Mr. Speaker, I come to

the floor today to cover two points.

One will cover recent rulings in the

FCC regarding the 1996 Telecommunications

Act, and the other is we are

going to talk about our foreign policy

with Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, in 1996 the Telecommunications

Act was heralded as a

grand attempt to move the telecom

markets toward competition. I was a

conferee on that bill. It was a great

compromise between the House and the

Senate. That bill was greatly heralded

by many people, but 7 years later the

Act’s intent has been overrun by the

FCC’s recent decision that has effectively

blocked competition and created

disincentives for investment by maintaining

the UNE–P status quo.

It is not only the intent of the act

that is being circumvented. More tangibly,

the already-fragile telecom industry

has suffered another financial

setback. In response to the FCC’s decision,

many of Wall Street’s analysts

have made their voices heard on the

negative effects that the decision will

have on the economy, including Morgan

Stanley, Goldman Sachs, Lehman

Brothers and others.

An analogy of the FCC’s decision

would be to allow McDonald’s, or Burger

King, a competitor, to come into

their restaurants and use their entire

facilities. You bring your meat, you fry

it up, you bring your own drinks, you

use it all, you use their advertising,

you use their building, you use their

drive-up window, you use their cash

registers, and you are in competition

with the McDonald’s or Burger King

franchise?

No one in America would ever allow

a competitor to do such a thing. But

that is what is happening in the telecommunications

industry. What incentive

is there at all to allow investment,

if that in fact is what is going to

occur?

As a matter of public policy, the

FCC’s decision simply makes no sense.

On one hand, the commission

deregulates broadband, and on the

other hand it complicates and multiplies

regulation on UNE–P.

Last year, this body passed the Tauzin-

Dingell broadband legislation, 273

to 157. I think we could argue that the

will of the Congress had an impact on

how the FCC views broadband. Do we

now pass another bill to show the FCC

that further regulation on UNE–P offers

no help to the Nation’s economy?

Mr. Speaker, if that is what it takes,

then I say, let us do it.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the

chairman of the Committee on Armed

Services has joined us here for this

Special Order on behalf of the Republican

leadership.

There were some what I call the

voices of dissent that came to the

floor, the voice of dissent with regard

to war. I call it the sounds of freedom.

One was asking, please give peace a

chance. The other one was saying I am

concerned about the long-term damage

to our alliances if we do not follow

what Germany, Russia, China, and

France are asking for. The other says

we just need to continue our diplomacy

and we should follow the lead of the

French. That was the voice of dissent

that came here to the floor today.

I would say to the gentleman from

California (Mr. HUNTER), to those

voices out there that say give peace a

chance, it is easy to say that when you

sit in freedom, and peace is truly the

consequence of freedom. America represents

freedom, and we export hope

and opportunity; and Iraq and some of

the sub-national terrorist organizations

that represent tyranny, they export

fear and terror.

I yield to the gentleman.

Reclaiming my time, beginning

with the threat, I think is

probably the right place for us to start

this discussion here today.

A report released on September 9,

2002, from the International Institute

for Strategic Studies, an independent

research organization, concludes that

Saddam Hussein at that time, actually

Saddam Hussein could build a nuclear

bomb within months if he were able to

obtain the fissile material. Iraq has

stepped up its quest for nuclear weapons

and has embarked on a worldwide

hunt for materials to make an atomic

bomb. We all know about the aluminum

tubes, the dual-use material

and technologies that he has been trying

to obtain.

So the gentleman’s comments with

regard to time, it is true; and I do not

know why some people are unwilling to

acknowledge this individual’s ambitions.

Saddam Hussein has repeatedly

met with his nuclear scientists over

the past few years, signaling his continued

interest in developing a nuclear

weapons program.

With regard to chemical munitions,

Iraq admits but UNSCOM cannot confirm

the destruction of 6,500 chemicalweapon

bombs filled with 1,000 tons of

agent, over 3,000 tons of chemical warfare

agents, 614 tons of precursor

chemicals used to make the most toxic

nerve agent, VX, 550 artillery munitions,

155 millimeter, filled with mustard

and chemical warfare agent, and

31,658 empty and filled chemical weapons

munitions.

