If the gentleman

would yield on that point, I agree with

the gentleman that the folks who express

their dissent and have been expressing

their dissent in government,

basically giving the other side of the

debate, are providing a public service

by doing that. But I think there are a

few observations that are important

here.

There have been people demonstrating

worldwide in large numbers,

hundreds of thousands of people,

against the prospect of war with Iraq. I

do not think any of those people demonstrated

when the Kurdish babies

were laid low by the gas attacks with

poison gas that Saddam Hussein spread

over their villages.

I do not think any of those folks

demonstrated when he gassed Iranians

by the tens of thousands, or when he

executed his own people, cut off their

ears and did the myriad of reprehensible

acts that have now been ascribed

to him, both in closed-door sessions by

our intelligence officers and in open

sessions by various human rights agencies.

So I think it is always important to

set the record straight, or to come into

these debates with a full understanding

of where they come from. And I think

one of the most honest talk shows that

was ever devised for television was

‘‘Crossfire,’’ where the conservative

would say ‘‘from the right,’’ and the

liberal would say ‘‘from the left.’’

But it is obvious that the people who

are demonstrating by the hundreds of

thousands, some of them well-meaning

people, also include lots of people who

are not necessarily demonstrating because

they have a great love of mankind,

or that they are special peace

people or have a special care about humanity,

because, if they did, they

would have been demonstrating when

Saddam Hussein gassed those Kurdish

babies by the hundreds. They were not

demonstrating there, so that did not

bother them.

It did not bother them because it was

not destabilizing. I think a lot of folks

do not like the idea that war in itself

is something unsure, it is destabilizing,

that it potentially affects the cost of

gasoline in your automobile, it potentially

affects your community, it may

affect relatives who may have to go off

to war. So it is something that brings

about a feeling of unsettlement.

But let us answer that question the

gentleman brought up, why are we entering

into this confrontation, it appears?

I think one question that could

be well thrown back is this: in 1991,

when we had not only lots of folks in

this country and around the world

against us taking action against Iraq

when they invaded Kuwait, we not only

had lots of folks on the streets around

the world, but we also had a majority

of the Democrat leadership. I do not

fault that Democrat leadership for having

taken their position, which they

have a political right to do, and taking

that side of the debate. But we found

afterwards, to answer those people who

said give peace some time, give it a

chance, give us another 10 months, 18

months, whatever, we found out that

according to United Nations estimates,

Saddam Hussein at the time that we

defeated him in battle was 6 months

away from having a nuclear weapon.

So certainly those well-meaning

folks who thought that time was on

our side discovered afterward, and to

the surprise of everyone, conservatives,

liberals, Democrats, Republicans, none

of us knew how close he was to having

that system. So time is not always on

our side.

It is my estimate, after having conducted

some closed hearings and some

open hearings, eight hearings in total,

it is my judgment that this country is

going to have a nuclear device in about

3 years, and, along with that capability,

possessing that capability, because

we have allies who have nuclear

devices, Britain has nuclear devices

and we are not worried about them,

that country has with its present leadership,

I think, the intent to use that

capability against Americans, either in

theater or in the American homeland.

Mr. Speaker, when you add up capability

plus intent, you have a national

interest; and our national interest now

is to take that away from him before

he has the full capability. So I think

that reasonable people can differ on

this subject. But the lesson of Desert

Storm I was that time is not always on

our side.

If the gentleman

would yield on that point, the facts

that the gentleman is putting out are

especially important because those are

not guesses on our part. In fact, they

are not even guesses on the part of the

United Nations or on the part of the

arms inspectors. Those come from documents

from the Iraqis themselves,

from their own declarations and their

own documents. So the 6,500 liters of

anthrax, for example, which is enough

anthrax to kill around 1 million folks,

is something that came from their documentation,

not ours. That is something

that they have not turned over.

The thousands of chemical munitions

that the gentleman has gone through,

that comes from their documentation,

not ours. So this is like the storekeeper

who says here is my inventory

list, and then later on he wants you to

expect that somehow, without any outward

manifestation or anything that

could be picked up or anything that

was shown to the rest of the world, all

of those weapons have disappeared.

Let me just say, and this might be

the time to comment on this, the easiest

bet in show business is that this

tiny little handful of so-called inspectors,

and there are less inspectors than

there are policemen in the average

small town in America, the idea they

are somehow going to be able to go

through this massive state and discover

weapons of mass destruction in

these vast empty buildings that the inspectors

are being shown by the Iraqi

bureaucrats, the idea that that is in

some way going to happen is an absolute

fantasy.

