Mr. Speaker, just off the rotunda

of the U.S. Capitol building stands a

statue of a fellow Pennsylvanian by the name

of John Muhlenberg. In early 1776, this 29

year-old Lutheran Minister gave a sermon in

Woodstock, Virginia in which he called upon

the men of his congregation to join him in

fighting for our Nation’s independence.

Quoting the Book of Ecclesiastes, Pastor Muhlenberg

said: ‘‘There is an appointed time for

everything. And there is a time for every event

under heaven . . . A time for war and a time

for peace.’’ Contending that the time for war

had arrived, Pastor Muhlenberg then concluded

his sermon by casting off his clerical

robes to reveal the uniform of a Continental

Army officer. Pastor Muhlenberg went on to

serve as a general in the Continental Army.

More than a century and a half later, in an

address at Chautauqua, New York in 1936,

President Franklin Delano Roosevelt stated, ‘‘I

hate war.’’ Yet, after Pearl Harbor roused our

nation from a slumbering isolationism, President

Roosevelt knew that the time for war had

come. The actions of Pastor Muhlenberg and

President Roosevelt remind us that, from the

very beginning of our great Nation to modern

times, war is always regrettable, but sometimes

necessary to protect the lives of our citizens

and to secure the important principles for

which our Nation stands.

As our Nation now seeks to address the

very serious and immediate threat that Saddam

Hussein’s regime poses to American

lives, both abroad and here at home, it remains

to be seen whether war will be a necessary

part of our Nation’s efforts. I certainly

hope and pray that it will not. Unfortunately,

however, Saddam Hussein’s actions, past and

present, do not provide much reason to believe

that my hopes and prayers will be fulfilled.

If diplomacy is to have any chance of success,

Saddam Hussein must fully and unequivocally

understand that, if necessary, the

United States and other peace-loving nations

will no longer stand idly by while he further enhances

his chemical and biological weapons

of mass destruction (WMD) and aggressively

pursues the production of nuclear weapons.

Saddam Hussein must understand that, if necessary,

we will use military force to eliminate

the threat that his weapons pose to our citizens.

It is thus imperative for the United States

Congress to pass legislation authorizing President

George Bush to use military force to ‘‘defend

the national security of the United States

against the continuing threat posed by Iraq’’

and to ‘‘enforce all relevant United Nations Security

Council resolutions regarding Iraq.’’ I

therefore join my Republican and Democrat

colleagues in voting in favor of this legislation,

House Joint Resolution 114. Importantly, H.R.

Res. 114 requires that, prior to using military

force against Saddam Hussein’s regime,

President Bush must officially determine that

further reliance on ‘‘diplomatic or other peaceful

means alone either will not adequately protect

the national security of the United States’’

or will not likely ‘‘lead to enforcement of all relevant

United Nations Security Council resolutions

regarding Iraq.’’ Such determination must

be shared with the House and Senate.

My decision to support H.J. Res. 114 followed

much deliberation and was the product

of countless hours of careful review of information

from many sources. I have fully considered

the views and concerns of hundreds of

19th District residents. As a member of the

House Subcommittee on National Security,

Veterans Affairs, and International Relations, I

have participated in numerous classified briefings

with various Administration officials, including

Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld,

National Security Advisor Condoleezza

Rice, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff

General Richard Myers, and Deputy Director

of the Central Intelligence Agency John

McLaughlin. I have also met overseas and in

Washington with leaders of the Iraqi National

Congress (INC), a coalition of Shi’a, Sunni,

and Kurdish Iraqi dissidents seeking to liberate

their people from Saddam Hussein’s oppressive

rule. Although very diverse in their backgrounds,

they are united in a common belief

that Saddam Hussein’s military regime must

be replaced with a more humane government.

My interactions with the INC representatives

leads me to believe that the removal of Saddam

Hussein will be embraced enthusiastically

by the overwhelming majority of the Iraqi people—

just as the people of Afghanistan embraced

their liberation from the Taliban.