Iraq continues to rebuild and expand

the dual-use infrastructure that could

quickly divert from chemical weapons

production such as chlorine and phenol

plants.

Iraq is seeking also to purchase

chemical weapons, agents, precursors,

and applicable production equipment

and is making an effort, obviously, to

hide those facilities while inspections

even continue.

With regard to biological weapons,

Iraq admits, but the U.N. cannot confirm,

the destruction of 8,500 liters of

anthrax, 2,160 kilograms of bacterialgrowth

media, enough to produce 26,000

liters of anthrax, 38,000 liters of botulinum

toxin and 5,500 liters of

aflatoxin.

Mr. Speaker, I would

ask the gentleman, is this the same nuclear

reactor that was built by the

French?

I would say to the gentleman

from California (Mr. HUNTER),

since we talked about the present

threat, let us spend a little time on

what Saddam Hussein has done from

1991 to present.

With regard to his repression of the

Iraqi people themselves, there is his refusal

to admit human rights monitors;

continued torture; the executions and

repression of political opposition; disappearances

of people in the night;

withholding of food and medicine in

the food for peace program; the mass

murder of Iraqi Kurds and Iraq Shi’a

Muslims. He continues to support

international terrorist organizations,

which has been well known.

He also has refused to account for

Gulf War prisoners. In his failure to account,

Saddam Hussein has been unwilling

to come forward on 609 cases of

missing Gulf War prisoners of war and

missing in action representing 14 nationalities,

including one American

pilot. We also have Saddam Hussein

failing to return and account for a

large number of Kuwaiti citizens and

citizens of other countries who were

detained during the Iraqi occupation.

Also, Saddam Hussein has refused to

return stolen property from Kuwait,

and Saddam Hussein has continued his

efforts to circumvent the economic

sanctions.

So for those who are saying give

peace a chance, let us let the economic

sanctions work, are they working, I

ask the gentleman from California?

Mr. Speaker, to support

the gentleman’s position on a preemptive

strike, I think it has been clear

that Saddam Hussein’s efforts to circumvent

the economic sanctions has

proven itself very successful. Saddam

has illegally imported hundreds of billions

of dollars in goods, in violation of

economic sanctions, and even outside

of the U.N.’s oil for food program.

For example, Iraq has imported a

fiberoptic communications system that

supports the Iraqi military. It has diverted

dual use end items obtained

under the oil-for-food program for military

purposes. For example, Iraq diverted

U.N.-approved trucks for humanitarian

relief purposes for military

purposes, and has used construction

equipment to rebuild weapons of mass

destruction-affiliated facilities. They

came to Iraq under the dual use program.

Saddam Hussein also has about $3

billion in illegal proceeds that he is

able to use with these items. He is contracting

with over 75 nations around

the world, and he is giving priority

contracts to France, Germany, and

Russia in return for their support in

this very difficult time.

Does the gentleman have any comments

he would like to add?

I thank the gentleman

from California, Mr. Speaker.

There have been over 17 resolutions

before the United Nations in which

Saddam Hussein continues his open defiance.

The first resolution was November 29

of 1990, that said Iraq must comply

fully with Resolution 660 regarding the

illegal invasion of the country of Kuwait.

The next resolution was number 686,

on March 2 of 1991. It says Iraq must release

prisoners detained during the

Gulf War. Iraq must return Kuwaiti

property seized during the Gulf War.

Iraq must accept the liability from

international law for damages during

its illegal invasion of Kuwait. He has

not done anything about that.

The next resolution, number 687 on

April 3 of 1991, Iraq must unconditionally

accept the destruction, removing

and rendering harmless under international

supervision of chemical and

biological weapons, all stocks of

agents, and all related subsystems and

components of all research development,

support, and manufacturing facilities.

This was in 1991.

Iraq must unconditionally agree not

to acquire or develop nuclear weapons

or nuclear weapons-usable material, or

any research, development, or manufacturing

facilities. It continues, recalcitrant.

