by greater than 20 percent: Provided further, That this section shall not apply to contract awards for military construction on Kwajalein Atoll for which the lowest responsive and responsible bid is submitted by a Marshallese contractor.

SEC. 113. The Secretary of Defense is to inform the appropriate committees of Congress, including the Committees on Appropriations, of the plans and scope of any proposed military exercise involving United States personnel 30 days prior to its occurring, if amounts expended for construction, either temporary or permanent, are anticipated to exceed $100,000.

SEC. 114. Not more than 20 percent of the appropriations in Military Construction Appropriations Acts which are limited for obligation during the current fiscal year shall be obligated during the last 2 months of the fiscal year.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 115. Funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for construction in prior years shall be available for construction authorized for each such military department by the authorizations enacted into law during the current session of Congress.

SEC. 116. For military construction or family housing projects that are being completed with funds otherwise expired or lapsed for obligation, expired or lapsed funds may be used to pay the cost of associated supervision, inspection, overhead, engineering and design on those projects and on subsequent claims, if any.

SEC. 117. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any funds appropriated to a military department or defense agency for the construction of military projects may be obligated for a military construction project or contract, or for any portion of such a project or contract, at any time before the end of the fourth fiscal year after the fiscal year for which funds for such project were appropriated if the funds obligated for such project: (1) are obligated from funds available for military construction projects; and (2) do not exceed the amount appropriated for such project, plus any amount by which the cost of such project is increased pursuant to law.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 118. During the 5-year period after appropriations available to the Department of Defense for military construction and family housing operation and maintenance and construction have expired for obligation, upon a determination that such appropriations will not be necessary for the liquidation of obligations or for making authorized adjustments to such appropriations for obligations incurred during the period of availability of such appropriations, unobligated balances of such appropriations may be transferred into the appropriation ''Foreign Currency Fluctuations, Construction, Defense'' to be merged with and to be available for the same time period and for the same purposes as the appropriation to which transferred.

SEC. 119. The Secretary of Defense is to provide the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives with an annual report by February 15, containing details of the specific actions proposed to be taken by the Department of Defense during the current fiscal year to encourage other member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Japan, Korea, and United States allies bordering the Arabian Sea to assume a greater share of the common defense burden of such nations and the United States.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 120. During the current fiscal year, in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense, proceeds deposited to the Department of Defense Base Closure Account established by section 207(a)(1) of the Defense Authorization Amendments and Base Closure and Realignment Act (Public Law 100–526) pursuant to section 207(a)(2)(C) of such Act, may be transferred to the account established by section 2906(a)(1) of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1991, to be merged with, and to be available for the same purposes and the same time period as that account.

SEC. 121. (a) No funds appropriated pursuant to this Act may be expended by an entity unless the entity agrees that in expending the assistance the entity will comply with sections 2

through 4 of the Act of March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10a–10c, popularly known as the ''Buy American Act'').

(b) No funds made available under this Act shall be made available to any person or entity who has been convicted of violating the Act of March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10a–10c, popularly known as the ''Buy American Act'').

SEC. 122. (a) In the case of any equipment or products that may be authorized to be purchased with financial assistance provided under this Act, it is the sense of the Congress that entities receiving such assistance should, in expending the assistance, purchase only American-made equipment and products.

(b) In providing financial assistance under this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall provide to each recipient of the assistance a notice describing the statement made in subsection (a) by the Congress.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 123. Subject to 30 days prior notification to the Committees on Appropriations, such additional amounts as may be determined by the Secretary of Defense may be transferred to the Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund from amounts appropriated for construction in ''Family Housing'' accounts, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same period of time as amounts appropriated directly to the Fund: Provided, That appropriations made available to the Fund shall be available to cover the costs, as defined in section 502(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, of direct loans or loan guarantees issued by the Department of Defense pursuant to the provisions of subchapter IV of chapter 169, title 10, United States Code, pertaining to alternative means of acquiring and improving military family housing and supporting facilities.

SEC. 124. None of the funds appropriated or made available by this Act may be obligated for Partnership for Peace Programs in the New Independent States of the former Soviet Union.

SEC. 125. (a) Not later than 60 days before issuing any solicitation for a contract with the private sector for military family housing the Secretary of the military department concerned shall submit to the congressional defense committees the notice described in subsection (b).

(b)(1) A notice referred to in subsection (a) is a notice of any guarantee (including the making of mortgage or rental payments) proposed to be made by the Secretary to the private party under the contract involved in the event of—

(A) the closure or realignment of the installation for which housing is provided under the contract;

(B) a reduction in force of units stationed at such installation; or

(C) the extended deployment overseas of units stationed at such installation.

(2) Each notice under this subsection shall specify the nature of the guarantee involved and assess the extent and likelihood, if any, of the liability of the Federal Government with respect to the guarantee.

(c) In this section, the term ''congressional defense committees'' means the following:

(1) The Committee on Armed Services and the Military Construction Subcommittee, Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

(2) The Committee on Armed Services and the Military Construction Subcommittee, Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 126. During the current fiscal year, in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense, amounts may be transferred from the account established by section 2906(a)(1) of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1991, to the fund established by section 1013(d) of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 3374) to pay for expenses associated with the Homeowners Assistance Program. Any amounts transferred shall be merged with and be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the fund to which transferred.

SEC. 127. Notwithstanding this or any other provision of law, funds appropriated in Military Construction Appropriations Acts for operations and maintenance of family housing shall be the exclusive source of funds for repair and maintenance of all family housing units, including general or flag officer quarters: Provided, That not more than $35,000 per unit may be spent annually for the maintenance and repair of any general or flag officer quarters without 30 days advance prior notification to the appropriate committees of Congress, except that an after-the-fact notification shall be submitted if the limitation is exceeded solely due to costs associated with environmental remediation that could not be reasonably anticipated at the time of the budget submission: Provided further, That the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) is to report annually to the Committees on Appropriations all operations and maintenance expenditures for each individual general or flag officer quarters for the prior fiscal year.

SEC. 128. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to use funds received pursuant to section 2601 of title 10, United States Code, for the construction, improvement, repair, and maintenance of the historic residences located at Marine Corps Barracks, 8th and I Streets, Washington, D.C.: Provided, That the Secretary notifies the appropriate committees of Congress 30 days in advance of the intended use of such funds: Provided further, That this section remains effective until September 30, 2004.

SEC. 129. None of the funds made available in this Act may be transferred to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government, except pursuant to a transfer made by, or transfer authority provided in, this Act or any other appropriation Act.

SEC. 130. Amounts appropriated for a military construction project at Camp Kyle, Korea, relating to construction of a physical fitness center, as authorized by section 8160 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2000 (Public Law 106–79; 113 Stat. 1274), shall be available instead for a similar project at Camp Bonifas, Korea.

SEC. 131. (a) REQUESTS FOR FUNDS FOR ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AT BRAC SITES IN FUTURE FISCAL YEARS.—In the budget justification materials submitted to Congress in support of the Department of Defense budget for any fiscal year after fiscal year 2003, the amount requested for environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities in such fiscal year with respect to military installations approved for closure or realignment under the base closure laws shall accurately reflect the anticipated cost of such activities in such fiscal year.

(b) BASE CLOSURE LAWS DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''base closure laws'' means the following:

(1) Section 2687 of title 10, United States Code.

(2) The Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (part A of title XXIX of Public Law 101–510; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note).

(3) Title II of the Defense Authorization Amendments and Base Closure and Realignment Act (Public Law 100–526; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note).

This Act may be cited as the ''Military Construction Appropriation Act, 2003''.

And the Senate agree to the same.

DAVID L. HOBSON,
JAMES T. WALSH,
DAN MILLER,
ROBERT ADERHOLT,
KAY GRANGER,
VIRGIL H. GOODE, Jr.,
JOE SKEEN,
DAVID VITTER,
C.W. BILL YOUNG,
JOHN W. OLVER,
CHET EDWARDS,
SAM FARR,
ALLEN BOYD,
NORMAN D. DICKS,
DAVID R. OBEY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

DIANNE FEINSTEIN,
DANIEL K. INOUYE,
TIM JOHNSON,
MARY L. LANDRIEU,
HARRY REID,
ROBERT C. BYRD,
KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON,
CONRAD BURNS,
LARRY CRAIG,
MIKE DEWINE,
TED STEVENS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5011) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2003, and for other purposes, submit the following joint statement to the House of Representatives and the Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The Senate deleted the entire House bill after the enacting clause and inserted the Senate bill (S. 2709). The conference agreement includes a revised bill.

ITEMS OF GENERAL INTEREST

Matters Addressed by Only One Committee.—The language and allocations set forth in House Report 107–533 and Senate Report 107–202 should be complied with unless specifically addressed to the contrary in the conference report and statement of the managers. Report language included by the House which is not changed by the report of the Senate or the conference, and Senate report language which is not changed by the conference is approved by the committee of conference. The statement of the managers, while repeating some report language for emphasis, does not intend to negate the language referred to above unless expressly provided herein. In cases where the House or the Senate have directed the submission of a report from the Department of Defense, such report is to be submitted to both House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

Foreign Currency Fluctuation Savings.—The conference agreement rescinds funds from the following accounts in the specified amounts to reflect savings from favorable foreign currency fluctuations:

Account	*Amount*
Military Construction, Army	$13,676,000
Military Construction, Navy	1,340,000
Military Construction, Air Force	10,281,000
Military Construction, Defense-wide	2,976,000
Family Housing Construction, Army	4,920,000
Family Housing Construction, Navy and Marine Corps	2,652,000
Family Housing Construction, Air Force	8,782,000
Total	44,627,000

Revised Economic Assumptions.—The conference agreement includes reductions totaling $57,000,000, which result from the Office of Management and Budget's (OMB's) re-estimation of inflation in its mid-session review

of the budget request. The conferees direct the Department to distribute these reductions proportionally against each project and activity in each account as follows:

Account	*Amount*
Military Construction, Army	$8,000,000
Military Construction, Navy	5,000,000
Military Construction, Air Force	5,000,000
Military Construction, Defense-wide	3,000,000
Military Construction, Army National Guard	1,000,000
NATO Security Investment Program	1,000,000
Family Housing Construction, Army	2,000,000
Family Housing Operation and Maintenance, Army	8,000,000
Family Housing Construction, Navy and Marine Corps	3,000,000
Family Housing Operation and Maintenance, Navy and Marine Corps	6,000,000
Family Housing Construction, Air Force	5,000,000
Family Housing Operation and Maintenance, Air Force	6,000,000
Base Realignment and Closure	4,000,000
Total	57,000,000

United States Army South.—In the statement of the managers accompanying the Fiscal Year 2002 Department of Defense Appropriations Act (Public Law 107–117), the conferees directed the Department of the Army to provide information to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations by February 28, 2002, regarding the relocation of the headquarters of U.S. Army South. The Army failed to comply with this direction for several reasons, some of which were not within its control. Nonetheless, the conferees remind the Department of the Army that it expects compliance with specific direction included in committee reports. If the Army is unable to comply with that direction or changes the manner in which the direction is to be implemented, the committees should be given the courtesy of an explanation.

Sustainment, Restoration, and Modernization: Reporting Requirement.—The conferees agree to the following general rules for repairing a facility under operation and maintenance funding:

Components of the facility may be repaired by replacement, and such replacement can be up to current standards or code;

Interior arrangements and restorations may be included as repair, but additions, new facilities, and functional conversions must be performed as military construction projects;

Such projects may be done concurrent with repair projects, as long as the final conjunctively funded project is a complete and usable facility; and

The appropriate Service Secretary shall notify the appropriate Committees 21 days prior to carrying out any repair project with an estimated cost in excess of $7,500,000.

In future budget requests, the Department is directed to provide the sustainment, restoration, and modernization backlog at all installations for which there is a requested construction project. This information is to be provided on the form 1390. In addition, for all troop housing requests, the form 1391 is to show all sustainment, restoration, and modernization conducted in the past two years and future requirements for such housing at the installation.

Family Housing Operation and Maintenance: Financial Management.—The conferees agree to continue the restriction on the transfer of funds between the family housing operation and maintenance accounts. The limitation is ten percent to all primary accounts and subaccounts. Such transfers are to be reported to the appropriate Committees within thirty days of such action.

Erosion Study.—The conferees direct the General Accounting Office to conduct a study of Alaska Native villages affected by flooding and erosion including but not limited to Kaktovik, Barrow, Point Hope, Kivalina, Unalakleet, and Bethel.

The General Accounting Office should consult with the following agencies: (a) the Secretary of the Army to determine: (1) which villages can reasonably be protected through construction of seawalls, rip rap, and other engineered structures and at what cost, and; (2) which villages cannot reasonably be protected and will be required to relocate; (b) the Secretary of the Interior to identify possible relocation sites including federal lands and existing villages; (c) the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to determine the cost of constructing housing and water and sewer systems in relocated villages; (d) the Secretary of Health and Human Services to determine the cost of constructing health facilities in relocated villages; (e) the Secretary of Agriculture to determine the cost of constructing power systems in relocated villages; and (f) the Secretary of Transportation to determine the cost of constructing airports, roads, and dock facilities in relocated villages. This report should be submitted to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations no later than October 1, 2003.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY

(INCLUDING RESCISSION)

The conference agreement appropriates $1,683,710,000 for Military Construction, Army, instead of $1,514,557,000 as proposed by the House and $1,679,212,000 as proposed by the Senate. This amount reflects $8,000,000 in savings that result from the re-estimation of inflation. Within this amount, the conference agreement earmarks $163,135,000 for study, planning, design, architect and engineer services, and host nation support instead of $158,664,000 as proposed by the House and $136,835,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conference agreement rescinds $49,376,000 from funds provided to this account in previous Military Construction Appropriation Acts. The rescission includes $13,676,000 to reflect savings from favorable foreign currency fluctuations as proposed by the Senate. The House bill proposed rescinding these savings in section 128 of the General Provisions. In addition, the rescission includes $5,000,000 from a project that is no longer needed at Fort Bliss in Texas as proposed by the House, and $30,700,000 from three projects that are no longer needed at Fort Buchanan in Puerto Rico.

Kansas—Fort Leavenworth: U.S. Disciplinary Barracks.—The conferees are concerned that the Department of the Army is planning to relinquish its current mission of confining level III military inmates convicted under the Uniformed Code of Military Justice by transferring the mission to the Bureau of Prisons. This decision appears to have been made despite the Army's recent completion of the new maximum security U.S. Disciplinary Barracks at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas. The conferees direct the Army to submit a report to the congressional defense committees no later than December 15, 2002, on the rationale for this proposal as well as the impact a policy change will have on the operation of the new U.S. Disciplinary Barracks at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas.

New Mexico—White Sands Missile Range: Anechoic Chamber.—Of the additional funds provided for planning and design in this account, the conferees direct that not less than $1,000,000 be made available for the planning and design of this facility.

Puerto Rico—Fort Buchanan: Rescission of Funds.—The conferees agree to rescind $30,700,000 from unobligated balances in this account. The National Defense Authorization Act, 2001 (Public Law 106–398) established a construction moratorium in Puerto Rico due to concern over long-term stationing requirements. This moratorium halted three previously appropriated construction projects totaling $30,700,000 at Fort Buchanan in Puerto Rico. As a result of the recent decision to relocate the headquarters of U.S. Army South from Fort Buchanan to Fort Sam Houston, Texas, these projects are no longer needed and the conferees agree to rescind the funds.

Stryker Brigade Combat Team (SBCT) Initiative.—The conference agreement includes $25,000,000 above the budget request to assist in the Army's transformation effort. The Senate proposed $100,000,000 for this initiative. The House did not include a similar proposal. This funding is to support infrastructure requirements relating to fielding of the Stryker Brigade Combat Teams (SBCTs). It is the intent of the conferees that the Army has the discretion to determine how these funds will be allocated in support of transformation, subject to notification to the congressional defense committees 15 days prior to the obligation of these funds.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVY

(INCLUDING RESCISSION)

The conference agreement appropriates $1,305,128,000 for Military Construction, Navy, instead of $1,245,765,000 as proposed by the House and $1,216,643,000 as proposed by the Senate. This amount reflects $5,000,000 in savings that result from the re-estimation of inflation. Within this amount, the conference agreement earmarks $87,043,000 for study, planning, design, architect and engineer services instead of $94,825,000 as proposed by the House and $91,620,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conference agreement rescinds $1,340,000 from funds provided to this account in previous Military Construction Appropriation Acts to reflect savings from favorable foreign currency fluctuations as proposed by the Senate. The House bill proposed rescinding these funds in section 128 of the General Provisions.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

(INCLUDING RESCISSION)

The conference agreement appropriates $1,080,247,000 for Military Construction, Air Force, instead of $964,302,000 as proposed by the House and $1,175,617,000 as proposed by the Senate. This amount reflects $5,000,000 in savings that result from the re-estimation of inflation. Within this amount, the conference agreement earmarks $72,283,000 for study, planning, design, architect and engineer services instead of $78,951,000 as proposed by the House and $87,555,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conference agreement rescinds $13,281,000 from funds provided to this account in previous Military Construction Appropriation Acts. The rescission includes $10,281,000 to reflect savings from favorable foreign currency fluctuations as proposed by the Senate. The House bill proposed rescinding these savings in section 128 of the General Provisions. In addition, the rescission includes $3,000,000 from funds appropriated in Public Law 107–64 for the civil engineer maintenance complex at Osan Air Base in Korea. The Defense Department has informed Congress that this project was canceled due to the U.S.-Korea Land Partnership Plan signed on March 29, 2002.

Air Mobility Modernization Program.—The conference agreement includes $25,000,000 above the budget request to assist in the Air Force's mobility modernization program. The Senate proposed $100,000,000 for this initiative. The House did not include a similar proposal. This funding is to support infrastructure requirements related to the implementation of this program. It is the intent of the conferees that the Air Force has the discretion to determine how these funds will be allocated in support of transformation, subject to notification to the congressional defense committees 15 days prior to the obligation of these funds.

Arizona—Luke Air Force Base: Land Acquisition.—The conferees agree to provide $13,000,000 to be used for a land acquisition to preserve access to the Barry M. Goldwater Range (BMGR), to prevent incompatible land uses and encroachment, and to increase the margin of safety in the Live Ordnance Departure Area (LODA) southwest of Luke Air Force Base.

North Dakota—Minot Air Force Base: Cruise Missile Storage Facility, Phase I.—Although the conferees were able to fund only Phase I of this project due to funding constraints, the conferees recognize the importance of this facility and strongly urge the Air Force to include full funding to complete the project in its fiscal year 2004 budget submission.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, DEFENSE-WIDE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER AND RESCISSION OF FUNDS)

The conference agreement appropriates $874,645,000 for Military Construction, Defense-wide, instead of $901,066,000 as proposed by the House and $927,242,000 as proposed by the Senate. This amount reflects $3,000,000 in savings that result from the re-estimation of inflation. Within this amount, the conference agreement earmarks $50,432,000 for study, planning, design, architect and engineer services instead of $45,432,000 as proposed by the House and $57,789,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conference agreement rescinds $2,976,000 from funds provided to this account in previous Military Construction Appropriation Acts to reflect savings from favorable foreign currency fluctuations as proposed by the Senate. The House bill proposed rescinding these funds in section 128 of the General Provisions.

California—Presidio of Monterey: Medical Clinic Expansion.—The conferees are aware that the current medical clinic located at the Presidio of Monterey, which serves both the Defense Language Institute and the Naval Postgraduate School, must annually turn away 10,000 active duty family members and a large retiree population of 20,000 because of insufficient clinic space for primary care and selected specialty care. This situation is further exacerbated by the increased student enrollment at the Defense Language Institute to meet the language training demands of Operation Enduring Freedom. Therefore, the conferees encourage the Department to make this project a priority and program the requirement within the Future Years Defense Plan.

Chemical Demilitarization.—The conference agreement reduces the budget request for the Ammunition Demilitarization Facility (Phase V) project at Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland by $10,000,000 rather than a general reduction to the chemical demilitarization program as proposed by the Senate. The House did not include a similar reduction. The reduced amount reflects revised facility requirements resulting from the acceleration initiative for the destruction of chemical agents at Aberdeen Proving Ground.

The conferees are pleased with the Army's proposal to accelerate the neutralization of chemical agents and urge the Department of Defense to execute it as quickly as possible. The chemicals stored at these sites create health and environmental hazards.

As a result of revisions to accelerate the chemical demilitarization program, several military construction projects at Aberdeen Proving Ground have been terminated, leaving partially-completed structures. The conferees support the Department of the Army efforts to redesign and complete these partially-constructed buildings to meet other military construction needs. The conferees urge the Department of Defense to reach firm decisions on the re-use of these buildings without further delay. The Department is directed to submit a report to the congressional defense committees no later than December 31, 2002, on plans for re-use of existing and partially-constructed chemical demilitarization buildings at Aberdeen Proving Ground that are not needed as a result of the accelerated program. The conferees encourage the use of available funds to complete planning and design for re-use of the partially-constructed buildings during fiscal year 2003, and urge the Department to include the redesigned projects in the fiscal year 2004 budget submission.

In addition, the conferees agree to delete language proposed by the House and not included by the Senate, that makes $84,400,000 contingent upon the program meeting milestones agreed upon by the Secretary of Defense and the Office of Management and Budget. This language is not necessary and potentially could cause Chemical Weapons Convention Treaty compliance issues.

Energy Conservation Improvement Program.—The conferees agree to reduce this program by $15,000,000 due to substantial prior year unobligated balances.

Texas—Kingsville Naval Air Station: Replace Fuel Farm.—The conferees agree this project should be executed with funds made available for planning and design in this account rather than with funds in the ''Military Construction, Navy'' account, as proposed by the Senate.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

The conference agreement appropriates $241,377,000 for Military Construction, Army National Guard, instead of $159,672,000 as proposed by the House and $208,482,000 as proposed by the Senate. This amount reflects $1,000,000 in savings that result from the re-estimation of inflation.

Indiana—Gary: Army Aviation Support Facility and Readiness Center.—In response to the additional needs of homeland security and the protection of metropolitan areas, the conferees encourage the Army National Guard to include this project in its fiscal year 2004 budget submission.

Iowa—Waterloo: Readiness Center Addition.—Of the funds provided for unspecified minor construction in this account, the conferees urge the Army National Guard to provide $1,388,400 for an addition to the Readiness Center at Waterloo, Iowa.

Mississippi—Tupelo: Army Aviation Support Facility.—Of the amount provided for planning and design in this account, the conferees direct that not less than $891,000 be made available to design this facility instead of $879,000 for design of the Readiness Center at Tupelo, Mississippi as proposed by the House.

Pennsylvania—Fort Indiantown Gap: Multipurpose Training Range.—Of the funds provided for planning and design in this account, the conferees direct that not less than $1,400,000 be made available to design this project.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

The conference agreement appropriates $203,813,000 for Military Construction, Air National Guard, instead of $119,613,000 as proposed by the House and $217,988,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Massachusetts—Otis Air National Guard Base: Fire Crash Rescue Station/Control Tower.—The conferees agree this project should be executed with funds made available for planning and design in this account as proposed by the House rather than with funds in the ''Military Construction, Air Force'' account, as proposed by the Senate.

Minnesota—Duluth International Airport: Aircraft Maintenance Complex and Shops, Phase II.—The conferees were unable to fully fund the final phases of this project due to funding constraints. Mindful of the importance of the facility, the conferees strongly urge the Air National Guard to provide full funding to complete the project in its fiscal year 2004 budget submission.

Ohio—Toledo Express Airport: Replace Logistics Complex.—Of the funds provided for planning and design in this account, the conferees direct that not less than $472,000 be made available for the design of this facility.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY RESERVE

The conference agreement appropriates $100,554,000 for Military Construction, Army Reserve, instead of $99,059,000 as proposed by the House and $66,487,000 as proposed by the Senate.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVAL RESERVE

The conference agreement appropriates $74,921,000 for Military Construction, Naval Reserve, instead of $75,821,000 as proposed by the House and $58,671,000 as proposed by the Senate.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE RESERVE

The conference agreement appropriates $67,226,000 for Military Construction, Air Force Reserve, instead of $75,276,000 as proposed by the House and $58,209,000 as proposed by the Senate.

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM

Due to savings that result from the re-estimation of inflation, the conferees agree to reduce this appropriation from $168,200,000 to $167,200,000.

The conferees agree to clarify Senate report language directing the Department to identify the level of funding anticipated for NATO enlargement and Partnership for Peace. This report should be provided to the Committees on Appropriations no later than June 15, 2003.

FAMILY HOUSING CONSTRUCTION, ARMY

(INCLUDING RESCISSION)

The conference agreement appropriates $280,356,000 for Family Housing Construction, Army, instead of $283,346,000 as proposed by the House and $282,856,000 as proposed by the Senate. This amount reflects $2,000,000 in savings that result from the re-estimation of inflation. The conference agreement rescinds $4,920,000 from funds provided to this account in previous Military Construction Appropriation Acts to reflect savings from favorable foreign currency fluctuations as proposed by the Senate. The House bill proposed rescinding these funds in section 128 of the General Provisions.

Germany-Stuttgart: General Officer Quarters.—In light of the symbolic importance of the Deputy Commander-in-Chief's European Command residence in Stuttgart, the conferees deny the budget request for $990,000 to build the new on-post General Officer Quarters (GOQ). The House proposed to fully fund the project. The Senate proposed to reduce the project by $490,000.

FAMILY HOUSING OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

Due to savings that result from the re-estimation of inflation and a $5,000,000 reduction

for excessive housing privatization consulting costs, the conferees agree to reduce this appropriation from $1,119,007,000 to $1,106,007,000.

FAMILY HOUSING CONSTRUCTION, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

(INCLUDING RESCISSION)

The conference agreement appropriates $376,468,000 for Family Housing Construction, Navy and Marine Corps, instead of $380,268,000 as proposed by the House and $374,468,000 as proposed by the Senate. This amount reflects $3,000,000 in savings that result from the re-estimation of inflation. The conference agreement rescinds $2,652,000 from funds provided to this account in previous Military Construction Appropriation Acts to reflect savings from favorable foreign currency fluctuations. The House bill proposed rescinding these funds in section 128 of the General Provisions.

FAMILY HOUSING OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

Due to savings that result from the re-estimation of inflation, the conferees agree to reduce this appropriation from $867,788,000 to $861,788,000.

FAMILY HOUSING CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

(INCLUDING RESCISSION)

The conference agreement appropriates $684,824,000 for Family Housing Construction, Air Force, instead of $689,824,000 as proposed by the House and $676,694,000 as proposed by the Senate. This amount reflects $5,000,000 in savings that result from the re-estimation of inflation. The conference agreement rescinds $8,782,000 from funds provided to this account in previous Military Construction Appropriation Acts to reflect savings from favorable foreign currency fluctuations as proposed by the Senate. The House bill proposed rescinding these funds in section 128 of the General Provisions.

FAMILY HOUSING OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

Due to savings that result from the re-estimation of inflation and a $5,000,000 reduction for excessive housing privatization consulting costs, the conferees agree to reduce this appropriation from $874,050,000 to $863,050,000.

BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACCOUNT

The conference agreement appropriates $561,138,000 for the Base Realignment and Closure Account, instead of $545,138,000 as proposed by the House and $645,138,000 as proposed by the Senate. This amount reflects $4,000,000 in savings that result from the re-estimation of inflation.

Environmental Cleanup Acceleration Initiative.—The conference agreement includes $20,000,000 above the budget request to accelerate the pace of environmental cleanup at closed or realigned military installations. The Senate proposed $100,000,000 for this initiative. The House did not include a similar proposal. Based on requirements identified by the services, the conferees direct that, of the additional funding provided, $11,000,000 be made available for the Navy, $6,000,000 for the Air Force, and $3,000,000 for the Army.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

The conference agreement includes general provisions (sections 101–120) that were not amended by either the House or Senate in their versions of the bill.

The conference agreement includes a provision, section 121, as proposed by the House, which prohibits the expenditure of funds except in compliance with the Buy American Act. The Senate bill contained no similar provision.

The conference agreement includes a provision, section 122, as proposed by the House, which states the recipients of equipment or products purchased with funds provided in this Act should be notified that they must purchase American-made equipment and products. The Senate bill contained no similar provision.

The conference agreement includes a provision renumbered section 123, as proposed by the Senate, permitting the transfer of funds from Family Housing Construction accounts to the Family Housing Improvement Fund. The House bill contained a similar provision with additional language permitting the transfer of funds from unaccompanied housing projects in the Military Construction accounts to the Family Housing Improvement Fund to support barracks privatization. Without prejudice to the concept, the conferees agree to delete language as proposed by the House allowing the service components to intermingle family housing and unaccompanied housing funds for the purpose of privatizing barracks projects. Rather than authorizing these expenditures, the conferees prefer to wait for policy guidance from the authorizing committees.

Areas of concern, however, are the unknown consequences of co-mingling these funds to the integrity of the audit trail. Specifically, the conferees are concerned that the Department of Defense and Congress must be able to clearly identify and track the financial advantages of privatizing unaccompanied barracks versus the traditional military construction approach. Especially during this pilot program, a merger of family housing and unaccompanied housing funding would not allow for a true comparison. Without that analysis, the Congress will not be able to determine the best approach to provide funds for unaccompanied housing.

The conference agreement includes a provision renumbered section 124, as proposed by the Senate, to prohibit the obligation of funds for Partnership for Peace programs in the New Independent States of the former Soviet Union. The House bill contained no similar provision. The Administration requested eliminating this limitation on providing NATO Security Investment Program (NSIP) funds for non-NATO countries that participate in Partnership for Peace programs. The conferees are concerned that NSIP funds are already oversubscribed and that expanding the scope of the program beyond NATO membership would compound an already serious problem. However, the conferees agree that the matter can be re-addressed should the Department have compelling and specific reasons to make NSIP funds available beyond the alliance.

The conference agreement includes a provision renumbered section 125, as proposed by the House and the Senate, which requires the Secretary of Defense to notify Congressional Committees sixty days prior to issuing a solicitation for a contract with the private sector for military family housing.

The conference agreement includes a provision renumbered section 126, as proposed by the Senate, which provides transfer authority from the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) account to the Homeowners Assistance Program. The House bill contained a similar provision with additional language providing transfer authority from the operation and maintenance accounts in the Department of Defense Appropriations Bill to the Homeowners Assistance Program.

The conference agreement includes a provision renumbered section 127, as proposed by the Senate, regarding funding for operation and maintenance of general officer quarters. The House provision did not authorize after-the-fact notification for costs associated with environmental remediation.

The conference agreement includes a provision renumbered section 128, as proposed by the House, authorizing the use of private funds for the construction, improvement, repair, and maintenance of historic residences at 8th and I Marine Barracks in Washington, D.C. The conferees agree to modify the provision by changing the authorization expiration from September 30, 2006 to September 30, 2004. The conferees direct the Secretary of the Navy to submit a report no later than February 28, 2003, outlining: (1) the current status of renovation efforts at 8th and I; (2) the total funds expended to date on renovation efforts (appropriated funds and private funds); (3) the current balance of the Friends of the Home of the Commandant's Fund, Fund activities to date, and future activities planned for the Fund; and (4) the overall projected cost of the renovation efforts at 8th and I.

The conference agreement includes a provision renumbered section 129, as proposed by the House, which limits funds from being transferred from this appropriation measure into any new instrumentality without authority from an appropriation Act. The Senate bill contained no similar provision.

The conference agreement includes a provision renumbered section 130, as proposed by the House, which transfers amounts appropriated for a physical fitness center at Camp Kyle, Korea, to a similar project at Camp Bonifas, Korea. The Senate bill contained no similar provision.

The conference agreement includes a provision renumbered section 131, as proposed by the Senate, which directs the Department of Defense to accurately reflect the cost of environmental remediation activities in its future budget submissions for the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) account. The House bill contained no similar provision.

Those general provisions not included in the conference agreement are as follows:

The conference agreement deletes the House provision rescinding funds from various accounts to reflect savings from favorable foreign currency fluctuations.

The conference agreement deletes the House provision limiting funds from being expended to prepare conveyance documents at the former Fort Ord in California.

The conference agreement deletes the House provision limiting funds provided in this Act from being used to relocate the headquarters of U.S. Army, South.

The conference agreement deletes Senate sections 127 through 131. The projects provided in these provisions were considered within the full scope of projects in conference. Projects included in the conference agreement are provided in the state list accompanying this report.

TITLE I – MILITARY PERSONNEL

The conferees agree to the following amounts for the Military Personnel accounts:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
16250 RECAPITULATION				
16300 MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY	27,079,392	26,832,217	26,939,792	26,855,017
16350 MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY	22,074,901	21,874,395	21,975,201	21,927,628
16400 MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS	8,558,887	8,504,172	8,507,187	8,501,087
16450 MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE	22,142,585	21,957,757	22,036,405	21,981,277
16500 RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY	3,398,555	3,373,455	3,402,055	3,374,355
16550 RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY	1,927,152	1,897,352	1,918,352	1,907,552
16600 RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS	557,883	553,983	554,383	553,983
16650 RESERVE PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE	1,243,904	1,236,904	1,237,504	1,236,904
16700 NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY	5,128,988	5,070,188	5,128,588	5,114,588
16750 NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE	2,135,611	2,124,411	2,126,061	2,125,161
16800 GRAND TOTAL, MILITARY PERSONNEL	94,247,858	93,424,834	93,825,528	93,577,552

MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
50 MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY				
100 ACTIVITY 1: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF OFFICER 150 BASIC PAY	4,138,217	4,138,217	4,138,217	4,138,217
200 RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL	1,133,871	1,133,871	1,133,871	1,133,871
250 DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM ACCRUAL	270,390	270,390	270,390	270,390
350 BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING	832,483	832,483	832,483	832,483
400 BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE	156,455	156,455	156,455	156,455
450 INCENTIVE PAYS	76,694	76,694	76,694	76,694
500 SPECIAL PAYS	218,677	218,677	218,677	218,677
550 ALLOWANCES	65,397	65,397	65,397	65,397
600 SEPARATION PAY	111,690	111,690	85,690	85,690
650 SOCIAL SECURITY TAX	313,641	313,641	313,641	313,641
700 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	7,317,515	7,317,515	7,291,515	7,291,515
750 ACTIVITY 2: PAY AND ALLOW OF ENLISTED PERS 800 BASIC PAY	9,277,977	9,278,940	9,278,940	9,278,940
825 RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL	2,542,166	2,542,430	2,542,430	2,542,430
850 DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM ACCRUAL	1,943,850	1,943,850	1,943,850	1,943,850
1000 BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING	1,474,070	1,474,070	1,474,070	1,474,070
1050 INCENTIVE PAYS	67,866	67,866	67,866	67,866
1100 SPECIAL PAYS	547,812	497,812	531,312	510,812
1150 ALLOWANCES	409,382	409,382	409,382	409,382
1200 SEPARATION PAY	321,423	318,523	318,423	318,423
1250 SOCIAL SECURITY TAX	701,953	702,026	702,026	702,026
1300 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2	17,286,499	17,234,899	17,268,299	17,247,799
1350 ACTIVITY 3: PAY AND ALLOW OF CADETS 1400 ACADEMY CADETS	47,352	47,352	47,352	47,352

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
1500 ACTIVITY 4: SUBSISTENCE OF ENLISTED PERS				
1550 BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE	833,180	833,180	833,180	833,180
1600 SUBSISTENCE-IN-KIND	614,538	614,538	614,538	614,538
1625 FAMILY SUBSISTENCE SUPPLEMENTAL ALLOWANCE	5,198	5,198	5,198	5,198
1650 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4	1,452,916	1,452,916	1,452,916	1,452,916
1700 ACTIVITY 5: PERMANENT CHANGE OF STATION				
1750 ACCESSION TRAVEL	188,434	188,434	188,434	188,434
1800 TRAINING TRAVEL	46,250	46,250	46,250	46,250
1850 OPERATIONAL TRAVEL	179,001	179,001	179,001	179,001
1900 ROTATIONAL TRAVEL	525,754	525,754	525,754	525,754
1950 SEPARATION TRAVEL	152,926	152,926	152,926	152,926
2000 TRAVEL OF ORGANIZED UNITS	1,822	1,822	1,822	1,822
2050 NON-TEMPORARY STORAGE	28,105	28,105	28,105	28,105
2100 TEMPORARY LODGING EXPENSE	20,672	20,672	20,672	20,672
2200 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 5	1,142,964	1,142,964	1,142,964	1,142,964
2250 ACTIVITY 6: OTHER MILITARY PERS COSTS				
2300 APPREHENSION OF MILITARY DESERTERS	611	611	611	611
2350 INTEREST ON UNIFORMED SERVICES SAVINGS	202	202	202	202
2400 DEATH GRATUITIES	3,360	3,360	3,360	3,360
2450 UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS	83,314	77,939	83,314	77,939
2500 SURVIVOR BENEFITS	7,204	7,204	7,204	7,204
2550 EDUCATION BENEFITS	19,163	19,163	19,163	19,163
2575 ADOPTION EXPENSES	252	252	252	252
2600 SPECIAL COMPENSATION FOR SEVERELY DISABLED RETIREES	20,200	---	20,200	20,200
2625 TRANSPORTATION SUBSIDY	2,092	2,092	2,092	2,092
2675 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 6	136,398	110,823	136,398	131,023
2690 LESS REIMBURSABLES	-294,352	-294,352	-294,352	-294,352
2760 UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENT	-9,900	-9,900	-9,900	-9,900
2770 LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS NOT ADOPTED	---	-9,300	---	---
2780 DHP ACCRUAL REESTIMATE	---	-110,700	-101,800	-110,700
2790 UNOBLIGATED BALANCES	---	-50,000	---	-50,000
2800 ADOPTED LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS	---	---	6,400	6,400
2845 TOTAL, MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY	27,079,392	26,832,217	26,939,792	26,855,017

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
2850 MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY				
2900 ACTIVITY 1: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF OFFICER 2950 BASIC PAY	2,887,210	2,887,210	2,887,210	2,887,210
3000 RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL	791,096	791,096	791,096	791,096
3100 DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM ACCRUAL	248,010	248,010	248,010	248,010
3150 BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING	730,451	730,451	730,451	730,451
3200 BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE	109,467	109,467	109,467	109,467
3250 INCENTIVE PAYS	177,881	177,881	177,881	177,881
3300 SPECIAL PAYS	257,016	257,016	257,016	257,016
3350 ALLOWANCES	55,443	55,443	55,443	55,443
3400 SEPARATION PAY	59,069	54,569	40,069	40,069
3450 SOCIAL SECURITY TAX	219,838	219,838	219,838	219,838
3500 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	5,535,481	5,530,981	5,516,481	5,516,481
3550 ACTIVITY 2: PAY AND ALLOW OF ENLISTED PERS 3600 BASIC PAY	7,434,536	7,434,536	7,434,536	7,434,536
3650 RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL	2,037,050	2,037,050	2,037,050	2,037,050
3700 DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM ACCRUAL	1,460,429	1,460,429	1,460,429	1,460,429
3800 BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING	2,075,003	2,075,003	2,075,003	2,075,003
3850 INCENTIVE PAYS	100,889	100,889	100,889	100,889
3900 SPECIAL PAYS	911,110	888,110	906,110	897,110
3950 ALLOWANCES	386,850	386,850	386,850	386,850
4000 SEPARATION PAY	213,869	196,469	213,869	213,869
4050 SOCIAL SECURITY TAX	563,249	563,249	563,249	563,249
4100 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2	15,182,985	15,142,585	15,177,985	15,168,985
4150 ACTIVITY 3: PAY AND ALLOW OF MIDSHIPMEN 4200 MIDSHIPMEN	47,294	47,294	47,294	47,294
4300 ACTIVITY 4: SUBSISTENCE OF ENLISTED PERS 4350 BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE	573,757	573,757	573,757	573,757

