Mr. Speaker, I thank

the gentleman for yielding me this

time.

I wish to respond to some of the comments

made just now by the gentleman

from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) and

earlier by the distinguished chairman

of the Committee on International Relations,

the gentleman from Illinois

(Mr. HYDE).

It is true that this resolution seeks

to have the United States first act in a

multilateral basis through the U.N.,

but we are not transferring the job of

protecting Americans to the United

Nations. In section 8 of this resolution

it says, ‘‘inherent right to self-defense.’’

Nothing in this joint resolution,

the Spratt substitute, is intended

to derogate or otherwise limit the authority

of the President to use military

force and self-defense pursuant to the

Constitution of the United States and

the War Powers resolution.

But there is a reason why we need to

act on a multilateral basis. It is because

if we act against Saddam’s weapons

of mass destruction together with

allies, we are less likely to provoke an

Islamic fundamentalist uprising in the

Middle East. We are more likely to diminish

the number of recruits to

Osama bin Laden, not to accentuate

the number of recruits to terrorist

causes.

Insofar as people have suggested this

is a steeple chase or they are roadblocks

to getting the second resolution

passed, it is a week-long proposition.

Come back, we have the resolution laid

out in this substitute, there are no

amendments, no points of order, it

comes to the floor, we will have a debate

of 20 hours, and it will be done.

This is critical. This is as important

a vote as the vote on final passage, and

I urge Members to support the Spratt

substitute.

Mr. Speaker, I thank

the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to

the resolution. Saddam Hussein is a tyrant

to his own people and a threat to

ourselves and to others. If this were

simply a referendum on him, the vote

today would be unanimous.

But the resolution before us raises

two questions of fundamental importance,

questions that are agonizing for

Members of this body: First, how do we

diminish the threat from Iraq without

empowering Islamic fundamentalism

and creating new recruits for terrorist

groups; and, second, how do we avoid

setting a dangerous global precedent

for other nations to launch unilateral

preemptive attacks as a legitimate

tool of national policy?

The resolution negotiated between

the President and House leadership is

still a blank check. The Spratt substitute,

in its essence, said that we are

not willing to provide a blank check

now for unilateral military action,

though we are willing to provide or authorize

military force multilaterally.

This resolution unwisely justifies action

against Iraq under the Bush administration’s

new doctrine of preemption

and regime change. This justification

has the potential to create precedents

that will come back to haunt us

if adopted by our Nation or by others.

Under the Constitution, the President

and Congress share warmaking

powers. Yet, the underlying resolution

represents an abdication of Congress’

historic role. We cannot look into the

future. If we act unilaterally, we do not

know today what support we might

have from some allies, how many

troops it would take, what the President

has in mind. A decision to use unilateral

force should be postponed to a

later date.

In the war on terrorism, we need

more friends and allies and fewer enemies.

We will get to that place if we

first make a commitment to working

with our allies, and only later, if necessary,

authorize the use of unilateral

force.

I urge my colleagues not to give our

rights away in this Congress, and to reject

the resolution.