Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the resolution now before

the Congress. I supported the father of

the current President on his resolution

and was one of the few Democrats who

did. I was right. There was a strong,

present imperative by this country and

by the nations of the world. It made

sense, it was good, and it was something

which was accepted and followed

by the people of the world.

There is no evidence that our allies

in Europe support the efforts that are

described by the President to be made

by the United States. The people and

the countries in the area do not support

this undertaking; and, overwhelmingly,

the American people oppose this

kind of effort, an effort intelligently,

wisely and necessary to be made to

achieve the purposes of everybody, that

is, elimination of weapons of mass destruction

from within the country of Iraq.

Mr. Saddam Hussein has no friends in

the world. Everybody fears him and

most despise him, but the President

has chosen the wrong course. He has

given us a request for a blank check.

There has been inadequate or no discussion

with our allies and friends.

There has not been sufficient discussion

with the Congress or the people of

the United States, and the countries in

the area are troubled because they feel

that they do not understand what it is

the United States intends to do, when, how or why.

We are embarking upon a unique and

new doctrine. We will engage in a unilateral

preemptive strike, if the early

pronouncements of the administration

are to be believed, and our purpose

there is the removal of Saddam Hussein,

obviously a desirable change. But,

more recently, the President has said

our purpose now is to disarm Mr. Hussein

and Iraq of their weapons of mass

destruction. I am not clear what course

it is that the President has in mind,

but I am convinced that proceeding

into this situation without allies, without

bases, without proper and adequate

logistic support is an act of great folly.

It poses enormous risks to the troops

that we would be sending, and it poses

enormous risk to this country and to

our foreign policy.

Not only is it novel and dangerous to

talk about preemptive strikes, but it is

something which need not be done. A

proper exercise of leadership in the

U.N. will cause that institution to follow the United States; and I would

urge us, as the remaining superpower,

to exercise leadership and have enough

confidence in ourselves and our capacity to lead to proceed to embark upon

that course. I do not see this resolution

before us as being a device which stimulates

or encourages that. Perhaps the

President would exercise that kind of

leadership. I see no evidence that such, however, is to be the case.

I was here during the time of the

missile crisis, and I remember that the

President at that time observed that

the worst course to be taken was a preemptive

war. Our policy succeeded. We

forced the missiles out. And when the

matter was discussed in the United Nations,

our ambassador there, Mr. Stevenson, showed them a photograph of

what was transpiring and that the Soviets

had moved missiles into Cuba.

The world accepted, approved and followed the United States.

We have not seen that the people of

the world are convinced that we have

made the case that Mr. Saddam Hussein

would embark immediately or at a

time of risk to the United States on

the use of weapons of mass destruction.

Perhaps he would, and I do not trust

him, but I would note to my colleagues

that there is a sensible way of achieving

the following and the support of

the people of the world.

George Herbert Walker Bush chose it,

and I supported him. He went around

the world and he assembled not just

the countries in the area, not just our

allies, but the whole world. And but for

the fact that we pulled out too soon,

the matter would have been disposed of

completely and satisfactorily then.

We have not taken the steps that are

necessary to assure either that the nations

of the world, our friends and allies

in Europe or the nations in the

area would support this undertaking. I

am not a dove, and I am not a hawk. I

am a very sensible Polish American,

and it is my view that the game here is

to win, and we best win by using the resources

of the United Nations and the following of the whole world as we assemble

a coalition to disarm or dispose of Saddam Hussein. To take some other

course is to accept foolish risks, including the risk of failure.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the resolution

now before the Congress. I supported

the father of the current president on his resolution

and was one of the few Democrats who

did. I was right. There was a strong, present

imperative by this country and by the nations

of the world. It made sense, it was good, and

it was something which was accepted and followed by the people of the world.

There is no evidence that our allies in Europe

support the efforts that are described by

the President to be made by the United

States. The people and the countries in the

area do not support this undertaking; and,

overwhelmingly, the American people oppose

this kind of effort, because it is not made intelligently,

wisely and in ways necessary to

achieve its purpose. The basic purpose is the

elimination of weapons of mass destruction

from within the country of Iraq.

Mr. Saddam Hussein has no friends in the

world. People fear him and most despise him.

But the President has chosen the wrong

course. He has given us a request for a blank

check. There has been inadequate or no discussion

with our allies and fiends. There has

not been sufficient discussion with the Congress

or the people of the Untied States, and

the countries in the area are troubled because

they feel that they do not understand what it

is the United States intends to do, when, how or why.

We are embarking on a unique and new

doctrine. We propose to engage in a unilateral

preemptive strike, if the early pronouncements

of the administration are to be believed. Our

purpose there is the removal of Saddam Hussein,

obviously a desirable change, but again

done unilaterally—a great strategic and tactical

error. More recently, the President has

said that our purpose now is to disarm Mr.

Hussein and Iraq of their weapons of mass

destruction. I am not clear what course it is

that the President has in mind, but I am convinced

that proceeding into this situation without

allies, without bases, without proper and

adequate logistical support is risky, indeed, it

is an act of great folly. It poses enormous

risks to the troops that we would be sending,

and it poses enormous risk to this country, to

the success of the undertaking, and to our foreign policy.

Not only is it novel and dangerous to talk

about preemptive strikes, but it is something

which need not be done. A proper exercise of

leadership in the U.N. will cause that institution

and its members to follow the United

States. I would urge us, as the remaining superpower,

to exercise leadership and have

enough confidence in ourselves, and in our

capacity to lead, to embark upon that wiser

and more propitious course. I do not see this

resolution before us as being a device which

stimulates or encourages other nations to follow

the United States. Perhaps the President

would exercise that kind of leadership. He certainly

should. I would support him in that. I see

no evidence that such, however, is to be the case.

I was here during the time of the missile crisis,

and I remember that President Kennedy at

that time observed that the worst course to be

taken was a preemptive war. His policies succeeded.

We forced the missiles out, peace

was maintained, and when the matter was discussed

in the United Nations, our ambassador

there, Mr. Stevenson, showed them a photograph

of what was transpiring and that the Soviets

had moved missiles into Cuba. The world

accepted, approved and followed the United States.

We have not seen that the people of the

world are convinced that we have made the

case that Mr. Saddam Hussein would embark

immediately or at some early time to use

weapons of mass destruction. I do not trust

him, and he might, but losing to him in this

matter would make such use of weapons of

mass destruction more certain. I would note to

my colleagues that there is a sensible way of

achieving the following of the world and the

support of the nations of the world.

President George Herbert Walker Bush

chose it, and I supported him. That President

went around the world and assembled not just

the countries in the Middle East, not just our

allies, but the whole world. And but for the fact

that we pulled out too soon, the matter would

have been disposed of completely and satisfactorily then.

We have not taken the steps that are necessary

to assure either that the nations of the

world, our friends and allies in Europe, or the

friendly nations in the Middle East will support

this undertaking. I am not a dove, and I am

not a hawk. I am very sensible Polish American,

and it is my view that the game here is

to win. And we best win by using the resources

of the United Nations and the following

of the whole world as we assemble a

coalition to disarm or dispose of Saddam Hussein.

To take some other course is to accept

foolish risks, including the risk of failure. Let

us do it right. If we do, we will win.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I insert into the

RECORD, a letter I sent the President outlining

my views and questions to be addressed before

we embark on this risky endeavor.