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
4400 SUBSISTENCE-IN-KIND	344,595	344,595	344,595	344,595
4425 FAMILY SUBSISTENCE SUPPLEMENTAL ALLOWANCE	2,640	2,640	2,640	2,640
4450 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4	920,992	920,992	920,992	920,992
4500 ACTIVITY 5: PERMANENT CHANGE OF STATION 4550 ACCESSION TRAVEL	64,511	64,511	64,511	64,511
4600 TRAINING TRAVEL	58,287	58,287	58,287	58,287
4650 OPERATIONAL TRAVEL	180,140	180,140	180,140	180,140
4700 ROTATIONAL TRAVEL	268,923	268,923	268,923	268,923
4750 SEPARATION TRAVEL	105,254	105,254	105,254	105,254
4800 TRAVEL OF ORGANIZED UNITS	19,375	19,375	19,375	19,375
4850 NON-TEMPORARY STORAGE	11,390	11,390	11,390	11,390
4900 TEMPORARY LODGING EXPENSE	13,888	13,888	13,888	13,888
4950 OTHER	7,247	7,247	7,247	7,247
5000 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 5	729,015	729,015	729,015	729,015
5050 ACTIVITY 6: OTHER MILITARY PERSONNEL COSTS 5100 APPREHENSION OF MILITARY DESERTERS	825	825	825	825
5150 INTEREST ON UNIFORMED SERVICES SAVINGS	209	209	209	209
5200 DEATH GRATUITIES	1,470	1,470	1,470	1,470
5250 UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS	50,858	44,085	50,858	44,085
5300 SURVIVOR BENEFITS	2,748	2,748	2,748	2,748
5350 EDUCATION BENEFITS	6,746	6,746	6,746	6,746
5400 ADOPTION EXPENSES	236	236	236	236
5420 SPECIAL COMPENSATION FOR SEVERELY DISABLED RETIREES	10,433	---	10,433	10,433
5440 TRANSPORTATION SUBSIDY	4,391	4,391	4,391	4,391
5500 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 6	77,916	60,710	77,916	71,143
5510 LESS REIMBURSABLES	-399,282	-399,282	-399,282	-399,282
5580 UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENT	-19,500	-19,500	-19,500	-19,500
5590 LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS NOT ADOPTED	---	-3,000	---	---
5600 DHP ACCRUAL REESTIMATE	---	-85,400	-78,600	-85,400
5610 UNOBLIGATED BALANCES	---	-50,000	---	-25,000
5620 ADOPTED LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS	---	---	2,900	2,900
5645 TOTAL, MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY	22,074,901	21,874,395	21,975,201	21,927,628

Adjustments to Budget Activities

Adjustments to the budget activities are as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

Budget Activity 1: Pay and Allowances of Officers:	
3400 Separation Pay/$30,000 Lump Sum Bonus	-19,000
Budget Activity 2: Pay and Allowances of Enlisted Personnel:	
3900 Special Pays/Selective Reenlistment Bonus	-14,000
Budget Activity 6: Other Military Personnel Costs:	
5250 Unemployment Benefits	-6,773
Other Adjustments:	
5600 DHP Accrual Reestimate	-85,400
5610 Unobligated Balances	-25,000
5620 Adopted Legislative Proposals	2,900

MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
5650 MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS				
5700 ACTIVITY 1: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF OFFICER 5750 BASIC PAY	953,611	953,611	953,611	953,611
5800 RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL	261,005	261,005	261,005	261,005
5850 DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM ACCRUAL	83,310	83,310	83,310	83,310
5950 BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING	193,249	193,249	193,249	193,249
6000 BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE	37,231	37,231	37,231	37,231
6050 INCENTIVE PAYS	46,651	46,651	46,651	46,651
6100 SPECIAL PAYS	2,451	2,451	2,451	2,451
6150 ALLOWANCES	19,727	19,727	19,727	19,727
6200 SEPARATION PAY	16,126	15,226	11,126	11,126
6250 SOCIAL SECURITY TAX	73,350	73,350	73,350	73,350
6300 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	1,686,711	1,685,811	1,681,711	1,681,711
6350 ACTIVITY 2: PAY AND ALLOW OF ENLISTED PERS 6400 BASIC PAY	3,297,782	3,298,382	3,298,382	3,298,382
6450 RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL	900,416	900,416	900,416	900,416
6500 DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM ACCRUAL	718,487	718,487	718,487	718,487
6600 BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING	606,017	606,017	606,017	606,017
6650 INCENTIVE PAYS	8,356	8,356	8,356	8,356
6700 SPECIAL PAYS	118,988	118,988	118,988	118,988
6750 ALLOWANCES	163,489	163,489	163,489	163,489
6800 SEPARATION PAY	62,002	59,802	51,002	51,002
6850 SOCIAL SECURITY TAX	251,375	251,375	251,375	251,375
6900 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2	6,126,912	6,125,312	6,116,512	6,116,512
6950 ACTIVITY 4: SUBSISTENCE OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL 7000 BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE	269,393	269,393	269,393	269,393

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
7050 SUBSISTENCE-IN-KIND	189,268	189,268	189,268	189,268
7075 FAMILY SUBSISTENCE SUPPLEMENTAL ALLOWANCE	750	750	750	750
7100 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4	459,411	459,411	459,411	459,411
7150 ACTIVITY 5: PERMANENT CHANGE OF STATION 7200 ACCESSION TRAVEL	39,258	39,258	39,258	39,258
7250 TRAINING TRAVEL	7,431	7,431	7,431	7,431
7300 OPERATIONAL TRAVEL	68,889	68,889	68,889	68,889
7350 ROTATIONAL TRAVEL	99,944	99,944	99,944	99,944
7400 SEPARATION TRAVEL	43,492	43,492	43,492	43,492
7450 TRAVEL OF ORGANIZED UNITS	3,124	3,124	3,124	3,124
7500 NON-TEMPORARY STORAGE	5,006	5,006	5,006	5,006
7550 TEMPORARY LODGING EXPENSE	10,985	10,985	10,985	10,985
7600 OTHER	2,191	2,191	2,191	2,191
7650 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 5	280,320	280,320	280,320	280,320
7700 ACTIVITY 6: OTHER MILITARY PERSONNEL COSTS 7750 APPREHENSION OF MILITARY DESERTERS	1,437	1,437	1,437	1,437
7800 INTEREST ON UNIFORMED SERVICES SAVINGS	16	16	16	16
7850 DEATH GRATUITIES	708	708	708	708
7900 UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS	28,753	19,738	28,753	25,753
7950 SURVIVOR BENEFITS	1,511	1,511	1,511	1,511
8000 EDUCATION BENEFITS	1,725	1,725	1,725	1,725
8020 ADOPTION EXPENSES	80	80	80	80
8040 SPECIAL COMPENSATION FOR SEVERELY DISABLED RETIREES	2,900	---	2,900	2,900
8060 TRANSPORTATION SUBSIDY	1,297	1,297	1,297	1,297
8150 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 6	38,427	26,512	38,427	35,427
8160 LESS REIMBURSABLES	-32,294	-32,294	-32,294	-32,294
8240 UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENT	-600	-600	-600	-600
8250 LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS NOT ADOPTED	---	-300	---	---
8260 DHP ACCRUAL REESTIMATE	---	-40,000	-36,900	-40,000
8265 ADOPTED LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS	---	---	600	600
8295 TOTAL, MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS	8,558,887	8,504,172	8,507,187	8,501,087

Adjustments to Budget Activities

Adjustments to the budget activities are as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

Budget Activity 1: Pay and Allowances of Officers:	
6200 Separation Pay/$30,000 Lump Sum Bonus.....	-5,000
Budget Activity 2: Pay and Allowances of Enlisted Personnel:	
6400 Basic Pay/CT-FP DERF Transfer--CINC Security Force Personnel.....	600
6800 Separation Pay/$30,000 Lump Sum Bonus.....	-11,000
Budget Activity 6: Other Military Personnel Costs:	
7900 Unemployment Benefits	-3,000
Other Adjustments:	
8260 DHP Accrual Reestimate	-40,000
8265 Adopted Legislative Proposals.....	600

MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

	(In thousands of dollars)			
	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
8300 MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE				
8350 ACTIVITY 1: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF OFFICER				
8400 BASIC PAY	3,872,634	3,872,634	3,872,634	3,872,634
8450 RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL	1,061,102	1,061,102	1,061,102	1,061,102
8500 DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM ACCRUAL	326,881	326,881	326,881	326,881
8600 BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING	778,898	778,898	778,898	778,898
8650 BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE	145,032	145,032	145,032	145,032
8700 INCENTIVE PAYS	284,327	284,327	284,327	284,327
8750 SPECIAL PAYS	261,119	203,536	261,119	222,436
8800 ALLOWANCES	58,222	58,222	58,222	58,222
8850 SEPARATION PAY	122,004	121,204	90,004	90,004
8900 SOCIAL SECURITY TAX	294,071	294,071	294,071	294,071
8950 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	7,204,290	7,145,907	7,172,290	7,133,607
9000 ACTIVITY 2: PAY AND ALLOW OF ENLISTED PERS				
9050 BASIC PAY	7,105,972	7,105,972	7,105,972	7,105,972
9100 RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL	1,947,036	1,947,036	1,947,036	1,947,036
9200 DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM ACCRUAL	1,328,732	1,328,732	1,328,732	1,328,732
9250 BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING	1,542,052	1,542,052	1,542,052	1,542,052
9300 INCENTIVE PAYS	33,250	33,250	33,250	33,250
9350 SPECIAL PAYS	444,437	442,539	439,437	437,539
9400 ALLOWANCES	359,219	359,219	359,219	359,219
9450 SEPARATION PAY	135,166	135,166	134,166	134,166
9500 SOCIAL SECURITY TAX	543,607	543,607	543,607	543,607
9550 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2	13,439,471	13,437,573	13,433,471	13,431,573
9600 ACTIVITY 3: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF CADETS				
9650 ACADEMY CADETS	49,821	49,821	49,821	49,821

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
9750 ACTIVITY 4: SUBSISTENCE OF ENLISTED PERS				
9800 BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE	722,407	722,407	722,407	722,407
9850 SUBSISTENCE-IN-KIND	124,086	124,086	124,086	124,086
9875 FAMILY SUBSISTENCE SUPPLEMENTAL ALLOWANCE	1,177	1,177	1,177	1,177
9900 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4	847,670	847,670	847,670	847,670
9950 ACTIVITY 5: PERMANENT CHANGE OF STATION				
10000 ACCESSION TRAVEL	95,779	95,779	95,779	95,779
10050 TRAINING TRAVEL	65,087	65,087	65,087	65,087
10100 OPERATIONAL TRAVEL	166,545	166,545	166,545	166,545
10150 ROTATIONAL TRAVEL	466,133	466,133	466,133	466,133
10200 SEPARATION TRAVEL	120,933	120,933	120,933	120,933
10250 TRAVEL OF ORGANIZED UNITS	6,614	6,614	6,614	6,614
10300 NON-TEMPORARY STORAGE	25,446	25,446	25,446	25,446
10350 TEMPORARY LODGING EXPENSE	42,226	42,226	42,226	42,226
10450 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 5	988,763	988,763	988,763	988,763
10500 ACTIVITY 6: OTHER MILITARY PERS COSTS				
10550 APPREHENSION OF MILITARY DESERTERS	100	100	100	100
10600 INTEREST ON UNIFORMED SERVICES SAVINGS	595	595	595	595
10650 DEATH GRATUITIES	1,506	1,506	1,506	1,506
10700 UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS	26,456	19,709	26,456	19,709
10750 SURVIVOR BENEFITS	3,290	3,290	3,290	3,290
10800 EDUCATION BENEFITS	3,690	3,690	3,690	3,690
10820 ADOPTION EXPENSES	800	800	800	800
10840 SPECIAL COMPENSATION FOR SEVERELY DISABLED RETIREES	20,400	---	20,400	20,400
10860 TRANSPORTATION SUBSIDY	14,290	14,290	14,290	14,290
10950 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 6	71,127	43,980	71,127	64,380
10960 LESS REIMBURSABLES	-443,957	-443,957	-443,957	-443,957
10980 B-52 FORCE STRUCTURE	---	---	3,700	2,600
11060 UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENT	-14,600	-14,600	-14,600	-14,600
11070 LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS NOT ADOPTED	---	-14,600	---	---
11080 DHP ACCRUAL REESTIMATE	---	-82,800	-76,100	-82,800
11090 ADOPTED LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS	---	---	4,220	4,220
11140 TOTAL, MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE	22,142,585	21,957,757	22,036,405	21,981,277

RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
11150 RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY				
11200 ACTIVITY 1: UNIT AND INDIVIDUAL TRAINING				
11250 PAY GROUP A TRAINING (15 DAYS & DRILLS 24/48)	1,209,865	1,164,865	1,164,865	1,164,865
11300 PAY GROUP B TRAINING (BACKFILL FOR ACT DUTY)	39,372	39,372	39,372	39,372
11350 PAY GROUP F TRAINING (RECRUITS)	169,922	169,922	169,922	169,922
11400 PAY GROUP P TRAINING (PIPELINE RECRUITS)	10,117	10,117	10,117	10,117
11420 DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM ACCRUAL	339,788	339,788	339,788	339,788
11500 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	1,769,064	1,724,064	1,724,064	1,724,064
11600 MOBILIZATION TRAINING	18,142	18,142	18,142	18,142
11650 SCHOOL TRAINING	100,610	100,610	108,110	108,110
11700 SPECIAL TRAINING	120,540	128,040	120,540	120,540
11750 ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT	1,134,589	1,155,589	1,193,089	1,155,589
11800 EDUCATION BENEFITS	51,378	51,378	51,378	51,378
11850 ROTC - SENIOR, JUNIOR	99,243	99,243	99,243	99,243
11900 HEALTH PROFESSION SCHOLARSHIP	29,556	29,556	29,556	29,556
11925 DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM ACCRUAL	62,614	62,614	62,614	62,614
11950 OTHER PROGRAMS	13,819	13,819	13,819	13,819
11960 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2	1,630,491	1,658,991	1,696,491	1,658,991
11970 UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENT	-1,000	-1,000	-1,000	-1,000
11980 ADDITIONAL FULL-TIME SUPPORT	---	11,500	---	11,400
11990 DHP ACCRUAL REESTIMATE	---	-20,100	-18,500	-20,100
12000 ADOPTED LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS	---	---	1,000	1,000
12090 TOTAL RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY	3,398,555	3,373,455	3,402,055	3,374,355

Adjustments to Budget Activities

Adjustments to the budget activities are as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

Budget Activity 1: Unit and Individual Training:	
11250 Pay Group A Training/Realignment to BA 2.....	-7,500
11250 Pay Group A Training/Annual Training Participation Rates	-37,500
Budget Activity 2: Other Training and Support:	
11650 School Training/Realignment from BA 1.....	7,500
11750 Administration and Support/CT-FP DERF Transfer--Threat Force Protection Condition Bravo.....	21,000
Other Adjustments:	
11980 Additional Full-Time Support.....	11,400
11990 DHP Accrual Reestimate	-20,100
12000 Adopted Legislative Proposals.....	1,000

RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
12100 RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY				
12150 ACTIVITY 1: UNIT AND INDIVIDUAL TRAINING				
12200 PAY GROUP A TRAINING (15 DAYS & DRILLS 24/48)	704,404	704,404	704,404	704,404
12225 PAY GROUP B TRAINING (BACKFILL FOR ACT DUTY)	3,854	3,854	3,854	3,854
12250 PAY GROUP F TRAINING (RECRUITS)	3,238	3,238	3,238	3,238
12275 DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM ACCRUAL	128,212	128,212	128,212	128,212
12350 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	839,708	839,708	839,708	839,708
12400 ACTIVITY 2: OTHER TRAINING AND SUPPORT				
12450 MOBILIZATION TRAINING	6,343	6,343	6,343	6,343
12500 SCHOOL TRAINING	16,099	16,099	16,099	16,099
12550 SPECIAL TRAINING	53,151	53,151	53,151	53,151
12600 ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT	877,719	877,719	877,719	877,719
12650 EDUCATION BENEFITS	1,103	1,103	1,103	1,103
12700 ROTC - SENIOR, JUNIOR	38,242	38,242	38,242	38,242
12750 HEALTH PROFESSION SCHOLARSHIP	28,988	28,988	28,988	28,988
12775 DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM ACCRUAL	65,899	65,899	65,899	65,899
12820 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2	1,087,544	1,087,544	1,087,544	1,087,544
12840 UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENT	-100	-100	-100	-100
12850 LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS NOT ADOPTED	---	-100	---	---
12860 DHP ACCRUAL REESTIMATE	---	-9,700	-8,900	-9,700
12870 UNOBLIGATED BALANCES	---	-20,000	---	-10,000
12880 ADOPTED LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS	---	---	100	100
12940 TOTAL, RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY	1,927,152	1,897,352	1,918,352	1,907,552

Adjustments to Budget Activities

Adjustments to the budget activities are as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

Other Adjustments:		
12860	DHP Accrual Reestimate	-9,700
12870	Unobligated Balances	-10,000
12880	Adopted Legislative Proposals	100

RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
12950 RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS				
13000 ACTIVITY 1: UNIT AND INDIVIDUAL TRAINING				
13050 PAY GROUP A TRAINING (15 DAYS & DRILLS 24/48)	172,881	172,881	172,881	172,881
13100 PAY GROUP B TRAINING (BACKFILL FOR ACT DUTY)	16,969	16,969	16,969	16,969
13150 PAY GROUP F TRAINING (RECRUITS)	72,473	72,473	72,473	72,473
13200 PAY GROUP P TRAINING (PIPELINE RECRUITS)	177	177	177	177
13225 DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM ACCRUAL	66,340	66,340	66,340	66,340
13300 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	328,840	328,840	328,840	328,840
13350 ACTIVITY 2: OTHER TRAINING AND SUPPORT				
13400 MOBILIZATION TRAINING	2,304	2,304	2,304	2,304
13450 SCHOOL TRAINING	10,710	10,710	10,710	10,710
13500 SPECIAL TRAINING	29,874	29,874	29,874	29,874
13550 ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT	141,474	141,474	141,474	141,474
13600 EDUCATION BENEFITS	16,198	16,198	16,198	16,198
13650 ROTC - SENIOR, JUNIOR	5,282	5,282	5,282	5,282
13675 DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM ACCRUAL	10,801	10,801	10,801	10,801
13700 OTHER PROGRAMS	12,400	12,400	12,400	12,400
13710 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2	229,043	229,043	229,043	229,043
13740 DHP ACCRUAL REESTIMATE	---	-3,900	-3,500	-3,900
13840 TOTAL, RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS	557,883	553,983	554,383	553,983

Adjustments to Budget Activities

Adjustment to the budget activities is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

Other Adjustments:	
13740 DHP Accrual Reestimate	-3,900

RESERVE PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

	(In thousands of dollars)			
	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
13850 RESERVE PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE				
13900 ACTIVITY 1: UNIT AND INDIVIDUAL TRAINING				
13950 PAY GROUP A TRAINING (15 DAYS & DRILLS 24/48)	520,875	520,875	520,875	520,875
14000 PAY GROUP B TRAINING (BACKFILL FOR ACT DUTY)	105,332	105,332	105,332	105,332
14050 PAY GROUP F TRAINING (RECRUITS)	24,933	24,933	24,933	24,933
14075 DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM ACCRUAL	132,127	132,127	132,127	132,127
14100 OTHER	95	95	95	95
14150 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	783,362	783,362	783,362	783,362
14200 ACTIVITY 2: OTHER TRAINING AND SUPPORT				
14250 MOBILIZATION TRAINING	3,058	3,058	3,058	3,058
14300 SCHOOL TRAINING	71,351	71,351	71,351	71,351
14350 SPECIAL TRAINING	148,351	148,351	148,351	148,351
14400 ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT	143,948	143,948	143,948	143,948
14450 EDUCATION BENEFITS	7,700	7,700	7,700	7,700
14500 ROTC - SENIOR, JUNIOR	53,315	53,315	53,315	53,315
14525 HEALTH PROFESSION SCHOLARSHIP	26,189	26,189	26,189	26,189
14550 DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM ACCRUAL	6,630	6,630	6,630	6,630
14600 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2	460,542	460,542	460,542	460,542
14610 DHP ACCRUAL REESTIMATE	---	-7,000	-6,400	-7,000
14690 TOTAL, RESERVE PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE	1,243,904	1,236,904	1,237,504	1,236,904

Adjustments to Budget Activities

Adjustment to the budget activities is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

Other Adjustments:	
14610 DHP Accrual Reestimate	-7,000

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

	(In thousands of dollars)			
	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
14700 NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY				
14750 ACTIVITY 1: UNIT AND INDIVIDUAL TRAINING				
14800 PAY GROUP A TRAINING (15 DAYS & DRILLS 24/48)	1,811,587	1,783,587	1,811,587	1,793,587
14850 PAY GROUP F TRAINING (RECRUITS)	246,397	246,397	246,397	246,397
14900 PAY GROUP P TRAINING (PIPELINE RECRUITS)	24,894	24,894	24,894	24,894
14925 DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM ACCRUAL	577,660	577,660	577,660	577,660
15000 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	2,660,538	2,632,538	2,660,538	2,642,538
15050 ACTIVITY 2: OTHER TRAINING AND SUPPORT				
15100 SCHOOL TRAINING	229,609	229,609	229,609	229,609
15150 SPECIAL TRAINING	141,503	141,503	141,503	141,503
15200 ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT	1,926,099	1,926,099	1,954,499	1,926,099
15250 EDUCATION BENEFITS	66,158	66,158	66,158	66,158
15275 DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM ACCRUAL	107,181	107,181	107,181	107,181
15350 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2	2,470,550	2,470,550	2,498,950	2,470,550
15370 EMERGENCY SPILL RESPONSE PROGRAM	---	---	600	600
15380 UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENT	-2,100	-2,100	-2,100	-2,100
15390 ADDITIONAL FULL-TIME SUPPORT	---	28,400	---	35,100
15400 DHP ACCRUAL REESTIMATE	---	-34,200	-31,500	-34,200
15410 UNOBLIGATED BALANCES	---	-25,000	---	---
15420 ADOPTED LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS	---	---	2,100	2,100
15445 TOTAL, NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY	5,128,988	5,070,188	5,128,588	5,114,588

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

	(In thousands of dollars)			
	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
15450 NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE				
15500 ACTIVITY 1: UNIT AND INDIVIDUAL TRAINING				
15550 PAY GROUP A TRAINING (15 DAYS & DRILLS 24/48)	776,478	776,478	776,478	776,478
15600 PAY GROUP F TRAINING (RECRUITS)	41,453	41,453	41,453	41,453
15650 PAY GROUP P TRAINING (PIPELINE RECRUITS)	1,174	1,174	1,174	1,174
15675 DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM ACCRUAL	148,970	148,970	148,970	148,970
15750 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	968,075	968,075	968,075	968,075
15800 ACTIVITY 2: OTHER TRAINING AND SUPPORT				
15850 SCHOOL TRAINING	130,702	130,702	130,702	130,702
15900 SPECIAL TRAINING	109,752	109,752	109,752	109,752
15950 ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT	817,601	817,601	818,351	818,351
16000 EDUCATION BENEFITS	33,569	33,569	33,569	33,569
16025 DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM ACCRUAL	75,912	75,912	75,912	75,912
16100 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2	1,167,536	1,167,536	1,168,286	1,168,286
16120 DHP ACCRUAL REESTIMATE	---	-11,200	-10,300	-11,200
16200 TOTAL, NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE	2,135,611	2,124,411	2,126,061	2,125,161

Adjustments to Budget Activities

Adjustments to the budget activities are as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

Budget Activity 2: Other Training and Support:	
15950 Administration and Support/Additional AGR End Strength	750
Other Adjustments:	
16120 DHP Accrual Reestimate	-11,200

TITLE II – OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

A summary of the conference agreement on the items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

		Budget	House	Senate	Conference
50000	RECAPITULATION				
50050	O & M, ARMY	23,961,173	23,942,768	24,048,107	23,992,082
50150	O & M, NAVY	28,697,235	29,121,836	29,410,276	29,331,526
50250	O & M, MARINE CORPS	3,310,542	3,579,359	3,576,142	3,585,759
50300	O & M, AIR FORCE	26,772,768	27,587,959	27,463,678	27,339,533
50400	O & M, DEFENSE-WIDE	14,169,258	14,850,377	14,527,853	14,773,506
50500	O & M, ARMY RESERVE	1,880,110	1,976,710	1,963,710	1,970,180
50550	O & M, NAVY RESERVE	1,159,734	1,239,309	1,233,759	1,236,809
50600	O & M, MARINE CORPS RESERVE	185,532	189,532	185,532	187,532
50650	O & M, AIR FORCE RESERVE	2,135,452	2,165,604	2,160,604	2,163,104
50700	O & M, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD	4,049,567	4,231,967	4,266,412	4,261,707
50750	O & M, AIR NATIONAL GUARD	4,062,445	4,113,010	4,113,460	4,117,585
50790	OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS TRANSFER FUND	50,000	---	50,000	5,000
50800	UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES	9,614	9,614	9,614	9,614
50850	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, ARMY	395,900	395,900	395,900	395,900
50900	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NAVY	256,948	256,948	256,948	256,948
50950	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, AIR FORCE	389,773	389,773	389,773	389,773
51000	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEFENSE-WIDE	23,498	23,498	23,498	23,498
51050	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, FORMERLY USED DEFENSE SITES	212,102	212,102	252,102	246,102
51200	OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER, AND CIVIC AID	58,400	58,400	58,400	58,400
51300	FORMER SOVIET UNION THREAT REDUCTION	416,700	416,700	416,700	416,700
51460	SUPPORT OF INTERNATIONAL SPORTING COMPETITIONS	19,000	19,000	19,000	19,000
51470	DEFENSE EMERGENCY RESPONSE FUND	19,338,151	---	---	---
51480	RETIREMENT ACCRUALS	---	---	---	---
51490	TRAVEL	---	---	---	---
51600	GRAND TOTAL, O & M	131,553,902	114,780,366	114,821,468	114,780,258

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
100 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY				
150 BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES				
200 LAND FORCES 250 DIVISIONS	1,425,204	1,439,304	1,425,204	1,436,404
300 CORPS COMBAT FORCES	424,191	424,191	424,191	424,191
350 CORPS SUPPORT FORCES	361,001	361,001	361,001	361,001
400 ECHELON ABOVE CORPS SUPPORT FORCES	405,752	405,752	405,752	405,752
450 LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,115,776	1,123,776	1,165,776	1,162,276
500 LAND FORCES READINESS 550 FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,529,998	1,581,498	1,573,998	1,576,498
600 LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	491,947	491,947	481,947	481,947
650 LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	808,666	808,666	808,666	808,666
700 LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT 750 BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	3,207,409	3,214,409	3,201,409	3,207,409
800 FAC SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MOD (OP FORCES)	1,146,516	1,150,516	1,152,616	1,152,216
850 MANAGEMENT & OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS	297,834	307,234	306,834	305,234
900 UNIFIED COMMANDS	83,961	83,961	103,361	99,361
950 MISCELLANEOUS ACTIVITIES	1,607,610	1,622,610	1,622,610	1,622,610
1045 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	12,905,865	13,014,865	13,033,365	13,043,565
1050 BUDGET ACTIVITY 2: MOBILIZATION				
1100 MOBILITY OPERATIONS 1200 STRATEGIC MOBILIZATION	365,257	365,257	365,257	365,257
1250 ARMY PREPOSITIONED STOCKS	158,237	158,237	158,237	158,237
1300 INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	9,497	9,497	9,497	9,497
1325 FAC SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MOD (OP FORCES)	11,473	11,473	11,473	11,473
1350 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2	544,464	544,464	544,464	544,464

CONFERENCE TOTAL—WITH COMPARISONS

The total new budget (obligational) authority for the fiscal year 2003 recommended by the Committee of Conference, with comparisons to the fiscal year 2002 amount, the 2003 budget estimates, and the House and Senate bills for 2003 follows:

[In thousands of dollars]

New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 2002	$10,604,400
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 2003	9,664,04
House bill, fiscal year 2003	10,083,000
Senate bill, fiscal year 2003	10,622,000
Conference agreement, fiscal year 2003	10,499,000
Conference agreement compared with:	
New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 2002	−105,400
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 2003	+834,959
House bill, fiscal year 2003	+416,000
Senate bill, fiscal year 2003	−123,000

DAVID L. HOBSON,
JAMES T. WALSH,
DAN MILLER,
ROBERT ADERHOLT,
KAY GRANGER,
VIRGIL H. GOODE, Jr.,
JOE SKEEN,
DAVID VITTER,
C.W. BILL YOUNG,
JOHN W. OLVER,
CHET EDWARDS,
SAM FARR,
ALLEN BOYD,
NORMAN D. DICKS,
DAVID R. OBEY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

DIANNE FEINSTEIN,
DANIEL K. INOUYE,
TIM JOHNSON,
MARY L. LANDRIEU,
HARRY REID,
ROBERT C. BYRD,
KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON
CONRAD BURNS,
LARRY CRAIG,
MIKE DEWINE,
TED STEVENS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 114, AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE AGAINST IRAQ RESOLUTION OF 2002

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HULSHOF).

(Mr. HULSHOF asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HULSHOF. Mr. Speaker, ''When in the course of human events it becomes necessary for the people to dissolve the political bonds which have connected them with another, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them.''

When the delegates to the Second Continental Congress began to debate those immortal words in July of 1776, they did not have the long lens of history to guide them. These bold men adopted the radical idea of independence based upon deeply-held convictions and beliefs that bloodshed, though unwanted, was a probable course. Indeed, when the document declaring independence was executed in August of that year, 30,000 British and Hessian troops were assembled at Staten Island, New York, a 3 days' journey from Philadelphia.

At first blush, those of you reminded of this narrative would quickly make the distinction that those Philadelphia delegates and the colonists they represented were in imminent peril, and we are not. Is that in fact the case after September 11? America's enemies today do not dispatch columns of infantrymen ''across the green'' or battleships upon the high seas. Instead, we face a deadlier threat in chemical and biological weapons willing to be dispersed by an army of anonymous killers. This 107th Congress, as our forefathers before, must face this difficult issue without the benefit of history's clarity.

I have been contacted by a number of Missourians with wide-ranging opinions, and some have proclaimed, ''Let us not wage war with Iraq.'' Would that I could will it so, possessing the knowledge as I do of the threat Iraq poses. Would that Saddam Hussein lay down his arms, those weapons designed to commit mass murder against the defenseless.

Now, time does not permit me to make my case, but there has been a lot of discussion about the case that has been made, and I am convinced that Iraq continues to possess and manufacture weapons of mass destruction in defiance of 12 years of Security Council resolutions.

My colleague, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), a good friend, a moment ago said there is no definitive link between Iraq and the attacks of September 11, 2001; and I acknowledge that. However, our United States intelligence services have detected that Saddam's regime has begun efforts to reach out to terrorist groups with global reach.

I acknowledge that Saddam Hussein's regime is largely secular and has often clashed with fanatical religious fundamentalist groups. However, I am mindful of a disquieting adage, the enemy of my enemy is my friend.

The resolution I support today suggests a variety of means to disarm Iraq without immediately resorting to the end of open warfare. It is imperative that the United Nations take strong action to implement a comprehensive and unfettered regime of weapons inspections. It is deeply troubling to me, however, that the only thing that seems to compel Saddam Hussein into compliance is the threat of military force. Certainly many questions remain. However, the risks of inaction are greater, in my mind, than the risks of action.

Ironically, a number of family members who lost loved ones last September have come to Capitol Hill and have questioned the inability of our intelligence agencies to foresee those attacks prior to September 11. Why did we not act upon those threads of information, they ask plaintively? Why did we not prevent the horrific attacks of that crisp, clear morning?

Mr. Speaker, let us not allow that tragic history to be repeated. We have a moral responsibility to defend our Nation from harm. This conflict has been brought to us, and we have provoked it only by being free. We must move forward decisively, confident in the knowledge that our voices, which cry out so desperately for a lasting peace, have been and will be heard by the rest of the world.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. PASTOR), a member of the House Committee on Appropriations, a top member of the Committee on Energy and Water and on the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

(Mr. PASTOR asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Speaker, I am committed to the war against terrorism and believe that stopping Saddam Hussein from developing weapons of mass destruction is a necessary part of that effort. But at this time, however, I believe it is premature to authorize a unilateral attack on Iraq.

Working with the international community is the surest means of addressing this threat effectively, sharing costs and resources and ensuring stability in Iraq and throughout the Middle East in the event of a regime change. While the President has spoken of the value of a coalition effort, the resolution before the House today undermines the importance of our allies and of maintaining the momentum of international cooperation in the wider war on terrorism.

I support the Spratt amendment to this resolution. This amendment would authorize the use of U.S. forces in support of a new U.N. Security Council resolution mandating the elimination, by force, if necessary, of all Iraqi weapons of mass destruction and means of producing such weapons. Should the Security Council fail to produce such a resolution, the amendment calls on the President then to seek authorization for unilateral military action. In this way, the amendment emphasizes our preference for a peaceful solution and coalition support, while recognizing that military force and unilateral action may be appropriate at some point.

We should not rush into war without the support of our allies. We should not send American troops into combat before making a full-faith effort to put U.N. inspectors back into Iraq under a more forceful resolution. We should not turn to a policy of preemptive attack, which we have so long and so rightly

condemned, without first providing a limited-time option for peaceful resolution of the threat.

America has long stood behind the principles of exhausting diplomacy before resorting to war; and, at times like this, we must lead by example.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 114, authorization of use of force against Iraq.

After the attacks of September 11, Congress reaffirmed our commitment to keep the American people safe from international threats. That commitment faces its first true test as we debate this resolution.

We are faced with clear evidence of a threat against the security of the American people. We have several options to deal with this threat. This resolution will provide all necessary options to the President for protecting the security interests of the American people.

By giving the President the needed flexibility, Iraq and the rest of the world will know that we are prepared to enforce our demands for disarmament with the use of force.

By giving the President this flexibility, the American people can be fully defended from the threat Iraq poses to our national security.

It is clear that Saddam Hussein constitutes a grave threat to the security of the United States through his motives, history, technological capabilities and his support for international terrorism. Saddam Hussein is a ruthless dictator who has sworn eternal hostility to the United States. There is evidence that this same dictator has financed and supported international terrorism, including harboring members of al Qaeda. Despite agreeing to fully disarm by ridding itself of weapons of mass destruction, Iraq has worked to actually enhance its weapons program, increasing its stockpiles of biological and chemical weapons and working to build nuclear weapons.

Saddam Hussein has used weapons of mass destruction against his neighbors and his own people. He has attempted assassinations of foreign leaders, including an American president.

Alone, these facts are very troubling. Together, they present a clear and present danger to the national security of the United States. Saddam Hussein has the motive, has the capabilities and the absence of humanity that is all too clear. Ignoring this evidence would be abandoning our duty to the security of the American people.

Now we are faced with this question: How do we deal with this threat? The answer is to leave all options at the President's disposal on the table, including military options. Like everyone in this Chamber, I sincerely hope and pray it will never come to that. Nevertheless, I believe the evidence justifies the President to act in the interests of our national security. This resolution gives the President the necessary authority to deal with this threat.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution that will come before us for final passage has already been written at the White House. I very much wish that it had a different phraseology, but that is not the choice of individual Members. The only question that will come before us that we can influence as individual Members is by what margin does that resolution pass. Does it get 325 votes, or 375, or somewhere in between?

□ 1645

Saddam Hussein does not fully understand our political process. He sees a nation in the throws of an election where we speak quite harshly to each other on domestic issues, and we will be doing more of that in the coming weeks. There is no better way to assure that Saddam capitulates on the issue of inspectors, no better way to assure that this war does not have to be fought, no better way to assure a peaceful resolution of this conflict than for us to pass this resolution by the largest possible margin and make sure that Saddam understands that America is united and capitulation on the issue of inspectors is the only rational course and the only course that will assure his own personal safety.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW).

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I rise in strong support of this most balanced resolution. Like most of my colleagues who support the President in this important matter, I am not voting for this resolution because I have any wish to speed to war; I am voting for this resolution because I hold out hope for peace, a peace that can still come, but only if the United Nations will apply decisive pressure to Iraq to open itself to unconditional, unfettered weapons inspection.

Unfortunately, the last decade has shown that without the use of force as a threat, Saddam Hussein will continue to stonewall and ignore every resolution issued by the United Nations, all the while amassing weapons of terror. The resolution before us today does not send us to war, but it does provide a powerful incentive for Hussein to finally comply with the dictates of the United Nations. With the threat of force, the United Nations and President Bush will be able to negotiate from a position of strength.

Nobody, no legislator, Republican or Democrat, takes this responsibility of sending our children off to war lightly, but nor can we stand by as Saddam Hussein and his regime continue to work to amass stockpiles of the world's most deadly weapons. My deepest fears lay in the thought that he could soon supply terrorists with nuclear weapons. We simply cannot ignore our responsibility to protect our country, democracy, and our lone democratic ally in the Middle East, the State of Israel.

Mr. Speaker, again, I hold out my hope for peace; but to rely upon a dictatorial madman with little respect for the life of even his own people, let alone American life, to bring about a peaceful resolution to this crisis would be foolhardy. It is for that reason I strongly believe that we must strengthen the President's hand. With a hopeful heart, but realistic concern over this threat, I will cast my vote in support of this resolution as a last chance for peace.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON), a member of the Committee on International Relations and former ambassador to Micronesia.

Ms. WATSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I stand to oppose H.J. Res. 114, the authorization for military force against Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I have attended numerous administrative hearings on Iraq where not one bit of new evidence was offered to demonstrate that presently Saddam Hussein is more of a menace than that proven diabolical character, Osama bin Laden. Why are we not still focusing our attention on him? I remember so well the declaration made by the President: ''Wanted, dead or alive.'' We have painfully experienced his capacity to wreak havoc on thousands of our people from thousands of miles from his own perch. And now, he appears to be an afterthought.

We have given Saddam Hussein the power to force the greatest country on Earth to abandon its domestic agenda, to potentially violate the U.N. charter, and possibly take unilateral and preemptive action before exhausting all diplomatic efforts. I am not convinced that Saddam Hussein warrants the daily headlines and the extraordinary amount of time and resources given to him. We are equating his power with ours and, in some ways, ascribing it to be beyond our ability to detect.

While we are monitoring his every move, I have no doubt that if he were to plan an attack on the United States or on our allies, we would be able to stop him in his tracks. But what we cannot do is to provide the proof of Osama bin Laden's whereabouts or whether he is dead or alive, or who spread anthrax and, currently, right here in this country, who is killing innocent Americans in a close radius of the White House. But our focus remains thousands of miles away on a villain who cowardly goes after the weakest. It is beneath us to choose war over diplomacy, and not only carry a big stick, but beat our perceived enemy over the head with it.

The United Nations is being diminished with our rhetoric of the last few weeks. As a charter member, we are not giving it credit for trying to uphold the principle of sovereign equality of

all its members. The U.N. charter states that in recognition of the sovereignty of all nations, all shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means. The U.N. charter also states that all members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or the use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State.

Chapter VI of the charter empowers the Security Council to investigate any disputes and to recommend appropriate procedures for the settlement of the dispute. If the dispute is not resolved, it is then referred to the Security Council for action. Under Chapter VII, the U.N. Security Council shall determine the existence of threats to peace. Article 46 provides that plans for the application of armed force shall be made by the Security Council. The U.N. charter does not provide for preemptive or first-strike options of member states against a perceived threat.

Too little in this House has been made of peace. When will we mature to a point when we will find noncombative ways to settle our differences? When are we ready to use our higher selves to find ways to be nonviolent? To effect a regime change, we are threatening an invasion of a territorial foe to enhance our own security; but such an invasion will, in fact, degrade and diminish us.

This resolution offers only the incessant drumbeat of war. During the Vietnam War, it was often said that ever every time we kill a Viet Cong guerrilla, we create two more. Our invasion of Iraq will be watched by millions of Muslim men and women. Many governments around the world will become less cooperative in helping us track down terrorist operatives in their countries. Hundreds, if not thousands, of American men and women may perish in the streets of Baghdad. Our invasion will engender a bottomless well of bitterness and resentment towards the United States that will haunt us for decades to come. We now have a choice to maintain the moral high ground or sink to the depths of our tormentors. History will record this moment.

