Mr. Speaker, I yield myself

such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong opposition to the

amendment in the nature of a substitute

offered by the gentlewoman

from California. I certainly do not

mean to offend her. She is one of the

very good Members of the House Committee

on International Relations, but

I think her amendment suffers from

terminal anemia. It is like slipping

someone an aspirin who has just been

hit by a freight train.

Let us review Saddam Hussein’s pattern

of lawlessness. He is employing

the vast wealth of his country and a legion

of capable scientists and technicians

to develop biological, chemical

and nuclear weapons at the expense of

food and medicine for the women and

children of Iraq. He invades neighboring

countries, and continues his

support for some of the world’s most

notorious terrorists and the groups

that support them.

In the mid 1990s, U.N. inspectors unearthed

detailed drawings for constructing

a nuclear device. In 1998, the

International Atomic Energy Agency

began dismantling nuclear weapons facilities

in Iraq, including three uranium

enrichment plants. Over the past

decade, he subjected tens of thousands

of political opponents to arbitrary arrest,

imprisonment, starvation, mutilation

and rape.

On Monday night, President Bush announced

that Saddam possesses a growing

fleet of manned and unmanned aerial

vehicles that could be used to disburse

his stockpile of chemical and biological

weapons across broad areas.

While Saddam repeatedly violates

the myriad of U.N. Security Council

resolutions passed since 1991, the world

watches, the world waits and the world

does nothing.

So how do supporters of the Lee substitute

propose to respond to Saddam’s

continuing affront to international law

and norms? With conciliation and negotiation.

For 11 years, the international community

has attempted to do just that.

Weapons inspectors have been banned

from Iraq since 1998. During the 7 years

inspectors were permitted in the country,

their efforts were undermined by

Iraqi coercion and cover-up.

The gentlewoman is certainly correct

that the United States should work to

build an international consensus to ferret

out and destroy Saddam’s weapons

of mass destruction. And as we speak,

the Bush administration is engaging

the United Nations to employ arms to

force Saddam to comply with Security

Council resolutions. But in the last

analysis, the security of the United

States cannot be held hostage to a failure

by the United Nations to act because

of a threat of a Security Council

veto by Russia, China or France.

The Lee substitute essentially advocates

the futile policies of the previous

decade and fails to recognize the

United States as a sovereign Nation

with an absolute right of self-defense, a

right clearly recognized by Article 51 of

the U.N. Charter.

Without a strongly worded Congressional

resolution that gives the President

the flexibility he needs, the Iraqi

regime will have no incentive to comply

with existing or new U.N. resolutions.

Only clear and direct action of

this Congress will send the essential

message to the United Nations that the

current stalemate must end. Only resolute

action by this Congress can ensure

the peace that all of us claim as a goal.

The Lee substitute is a well-intentioned

but perilous receipt for inaction,

based on wishful thinking, and that is

what makes it so dangerous. We have

had more than a decade of obfuscation

by Saddam Hussein. At what point do

the United States and the international

community say enough?

Enough lies, enough evasions, enough

duplicity, enough fraud, enough deception.

Enough.

I think the time has now come. I

urge a no vote on this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of

my time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself

such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose the amendment

in the nature of a substitute offered

by the gentleman from South

Carolina. First and foremost, this substitute

neither recognizes nor protects

American sovereignty. It clearly yields

to the United Nations the right and obligation

to protect America. It relies

on the U.N. first as a trigger mechanism.

The President must wait until

the U.N. acts or if it does not act or if

it does not act properly, and God only

knows how long that will take, then

the President must return to Congress

for further authorization for the use of

force. And then once authorization is

obtained, the use of force is limited to

dealing with weapons of mass destruction

and ballistic missile threats, but

what about other threats to the U.S.

national security such as the use of

conventional weapons or Iraqi terrorism?

Iraq is a terrorist nation. Evidence

exists that Iraqi operatives met with al

Qaeda terrorists. This amendment does

not allow the President to use force

now even if an immediate or imminent

terrorist threat is present. When the

U.N. fails to act or does not act properly,

the President must come back to

Congress and seek authorization to use

military force, but first he must certify

to Congress that the U.N. has failed to

pass a resolution or the U.N. has passed

an insufficient resolution and the use

of military force against Iraq ‘‘will not

impair international cooperation in the

fight against terrorism.’’ In other

words, if a Nation, say Iran, North

Korea or Syria, maintains that it will

no longer cooperate in the war against

terrorism, then international cooperation

has been impaired. How can the

President make such a certification?

At that point is he unable to ask Congress

for the authorization to use

force? Why would we want to have

these types of roadblocks impeding our

President at a time when he is trying

to defend the national security of the

United States? This amendment imposes

a steeple chase on the President

with one hurdle after another.

