Mr. Speaker,

let me say to my very good friends

on the other side, this amendment

builds on the lessons of leadership from

our success in the Persian Gulf War.

Virtually no American lives lost and

our specific mission accomplished.

We want to do just what we did in

1991. President Bush waited until after

the congressional midterm elections.

He secured the United Nations Security

Council authorization to use international

force. We had the support of

Iraq’s Arab neighbors. We did not position

this country as a target for vengeance

from Arab and Muslim extremists,

and for a decade, we have contained

and sanctioned Saddam.

We are fighting another war today, a

war on terrorism, and our intelligence

agencies tell us these are separate

wars. This amendment focuses on winning

both wars and securing our deserved

position as the unparalleled

leader and inspiration of the free

world.

The rest of the free world is no less

determined to protect their families

and individual liberties. Let us make

this war and the war on terrorism an

international and definitive success.

Mr. Speaker,

I thank my good friend from California

(Mr. LANTOS) for yielding me

time.

Mr. Speaker, there are compelling,

fundamental reasons why this body

should oppose this resolution. With

great power comes great responsibility,

great responsibility to conduct our foreign

policy in a manner worthy of our

world leadership, consistent with the

international standards of conduct

that we have worked so hard to establish

for the better part of the 20th century.

The United States must continue

to act in a manner that serves as an example

to the rest of the world.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress is the

people’s body. That is why before we

offer up the lives of our sons and

daughters in the cause of war, we must

have the final say. The amendment

that just failed was about upholding

the integrity of this institution and

the U.S. Constitution that must guide

all our actions. We should be making

Saddam Hussein irrelevant, not

marginalizing the United States Congress.

We make him irrelevant by disarming

him, discovering and destroying

all of his weapons of mass destruction

and his means of delivering them.

We can accomplish that objective

without leaving our allies on the sidelines

or further inflaming the passions

of people, especially in the Arab and

Muslim world, who do not understand

or trust our noble intent.

We are not the only people prepared

to sacrifice our lives for the family security

and individual freedoms that

motivate the human race.

We oppose this resolution for the

same reasons the first President Bush

delayed a comparable debate until

after the midterm congressional elections

a decade ago, why he pressed so

hard and successfully for the United

Nations Security Council’s support,

and why he successfully achieved the

support of Iraq’s Arab neighbors.

Mr. Speaker, we do not need a new

national security strategy that, with a

policy of unilateral preemption, tramples

the foundation of the international

rules of law that has been this

generation’s legacy to this small planet.

We should be standing on the shoulders

of the great leaders who have preceded

us in this body and who are the

true authors of our existing national

security strategy that remains the best

hope of peace and progress for all of

mankind.