MAKING IN ORDER AT ANY TIME CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 3295, HELP AMERICA VOTE ACT OF 2002

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order at any time to consider the conference report to accompany H.R. 3295; that all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration be waived; and that the conference report be considered as read when called up.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LINDER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PICKERING).

Mr. PICKERING. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of the resolution before us.

The most grave responsibility any Member of Congress ever undertakes or considers is the vote to give the President of the United States the authority to use force if necessary.

On September 11, I drove past the Pentagon. I came in to my congressional office building, and I was informed that a plane had just struck the Pentagon. We left our offices, we went to a place, we tried to call our families, the communications systems were jammed. It took 3 hours until I could finally talk to my wife and I have five sons, and I began talking to each of my boys. I got to my second son, Ross, and he was crying, and he asked me, Daddy, are we safe?

In my lifetime, I never asked that question. I never asked that question, Are we safe, of my mother and daddy, of my father, because the generations that went before us gave us the blessings of liberty. They protected and defended our safety and security when a threat, a challenge emerged; when we were at risk, they answered the call. So many times in our Nation's history, we have had the strong voices that have given us warnings and called us to action, and so many times we did not listen. Winston Churchill called on the world to look and to act at the threat that Hitler posed, and the world did not listen; and because of that, more death and more destruction and world war came.

Today, we have an opportunity, backed by a clear and convincing threat, and backed by a leader of character, to hear the warnings, to know that nuclear capability is around the corner in the hands of a dictator, in the hands of a tyrant; and he could use it, and the death and the destruction that it could cause would be devastating. It would be overwhelming. But if we act now, we can stop it. We can prevent it. We can preempt it.

For those reasons, we have the moral obligation to act. I support the resolution, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD).

(Mr. BOYD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I rise in support of H.J. Res. 114.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of giving the President the authority to go to war with Iraq if it becomes necessary. I came to this difficult decision only after considering the threat to our national security that allowing Saddam Hussein to acquire long range missiles and nuclear weapons represents. While we should continue to seek a diplomatic solution, inaction is not an option. I feel that we must give the president the option of using force to remove this threat to our nation if diplomacy does not work.

No one in the United States wants another war with Iraq if it can be avoided. However, we know that Iraq has chemical and biological weapons, and is frantically working to develop nuclear weapons and a way to deliver them to the United States. This presents a serious threat to our national security and has the potential to destroy any chance for peace in the Middle East.

I believe our first step should be to develop a new, tougher weapons inspection resolution which would allow the U.N. inspectors unfettered access to all sights in Iraq, including the presidential palaces. If it is implemented successfully, the resolution would serve to disarm Iraq and would not require an armed confrontation. However, as President Bush has noted, the track record of Iraq's compliance with U.N. resolutions is abysmal, and this time we must give him the tools necessary to ensure that Iraq is truly disarmed.

In addition, I believe that before we use military force against Iraq that the administration should work to reassemble the coalition that was so successful during the Gulf War or like the one we developed to combat terrorism. While we could defeat Iraq without a coalition, policing and rebuilding Iraq will take years, and we will need allies to undertake this long and difficult task.

Those of us in this chamber who have worn the military uniform of this great country, understand the ravages and consequences of war, and do not take this vote lightly. All diplomatic options should be exhausted before the use of military force, but I believe the option of force must be available to the President as a last resort. Giving the authority to use force does not mean war, it only gives our commander-in-chief the maximum flexibility to protect our nation.

If it comes to war, many of our nation's sons and daughters will be put in harms way in order to protect our freedoms from Saddam Hussein's reign of terror and to keep him from acquiring nuclear weapons and the means of delivering them to the United States. I would never send our young men and women into combat unless it was absolutely necessary; and unless Iraq allows weapons inspectors into the country with unfettered access it will be necessary. Congress needs to give the President the authority he needs to protect America while encouraging the use of diplomacy and negotiations to try and arrive at a peaceful solution to this problem before turning to military force and this is why I will vote to give him the ability to eliminate this threat to American security.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND), who has just arrived and is now available to convince the entire House of Representatives.

(Mr. KIND asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. We have before us today one of the most important issues that a democracy must decide, whether to potentially go to war against another nation. It is a vote of conscience, and I believe reasonable people can disagree while looking at the same set of facts.

□ 1700

September 11, however, has changed the psyche of our Nation forever. We witnessed in horror what a few suicidal terrorists can accomplish in a low-tech

operation, and now we shudder to imagine what suicidal terrorists can accomplish if they gain access to high-tech weapons of mass destruction.

I believe Saddam Hussein has biological and chemical weapons of mass destruction and that he is aggressively seeking to develop nuclear capability. But I also believe that he can be deterred because, as New York Times columnist Thomas Friedman puts it, Saddam loves his life more than he hates us.

It is, however, irrefutable that Saddam is in blatant violation of numerous U.N. resolutions that call for his disarmament of these weapons. Now the question becomes: How do we enforce these resolutions and accomplish the universal goal of disarming his weapons of mass destruction?

I have come to the conclusion that my two sons' futures and the future of all our children across the globe will be made a little safer if Saddam disarms, on his own or with our help; militarily, if necessary. I pray that it is done peacefully. I pray that he blinks.

But I have also concluded that we are dealing with a person who will not do the right thing unless, literally, he has a gun pointing at his head. Therefore, I support the resolution before us today.

But I also support the Spratt amendment, because how we accomplish our goals and with whom can make all the difference. We need to do this with the help and the support of the international community. I believe that it would be disastrous if we try to accomplish disarmament through unilateral military action.

The process we take will determine whether the rest of the world views us as a beacon or as a bully. We could remain a beacon of hope and optimism as the leader of the free world, promoting economic progress for all, respecting human rights, and ensuring democratic values such as freedom, political pluralism, religious tolerance, free speech, and respect for the rule of law; or we could be viewed as the superpower bully, imposing our military power whenever we want and wherever we want.

I give the President the benefit of the doubt when he now says that the use of military force will be a last resort, not a first option; that regime change can also mean attitude change of Saddam's; and that we will work hard to gather international support for disarming him before military action is taken.

That is what the administration should have been saying from day one, and it is now reflected in the new resolution before us today.

We need to do this the right way because U.N. engagement and international support is essential. I subscribe to the Thomas Friedman ''crystal store'' theory of U.S. foreign policy: If you break it, you own it. If we break Iraq, we will have the responsibility to rebuild it, just as we need to rebuild Afghanistan today. This is another vital reason why international support is critical for our action in Iraq, for what happens the day after.

We have never been good at nation building. We can accomplish military goals with little help, but our democracy does not have the experience or the sustainability for successful nation building. Therefore, we must approach the aftermath of any conflict in the region with the greatest degree of humility.

In addition, I am concerned that the administration is developing a blind spot. They are becoming overly intoxicated with the use of our military power. I am glad that we have the world's most powerful military; but this is not just a battle of military might, it is also a battle of values and ideas in the region. Our message to the outside world needs to be better than: You are either for us or you are against us; and if you are against us, we are going to kill you.

Instead, we need to send a message through words and deeds that we are interested in being good global citizens as well. Unfortunately, the unilateralist message this administration has sent from day one has now come back to haunt us in our attempt to secure support against Iraq: No to the global climate treaty, no to the biological treaty, no to the land mines treaty, no to the ABM treaty, no to an international crimes tribunal. If the rest of the world does not like it, that is just tough.

Instead, the world needs to hear from us that we are concerned about our global environment; we are concerned about their economic progress; we are concerned that 2 billion people must survive on just $1 a day; that 1.5 billion people, most of them children, cannot even get a clean glass of water; and that we want to help eradicate the scourge of AIDS.

Furthermore, the world needs to hear that we are truly interested in being honest brokers in finding a peaceful solution to the conflict in the Middle East. We need to recognize that the real battleground for peace throughout the world ultimately lies in education. We cannot just keep looking at the Arab world as a great gas station, indifferent to what happens inside their countries, because the gas now is leaking, and there are people starting to throw matches around.

If we have learned anything from September 11, it is that if we do not visit and help in a bad neighborhood, that bad neighborhood can come and visit us.

So for the sake of our young military troops, for the sake of the Iraqi people, and for the sake of our Nation as it is perceived by the rest of the world in the 21st century, I pray that we can accomplish Saddam's disarmament peacefully and, if not, then with international support.

But today we need to give the President this tool in his diplomatic arsenal, and also pray that he uses it wisely.

May God continue to bless these United States of America.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS).

(Mr. BASS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Joint Resolution 114.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to address the House today in support of the resolution before us. The decision to allow our military to use force against Iraq will be one of the most important votes we cast in this Congress, but the responsible choice to support the resolution is clear.

Over the past few weeks, we have labored over the proper scope and limitations for this significant measure. The compromise language has been drafted by key House and Senate leaders, and the President.

This resolution is in the best interest of America's national security. After a decade of deceit and deception, in which we have permitted a hostile dictator to repeatedly violate every agreement we have in good faith put before him, the use of force has become a necessary option. I think I speak for all members of this Congress when I say that I hope and pray that military force does not become required; however, we must prepare for all possible outcomes.

This resolution protects the Congress' ability to remain fully involved in future decisions and actions in Iraq. It provides the resources for the United States to act ion the best interest of our national security, while remaining committed to generating support for a multilateral coalition.

I support our President and commend his efforts to ensure that the citizen's of American do not live in fear of another tragic terrorist attack or of harm from rogue nations. With passage of this resolution, we will provide our Commander in Chief with the resources necessary to carry out his greatest task of all—providing for the continued safety of our citizens.

This resolution to authorizer military action against Iraq is one that has been seriously deliberated by the President, his policy makers, and this Congress.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), the chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, ''does this body have the will and resolve to commit this Nation to a future of peace, or will we leave for our children an inheritance of uncertainty and world instability? I do not want to see our Nation at war, and I pray that this crisis will be resolved peacefully. But I cannot in good conscience deny to the President of the United States every power and tool that he is entitled to in his efforts to resolve this crisis.''

Mr. Speaker, I spoke these words right here in this very spot on the floor of the House of Representatives during my first speech as a Member of this body. One day later, on January 12, 1991, I cast my first vote, one to give

the President the authority to use the Armed Forces in removing Saddam Hussein from Kuwait.

As a freshman Member of Congress, I could not ever have imagined that more than a decade later this body again would be faced with the challenge of dealing with Saddam Hussein's outlaw regime. But here we are in 2002, and Saddam is once again at the heart of our national security concerns.

The September 11 terrorist attacks have changed this Nation forever. Those tragic events increased our appreciation of our vulnerability to terrorist attacks, particularly from weapons of mass destruction. Saddam Hussein has actively developed a deadly biological and chemical weapons program, and he is actively pursuing the development of nuclear weapons. We cannot ignore this reality.

What has changed since the last time I voted to use our Armed Forces against Iraq has not been a new identification of our enemy, but the reassessment of our national security risk. The last 11 years have proven that attempting to contain Saddam through an ineffective weapons inspection regime does not alter his intentions nor force him to disarm. We must resolve to stand firm against Hussein's regime to guarantee security for Americans and the international community and justice for the Iraqi people.

I commend President Bush for his consistent consultation with the international community and with the congressional leadership on both sides as he develops a strategy for confronting this grave threat. The resolution before us today is a result of those consultations, and its passage is the United States government's opportunity to speak with one voice in its efforts to protect American interests at home and abroad.

We cannot expect the United Nations Security Council to take action to protect not only our interests but the interests of the international community without sending it a strong signal of our own resolve.

Looking back on the vote that this House cast to authorize force back in 1991, I can recall how somber my colleagues and I were as we contemplated the consequences of our actions. Today, I sense a similar mood in the House. Whenever Congress votes to authorize the use of the greatest Armed Forces in the world, it is destined to be one of the most serious and difficult votes ever cast by our Members. It is not a decision we relish, but it is one that we must make.

I pray and hope that the need to use military force to disarm Hussein's regime is not imminent. However, I stand ready to support such an action should the President deem it necessary.

The famous legislator and philosopher, Sir Edmond Burke from England, once said, ''All that is needed for evil to exist is for good men to do nothing.'' I also recall the words of our great President Ronald Reagan when he said ''If not now, when? If not us, who?''

It is time for us to act, it is time to support our President, and it is time to tell the rest of the world that the American people speak with just one voice.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

(Mr. SOUDER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, today the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight unanimously approved the report of the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy, and Human Resources titled ''Federal Law Enforcement at the Borders and Ports of Entry,'' the most comprehensive report ever on our Nation's border security.

As chairman of this subcommittee, I would like to discuss some of the findings and how I feel they impact the debate on the resolution regarding Iraq that is before us.

There are 130 official ports of entry on the northern border at which it is legal to cross, whether by vehicle or foot. There are an additional over 300 unofficial crossing areas along the northern border, roads which are unmonitored and allow for individuals or groups to cross undetected.

Near Blaine, Washington, the only barrier is a narrow ditch easily stepped over and containing no water between two roads. In northwest North Dakota, it is even easier: It is flat for miles, and there is no ditch. As for the southern border, it is not exactly known as impenetrable. If we cannot stop tens of thousands of illegal immigrants, it does not breed a lot of confidence that we can stop all terrorists.

Our subcommittee has also begun to study port security. The challenges in our largest harbors, Long Beach and Los Angeles, are overwhelming. But by the time a nuclear device has slipped into L.A., we are already in deep trouble. Preclearance at point of origin, or at a point prior to coming into the U.S., is a probable method to reduce risk; but shipments could have chemical, biological, or nuclear weapons added en route at the receiving harbor or in transit to the next shipping point.

I have not even discussed airport security.

The point of my comments is this: If those opposed to this resolution somehow think we are going to stop terrorists from crossing our borders, that by itself is an incredibly high-risk strategy doomed to probable failure. As chemicals come across in different forms or nuclear weapons in parts, even with dramatically improved security we will not catch it all.

We need a multifaceted approach. We need a vastly improved intelligence collection and information-sharing. That is obvious to everyone. We are working to improve border security, port security, and airport security. But when we can see the chemical and biological facilities that have manufactured, can manufacture, and probably are manufacturing weapons of mass destruction intended for us, we need to act to destroy those facilities. When we get solid intelligence that someone intends to kill Americans and that they have the weapons to do so, we need to eliminate their capacity to do so.

If this leader and nation have already demonstrated, as Saddam Hussein has, a willingness to use such weapons of mass destruction to terrorize, like Iraq, alone in the world in demonstrating such willingness, then the need to act becomes urgent.

The American people do not want to burn while the politicians fiddle. We need to strengthen our borders. We need to monitor suspected terrorists and arrest those who become active. We need to take out the capacity of those bent on terrorizing our Nation.

If we implement all of these strategies, we have a chance of success. Partial, timid strategies against people bent upon killing Americans will not save lives. They will cost lives.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. JENKINS).

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution.

The preamble of this resolution sets out in detailed chronological order the obligations that were imposed upon and accepted by the regime of Saddam Hussein as the result of a United Nations-sponsored ceasefire in 1991. They were clear obligations for Saddam Hussein to end his nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons programs and the means to deliver them and to end his support for international terrorism. I have heard no one deny the existence of these obligations. I have heard no credible denial of their breach.

Since our country has been attacked by terrorists and we continue to be threatened, at least in part, due to the breach of these obligations, it becomes the duty of the President and this Congress to chart a course of action that will protect our country and all its citizens. This resolution in my opinion charts such a course.

□ 1715

It provides that the President is authorized to use the Armed Forces as he deems necessary and appropriate to defend the national security of the United States, and, secondly, to enforce all relevant United Nations Security Council resolutions regarding Iraq.

In the final analysis, it boils down to a matter of judgment, whether we should vote ''yes'' or ''no.'' My judgment is unless I vote ''yes,'' I have failed to meet the obligation that I have to the more than 630,000 men, women and children who constitute the First Congressional District of Tennessee who are at risk today because of the failures of Saddam Hussein.

Is there any question in anybody's mind what the votes of any of those brave leaders who founded or helped perpetuate our Nation would be? Leaders like President Washington, President Lincoln, President Truman, or

President Eisenhower, all who demonstrated during their time in office the good judgment to chart and the courage to complete a difficult course.

Can we not agree all of us in this Chamber that mankind would have been spared terrible agony and death if the judgment of Winston Churchill had been heard and heeded and adopted as a course of action in the 1930's?

The eyes of all our great leaders of the past and the eyes of all who have laid down their lives for our freedom are upon us today to see if we are proper stewards of the freedom and the opportunities that they afforded us with their sacrifices. This decision is vital, not only to the future of Americans, but to the future of the world community and to all who would throw off the yoke of tyranny and oppression and escape the horrors of chemical, bacteriological, and nuclear warfare.

If we are forced to action following this resolution, and it is everybody's hope that we will not be, it will be easier in proportion to our accord for those who represent us on the battlefield.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO).

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, over the last 6 weeks, the President has changed long-standing policy that prohibits a unilateral American first strike and has argued that his new policy should be imposed upon Iraq.

President Bush, to his credit, has decided to include Congress in this process and to seek international support for his positions, although he will not wait for such support to enforce his new policy.

The process is important, but it is not the most important aspect of his efforts. For me, the most important question in this entire matter is what happens after Saddam Hussein is dethroned. Forty years ago we amended our policies to state that America will no longer allow long-range nuclear weapons to be installed in our hemisphere, a precise policy that applied only to Cuba at that time.

Twenty years ago we amended our policy to state that America will not allow foreign leaders to enrich themselves by using their governmental structure to ship illegal drugs into America. Again, a precise policy which applied only to Panama at the time. Although the President has changed some of his arguments, there do seem to be three constant points that he uses.

Number one, Iraq has weapons of mass destruction. Number two, Iraq has supported terrorists even if the link to al Qaeda cannot be proven. Number three, Iraq has a history of aggression and brutality against its own people and against its neighbors. We all agree on all of those points. They are not subject to debate. Based on constant repetition of these factors, we must conclude these are the criteria America will use to implement our new unilateral strike policy. But is this reaction to Iraq's threat comparable to previous reactions to such threats? Is it clear and precise? Who else violates this new policy and, therefore, who would be next to have our new policy implemented against them?

Let us start with Iran. They have weapons of mass destruction. Iran has certainly supported terrorists and does so today. In fact, many people believe that this country, Iran, now is home to more al Qaeda members than any other country in the world. Finally, Iran has a history of aggression and brutality against its own people and its neighbors. When do we attack Iran?

What about China? They certainly have very powerful weapons of mass destruction, including nuclear weapons. They are the leading sellers of both weapons of mass destruction and, more importantly, the industrial means to produce such weapons around the world. They have ignored all calls to withdraw from Tibet or to treat Tibetans fairly. They brutalize the Falun Gong. They brutalize Christians. They threaten Taiwan and the peace in of all of Asia. When do we attack China?

When do we attack the Sudan? When do we attack North Korea? When do we attack Russia itself?

Each of these countries meets all of the criteria the President is now using to say we should attack Iraq unilaterally.

Most Americans want Saddam Hussein gone. So do I. Most Americans want the United States to remain the strongest Nation in the world. So do I. But most Americans also want the United States of America to continue to be the world's moral leader while we accomplish both of these goals.

President Bush's unclear, imprecise new policy in support of a unilateral force first strike does not do it.

Not long ago another American stated, ''Our purpose is peace. The United States intends no rashness and seeks no wider war. We seek the full and effective restoration of international agreements.'' This House reacted by voting, ''The United States is prepared as the President determines to take all necessary steps including the use of armed forces.''

I am sure some of you recognize these words from the 1963 Gulf of Tonkin Resolution that led to the Vietnam debacle. We all know the results of that resolution. We all know that this House had to repeal this resolution 6 years later.

This resolution before us tonight uses virtually the same language and grants the President comparable authority to the Gulf of Tonkin resolution. But I think our actions here today may actually prove to be more dangerous because we base them on a new policy of unilateral first strike. At a minimum, the President needs to refine his new policy before we implement. Until we do so, America must adhere to the long-standing policies in existence now. Those policies require international agreement on war and peace, and they require war to be the last alternative, not the first.

As of today, the United States, and we know it, has not exhausted our peaceful options; and by tomorrow when we vote on this, we will have set America and the world on a new course that has not yet been fully thought out or debated. We owe it to ourselves and to our children to go slow.

Others have cited history as well. Let me be clear, no one has forgotten September 11. Everyone wants to avoid another such incident. But no one has divine insight as how to best accomplish that goal. Let me ask those who have cited World War II and to remind them that when Iraq did try to expand its borders, the world did react. This Congress reacted, unlike Europe in the 1930's. The comparison is not valid.

If necessary there will be plenty of time to wage war against Iraq, and I may support it. But if an unnecessary war is waged, we risk forfeiting America's well-deserved reputation as humanity's best hope for a long-lasting worldwide peace.

Mr. Speaker, I urge this Congress to vote ''no'' on this resolution.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON).

(Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution and want to focus on what this debate is all about.

This debate is all about whether Saddam continued to build weapons of mass destruction after 1991 and would he use them. Well, I think everyone is in agreement in the second question, that he will use them because he has already done that. He has done it with the Kurds. He has done it with his own population a number of times.

Let us talk about whether or not he has weapons of mass destruction and how he got them. Mr. Speaker, I have given no less than 12 speeches on the floor of this House about the proliferation that occurred to Saddam Hussein in the 1990s.

Mr. Speaker, I insert two documents that I have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD five times in the past.

Mr. Speaker, these are chronologies of weapons-related transfers of technology to Saddam by Chinese interests and Russian interests.

[Los Angeles Times Editorials, May 21, 1998]

INDIGNATION RINGS SHALLOW ON NUKE TESTS

(By Curt Weldon)

Escalating tensions between India and Pakistan should come as no surprise to the Clinton administration. Since the president took office, there have been dozens of reported transfers of sensitive military technology by Russia and China—in direct violation of numerous international arms control agreements—to a host of nations, including Pakistan and India.

Yet the Clinton administration has repeatedly chosen to turn a blind eye to this proliferation of missile, chemical-biological and nuclear technology, consistently refusing to impose sanctions on violators. And in those handful of instances where sanctions were imposed, they usually were either quickly waived by the administration or allowed to expire. Rather than condemn India for current tensions, the blame for the political powder keg that has emerged in Asia should be laid squarely at the feet of President Clinton. It is his administration's inaction and refusal to enforce arms control agreements that have allowed the fuse to grow so short.

In November 1992, the United States learned that China had transferred M–11 missiles to Pakistan. The Bush administration imposed sanctions for this violation but Clinton waived them a little more than 14 months later. Clearly, the sanctions did not have the desired effect: Reports during the first half of 1995 indicated that M–11 missiles, additional M–11 missile parts, as well as 5,000 ring magnets for Pakistani nuclear enrichment programs were transferred from China. Despite these clear violations, no sanctions were imposed. And it gets worse.

Not to be outdone by its sworn foe, India aggressively pursued similar technologies and obtained them, illicitly, from Russia. From 1991 to 1995, Russian entities transferred cryogenic liquid oxygen-hydrogen rocket engines and technology to India. While sanctions were imposed by President Bush in May 1992, the Clinton administration allowed them to expire after only two years. And in June 1993, evidence surfaced that additional Russian enterprises were involved in missile technology transfers to India. The administration imposed sanctions in June 1993, and then promptly waived them for a month, never following up on this issue.

Meanwhile, Pakistan continued to aggressively pursue technology transfers from China. In August 1996, the capability to manufacture M–11 missile or missile components was transferred from China to Pakistan. No sanctions. In November 1996, a special industrial furnace and high-tech diagnostic equipment were transferred from China to an unprotected Pakistani nuclear facility. No sanctions. Also during 1996, the director of the Central Intelligence Agency issued a report stating that China had provided a ''tremendous variety'' of technology and assistance for Pakistan's ballistic missile program and was the principal supplier of nuclear equipment for Pakistan's program. Again, the Clinton administration refused to impose sanctions.

Finally, in recent months we have learned that China may have been responsible for the transfer of technology for Pakistan's Ghauri medium-range ballistic missile. Flight tested on April 6, 1998, the Ghauri missile has been widely blamed as the impetus for India's decision to detonate five nuclear weapons in tests earlier this month. Again, no sanctions were imposed on China.

Retracing the history of these instances of proliferation, it is obvious that Pakistan and India have been locked in an arms race since the beginning of the decade. And the race has been given repeated jump-starts by China and Russia, a clear violation of a number of arms control agreements. Yet rather than enforce these arms control agreements, the Clinton administration has repeatedly acquiesced, fearing that the imposition of sanctions could either strain relations with China and Russia or potentially hurt U.S. commercial interests in those countries.

Now the Clinton administration has announced a get-tough policy, threatening to impose sanctions on India for testing its nuclear weapons. But what about Russia and China, the two nations that violated international arms agreements? Shouldn't they also be subject to U.S. sanctions for their role in this crisis? Sadly, the Clinton administration is likely to ignore the proliferators and impose sanctions solely on India. In the meantime, China and Russia will continue their proliferation of missile and nuclear technology to other nations, including rogue states such as Iran, Iraq and Syria.

CHRONOLOGY OF CHINESE WEAPONS-RELATED TRANSFERS

Date of transfer or report	Reported transfer by China	Possible violation	Administration's response
Nov. 1992	M–11 missiles or related equipment to Pakistan (The Administration did not officially confirm reports that M–11 missiles are in Pakistan.).	MTCR—Arms Export Control Act, Export Administration Act	Sanctions imposed on Aug. 24, 1993, for transfers of M–11 related equipment (not missiles); waived on Nov. 1, 1994.
Mid-1994 to mid-1995	Dozens or hundreds of missile guidance systems and computerized machine tools to Iran.	MTCR—Iran-Iraq Arms Nonproliferation Act, Arms Export Control Act, Export Administration Act.	No sanctions.
2nd quarter of 1995	Parts for the M–11 missile to Pakistan	MTCR—Arms Export Control Act, Export Administration Act	No sanctions.
Dec. 1994 to mid-1995	5,000 ring magnets for an unsafeguarded nuclear enrichment program in Pakistan.	NPT—Export-Import Bank Act, Nuclear Proliferation Prevention Act, Arms Export Control Act.	Considered sanctions under the Export-Import Bank Act; but announced on May 10, 1996, that no sanctions would be imposed.
July 1995	More than 30 M–11 missiles stored in crates at Sargodha Air Force Base in Pakistan.	MTCR—Arms Export Control Act, Export Administration Act	No sanctions.
Sept. 1995	Calutron (electromagnetic isotope separation system) for uranium enrichment to Iran.	NPT—Nuclear Proliferation Prevention Act, Export-Import Bank Act, Arms Export Control Act.	No sanctions.
1995–1997	C–802 anti-ship cruise missiles and C–801 air-launched cruise missiles to Iran.	Iran-Iraq Arms Nonproliferation Act	No sanctions.
before Feb. 1996	Dual-use chemical precursors and equipment to Iran's chemical weapon program.	Arms Export Control Act, Export Administration Act	Sanctions imposed on May 21, 1997.
summer 1996	400 tons of chemicals to Iran	Iran-Iraq Arms Nonproliferation Act,[1] Arms Export Control Act, Export Administration Act.	No sanctions.
Aug. 1996	Plant to manufacture M–11 missiles or missile components in Pakistan.	MTCR—Arms Export Control Act, Export Administration Act	No sanctions.
Aug. 1996	Gyroscopes, accelerometers, and test equipment for missile guidance to Iran.	MTCR—Iran-Iraq Arms Nonproliferation Act, Arms Export Control Act, Export Administration Act.	No sanctions.
Sept. 1996	Special industrial furnace and high-tech diagnostic equipment to unsafeguarded nuclear facilities in Pakistan.	NPT—Nuclear Proliferation Prevention Act, Export-Import Bank Act, Arms Export Control Act.	No sanctions.
July-Dec. 1996	Director of Central Intelligence (DCI) reported ''tremendous variety'' of technology and assistance for Pakistan's ballistic missile program.	MTCR—Arms Export Control Act, Export Administration Act	No sanctions.
July-Dec. 1996	DCI reported ''tremendous variety'' of assistance for Iran's ballistic missile program.	MTCR—Iran-Iraq Arms Nonproliferation Act, Arms Export Control Act, Export Administration Act.	No sanctions.
July-Dec. 1996	DCI reported principal supplies of nuclear equipment, material, and technology for Pakistan's nuclear weapon program.	NPT—Nuclear Proliferation Prevention Act, Export-Import Bank Act, Arms Export Administration Act.	No sanctions.
July-Dec. 1996	DCI reported key supplies of technology for large nuclear projects in Iran.	NPT—Iran-Iraq Arms Nonproliferation Act, Nuclear Proliferation Prevention Act, Export-Import Bank Act, Arms Export Administration Act.	No sanctions.
July-Dec. 1996	DCI reported ''considerable'' chemical weapon-related transfers of production equipment and technology to Iran.	Iran-Iraq Arms Nonproliferation Act, Arms Export Control Act, Export Administration Act.	No sanctions.
Jan. 1997	Dual-use biological items to Iran	BWC—Iran-Iraq Arms Nonproliferation Act, Arms Export Control Act, Export Administration Act.	No sanctions.
1997	Chemical precursors, production equipment, and production technology for Iran's chemical weapon program, including a plant for making glass-lined equipment.	Iran-Iraq Arms Nonproliferation Act, Arms Export Control Act, Export Administration Act.	No sanctions.
Sept. to Dec. 1997	China Great Wall Industry Corp. provided telemetry equipment used in flight-tests to Iran for its development of the Shahab-3 and Shahab-4 medium range ballistic missiles.	MTCR—Iran-Iraq Arms Nonproliferation Act, Arms Export Control Act, Export Administration Act.	No sanctions.
Nov. 1997/April 1998	May have transferred technology for Pakistan's Ghauri medium-range ballistic missile that was flight-tested on April 6, 1998.	MTCR—Arms Export Control Act, Export Administration Act	No sanctions.

[1] Additional provisions on chemical, biological or nuclear weapons were not enacted until February 10, 1996.

BWC: Biological Weapons Convention; MTCR: Missile Technology Control Regime; and NPT: Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty.

CHRONOLOGY OF SUSPECTED RUSSIAN WEAPONS-RELATED TRANSFERS

Date of transfer or report	Reported Russian transfers that may have violated a regime or law	Possibly applicable treaties, regimes, and/or U.S. laws	Administration's response
early 1990s	Russians sold drawings of a sarin plant, manufacturing procedures, and toxic agents to a Japanese terrorist group.	AECA sec. 81, EAA sec. 11C	No publicly known sanction.
1991	Transferred to China three RD–120 rocket engines and electronic equipment to improve accuracy of ballistic missiles.	MTCR, AECA sec. 73, EAA sec. 11B	No publicly known sanction.
1991–1995	Transferred Cryogenic liquid oxygen/hydrogen rocket engines and technology to India.	MTCR, AECA sec. 73, EAA sec. 11B	Sanctions against Russia and India under AECA and EAA imposed on May 6, 1992; expired after 2 years.
1992–1995	Russian transfers to Brazil of carbon-fiber technology for rocket motor cases for space launch program.	MTCR, AECA sec. 73, EAA sec. 11B	Sanctions reportedly secretly imposed and waived.
1992–1996	Russian armed forces delivered 24 Scud-B missiles and 8 launchers to Armenia.	MTCR, AECA sec. 73, EAA sec. 11B	No publicly known sanction.

CHRONOLOGY OF SUSPECTED RUSSIAN WEAPONS-RELATED TRANSFERS—Continued

Date of transfer or report	Reported Russian transfers that may have violated a regime or law	Possibly applicable treaties, regimes, and/or U.S. laws	Administration's response
June 1993	Additional Russian enterprises involved in missile technology transfers to India.	MTCR, AECA sec. 73, EAA sec. 11B	Sanctions imposed on June 16, 1993 and waived until July 15, 1993; no publicly known follow-up sanction.
1995-present	Construction of 1,000 megawatt nuclear reactor at Bushehr in Iran.	IIANPA sec. 1604 and 1605, FOAA, NPPA sec. 821, FAA sec. 620G	Refused to renew some civilian nuclear cooperation agreements; waived sanctions on aid.
Aug. 1995	Russian assistance to Iran to develop biological weapons	BWC, AECA sec. 81, EAA sec. 11C, IIANPA sec. 1604 and 1605, FAA sec. 620G and 620H.	No publicly known sanction.
Nov. 1995	Russian citizen transferred to unnamed country technology for making chemical weapons.	AECA sec. 81, EAA sec. 11C	Sanctions imposed on Nov. 17, 1995.
Dec. 1995	Russian gyroscopes from submarine launched ballistic missiles smuggled to Iraq through middlemen.	United Nations Sanctions, MTCR, AECA sec. 73, EAA sec. 11B, IIANPA sec. 1604 and 1605, FAA sec. 620G and 620H.	No publicly known sanction.
July-Dec. 1996	DCI reported Russia transferred to Iran ''a variety'' of items related to ballistic missiles.	MTCR, AECA sec. 73, EAA sec. 11B, FAA sec. 620G and 620H, IIANPA sec. 1604 and 1605, FOAA.	No publicly known sanction.
Nov. 1996	Israel reported Russian assistance to Syria to build a chemical weapon plant.	AECA sec. 81, EAA sec. 11C, FAA sec. 620G and 620H	No publicly known sanction.
1996–1997	Delivered 3 Kilo diesel-electric submarines to Iran	IIANPA sec. 1604 and 1605, FAA sec. 620G and 620H	No publicly known sanction.
Jan.-Feb. 1997	Russia transferred detailed instructions to Iran on production of the SS–4 medium-range missile and related parts.	MTCR, AECA sec. 73, EAA sec. 11B, FAA sec. 620G and 620H, IIANPA sec. 1604 and 1605, FOAA.	No publicly known sanction.
April 1997	Sale of S–300 anti-aircraft/anti-missile missile system to Iran to protect nuclear reactors at Bushehr and other strategic sites.	IIANPA sec. 1604 and 1605, FAA sec. 620G and 620H	No publicly known sanction.
Oct. 1997	Israeli intelligence reported Russian technology transfers for Iranian missiles developed with ranges between 1,300 and 10,000 km. Transfers include engines and guidance systems.	MTCR, AECA sec. 73, EAA sec. 11B, IIANPA sec. 1604 and 1605, FAA sec. 620G and 620H, FOAA.	No publicly known sanction.

Regimes:
BWC: Biological Weapons Convention; and MTCR: Missile Technology Control Regime.
U.S. Laws:
AECA: Arms Export Control Act; EAA: Export Administration Act; FAA: Foreign Assistance Act; FOAA: Foreign Operations Appropriations Act; IIANPA: Iran-Iraq Arms Non-Proliferation Act; and NPPA: Nuclear Proliferation Prevention Act.

Mr. Speaker, during the 1990s, I would remind my colleagues, 37 times we had evidence of China and Russia transferring weapon technology to Hussein. Every one of those should have required a response, should have required sanctions. The previous administration imposed sanctions a total of four times out of 37. In nine of those cases, it was chemical and biological weapon technology, the very technology today that we are worried about. We saw it being transferred, and we did nothing about it. In fact, only in two of those nine cases did we impose the required sanctions.

Mr. Speaker, we have evidence which I will submit in the RECORD also of Iraq's policy on their defense system and offensive capabilities, both a 1984 document and a 1987 document. In the document Saddam's military talks about the use of chemical and biological weapons.

In President Bush's speech this past week he said, ''All that might be required of Saddam are a small container and one terrorist or Iraqi intelligence operative to deliver it.''

Well, here it is. Mr. Speaker, this is a biological disbursing device. You can build it for less than $100. If I would not offend the Parliamentarian, I would turn it on and you would have a plume in this room. If you put that device in the Metro station subway in D.C. and activate it, based on a study by the Office of Technology Assessment, you would have 150,000 people in the D.C. commuter system killed by the dispersion of 4.5 kilograms of anthrax.

Just like we saw back in the 1990s when we had evidence that Russian entities transferred these devices, a Soviet accelerometer and a Soviet gyroscope, which the previous administration did nothing about, never imposed the required sanctions. Now we have to pay the price.

Does Saddam have chemical and biological weapons? Absolutely. Where did he get it from? He got it from those 37 transfers that we knew about that are now in the record that we did nothing about. Does he have a nuclear weapon like the one I have in front of me that General Alexander Lebed told my delegation in 1997 that they built? And the previous administration when it became public said, we deny the Russians ever built them.

The previous administration sided with the Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and said we have no reason to doubt them, even though two top Russian leaders said there was reason to believe 80 of these devices were missing.

The reason why we have to support the President is because the failures of our policies in the past decade have given Saddam Hussein biological and chemical weapon capability, nuclear weapon capability, missile capability, none of which should have occurred during the 1990s if we would have enforced the very arms control agreements that the other side now talks about. Thirty-seven times we had evidence, nine cases of chemical and biological weapons going from Russian and China to Iraq. And what did we do? We went like this and like that. And now we are faced with the consequence.

So what President Bush has said is we must stand up and we must show the world that we will not tolerate what went on in the 1990s. We will not sit back and allow 37 violations to go unchecked. We will not pretend we do not see them because we want to keep Yeltsen in power. We will not pretend we do not want to see them because we want to protect the financial interests of the PLA for our fund-raising purposes.

We should have done this during the 1990s, but we did not. I say to my colleagues, support this resolution. Give the President a unanimous voice that says to the U.N., we will act to finally do what we did not do in the 1990s, and that is enforce the requirements of the six resolutions that were passed back then.

And if my colleagues want to see what a biological disbursement weapon looks like, come see me. I will activate it for them in the cloak room.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution. As I have listened to this thorough debate and thought about the resolution we are about to vote on, it seems to me the Persian Gulf War has never really ended. In 1991 Saddam Hussein agreed to a conditional surrender. He has not met the conditions of his surrender. Iraq is still fighting, and we need to respond.

I have heard some of my colleagues say that use of force against Iraq would be a preemptive strike. I disagree. In 1991 Saddam Hussein said Iraq would comply with all United Nations resolutions. Iraq has not done so. Iraq agreed to eliminate nuclear, chemical and biological weapons programs. Today Iraq still has weapons of mass destruction and the will to use them.

Hussein agreed to allow unfettered weapons inspection in this country. However, Iraq has done everything possible to obstruct those inspections. Iraq pledged to keep planes out of the no-fly zone. In the past few years, his pilots have fired on U.S. and British troops 1,600 times. They have shot at us 460 times this year alone.

Iraq continues to be a threat to the area. In 1993 Iraqi troops moved toward the Kuwaiti border. Iraqi planes continued to fly in the no-fly zone. When Iraq banned U.N. inspections in 1998, President Clinton responded by launching missiles into the country.

□ 1730

Was that a preemptive strike? Along with the British, we dropped more than 600 bombs on Iraqi military targets. We have continued strikes against Iraq air defense installations and in response to Iraq shots at our planes in the no-fly zone.

Iraq must be held to the conditions it agreed to. This Congress authorized action to bring Iraq into compliance in 1998. We must do so again. Until Iraq

complies with the terms of its conditional surrender, there has been no surrender. The Persian Gulf War is ongoing.

Further, U.S. action against Iraq is not a preemptive strike, but is our responsibility to bring Saddam Hussein's continued plotting of his international obligations to an end. President Bush wants the commitment that Congress stands with him in dealing with Iraq.

I urge that Congress stand with President Bush and support the resolution to finally end the Gulf War once and for all.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS).

(Mr. STEARNS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution, but we are engaged in debating the most difficult decision that Members of Congress are called upon to make.

Notwithstanding that, Saddam Hussein is uniquely evil, the only ruler in power today, and the first one since Hitler, to commit chemical genocide. I believe there is reason for the long term to remove him from power. This resolution is the first step.

My colleagues, remember that Israel absorbed the world's hatred and scorn for its attack on and destruction of Iraq's Osirak nuclear reactor in 1981. Today it is accepted by most arms control experts that had Israel not destroyed Osirak, Hussein's Iraq would have had nuclear power by 1990, when his forces pillaged their way through Kuwait.

We can see on this chart all the resolutions that were passed and that Saddam Hussein did not comply with. In fact, there were 12 immediately after the war; 35 after those 12. All together, 47 resolutions, of which he scarcely complied.