Iraq must unconditionally accept the

destruction, removal and rendering

harmless under international supervision

all ballistic missiles with a

range greater than 150 kilometers. Now

he is destroying missiles; this was back

on April 3 of 1991. The list goes on and

on under that resolution.

The next resolution out of the U.N.

Security Council was number 688 on

April 5 of 1991. It condemns the repression

of the Iraqi civilian population,

the consequences of which threaten

international peace and security.

Iraq must immediately end repression

of the civilian population, and

Iraq must allow immediate access of

international humanitarian organizations

to those in need of assistance. It

never happened. Those were the words

of the U.N. April 5 of 1991.

The next resolution came from the

U.N. Security Council, number 707, on

August 15 of 1991.

It condemned Iraq’s serious violation

of resolution 687. It condemned Iraq’s

noncompliance with the International

Atomic Energy Agency and its obligations

under the Nuclear Nonproliferation

Treaty. Iraq must halt nuclear activities

of all kinds until the Security

Council deems Iraq in full compliance.

August 15 of 1991. Never happened.

The next resolution by the U.N. Security

Council, No. 715, October 11 of

1991, said Iraq must fully cooperate

with the U.N. and the International

Atomic Energy Agency inspectors.

Never happened.

The next resolution from the U.N.

Security Council, No. 949, October 15 of

1994, condemns Iraq’s recent military

deployments toward Kuwait. Iraq must

not utilize its military or other forces

in a hostile manner to threaten its

neighbors or U.N. operations in Iraq.

Iraq must fully cooperate with U.N.

weapons inspectors and Iraq must not

enhance its military capability in

southern Iraq. Never happened.

The next U.N. Security Council resolution

was No. 1051 on March 27, 1996.

They said Iraq must report shipments

of dual-use end items related to weapons

of mass destruction to the U.N. and

to the International Atomic Energy

Agency. Iraq must fully cooperate with

the U.N. and these agency inspectors

and allow immediate unconditional,

unrestricted access. It never happened.

The next U.N. Security Council resolution,

1060, on June 12, 1996. It deplores

Iraq’s refusal to allow access to

U.N. inspectors and Iraq’s clear violations

of previous U.N. resolutions. Iraq

must cooperate fully with U.N. weapons

inspectors and allow immediate unconditional

and unrestricted access. It

never happened.

The next resolution by the U.N. Security

Council was No. 1115 on June 21

of 1997. It condemns repeated refusal of

Iraq authorities to allow access to U.N.

inspectors which constitutes a clear

and flagrant violation of U.N. resolutions

687, 707, 715 and 1061. Iraq must

fully cooperate with the U.N. weapons

inspectors and allow immediate, unconditional

and unrestricted access.

Iraq must give immediate unconditional,

unrestricted access to Iraqi officials

whom the U.N. inspectors want to

interview. It never happened.

The next U.N. Security Council resolution

was 1134 on October 23, 1997. It

condemns repeated refusal of Iraqi authorities

to all access to the U.N. inspectors

which constitutes a flagrant

violation, again, of resolutions 687, 707,

715, and 1061. It says Iraq must fully cooperate

with the U.N. weapons inspectors

and allow immediate unconditional,

unrestricted access.

Boy, this sounds like a broken

record.

Iraq must give immediate unconditional,

unrestricted access to Iraqi officials

whom U.N. inspectors want to

interview. It never happened.

The next resolution came from the

U.N. Security Council on November 12,

1997. It condemned the continued violations

by Iraq of previous U.N. resolutions

including the implicit threat of

safety of aircraft operated by U.N. inspectors

and the tampering of U.N. inspectors’

monitoring equipment. It reaffirmed

Iraq’s responsibility to ensure

the safety of U.N. inspectors, and Iraq

must fully comply with U.N. inspections

and allow immediate unconditional,

unrestricted access. It never

happened.

The next U.N. Security Council resolution

was 1154 on March 2, 1998. They

said Iraq must fully cooperate with the

U.N. and the International Atomic Energy

Agency weapons inspectors and

allow immediate unconditional, unrestricted

access and notes that any violation

would have the severest of consequences

for Iraq. That was in 1998. Do

you think Iraq was scared? These words

are beginning to get very, very empty

if you say them over and over again.