So I predicted early on, before this

thing ever started, on the record, that

they were not going to find anything of

import. These folks have had a long

time to bury it. And the Iraqi bureaucrat

who actually leads arms inspectors

into these places, and 90 percent of

them are places where they have been

before, time and again, big empty

buildings, and lo and behold, there is a

weapon of mass destruction that somehow

the maid forgot to clean up from

the night before, that bureaucrat is

going to be considered two things: one,

the dumbest bureaucrat in Iraqi history,

and, secondly, shortly thereafter,

the deadest bureaucrat in Iraqi history.

So this is a state that has had an entire

agency devoted to hiding things

very effectively, and the idea that this

little bitty corporal’s guard of socalled

inspectors is somehow going to

find them, is like saying that this massive

police force in Washington, DC.,

and the police force in D.C. is 10 times

as big as the inspectors for all of Iraq,

it is like saying that the drug lords of

Washington, DC. are expected to pile

all of their cocaine at an intersection

on Pennsylvania Avenue at a given

time. When they do not pile it up, and

the Washington Post thereby concludes

that there is not any cocaine in Washington,

DC., you will have the equivalency

to what some of the media is

doing today with these reports of negative

findings with respect to Iraq.

Of course, they are not going to turn

over this stuff that they have spent

millions of dollars hiding to this little

bitty force which does not have the

ability to go in and which is having absolutely

no success in terms of finding

it.

Remember this great idea where we

were going to isolate or bring out for

interrogation these people in the Iraqi

technical establishment, the scientists,

the engineers who build this stuff?

Somehow we were going to get them

and the families alone outside of the

country, and then they were going to

tell us things, just like the ones that

have come out have told us.

Now, that has not happened; and not

surprisingly, while these people are

under the control of Saddam Hussein,

while the Iraqi guard stands there and

looks them in the eye, they say, I

would rather not talk unless I am accompanied

by one of Mr. Hussein’s officials.

Well, of course they say that. The

safety of their lives and the lives of

their children depend on them saying

that.

This country has to act in the security

interests of the United States. I

recall, with respect to these other

countries that have not come on board,

that when Menachem Begin hit the

Iraqi nuclear reactor site in Osirak in

the 1980s, lots of countries in the world

publicly deplored the act, and said this

was a terrible intrusion on the Iraqi

airspace. They then walked quietly

into the security of their own offices

and they breathed sighs of relief because

that capability had been taken

way.

Yes. I think one

French engineer was killed that way.

There was one engineer working on a

Saturday or Sunday at the Iraqi site.

As I recall, there was one engineer

killed.

My point is, the world has two faces;

one face in which they, too, are deathly

afraid of an emerging nuclear capability

on the part of Saddam Hussein,

and terrified with the present-day

chemical and biological weapons capability.

They do not want him to hurt

them, they want us to protect them.

On the other hand, those people, especially

the people that Don Rumsfeld

describes as those who live in the

neighborhood, who have to deal with

them, are going to be very reluctant to

publicly say that the bully should be

taken on, because the bully is going to

remember what they said.

I think the gentleman

has given an excellent representation

of what this dictator does, Mr. Speaker,

and what he stands for. I think that

builds an excellent context in which we

can try to evaluate whether or not

peace would work, given a chance.

First, he is deceptive. Secondly, I

think he believes his future depends on

manufacturing weapons of mass destruction.

Third, he is willing to take

his own people through enormous discomfort

and inconvenience and danger

in order to achieve his own political

ends.

But I would say to the gentleman

that there are pieces of Saddam Hussein’s

activities, although maybe not

the composite, but it can be fairly said,

and it has been said by lots of people,

are there not other dictators in the

world who do the same thing, and we

are not attacking them?

I would say that that is true. I would

say the reason that I think we should

move forward, and I think is the major

justification for this massive operation,

is American security. This guy

is the leader who has used ballistic

missiles against American troops and

killed them with it. He has used poison

gas against his own people in recent

times. He has exhibited a willingness

to kill Americans.

As a result of the background that I

have seen and the facts that I have

seen, it is my conclusion that if he can

achieve the production of a nuclear device,

that at some point he will use it

on our troops in theater or on Americans.

I think it is a wise decision to

keep him from being able to do that.

That takes us to, I think, what I

think is a very important point for policy

debate. It has been a point for policy

debate. We now have what I call the

Pearl Harbor school emerging from the

other side of this debate. Those are the

people who say, by golly, we are America.

We wait for our Pearl Harbors before

we respond. When the enemy inflicts

a heavy blow on us, that is when

we rally; that is when we talk about

the day of infamy; and that is when we

go out and strike back and overwhelm

the enemy, and justice prevails.

The problem with the Pearl Harbor

school is that these weapons are so severe

today and so dangerous and so destructive

that we cannot afford to wait

to have a Pearl Harbor occur before we

eliminate the source. To some degree,

we are carrying that out right now.