Now, let us take the resolution on this chart, which is 687, governing the cease-fire in 1991. It required that Iraq unconditionally accept the destruction, removal or rendering harmless its chemical and biological weapons. Within 15 days after the passage of the resolution, Iraq was to have provided the locations, the amounts, and types of those specified items. Over a decade later, we still have little information on that.

That is why I applaud President Bush for taking his case to the United Nations and placing the burden of action upon the organization to enforce its own resolutions passed on Iraq. We owe diplomacy and peaceful opportunities the due diligence necessary to rid this despotic regime of weapons of mass destruction and terrorism sponsorship. However, if the U.S. is not credible in alternatives for noncompliance, we will again be at the crossroads asking the same question: If not now, when?

Let us move forward with this resolution, develop a consensus, and work together with other nations to remove this evil dictator.

Mr. Speaker, our vote this week will be whether or not to authorize the President of the United States to use necessary and appropriate force to defend the national security of the United States against the continuing threat posed by Iraq. I would like to emphatically state that no decision weighs heavier on the mind of a President, or a Member of Congress, than the decision to send our men and women of the Armed Forces into action.

And I want to thank the President for working hard to make the case for possible—and I want my colleagues and the public to understand this—possible action against Iraq. The President stated last night that he hopes military action is not required. Iraq can avoid conflict by adhering to the security resolutions requiring "declaring and destroying all of its weapons of mass destruction, ending support for terrorism and ceasing the persecution of its civilian population. And, it must release or account for all gulf war personnel, including an American pilot, whose fate is still unknown."

To quote a recent article from the "Weekly Standard":

> There are, of course, many repugnant dictators in the world; a dozen or so in the Middle East alone. But Saddam Hussein is a figure of singular repugnance, and singular danger. To review: There is no dictator in power anywhere in the world who has, so far in his career, invaded two neighboring countries; fired ballistic missiles at the civilians of two other neighboring countries; tried to have assassinated an ex-president of the United States; harbored al-Qaida fugitives . . . attacked the soldiers of an enemy country with chemical weapons; conducted biological weapons experiments on human subjects; committee genocide; and there is, of course, the matter of the weaponized aflatoxin, a tool of mass murder and nothing else.

And lastly, my colleagues, President Bush is not alone in calling for a regime change. Congress made the need for regime change clear in 1998 with the passage of the Iraq Liberation Act. The congress specifically stated "It should be the policy of the United States to support efforts to remove the regime headed by Saddam Hussein from power in Iraq and to promote the emergence of a democratic government to replace that regime." In that legislation we also called upon the United Nations to establish an international criminal tribunal to prosecute Saddam Hussein and those in his regime for crimes against humanity and criminal violation of international law.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to respond to the comments made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), who pointed out that our actions against Saddam during the 1990s were not as aggressive as they should have been.

I would point out that we were also not aggressive until September 11 of the prior year. Both administrations failed to grasp the importance of Saddam Hussein's weapons program until September 11 of last year.

I would also point out that when the prior administration did take military action against Saddam Hussein, it did not receive the level of support and unified support that it should have.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5½ minutes to the extremely distinguished and thoughtful gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FORD).

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I join the gentleman from California and associate myself with his remarks. I would hope my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), who I believe is right on this issue, would refrain from politicizing. If there is blame to go around, there is certainly enough blame to go around here in this town today, yesterday, and even a few days ago.

After careful consideration, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution. This vote is the most important and difficult one I have cast since coming to Congress some 6 years ago. I sincerely hope, as I imagine most of my colleagues do, that we will never have to cast another one like it.

I have listened carefully to the concerns and objections of many of my colleagues and constituents; and having never served in the Armed Forces, I have sought the counsel of those who have. I have reviewed the available intelligence about the threat from Iraq and weighed the risk of a potential conflict with Iraq in the context of our ongoing war on terrorism; and I have reached the conclusion, as many have, that the risk of inaction and delay far outweigh the risk of action.

Saddam Hussein has stockpiled chemical and biological weapons, as all have mentioned today, and is seeking the means to deliver them, if he does not already have the capacity now. He is developing missile delivery systems that could threaten American citizens, service members, and our own allies in the region. But in today's world, a sworn enemy of America does not need a missile to deliver weapons of mass destruction. All he needs is a suitcase, a small plane, a cargo ship, or a single suicidal terrorist.

The most compelling case for action, however, Mr. Speaker, is the nuclear threat. Let us be clear. We do not have the intelligence suggesting that an imminent nuclear threat is upon us. I would urge Secretary Rumsfeld to cease suggesting to Americans that there is some connection between Saddam Hussein and al Qaeda unless he has evidence to present to this Congress and to this public.

What we do have evidence of is that Saddam Hussein continues to desire to obtain a nuclear weapon. And we know that should he obtain the raw materials, which may be available to him in any number of ways, he could build a nuclear bomb in less than a year. The Iraqi regime's efforts to obtain nuclear weapons are coupled with the recklessness of the Iraqi dictator. We know that Saddam is capable of murder and untold cruelty. We know that Saddam is capable of aggression and also capable of miscalculating his adversary's response to his aggression.

Weapons of mass destruction in the hands of a cruel, reckless, and misguided dictator pose a clear and present danger to our security. I could not vote to authorize military action

abroad if I did not believe that Saddam Hussein poses a growing threat to our security, one that will not recede just because we hope it goes away. That is why I support giving the President the authority to achieve our fundamental goal: disarming the Iraqi regime of all weapons of mass destruction.

As we consider this resolution, every Member should read it carefully so we do not mischaracterize what we are voting on here today. So what is this resolution for? First, it is a resolution stating Congress' support for our diplomatic efforts. This resolution must not be taken as an endorsement of unilateralism. It explicitly affirms Congress' support for the President's efforts to work through the U.N. Security Council to address Iraq's ''delay, evasion and noncompliance.'' It calls for prompt and decisive action by the U.N. Security Council to enforce its own mandates on Iraq.

Second, this resolution is not a declaration of war. The resolution forces the President to affirm that all diplomatic and peaceful means have proven inadequate to protect our Nation's security. This gives the President the flexibility to dangle a stick with that carrot.

At the same time, it affirms that military action must be used only as a last resort. If it were up to some of us in this Congress, we would have done it another way, perhaps building international support before coming to Congress, but this President chose to do it another way.

Third, the resolution more defines our purpose in authorizing the use of force. The use of force has two clearly defined purposes: one, to defend the national security of the United States against the continuing threat posed by Iraq; and, two, to enforce all relevant United Nations Security Council resolutions regarding Iraq.

Unlike the White House's draft language, the resolution carefully limits its authorization to Iraq and only Iraq. And it is clear that our purpose is to protect against the threat to the United States. This resolution authorizes military action to disarm Iraq but does not mention regime change. The goal is Iraq's disarmament and full compliance with U.N. mandates.

I applaud Leader GEPHARDT and others, including Republicans and Democrats in the Senate, for helping to negotiate such language.

Although I strongly support the President in addressing the threat from Iraq, I believe the President must be more candid with us and the American people about the long-term commitment that is going to be needed in Iraq. It has been a year since we began the campaign in Afghanistan; and our efforts there politically, economically, and militarily are nowhere close to concluding. I visited Afghanistan in February and March and witnessed firsthand how fragile the peace is there. It will take years to forge stability in Afghanistan and years in Iraq.

War is the last outcome that I want, and the last outcome I believe the President wants; but when America's national security is at stake, the world must know that we are prepared to defend our Nation from tyrants and from terrorists. With that, I ask every Member of Congress to support this resolution supporting our President and supporting our Nation.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I stand in support of Joint Resolution 114.

Mr. Speaker, the way I see it is this way. Let us just say, hypothetically, if it was August 2001, and I stood before this House and said, listen, there is a guy out there named Osama bin Laden who is associated with a terrorist group named al Qaeda, and this terrorist group has found safe haven inside the corrupt Taliban government of Afghanistan. And, my colleagues, I think we should do something about it because our intelligence is not necessarily absolute, but this guy is up to no good and we need to strike before he strikes us.

Now, if I had said that in August of 2001, people would have said, that war monger, that jingoistic guy from Georgia. What is he talking about? Yet before September 11, would it not have been nice if we could have had that speech and maybe prevented the tragedy of September 11?

Well, here we are. We know Saddam Hussein has violated treaty after treaty which happened after Desert Storm, starting with U.N. Resolution 660, U.N. Resolution 678, U.N. Resolution 686, 687, 688, 701, all of them. In fact, 16 total of very significant matters going back to Resolution 660. All of them violated, Mr. Speaker.

And then here is the situation with the weapons. We know that they have VX. It is a sticky, colorless liquid that interferes with nerve impulses of the body, causes convulsions and paralysis. U.N. inspectors estimate that Iraq has the means to make 200 tons of VX. Sarin Gas. And, of course, we know that it causes convulsions and paralysis as well. It was used in a small quantity in a Tokyo subway in 1995. Again, inspectors estimate that they have maybe as high as 800 tons of sarin gas. It goes on. Mustard gas, anthrax, and other great worrisome chemical and biological weapons in their stockpile. We also know that he is trying to become nuclear capable.

Finally comes the question of terrorism. We know that the State Department has designated Iraq as a state that sponsors international terrorism. We know that they shelter the Abu Nidal terrorist organization that has carried out terrorist attacks in 20 different countries and killed over 900 people.

We also know that Iraq shelters several prominent terrorist Palestinian organizations, including the Palestine Liberation Front, which is known for its attacks on Israel, including one on the Achille Lauro ship that killed the United States citizen, Leon Klinghoffer.

My colleagues, the time to act is now. If we could just think for a minute what the price of action is versus inaction. Had Todd Beamer and the other passengers of Flight 93 elected a course of inaction on September 11, the price would have been significantly different for particularly those of us in this building. This is a time that calls for action. And in the great words of Todd Beamer, let me close with this: ''Let's roll.''

It is time to do something. Let us pass this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Joint Resolution 114, Authorizing the Use of Military Force Against Iraq.

Here's how I view the situation: Suppose last August (2001), I gave a speech announcing, ''There's a guy named Osama Bin Laden who is involved in a terrorist group called Al Quida, which has found a safe haven and training opportunities inside the corrupt Taliban government of Afghanistan. Bin Laden and his terrorist allies probably were involved in the 1993 bombing of the WTC, the bombing of the USS *Cole* in Yemen, and the bombing of our embassies in Africa. We know Bin Laden hates America and it is likely his group will attack our country in the future. Therefore we need to eliminate him. I suggest we start bombing his hideouts in Afghanistan immediately.''

Had I given that speech, I would have been laughed at and called a warmonger, even though action against Al Quida in August 2001 could have saved thousands of lives in both America and Afghanistan. But this, in fact, is our situation today. Saddam Hussein hates us. He harbors terrorist groups, possesses chemical and biological weapons, and may become nuclear capable in a short period of time. America traditionally does not do preemptive strikes, but the events of September 11th change everything. Americans will not tolerate the threat of another horrific attack against the United States. Although no American desires a war, the best way to ensure Hassein's compliance with UN resolutions, and reduce the threat he poses to our national security, is for Congress to confirm the United State's willingness to use force if necessary.

Mr. Speaker, let me give you an account of all the reasons why I support this resolution.

The whole world knows that Saddam Hussein has repeatedly violated all 16 of the United Nations Security Council Resolutions (UNSCRs) for more than a decade. These violations should not be taken lightly and are worthy of review. The list is substantial:

UNSCR 678—NOVEMBER 29, 1990—VIOLATED

Iraq must comply fully with UNSCR 660 (regarding Iraq's illegal invasion of Kuwait) ''and all subsequent relevant resolutions.''

Authorizes U.N. Member States ''to use all necessary means to uphold and implement resolution 660 and all subsequent relevant resolutions and to restore international peace and security in the area.''

UNSCR 686—MARCH 2, 1991—VIOLATED

Iraq must release prisoners detained during the Gulf War.

Iraq must return Kuwaiti property seized during the Gulf War.

Iraq must accept liability under international law for damages from its illegal invasion of Kuwait.

UNSCR 687—APRIL 3, 1991—VIOLATED

Iraq must ''unconditionally accept'' the destruction, removal or rendering harmless ''under international supervision'' of all ''chemical and biological weapons and all stocks of agents and all related subsystems and components and all research, development, support and manufacturing facilities.''

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

Iraq must ''unconditionally accept'' the destruction, removal or rendering harmless ''under international supervision'' of all ''ballistic missiles with a range greater than 150 KM and related major parts and repair and production facilities.''

Iraq must not ''use, develop, construct or acquire'' any weapons of mass destruction.

Iraq must reaffirm its obligations under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

Creates the United Nations Special Commission (UNSCOM) to verify the elimination of Iraq's chemical and biological weapons programs and mandated that the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) verify elimination of Iraq's nuclear weapons program.

Iraq must declare fully its weapons of mass destruction programs.

Iraq must not commit or support terrorism, or allow terrorist organizations to operate in Iraq.

Iraq must cooperate in accounting for the missing and dead Kuwaitis and others.

Iraq must return Kuwaiti property seized during the Gulf War.

UNSCR 688—APRIL 5, 1991—VIOLATED

''Condemns'' repression of Iraqi civilian population, ''the consequences of which threaten international peace and security.''

Iraq must immediately end repression of its civilian population.

Iraq must allow immediate access to international humanitarian organizations to those in need of assistance.

UNSCR 707—AUGUST 15, 1991—VIOLATED

''Condemns'' Iraq's ''serious violation'' of UNSCR 687.

''Further condemns'' Iraq's noncompliance with IAEA and its obligations under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

Iraq must halt nuclear activities of all kinds until the Security Council deems Iraq in full compliance.

Iraq must make a full, final and complete disclosure of all aspects of its weapons of mass destruction and missile programs.

Iraq must allow U.N. and IAEA inspectors immediate, unconditional and unrestricted access.

Iraq must cease attempts to conceal or move weapons of mass destruction, and related materials and facilities.

Iraq must allow U.N. and IAEA inspectors to conduct inspection flights throughout Iraq.

Iraq must provide transportation, medical and logistical support for U.N. and IAEA inspectors.

UNSCR 715—OCTOBER 11, 1991—VIOLATED

Iraq must cooperate fully with U.N. and IAEA inspectors.

UNSCR 949—OCTOBER 15, 1994—VIOLATED

''Condemns'' Iraq's recent military deployments toward Kuwait.

Iraq must not utilize its military or other forces in a hostile manner to threaten its neighbors or U.N. operations in Iraq.

Iraq must cooperate fully with U.N. weapons inspectors.

Iraq must not enhance its military capability in southern Iraq.

UNSCR 1051—MARCH 27 19961—VIOLATED

Iraq must report shipments of dual-use items related to weapons of mass destruction to the U.N. and IAEA.

Iraq must cooperate fully with U.N. and IAEA inspectors and allow immediate, unconditional and unrestricted access.

UNSCR 1060—JUNE 12, 1996—VIOLATED

''Deplores'' Iraq's refusal to allow access to U.N. inspectors and Iraq's ''clear violations'' of previous U.N. resolutions.

Iraq must cooperate fully with U.N. weapons inspectors and allow immediate, unconditional and unrestricted access.

UNSCR 1115—JUNE 21, 1997—VIOLATED

''Condemns repeated refusal of Iraqi authorities to allow access'' to U.N. inspectors, which constitutes a ''clear and flagrant violation'' of UNSCR 687, 707, 715, and 1060.

Iraq must cooperate fully with U.N. weapons inspectors and allow immediate, unconditional and unrestricted access.

Iraq must give immediate, unconditional and unrestricted access to Iraqi officials whom U.N. inspectors want to interview.

UNSCR 1134—OCTOBER 23, 1997—VIOLATED

''Condemns repeated refusal of Iraqi authorities to allow access'' to U.N. inspectors, which constitutes a ''flagrant violation'' of UNSCR 687, 707, 715, and 1060.

Iraq must cooperate fully with U.N. weapons inspectors and allow immediate, unconditional and unrestricted access.

Iraq must give immediate, unconditional and unrestricted access to Iraqi officials whom U.N. inspectors want to interview.

UNSCR 1137—NOVEMBER 12, 1997—VIOLATED

''Condemns the continued violations by Iraq'' of previous U.N. resolutions, including its ''implicit threat to the safety of'' aircraft operated by U.N. inspectors and its tampering with U.N. inspector monitoring equipment.

Reaffirms Iraq's responsibility to ensure the safety of U.N. inspectors.

Iraq must cooperate fully with U.N. weapons inspectors and allow immediate, unconditional unrestricted access.

UNSCR 1154—MARCH 2, 1998—VIOLATED

Iraq must cooperate fully with U.N. and IAEA weapons inspectors and allow immediate, unconditional and unrestricted access, and notes that any violation would have the ''severest consequences for Iraq.''

UNSCR 1194—SEPTEMBER 9, 1998—VIOLATED

''Condemns the decision by Iraq of 5 August 1998 to suspend cooperation'' with U.N. and IAEA inspectors, which constitutes ''a totally unacceptable contravention'' of its obligations under UNSCR 687, 7078, 715, 1060, 1115, and 1154.

Iraq must cooperate fully with U.N. and IAEA weapons inspectors, and allow immediate, unconditional and unrestricted access.

UNSCR 1205—NOVEMBER 5, 1998—VIOLATED

''Condemns the decision by Iraq of 31 October 1998 to cease cooperation'' with U.N. inspectors as ''a flagrant violation'' of UNSCR 687 and other resolutions.

Iraq must provide ''immediate, complete and unconditional cooperation'' with U.N. and IAEA inspectors.

UNSCR 1284—DECEMBER 17, 1998—VIOLATED

Created the United Nations Monitoring, Verification and Inspections Commission (UNMOVIC) to replace previous weapon inspection team (UNSCOM).

Iraq must allow UNMOVIC ''immediate, unconditional and unrestricted access'' to Iraqi officials and facilities.

Iraq must fulfill its commitment to return Gulf War prisoners.

Calls on Iraq to distribute humanitarian goods and medical supplies to its people and address the needs of vulnerable Iraqis without discrimination.

While all these violations are extremely serious, there are 3 or 4 items that stand out in my mind.

His blatant refusal to allow U.N. weapons inspectors to oversee the destruction of his weapons of mass destruction.

His continued development of new biological and chemical weapons.

His continued pursuit of nuclear weapons, and

His support and harboring of terrorist organizations inside Iraq (including Al Quida).

Mr. Speaker, some people have said, ''why are we doing this now?'' They say there is no ''clear and present danger.'' I don't know how much clearer it has to be. The facts of the matter are documented, and undoubtedly pose a clear and present danger to our national security.

Documented U.N. weapons inspector reports show that Iraq continually deceived the inspectors and never provided definitive proof that they destroyed their stockpiles of biological and chemical weapons.

Iraq has admitted producing the world's most dangerous biological and chemical weapons, but refuses to give proof that they destroyed them. Examples of Iraq's chemical weapons include VX, Sarin Gas and Mustard Gas.

VX, the most toxic of chemical weapons, is a sticky, colorless liquid that interferes with the body's nerve impulses, causing convulsions and paralysis of the lungs and blood vessels. Victims essentially chock to death. A dose of 10 milligrams on the skin is enough to kill.

Iraq acknowledged making nearly 4 tons of VX, and ''claimed'' they destroyed it, but they never provided any definitive proof. U.N. inspectors estimate that Iraq has the means to make more than 200 tons of VX, and Iraq continues to rebuild and expand dual-use facilities that it could quickly adapt to chemical weapons production.

Sarin gas, a nerve agent like VX, causes convulsions, paralysis and asphyxiation. Even a small scale Sarin Gas attack such as the one used in the Tokyo subway in 1995 can kill and injure vast numbers of people.

Iraq acknowledged making approximately 800 tons of Sarin gas and thousands of rockets, artillery shells and bombs containing Sarin, but they have not accounted for hundreds of these weapons. Iraq willingly used these weapons against Iran during the Iran-Iraq war, and it also used them against Kurdish Iraqi civilians.

Mustard Gas, a colorless liquid that evaporates into a gas and begins dissolving upon

contact with the skin causes injuries similar to burns and damages the eyes and lungs.

Iraq acknowledged making thousands of tons of mustard gas and using the chemical during it's war with Iran, but told U.N. inspectors they ''misplaced'' 550 mustard filled artillery shells after the Gulf war.

Examples of Iraq's biological weapons include Anthrax, Botulimun Toxin and Aflatoxin

Anthrax, as we all know, is a potentially fatal bacterium that causes flu like symptoms before filling the lungs with fluid and causing death. Just a few tiny spores are enough to cause the deadly infection.

Iraq has acknowledged making 2,200 gallons of anthrax spores—enough to kill millions, but U.N. inspectors determined that Iraq could have made three times as much. Inspectors say that at least 16 missile warheads filled with Anthrax are missing, and Iraq is working to produce the deadlier powdered form of Anthrax that could be sprayed from aircraft, put into missile warheads, or given to terrorists.

Botulimun Toxin, is a poison that is one of the deadliest substances known to man. Even in small doses it causes gastrointestinal infection and can quickly advance to paralysis and death. A mere 70 billionths of a gram is enough to kill if inhaled.

Iraq acknowledged making 2,200 gallons of Botulimun Toxin, most of which was put into missile warheads and other munitions. At least five missile warheads with Botulimun Toxin are missing according to U.N. inspectors.

Aflatoxin, is a poison that can cause swelling of the abdomen, lungs and brain resulting in convulsion, coma and death.

Iraq acknowledged making more than 520 gallons of Aflaxtoxin and putting it into missile warheads and bombs. At least four Aflatoxin—filled missile warheads are missing according to U.N. inspectors.

It is also a fact (and a clear and present danger) that Saddam Hussein continues his work to develop a nuclear weapon.

We know he had an advanced nuclear weapons development program before the Gulf War, and the independent Institute for Strategic Studies concluded that Saddam Hussein could build a nuclear bomb within months if he were able to obtain fissile material.

We now know that Iraq has embarked on a worldwide hunt for materials to make an atomic bomb. In the last 14 months, Iraq has sought to buy thousands of specially designed aluminum tubes, which are believed to be intended for use as components of centrifuges to enrich uranium.

As if weapons of mass destruction in the hands of a ruthless dictator were not enough, we now know that Saddam Hussein harbors terrorist organizations within Iraq.

Iraq is one of seven countries that have been designated by the State Department as ''state sponsors of international terrorism.'' UNSUR 687 prohibits Saddam Hussein from committing or supporting terrorism, or allowing terrorist organizations to operate in Iraq. Saddam continues to violate these UNSUR provisions.

Iraq shelters the Abu Nidal Terrorist Organization that has carried out terrorist attacks in twenty countries, killing or injuring almost 900 people. These terrorists have offices in Baghdad and received training, logistical assistance, and financial aid from the government of Iraq.

Iraq also shelters several prominent Palestinian terrorist organizations in Baghdad, including the Palestine Liberation Front (PLF), which is known for attacks against Israel and is headed by Abu Abbas, who carried out the 1985 hijacking of the cruise ship *Achille Lauro* and murdered U.S. citizen Leo Klinghoffer.

Hussein increased from $10,000 to $25,000 the money he offers to families of Palestinian suicide/homicide bombers who blow themselves up with belt explosives.

Several former Iraqi military officers have described a highly secret terrorist training facility in Iraq known as Salman Pak, where both Iraqis and non-Iraqi Arabs receive training on hijacking planes and trains, planting explosives in cities, sabotage, and assassinations.

And in 1993, the Iraqi Intelligence Service (IIS) attempted to assassinate former U.S. President George Bush and the Emir of Kuwait. Kuwaiti authorities thwarted the terrorist plot and arrested 17 suspects, led by two Iraqi nationals.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know how much clearer it needs to be. The American people will not understand if we ignore these facts, sit back, and wait for the unacceptable possibility of Saddam Hussein providing a weapon of mass destruction to a terrorist group for use against the United States.

Saddam Hussein was the only world leader to fully condone the September 11 attacks on America. His media even promised the American people that if their government did not change its policies toward Iraq, it would suffer even more devastating blows. He has even endorsed and encouraged acts of terrorism against America.

The case is clear. We know Saddam Hussein has weapons of mass destruction, we know he harbors terrorists including al-Qaida, and we know he hates America, so the case against Saddam really isn't the issue. The question is what are we going to do about it.

Cearly, we must authorize the use of military force against Iraq in case it becomes necessary. The President has said that military action is a last resort, and our bipartisan resolution calls for the same tact, but Saddam Hussein must know that America is prepared to use force if he continues to defy UN Security Council resolutions and refuses to disarm.

As the President said, approving this resolution does not mean that military action is imminent or unavoidable. The resolution will tell the United Nations, and all nations, that America speaks with one voice and is determined to make the demands of the civilized world mean something. Congress will be sending a message to Saddam Hussein that his only choice is full compliance—and the time remaining for that choice is limited.

The Speaker, the price of taking action against this evil dictator may be high, but history has shown that the price of inaction is even higher. Had Todd Beamer and the passengers of flight 93 elected a course of inaction on September 11th, the price may have been far higher for those of us in this building. There comes a time when we must take action. A time when we must risk lives in order to save lives. This resolution authorizes action, if necessary, to protect America.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that I speak for every member of this House when I say I hope we can avoid war & that Saddam Hussein will allow unfettered access to all sites and willingly disarm. But if he does not, then the Congress will have done its duty and given the President the authority he needs to defend our great nation. The authority to take action if Iraq continues to delay, deceive and deny. If Hussein complies, our resolution will have worked, but if he does not, then in the words of that brave American Todd Beamer, ''Let's Roll!''

□ 1745

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH).

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Speaker, in this body our first and highest responsibility is protecting our homeland, and that responsibility may from time to time require us to embrace unpopular policies and justify them to our constituents when we recognize a transcendent danger to our country.

Mr. Speaker, I realize my vote for this resolution authorizes a military action that may put at risk thousands of American lives in Iraq. However, the tragedies of September 11 have vividly highlighted the danger that inaction may risk tens, if not hundreds of thousands of innocent American lives here at home from terrorism.

This bipartisan resolution was drafted in recognition of this fact and, therefore, presents our President with the initiative in continuing the global war against terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, we know that Saddam Hussein, like Osama bin Laden, hates America and has called for the murder of Americans everywhere. We know that Saddam Hussein even in the face of crippling economic sanctions has found the resources to reconstruct his chemical and biological weapons programs, even at great painful expense to his people.

We know that Saddam Hussein is directing an aggressive program to procure components necessary for building nuclear devices and that he actively supports terror in other nations, including Israel. So the question before us is, do we wait for Saddam Hussein to become a greater threat, or do we address that threat now?

CIA Director Tenet has told us in recent days that al Qaeda has sought cooperation from Iraq. I cannot stand here and trust that Saddam Hussein will not supply al Qaeda and other terrorist networks with weapons that could be used to massacre more Americans. On the contrary, we have every reason to believe that the Iraqi dictator would share his growing arsenal of terror with agents willing to strike at the United States.

With this in mind, and given other revelations from captured members of al Qaeda, it is clear that time is not on our side. That is why I support this balanced and nuanced resolution providing our President with the powerful backing of Congress in an effort to disarm Iraq. It is my sincere hope that this resolution will stimulate intrusive and decisive action by the United Nations and at the same time lead to a full disarmament of Saddam Hussein. But if it does not, the United States of America must stand willing to act in

order to prevent more events like those of September 11.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON), a member of the Committee on Armed Services and a combat veteran from Vietnam.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the vote we are debating today will be the most significant vote that we cast during this Congress and perhaps during our entire careers. I say that for two reasons.

First, this vote may very well send our American soldiers into what has been called on this floor ''harm's way.'' Make no mistake about it, it is important to note that is a very nice and sanitary way of saying that our soldiers will be going to war. They will face combat conditions that our forces have not seen during most of our lifetimes. According to the military experts and the generals I have heard from, the casualty rates may be high.

If, as some expect, Saddam Hussein uses chemical and biological weapons to defend Baghdad, the results will be horrifying.

Mr. Speaker, I have been in combat; and I am not willing to vote to send another soldier to war without clear and convincing evidence that America or our allies are in immediate danger and not without the backup and support of allied forces.

The President delivered a good speech on Monday evening. I agree with him that Saddam Hussein is a ruthless dictator and that he is trying to build an arsenal of weapons of mass destruction. However, he showed us no link between Iraq and September 11, nor did he produce any evidence that even suggests that America or our allies are in immediate danger.

This morning we learned from the CIA that Saddam Hussein is unlikely to use chemical or biological weapons if unprovoked by a U.S. military campaign. Most alarming about that news today is the report concludes by saying that, if we attack, the likelihood of him using weapons of mass destruction to respond would be ''pretty high.''

Second, this vote is a radical departure from the foreign policy doctrine that has served us honorably for the past 200 years. This radical departure to an unprovoked, preemptive first-strike policy creates what I believe will be a grave new world. This new foreign policy doctrine will set an international precedent that tells the world, if they think their neighbor is a threat, attack them.

This, I believe, is precisely the wrong message for the greatest Nation, the only true superpower Nation and the most wonderful democracy our planet has known, to send to Russia and Chechnya, to India and Pakistan, to China and Taiwan, and to whomever else is listening. And one thing we know, everyone is listening.

For these two reasons, I cannot support a resolution that does not first require that all diplomatic options be exhausted, that we work with the United Nations Security Council, and that we proceed to disarm Iraq with a broad base of our allies.

I appreciate the President's new position that war is the last option and that he will lead a coalition in our effort in Iraq. But, unfortunately, that is not what this resolution says. This resolution is weak at best on exhausting the diplomatic options and relinquishes to the executive branch Congress' constitutional charge to declare war. I believe that is wrong.

We must address the potential danger presented by Saddam Hussein. The first step should be the return of the U.N. weapons inspectors; and they must have unrestricted and unfettered access to every square inch of Iraq, including the many presidential palaces. We must then work with the Security Council to ensure the strictest standards, protocols, and modalities are in place to make certain that Hussein cannot weasel out of any of these inspections.

Finally, we need to amass the allied support necessary to carry out the inspections in a manner that will guarantee Iraq is completely stripped of all weapons of mass destruction and left unable to pursue new weapons of this type.

We had great success in building a coalition to fight terrorism, and we should do no less when it comes to disarming Saddam Hussein. We must respect international order and international law in our efforts to make this world a safer place.

With our military might, we can easily gain superiority over anyone in the world. However, it takes more than military might to prevail in a way that provides hope and prosperity, two ingredients that make it less likely for terrorism to breed and impossible for repressive dictators to rule.

Mr. Speaker, if it is the decision of this Congress to go to war, I will support our troops 1,000 percent. However, I saw Baghdad and I know fighting a war there will be ugly and casualties may be extremely high. Let us exhaust the diplomatic options, return the weapons inspectors, continue to build an international coalition so Saddam Hussein sees the world, not just the U.S. at the end of the gun. By doing this, we can avoid sending our soldiers into combat in Baghdad unless it is absolutely the last option.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, voting to authorize sending young Americans to war is a serious decision. Members will make that decision in this Chamber tomorrow.

Yesterday and today we have heard very impressive debate, most of which favors the resolution; some did not. We have heard over and over again the threat that Saddam Hussein and his regime is not only to the United States and our interests but to many other parts of the world.

I am not going to restate those issues that have already been stated yesterday and today, but as one of the many cosponsors of House Joint Resolution 114, I do rise in support of this resolution to authorize the use of United States military force against Saddam Hussein's regime.

Much like the first hours and days after September 11, the world, our friends and our foes, wondered how would the United States respond to that attack on our Nation? They wanted to know if we as a Nation would follow through with a serious response to bring the terrorists to justice. They wanted to see if we would respond with a token strike, as we did following the attack on U.S. troops in Somalia, at Khobar Towers in Saudi Arabia, against our embassies in Kenya and Tanzania, and in the attack on our sailors aboard the USS *Cole*. The world watched. Our credibility was at stake. Before joining us, many of our friends were waiting to see if we were serious this time. Our enemies were not concerned because they believed they could absorb another token response, as they had in past years.

But the message became clear just 3 days after September 11. A response was certain when Congress, with a strong bipartisan vote, stood and unanimously approved a $40 billion emergency supplemental appropriations bill to allow the President of the United States to lead not only a recovery effort in those parts of our country that were attacked in New York City and at the Pentagon but to pursue the war against the Taliban and against al Qaeda and against any terrorist, wherever they might be hiding. It was to fund the war against terrorism, wherever they were waiting to attack again.

When Congress spoke, almost immediately, with unity and with force, our friends knew we were serious this time, and it was with confidence that they joined our cause. And our enemies knew right away that America was serious; and when President Bush said what it was we were going to do, they knew that we had the resolve to fight the battle, no matter how long it would take or where it would lead.

Today, we are in a similar situation. There is no question about the threat to our Nation from Saddam Hussein's regime, to our allies, and to world peace. As has been pointed out here many times today, he has defied one United Nations resolution after another for more than a decade.

Remember, he lost the war. He lost the war in Desert Storm, and he signed up to certain rules and regulations which go along with losing a war, and he has ignored all of them. He has developed and stockpiled chemical and biological weapons. We know that he is seeking nuclear weapons. We know

that he has aided and abetted terrorists who have struck international targets around the world. But now it is time for Congress to speak again with a firm and resolute voice, just as we did on September 14, 3 days after the cowardly attacks on innocent Americans.

Many of our friends are watching and they are waiting today, as they were last year. Are they going to join with us, or not? Is this a serious effort, or not? Is Congress speaking for the American people to support the President of the United States as he seeks to protect this Nation and our interests?

President Bush needs Congress to act to convince our allies, our friends, and our enemies that we are serious. They need to know that our Nation is resolved to continue this battle against terrorism into Iraq if necessary.

Many have said that Saddam Hussein is not a real threat to the United States because he is so far away, and he is far away. It is a long distance.

□ 1800

Many have said that the President's speech Monday night did not address a lot of new subjects. He compiled and organized very well, many of the existing arguments. But he did say something new for those who paid really close attention. The President discussed for the first time publicly information that many of our colleagues who work with intelligence issues have been aware of for quite some time. That involves Saddam Hussein's aggressive efforts to develop and use unmanned aerial vehicles, UAVs, as a delivery method for his weapons of mass destruction. The SCUDs did not have a very long range. The SCUDs were not very accurate. I can attest to that because one night visiting with General Schwarzkopf during Desert Storm in Saudi Arabia, a SCUD was launched near our site, and it landed not too far away; but it was far enough away that it did not hurt anybody. So we know that the SCUDs were not that accurate. UAVs are a different story. UAVs have a much longer range; UAVs are able to be piloted and trained specifically on a target. UAVs are dangerous. And if my colleagues do not think UAVs have a long range, we ourselves have flown a UAV from the United States to Australia and back. Saddam is aggressively seeking ability to use those long-range UAVs to put so many more targets in his sights. We cannot let that happen.

Mr. Speaker, with this resolution Congress reaffirms our support for the international war against terrorism. It continues to be international in nature, as this resolution specifically expresses support for the President's efforts to strictly enforce, through the United Nations Security Council, and I will repeat that, through the United Nations Security Council, all relevant Security Council resolutions applicable to Iraq. It also expresses support for the President's efforts to obtain prompt decisive action by the Security Council to ensure that Iraq abandons its strategy of delay, evasion, and noncompliance with those resolutions.

One of the lessons of September 11 is that terrorism knows no boundaries. Its victims are men and women, children and adults. It can occur here; it can occur abroad. It can occur anywhere. Terrorists strike without warning. If we are to fight and win the war on terrorism, we must remain united, united in the Congress, united with the President of the United States, and united with the American people. President Bush told the Nation last September that victory would not come quickly or easily. It would be a battle unlike any our Nation has ever waged. Now is not the time to send a mixed message to our friends and allies. Now is not the time to show our enemies any weakness in our resolve.

Mr. Speaker, as we prepare to record our votes on this important resolution, we should remember the victims of terrorism, September 11 and other examples, and our promise last year to seek out and destroy the roots of terrorism whether it be its sponsors, planners, or the perpetrators of these cowardly missions. We should remember the unity of our Nation and the world. The battle continues, the stakes remain high, and the cause remains just. America must again speak one more time with unity, with force, and with clarity. This resolution does that.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP).

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, the Iraqi regime has posed a threat to peace, to the United States, and to the world for too long. In order to protect America against this very real and growing threat, I support giving the President the authority to use force, to use military action if necessary against Iraq. Without a doubt this is one of the most difficult decisions I have had to make as a Member of Congress. But after briefings from the administration, testimony from congressional hearings, I am convinced the threat to our Nation's safety is real. After repeatedly failing to comply with U.N. inspections, Saddam Hussein's efforts to build weapons of mass destruction, biological, chemical and nuclear, have gone unchecked for far too long. The world cannot allow him to continue down this deadly path. Saddam Hussein must comply with U.N. inspections; but if not, America and our coalition must be prepared to meet this threat.

After the Gulf War, in compliance with U.N. resolutions, a no-fly zone was implemented. The purpose was to protect Iraqi Kurds and Shiite Muslims from Saddam Hussein's aggressions and to conduct aerial surveillance. But since its inception, pilots patrolling the zones have come under repeated attack from Iraqi missiles and artillery.

The connection between Iraq's weapons of mass destruction and its longstanding ties to terrorist networks such as al Qaeda has significantly altered the U.S. security environment. The two linked together pose a clear and present danger to our country. Consider that Saddam Hussein could supply the terrorists who have sleeper cells in our land with weapons of mass destruction to attack the U.S. while concealing his responsibility for the action. It is a very real and growing threat. The Iraqi regime has been building a case against itself for more than 10 years, and if we fail to heed the warning signs and allow them to continue down this path, the results could be devastating, but they would not be a surprise.

After September 11, we are on notice. If Saddam Hussein refuses to comply with U.N. resolutions and diplomatic efforts, we have only one choice in order to ensure the security of our Nation and the safety our citizens.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS), a member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, years ago when I was a world away fighting to contain the scourge of communism in Southeast Asia, a movement grew up here at home to protest what we were doing. Late in the war, one of the anthems of that movement was a song by John Lennon called ''Give Peace a Chance.'' We are not here to debate the Vietnam War, but we are discussing war and peace. Peace is a very precious thing, and we should defend it and even fight for it. And we have given peace a chance for 11 long years.

We gave peace a chance through diplomacy, but Saddam Hussein has broken every agreement that came out of that diplomacy. We gave peace a chance through weapons inspections, but Saddam Hussein orchestrated an elaborate shell game to thwart that effort. We gave peace a chance through sanctions, but Saddam Hussein used those sanctions as an excuse to starve his own people. We gave peace a chance by establishing no-fly zones to prevent Saddam Hussein from killing more of his own citizens, but he shoots at our planes every day. We gave peace a chance by allowing him to sell some oil to alleviate the suffering of the Iraqi people, but instead he used the revenue to build more weapons of mass destruction.

Mr. Speaker, we have given peace a chance for more than a decade, and it has not worked. Even now our President is actively working to achieve a diplomatic solution by getting the United Nations to pass a resolution with teeth; and while the United Nations has an important role to play in this, no American President and no American Congress can shirk our responsibility to protect the American people. If the U.N. will not act, we must.

If we go down to the other end of the national Mall, we will see on the Korean War Memorial the words ''Freedom is not free.'' Peace is not free either. What some of those who are protesting the President's request for military authority do not understand is that our freedoms were not won with poster paint. Antiwar protestors do not win our freedoms or our peace. The freedom to live in peace was won by men and women who gave their lives on the battlefields of history.

As the world's only remaining superpower, we now even have an even greater responsibility to stand up to prevent mass murder before it happens. No world organization can override the President's duty and our duty to protect the American people. If Mohammed Atta had had a nuclear weapon, he would have used that weapon in New York and not an airplane. By all accounts Saddam Hussein is perhaps a year away from having nuclear weapons. He already has chemical and biological weapons capable of killing millions.