The next resolution was 1194, September

9 of 1998. It condemned the decision

by Iraq on the 5th of August 1998

to suspend cooperation with the U.N.

and the International Atomic Energy

Agency inspectors, which constitutes a

‘‘totally unacceptable contravention of

its obligations under the U.N. resolutions

687, 707, 715, 1060, 1115, and 1154.’’

And they said Iraq must fully cooperate

with the U.N. and IAEA weapons

inspectors and allow immediate unconditional,

unrestricted access.

The next resolution came on the 5th

of November of 1998. It was resolution

1205 of the U.N. Security Council. It

condemns the decision by Iraq of 31 October

1998 to cease cooperation with

the U.N. inspectors as a flagrant violation

of resolution 687 and other resolutions.

And they said Iraq must immediately

and completely and unconditionally

cooperate with the U.N. and

IAEA inspectors. It never happened.

The next resolution by the U.N. Security

Council was No. 1284, December

17, 1999. It created the United Nations

Monitoring, Verification and Inspection

Commission to replace previous

weapons inspection teams. And they

said Iraq must allow this new inspection

team the immediate unconditional,

unrestricted access to Iraqi officials

and its facilities. Iraq must fulfill

its commitment to return Gulf War

prisoners, this is 1999, and calls on Iraq

to distribute humanitarian goods and

medical supplies to its people and address

the needs of vulnerable Iraqis

without discrimination. It never happened.

The next resolution then was the one

which is presently being discussed,

1441. This resolution was meant to be

different from all of these that I just

mentioned. Because this resolution was

by its very nature words that were negotiated

painstakingly to give a final

opportunity for Iraq to comply with its

disarmament obligations under all

these relevant resolutions by the council.

During that same time, Congress decided

it would also exercise a voice. In

1998 there was H.R. 4655, a sense of the

Congress that U.S. policy is regime

change and democracy for Iraq. That

was during the Clinton administration,

October 5 of 1998.

On December 20 of 2001, House Joint

Resolution 75, Congress spoke and said

Iraq is in material breach of U.N. resolutions.

It passed this House by a vote

of 390 to 12.

The next resolution that came from

this House was on October 10, 2002,

which authorized military force in Iraq

and passed this House by a vote of 296

to 132. So we have had a continued decade

of deception and defiance that has

been noted.

The decade of deception and defiance

continues. I went through this long litany.

Sure, it may have taken 15 minutes,

but it was 10 years of work and

labor by the U.N.

The time for the U.N. in its relevancy

and materiality of this present is before

us. Are the words going to have

meaning? The President has come forward

and made that point very clear to

the United Nations.

My hope is that the U.N. stands firm

and gives definition to their meaning.

Saddam Hussein has had a long history

of complying with inspectors on a very

small and technical scale, and then he

continues to cheat inspectors on a very

large scale. His tactical concessions

are designed to buy time and ease pressure

on his regime and to split the

international community and to hopefully

end resolve.

Since 1991 Saddam has presented no

fewer than six, six full and final and

complete declarations of his illegal biological

weapons programs alone. Each

of these has been an outward lie and

has failed to account for large stockpiles

of prohibited materials.

The United Nations has worked with

three countries to give very good examples

of cooperative disarmament.

Those countries would be South Africa,

Kazakhstan, and Ukraine. And there

are three very basic elements of cooperation.

One is a decision must be

made at the highest level to disarm.

Next would be you have to state your

national intentions. And third is you

cooperate with international efforts to

verify the disarmament behavior and

that it is open and it is transparent,

not secretive.

Iraq with regard to its highest level,

their efforts are concealment. Iraq also

tasked its key institutions toward

thwarting the inspectors, and instead

of transparency, Iraq chooses to conceal

and lie. That is very, very different

from what we have seen. So the

cosmetic compliance that is presently

going on is nothing new.