In conclusion, this substitute amendment

would strike the bipartisan

agreement that we have worked so

hard to bring about and which is reflected

in House Joint Resolution 114.

Its primary focus is on approval of the

U.N. before any military action can be

taken against Iraq. It does not recognize

the sovereignty of the United

States, and it fails to acknowledge the

President’s warning in his speech on

Monday that the danger from the Iraqi

regime is an imminent and urgent

threat to the United States. I do not

propose that we subordinate our foreign

policy to the Security Council

whose permanent members include

France, China, and Russia, and I urge a

no on this amendment in the nature of

a substitute.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of

my time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself

1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, when you retire from

Congress and the great summing up

comes with your great-grandchildren

or great-great-grandchildren, and people

say, ‘‘What did you do in Congress,’’

you say, ‘‘Well, I voted to yield

sovereignty to the United Nations. I

voted to have the decision to defend

the United States national interests to

the Security Council, which is composed

of five members, three of which

are France, China, and Russia.’’

What a precedent, to condition our

taking action by getting approval and

by getting a new resolution. What is

that, Resolution No. 7,842? No, it is

only about the seventeenth resolution.

A new resolution authorizing the

United States to defend its national interests?

This is not a preemptive strike. The

shooting has never stopped from Desert

Storm. There was a cease-fire, not a

peace treaty, in February of 1991 and,

after that, every day they shoot at us

in the sky.

So this is not preemptive, it is just

finishing what should have been finished

several years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself

1 minute.

History is an exciting adventure. On

April 28, 1999, in this very Chamber,

right where we are now, this House

voted to allow the President, President

Clinton, without any U.N. resolution,

to take military action: Bombing in

Kosovo. And among those who voted to

allow the President to do this, without

a U.N. resolution, but to go ahead,

gung ho, was virtually everybody that

has spoken on that side of the Chamber.

Absolutely, I applaud them. I do not

know what changed them, why they

now demand we process this through

the U.N., but they did not feel that way

back then, in April of 1999, and I have

the rollcall if anybody cares to see it.

But everybody voted to bomb Kosovo.

Now, is that because that was President

Clinton? There must be some explanation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the

gentleman from California (Mr. COX).

Mr. Speaker, I oppose the

motion to recommit; and if anybody

wants detailed reasons, I suggest they

read it. It sets up roadblocks that I

think are virtually insurmountable.

In the thousands of words we have

heard in the last couple of days uttered

on Iraq, a few important truths

emerge. First, Saddam Hussein is a

very dangerous person. The history of

his regime is one of unrestrained violence

against Iran, against Kuwait,

against the Kurds, against the Shias,

and against others whose only offense

is to oppose his despotic regime. Secondly,

he hates America. Thirdly, he is

making a feverish attempt to arm with

weapons of immeasurable destructive

capacity; and when he is ready, he will

use them.

Do you remember the first time you

saw the films of the mushroom cloud

engulfing Hiroshima and then you

learned about the deadly effect of radiation

on humans? That was 1945. Does

the fact that modern thermal nuclear

weapons would unleash a thousand

times the destructive power of Hiroshima

worry you at all? You might ask

why are we debating this resolution at

this moment in time. The answer

should be apparent: September 11,

which was more than a wake-up call. It

shook us out of a long, deep sleep and

held us by the throat. It taught us

there are people in the world willing to

destroy themselves to gratify their hatred

and we had better take them seriously.

We tend to visualize what we call

weapons of mass destruction in terms

of bombs reducing buildings to rubble,

but missiles can carry bombs with

chemical and biological agents that

can poison a city as well as destroy its

infrastructure. Either way, it is death

and destruction on a horrendous scale.

Is such an attack imminent? Did we

know Pearl Harbor was imminent? Did

we know the World Trade Center attacks

were imminent? The willingness

to destroy must never marry the capability

to destroy. And Santayana was

right, those who do not read history

are condemned to relive it.

In a book written sometime after, I

suppose, in the 1940’s by William C.

Bullit, who was our first ambassador to

Russia appointed by President Roosevelt

called ‘‘The Great Globe Itself,’’

he said: ‘‘To beat our swords into plowshares

while the spiritual descendants

of Genghis Khan stalk the earth is to

die and leave no descendants.’’

The world looks to us for leadership.

The world looks to us for strength and

resolve. We make no demands for territory

or commercial advantage. All we

want is a peaceful world. ‘‘If you love

peace, prepare for war,’’ said the ancient

Romans. There are ideals and

ideas worth fighting for. They are the

civilizing forces that make life worth

living, that respect the dignity that is

every person’s entitlement. Those

ideals and principles are under attack

and we must defend them. By supporting

the President, we send a message

to the forces of conquest and

chaos that America, the West, is not as

decadent as they may think. Support

the President.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance

of my time.