When police detectives investigate a crime, they look for three things: means, motive, and opportunity. Clearly Saddam Hussein has the means, he has the weapons, and he has the motive. He hates America, he hates the Kurds, he hates Kuwaitis, he hates Iran, he hates Israel, he hates anyone who gets in his way. And we know that when he hates people, he kills them, sometimes by the thousand. He has shown the propensity to use his weapons and so he has the means and the motive. But does he have the opportunity? Saddam Hussein could easily pass a suitcase with a nuclear weapon off to an al Qaeda terrorist with a one-way ticket to New York. No fingerprints, no evidence, and several million dead Americans.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very real danger. Before September 11 we might have thought this could never happen. Today we are too wise to doubt it, and it is a danger that grows every day. Every day Saddam Hussein grows stronger. Every day Saddam Hussein builds more chemical and biological weapons. Every day Saddam Hussein comes a little closer to achieving nuclear weapons capability. Every day that passes, America grows more vulnerable to a Saddam-sponsored terrorist attack.

In this case inaction is more costly than action. The price of delay is a greater risk. The price of inaction could be catastrophic, even worse than September 11. We must disarm Saddam Hussein.

Mr. Speaker, we are not advocating war. We are calling for peace, but peace might only be possible if we are willing to fight for it, and the President needs that authority to do that. I urge support for the resolution.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and that he be able to control and yield that time to others.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILCHREST). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very difficult vote for me. If there is ever one vote that should be made in the national interest, a vote that transcends politics and where Members must vote their conscience, it is the one that is before us tonight.

I have received thousands of letters against the resolution, and just this past weekend over 15,000 gathered in Central Park in my district to protest. But what is at stake are not our political careers or an election, but the future of our country and our way of life. I believe there is a more compelling case now against Saddam than 12 years ago. Then the threat was of a geopolitical nature, a move to change the map of the Middle East. But I never saw it as a direct threat to our Nation.

The main question before us today is whether Saddam is a threat to the United States and our allies. No one doubts that he has chemical and biological weapons. No one doubts that he is trying to stockpile weapons of mass destruction. No one doubts that he has thwarted inspections in the past and has developed UAVs. No one doubts that he has consistently worked to develop nuclear power. No one doubts that he has twice invaded his neighbors. The question is, Will he use these weapons against the United States and our allies, and can we deter him without using force?

As Lincoln said in the beginning days of the Civil War: ''The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise to the occasion. As our case is new, so must we think anew and act anew.''

I would be for deterrence if I thought it would work. We are in a new era and no longer in the Cold War. Deterrence depends on the victim knowing from where the aggression will come and the aggressor knowing the victim will know who has attacked him. It has been a year since the anthrax attacks in our Nation, and we still do not know where the attacks came from. Saddam has likely taken notice that we were unable to tie evidence of attacks to their source, and if he believes he can give weapons of mass destruction to terrorists to use against us without our knowing he has done so, our ability to deter him from such a course of action will be greatly diminished.

□ 1615

Opponents of our war talk about the unintended consequences of war. They do not talk about the unwanted consequences of not disarming Saddam. In today's environment, it is very possible he could supply weapons to terrorists who will attack the United States or our allies around the world.

I am pleased the resolution has been improved with congressional input. We should proceed carefully, step by step, and use the United Nations and the international community to disarm Saddam so that we are safer in the United States and New York and in our respective States and clear around the world.

Just today I spoke with British Permanent Representative to the United Nations, Sir Jeremy Greenstock, on this issue. Ambassador Greenstock told me that the members of the Security Council, both permanent and otherwise, will approve a robust inspection resolution; and if this fails to disarm Iraq, he expects a second resolution that may authorize force.

I come from a family of veterans. Most recently, my brother served in the 101st Airborne in Vietnam. It happens to be his birthday today. He told me that he parachuted many times behind enemy lines to acquire enemy intelligence. He saw many of his friends machine gunned down. This searing experience left deep wounds. So it is my deepest hope that we will not have to send our men and young women into harm's way.

So it is with a very heavy heart, but a clear resolve, that I will be voting to support this resolution. The accumulation of weapons of mass destruction by Saddam and the willingness of terrorists to strike innocent people in the United States and our allies across the world have, unfortunately, ushered in a dangerous new era. It is a danger that we cannot afford to ignore.

I will be voting yes. I will be supporting the President on this resolution.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this resolution to authorize the use of military force against Iraq. I stand behind the Commander-in-Chief and our men and women in uniform who may be called upon to defend America's freedom again.

The War Powers Resolution was passed to ensure that the collective judgment of both the Congress and the President will apply before the introduction of our Armed Forces into hostilities. I want to commend the President for working with Congress on crafting this critical resolution.

Time and time again, Mr. Speaker, Saddam Hussein and the Iraqi regime have refused to comply with the sanctions imposed by the United States and its international community. In 1990, Iraq committed an unprovoked act of aggression and occupation against its Arab neighbor Kuwait, a peace-loving nation.

After the Gulf War, the Iraqi government continually violated the terms of the United Nations-sponsored cease-fire agreement. They refused to provide access to weapons inspectors to investigate suspected weapon production facilities.

Americans and coalition force pilots have been fired upon thousands of times while lawfully enforcing the no-fly zone crafted by the United Nations Security Council. In 1993, they attempted to assassinate former President Bush. As we speak here today, members of al Qaeda are known to be within the borders of Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, history has proven that Saddam Hussein and his government cannot be dealt with through diplomatic channels or peaceful means. He only understands death, destruction and trampling on the human rights of others, as evidenced by his treatment of the Kurdish people in Northern Iraq and anyone in his government who questions his power.

Some may argue that America is acting as the aggressor and planning a preemptive strike without justification. To the contrary, this is anticipatory self-defense against evil forces and weapons that threaten our national security and peace and stability throughout the Persian Gulf and the world.

We do not want to see another day like September 11 ever again in America, or anywhere else on God's great Earth. If we do not put an end to Iraq's development of its weapons of mass destruction program, the future could be worse.

America must act forcefully and with great resolve because the costs are too high. The time has come for America once again to set the example for the rest of the free world. Our children and our grandchildren should not have to face this threat again.

I ask all of my colleagues to vote in favor of this joint resolution.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT).

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for the President in his policy regarding Iraq. Resolutions regarding war are not something we consider without much thought, and this should be very serious business for this House and each Member of it.

The last few months, there has been much talk about Iraq being given the opportunity to respond to weapons inspections. Sometimes this is said as if it were a new idea. However, when a defiant Saddam Hussein has repeatedly rejected inspections and threatened inspectors, there is little reason to believe that he will cooperate.

You may have seen the movies in which a prison is going to be inspected. The warden replaces the spoiled food with fresh vegetables and maybe even a meat entree. If Saddam Hussein allows inspectors in, it will only be at specific locations and not the unlimited, surprise inspections that we need in order to have our questions answered.

The fact that our President would consider any additional form of inspection is a testimony of his desire to avoid conflict. Saddam Hussein's actions in the past show a lack of regard, both for his own people and for his neighboring nations.

I remember back about 10 years ago as a young man preparing to practice law. It was about that time that the U.S. and our allies spent an enormous time and effort freeing the Kuwaiti people and hoped that the Iraqi people would also be able to free themselves from the dictator.

In World War II, Hitler introduced a concept of blitzkrieg, a high-speed attack by land and air. Today's increasingly long-range and accurate rockets, armed with warheads of mass destruction, makes blitzkrieg look like slow motion.

The President's top advisers and the Secretary of Defense, along with other members of the President's Cabinet, have briefed Members of Congress repeatedly and in a timely manner. I went down to Pennsylvania Avenue to the White House just last week, and back on September 19 met with the Secretary of Defense along with several other Members of Congress at the Pentagon to discuss and be briefed on the situation in Iraq.

Now, the President needs our support so that he can act quickly and decisively against the threat of Iraq should he deem that action necessary.

Again, let me stress, the action that we take this week is not just another vote for the United States Congress. It is, indeed, one of those landmark votes that will be long remembered and recorded in the history books. The action that we take this week might just, and certainly we pray, negate the need to send our troops into harm's way.

I would urge all the Members to support our President and vote yes on this resolution.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT).

(Mr. NETHERCUTT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate that we fully discuss here the most serious responsibility that is entrusted to Congress, and that is authorizing the President to use force in the defense of our Nation. The decision by Congress to authorize the deployment of the U.S. military requires somber analysis and sober consideration, but it is not a discussion that we should delay.

The President has presented to the American people a compelling case for intervening in Iraq, and this body has acted deliberately in bringing to the House floor a resolution that unequivocally expresses our support for our Commander-in-Chief.

The threat to our national security from Iraq could not be more apparent. After the 1991 Persian Gulf War, the United Nations Special Commission on Iraq succeeded in destroying thousands of chemical munitions, chemical agents and precursor chemicals. Iraq admitted to developing offensive biological weapons, including botulinum, anthrax, aflatoxin, clostridium and others.

Yet this list of poisons describes only what the U.N. inspectors were able to detect in the face of official Iraqi resistance, deception and denial. They could not account for thousands of chemical munitions, 500 mustard gas bombs and 4,000 tons of chemical weapons precursors. In the intervening period, development efforts have continued unabated, and accelerated following the withdrawals of U.N. inspectors.

Iraq has repeatedly demonstrated a resolve not only to develop deadly weapons of mass destruction but to use them on their own people: 5,000 killed, 20,000 Iranians killed through mustard gas clouds and the most deadly agents that were inflicted on human beings. Perhaps in different hands the deadly arsenal possessed by Saddam Hussein's Iraq would be less of an imminent threat.

This authorization of force that we will vote on soon is at some level also a recognition of the ongoing state of war with Iraq. In the last 3 weeks, 67 attempts have been made to down collision aircraft. Four hundred and six attempts have been made this year.

The U.S. has struggled against the tepid resolutions and general inactivity of the international community for a decade. Regime change cannot happen through domestic posturing. Disarmament requires more than fervent hopes and good wishes.

On December 9, 1941, President Roosevelt said, ''There is no such thing as impregnable defense against powerful aggressors who sneak up in the dark and strike without warning. We cannot measure our safety in terms of miles on any map.''

In 1941, Congress stood with the President and promised full support to protect and defend our Nation. I urge our colleagues today to do the same.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), who serves with distinction on the Committee on International Relations and is the ranking Democrat on the Subcommittee on Health Care of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, for years our policy in this country has been one of containment, of deterrence, of collective security, of diplomacy. We contained and we deterred Joseph Stalin and the Soviets for decades. We have contained and deterred Fidel Castro and the Cubans for 40 years. We have contained and deterred Communist China in its expansionist tendencies for 5 decades.

Now this President wants to radically change our decades-old foreign policy of containment and deterrence to a policy of first strike. What does that tell the world? Does it embolden Russia to attack Georgia to better deal with Chechnya? Does it set an international precedent for China to go into Taiwan or deal even more harshly with Tibet? Does it embolden India or Pakistan, or both, each with nuclear weapons, from going to war in Kashmir?

The whole point of the Security Council is to prevent member states, including veto-wielding permanent members, perhaps especially veto-wielding permanent members, to prevent those member states from launching first strike, unilateral, unprovoked war.

Resolution 678, which authorized the Gulf War, called explicitly for countries cooperating with the exiled Kuwaiti loyals to create a coalition to use force. No country, no country in international law, has the unilateral right to decide Iraq has not complied with U.N. requirements, let alone what the U.N. response should be.

A couple of weeks ago, three retired four-star generals testified in the other body, stating that attacking Iraq without a United Nations' resolution supporting military action could limit aid from allies, would supercharge, in the general's words, supercharge recruiting for al Qaeda and undermine our war on terrorism.

□ 1830

There are too many questions the administration has yet to answer. If we strike Iraq on our own, what happens to our campaign against terrorism? Most of our allies in the war on terror oppose U.N. unilateral action against Iraq. Will our coalition against terrorism fracture? And if we win a unilateral war, will we be responsible for unilaterally rebuilding Iraq?

I am not convinced this administration possesses the political commitment to reconstruct the damage after we defeat Saddam Hussein to bring democracy to that country. It will entail appropriations of hundreds of millions of dollars a year, year after year after year. Do we have the political will and the financial commitment to do that in that country, in that region? Should a new enemy arise while we are paying for the campaign against al Qaeda and the reconstruction of Iraq, will our resources be so overextended that we will not be able to address this new threat?

This Congress should not authorize the use of force unless the administration details what it plans to do and how we will deal with the consequences of our actions, namely, what will the U.S. role be after military action is completed? We should set stronger conditions before any military action is permitted.

The President should present to Congress a comprehensive plan that addresses the full range of issues associated with action against Iraq: a cost estimate for military action, a cost estimate for reconstruction of Iraq, along with a proposal for how the U.S. is going to pay for these costs. We are going more into debt. Will there ever be a prescription drug benefit? Will we continue to underfund education? Will the economy continue to falter if we do this war?

We should do an analysis of the impact on the U.S. domestic economy of the use of resources for military action and the use of resources for reconstruction of Iraq. We should answer the questions.

We should have a comprehensive plan for U.S. financial and political commitment to long-term cultural, economic, and political stabilization in a free Iraq if the President is going to talk about Iraq being a model of democracy in the Middle East.

We should have a comprehensive statement that details the extent of the international support for military operations in Iraq and what effect a military action against Iraq will mean for the broader war on terrorism.

We should have a comprehensive analysis of the effect on the stability of Iraq, and the region, of any regime change in Iraq that may occur as a result of U.S. military action.

And, finally, we should have a commitment that the U.S. will take necessary efforts to protect the health, safety, and security of the U.S. Armed Forces and Iraqi civilians.

Mr. Speaker, before we send our young men and women to war, before we put our young men and women in harm's way, we must make certain in every way that this is the best course of action.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, could I inquire as to the time remaining on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILCHREST). The gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) has 2 hours and 26 minutes remaining; the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) has 39 minutes remaining; and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) has 20 minutes remaining.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman on the other side of the aisle if we could agree to a 2- or 3-to-1 split in order to normalize the time, since there is such a disparity in the amount consumed.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I would agree to a 2-to-1 split, I would say to my friend from California.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. We will proceed with two in a row and then yield.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS).

(Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, if there is anything that 9–11 and the events of that day taught us, it is that our policy of containment and deterrence does not work against terrorists who are willing to blow themselves up and, at the same time, innocent civilians.

I rise in support of this historic resolution, fully aware that this may be one of the most important votes this body casts.

We all hope that we can disarm Iraq without bloodshed. That is our goal. We all hope and pray that risking the lives of the women and men of our Armed Forces will prove unnecessary. We hold out hope that this time, against the recent tide of history, Saddam will allow U.N. inspectors full access, free of deception and delay. But if the events of 9–11 and ongoing intelligence-gathering have shown us anything, Mr. Speaker, it is that we must remain ever vigilant against the new and growing threat to the American way of life. Terrorists who are willing to commit suicide to murder thousands of innocents will not be halted by the conventional means and policies of deterrence we have deployed.

The greatest danger we face is in not acting, in assuming the terrorists who are committed to destroying our Nation will remain unarmed by Saddam. The first strike could be the last strike for too many Americans.

Mr. Speaker, we know enough at this point about the specific dangers posed by Iraq to make this resolution unavoidable: large stockpiles of chemical and biological weapons, an advanced and still-evolving nuclear weapons production program, support for and the harboring of terrorist organizations, the brutal repression and murder of its own civilian population, and the utter disregard for U.N. resolutions and dictates.

Mr. Speaker, we know enough.

We all applaud and support the President's commitment to working with the U.N. Security Council to deal with the threat that Iraq poses to the United States and our allies. I continue to hope and pray for a peaceful, internationally driven resolution to this crisis, but I believe that passing this resolution strengthens the President's hand to bring this about.

But with the events of September 11 still fresh in our minds and in our hearts, we cannot rest our hopes on the possibility that Iraq will comply with U.N. resolutions. Iraq has defied the United Nations openly for over a decade.

Today we are being asked to fulfill our responsibilities to our families, our constituents, and our Constitution; and I think we have to give the President the appropriate tools to proceed if Saddam does not cooperate with the arms inspectors and comply with existing U.N. resolutions.

While we should seek the active support of other nations, we must first and foremost protect our homeland, our people, and our way of life.

Mr. Speaker, I pray for the best as we prepare for the worst. Today, we recognize that there may come a time in a

moment when we realize that we are involved in a profound global struggle in which Saddam's regime is clearly at the epicenter on the side of evil; when it becomes clear there are times when evil cannot be appeased, ignored, or simply forgotten; when confrontation remains the only option.

There are moments in history when conscience matters, in fact, when conscience is the only thing that matters. I urge my colleagues to vote their conscience and acknowledge the danger confronting us, by not entrusting our fate to others, by demonstrating our resolve to rid the world of this menace. I urge this with a heavy heart, but a heart convinced that if confrontation should be required, we are ready for the task.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER).

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution.

Defending America against all enemies, foreign and domestic, is the first and fundamental purpose of the Federal Government. Once, it took countries of great economic wealth to field a powerful military, to threaten the United States, and to place our people in fear. The threat of this new century has now changed, because we have individuals that truly hate us and can use something as simple as box cutters to place our people in fear and terror.

With regard to the threat of Saddam Hussein, it must be recognized for what it is: a deliberate and patient campaign by Saddam to terrorize free people and undermine the very foundations of liberty.

I am sufficiently convinced without hesitation that Saddam represents a clear and present danger. As a Gulf War veteran, I am filled with emotion to contemplate that my comrades will once again be upon the desert floor. I submit that it is easier to be ordered to war than to vote that someone else may go in my place. However, now is the time for our Nation to in fact be vigilant and to authorize the President to preserve freedom through military action, if necessary, and to take our foreign policy as defense in depth.

In many respects, this resolution represents a continuation of the Gulf War. Saddam Hussein agreed to provisions of the cease-fire. He has violated his cease-fire, he has been flagrant in his violations, and the hostility is now open and notorious. After a decade of denial, deception, and hostility toward the world, it is time to seek Iraq's compliance and, if necessary, remove this despotic dictator, his weapons of mass destruction, and the terrorists he supports and harbors.

Saddam Hussein and the Ba'ath Party rule Iraq through terror and fear. I will share some personalized stories.

Through interrogations at the enemy prisoner of war camp during the Gulf War, having done these interviews with Iraqi high command conscripts, I learned several things: number one, the Iraqi people do not like Saddam because he, in fact, keeps the great wealth to himself, keeps different tribes in ignorance, to the pleasure of his own tribe. In fact, one of the conscripts that I interrogated was scared to death of an American soldier. Why? Because they had been told that if you are captured by Americans, that you, in fact, would be quartered, your body would be quartered. Over 90,000 Iraqis that were held in two prisoner of war camps, I say to my colleagues, have had the opportunity to tell the stories of how well they were treated by Americans and, in fact, they called the prisoner of war camps ''the hotel.''

Let me tell about their leadership. Before the interrogation of a two-star Iraqi general, he was sitting with his legs crossed on the desert floor with his hands in his face weeping like a child. I had an interpreter with me. When I walked up, I kicked the bottom of his boot and, through the interpreter, I asked him to stand at attention. He stood up and I asked him if he was an Iraqi general. He responded and said yes, he was. Here I am, an American captain in the Army, and I told him, then if you are an Iraqi general, then act like one.

Mr. Speaker, why would an Iraqi general be weeping upon the desert floor? Because Saddam hand-selects his general officers. They do not earn it. The men who serve in their military have not earned the trust and confidence.

Also, what will be told is the lethality of American combat troops. They know exactly what happened in the short war of the gulf. The operations with regard to any military action that may occur in the Gulf War, I say to my colleagues, is so completely different than the operations of 10 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I have faith in the Iraqi people because I also remember them. Do my colleagues know what their request was at the prisoner of war camp to bring calm? They just wanted to listen to Madonna. So that is what we did. We piped in Madonna. They wanted to listen to ''The Material Girl.'' Their culture is far more Westernized than we could ever imagine, and they like Americans.

This is not against the Iraqi people. This is any action to get Saddam Hussein to comply with the cease-fire to disarm; and if, in fact, he does not, then force is the means of last resort. And the soldiers, while they prepare to fight and win the Nation's wars, they are the ones who have taken the oath to lay down their life for the Constitution, and they do not want to fight. In fact, they want peace. But if called upon, they, in fact, will serve.

So I will vote for this resolution, and I will think about my comrades who may be placed in harm's way, and I also will think of the children that are left behind and the spouses who will keep the watch fires burning for their loved ones. Support the resolution.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. CARSON).

Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, for more than a decade, American foreign policy has struggled to define its role in the post-Cold War world. Unsure of when to use military force, how to use it, and with which allies, we have stumbled from engagement to ad hoc engagement from Somalia to Kosovo. We have at times acted hastily in the world; more often, far too late.

Our recent fecklessness points up the foreign policy confusion that the welcome end of the long war with totalitarianism has left with us. Confronted with the Soviet Union, Democrats and Republicans were united in the goals of containment and deterrence, this latter purpose backed up by the threat of nuclear annihilation. Such strategies are, of course, still not outdated, as we face an unstable Russia and a growing China, both armed with significant nuclear arsenals. But the primacy of these doctrines has no doubt receded with the Peace of Paris and with the difficult challenges that have arisen since.

As our Nation enters the 21st century, we are confronted by some of these challenges, like humanitarian crises in Somalia which are brought into our homes through the global reach of communications technology, and world opinion demands action to bring relief. Ethnic cleansing, with its echoes of the Holocaust, insist that the United States and its Western allies make good on the promise of ''never again.'' And the spread of weapons of mass destruction, which means that, for the first time in history, a nonstate actor can inflict lethal harm on a State, compels us to develop new doctrines of defense.

□ 1845

It is amidst this intellectual muddle that the current crisis with Iraq arises. There are certain undeniable facts about Saddam Hussein, who has so ruthlessly ruled Iraq for more than 20 years. He alone in the world has used chemical weapons, against his own people. He has a sophisticated biological weapons program. Most importantly, he has an insatiable appetite for nuclear weapons, which, but for the foresight of Israel and the success of the Gulf War, he would already possess. With these capabilities, Saddam Hussein has repeatedly tried to dominate the Middle East, a region of critical importance to the United States.

These facts alone dictate immediate action to disarm Iraq. If Saddam Hussein were to acquire a nuclear weapon, he would be able to muscle surrounding states, as he attempted to do with Kuwait in 1990, with relative impunity, for the threat of nuclear reprisal would deter all but the most determined vindicators of international law and Middle East stability.

Were Saddam Hussein to control not only his own mighty oil fields but also

those of his neighbors, the havoc to the world economy could not be overestimated, as would the danger to our long-standing ally, Israel.

Many people over the last 2 days have spoken eloquently of the need for United Nations approval before any American action against Iraq. President Bush was wise to recently address the U.N., and I am confident that the United Nations will acknowledge the need to enforce its own resolutions demanding the disarmament of Iraq; and recognize, too, that only the threat of military force can make those demands understood.

But if the United Nations itself has so little self-regard as to not demand compliance by Iraq, then that body's impotence should not forestall the United States from making the world's demands on its own.

While consistency is not always valued highly in Congress, my own party would well remember that President Bill Clinton chose to take action in Kosovo without any approval from the Security Council; indeed, against the opposition of at least one permanent Security Council member, but with the approval of most Democrats in the House of Representatives.

Still others of my colleagues have suggested that we must wait for further provocation by Iraq. Somehow, they argue, it is against the American tradition to take preventative military action; or they argue that Iraq can be deterred in the same manner as was the Soviet Union. Grenada, Panama, and Haiti rebut the notion that the United States is a stranger to unilateral preventative action, as does the commonsense realization that times have changed, and it is not so much the detonation of a nuclear bomb that threatens the United States but Iraq's mere possession of such a weapon.

Deterrence works well when it must, but the assumption that all are deterrable is, in the wake of September 11, on very shaky footing, indeed.

There is, in the end, no choice about disarmament. The only alternatives are between forced agreement or nonconsensual military force. Paradoxically, it is the threat of force which we authorize in this resolution that offers the best chance for a peaceful disarmament.

The authorization of force, which has in recent years taken the place of formal declarations of war, is the most grave and momentous decision anyone in Congress can make, but we will authorize force against Iraq tomorrow, and we will be right to do so. We will be right not because we desire war with Iraq, but because we desire to prevent it; right not because we lead this cause, but because no one else will; and right not because war is our first resort, but, unlike Iraq, it is always our last.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA), Chair of the Subcommittee on Aviation.

Mr. MICA. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in a perfect world, if given a simple choice, no rational human being would advocate war over peace. No father and no mother would ever want to send their daughter or son into harm's way. No truly civilized people would ever want to sit idly by and let their friends and allies be annihilated.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, these are principled beliefs, all of which confront us at this difficult time. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, today we do not live in a perfect world. Tonight, however, as we debate the question of giving our President and Commander-in-Chief Congress' authorization to conduct war, we must remember the lessons of history. More than 60 years ago, many closed their eyes, many covered their ears, or chanted the same chorus for peace that we now hear. Mr. Speaker, when will we learn that we cannot trust, we cannot pacify, and we cannot negotiate with a mass murderer?

Mr. Speaker, humanity cannot afford ever to experience another Holocaust as a cruel reminder. Israel is not an expendable commodity.

Tonight, just a few miles from here near our Nation's Capitol, a mad killer lurks. Think of the terror tonight of those in range of that single madman. Think also of the terror in Israel, never knowing true security. I ask the Members, is that the kind of world we want our children and grandchildren to live in? I say no, a thousand times no.

That is why tonight I will support this resolution. I rise in support of the resolution and our President to ensure that we do not repeat history, or that we do not have our children live in that kind of world.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE).

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Joint Resolution 114 to provide authorization for the use of military force against Iraq. While I hope and pray President Bush does not have to commit our troops to such action, I believe that he must have the authority he needs to protect U.S. national security interests.

The events of September 11 showed that we are not protected from an attack on our homeland. There can be no doubt that Saddam Hussein possesses and continues to cultivate weapons of mass destruction. The U.N. weapons inspectors were thrown out of Iraq 4 years ago for a reason. A first strike made with weapons of mass destruction can result in millions dead, and the U.S. must be prepared to act preemptively.

Some ask why we must act against this threat in particular. The answer is that this threat is unique. I need not remind anyone that Hussein has used weapons of mass destruction already against his own people. In addition, he has tried to dominate the Middle East and has struck other nations in the region, including our ally, Israel, without warning.

Keeping this in mind, it seems to me that we, as guardians of freedom, have an awesome responsibility to act to ensure that Saddam Hussein cannot carry out a first strike against the United States or our allies.

Mr. Speaker, while there is no doubt that unqualified support for military intervention from the U.N. is preferable, we must be prepared to defend ourselves alone. We must never allow the foreign policy of our country to be dictated by those entities that may or may not have U.S. interests at heart.

The resolution before us does not mandate military intervention in Iraq. It does, however, give President Bush clear authority to invade Iraq should he determine that Hussein is not complying with the conditions we have laid before him. Chief among these is full and unfettered weapons inspections. If he fails to comply, we will have no choice but to take action. Our security demands it.

Mr. Speaker, the world community watching this debate ought not conclude that respectful disagreements on the floor of this House divide us. On the contrary, we find strength through an open airing of all views. We never take this privilege for granted, and we need look no further than to Iraq to understand why.

At the end of this debate, Congress will speak with one voice. I find comfort in the knowledge that this unity represents a promise that we will never back down from preserving our freedoms and protecting our homeland from those who wish to destroy us.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES), who serves on the Committee on Financial Services and whose career has been earmarked by respect for the rule of law.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for that kind yielding of time to me.

Mr. Speaker, this is a quote: ''I'm concerned about living with my conscience, and searching for that which is right and that which is true, and I cannot live with the idea of being just a conformist following a path that everybody else follows. And this has happened to us. As I've said in one of my books, so often we live by the philosophy 'Everybody's doing it, it must be alright.' we tend to determine what is right and wrong by taking a sort of Gallup poll of the majority opinion, and I don't think this is the way to get at what is right.

''Arnold Toynbee talks about the creative minority and I think more and more we must have in our world that creative minority that will take a stand for that which conscience tells them is right, even though it brings about criticism and misunderstanding and even abuse.''

That is excerpted from a 1967 interview of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here today as a part of a creative minority in Congress

who oppose this apparently inevitable resolution granting the President the authority to use force to remove Saddam Hussein from power. But I will not be a silent minority.

I know who Saddam Hussein is. I know he has viciously killed hundreds of thousands of Kurds in northern Iraq with chemical and biological weapons. I know he has murdered members of his own cabinet; in fact, his own family. I remember vividly his aggressions in Iran and Kuwait and the SCUD missiles he launched into Israel in the Gulf War. I know the contempt he has shown toward the U.N. and its weapons inspectors as they attempted to enforce post-Gulf War resolutions; and I know that the world, and particularly the Gulf region, would be a better and safer place without Saddam Hussein in power and those of his ilk in power.

But I also know that the resolution before us is a product of haste and hubris, rather than introspection and humility. I have seen President Bush confront the Iraq question with arrogance and condescension, initially bullying this Congress, our international allies, and the American people with accusations and threats and tales of terror eliciting fear in their hearts and minds.

President Bush has told us that war is not inevitable, but does anyone really believe that? For months, this administration has marched inexorably towards an attack on Iraq, changing its rationale to suit the circumstances. I have no doubt that, regardless of what we do here or what Saddam does there, we will go to war. I pray I am wrong.

The CIA today said Saddam is unlikely to initiate a chemical or biological attack against the United States and presented the alarming possibility that an attack on Iraq could provoke him into taking the very actions this administration claims an invasion would prevent.

I know, too, who we are. America has never backed down from a just war. From the Revolutionary era to the Civil War, across Europe, Asia, and Africa, in two world wars, just a dozen years ago in the Persian Gulf, and countless missions to faraway places like Bosnia, Kosovo, Liberia, and Afghanistan, America fought. We fought with righteousness, determination, and vision. We fought because principles and freedoms were threatened. We fought because fighting was our last choice.

America has always fought with a vision to the future and has been merciful and generous in our victories.

But the White House has not offered any vision for post-Saddam Iraq. As a Nation founded on moral principles, we have a moral obligation to prepare a plan for rebuilding Iraq before we declare war. Iraq, like Afghanistan and many of the other nations in the Gulf region, is made up of many ethnic groups that will compete for power in the vacuum that is created by Saddam Hussein's ouster. But as important as the tactical plans to overthrow Saddam Hussein are, we must address how we intend to help the Iraqi people institute a democratic government.

I ask the President, can he not answer a few simple questions: Have we completed the war on terrorism? What happened to Osama bin Laden? Do we know how long a war in Iraq would last? Has there been any assessment for the American people of how much a war in Iraq will cost our economy? Does he have any idea of the human loss we should expect in a war with Iraq?

Instead of answers, he gives us bombast. Yes, we have all heard the rhetoric: Saddam is evil, Saddam hates America, Saddam must be stopped, and you are either with us or against us. If you are not with us, we don't need you.

□ 1900

But when the rhetoric is peeled away, truth emerges.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot go on but I say to all of my colleagues, let us be the creative minority. Vote against allowing force against Iraq.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILCHREST). Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and not to the President.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time for debate on this resolution be extended for 2 hours to be equally divided between the majority and minority.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair grants an additional hour to be controlled by the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) and by the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN).

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from California (Mr. ISSA) for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, as Members of Congress we face no more important issues than those of war and peace, and for that reason I agree wholeheartedly with my colleague from Ohio (Mrs. JONES) who just spoke that this must be a vote of Congress. For that reason this extended debate on the House floor is very appropriate and the views expressed by Members of Congress are deserving of respect. Having read it closely, my view is that the carefully crafted resolution before us is the right approach.

On Monday in my hometown of Cincinnati, the President of the United States clearly explained to the country what is at stake. He not only made the case that inaction is not an option, but that given the dangers and defiance of the Iraqi regime, the threat of military action must be an available option. Time and time again, Saddam Hussein has proven to be a threat to the peace and security of the region. That is why the international community through the United Nations has repeatedly called on the Iraqi regime to keep its word and open all facilities to weapons inspections. Yet repeatedly Iraq has refused, defying the United Nations. There is no reason to believe that without the threat of force, the disarmament the Iraqi regime agreed to as part of the disarmament after the Gulf War more than 10 years ago will ever occur.

And there is other gathering danger and risk to America and all freedom-loving people. The horror of September 11, Mr. Speaker, awakened us to that reality. We know that the Iraqi regime is producing and stockpiling chemical and biological weapons. We know they are in the process of obtaining a nuclear weapon. We know that this regime has a consistent record of aggression of supporting terrorist activities. Once the Iraqi regime possesses a nuclear weapon, it, or the technology that creates it, could easily be passed along to a terrorist organization. Already chemical and biological weapons could be provided. We must not permit this to happen.

The resolution will authorize military action but only if it is necessary. I would hope that every Member in this Chamber would pray that it would not be necessary. But the choice is clear, and it is a choice for the Iraqi regime to make. If the regime refuses to disarm, our military and our coalition partners will be compelled to make a stand for freedom and security against tyranny and terrorism. And if we take this course, it will not be unilateral as others on this floor have said. The United States will not be alone.

I commend the President for his diplomatic initiatives, for continuing to try to work through the United Nations, and for an impressive array of coalition partners already assembled. I do not take lightly the fact that the course laid out by this resolution may put at risk the lives of young men and women in uniform. But I believe not authorizing the possible use of force would put even more innocent Americans at risk.

This is a solemn debate and a tough vote of conscience. Mine will be a vote for an approach that I believe faces up to the very real dangers we face and maximizes the chance that these dangers can be addressed with a minimum loss of life. I will strongly support our President, Mr. Speaker, and I support the resolution.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) and that he be able to control and yield that time to others.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER).

(Mr. TANNER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

September 11, 2001, is a day that will rank with December 7, 1941, as a day of infamy in the history of the United States. That one event, 9–11, changed the world we live in forever. I serve as a delegate to the NATO Parliamentary Assembly from the Congress and never have I seen the outpouring of good will and support from our NATO allies as we experienced in the aftermath of 9–11.

For the first time in the 50-plus-year history of the mightiest military alliance in modern times, article 5 of the NATO charter was invoked stating in essence that when one member nation comes under attack, all consider themselves under attack and each pledges to the other member nations all military, diplomatic, and territorial assets they individually and collectively possess.

This past summer, less than a year from 9–11, the President and Vice President began to talk about a regime change in Iraq. The philosophy was this: Saddam Hussein is a despot and a threat to develop and perfect weapons of mass destruction including nuclear capabilities; and, therefore, he must be removed. Further, we, the United States, were going to effectuate that change with or without our allies, save the British. Suddenly the good will and support for America began to erode, particularly among our European allies and even here at home.

In fact, some with good reason, in my view, think an election in Germany turned on this one issue. The United States, led by President Bush and Vice President CHENEY's rhetoric, was boxing herself into a very dangerous and potentially disastrous position. Should that policy have continued, I would have voted ''no'' on this resolution.

Why do I say that? The best offense we have available to us to protect our country and our citizens is accurate, timely intelligence information so that we know what al Qaeda or others are planning, how they are planning it, when they are planning to attack us again so that we can stop it. In this war of terrorism, all of the United States military might and every weapon our country possesses is of little or no value in the defense of our homeland without these intelligence resources.

This unilateral approach by the administration threatened to jeopardize cooperation from those around the world who may be in a position to give us such intelligence information. World support, world opinion and the good will of every nation, no matter how small or militarily insignificant, has never been more important to us. A whisper in one ear from Kabul to Bagdad to the Philippines to Germany or even to Oregon can be more important in this war than all of the military might on Earth, for it may give us the warning we need to stop another event in this country as occurred on 9–11.

Thankfully, the President's appearance at the United Nations last month and his speech in Cincinnati Monday night sent a signal to our allies and to many of our own citizens who do not and did not support the ''lone cowboy'' approach, that the administration finally recognized the importance of international cooperation and the role of all civilized people as expressed by the United Nations in this war against humanity. Again, I refer not to the military resources offered by our global allies, but to the intelligence information which is vital or perhaps more vital to our national defense.

The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) has an amendment which I believe does no harm to the substance of the resolution and in my view is much preferable and more compatible with our constitutional powers as Congress. I hope every Member will seriously consider its adoption. But should that fail, I believe that passage of this resolution is in the best interest of our country at this time. Such action on our part will hopefully spur movement in the international arena to enforce the United Nations resolutions when violated, with civilization as the prosecutor and humanity as the victor.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I join my many esteemed colleagues today in support of the resolution authorizing the President to use force against Iraq. This is a historic moment in our country, and it should not be taken lightly. But it is not the first historic moment when it comes to Saddam Hussein's regime. This is hopefully the last chapter in a long saga of our dealings with Saddam Hussein.

More than 20 years ago he began to endanger his neighbors. More than 12 years ago he invaded Kuwait. His cruel regime has had a long history of the kind of practices that are not tolerated anywhere on this globe, and yet they persist.

Mr. Speaker, Saddam Hussein is in fact writing the last chapter as we speak in a 12-year war. We are not considering action which would be preemptive or a strike to begin a war. We are, in fact, dealing with an absence of peace which has cost America lives and time and effort for more than a decade. Over the past 10 years he has made a mockery of the United Nations and the multi-national diplomacy that we have in fact participated in. He has systematically undermined the United Nations resolutions that were designed to disarm and reform his regime. He threw out weapons inspectors in 1998 and has rebuilt his weapons of mass destruction; and there is no question he intends to target America. In fact, in 1993 he targeted President George Herbert Bush for assassination.

Each of those events was more than sufficient for us to do what we now must do. But the United States was patient. The United Nations was patient. We have all been patient for more than a decade. I believe that we need not look for the proverbial straw that breaks the camel's back; but in fact we need to simply ask, Why did we wait so long? Why did we tolerate this dictator so long? Even why in 1998 when the last administration rightfully so called for a regime change did we not act?

I hope that this body in its consideration of this resolution does not ask why should we act today, but in fact should ask why should we not act and why did we take so long?

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), who serves as the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Immigration, Border Security and Claims on the House Committee on the Judiciary, as well as a member of the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism and Homeland Security, who recently returned from Afghanistan where she conducted a fact-finding mission.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished member of the Committee on International Relations for his kindness in yielding me time.

As many of us who have come to this floor, I come with a heavy heart but a respect for my colleagues and the words that they have offered today.

□ 1915

As I stand here, I sometimes feel the world is on our shoulders, but I also think that my vote is a vote for life or death—I have chosen life and so I take the path of opposition to this resolution in order to avoid the tragic path that led former Secretary of Defense Robert MacNamara to admit, in his painful mea culpa regarding the Vietnam War, we were wrong, terribly wrong.

He saw the lost lives of our young men and women, some 58,000 who came home in body bags; and after years of guilt stemming from his role in prosecuting the war in Vietnam, MacNamara was moved to expose his soul on paper with his book, ''In Retrospect: The Tragedy and Lessons of Vietnam.'' He noted the words of an ancient Greek philosopher that ''the reward of suffering is experience,'' and concluded solemnly, let this be the lasting legacy of Vietnam; that we never send our young men and women into war without thoughtful, provocative analysis and an offer of diplomacy.

I stand in opposition for another reason, and that is because I hold the Constitution very dear. I might suggest to my colleagues that when our Founding Fathers decided to write the Constitution over 4 months of the hot summer of 1787, they talked about the distribution of authority between legislative,

executive and judicial branches, and they said it was a bold attempt to create an energetic central government at the same time that the sovereignty of the people would be preserved.

Frankly, the people of the United States should make the determination through this House of a declaration of war. And as the Constitution was written, it said, ''We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, provide for the common defense, establish the Constitution of the United States of America.'' For that reason, I believe that this Nation, that suffered a war in Vietnam, should understand the importance of having the Congress of the United States declare war.

The reason I say that is we continue to suffer today as countless veterans of that generation from Vietnam have never recovered from the physical and mental horrors of their experiences, many reliving the nightmares, plagued by demons as they sleep homeless on our streets at night. What a price we continue to pay for that mistake. Can we afford to make it again?

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this resolution because it so clearly steers us towards a treacherous path of war while yielding sparse efforts to guide us to the more navigable road to peace. As Benjamin Franklin said in 1883, ''There never was a good war or a bad peace.'' Mr. Speaker, we have yet to give the power of diplomacy a chance and the power of the moral rightness of the high ground the chance that civilization deserves. Do we not deserve as well as the right to die the right to live? We have had the experience of Vietnam to see the alternatives. So if the unacceptable costs of war come upon us, why not use diplomacy? It is time to use diplomacy now.