With regards to Dr. Blix, I want to

extend my thanks. He has a very difficult

job to do. He is trying to make

Saddam Hussein comply. Knowing that

this track record that we have laid out,

knowing the little games he plays, and

the cheat and retreat strategy that he

has, Dr. Blix has a tremendous job. But

Dr. Blix was never meant there to be a

detective. He was meant there to work

with a country cooperatively in a

transparent effort to disarm the country

that was meant to comply with all

of these resolutions.

So almost what has happened is that

the world has placed an unrealistic expectation

upon Dr. Blix. We cannot do

that and should not do that to him.

That is why resolution 1441, it demands

nothing less than the full and immediate

disarmament by Iraq. So this report

that is going to be presented tomorrow

is extremely important. I believe

that no one can say that Iraq’s

cooperation has been full and immediate

because the regime has submitted

a false declaration, it has blocked private

interviews. Only 5 of the 30 requested

UNMOVIC have even taken

place. They have threatened witnesses

and their families with death, and they

have hidden documents and concealed

materials from inspectors.

The ‘‘why now’’ question for me is

obvious. For others who perhaps do not

know about all these resolutions and

what has gone on, it is a good question

to ask. The President has come forward

with a preemptive doctrine. Some

maybe do not understand what a preemptive

doctrine is.

What is extremely important is after

September 11 is that we have a right of

self-defense. We also should be taking

our defenses in doubt. What that means

is you do not just say we are only going

to focus on homeland security. We are

going to cower in our defenses and seek

the security because we feel unsecure.

No. You take it to where the threat is.

So whether it is in Afghanistan or

whether it is in the Horn of Africa or

wherever al Qaeda is trying to hide,

you work cooperatively with nations;

you take it to the terrorist organizations.

Likewise, with Saddam Hussein, who

poses a threat to destabilize the region

of the Middle East, the United States

as a superpower, some people are uncomfortable

with that word, but it is

true. The United States is the sole remaining

superpower. We have a responsibility

to regional stability in the

world.

Saddam Hussein has been recalcitrant

to the world, and his threats

will continue along with his cooperation

with these terrorist organizations.

Now, I am a father, like many. My

son is 17. I love Ryan. But if I said,

Ryan, you know, you have got a curfew

and he violated his curfew 17 times and

I did nothing, and I see he is getting

ready to go out tomorrow night and I

said, Ryan, remember your curfew,

what do you think he is going to do? He

is going to come home whenever he

pleases. Why? Because my words are

hollow. They mean nothing. I say

them, but he will not follow them because

they have no meaning or definition,

therefore, no consequence for the

recalcitrant act. That is Saddam Hussein.

So all these resolutions that I talked

about, great words. They are firm. But

if the U.N. is not going to give meaning

and definition to the words, who will?

Who will stand up and exercise the

might to make right? Once again, the

United States, we have seen this before.

We have been there before. We are

going to do it again.

I think about my comrades who find

themselves on the desert floor. I remember

very much what it was like.

One thing I can share and to the mothers

and fathers who have their loved

ones who are about to be in harm’s way

is that not only has this Congress

taken the appropriate resources to help

train and equip these men and women

over the last decade, this force is better

than the force that I fought with in

the Gulf War. I am so proud of them.

When I see them, they give me chills.

They represent the very best of America.

I will never forget the scene in the

Indianapolis airport of a young sailor

who was getting ready to be shipped

off, and he has his sisters with him, his

very young brother, his parents are

standing there and his grandparents

are also standing there, and he is

standing there in a sailor’s uniform.

His youngest brother is holding the

sailor’s cap as if it were a crown, and it

is a scene unlike many scenes all

across the country.

Now this Congress has done its duty.

It has been vigilant to make sure that

this force is prepared. It will be highly

lethal, it will be highly mobile, and it

has very precise munitions.

With regard to the enemy for which

they are about to face, I remember the

Iraqi people themselves, to include the

conscripts. I interrogated many of

them during the Gulf War. They do not

like Saddam Hussein. Iraq is a very

wealthy country, and Saddam only

takes the wealth of that country to the

benefit of a very few as he suppresses

other tribes within Iraq. They do not

like Saddam Hussein.