September 11 killed a lot of Americans;

but, arguably, the new tightening of

our borders, the new security efforts

we have undertaken in the American

homeland should prevent some of those

things from being able to happen again.

Therefore, it could be argued that

there is no reason for us to be in Afghanistan

going after people and disrupting

terrorist groups; in fact, in

some cases taking on people who personally

were not involved in the event

of 1995.

But what we have discovered is that

we do have to do some preemption. I

think this question is going to be facing

us again and again in this century:

Are we going to stand by and watch

somebody who has demonstrated an intent

to kill Americans develop high

technology with which he can kill lots

of Americans, and stand by and wait

for him to gain that weapon and use it

on us before we respond; or are we

going to try to eliminate that danger

before the Pearl Harbor occurs?

That is a tough thing, because Americans

do not like to be the first ones to

strike out. When we watch the speech

of FDR after Pearl Harbor, there was

no dissent in the House Chamber. That

was an easy vote, that vote for war. We

were all together, we had that common

ground, and had that feeling that we

were in the right. As Joe Lewis said,

we felt that God was on our side.

Now we are faced with these terrible

weapons, and we cannot afford to take

the blow that will come from those systems.

In a way, we are a little bit like

little tiny postage stamp Israel that

stood there and watched this nuclear

reactor being built in Iraq. They had

seen the speeches by Saddam Hussein

where he made thinly veiled threats to

the effect that the final recipient of

the output of those nuclear reactor

plants would be weapons detonating in

Israel. Israel realized they were too

small, too flimsy, too frail to take that

massive blow, so they went out and destroyed

that plant.

Unfortunately, one person was killed.

He was an engineer from France who

was working there over the weekend.

But because of that, they saved thousands

of people from being killed.

So whether we embark on this policy

of preemption or not is a valid subject

for a major policy debate, but I think,

in many cases, the answer must be yes;

and certainly in this case this person is

a person who has already killed Americans

with ballistic missiles as well as

with conventional capability, and has

tried to acquire these other capabilities.

Because of that, I think we see the

intent, and when the intent is married

up with the ability to do it, we are

going to rue the day that we, for convenience’

sake and for stability’s sake

and for safety’s sake, we gave up an opportunity

to disarm him when we had

the opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I would

just say, and I hope my colleague will

excuse me, because I have to go try to

do something we have both been working

on, and that is talk to some folks

from our Committee on the Budget and

convince them we need more for defense.

But I would say, Mr. Speaker, that I

think the gentleman has laid out a

very well-documented case for taking

action. I notice also that the gentleman

is a veteran of the Gulf War. He

told me about the apprehension that he

and other Americans had when they

heard those missiles coming in.

This is a very dangerous situation we

are in. I think we have to acknowledge

it every time we debate this issue. Is

this dangerous? Yes, it is dangerous.

The policies of doing nothing are also

extremely dangerous. This is not going

to be the easy century following the

disassembly of the Soviet empire that

we once thought it was going to be.

I think we need to have a broad military

capability, the ability to make a

surgical strike, to fight guerilla warfare,

to take on conventional attack

and armored attack, and also the ability

to stop a missile attack. We live in

an age of missiles, and we have to be

able to stop that.

In this case, we have to have the ability

to preempt and disarm an adversary

whose intended goal is to destroy

Americans. I know it is a difficult,

tough thing to do, and I would just ask

the gentleman to comment on this a

little in his remarks after I leave.

I have been impressed with this

President, because if he had wavered

slightly through this last process of

the last 6 months or so, we would be

faltering right now. But he understands

his role, which is as President of

the United States, and his duty to the

security of the United States.

That is not a role which is to be subverted

by a vote by Cameroon, for example,

or some other country whose

name Americans have difficulty remembering.

It is an American obligation

to defend Americans. He is our

Commander in Chief. He staged the

forces very effectively for this operation.

He is willing to account for the

success or failure of any military operation.

He is a good commander in chief.

I think he has done the right things.

I think some of the allies falling by

the wayside was entirely predictable,

because when good old Americans can

carry the load, other countries are

often willing to let us do that. That is

why, when we bring 90 percent of the

funding to a military operation that

they ask us to do, like Bosnia, we

sometimes choke a little bit but we

usually do it; and usually they are willing

to stand back and let us bear the

brunt of those operations, because it is

practical for them for their politics

and economy.

But this President has kept his eye

on the ball, which is to disarm Saddam

Hussein. I think he is moving this mission

forward in a very effective manner.

I want to thank the gentleman. I

would like him to talk a little bit

about Desert Storm. I have to take off,

but I would like the gentleman to

share with folks about Desert Storm,

that the gentleman is a veteran of, and

the quality and capability of the folks

we have in the Armed Forces.