The resolution before us is unlikely to lead to peace now or in the future because of the dangerous precedent that it would set. The notion of taking a first strike against another sovereign nation risks upsetting the already tenuous balance of powers around the world. In a time when countless nations are armed with enough weaponry to destroy their neighbors with the mere touch of a button, it can hardly be said that our example of attacking another country in the absence of self-defense is an acceptable way to go. The justification would sow the seeds of peace if we decided to follow peace.

It is important to note that rather than the President's proposed doctrine of first strike, we would do well to look to diplomacy first. The first strike presumption of the President would represent an unprecedented departure from a long-held United States policy of being a nonaggressor. We would say to the world that it is acceptable to do a first strike in fear instead of pursuing all possible avenues to a diplomatic solution.

Imagine the world in chaos with India going after Pakistan, China opting to fight Taiwan instead of negotiating, and North Korea going after South Korea and erupting into an all-out war. Because actions always speak louder than words, the United States' wise previous admonitions to show restraint to the world would go to the winds, and then, of course, would fall on deaf ears.

There is another equally important reason I must oppose this resolution. It is because to vote for it would be to effectively abdicate our constitutional responsibility as a Member of Congress to declare war when conditions call for such action. The resolution before us declares war singly by the President by allowing a first strike without the knowledge of imminent danger and without the input of Congress. It is by article 1, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States that calls for us to declare war.

Saddam Hussein is evil. He is a despot. We know that. And I support the undermining of his government by giving resistance to the United States, to be able to address these by humanitarian aid, by military support in terms of training, and also by providing support to the resistance. Yet I think we can do other things. Diplomacy first, unfettered robust United States weapons inspections, monitored review by United Nations Security Council, Soviet Union model of ally-supported isolation, support of democratization, and developing a more stringent United States containment policy.

This resolution is wrong. We must not abdicate our responsibility. And most importantly, Mr. Speaker, as I go to my seat, I stand here on the side of saving the lives of the young men and women of this Nation.

As I stand on the House floor today with great respect for the heartfelt positions of my colleagues, I must take the path of opposition to this resolution in order to avoid following the tragic path that led former Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara to admit in his painful mea culpa regarding the Vietnam war, ''We were wrong, terribly wrong.'' After years of guilt stemming from his role in prosecuting the war in Vietnam, McNamara was moved to expose his soul on paper with his book: ''In Retrospect: The Tragedy and Lessons of Vietnam''. He noted the words of the ancient Greek dramatist Aeschylus who said ''The reward of suffering is experience,'' and concluded solemnly, ''Let this be the lasting legacy of Vietnam.'' Therefore this legacy should remind us that war is deadly and the Congress must not abdicate its responsibility.

This Nation did suffer as result of that war, and we continue to suffer today as countless veterans of that generation have never recovered from the physical and mental horrors of their experiences, many reliving the nightmares, plagued by demons as they sleep homeless on our streets at night. What a price we continue to pay for that mistake. Can we afford to make it again? I think not.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this resolution because it so clearly steers us toward a treacherous path of war, while yielding sparse efforts to guide us to the more navigable road to peace. And as Benjamin Franklin said in 1883, ''there never was a good war or a bad peace''—but we have yet to give the power of diplomacy and the power of the moral high ground the chance that civilization itself deserves. We have had the experience of Vietnam to see the alternatives, so if there were ever a time for diplomacy, it has got to be now.

The resolution before us is unlikely to lead to peace now or in the future because of the dangerous precedent that it would set. The notion of taking a first strike against another sovereign nation risks upsetting the already tenuous balance of powers around the world. In a time when countless nations are armed with enough weaponry to destroy their neighbors with the mere touch of a button, it can hardly be said that our example of attacking another country in the absence of a self defense justification would sow the seeds of peace around the world. Rather, the President's proposed doctrine of first strike, which would represent an unprecedented departure from a long-held United States' policy of being a non-aggressor, would say to the world that it is acceptable to do a first strike in fear, instead of pursuing all possible avenues to a diplomatic solution. Imagine the chaos in the world if India and Pakistan abandoned all notions of restraint, if China and Taiwan opted to fight instead of negotiate, and if North Korea and South Korea erupted into all-out war. Because actions always speak louder than words, the United States' wise previous admonitions to show restraint in the aforementioned conflicts would fall upon deaf ears as the nations would instead follow our dangerous lead.

There is another equally important reason that I must oppose this resolution. It is because to vote for it would be to effectively abdicate my Constitutional duty as a Member of Congress to delcare war when conditions call for such action. The resolution before us does authorize the President to declare war without the basis of imminent threat. Congress may not choose to transfer its duties under the Constitution to the President. The Constitution was not created for us to be silent. It is a body of law that provides the roadmap of democracy and national security in this country, and like any roadmap, it is designed to be followed. Only Congress is authorized to declare war, raise and support armies, provide and maintain a navy, and make the rules for these armed forces. There is nothing vague or unclear about the language in Article I, section 8, clauses 11–16 of our Constitution. In it, we are told that Congress has the power:

To declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and make rules concerning captures on land and water;

To raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than two years;

To provide and maintain a navy;

To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; and

To provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the union, suppress insurrections and repel invasions.

This system of checks and balances, which is essential to ensuring that no individual or branch of government can wield absolute power, cannot be effective if one individual is impermissibly vested with the sole discretionary authority to carry out what 535 Members of Congress have been duly elected by the people to do. It is through the process of

deliberation and debate that the views and concerns of the American people must be addressed within Congress before a decision to launch our country into war is made. The reason that we are a government of the people, for the people and by the people is because there is a plurality of perspectives that are taken into account before the most important decisions facing the country are made. Granting any one individual, even the President of the United States, the unbridled authority to use the Armed Forces of the United States as he determines to be necessary and appropriate is not only unconstitutional, but is also the height of irresponsibility.

Saddam Hussein is indeed an evil man. He has harmed his own people in the past, and cannot be trusted in the future to live peacefully with his neighbors in the region. I fully support efforts to disarm Iraq pursuant to the resolutions passed in the aftermath of the gulf war, and I do not rule out the possibility that military action might be needed in the future to see that those efforts come to fruition. I voted for the Iraqi Liberation Act in 1998 and still stand behind my decision to support the objective of helping the people of Iraq change their government. But that legislation contained an important caveat that precluded the use of United States armed forces to remove the government from power, and instead provided for various forms of humanitarian assistance. That Act, now has the effect of law, and unlike Iraq, we are a nation that respects the rule of law. And our Constitution, the supreme law of the land, sets forth the duties and responsibilities of Congress in clear, unambiguous language.

The indictment against Saddam Hussein is nothing new. He is a despot of the worst kind, and I believe that when the United Nations Security Council passes a resolution determining his present status and outlining a plan for the future, that will provide further documentation for Congress to act on a military option in Iraq. Right now, however, we are moving too far too quickly with many alarmist representations yet undocumented.

Some of us have begun to speculate about the cost that a war in Iraq might be. And while our economy now suffers because of corporate abuse and 2 years of a declining economy with high unemployment, I cannot help but to shudder when I think of what the cost might be—not only in dollars—but in human lives as well. My constituents, in flooding my offices with calls and e-mails all vehemently opposed to going to war, have expressed their concerns about the unacceptable costs of war. One Houston resident wrote, "This is a war that would cost more in money and lives that I am willing to support committing, and than I believe the threat warrants. Attacking Iraq is a distraction from, not a continuation of the 'war on terrorism'." I truly share this woman's concerns. In World War II, we lost 250,000 brave Americans who responded to the deadly attack on Pearl Harbor and the ensuing battles across Europe and Asia. In the Korean war, nearly 34,000 Americans were killed, and we suffered more than 58,000 casualties in Vietnam. The possible conflict in Iraq that the President has been contemplating for months now risks incalculable deaths because there is no way of knowing what the international implications may be. Consistent talk of regime change by force, a goal not shared by any of the allies in the United Nations, only pours fuel on the fire when you consider the tactics that a tyrant like Saddam Hussein might resort to if he realized that had nothing to lose. If he does possess chemical, biological or nuclear weapons, we can be assured that he would not hesitate to use them if the ultimate goal is to destroy his regime, instead of to disarm it. With that being the case, there can be little doubt that neighboring countries would be dragged into the fray—willingly or otherwise—creating an upheaval that would dwarf previous altercations in the region or possibly in the world. The resolution, as presently worded, opens the door to all of these possibilities and that is why I cannot support it.

Because I do not support the resolution does not mean that I favor inaction. To the contrary, I believe that immediate action is of the highest order. To that end, I would propose a five-point plan of action:

1. Diplomacy first;
2. Unfettered, robust United Nations weapons inspections to provide full disarmament;
3. Monitoring and review by United Nations Security Council;
4. Soviet Union model of allied supported isolation—support of democratization through governance training and support of resistance elements; and
5. Developing a more stringent United States containment policy.

What I can and will support is an effort for diplomacy first, and unfettered U.N. inspections. As the most powerful nation in the world, we should be a powerful voice for diplomacy—and not just military might. Since we are a just nation, we should wield our power judiciously—restraining where possible for the greater good. Pursuing peace means insisting upon the disarmament of Iraq. Pursuing peace means insisting upon the immediate return of the U.N. weapons inspectors. Pursuing peace and diplomacy means that the best answer to every conflict and crisis is not always violence.

Passing this resolution, and the possible repercussions that it may engender, will not enhance the moral authority of the United States in the world today and it will not set the stage for peace nor ensure that are providing for a more peaceful or stable world community.

Instead, as we ensure that Iraq does not possess illegal weapons, we should make good on the promise to the people that we made in the passage of the 1998 Iraqi Liberation Act. We should do all that we can to assist the people of Iraq because as President Dwight Eisenhower said, "I like to believe that people in the long run are going to do more to promote peace than our governments. Indeed, I think that people want peace so much that one of these days, governments had better get out of the way and let them have it." I oppose this resolution—H.J. Res. 114.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG).

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I am pleased and privileged to join this serious debate.

I want to talk on a number of issues that I think are very, very important to us as we confront the decision we must make and the vote we must take tomorrow. I want to talk about the seriousness of this issue. I want to talk about the question of preemption and why America might even contemplate striking under these circumstances. I want to address the concerns of those who say they simply do not want to go to war and talk about why I do not want to go to war either, but sometimes war is necessary. I want to talk about the issue of why now, because I think that is a very pressing issue. And I want to talk, most importantly, about how I believe this resolution is the most certain way, indeed perhaps the only way, we have to avoid war.

Let me begin with the seriousness of this issue. Beyond a shadow of a doubt, this will be the most solemn, most serious vote I believe I will cast in my tenure in the United States Congress. I have been here for some pretty serious votes. I have seen us balance a budget, I have seen us impeach a President, but nothing comes close to the vote on a resolution of force such as the one we will consider tomorrow. I approach that vote with the grave appreciation of the fact that lives are in the balance: lives of American soldiers, lives of innocent Iraqis, lives of people throughout the world.

I also approach that vote with the grave knowledge that while my son is 16 years old and would not likely serve in this war, I have many constituents and many friends with sons and daughters who are 18 years old or 19 or 20, and who may be called upon to go to war. This is, indeed, I believe, the most serious issue this Congress can contemplate, and it is one that has weighed on me for weeks.

Some of those amongst my constituents who are deeply worried about this issue say why should we act and why should we act under these circumstances? They argue that we should pursue deterrence. They argue that we should pursue containment; and then they argue that if neither deterrence nor containment work, we should wait until a first strike is launched and then we should respond.

Well, I would respond by saying history has proven sadly over the history of the Saddam Hussein regime that deterrence does not work. This is a man who has proven by his conduct over and over again that he cannot be deterred. This is a man who will not respond to the kind of signals that the rest of the world sends in hopes that a world leader would respond. Although we have attempted containment, this is a man who has proven he will not respond to containment.

At the end of the Gulf War, he agreed to a number of things that we are all now painfully aware of and that have been covered in this debate. He agreed to end his efforts to procure chemical and biological weapons. He agreed to end his efforts to obtain nuclear weapons. He agreed to end his efforts to have and to develop long-term missiles and other delivery systems. And yet none of those have worked.

At the end of the day, deterrence and containment simply have proven, over a pattern of 11 years, not to work. His

deceit, his deception, his continued pattern of forging ahead show us beyond a question of a doubt that he will not be deterred and he will not be contained.

We know some things. We know that because of the nature of the weapons that he has, and because of his willingness to use those weapons and to use them perhaps secretly, we cannot wait. I listened to the debate last night, and I was very impressed with it. One of my colleagues in this institution came to the floor and made an impassioned speech against this resolution and said, we absolutely should wait, and he cited the Revolutionary War and the command to our troops to wait until fired upon. I would suggest to my colleagues that when we have an enemy who has chemical and biological weapons of the nature of those that this enemy has, we simply cannot wait.

VX nerve gas kills by paralyzing the central nervous system and can result in death in 10 minutes. Sarin nerve gas, cyclosarin nerve gas, mustard gas. I am afraid the words ''chemical weapons'' have lost their meaning; but they should not, because they are abhorrent weapons, and he has them. There is no doubt.

Biological weapons. He has anthrax. He has botulism toxin. He has aflatoxin and he has resin toxin. It would be bad enough if he simply had those, but we know more. He has them and he has tried to develop strains of them that are resistent to the best drugs we have, resistent to our antibiotics. That is to say he has them, he could use them, and not until they had been used could we discover that the best our science has cannot match them.

Now, why can we not wait, given that type of history and that type of chemical? Because the reality is we do not know when he will strike. He could indeed strike and we would not know it for days or weeks, until it began to manifest itself.

But let us talk also about the whole possibility of him using terrorists. We talk a lot about him, and we get deceived by this discussion of he does not have a long-range missile that can reach the United States, because he does not have aircraft that can reach the United States, we ought not to worry about those. We talk about the issue that it could be months or a year before he could develop a nuclear weapon. All of those are false pretexts. All of those are serious mistakes.

The reality is that if he chooses to deliver those weapons through any of the means that we know he possibly could. By handing them in a backpack to a terrorist, we might never know that it was Saddam Hussein that delivered the weapon. And if he chooses to use chemical or biological weapons for such an attack, we might not know until hundreds, indeed until thousands, perhaps tens of thousands, perhaps millions of Americans were infected and fatally wounded and would die, and we would not know until afterwards.

I would suggest that the old doctrine of wait until they fire is simply no longer applicable under these circumstances.

Now, I have conscientious colleagues and I have constituents who come to me and say, I am not ready for war; I do not want war. I want to make it clear that no one wants war. Not a single Member of this body would choose war. And this resolution, as the President said the other night, does not mean that war is either imminent or unavoidable. The President made it clear he does not want war. But I would urge my colleagues that there are some certainties. One of those is that the best way to prevent war is to be prepared for war.

□ 1930

The best way to prevent such a war is to send clear and unmistakable signals. He has unarmed aerial vehicles. That is to say, he has model airplanes, and he has larger airplanes which can be operated by remote control.

It has been pointed out that, given his lack of trust, an unmanned aerial vehicle, an unmanned airplane, is the perfect weapon for this leader, this insane leader, to use, because he does not have to trust a pilot who might not follow orders. He has the operator of a remote-controlled vehicle standing next to him. If, in fact, the pilot were to choose to not drop his load, there would be little he could do in a manned aircraft to that pilot. But in an unmanned aerial vehicle, equipped with a chemical or biological weapon, he remains in control; and it could easily be done.

He could bring that kind of weapon to our shores in a commercial ship like the hundreds lined up right now off the coast of California and launch them from there, and we would not know about the attack until after it was done.

It seems to me that we cannot wait under these circumstances; and it seems to me that he has proven beyond a doubt that deterrence and containment, although we have tried them, simply will not work.

One colleague pointed out he has chemical and biological weapons; and in time, because he is seeking them, he will have nuclear weapons. It was also pointed out that if we want to rely upon a scheme of inspections, and my constituents back home would hope that we could rely on inspections. I would hope that also. But make no mistake about it, there are two serious flaws.

An inspection regime that relies on inspecting a country where hundreds of acres are off limits, cannot be gone into, the presidential palaces that are there, an inspection regime that relies on that is not an inspection regime at all. But an inspection regime where we know to a moral certainty that he has mobile production facilities is an inspection regime that will give us false hope.

I was in the Middle East when the first weapons inspectors were kicked out of Iraq. I was on a CODEL with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) and four or five other Members of Congress. They left Baghdad and went by ground to Jordan and flew to Bahrain. We had an opportunity to meet with them in Bahrain the first night they reached there. One of my colleagues who was there is here tonight on the other side of the aisle. We spent 2 to 2½ hours talking with weapons inspectors who had just been kicked out of Baghdad.

They made some serious impressions upon me which I will never forget. One was echoed in the President's speech last night, and that is the Iraq people are not our enemy. In fact, weapons inspectors explained to us that when individual Iraqis would learn that a given weapons inspector was an American, they would say, America, great place. I have a sister in San Francisco. I have a brother in Philadelphia.

The President said it right the other night. The Iraqi people are not our enemies, but they delivered another message to us and made another impression. That is, they explained to us carefully, six congressmen in a hotel room in Bahrain, now 7 years ago, they said, make no mistake about it, every time they got close to making a real discovery, every time they were at the door of a facility that they were convinced was producing chemical and biological weapons, there would be a stall, there would be a delay. They would be forced to stand outside the gates of that building for hours and hours while the inside was obviously being cleaned up.

Indeed, they would sometimes, when they got savvy to this, the inspectors would send somebody around to the back gate and watch the equipment, watch the trucks roll out the back door.

There is no question but that an inspection regime where they are determined to deceive you, where they are determined to deny you access to some locations, and where they have mobile facilities is no inspection regime at all.

I do not want war. No one wants war. But I am convinced that the risk of waiting is indeed too high.

I do not believe, and I agree with one of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who said, I do not believe that Saddam Hussein will ever submit to a legitimate inspection regime. But I know this much, he will never submit to such an inspection regime until and unless it is backed by credible threat of force. That is what we are talking about here tonight.

We also on that trip went and visited our American troops enforcing the no-fly zone, both the southern and the northern no-fly zone. The American people deserve to know that we have been at a state of war with this regime for 11 years. He has fired on our pilots over and over and over again. He probably fired on them today. He has certainly fired on them within the last

month. He has fired hundreds of times, and he has declared war against us. He has declared a holy war against us.

We know some other facts. We know over time Saddam Hussein's weapons regime will grow, and the threat will become worse. We do not want war, but it would appear doing nothing is the one way to ensure war.

I believe to the depth of my soul that this resolution is a measured and thoughtful proposal to achieve one thing, and that is the disarmament of Iraq and the Saddam Hussein regime, hopefully by peace, but if necessary by force.

I think we know that it has the potential of creating the coalition we all want. If America sends a weak signal and says we are not sure of our course, we are not sure of our path, how can we even hope to bring into our ranks and to our side allies in a battle against an insane leader such as Saddam Hussein?

I think we also know, those of us who intend to vote for this resolution, it holds a second potential and that is it could lead the United Nations, indeed, I am prayerful, as is the President, that it will lead the United Nations to rise to its obligations, to make its resolutions meaningful, to remove itself from the irrelevancy that it currently has by not enforcing its resolutions, and to stand with strength and to say once and for all to this vicious dictator, we will not let you flaunt the rule of law and the requirements imposed by the U.N.

It could indeed cause Saddam Hussein to come to his senses. I hope it will.

I know failing to act involves too great a risk. Failing to act exposes not just the people of his nation, whom he has terrorized and butchered and tortured, to suffer longer.

We know the dimensions to which he will go. We know the threat. We know he will in fact and has used violence of every dimension against his own people, and we know for a moral certainty he will bring that aggression against the rest of the world if not stopped.

No one is happy about this moment, but I believe it is the right course and, for those who truly want peace, the only course.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD a column from the New Yorker written by Jeffrey Goldberg. It is called ''The Great Terror.'' It is an interview of the people who were the victims of Saddam Hussein's attack on his own people. It documents his murder of some 50,000 to 200,000 Kurds.

[From the New Yorker, Mar. 25, 2002]

THE GREAT TERROR

(By Jeffrey Goldberg)

In northern Iraq, there is new evidence of Saddam Hussein's genocidal war on the Kurds—and of his possible ties to Al Qaeda.

In the late morning of March 16, 1988, an Iraqi Air Force helicopter appeared over the city of Halabja, which is about fifteen miles from the border with Iran. The Iran-Iraq War was then in its eighth year, and Halabja was near the front lines. At the time, the city was home to roughly eighty thousand Kurds, who were well accustomed to the proximity of violence to ordinary life. Like most of Iraqi Kurdistan, Halabja was in perpetual revolt against the regime of Saddam Hussein, and its inhabitants were supporters of the peshmerga, the Kurdish fighters whose name means ''those who face death.''

A young woman named Nasreen Abdel Qadir Muhammad was outside her family's house, preparing food, when she saw the helicopter. The Iranians and the peshmerga had just attacked Iraqi military outposts around Halabja, forcing Saddam's soldiers to retreat. Iranian Revolutionary Guards then infiltrated the city, and the residents assumed that an Iraqi counterattack was imminent. Nasreen and her family expected to spend yet another day in their cellar, which was crude and dark but solid enough to withstand artillery shelling, and even napalm.

''At about ten o'clock, maybe closer to ten-thirty, I saw the helicopter,'' Nasreen told me. ''It was not attacking, though. There were men inside it, taking pictures. One had a regular camera, and the other held what looked like a video camera. They were coming very close. Then they went away.''

Nasreen thought that the sight was strange, but she was preoccupied with lunch; she and her sister Rangeen were preparing rice, bread, and beans for the thirty or forty relatives who were taking shelter in the cellar. Rangeen was fifteen at the time. Nasreen was just sixteen, but her father had married her off several months earlier, to a cousin, a thirty-year-old physician's assistant named Bakhtiar Abdul Aziz. Halabja is a conservative place, and many more women wear the veil than in the more cosmopolitan Kurdish cities to the northwest and the Arab cities to the south.

The bombardment began shortly before eleven. The Iraqi Army, positioned on the main road from the nearby town of Sayid Sadiq, fired artillery shells into Halabja, and the Air Force began dropping what is thought to have been napalm on the town, especially the northern area. Nasreen and Rangeen rushed to the cellar. Nasreen prayed that Bakhtiar, who was then outside the city, would find shelter.

The attack had ebbed by about two o'clock, and Nasreen made her way carefully upstairs to the kitchen, to get the food for the family. ''At the end of the bombing, the sound changed,'' she said. ''It wasn't so loud. It was like pieces of metal just dropping without exploding. We didn't know why it was so quiet.''

A short distance away, in a neighborhood still called the Julakan, or Jewish quarter, even though Halabja's Jews left for Israel in the nineteen-fifties, a middle-aged man named Muhammad came up from his own cellar and saw an unusual sight: ''A helicopter had come back to the town, and the soldiers were throwing white pieces of paper out the side.'' In retrospect, he understood that they were measuring wind speed and direction. Nearby, a man named Awat Omer, who was twenty at the time, was overwhelmed by a smell of garlic and apples.

Nasreen gathered the food quickly, but she, too, noticed a series of odd smells carried into the house by the wind. ''At first, it smelled bad, like garbage,'' she said. ''And then it was a good smell, like sweet apples. Then like eggs.'' Before she went downstairs, she happened to check on a caged partridge that her father kept in the house. ''The bird was dying,'' she said. ''It was on its side.'' She looked out the window. ''It was very quiet, but the animals were dying. The sheep and goats were dying.'' Nasreen ran to the cellar. ''I told everybody there was something wrong. There was something wrong with the air.''

The people in the cellar were panicked. They had fled downstairs to escape the bombardment, and it was difficult to abandon their shelter. Only splinters of light penetrated the basement, but the dark provided a strange comfort. ''We wanted to stay in hiding, even though we were getting sick,'' Nasreen said. She felt a sharp pain in her eyes, like stabbing needles. ''My sister came close to my face and said, 'Your eyes are very red.' Then the children started throwing up. They kept throwing up. They were in so much pain, and crying so much. They were crying all the time. My mother was crying. Then the old people started throwing up.''

Chemical weapons had been dropped on Halabja by the Iraqi Air Force, which understood that any underground shelter would become a gas chamber. ''My uncle said we should go outside,'' Nasreen said. ''We knew there were chemicals in the air. We were getting red eyes, and some of us had liquid coming out of them. We decided to run.'' Nasreen and her relatives stepped outside gingerly. ''Our cow was lying on its side,'' she recalled. ''It was breathing very fast, as if it had been running. The leaves were falling off the trees, even though it was spring. The partridge was dead. There were smoke clouds around, clinging to the ground. The gas was heavier than the air, and it was finding the wells and going down the wells.''

The family judged the direction of the wind, and decided to run the opposite way. Running proved difficult. ''The children couldn't walk, they were so sick,'' Nasreen said. ''They were exhausted from throwing up. We carried them in our arms.''

Across the city, other families were making similar decisions. Nouri Hama Ali, who lived in the northern part of town, decided to lead his family in the direction of Anab, a collective settlement on the outskirts of Halabja that housed Kurds displaced when the Iraqi Army destroyed their villages. ''On the road to Anab, many of the women and children began to die,'' Nouri told me. ''The chemical clouds were on the ground. They were heavy. We could see them.'' People were dying all around, he said. When a child could not go on, the parents, becoming hysterical with fear, abandoned him. ''Many children were left on the ground, by the side of the road. Old people as well. They were running, then they would stop breathing and die.''

Nasreen's family did not move quickly. ''We wanted to wash ourselves off and find water to drink,'' she said. ''We wanted to wash the faces of the children who were vomiting. The children were crying for water. There was powder on the ground, white. We couldn't decide whether to drink the water or not, but some people drank the water from the well they were so thirsty.''

They ran in a panic through the city, Nasreen recalled, in the direction of Anab. The bombardment continued intermittently, Air Force planes circling overhead. ''People were showing different symptoms. One person touched some of the powder, and her skin started bubbling.''

A truck came by, driven by a neighbor. People threw themselves aboard. ''We saw people lying frozen on the ground,'' Nasreen told me. ''There was a small baby on the ground, away from her mother. I thought they were both sleeping. But she had dropped the baby and then died. And I think the baby tried to crawl away, but it died, too. It looked like everyone was sleeping.''

At that moment, Nasreen believed that she and her family would make it to high ground and live. Then the truck stopped. ''The driver said he couldn't go on, and he wandered away. He left his wife in the back of the truck. He told us to flee if we could. The chemicals affected his brain, because why else would someone abandon his family?''

As heavy clouds of gas smothered the city, people became sick and confused. Awat Omer was trapped in his cellar with his family; he said that his brother began laughing uncontrollably and then stripped off his clothes, and soon afterward he died. As night fell, the family's children grew sicker—too sick to move.

Nasreen's husband could not be found, and she began to think that all was lost. She led the children who were able to walk up the road.

In another neichborhood, Muhammad Ahmed Fattah, who was twenty, was overwhelmed by an oddly sweet odor of sulfur, and he, too, realized that he must evacuate his family; there were about a hundred and sixty people wedged into the cellar. ''I saw the bomb drop,'' Muhammad told me. ''It was about thirty metres from the house. I shut the door to the cellar. There was shouting and crying in the cellar, and then people became short of breath.'' One of the first to be stricken by the gas was Muhammad's brother Salah. ''His eyes were pink,'' Muhammad recalled. ''There was something coming out of his eyes. He was so thirsty he was demanding water.'' Others in the basement began suffering tremors.

March 16th was supposed to be Muhammad's wedding day. ''Every preparation was done,'' he said. His fiancee, a woman named Bahar Jamal, was among the first in the cellar to die. ''She was crying very hard,'' Muhammad recalled. ''I tried to calm her down. I told her it was just the usual artillery shells, but it didn't smell the usual way weapons smelled. She was smart, she knew what was happening. She died on the stairs. Her father tried to help her, but it was too late.''

Death came quickly to others as well. A woman named Hamida Mahmoud tried to save her two-year-old daughter by allowing her to nurse from her breast. Hamida thought that the baby wouldn't breathe in the gas if she was nursing, Muhammad said, adding, ''The baby's name was Dashneh. She nursed for a long time. Her mother died while she was nursing. But she kept nursing.'' By the time Muhammad decided to go outside, most of the people in the basement were unconscious; many were dead, including his parents and three of his siblings.

Nasreen said that on the road to Anab all was confusion. She and the children were running toward the hills, but they were going blind. ''The children were crying, 'We can't see! My eyes are bleeding!' '' In the chaos, the family got separated. Nasreen's mother and father were both lost. Nasreen and several of her cousins and siblings inadvertently led the younger children in a circle, back into the city. Someone—she doesn't know who—led them away from the city again and up a hill, to a small mosque, where they sought shelter. ''But we didn't stay in the mosque, because we thought it would be a target,'' Nasreen said. They went to a small house nearby, and Nasreen scrambled to find food and water for the children. By then, it was night, and she was exhausted.

Bakhtiar, Nasreen's husband, was frantic. Outside the city when the attacks started, he had spent much of the day searching for his wife and the rest of his family. He had acquired from a clinic two syringes of atropine, a drug that helps to counter the effects of nerve agents. He injected himself with one of the syringes, and set out to find Nasreen. He had no hope. ''My plan was to bury her,'' he said. ''At least I should bury my new wife.''

After hours of searching, Bakhtiar met some neighbors, who remembered seeing Nasreen and the children moving toward the mosque on the hill. ''I called out the name Nasreen,'' he said. ''I heard crying, and I went inside the house. When I got there, I found that Nasreen was alive but blind. Everybody was blind.''

Nasreen had lost her sight about an hour or two before Bakhtiar found her. She had been searching the house for food, so that she could feed the children, when her eyesight failed. ''I found some milk and I felt my way to them and then I found their mouths and gave them milk,'' she said.

Bakhtiar organized the children. ''I wanted to bring them to the well. I washed their heads. I took them two by two and washed their heads. Some of them couldn't come. They couldn't control their muscles. ''

Bakhtiar still had one syringe of atropine, but he did not inject his wife; she was not the worst off in the group. ''There was a woman named Asme, who was my neighbor,'' Bakhtiar recalled. ''She was not able to breathe. She was yelling and she was running into a wall, crashing her head into a wall. I gave the atropine to this woman.'' Asme died soon afterward. ''I could have used it for Nasreen,'' Bakhtiar said. ''I could have.''

After the Iraqi bombardment subsided, the Iranians managed to retake Halabja, and they evacuated many of the sick, including Nasreen and the others in her family, to hospitals in Tehran.

Nasreen was blind for twenty days. ''I was thinking the whole time, Where is my family? But I was blind. I couldn't do anything. I asked my husband about my mother, but he said he didn't know anything. He was looking in hospitals, he said. He was avoiding the question.''

The Iranian Red Crescent Society, the equivalent of the Red Cross, began compiling books of photographs, pictures of the dead in Halabja. ''The Red Crescent has an album of the people who were buried in Iran,'' Nasreen said. ''And we found my mother in one of the albums.'' Her father, she discovered, was alive but permanently blinded. Five of her siblings, including Rangeen, had died.

Nasreen would live, the doctors said, but she kept a secret from Bakhtiar: ''When I was in the hospital, I started menstruating. It wouldn't stop. I kept bleeding. We don't talk about this in our society, but eventually a lot of women in the hospital confessed they were also menstruating and couldn't stop.'' Doctors gave her drugs that stopped the bleeding, but they told her that she would be unable to bear children.

Nasreen stayed in Iran for several months, but eventually she and Bakhtiar returned to Kurdistan. She didn't believe the doctors who told her that she would be infertile, and in 1991 she gave birth to a boy. ''We named him Arazoo,'' she said. Arazoo means hope in Kurdish. ''He was healthy at first, but he had a hole in his heart. He died at the age of three months.''

I met Nasreen last month in Erbil, the largest city in Iraqi Kurdistan. She is thirty now, a pretty woman with brown eyes and high cheekbones, but her face is expressionless. She doesn't seek pity; she would, however, like a doctor to help her with a cough that she's had ever since the attack, fourteen years ago. Like many of Saddam Hussein's victims, she tells her story without emotion.

During my visit to Kurdistan, I talked with more than a hundred victims of Saddam's campaign against the Kurds. Saddam has been persecuting the Kurds ever since he took power, more than twenty years ago. Several old women whose husbands were killed by Saddam's security services expressed a kind of animal hatred toward him, but most people, like Nasreen, told stories of horrific cruelty with a dispassion and a precision that underscored their credibility. Credibility is important to the Kurds; after all this time, they still feel that the world does not believe their story.

A week after I met Nasreen, I visited a small village called Goktapa, situated in a green valley that is ringed by snow-covered mountains. Goktapa came under poison-gas attack six weeks after Halabja. The village consists of low mud-brick houses along dirt paths. In Goktapa, an old man named Ahmed Raza Sharif told me that on the day of the attack on Goktapa, May 3, 1988, he was in the fields outside the village. He saw the shells explode and smelled the sweet-apple odor as poison filled the air. His son, Osman Ahmed, who was sixteen at the time, was near the village mosque when he was felled by the gas. He crawled down a hill and died among the reeds on the banks of the Lesser Zab, the river that flows by the village. His father knew that he was dead, but he couldn't reach the body. As many as a hundred and fifty people died in the attack; the survivors fled before the advancing Iraqi Army, which levelled the village. Ahmed Raza Sharif did not return for three years. When he did, he said, he immediately began searching for his son's body. He found it still lying in the reeds. ''I recognized his body right away,'' he said.

The summer sun in Iraq is blisteringly hot, and a corpse would be unidentifiable three years after death. I tried to find a gentle way to express my doubts, but my translator made it clear to Sharif that I didn't believe him.

We were standing in the mud yard of another old man, Ibrahim Abdul Rahman. Twenty or thirty people, a dozen boys among them, had gathered. Some of them seemed upset that I appeared to doubt the story, but Ahmed hushed them. ''It's true, he lost all the flesh on his body,'' he said. ''He was just a skeleton. But the clothes were his, and they were still on the skeleton, a belt and a shirt. In the pocket of his shirt I found the key to our tractor. That's where he always kept the key.''

Some of the men still seemed concerned that I would leave Goktapa doubting their truthfulness. Ibrahim, the man in whose yard we were standing, called out a series of orders to the boys gathered around us. They dispersed, to houses and storerooms, returning moments later holding jagged pieces of metal, the remnants of the bombs that poisoned Goktapa. Ceremoniously, the boys dropped the pieces of metal at my feet. ''Here are the mercies of Uncle Saddam,'' Ibrahim said.

2. THE AFTERMATH

The story of Halabja did not end the night the Iraqi Air Force planes returned to their bases. The Iranians invited the foreign press to record the devastation. Photographs of the victims, supine, bleached of color, littering the gutters and alleys of the town, horrified the world. Saddam Hussein's attacks on his own citizens mark the only time since the Holocaust that poison gas has been used to exterminate women and children.

Saddam's cousin Ali Hassan al-Majid, who led the campaigns against the Kurds in the late eighties, was heard on a tape captured by rebels, and later obtained by Human Rights Watch, addressing members of Iraq's ruling Baath Party on the subject of the Kurds. ''I will kill them all with chemical weapons!'' he said. ''Who is going to say anything? The international community? Fuck them! The international community and those who listen to them.''

Attempts by Congress in 1988 to impose sanctions on Iraq were stifled by the Reagan and Bush Administrations, and the story of Saddam's surviving victims might have vanished completely had it not been for the reporting of people like Randal and the work of a British documentary filmmaker named Gwynne Roberts, who, after hearing stories

about a sudden spike in the incidence of birth defects and cancers, not only in Halabja but also in other parts of Kurdistan, had made some disturbing films on the subject. However, no Western government or United Nations agency took up the cause.

In 1998, Roberts brought an Englishwoman named Christine Gosden to Kurdistan. Gosden is a medical geneticist and a professor at the medical school of the University of Liverpool. She spent three weeks in the hospitals in Kurdistan, and came away determined to help the Kurds. To the best of my knowledge, Gosden is the only Western scientist who has even begun making a systematic study of what took place in northern Iraq.

Gosden told me that her father was a high-ranking officer in the Royal Air Force, and that as a child she lived in Germany, near Bergen-Belsen. ''It's tremendously influential in your early years to live near a concentration camp,'' she said. In Kurdistan, she heard echoes of the German campaign to destroy the Jews. ''The Iraqi government was using chemistry to reduce the population of Kurds,'' she said. ''The Holocaust is still having its effect. The Jews are fewer in number now than they were in 1939. That's not natural. Now, if you take out two hundred thousand men and boys from Kurdistan''—an estimate of the number of Kurds who were gassed or otherwise murdered in the campaign, most of whom were men and boys—''you've affected the population structure. There are a lot of widows who are not having children.''

Richard Butler, an Australian diplomat who chaired the United Nations weapons-inspection team in Iraq, describes Gosden as ''a classic English, old-school-tie kind of person.'' Butler has tracked her research since she began studying the attacks, four years ago, and finds it credible. ''Occasionally, people say that this is Christine's obsession, but obsession is not a bad thing,'' he added.

Before I went to Kurdistan, in January, I spent a day in London with Gosden. We gossiped a bit, and she scolded me for having visited a Washington shopping mall without appropriate protective equipment. Whenever she goes to a mall, she brings along a polyurethane bag, ''big enough to step into'' and a bottle of bleach. ''I can detoxify myself immediately,'' she said.

Gosden believes it is quite possible that the countries of the West will soon experience chemical and biological-weapons attacks far more serious and of greater lasting effect than the anthrax incidents of last autumn and the nerve-agent attack on the Tokyo subway system several years ago—that what happened in Kurdistan was only the beginning. ''For Saddam's scientists, the Kurds were a test population,'' she said. ''They were the human guinea pigs. It was a way of identifying the most effective chemical agents for use on civilian populations, and the most effective means of delivery.''

The charge is supported by others. An Iraqi defector, Khidhir Hamza, who is the former director of Saddam's nuclear-weapons program, told me earlier this year that before the attack on Balabja military doctors had mapped the city, and that afterward they entered it wearing protective clothing, in order to study the dispersal of the dead. ''These were field tests, an experiment on a town,'' Hamza told me. He said that he had direct knowledge of the Army's procedures that day in Halabja. ''The doctors were given sheets with grids on them, and they had to answer questions such as 'How far are the dead from the cannisters?' ''

Gosden said that she cannot understand why the West has not been more eager to investigate the chemical attacks in Kurdistan. ''It seems a matter of enlightened self-interest that the West would want to study the long-term effects of chemical weapons on civilians, on the DNA,'' she told me. ''I've seen Europe's worst cancers, but, believe me, I have never seen cancers like the ones I saw in Kurdistan.''

According to an ongoing survey conducted by a team of Kurdish physicians and organized by Gosden and a small advocacy group called the Washington Kurdish Institute, more than two hundred towns and villages across Kurdistan were attacked by poison gas—far more than was previously thought—in the course of seventeen months. The number of victims is unknown, but doctors I met in Kurdistan believe that up to ten per cent of the population of northern Iraq—nearly four million people—has been exposed to chemical weapons. ''Saddam Hussein poisoned northern Iraq,'' Gosden said when I left for Halabja. ''The questions, then, are what to do? And what comes next?''

3. HALABJA'S DOCTORS

The Kurdish people, it is often said, make up the largest stateless nation in the world. They have been widely despised by their neighbors for centuries. There are roughly twenty-five million Kurds, most of them spread across four countries in southwestern Asia: Turkey, Iran, Iraq, and Syria. The Kurds are neither Arab, Persian, nor Turkish; they are a distinct ethnic group, with their own culture and language. Most Kurds are Muslim (the most famous Muslim hero of all, Saladin, who defeated the Crusaders, was of Kurdish origin), but there are Jewish and Christian Kurds, and also followers of the Yezidi religion, which has its roots in Sufism and Zoroastrianism. The Kurds are experienced mountain fighters, who tend toward stubbornness and have frequent bouts of destructive infighting

After centuries of domination by foreign powers, the Kurds had their best chance at independence after the First World War, when President Woodrow Wilson promised the Kurds, along with other groups left drifting, and exposed by the collapse of the Ottoman Empire, a large measure of autonomy. But the machinations of the great powers, who were becoming interested in Kurdistan's vast oil deposits, in Mosul and Kirkuk, quickly did the Kurds out of a state.