One of the individuals I was interrogating

had, under his blouse, I saw this

red and blue sort of semicircle. I could

not understand exactly what it was. I

asked him to undo his blouse and it

was a Chicago Cubs T-shirt. He had relatives

that lived in Michigan, and they

were fans of the Cubs, and so he tried

to track the Chicago Cubs.

One other story. In order to help

bring calm and peace at the Western

antiwar camp, we gave the Iraqi prisoners,

over 46,000 of them, what they

wanted to hear. They wanted to listen

to Madonna. So we piped in Madonna

music. They are more Western than

one can imagine, and they do like

America, and they do not like Saddam

Hussein.

With regard to the leadership, I came

out of the interrogation tent. My interpreter

at the time was former King

Fahd’s grandson, Bandar, and as I come

out of this tent, there is an Iraqi general

officer sitting on the desert floor.

He is sitting there with his legs

crossed. His elbows are on his knees.

His hands are in his face, and he is

weeping like a child so hard that his

shoulders are actually shaking. I stood

there and I looked at this and behind

are his army. I walked up to the gentleman,

and I kicked the sole of his

boot. I then ordered him to stand at attention.

Through the interpreter he tells the

general man to stand up. I got really

close to him, looked at him, asked if he

was a general officer. He asked him and

acknowledged and shook his head and

said yes, and I told him then act like

one. Now think about this scene. I am

a United States Army captain, telling

an Iraqi general officer how to act.

Why? Why would a United States Army

captain have to do such a thing? Because

he was not a general officer because

of his strategic mind and his tactics.

He was a general officer because of

his loyalties and relationships to Saddam

Hussein.

So, with regard to ‘‘the enemy’’ in

which we are about to face, they are

not led by great military minds. So it

would be no wonder why the conscripts

and others will fold quickly. I also believe

that he was weeping, not for his

men which stood behind him, he was

weeping for himself because he knew

that upon repatriation, Saddam Hussein

would probably execute him. That

is the repression of Saddam Hussein.

The Kurds and the Shi-ites have been

waiting a long time for this day. I

know that in my own sense and feeling

of having gone through what no differently

that my ancestors have gone

through for freedom and liberty in this

country, I know about the consequences

of war. I know about the

long dark shadows of horror. I know

about things that are unimaginable

and things one does not speak of and

things that we see we just cannot believe.

War is inhumane toward mankind

and I cannot believe in this day

and age, for all of our sophistication

and technological advances, that man

still yet has not found a way to resolve

our differences.

The bottom line is this is not up to

us. This is now up to Saddam Hussein.

I still hold out the hope that there is a

country out there that is willing to

take him in and that we can actually

move in peacefully and change the regime.

That is my desire, that is my

hope. It is my prayer and I know that

the soldiers that are standing there

feel the same way. They pray for peace,

even though they are prepared for war

because they are the ones that gave an

oath to give their life to defend the

Constitution and our very liberties and

freedom.

So let me end where we started, with

the voice of dissent. I acknowledge the

voice of dissent as constructive to the

discussion. I find what is not constructive

are those in an antiwar message

that would also be ‘‘un-American.’’ Do

not go out and burn the flag. Do not

say and be obnoxious and do something

stupid. If a person has got something

that is constructive that can bring

peace and tranquillity to this world,

step forward and say it, but they can

do so in a manner without being un-

American or being disrespectful of individuals

of whom have lost loved ones,

or even have someone who finds themselves

in harm’s way in the very next

few days.

I think what we should do is go find

something and send it to a soldier that

is in the desert. Pick it out, support

the troops that are over there. Believe

me, it is a very lonely place, the Saudi

Arabia and Iraqi and Kuwaiti desert.

Just to glance upon the American flag

is something that will give a chill because

it is the only thing out there

that that can strike a memory of home

and of loved ones.

I know that the decision that President

Bush has in front of him is one

that he understands the burden of the

decision because he also understands

the opportunity that the peace will

bring, not only to the regional stability,

but the opportunities and new

alliances and greater heights for freedom.