My challenge is to fully explain my support

for H.J. Res. 114 when much of the most important

factual basis for this extremely serious

decision is classified information. While I cannot

legally share such classified material publicly,

I can frankly and honestly state that my

review of said material has wholly convinced

me that Saddam Hussein’s military regime

poses a grave threat to the safety and security

of American citizens, including here at home.

There is compelling evidence of Iraq’s biological

and chemical capabilities and Saddam

Hussein’s intended use of such weapons.

There is also strong evidence of his pursuit of

nuclear weapons. Of significant concern is

Iraq’s growing fleet of unmanned aerial vehicles

(UAVs) that are capable of dispensing biological

or chemical weapons. As President

Bush stated in his recent address to the Nation,

our intelligence information indicates that

Saddam Hussein is ‘‘exploring ways of using

these UAVs for missions targeting the United

States.’’

Please allow me to address various actions

by Iraq over the past 11 years that are in the

public domain. First, Iraq has a long record of

abetting terrorist groups. For example, Hussein

has regularly praised Palestinian suicide

bombers who have taken the lives of countless

innocent civilians, including American citizens.

He has also financially rewarded the

families of said suicide bombers. Although no

direct Iraqi involvement in the September 11

attacks has been proven, there is also strong

evidence that Iraq is serving as a safe harbor

for al Qaeda terrorists since the fall of the

Taliban regime in Afghanistan.

Second, as part of the United Nations sponsored

cease-fire agreement following the liberation

of Kuwait, Iraq agreed to dismantle its

weapons of mass destruction (WMD) programs

and allow inspections to ensure its

compliance with the agreement. Iraq has been

in continuous violation of the cease-fire terms,

playing ‘‘cat-and-mouse’’ games with United

Nations inspectors while continuing to develop

WMD. Since weapons inspectors were effectively

expelled in 1998, Iraq has been completely

free to continue its pursuit of developing

WMD and the means to deliver them.

Saddam Hussein has used chemical WMD in

the past against a neighboring country, Iran,

as well as against his own people, including

innocent children.

Third, Saddam Hussein has demonstrated

his continuing hostility towards the United

States by attempting to assassinate former

President George Bush in 1993 and firing regularly

on U.S. aircraft attempting to enforce

United Nations-sanctioned ‘‘no fly zones’’ in

northern and southern Iraq, the only protection

that the persecuted people in those regions

possess. In fact, according to the Joint Chiefs

of Staff, U.S. and other allied aircraft enforcing

the ‘‘no fly zones’’ have been fired upon several

thousand times by Iraqi military units.

Fourth, Saddam Hussein has engaged in

heinous human rights violations against his

own people. He has intimated political opponents

by ordering the systematic rape of wives

and mothers of said opponents and he has

forced parents to watch their children be tortured

as a means of political coercion.

‘‘Finally, it is important to note that ‘’regime

change’’ in Iraq is not a new policy adopted by

the Bush Administration. Rather, the Iraq Liberation

Act, which states that it is the policy of

the United States government ‘‘to support efforts

to remove the regime headed by Saddam

Hussein from power in Iraq and to promote

the emergence of a democratic government to

replace that regime,’’ was enacted in 1998.

Sponsored by Congressman BEN GILMAN in

the House and Senators TRENT LOTT and JOSEPH

LIEBERMAN in the Senate, the Iraq Liberation

Act passed the House by a vote of

360–38 and the Senate unanimously. President

Bill Clinton signed this act into law on

October 31, 1998.

If the use of military force against Saddam

Hussein’s regime does prove to be necessary

to protect our Nation’s security, such military

action must be carefully designed to minimize

the risk of injury and death to Iraqi civilians

and American military personnel. The enemy

is the regime of Saddam Hussein, not the Iraqi

people.

Ideally, President Bush, working hand-in-hand

with our allies and the United Nation’s

Security Council, will be successful in fully addressing

the threat that Saddam Hussein and

his military regime pose to world peace and to

our Nation’s security without having to resort

to military force. But if diplomatic efforts fail to

truly eliminate this grave threat to American

lives, then we must be prepared to act decisively,

just as our forefathers did during the

Revolutionary War and World War II.

President Bush well captured the challenge

before us when he stated,