In the nineteen-seventies, the Iraqi Kurds allied themselves with the Shah of Iran in a territorial dispute with Iraq. America, the Shah's patron, once again became the Kurds' patron, too, supplying them with arms for a revolt against Baghdad. But a secret deal between the Iraqis and the Shah, arranged in 1975 by Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, cut off the Kurds and brought about their instant collapse; for the Kurds, it was an ugly betrayal.

The Kurdish safe haven, in northern Iraq, was born of another American betrayal. In 1991, after the United States helped drive Iraq out of Kuwait, President George Bush ignored an uprising that he himself had stoked, and Kurds and Shiites in Iraq were slaughtered by the thousands. Thousands more fled the country, the Kurds going to Turkey, and almost immediately creating a humanitarian disaster. The Bush Administration, faced with a televised catastrophe, declared northern Iraq a no-fly zone and thus a safe haven, a tactic that allowed the refugees to return home. And so, under the protective shield of the United States and British Air Forces, the unplanned Kurdish experiment in self-government began. Although the Kurdish safe haven is only a virtual state, it is an incipient democracy, a home of progressive Islamic thought and pro-American feeling.

Today, Iraqi Kurdistan is split between two dominant parties: the Kurdistan Democratic Party, led by Massoud Barzani, and the Patriotic Union of Kurdistan, whose General Secretary is Jalal Talabani. The two parties have had an often angry relationship, and in the mid-nineties they fought a war that left about a thousand soldiers dead. The parties, realizing that they could not rule together, decided to rule apart, dividing Kurdistan into two zones. The internal political divisions have not aided the Kurds' cause, but neighboring states also have fomented disunity, fearing that a unified Kurdish population would agitate for independence.

Turkey, with a Kurdish population of between fifteen and twenty million, has repressed the Kurds in the eastern part of the country, politically and militarily, on and off since the founding of the modern Turkish state. In 1924, the government of Atatürk restricted the use of the Kurdish language (a law not lifted until 1991) and expressions of Kurdish culture; to this day, the Kurds are referred to in nationalist circles as ''mountain Turks.''

Turkey is not eager to see Kurds anywhere draw attention to themselves, which is why the authorities in Ankara refused to let me cross the border into Iraqi Kurdistan. Iran, whose Kurdish population numbers between six and eight million, was not helpful, either, and my only option for gaining entrance to Kurdistan was through its third neighbor, Syria. The Kurdistan Democratic Party arranged for me to be met in Damascus and taken to the eastern desert city of El Qamishli. From there, I was driven in a Land Cruiser to the banks of the Tigris River, where a small wooden boat, with a crew of one and an outboard motor, was waiting. The engine sputtered; when I learned that the forward lines of the Iraqi Army were two miles downstream, I began to paddle, too. On the other side of the river were representatives of the Kurdish Democratic Party and the peshmerga, the Kurdish guerrillas, who wore pantaloons and turbans and were armed with AK–47s.

''Welcome to Kurdistan'' read a sign at the water's edge greeting visitors to a country that does not exist.

Halabja is a couple of hundred miles from the Syrian border, and I spent a week crossing northern Iraq, making stops in the cities of Dahuk and Erbil on the way. I was handed over to representatives of the Patriotic Union, which controls Halabja, at a demilitarized zone west of the town of Koysinjaq. From there, it was a two-hour drive over steep mountains to Sulaimaniya, a city of six hundred and fifty thousand, which is the cultural capital of Iraqi Kurdistan. In Sulaimaniya, I met Fouad Baban, one of Kurdistan's leading physicians, who promised to guide me through the scientific and political thickets of Halabja.

Baban, a pulmonary and cardiac specialist who has survived three terms in Iraqi prisons, is sixty years old, and a man of impish good humor. He is the Kurdistan coordinator of the Halabja Medical Institute, which was founded by Gosden, Michael Amitay, the executive director of the Washington Kurdish Institute, and a coalition of Kurdish doctors; for the doctors, it is an act of bravery to be publicly associated with a project whose scientific findings could be used as evidence if Saddam Hussein faced a war-crimes tribunal. Saddam's agents are everywhere in the Kurdish zone, and his tanks sit forty miles from Baban's office.

Soon after I arrived in Sulaimanya, Baban and I headed out in his Toyota Camry for Halabja. On a rough road, we crossed the plains of Sharazoor, a region of black earth and honey-colored wheat ringed by jagged, snow-topped mountains. We were not travelling alone. The Mukhabarat, the Iraqi intelligence service, is widely reported to have

placed a bounty on the heads of Western journalists caught in Kurdistan (either ten thousand dollars or twenty thousand dollars, depending on the source of the information). The areas around the border with Iran are filled with Tehran's spies, and members of Ansar al-Islam, an Islamist terror group, were said to be decapitating people in the Halabja area. So the Kurds had laid on a rather elaborate security detail. A Land Cruiser carrying peshmerga guerrillas led the way, and we were followed by another Land Cruiser, on whose bed was mounted an anti-aircraft weapon manned by six peshmerga, some of whom wore black balaclavas. We were just south of the American- and British-enforced no-fly zone. I had been told that, at the beginning of the safe-haven experiment, the Americans had warned Saddam's forces to stay away; a threat from the air, though unlikely, was, I deduced, not out of the question.

''It seems very important to know the immediate and long-term effects of chemical and biological weapons,'' Baban said, beginning, my tutorial. ''Here is a civilian population exposed to chemical and possibly biological weapons, and people are developing many varieties of cancers and congenital abnormalities. The Americans are vulnerable to these weapons—they are cheap, and terrorists possess them. So, after the anthrax attacks in the States, I think it is urgent for scientific research to be done here.''

Experts now believe that Halabja and other places in Kurdistan were struck by a combination of mustard gas and nerve agents, including sarin (the agent used in the Tokyo subway attack) and VX, a potent nerve agent. Baban's suggestion that biological weapons may also have been used surprised me. One possible biological weapon that Baban mentioned was aflatoxin, which causes long-term liver damage.

A colleague of Baban's, a surgeon who practices in Dahuk, in northwestern Kurdistan, and who is a member of the Halabja Medical Institute team, told me more about the institute's survey, which was conducted in the Dahuk region in 1999. The surveyors began, he said, by asking elementary questions; eleven years after the attacks, they did not even know which villages had been attacked.

''The team went to almost every village,'' the surgeon said. ''At first, we thought that the Dahuk governorate was the least affected. We knew of only two villages that were hit by the attacks. But we came up with twenty-nine in total. This is eleven years after the fact.''

The surgeon is professorial in appearance, but he is deeply angry. He doubles as a pediatric surgeon, because there are no pediatric surgeons in Kurdistan. He has performed more than a hundred operations for cleft palate on children born since 1988. Most of the agents believed to have been dropped on Halabja have short half-lives, but, as Baban told me, ''physicians are unsure how long these toxins will affect the population. How can we know agent half-life if we don't know the agent?'' He added, ''If we knew the toxins that were used, we could follow them and see actions on spermatogenesis and ovogenesis.''

Increased rates of infertility, he said, are having a profound effect on Kurdish society, which places great importance on large families. ''You have men divorcing their wives because they could not give birth, and then marrying again, and then their second wives can't give birth, either,'' he said. ''Still, they don't blame their own problem with spermatogenesis.''

Baban told me that the initial results of the Halabja Medical Institute-sponsored survey show abnormally high rates of many diseases. He said that he compared rates of colon cancer in Halabja with those in the city of Chamchamal, which was not attacked with chemical weapons. ''We are seeing rates of colon cancer five times higher in Halabja than in Chamchamal,'' he said.

There are other anomalies as well, Baban said. The rate of miscarriage in Halabja, according to initial survey results, is fourteen times the rate of miscarriage in Chamchamal; rates of infertility among men and women in the affected population are many times higher than normal. ''We're finding Hiroshima levels of sterility,'' he said.

Then, there is the suspicion about snakes. ''Have you heard about the snakes?'' he asked as we drove. I told him that I had heard rumors. ''We don't know if a genetic mutation in the snakes has made them more toxic,'' Baban went on, ''or if the birds that eat the snakes were killed off in the attacks, but there seem to be more snakebites, of greater toxicity, in Halabja now than before.'' (I asked Richard Spertzel, a scientist and a former member of the United Nations Special Commission inspections team, if this was possible. Yes, he said, but such a rise in snakebites was more likely due to ''environmental imbalances'' than to mutations.)

My conversation with Baban was suddenly interrupted by our guerrilla escorts, who stopped the car and asked me to join them in one of the Land Cruisers; we veered off across a wheat field, without explanation. I was later told that we had been passing a mountain area that had recently had problems with Islamic terrorists.

We arrived in Halabja half an hour later. As you enter the city, you see a small statue modelled on the most famous photographic image of the Halabj massacre: an old man, prone and lifeless, shielding his dead grandson with his body.

A torpor seems to afflict Halabja; even its bazaar is listless and somewhat empty, in marked contrast to those of other Kurdish cities, which are well stocked with imported goods (history and circumstance have made the Kurds enthusiastic smugglers) and are full of noise and activity. ''Everyone here is sick,'' a Halabja doctor told me. ''The people who aren't sick are depressed.'' He practices at the Martyrs'' Hospital, which is situated on the outskirts of the city. The hospital has no heat and little advanced equipment; like the city itself, it is in a dilapidated state.

The doctor is a thin, jumpy man in a tweed jacket, and he smokes without pause. He and Baban took me on a tour of the hospital. Afterward, we sat in a bare office, and a woman was wheeled in. She looked seventy but said that she was fifty; doctors told me she suffers from lung scarring so serious that only a lung transplant could help, but there are no transplant centers in Kurdistan. The woman, whose name is Jayran Muhammad, lost eight relatives during the attack. Her voice was almost inaudible. ''I was disturbed psychologically for a long time,'' she told me as Baban translated. ''I believed my children were alive.'' Baban told me that her lungs would fail soon, that she could barely breathe. ''She is waiting to die,'' he said. I met another woman, Chia Hammassat, who was eight at the time of the attacks and has been blind ever since. Her mother, she said, died of colon cancer several years ago, and her brother suffers from chronic shortness of breath. ''There is no hope to correct my vision,'' she said, her voice flat. ''I was married, but I couldn't fulfill the responsibilities of a wife because I'm blind. My husband left me.''

Baban said that in Halabja ''there are more abnormal births than normal ones,'' and other Kurdish doctors told me that they regularly see children born with neural-tube defects and undescended testes and without anal openings. They are seeing—and they showed me—children born with six or seven toes on each foot, children whose fingers and toes are fused, and children who suffer from leukemia and liver cancer.

I met Sarkar, a shy and intelligent boy with a harelip, a cleft palate, and a growth on his spine. Sarkar had a brother born with the same set of malformations, the doctor told me, but the brother choked to death, while still a baby, on a grain of rice.

Meanwhile, more victims had gathered in the hallway; the people of Halabja do not often have a chance to tell their stories to foreigners. Some of them wanted to know if I was a surgeon, who had come to repair their children's deformities, and they were disappointed to learn that I was a journalist. The doctor and I soon left the hospital for a walk through the northern neighborhoods of Halabja, which were hardest hit in the attack. We were trailed by peshmerga carrying AK–47s. The doctor smoked as we talked, and I teased him about his habit. ''Smoking has some good effect on the lungs,'' he said, without irony. ''In the attacks, there was less effect on smokers. Their lungs were better equipped for the mustard gas, maybe.''

We walked through the alleyways of the Jewish quarter, past a former synagogue in which eighty or so Halabjans died during the attack. Underfed cows wandered the paths. The doctor showed me several cellars where clusters of people had died. We knocked on the gate of one house, and were let in by an old woman with a wide smile and few teeth. In the Kurdish tradition, she immediately invited us for lunch.

She told us the recent history of the house. ''Everyone who was in this house died,'' she said. ''The whole family. We heard there were one hundred people.'' She led us to the cellar, which was damp and close. Rusted yellow cans of vegetable ghee littered the floor. The room seemed too small to hold a hundred people, but the doctor said that the estimate sounded accurate. I asked him if cellars like this one had ever been decontaminated. He smiled. ''Nothing in Kurdistan has been decontaminated,'' he said.

4. AL-ANFAL

The chemical attacks on Halabja and Goktapa and perhaps two hundred other villages and towns were only a small part of the cataclysm that Saddam's cousin, the man known as Ali Chemical, arranged for the Kurds. The Kurds say that about two hundred thousand were killed. (Human Rights Watch, which in the early nineties published ''Iraq's Crime of Genocide,'' a definitive study of the attacks, gives a figure of between fifty thousand and a hundred thousand.)

The campaign against the Kurds was dubbed al-Anfal by Saddam, after a chapter in the Koran that allows conquering Muslim armies to seize the spoils of their foes. It reads, in part, ''Against them''—your enemies—''make ready your strength to the utmost of your power, including steeds of war, to strike terror into the hearts of the enemies of Allah and your enemies, and others besides, whom ye may not know, but whom Allah doth know. Whatever ye shall spend in the cause of Allah, shall be repaid unto you, and ye shall not be treated unjustly.''

The Anfal campaign was not an end in itself, like the Holocaust, but a means to an end—an instance of a policy that Samantha Power, who runs the Carr Center for Human Rights, at Harvard, calls ''Instrumental genocide.'' Power has just published ''A Problem from Hell,'' a study of American responses to genocide. ''There are regimes that set out to murder every citizen of a race,'' she said. ''Saddam achieved what he had to do without exterminating every last Kurd.'' What he had to do, Power and others say,

was to break the Kurds' morale and convince them that a desire for independence was foolish.

Most of the Kurds who were murdered in the Anfal were not killed by poison gas; rather, the genocide was carried out, in large part, in the traditional manner, with roundups at night, mass executions, and anonymous burials. The bodies of most of the victims of the Anfal—mainly men and boys—have never been found.

One day, I met one of the thousands of Kurdish women known as Anfal widows: Salma Aziz Baban. She lives outside Chamchamal, in a settlement made up almost entirely of displaced families, in cinder-block houses. Her house was nearly empty—no furniture, no heat, just a ragged carpet. We sat on the carpet as she told me about her family. She comes from the Kirkuk region, and in 1987 her village was uprooted by the Army, and the inhabitants, with thousands of other Kurds, were forced into a collective town. Then, one night in April of 1988, soldiers went into the village and seized the men and older boys. Baban's husband and her three oldest sons were put on trucks. The mothers of the village began to plead with the soldiers. ''We were screaming, 'Do what you want to us, do what you want!' '' Baban told me. ''They were so scared, my sons. My sons were crying.'' She tried to bring them coats for the journey. ''It was raining. I wanted them to have coats. I begged the soldiers to let me give them bread. They took them without coats.'' Baban remembered that a high-ranking Iraqi officer named Bareq orchestrated the separation; according to ''Iraq's Crime of Genocide,'' the Human Rights Watch report, the man in charge of this phase was a brigadier general named Bareq Abdullah al-Haj Hunta.

After the men were taken away, the women and children were herded onto trucks. They were given little water or food, and were crammed so tightly into the vehicles that they had to defecate where they stood. Baban, her three daughters, and her six-year-old son were taken to the Topzawa Army base and then to the prison of Nugra Salman, the Pit of Salman, which Human Rights Watch in 1995 described this way: ''It was an old building, dating back to the days of the Iraqi monarchy and perhaps earlier. It had been abandoned for years, used by Arab nomads to shelter their herds. The bare walls were scrawled with the diaries of political prisoners. On the door of one cell, a guard had daubed 'Khomeini eats shit.' Over the main gate, someone else had written, 'Welcome to Hell.' ''

''We arrived at midnight,'' Baban told me. ''They put us in a very big room, with more than two thousand people, women and children, and they closed the door. Then the starvation started.''

The prisoners were given almost nothing to eat, and a single standpipe spat out brackish water for drinking. People began to die from hunger and illness. When someone died, the Iraqi guards would demand that the body be passed through a window in the main door. ''The bodies couldn't stay in the hall,'' Baban told me. In the first days at Nugra Salman, ''thirty people died, maybe more.'' Her six-year-old son, Rebwar, fell ill. ''He had diarrhea,'' she said. ''He was very sick. He knew he was dying. There was no medicine or doctor. He started to cry so much.'' Baban's son died on her lap. ''I was screaming and crying,'' she said. ''My daughters were crying. We gave them the body. It was passed outside, and the soldiers took it.''

Soon after Baban's son died, she pulled herself up and went to the window, to see if the soldiers had taken her son to be buried. ''There were twenty dogs outside the prison. A big black dog was the leader,'' she said. The soldiers had dumped the bodies of the dead outside the prison, in a field. ''I looked outside and saw the legs and hands of my son in the mouths of the dogs. The dogs were eating my son.'' She stopped talking for a moment. ''Then I lost my mind.''

She described herself as catatonic; her daughters scraped around for food and water. They kept her alive, she said, until she could function again. ''This was during Ramadan. We were kept in Nugra Salman for a few more months.''

In September, when the war with Iran was over, Saddam issued a general amnesty to the Kurds, the people he believed had betrayed him by siding with Tehran. The women, children, and elderly in Nugra Salman were freed. But, in most cases, they could not go home; the Iraqi Army had bulldozed some four thousand villages, Baban's among them. She was finally resettled in the Chamchamal district.

In the days after her release, she tried to learn the fate of her husband and three older sons. But the men who disappeared in the Anfal roundups have never been found. It is said that they were killed and then buried in mass graves in the desert along the Kuwaiti border, but little is actually known. A great number of Anfal widows, I was told, still believe that their sons and husbands and brothers are locked away in Saddam's jails. ''We are thinking they are alive,'' Baban said, referring to her husband and sons. ''Twenty-four hours a day, we are thinking maybe they are alive. If they are alive, they are being tortured, I know it.''

Baban said that she has not slept well since her sons were taken from her. ''We are thinking, Please let us know they are dead, I will sleep in peace,'' she said. ''My head is filled with terrible thoughts. The day I die is the day I will not remember that the dogs ate my son.''

Before I left, Baban asked me to write down the names of her three older sons. They are Sherzad, who would be forty now; Rizgar, who would be thirty-one; and Muhammad, who would be thirty. She asked me to find her sons, or to ask President Bush to find them. ''One would be sufficient,'' she said. ''If just one comes back, that would be enough.''

5. WHAT THE KURDS FEAR

In a conversation not long ago with Richard Butler, the former weapons inspector, I suggested a possible explanation for the world's indifference to Saddam Hussein's use of chemical weapons to commit genocide—that the people he had killed were his own citizens, not those of another sovereign state. (The main chemical-weapons treaty does not ban a country's use of such weapons against its own people, perhaps because at the time the convention was drafted no one could imagine such a thing.) Butler reminded me, however, that Iraq had used chemical weapons against another country—Iran—during, the eight-year Iran-Iraq War. He offered a simpler rationale. ''The problems are just too awful and too hard,'' he said. ''History is replete with such things. Go back to the grand example of the Holocaust. It sounded too hard to do anything about it.''

The Kurds have grown sanguine about the world's lack of interest. ''I've learned not to be surprised by the indifference of the civilized world,'' Barham Salih told me one evening in Sulaimaniya. Salih is the Prime Minister of the area of Kurdistan administered by the Patriotic Union, and he spoke in such a way as to suggest that it would be best if I, too, stopped acting surprised. ''Given the scale of the tragedy—we're talking about large numbers of victims—I suppose I'm surprised that the international community has not come in to help the survivors,'' he continued. ''It's politically indecent not to help. But, as a Kurd, I live with the terrible hand history and geography have dealt my people.''

Salih's home is not prime ministerial, but it has many Western comforts. He had a satellite television and a satellite telephone, yet the house was frigid; in a land of cheap oil, the Kurds, who are cut off the Iraqi electric grid by Saddam on a regular basis, survive on generator power and kerosene heat.

Over dinner one night, Salih argued that the Kurds should not be regarded with pity. ''I don't think one has to tap into the Wilsonian streak in American foreign policy in order to find a rationale for helping the Kurds,'' he said. ''Helping the Kurds would mean an opportunity to study the problems caused by weapons of mass destruction.''

Salih, who is forty-one, often speaks bluntly, and is savvy about Washington's enduring interest in ending the reign of Saddam Hussein. Unwilling publicly to exhort the United States to take military action, Salih is aware that the peshmerga would be obvious allies of an American military strike against Iraq; other Kurds have been making that argument for years. It is not often noted in Washington policy circles, but the Kurds already hold a vast swath of territory inside the country—including two important dams whose destruction could flood Baghdad—and have at least seventy thousand men under arms. In addition, the two main Kurdish parties are members of the Iraqi opposition group, the Iraqi National Congress, which is headed by Ahmad Chalabi, a London-based Shiite businessman; at the moment, though, relations between Chalabi and the Kurdish leaders are contentious.

Kurds I talked to throughout Kurdistan were enthusiastic about the idea of joining, an American-led alliance against Saddam Hussein, and serving as the northen-Iraqi equivalent of Afghanistan's Northern Alliance. President Bush's State of the Union Message, in which he denounced Iraq as the linchpin of an ''axis of evil,'' had had an electric effect on every Kurd I met who heard the speech. In the same speech, President Bush made reference to Iraq's murder of ''thousands of its own citizens—leaving the bodies of mothers huddled over their dead children.'' General Simko Dizayee, the chief of staff of the peshmerga, told me, ''Bush's speech filled our hearts with hope.''

Prime Minister Salih expressed his views diplomatically. ''We support democratic transformation in Iraq,'' he said—half smiling, because he knows that there is no chance of that occurring unless Saddam is removed. But until America commits itself to removing Saddam, he said, ''we're living on the razor's edge. Before Washington even wakes up in the morning, we could have ten thousand dead.'' This is the Kurdish conundrum: the Iraqi military is weaker than the American military, but the Iraqis are stronger than the Kurds. Seven hundred Iraqi tanks face the Kurdish safe haven, according to peshmerga commanders.

General Mustafa Said Qadir, the peshmerga leader, put it this way: ''We have a problem. If the Americans attack Saddam and don't get him, we're going to get gassed. If the Americans decided to do it, we would be thankful. This is the Kurdish dream. But it has to be done carefully.''

The Kurdish leadership worries, in short, that an American mistake could cost the Kurds what they have created, however inadvertently: a nearly independent state for themselves in northern Iraq. ''We would like to be our own nation,'' Salih told me. ''But we are realists. All we want is to be partners of the Arabs of Iraq in building a secular, democratic, federal country.'' Later, he added, ''We are proud of ourselves. We have

inherited a devastated country. It's not easy what we are trying to achieve. We had no democratic institutions, we didn't have a legal culture, we did not have a strong military. From that situation, this is a remarkable success story.''

The Kurdish regional government, to be sure, is not a Vermont town meeting. The leaders of the two parties, Massoud Barzani and Jalal Talabani, are safe in their jobs. But there is a free press here, and separation of mosque and state, and schools are being built and pensions are being paid. In Erbil and in Sulaimaniya, the Kurds have built playgrounds on the ruins of Iraqi Army torture centers. ''If America is indeed looking for Muslims who are eager to become democratic and are eager to counter the effects of Islamic fundamentalism, then it should be looking here,'' Salih said.

Massoud Barzani is the son of the late Mustafa Barzani, a legendary guerrilla, who built the Democratic Party, and who entered into the ill-fated alliance with Iran and America. I met Barzani in his headquarters, above the town of Salahuddin. He is a short man, pale and quiet; he wore the red turban of the Barzani clan and a wide cummerbund across his baggy trousers—the outfit of a peshmerga.

Like Salih, he chooses his words carefully when talking about the possibility of helping America bring down Saddam. ''It is not enough to tell us the U.S. will respond at a certain time and place of its choosing,'' Barzani said. ''We're in artillery range. Iraq's Army is weak, but it is still strong enough to crush us. We don't make assumptions about the American response.''

One day, I drove to the Kurdish front lines near Erbil, to see the forward positions of the Iraqi Army. The border between the Army-controlled territory and the Kurdish region is porous; Baghdad allows some Kurds—nonpolitical Kurds—to travel back and forth between zones.

My peshmerga escort took me to the roof of a building overlooking the Kalak Bridge and, beyond it, the Iraqi lines. Without binoculars, we could see Iraqi tanks on the hills in front of us. A local official named Muhammad Najar joined us; he told me that the Iraqi forces arrayed there were elements of the Army's Jerusalem brigade, a reserve unit established by Saddam with the stated purpose of liberating Jerusalem from the Israelis. Other peshmerga joined us. It was a brilliantly sunny day, and we were enjoying the weather. A man named Azlz Khader, gazing at the plain before us, said, ''When I look across here, I imagine American tanks coming down across this plain going to Baghdad.'' His friends smiled and said, ''Inshallah''—God willing. Another man said, ''The U.S. is the lord of the world.''

6. THE PRISONERS

A week later, I was at Shinwe, a mountain range outside Halabja, with another group of peshmerga. My escorts and I had driven most of the way up, and then slogged through fresh snow. From one peak, we could see the village of Biyara, which sits in a valley between Halabja and a wall of mountains that mark the Iranian border. Saddam's tanks were an hour's drive away to the south, and Iran filled the vista before us. Biyara and nine other villages near it are occupied by the terrorist group Ansar al-Islam, or Supporters of Islam. Shinwe, in fact, might be called the axis of the axis of evil.

We were close enough to see trucks belonging to Ansar al-Islam making their way from village to village. The commander of the peshmerga forces surrounding Biyara, a veteran guerrilla named Ramadan Dekone, said that Ansar al-Islam is made up of Kurdish Islamists and an unknown number of so-called Arab Afghans—Arabs, from southern Iraq and elsewhere, who trained in the camps of Al Qaeda.

''They believe that people must be terrorized,'' Dekone said, shaking his head. ''They believe that the Koran says this is permissible.'' He pointed to an abandoned village in the middle distance, a place called Kheli Hama. ''That is where the massacre took place,'' he said. In late September, forty-two of his men were killed by Ansar al-Islam, and now Dekone and his forces seemed ready for revenge. I asked him what he would do if he captured the men responsible for the killing. ''I would take them to court,'' he said.

When I got to Sulaimaniya, I visited a prison run by the intelligence service of the Patriotic Union. The prison is attached to the intelligence-service headquarters. It appears to be well kept and humane; the communal cells hold twenty or so men each, and they have kerosene heat, and even satellite television. For two days, the intelligence agency permitted me to speak with any prisoner who agreed to be interviewed. I was wary; the Kurds have an obvious interest in lining up on the American side in the war against terror. But the officials did not, as far as I know, compel anyone to speak to me, and I did not get the sense that allegations made by prisoners were shaped by their captors. The stories, which I later checked with experts on the region, seemed at least worth the attention of America and other countries in the West.

The allegations include charges that Ansar al-Islam has received funds directly from Al Qaeda; that the intelligence service of Saddam Hussein has joint control, with Al Qaeda operatives, over Ansar al-Islam; that Saddam Hussein hosted a senior leader of Al Qaeda in Baghdad in 1992; that a number of Al Qaeda members fleeing Afghanistan have been secretly brought into territory controlled by Ansar al-Islam; and that Iraqi intelligence agents smuggled conventional weapons, and possibly even chemical and biological weapons, into Afghanistan. If these charges are true, it would mean that the relationship between Saddam's regime and Al Qaeda is far closer than previously thought.

When I asked the director of the twenty-four-hundred-man Patriotic Union intelligence service why he was allowing me to interview his prisoners, he told me that he hoped I would carry this information to American intelligence officials. ''The F.B.I. and the C.I.A. haven't come out yet,'' he told me. His deputy added, ''Americans are going to Somalia, the Philippines, I don't know where else, to look for terrorists. But this is the field, here.'' Anya Guilsher, a spokeswoman for the C.I.A., told me last week that as a matter of policy the agency would not comment on the activities of its officers. James Woolsey, a former C.I.A. director and an advocate of overthrowing the Iraqi regime, said, ''It would be a real shame if the C.I.A.'s substantial institutional hostility to Iraqi democratic resistance groups was keeping it from learning about Saddam's ties to Al Qaeda in northern Iraq.''

The possibility that Saddam could supply weapons of mass destruction to anti-American terror groups is a powerful argument among advocates of ''regime change,'' as the removal of Saddam is known in Washington. These critics of Saddam argue that his chemical and biological capabilities, his record of support for terrorist organizations, and the cruelty of his regime make him a threat that reaches far beyond the citizens of Iraq.

''He's the home address for anyone wanting to make or use chemical or biological weapons,'' Kanan Makiya, an Iraqi dissident, said. Makiya is the author of ''Republic of Fear,'' a study of Saddam's regime. ''He's going to be the person to worry about. He's got the labs and the knowhow. He's hellbent on trying to find a way into the fight, without announcing it.''

On the surface, a marriage of Saddam's secular Baath Party regime with the fundamentalist Al Qaeda seems unlikely. His relationship with secular Palestinian groups is well known; both Abu Nidal and Abul Abbas, two prominent Palestinian terrorists, are currently believed to be in Baghdad. But about ten years ago Saddam underwent something of a battlefield conversion to a fundamentalist brand of Islam.

''It was gradual, starting the moment he decided on the invasion of Kuwait,'' in June of 1990, according to Amatzia Baram, an Iraq expert at the University of Haifa. ''His calculation was that he needed people in Iraq and the Arab world—as well as God—to be on his side when he invaded. After he invaded, the Islamic rhetorical style became overwhelming,''—so overwhelming, Baram continued, that a radical group in Jordan began calling Saddam ''the New Caliph Marching from the East.'' This conversion, cynical though it may be, has opened doors to Saddam in the fundamentalist world. He is now a prime supporter of the Palestinian Islamic Jihad and of Hamas, paying families of suicide bombers ten thousand dollars in exchange for their sons' martyrdom. This is part of Saddam's attempt to harness the power of Islamic extremism and direct it against his enemies.

Kurdish culture, on the other hand, has traditionally been immune to religious extremism. According to Kurdish officials, Ansar al-Islam grew out of an idea spread by Ayman al-Zawahiri, the former chief of the Egyptian Islamic Jihad and now Osama bin Laden's deputy in Al Qaeda. ''There are two schools of thought'' in Al Qaeda, Karim Sinjari, the Interior Minister of Kurdistan's Democratic Party-controlled region, told me. ''Osama bin Laden believes that the infidels should be beaten in the head, meaning the United States. Zawahiri's philosophy is that you should fight the infidel even in the smallest village, that you should try to form Islamic armies everywhere. The Kurdish fundamentalists were influenced by Zawahiri'.''

Kurds were among those who travelled to Afghanistan from all over the Muslim world, first to fight the Soviets, in the early nineteen-eighties, then to join Al Qaeda. The members of the groups that eventually became Ansar al-Islam spent a great deal of time in Afghanistan, according to Kurdish intelligence officials. One Kurd who went to Afghanistan was Mala Krekar, an early leader of the Islamist movement in Kurdistan; according to Sinjari, he now holds the title of ''emir'' of Ansar al-Islam.

In 1998, the first force of Islamist terrorists crossed the Iranian border into Kurdistan, and immediately tried to seize the town of Haj Omran. Kurdish officials said that the terrorists were helped by Iran, which also has an interest in undermining a secular Muslim government. ''The terrorists blocked the road, they killed Kurdish Democratic Party cadres, they threatened the villagers,'' Sinjari said. ''We fought them and they fled.''

The terrorist groups splintered repeatedly. According to a report in the Arabic newspaper Al-Sharq al-Awsat, which is published in London, Ansar al-Islam came into being, on September 1st of last year, with the merger of two factions: Al Tawhid, which helped to arrange the assassination of Kurdistan's most prominent Christian politician, and whose operatives initiated an acid-tbrowing campaign against unveiled women; and a faction called the Second Soran Unit, which had been affiliated with one of the Kurdish Islamic parties. In a statement

issued to mark the merger, the group, which originally called itself Jund al-Islam, or Soldiers of Islam, declared its intention to ''undertake Jiihad in this region'' in order to carry out ''God's will.'' According to Kurdish officials, the group had between five hundred and six hundred members, including Arab Afghans and at least thirty Iraqi Kurds who were trained in Afghanistan.

Kurdish officials say that the merger took place in a ceremony overseen by three Arabs trained in bin Laden's camps in Afghanistan, and that these men supplied Ansar al-Islam with three hundred thousand dollars in seed money. Soon after the merger, a unit of Ansar al-Islam called the Victory Squad attacked and killed the peshmerga in Kheli Hama.

Among the Islamic fighters who were there that day was Rekut Hiwa Hussein, a slender, boyish twenty-year-old who was captured by the peshmerga after the massacre, and whom I met in the prison in Sulaimaniya. He was exceedingly shy, never looking up from his hands as he spoke. He was not handcuffed, and had no marks on the visible parts of his body. We were seated in an investigator's office inside the intelligence complex. Like most buildings in Sulaimaniya, this one was warmed by a single kerosene heater, and the room temperature seemed barely above freezing. Rekut told me how he and his comrades in Ansar al-Islam overcame the peshmerga.

''They thought there was a ceasefire, so we came into the village and fired on them by surprise,'' he said. ''They didn't know what happened. We used grenades and machine guns. We killed a lot of them and then the others surrendered.'' The terrorists trussed their prisoners, ignoring pleas from the few civilians remaining in the town to leave them alone. ''The villagers asked us not to slaughter them,'' Rekut said. One of the leaders of Ansar al-Islam, a man named Abdullah a'Shafi, became incensed. ''He said, 'Who is saying this? Let me kill them.' ''

Rekut said that the peshmerga were killed in ritual fashion: ''We put cloths in their mouths. We then laid them down like sheep, in a line. Then we cut their throats.'' After the men were killed, peshmerga commanders say, the corpses were beheaded. Rekut denied this. ''Some of their heads had been blown off by grenades, but we didn't behead them,'' he said.

I asked Rekut why he had joined Ansar al-Islam. ''A friend of mine Joined,'' he said quietly. ''I don't have a good reason why I joined. ''A guard then took him by the elbow and returned him to his cell.

The Kurdish intelligence officials I spoke to were careful not to oversell their case; they said that they have no proof that Ansar al-Islam was ever involved in international terrorism or that Saddam's agents were involved in the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon. But they do have proof, they said, that Ansar al-Islam is shielding Al Qaeda members, and that it is doing so with the approval of Saddam's agents.

Kurdish officials said that, according, to their intelligence, several men associated with Al Qaeda have been smuggled over the Iranian border into an Ansar al-Islam stronghold near Halabja. The Kurds believe that two of them, who go by the names Abu Yasir and Abu Muzaham, are highranking Al Qaeda members. ''We don't have any information about them,'' one official told me. ''We know that they don't want anybody to see them. They are sleeping in the same room as Mala Krekar and Abdullah al-Shafi''—the nominal leaders of Ansar al-Islam.

The real leader, these officials say, is an Iraqi who goes by the name Abu Wa'el, and who, like the others, spent a great deal of time in bin Laden's training camps. But he is also, they say, a highranking officer of the Mukhabarat. One senior official added, ''A man named Abu Agab is in charge of the northern bureau of the Mukhabarat. And he is Abu Wa'el's control officer.''

Abu Agab, the official said, is based in the city of Kirkuk, which is predominantly Kurdish but is under the control of Baghdad. According to intelligence officials, Abu Agab and Abu Wa'el met last July 7th, in Germany. From there, they say, Abu Wa'el travelled to Afghanistan and then, in August, to Kurdistan, sneaking across the Iranian border.

The Kurdish officials told me that they learned a lot about Abu Wa'el's movements from one of their prisoners, an Iraqi intelligence officer named Qassem Hussein Muhammad, and they invited me to speak with him. Qassem, the Kurds said, is a Shiite from Basra, in southern Iraq, and a twenty-year veteran of Iraqi intelligence.

Qassem, shamblinog, and bearded, was brought into the room, and he genially agreed to be interviewed. One guard stayed in the room, along with my translator. Qassem lit a cigarette, and leaned back in his chair. I started by asking him if he had been tortured by his captors. His eyes widened. ''By God, no,'' he said. ''There is nothing like torture here.'' Then he told me that his involvement in Islamic radicalism began in 1992 in Baghdad, when he met Ayman al-Zawahiri.

Qassem said that he was one of seventeen bodyguards assigned to protect Zawahiri, who stayed at Baghdad's Al Rashid Hotel, but who, he said, moved around surreptitiously. The guards had no idea why Zawahiri was in Baghdad, but one day Qassem escorted him to one of Saddam's palaces for what he later learned was a meeting with Saddam himself

Qassem's capture by the Kurds grew out of his last assignment from the Mukhabarat. The Iraqi intelligence service received word that Abu Wa'el had been captured by American agents. ''I was sent by the Mukhabarat to Kurdistan to find Abu Wa'el or, at least, information about him,'' Qassem told me. ''That's when I was captured, before I reached Biyara.''

I asked him if he was sure that Abu Wa'el was on Saddam's side. ''He's an employee of the Mukhabarat,'' Qassem said. ''He's the actual decision-maker in the group''—Ansar al-Islam—''but he's an employee of the Mukhabarat.'' According to the Kurdish intelligence officials, Abu Wa'el is not in American hands; rather, he is still with Ansar al-Islam. American officials declined to comment.

The Kurdish intelligence officials told me that they have Al Qaeda members in custody, and they introduced me to another prisoner, a young Iraqi Arab named Haqi Ismail, whom they described as a middle- to high-ranking member of Al Qaeda. He was, they said, captured by the peshmerga as he tried to get into Kurdistan three weeks after the start of the American attack on Afghanistan. Ismail, they said, comes from a Mosul family with deep connections to the Mukhabarat; his uncle is the top Mukhabarat official in the south of Iraq. They said they believe that Haqi Ismail is a liaison between Saddam's intelligence service and Al Qaeda.

Ismail wore slippers and a blanket around his shoulders. He was ascetic in appearance and, at the same time, ostentatiously smug. He appeared to be amused by the presence of an American. He told the investigators that he would not talk to the C.I.A. The Kurdish investigators laughed and said they wished that I were from the C.I.A.

Ismail said that he was once a student at the University of Mosul but grew tired of life in Iraq under Saddam Hussein. Luckily, he said, in 1999 he met an Afghan man who persuaded him to seek work in Afghanistan. The Kurdish investigators smiled as Ismail went on to say that he found himself in Kandahar, then in Kabul, and then somehow—here he was exceedingly vague—in an Al Qaeda camp. When I asked him how enrollment in an Al Qaeda camp squared with his wish to seek work in Afghanistan, he replied, ''Being a soldier is a job.'' After his training, he said, he took a post in the Taliban Foreign Ministry. I asked him if he was an employee of Saddam's intelligence service. ''I prefer not to talk about that,'' he replied.

Later, I asked, the Kurdish officials if they believed that Saddam provides aid to Al Qaeda affiliated terror groups or simply maintains channels of communication with them. It was getting late, and the room was growing even colder. ''Come back tomorrow,'' the senior official in the room said, ''and we'll introduce you to someone who will answer that question.''

7. THE AL QAEDA LINK

The man they introduced me to the next afternoon was a twenty-nine-year-old Iranian Arab, a smuggler and bandit from the city of Ahvaz. The intelligence officials told me that his most recent employer was bin Laden. When they arrested him, last year, they said, they found a roll of film in his possession. They had the film developed, and the photographs, which they showed me, depleted their prisoner murdering a man with a knife, slicing his ear off and then plunging the knife into the top of the man's head.

The Iranian had a thin face, thick black hair, and a mustache; he wore an army jacket, sandals, and Western-style sweatpants. Speaking in an almost casual tone, he told me that he was born in 1973, that his real name was Muhammad Mansour Shahab, and that he had been a smuggler most of his adult life.

''I met a group of drug traffickers,'' he said. ''They gave us drugs and we got them weapons,'' which they took from Iran into Afghanistan. In 1996, he met an Arab Afghan. ''His name was Othman,'' the man went on. ''He gave me drugs, and I got him a hundred and fifty Kalashnikovs. Then he said to me, 'You should come visit Afghanistan.' So we went to Afghanistan in 1996. We stayed for a while, I came back, did a lot of smuggling jobs. My brother-in-law tried to send weapons to Afghanistan, but the Iranians ambushed us. I killed some of the Iranians.''

