Mr. Speaker, it will reward

us to read the resolution we are being

asked to vote upon. It is self-refuting.

This resolution would have this Congress

find that Iraq and Saddam Hussein

unconditionally accepted U.N. Security

Council Resolution 687, their obligation

to destroy their chemical and

biological weapons. That was unconditional.

The resolution has us find that Iraq

unconditionally accepted its obligation

not to proceed with the development of

nuclear weapons. The resolution has us

find that Iraq agreed to immediate and

unconditional inspections.

The resolution goes on to have us

find that Iraq has failed to comply with

these obligations over a period of more

than a decade. The resolution has us

find that Iraq obstructed the inspectors

and ultimately expelled them in 1998.

Finally, the resolution has us find

that this noncompliance with the

United Nations Security Council resolutions,

including specifically Resolution

687, quote, ‘‘endangers U.S. security.’’

That is the preamble in this resolution.

That is the predicate. Then what

would the resolution have us do? Pass

yet one more U.N. resolution which, by

its terms, lacks enforcement. Only a

U.N. resolution that lacks enforcement

would be acceptable if we were to pass

the resolution that is before us.

What have we learned in 11 years?

Surely, without at least the threat of

military force, we will get exactly the

same result that we have had 16 times

in a row. There is a cost, indeed a much

heavier cost of doing nothing, of temporizing,

of adding a 17th, toothless

U.N. resolution to the 16 that Saddam

Hussein has already violated.

And to the charge that what we are

doing is unilateral, we must say, we

have already earned the cooperation of

Britain, Turkey, Canada, Poland, Romania,

Israel, Bulgaria, Australia,

Singapore, Japan and others. If we vote

to deny the President of the United

States the backing of this Congress at

this moment and think that then he

can win the support of other nations,

we are delusional.

All of us must surely hope that the

United Nations passes its next resolution,

that Saddam Hussein will, this

time, finally see reason and disarm.

But as the proverb says, He who lives

only by hope will die in despair.

My colleagues, let us unite hope with

reason and practicality and a willingness

to act. Let us defeat this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in

strong agreement with all of the essential

premises of the Spratt resolution

and urge a ‘‘no’’ vote because of its

conclusion. The Spratt resolution, like

the Lee resolution before it, spells out

precisely all of the reasons that we are

here today; that Saddam Hussein and

Iraq have unconditionally agreed to destroy

all chemical and biological weapons

there, ballistic missiles, to stop the

development and the seeking of nuclear

weapons; that Iraq unconditionally

agreed to immediate inspections.

The Spratt resolution goes on to say,

and would have this Congress find, that

Iraq and Saddam Hussein have ‘‘flagrantly

violated these unconditional

terms.’’ The Spratt resolution goes on

to say that Saddam Hussein and Iraq

are currently supporting international

terrorism and continuing to develop

chemical and biological weapons and

actively seeking nuclear weapons and

the ballistic missiles to deliver them.

But here, unlike the Lee resolution before

it, the Spratt resolution does not

denounce the use of force but rather

says that at this time we should have a

U.N. resolution that expressly authorizes

the use of force; and, if such a U.N.

resolution is adopted, then, by section

3 of this Spratt resolution, the Congress

today would have anticipatorily

authorized the use of force, expressly

authorized President Bush to use military

force to eliminate weapons of

mass destruction and missiles.

It even provides an expedited procedure

for the President to get Congressional

authority for war if the U.N.

does not act. In short, this resolution,

an alternative resolution that we are

now considering, accepts every single

premise of House Joint Resolution 114

that is supported by President Bush,

the Speaker of the House, the Democratic

leader of the House, the Republican

leader of the Senate, and, as of

today, the Democratic leader of the

Senate.

The Spratt resolution accepts the operative

conclusion of House Joint Resolution

114 that the authorization of

military force is essential. It is essential

if this time we are to succeed

where 16 past U.N. resolutions have

failed. So the only real difference is

that this different way of going after

all of the same objectives, based on all

of the same premises, this Rube Goldberg

mechanism that we have set up,

will scuttle the broad agreement that

has been reached among the House, the

Senate, and the executive and legislative

branches, this consensus that

America will stand as one.

This resolution will jeopardize, in

fact, passage of the very U.N. resolution

that it purports to support.

Mr. Speaker, as was so horribly

demonstrated on September 11,

the greatest threat to our country

today comes not from the world’s

greatest powers but, rather, from unstable

and dangerous individuals scattered

across much of the world with

nothing more in common than their

hatred of the United States.

Some of these individuals are

itinerant phantoms, like Osama bin

Laden. A very few control territory

and governments, like Mullah Omar

and Saddam Hussein.

It is for this reason that we are

forced to deal with Iraq. It is not merely

that Iraq’s brutal and ruthless dictatorship

is hostile to America, or that it

has given comfort to the al Qaeda terrorists,

or even that it possesses the

most gruesome weapons of mass murder.

Beyond all of this, Iraq’s barbaric

dictator, like the al Qaeda fanatics

whom he supports, is unstable and a

proven killer. We cannot deal with him

or the territory that he controls by terror

as if it were a nation state like any

other. It is not. Saddam Hussein does

not merely possess chemical weapons;

he has used them. He does not merely

mouth hatred for the United States; it

is well known that he attempted to assassinate

our President. He does not

merely tolerate global terrorism; he is

one of its main incubators.

We must ask, however, is confronting

Saddam Hussein worth the cost that we

will surely have to bear if we are required

to make good on our threat of

force? To that we must answer that

there is potentially an even heavier

cost of temporizing, of doing nothing,

of adding a 17th toothless U.N. resolution

to the 16 that Saddam Hussein

that is already violated.

What we learned on September 11 is

that turning a blind eye to the metastasizing

of cancer cells, of terrorist

cells, is the costliest choice we can

make.

What of our friends and sometime allies,

such as, for example, France and

Russia, who have accused us of going it

alone? If we approve this resolution

today without their prior agreement,

will we not simply display to Saddam

Hussein that the world lacks the international

agreement that is necessary

to win the war on terror?

To that I am afraid we must answer

that if even such great nations as

France and Russia cannot be convinced

to see their own self-interest in protecting

the civilized world from the

likes of Saddam Hussein, then, in fact,

the war on terrorism will indeed be

compromised.

But this is not the end, it is the beginning.

Just as Saddam Hussein must

know that America is serious, so, too,

must our friends and allies. If we vote

to deny the President the backing of

this Congress and think that then he

can win the support of additional nations,

we are delusional.

Mr. Speaker, our purpose is a good

one; and we must lead. To save a nation

from terrorist rule, as with Mullah

Omar and Saddam Hussein, protects

not only the citizens of those countries

but our own country and the entire

world. All of us must hope that when

the United Nations passes its resolution,

Saddam Hussein will this time finally

see reason and disarm.

But as the proverb says, he who lives

only by hope will die in despair. I ask

my colleagues to unite hope with reason

and practicality and willingness to

act. Let us support this resolution.