Mr. Speaker, I am supporting

the Spratt amendment because it provides

many safeguards to war—it authorizes

the use of force through a new UN Security

Council Resolution; however, should the UN

not adopt a resolution sanctioning the use of

force or not take any action at all, the amendment

would allow the President, if he deemed

the UN Security Council’s action insufficient, to

come to Congress to obtain authorization to

use the United States Armed Forces against

Iraq. Most importantly, the Spratt amendment

allows Congress to retain its rightful role in the

constitutional process as the body having the

authority to declare war.

The Spratt amendment is an especially important

safeguard—because it would give the

United Nations, essentially, the World, time to

examine the threat that Hussein poses and

then, in a sobering fashion, make a determination

as to whether a new resolution regarding

the elimination of Iraq’s weapons of mass destruction

should be adopted or whether to use

of force is the appropriate response to the

threat that Saddam Hussein poses.

We must not move hastily to the sobering

decision to use force against another country.

As it was discovered yesterday, it is now

known that the CIA has concluded Saddam

Hussein is unlikely to initiate a chemical or biological

attack against the United States.

Based on this CIA assessment, an attack on

Iraq could provide the very thing the President

claims he is trying to forestall—the use of

chemical or biological weapons by Saddam.

I believe it is extremely important that exhaust

all avenues of peace, make use of all

safeguards prior to sending our troops into

battle. We cannot be injudicious, premature or

inaccurate in our decision to go to war. The

Spratt amendment makes the possibility of a

unilateral attack on Iraq the last option—not

the first. Lets give the UN and the U.S. a

greater ability work towards a peaceful resolution

of our concerns with Saddam Hussein.