He soon returned with Othman to Afghanistan, where, he said, Othman gave him the name Muhammad Jawad to use while he was there. ''Othman said to me, 'You will meet Sheikh Osama soon.' We were in Kandahar. One night, they gave me a sleeping pill. We got into a car and we drove for an hour and a half into the mountains. We went to a tent they said was Osama's tent.'' The man now called Jawad did not meet Osama bin Laden that night. ''They said to me, 'You're the guy who killed the Iranian officer.' Then they said they needed information about me, my real name. They told Othman to take me back to Kandahar and hold me in jail for twenty-one days while they investigated me.''

The Al Qaeda men completed their investigation and called him back to the mountains. ''They told me that Osama said I should work with them,'' Jawad said. ''They told me to bring my wife to Afghanistan.'' They made him swear on a Koran that he would never betray them. Jawad said that he became one of Al Qaeda's principal weapons smugglers. Iraqi opposition sources told me that the Baghdad regime frequently smuggled weapons to Al Qaeda by air through

Dubai to Pakistan and then overland into Afghanistan. But Jawad told me that the Iraqis often used land routes through Iran as well. Othman ordered him to establish a smuggling route across the Iraq-Iran border. The smugglers would pose as shepherds to find the best routes. ''We started to go into Iraq with the sheep and cows,'' Jawad told me, and added that they initiated this route by smuggling tape recorders from Iraq to Iran. They opened a store, a front, in Ahvaz, to sell electronics, ''just to establish relationships with smugglers.''

One day in 1999, Othman got a message to Jawad, who was then in Iran. He was to smuggle himself across the Iraqi border at Fao, where a car would meet him and take him to a village near Tikrit, the headquarters of Saddam Hussein's clan. Jawad was then taken to a meeting at the house of a man called Luay, whom he described as the son of Saddam's father-in-law, Khayr Allah Talfah. (Professor Baram, who has long followed Saddam's family, later told me he believes that Luay, who is about forty years old, is close to Saddam's inner circle.) At the meeting, with Othman present, Mukhabarat officials instructed Jawad to go to Baghdad, where he was to retrieve several cannisters filled with explosives. Then, he said, he was to arrange to smuggle the explosives into Iran, where they would be used to kill anti-Iraqi activists. After this assignment was completed, Jawad said, he was given a thousand Kalashnikov rifles by Iraqi intelligence and told to smuggle them into Afghanistan.

A year later, there was a new development: Othman told Jawad to smuggle several dozen refrigerator motors into Afghanistan for the Iraqi Mukhabarat; a cannister filled with liquid was attached to each motor. Jawad said that he asked Othman for more information. ''I said, 'Othman, what does this contain?' He said, 'My life and your life.' He said they''—the Iraqi agents—''were going to kill us if we didn't do this. That's all I'll say.

''I was given a book of dollars,'' Jawad went on, meaning ten thousand dollars—a hundred American hundred-dollar bills. ''I was told to arrange to smuggle the motors. Othman told me to kill any of the smugglers who helped us once we got there.'' Vehicles belonging to the Taliban were waiting at the border, and Jawad said that he turned over the liquid-filled refrigerator motors to the Taliban, and then killed the smugglers who had helped him.

Jawad said that he had no idea what liquid was inside the motors, but he assumed that it was some type of chemical or biological weapon. I asked the Kurdish officials who remained in the room if they believed that, as late as 2000, the Mukhabarat was transferring chemical or biological weapons to Al Qaeda. They spoke carefully. ''We have no idea what was in the cannisters,'' the senior official said. ''This is something that is worth an American investigation.''

When I asked Jawad to tell me why he worked for Al Qaeda, he replied, ''Money.'' He would not say how much money he had been paid, but he suggested that it was quite a bit. I had one more question: How many years has Al Qaeda maintained a relationship with Saddam Hussein's regime? ''There's been a relationship between the Mukhabarat and the people of Al Qaeda since 1992,'' he replied.

Carole O'Leary, a Middle Eastern expert at American University, in Washington, and a specialist on the Kurds, said it is likely that Saddam would seek an alliance with Islamic terrorists to serve his own interests. ''I know that there are Mukhabarat agents throughout Kurdistan,'' O'Leary said, and went on, ''One way the Mukhabarat could destabilize the Kurdish experiment in democracy is to link up with Islamic radical groups. Their interests dovetail completely. They both have much to fear from the democratic, secular experiment of the Kurds in the safe haven, and they both obviously share a hatred for America.''

8. THE PRESENT DANGER

A paradox of life in northern Iraq is that, while hundreds, perhaps thousands, of children suffer from the effects of chemical attacks, the child-mortality rate in the Kurdish zone has improved over the past ten years. Prime Minister Salih credits this to, of all things, sanctions placed on the Iraqi regime by the United Nations after the Gulf War because of Iraq's refusal to dismantle its nonconventional-weapons program. He credits in particular the program begun in 1997, known as oil-for-food, which was meant to mitigate the effects of sanctions on civilians by allowing the profits from Iraq oil sales to buy food and medicine. Calling this program a ''fantastic concept,'' Salih said, ''For the first time in our history, Iraqi citizens—all citizens—are insured a portion of the country's oil wealth. The north is a testament to the success of the program. Oil is sold and food is bought.''

I asked Salih to respond to the criticism, widely aired in the West, that the sanctions have led to the death of thousands of children. ''Sanctions don't kill Iraqi children,'' he said. ''The regime kills children.''

This puzzled me. If it was true, then why were the victims of the gas attacks still suffering from a lack of health care? Across Kurdistan, in every hospital I visited, the complaints were the same: no CT scans, no MRIS, no pediatric surgery, no advanced diagnostic equipment, not even surgical gloves. I asked Salih why the money designated by the U.N. for the Kurds wasn't being used for advanced medical treatment. The oil-for-food program has one enormous flaw, he replied. When the program was introduced, the Kurds were promised thirteen per cent of the country's oil revenue, but because of the terms of the agreement between Baghdad and the U.N.—a ''defect,'' Salih said—the government controls the flow of food, medicine, and medical equipment to the very people it slaughtered. Food does arrive, he conceded, and basic medicines as well, but at Saddam's pace.

On this question of the work of the United Nations and its agencies, the rival Kurdish parties agree. ''We've been asking for a four-hundred-bed hospital for Sulaimaniya for three years,'' said Nerchivan Barzani, the Prime Minister of the region controlled by the Kurdish Democratic Party, and Salih's counterpart. Sulaimanlya is in Salih's territory, but in this case geography doesn't matter. ''It's our money,'' Barzani said. ''But we need the approval of the Iraqis. They get to decide. The World Health Organization is taking its orders from the Iraqis. It's crazy.''

Barzani and Salih accused the World Health Organization, in particular, of rewarding with lucrative contracts only companies favored by Saddam. ''Every time I interact with the U.N.,'' Salih said, ''I think, My God, Jesse Helms is right. If the U.N. can't help us, this poor, dispossessed Muslim nation, then who is it for?''

Many Kurds believe that Iraq's friends in the U.N. system, particularly members of the Arab bloc, have worked to keep the Kurds' cause from being addressed. The Kurds face an institutional disadvantage at the U.N., where, unlike the Palestinians, they have not even been granted official observer status. Salih grew acerbic: ''Compare us to other liberation movements around the world. We are very mature. We don't engage in terror. We don't condone extremist nationalist notions that can only burden our people. Please compare what we have achieved in the Kurdistan national-authority areas to the Palestinian national authority of Mr. Arafat. We have spent the last ten years building a secular, democratic society, a civil society. What has he built?''

Last week, in New York, I met with Benon Sevan, the United Nations undersecretary-general who oversees the oil-for-food program. He quickly let me know that he was unmoved by the demands of the Kurds. ''If they had a theme song, it would be 'Give Me, Give Me, Give Me,'" Sevan said. ''I'm getting fed up with their complaints. You can tell them that.'' He said that under the oil-for-food program the ''three northern govemorates''—U.N. officials avoid the word ''Kurdistan''—have been allocated billions of dollars in goods and services. ''I don't know if they've ever had it so good,'' he said.

I mentioned the Kurds' complaint that they have been denied access to advanced medical equipment, and he said, ''Nobody prevents them from asking. They should go ask the World Health Organization''—which reports to Sevan on matters related to Iraq. When I told Sevan that the Kurds have repeatedly asked the W.H.O., he said, ''I'm not going to pass judgment on the W.H.O.'' As the interview ended, I asked Sevan about the morality of allowing the Iraqi regime to control the flow of food and medicine into Kurdistan. ''Nobody's innocent,'' he said. ''Please don't talk about morals with me.''

When I went to Kurdistan in January to report on the 1988 genocide of the Kurds, I did not expect to be sidetracked by a debate over U.N. sanctions. And I certainly didn't expect to be sidetracked by crimes that Saddam is committing against the Kurds now—in particular—''nationality correction,'' the law that Saddam's security services are using to implement a campaign of ethnic cleansing. Large-scale operations against the Kurds in Kirkuk, a city southeast of Erbil, and in other parts of Iraqi Kurdistan under Saddam's control, have received scant press attention in the West; there have been few news accounts and no Security Council condemnations drafted in righteous anger.

Saddam's security services have been demanding that Kurds ''correct'' their nationality by signing papers to indicate that their birth records are false—that they are in fact Arab. Those who don't sign have their property seized. Many have been evicted, often to Kurdish-controlled regions, to make room for Arab families. According to both the Kurdistan Democratic Party and the Patriotic Union of Kurdistan, more than a hundred thousand Kurds have been expelled from the Kirkuk area over the past two years.

Nationality correction is one technique that the Baghdad regime is using in an overall ''Arabization'' campaign, whose aim is to replace the inhabitants of Kurdish cities, especially the oil-rich Kirkuk, with Arabs from central and southern Iraq, and even, according to persistent reports, with Palestinians. Arabization is not new, Peter Galbraith, a professor at the National Defense University and a former senior adviser to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, says. Galbraith has monitored Saddam's anti-Kurdish activities since before the Gulf War. ''It's been going on for twenty years,'' he told me. ''Maybe it's picked up speed, but it is certainly nothing new. To my mind, it's part of a larger process that has been under way for many years, and is aimed at reducing the territory occupied by the Kurds and at destroying rural Kurdistan.''

''This is the apotheosis of cultural genocide,'' said Saedi Barzinji, the president of Salahaddin University, in Erbil, who is a human-rights lawyer and Massoud Barzani's legal adviser. Barzinji and other Kurdish leaders believe that Saddam is trying to set up a buffer zone between Arab Iraq and

Kurdistan, just in case the Kurds win their independence. To help with this, Barzinji told me last month, Saddam is trying to rewrite Kirkuk's history, to give it an ''Arab'' past. If Kurds, Barzinji went on, ''don't change their ethnic origin, they are given no food rations, no positions in government, no right to register the names of their new babies. In the last three to four weeks, hospitals have been ordered, the maternity wards ordered, not to register any Kurdish name.'' New parents are ''obliged to choose an Arab name.'' Barzinji said that the nationality-correction campaign extends even to the dead. ''Saddam is razing the gravestones, erasing the past, putting in new ones with Arab names,'' he said. ''He wants to show that Kirkuk has always been Arab.''

Some of the Kurds crossing the demarcation line between Saddam's forces and the Kurdish zone, it is said, are not being expelled but are fleeing for economic reasons. But in camps across Kurdistan I met refugees who told me stories of visits from the secret police in the middle of the night.

Many of the refugees from Kirkuk live in tent camps built on boggy fields. I visited one such camp at Beneslawa, not far from Erbil, where the mud was so thick that it nearly pulled off my shoes. The people at the camp—several hundred, according to two estimates I heard—are ragged and sick. A man named Howar told me that his suffering could not have been avoided even if he had agreed to change his ethnic identity.

''When you agree to change your nationality, the police write on your identity documents 'second-degree Arab,' which they know means Kurd,'' he told me. ''So they always know you're a Kurd.'' (In a twist characteristic of Saddam's regime, Kurdish leaders told me, Kurds who agree to ''change'' their nationality are fined for having once claimed falsely to be Kurdish.)

Another refugee, Shawqat Hamid Muhammad, said that her son had gone to jail for two months for having a photograph of Mustafa Barzani in his possession. She said that she and her family had been in the Beneslawa camp for two months. ''The police came and knocked on our door and told us we have to leave Kirkuk,'' she said. ''We had to rent a truck to take our things out. We were given one day to leave. We have no idea who is in our house.'' Another refugee, a man named Ibrahim Jamil, wandered over to listen to the conversation. ''The Arabs are winning Kirkuk,'' he said. ''Soon the only people there will be Arabs, and Kurds who call themselves Arabs. They say we should be Arab. But I'm a Kurd. It would be easier for me to die than be an Arab. How can I not be a Kurd?''

Peter Galbraith told me that in 1987 he witnessed the destruction of Kurdish villages and cemeteries—''anything, that was related to Kurdish identity,'' he said. ''This was one of the factors that led me to conclude that it is a policy of genocide, a crime of intent, destroying a group whole or in part.''

9. IRAQ'S ARMS RACE

In a series of meetings in the summer and fall of 1995, Charles Duelfer, the deputy executive chairman of the United Nations Special Commission, or UNSCOM—the now defunct arms-inspection team—met in Baghdad with Iraqi government delegations. The subject was the status of Iraq's nonconventional-weapons programs, and Duelfer, an American diplomat on loan to the United Nations, was close to a breakthrough.

In early August, Saddam's son-in-law Hussein Kamel had defected to Jordan, and had then spoken publicly about Iraq's offensive biological, chemical, and nuclear capabilities. (Kamel later returned to Iraq and was killed almost immediately, on his father-in-law's orders.) The regime's credibility was badly damaged by Kamel's revelations, and during these meetings the Iraqi representatives decided to tell Duelfer and his team more than they had ever revealed before. ''This was the first time Iraq actually agreed to discuss the Presidential origins of these programs,'' Duelfer recalled. Among the most startling admissions made by the Iraqi scientists was that they had weaponized the biological agent aflatoxin.

Aflatoxin, which is produced from types of fungi that occur in moldy grains, is the biological agent that some Kurdish physicians suspect was mixed with chemical weapons and dropped on Kurdistan. Christine Gosden, the English geneticist, told me, ''There is absolutely no forensic evidence whatsoever that aflatoxins have ever been used in northern Iraq, but this may be because no systematic testing has been carried out in the region, to my knowledge.''

Duelfer told me, ''We kept pressing the Iraqis to discuss the concept of use for aflatoxin. We learned that the origin of the biological-weapons program is in the security services, not in the military—meaning that it really came out of the assassinations program.'' The Iraqis, Duelfer said, admitted something else: they had loaded aflatoxin into two Scud-ready warheads, and also mixed aflatoxin with tear gas. They wouldn't say why.

In an op-ed article that Duelfer wrote for the Los Angeles Times last year about Iraqi programs to develop weapons of mass destruction, he offered this hypothesis: ''If a regime wished to conceal a biological attack, what better way than this? Victims would suffer the short-term effects of inhaling tear gas and would assume that this was the totality of the attack: Subsequent cancers would not be linked to the prior event.''

United Nations inspectors were alarmed to learn about the aflatoxin program. Richard Spertzel, the chief biological-weapons inspector for UNSCOM, put it this way: ''It is a devilish weapon. Iraq was quite clearly aware of the long-term carcinogenic effect of aflatoxin. Aflatoxin can only do one thing—destroy people's livers. And I suspect that children are more susceptible. From a moral standpoint, aflatoxin is the cruellest weapon—it means watching children die slowly of liver cancer.''

Spertzel believes that if aflatoxin were to be used as a weapon it would not be delivered by a missile. ''Aflatoxin is a little tricky,'' he said. ''I don't know if a single dose at one point in time is going to give you the long-term effects. Continuous, repeated exposure—through food—would be more effective.'' When I asked Spertzel if other countries have weaponized aflatoxin, he replied, ''I don't know any other country that did it. I don't know any country that would.''

It is unclear what biological and chemical weapons Saddam possesses today. When he maneuvered UNSCOM out of his country in 1998, weapons inspectors had found a sizable portion of his arsenal but were vexed by what they couldn't find. His scientists certainly have produced and weaponized anthrax, and they have manufactured botulinum toxin, which causes muscular paralysis and death. They've made Clostridium perfringens, a bacterium that causes gas gangrene, a condition in which the flesh rots. They have also made wheat-cover smut, which can be used to poison crops, and ricin, which, when absorbed into the lungs, causes hemorrhagic pneumonia.

According to Gary Milhollin, the director of the Wisconsin Project on Nuclear Arms Control, whose Iraq Watch project monitors Saddam's weapons capabilities, inspectors could not account for a great deal of weaponry believed to be in Iraq's possession, including almost four tons of the nerve agent VX; six hundred tons of ingredients for VX; as much as three thousand tons of other poison-gas agents; and at least five hundred and fifty artillery shells filled with mustard gas. Nor did the inspectors find any stores of aflatoxin.

Saddam's motives are unclear, too. For the past decade, the development of these weapons has caused nothing but trouble for him; his international isolation grows not from his past crimes but from his refusal to let weapons inspectors dismantle his nonconventional-weapons programs. When I asked the Iraqi dissident Kanan Makiya why Saddam is so committed to these programs, he said, ''I think this regime developed a very specific ideology associated with power, and how to extend that power, and these weapons play a very important psychological and political part.'' Makiya added, ''They are seen as essential to the security and longevity of the regime.''

Certainly, the threat of another Halabja has kept Iraq's citizens terrorized and compliant. Amatzia Baram, the Iraq expert at the University of Haifa, told me that in 1999 Iraqi troops in white biohazard suits suddenly surrounded the Shiite holy city of Karbala, in southern Iraq, which has been the scene of frequent uprisings against Saddam. (The Shiites make up about sixty percent of Iraq's population, and the regime is preoccupied with the threat of another rebellion.) The men in the white suits did nothing; they just stood there. ''But the message was clear,'' Baram said. ''What we did to the Kurds in Halabja we can do to you.'' It's a very effective psychological weapon. From the information I saw, people were really panicky. They ran into their homes and shut their windows. It worked extremely well.''

Saddam's weapons of mass destruction clearly are not meant solely for domestic use. Several years ago in Baghdad, Richard Butler, who was then the chairman of UNSCOM, fell into conversation with Tariq Aziz, Saddam's confidant and Iraq's deputy Prime Minister. Butler asked Aziz to explain the rationale for Iraq's biological-weapons project, and he recalled Aziz's answer: ''He said, 'We made bioweapons in order to deal with the Persians and the Jews.' ''

Iraqi dissidents agree that Iraq's programs to build weapons of mass destruction are focussed on Israel. ''Israel is the whole game,'' Ahmad Chalabi, the leader of the Iraqi National Congress, told me. ''Saddam is always saying publicly, 'Who is going to fire the fortieth missile?' ''—a reference to the thirty-nine Scud missiles he fired at Israel during the Gulf War. ''He thinks he can kill one hundred thousand Israelis in a day with biological weapons.'' Chalabi added, ''This is the only way he can be Saladin''—the Muslim hero who defeated the Crusaders. Students of Iraq and its government generally agree that Saddam would like to project himself as a leader of all the Arabs, and that the one sure way to do that is by confronting Israel.

In the Gulf War, when Saddam attacked Israel, he was hoping to provoke an Israeli response, which would drive America's Arab friends out of the allied coalition. Today, the experts say, Saddam's desire is to expel the Jews from history. In October of 2000, at an Arab summit in Cairo, I heard the vice-chairman of Iraq's Revolutionary Command Council, a man named Izzat Ibrahim al-Douri, deliver a speech on Saddam's behalf, saying, ''Jihad alone is capable of liberating Palestine and the rest of the Arab territories occupied by dirty Jews in their distorted Zionist entity.''

Amatzia Baram said, ''Saddam can absolve himself of all sins in the eyes of the Arab and Muslim worlds by bringing Israel to its knees. He not only wants to be a hero in his

own press, which already recognizes him as a Saladin, but wants to make sure that a thousand years from now children in the fourth grade will know that he is the one who destroyed Israel.''

It is no comfort to the Kurds that the Jews are now Saddam's main preoccupation. The Kurds I spoke with, even those who agree that Saddam is aiming, his remaining Scuds at Israel, believe that he is saving some of his ''special weapons''—a popular euphemism inside the Iraqi regime for a return visit to Halabja. The day I visited the Kalak Bridge, which divides the Kurds from the Iraqi Army's Jerusalem brigade, I asked Muhammad Najar, the local official, why the brigade was not facing west, toward its target. ''The road to Jerusalem,'' he replied, ''goes through Kurdistan.''

A few weeks ago, after my return from Iraq, I stopped by the Israeli Embassy in Washington to see the Ambassador, David Ivry. In 1981, Ivry, who then led Israel's Air Force, commanded Operation Opera, the strike against the Osirak nuclear reactor near Baghdad. The action was ordered by Prime Minister Menachem Begin, who believed that by hitting the reactor shortly before it went online he could stop Iraq from building an atomic bomb. After the attack, Israel was condemned for what the Times called ''inexcusable and short-sighted aggression.'' Today, though, Israel's action is widely regarded as an act of muscular arms control. ''In retrospect, the Israeli strike bought us a decade,'' Gary Milhollin, of the Wisconsin Project, said. ''I think if the Israelis had not hit the reactor the Iraqis would have had bombs by 1990''—the year Iraq invaded Kuwait.

Today, a satellite photograph of the Osirak site hangs on a wall in Ivry's office. The inscription reads, ''For General David Ivry—With thanks and appreciation for the outstanding job he did on the Iraqi nuclear program in 1981, which made our job much easier in Desert Storm.'' It is signed ''Dick Cheney.''

''Preemption is always a positive,'' Ivry said.

Saddam Hussein never gave up his hope of turning Iraq into a nuclear power. After the Osirak attack, he rebuilt, redoubled his efforts, and dispersed his facilities. Those who have followed Saddam's progress believe that no single strike today would eradicate his nuclear program. I talked about this prospect last fall with August Hanning, the chief of the B.N.D., the German intelligence agency, in Berlin. We met in the new glass-and-steel Chancellery, overlookincg the renovated Reichstag.

The Germans have a special interest in Saddam's intentions. German industry is well represented in the ranks of foreign companies that have aided Saddam's nonconventional-weapons programs, and the German government has been publicly regretful. Hanning told me that his agency had taken the lead in exposing the companies that helped Iraq build a poison-gas factory at Samarra. The Germans also feel, for the most obvious reasons, a special responsibility to Israel's security, and this, too, motivates their desire to expose Iraq's weapons-of-mass-destruction programs. Hanning is tall, thin, and almost translucently white. He is sparing with words, but he does not equivocate. ''It is our estimate that Iraq will have an atomic bomb in three years,'' he said.

There is some debate among arms-control experts about exactly when Saddam will have nuclear capabilities. But there is no disagreement that Iraq, if unchecked, will have them soon, and a nuclear-armed Iraq would alter forever the balance of power in the Middle East. ''The first thing that occurs to any military planner is force protection,'' Charles Duelfer told me. ''If your assessment of the threat is chemical or biological, you can get individual protective equipment and warning systems. If you think he's going to use a nuclear weapon, where are you going to concentrate your forces?''

There is little doubt what Saddam might do with an atomic bomb or with his stocks of biological and chemical weapons. When I talked about Saddam's past with the medical geneticist Christine Gosden, she said, ''Please understand, the Kurds were for practice.''

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI).

(Mr. BORSKI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution.

We in Congress must stand behind the President in granting him the authority to use military force against Iraq. The only chance to prevent war is to be prepared to go to war. We will not rush to war, but we cannot stand by while Iraq's weapons of mass destruction program poses a growing threat to our national security. Over the past few weeks, many have voiced a number of questions, including why we must take action at this moment, how long our armed forces may be in Iraq, and what the humanitarian, economic, and political costs of a military response may be. These are all valid concerns and questions I have considered. Ultimately, we must decide whether the threats we face merit the risk of American lives. The consequences of this vote are serious, and I have not had to make a more difficult decision in my 20 years in Congress. I believe that support for this resolution will send a strong, decisive signal to Saddam Hussein that his continued violation of U.N. Security Resolutions will not be tolerated.

This vote is evidence that the challenges we face today are unique in the context of our history. We as a nation, could not have prevented the horrific acts of September 11th and I witnessed the destruction firsthand, at both the World Trade Center and at the Pentagon. Because of the events of September 11th, we cannot wait to act on a threat to our nation and to the American people, lest we allow ourselves to be victims once again. We are faced with a situation in which the lessons of history speak clearly of danger, and we face a threat unlike any other in history. Iraqi President Saddam Hussein has proven himself to be a ruthless and unpredictable enemy, and even the slightest threat posed by his regime is one that we are unable to ignore without great risk to our national security. The world has come to know a long and terrible list of grievances against Saddam Hussein, including the brutal repression and torture of his political opponents, the use of chemical weapons against his own people, and his tireless pursuit of weapons of mass destruction. It is this record of brutality and tendency toward violence that should focus our attention on Iraq. Intelligence reports from both the United States and Great Britain highlight Iraq's relentless drive to produce chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons, and there is mounting evidence that Saddam Hussein is only 1–5 years away from nuclear weapons capability. Knowing that containment and deterrence are ineffective against the Iraqi regime, we have no choice. Knowing that Saddam Hussein has consistently violated United Nations resolutions we must act. We must act in a timely fashion to avoid the possibility that Saddam Hussein will use these weapons or that he would transfer these weapons to a terrorist organization such as Al Qaeda, which would not hesitate to use them against us. We cannot wait to protect ourselves until it is too late to do so. Now more than ever we must be proactive to protect Americans, our country, and our way of life.

In 1991, after the United States and United Nations had demonstrated a willingness to peacefully resolve the crisis that followed the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait, and after Saddam Hussein refused to comply with several U.N. Security Council Resolutions, I cast my vote in favor of military action against Iraq. I voted for the resolution then because I believed that my support would help demonstrate that Congress, the President, and the American people stand together against Saddam Hussein's defiance.

Since the Persian Gulf War, Saddam Hussein has repeatedly demonstrated his disdain for the authority of international law by defying U.N. Security Council Resolutions that were designed to ensure that Iraq does not pose a threat to international peace and security. Inspections and sanctions have both failed in the past to address the threat posed by Iraq. We should work toward a viable U.N. Security Council Resolution and build an international coalition to support action to dismantle Iraq's weapons of mass destruction. If we do take military action with such broad support, it will not set a precedent for preemption, but will boldly state the necessity for any future disputes to be resolved first through diplomatic channels.

I firmly believe that diplomatic efforts should precede any military action before we commit our men and women to fight for peace and justice. At a recent briefing, Secretary of State Colin Powell assured me that every effort is being made to reach an agreement on a U.N. Security Council Resolution, so that if we act, we will not act alone. Military power must not be the basis of our strategy, but should be one of many options we have at our disposal. It is my hope that we will do all that we can to avoid armed conflict, but should we engage, we will do so to promote peace and protect our national security.

Our unity in this vote will deliver a message to the international community that we as Americans share the belief that the threat we face is real, and that our cause is just. It is my hope that this vote is the first step toward increased peace and stability in the Middle East and a more secure future for the United States and for the world.

I believe that a strong vote in favor of this resolution will prompt the American people, the United Nations, and the international community to join in support of action to neutralize the threat that is posed by Saddam Hussein and the proliferation of his program of weapons of mass destruction.

Mr. Speaker, a few years ago, when my youngest daughter, Maggie, was only 5 years old, she was here with my family for the swearing-in ceremony for Members of the

House. Members were then casting their votes for our party leadership, and I tried to test her by asking her if we were Republicans or Democrats. ''We're Americans, aren't we Dad?'' was her reply. This is how I believe we, as Members of Congress, should view this vote. All of us want the best for the American people and I hope that partisanship can be put aside for the moment, as each of us vote our conscience. We have come together as a nation since September 11th, and we still must remain unified in the face of any threat to our nation. I urge a vote in favor of this resolution.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO).

(Mr. COSTELLO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I stand in opposition to this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the most important and difficult decision a Member of Congress must make is the decision to send our troops—our sons, daughters, husbands and wives—in harm's way.

Each member must do as I have done—listen to the arguments on both sides of the issue, assemble and review all available information and then do what they believe is in the best interest of our nation.

Some people have questioned the President's motives and the timing of this resolution. A few members of this body traveled to Baghdad to meet with officials of the government of Iraq.

Frankly, I was appalled to see a Member of the Congress from my party in Baghdad questioning the motives of President Bush. I do not question the President's motives. I believe the President is doing what he believes is in the best interest of our nation.

After much though and deliberation, I have decided to vote against the resolution before us giving the President the discretion to send our troops to war in Iraq. I do so for the following reasons:

First, I believe we have a moral obligation and a responsibility to exhaust every possible resolution before sending our troops into harm's way. I do not believe that we have attempted to assemble an international coalition similar to the coalition that President George Herbert Walker Bush brought together to undertake the mission of Desert Shield and Desert Storm in 1990–1991.

Second, Iraq does not present a direct immediate threat to the United States. I have attended numerous briefings from the Bush administration on this topic, and I have yet to hear a good explanation as to why Saddam Hussein is a greater threat to us today than he was six months or a year ago. In fact, our intelligence agencies have concluded that Saddam Hussein is unlikely to attack the United States unprovoked, but there is a real change that Saddam Hussein will use weapons of mass destruction in response to an invasion.

Last and more importantly, the President's decision to change our military doctrine from containment to preemptive action could have major ramifications to the United States and may lead to war between other countries.

For the past 50 years, the United States has used our military troops to contain aggression against the U.S. and our allies. We have been able to persuade our allies to use restraint instead of their military under the most difficult circumstances and times. During the Persian Gulf war, the U.S. was able to persuade Israel to show great restraint while Saddam Hussein was deploying scud missiles toward Israel. Since the Persian Gulf war, the Israelis at the request of the United States have shown restraint in dealing with Arafat and the PLO.

If the U.S military attacks a country in order to counter a perceived future security risk, other countries may very well adopt the same preemptive policy. Those countries are more likely to follow the U.S. and less likely to show restraint, with serious potential consequences for Israel and the Palestinians, India and Pakistan, Russia and Chechnya, China and Taiwan, and the list goes on.

Secretary Colin Powell recently reminded us that other countries look to the United States for our leadership and example. I agree! I only hope that when looking to the United States that they do not adopt the new preemptive military policy and use that same policy against their enemies.

Mr. Speaker, this administration should follow the example of the President's father prior to Desert Shield and during Desert Storm. We should be putting together an international coalition to send in weapon inspectors and if necessary take military action to disarm Saddam Hussein. A ''go it alone'' attitude or policy could have devastating consequences on our troops, the people of Israel and other parts of the world.

Mr. Speaker, therefore, I will vote against this resolution and in favor of the Spratt substitute.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK), a distinguished member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

(Mr. STUPAK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, we are being asked to commit our young servicemen and women to a possible war in Iraq. It is important for everyone to understand the gravity of this vote and the legal, ethical and moral grounds for such a grave commitment of U.S. lives and resources.

To date, I have received nearly 900 communications opposed to the United States acting unilaterally against Iraq and approximately 16 communications in support of the President's position. No matter what the result of the vote on each proposed resolution, I am confident that every Member will rally around our brave young servicemen and women if or when they are committed to hostile action in Iraq or anywhere else in the world.

Over the past few weeks, I have attended classified briefings on Capitol Hill, at the Pentagon, and with the President. In reflecting upon the views, opinions, and concerns expressed by my constituents, and after a thorough review of international law, it is clear that war with another country should only be declared if your country is directly attacked; if another nation is an accomplice in the attack on your country; if there is an immediate pending attack on your country; and, finally, if there is defiance of international law in the community.

To rush headlong into war without world support under any one of these four conditions violates every principle and every ideal on which this great Nation is founded and on which a free and democratic world exists.

In review of these four principles, there is no question that Iraq did not directly attack America. The evidence is also clear that Iraq was not an accomplice with the al Qaeda attacks on America. If there was any complicity by Iraq and Saddam Hussein, I am confident the President would have addressed this complicity in his U.N. address or in Monday's speech to the American people. In the classified briefings, no one could document with any certainty Iraq's complicity in the attacks on America.

There is no dispute that Iraq is not an immediate imminent military threat to the United States at this time. Some people would argue Saddam Hussein will give biological, chemical or nuclear weapons when obtained to terrorist groups, but there has been no credible evidence provided to House Members of these weapons being supplied to terrorists.

Individuals may still argue that we must assume that Iraq must have an accomplice with the al Qaeda attacks of September 11. If we wish to make this assumption, and it is only an assumption, not fact, then the President already has the authority to use ''all necessary and appropriate force against Iraq.'' If Saddam Hussein and Iraq are directly or indirectly responsible in any way with the attacks of September 11, the President has the authorization to take whatever means necessary to bring them to justice. The authority was given to the President just 3 days after the cowardly attacks on our country.

The link between the September 11 attacks and Saddam Hussein is so tangential even the President cannot justify military action against Saddam Hussein and Iraq based on complicity.

The strongest claim for military action against Iraq is its continued defiance of international law since the 1991

Gulf War cease-fire. It is on this principle that President Bush went to the U.N. to seek their approval to use the U.S. military to enforce U.N. resolutions against Iraq. The legal, ethical and moral justification to get rid of Saddam Hussein and invade Iraq is enforcement of international law, the U.N. resolutions.

The United States has never invoked a first strike invasion of another nation based on a fear of what might happen tomorrow. Now is not the time for a first strike policy based on fear, but let us strike with the support of the U.N. Security Council resolutions, with a multinational force to once and for all rid the world of Saddam Hussein.

If we now allow the U.S. military to invade a nation or change a regime because of fear, then the goals of terrorism have been accomplished. If we allow the U.S. to become a first-strike nation in the name of defeating terrorism because of the possibility of future terrorist attacks, this opens the world to a Pandora's box of selected conflicts around the world. The U.S. would lose its moral, ethical and legal grounds and its stature to protest or to prevent, for example, Russia from invading Georgia to hunt down Chechnya rebels, Pakistan from invading India, or China from invading Taiwan.

In our world, terrorism would now be defined and determined by the aggressor nation. The United States would lose its legal and moral ability to protest, as it did in 1979, the Soviet army's invasion of Afghanistan.

The situation in Iraq must be addressed, but we must not be seen as moving forward unilaterally, and we must not alienate our allies who support it and fought with us in the Persian Gulf War.

N O T I C E

Incomplete record of House proceedings. Except for concluding business which follows, today's House proceedings will be continued in the next issue of the Record.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

9573. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Technical Assistance for Specialty Crops Program (RIN: 0551-AA63) received October 7, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

9574. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Labor, transmitting a bill entitled, ''Black Lung Consolidation of Administrative Responsibilities Act''; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

9575. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Plans For Designated Facilities and Pollutants: Massachusetts; Plan for Controlling MWC Emissions From Existing Large MWC Plants [MA-01-7203a; FRL-7387-5] received October 7, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

9576. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Iowa [IA 154-1154a; FRL-7392-6] received October 7, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

9577. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Indiana [IN144-1a; FRL-7390-3] received October 7, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

9578. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; West Virginia; To Prevent and Control Air Pollution from the Operation of Hot Mix Asphalt Plants [WV 047-6021a; FRL-7391-3] received October 7, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

9579. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Utah; Vehicle Inspection and Maintenance Programs; Salt Lake County and General Requirements and Applicability [UT-001-0038, UT-001-0039, UT-001-0040; FRL-7262-2] received October 7, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

9580. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; New Hampshire; Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) of Air Quality Permit Requirements [NH-01-48-7174a; A-1-FRL-7376-5] received October 7, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

9581. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Implementation of the Cable Television Consumer Protection and Competition Act of 1992; Development of Competition and Diversity in Video Programming Distribution: Section 628(c)(5) of the Communications Act; Sunset of Exclusive Contract Prohibition [CS Docket No. 01-290] received October 3, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

9582. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.622(b), Table of Allotments, Digital Television Broadcast Stations (Fort Wayne, Indiana) [MB Docket No. 01-302, RM-10333] received October 8, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

9583. A letter from the Secretary of the Commission, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Rule Concerning Disclosures Regarding Energy Consumption and Water Use of Certain Home Appliances and Other Products Required Under the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (''Appliance Labeling Rule'') — received October 4, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

9584. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Specification of a Probability for Unlikely Features, Events and Processes (RIN: 3150-AG91) received October 7, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

9585. A letter from the Chairman and Co-Chairman, Congressional Executive Commission on China, transmitting the Commission's first 2002 annual report; to the Committee on International Relations.

9586. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule — Schedule of Fees for Consular Services, Department of State and Overseas Embassies and Consulates — received October 7, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

9587. A letter from the Auditor, District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of a report entitled, ''Mismanaged Special Education Payment System Vulnerable to Fraud, Waste and Abuse,'' pursuant to D.C. Code section 47—117(d); to the Committee on Government Reform.

9588. A letter from the Auditor, District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of a report entitled, ''Certification of the Fiscal Year 2002 Revenue Projection in Support of the District's $283,870,000 Multimodal General Obligation Bonds and Refunding Bonds,'' pursuant to D.C. Code section 47—117(d); to the Committee on Government Reform.

9589. A letter from the Executives Resources and Special Programs Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

9590. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species Fisheries; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna [I.D. 083002D] received October 8, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9591. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States and in the Western Pacific; Coastal Pelagic Species Fisheries; Closure of the Fishery for Pacific Sardine North of Pt. Piedras Blancas, CA [Docket No. 011218302-1302-01; 091202B] received October 7, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9592. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Stone Crab Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; Amendment 7 [Docket

No. 020606141-22212-02; I.D. 031402C] (RIN: 0648-AN10) received October 7, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9593. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Vessels Catching Pacific Cod for Processing by the Inshore Component in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 011218304-1304-01; I.D. 092502E] received October 7, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9594. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Atka Mackerel in the Western Aleutian District [Docket No. 011218304-1304-01; I.D. 092402D] received October 7, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9595. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Trawl Gear in the Chum Salmon Savings Area of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No. 011218304-1304-01; I.D. 091902D] received October 1, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9596. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's proposed legislation entitled, ''Child Abduction and Sexual Abuse Prevention Act of 2002''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9597. A letter from the Program Analyst,FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model CL-600-2B19 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2002-NM-196-AD; Amendment 39-12887; AD 2002-19-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 4, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9598. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Vulcanair S.p.A. P 68 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2002-CE-13-AD; Amendment 39-12888; AD 2002-19-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 4, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9599. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Textron Lycoming IO-540, LTIO-540, and TIO-540 Series Reciprocating Engines [Docket No. 2002-NE-03-AD; Amendment 39-12883; AD 2002-19-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 4, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9600. A letter from the Program Analyst,FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; SOCATA — Groupe AEROSPATIALE Model TBM 700 Airplanes [Docket No. 2002-CE-15-AD; Amendment 39-12881; AD 2002-19-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 4, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9601. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30331; Amdt. No. 3024] received October 4, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9602. A letter from the FMCSA Regulations Officer, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Development of a North American Standard for Protection Against Shifting and Falling Cargo (RIN: 2126-AA27) received October 1, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9603. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30330; Amdt. No. 3023] received October 4, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9604. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Procurement, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Contract Numbering (RIN: 2700-AC33) received October 8, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science.

9605. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Regulatory Law, Department of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Enrollment — Provision of Hospital and Outpatient Care to Veterans (RIN: 2900-AK38) received October 7, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

9606. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Extension of Transition Relief for Foreign Partnerships and their Withholding Agents under Notice 2001-4 [Notice 2002-66] received October 3, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9607. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Examination of returns and claims for refund, credit or abatement; determination of correct tax liability (Rev. Proc. 2002-66) received October 3, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9608. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Qualified covered call options (Rev. Rul. 2002-66) received October 3, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9609. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Tax Treatment of Payments Made Under the USDA Peanut Quota Buyout Program [Notice 2002-67] received October 3, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9610. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Weighted Average Interest Rate Update [Notice 2002-68] received October 3, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9611. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Summary of Revenue Procedure 2002-64 (Rev. Proc. 2002-64) received October 3, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.