Mr. Speaker, I would like

to inquire whether or not either gentleman

is opposed to the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I request the

time in opposition.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself

such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, understand this legislation

came before the committee on Friday,

one legislative day prior to today.

There has been no committee report

filed, and it was brought up under suspension.

And I believe this legislation

is very serious legislation. It is not a

casual piece of legislation condemning

a leader in another country that is

doing less than honorable things.

I see this piece of legislation as essentially

being a declaration of virtual

war. It is giving the President tremendous

powers to pursue war efforts

against a sovereign Nation. It should

not be done casually. I think it is another

example of a flawed foreign policy

that we have followed for a good

many decades.

For instance, at the beginning of this

legislation it is cited as one of the reasons

why we must do something. It

says on September 22, 1980, Iraq invaded

Iran starting an 8-year war in

which Iraq employed chemical weapons

against Iranian troops, very serious

problems. We should condemn that.

But the whole problem is we were

Iraq’s ally at that time, giving him

military assistance, giving him funds

and giving him technology for chemical

weapons.

So here we are now deciding that we

have to virtually declare war against

this individual. It is not like he is the

only hoodlum out there. I could give

my colleagues a list of 15 or 20. I do not

like the leadership of China. Why do we

not do something about China? I do not

like the leadership of Sudan. But all of

a sudden we have to decide what we are

going to give this President to pursue

getting rid of Saddam Hussein.

Just a few months ago, or last November,

we passed a resolution, and the

resolution was H.R. 137. It sounded

very general and very benign, and it

talked about the atrocities caused by

Saddam Hussein, and we asked to condemn

and also to set up a U.N. commission

to study this and give the U.N. authority

to pursue arrests and convict

and try Saddam Hussein. So this is not

something we are doing for the interests

of the United States. We are doing

this under the interests of the United

Nations, but we are the spokesperson

for them.

Not too long ago, a few years back, in

1980s, in our efforts to bring peace and

democracy to the world we assisted the

freedom fighters of Afghanistan, and in

our infinite wisdom we gave money,

technology and training to Bin Laden,

and now, this very year, we have declared

that Bin Laden was responsible

for the bombing in Africa. So what is

our response, because we allow our

President to pursue war too easily?

What was the President’s response?

Some even say that it might have been

for other reasons than for national security

reasons. So he goes off and

bombs Afghanistan, and he goes off and

bombs Sudan, and now the record

shows that very likely the pharmaceutical

plant in Sudan was precisely

that, a pharmaceutical plant.

So I say we should stop and think for

a minute before we pursue and give the

President more authority to follow a

policy that to me is quite dangerous.

This to me is equivalent to declaring

war and allowing the President to pursue

this.

Another complaint listed on this legislation:

in February 1988 Iraq forcibly

relocated Kurdish civilians from their

homes. Terrible thing to do, and they

probably did; there is no doubt about

it. But what did we do after the Persian

Gulf war? We encouraged the

Kurdish people to stand up and fight

against Saddam Hussein, and they did,

and we forgot about them, and they

were killed by the tens of thousands.

There is no reason for them to trust us.

There is no reason for the Sudanese

people to believe and trust in us, in

what we do when we rain bombs on

their country and they have done nothing

to the United States. The people of

Iraq certainly have not done anything

to the United States, and we certainly

can find leaders around the world that

have not done equally bad things. I

think we should stop and think about

this.

Just today it was announced that the

Turks are lined up on the Syrian border.

What for? To go in there and kill

the Kurds because they do not like the

Kurds. I think that is terrible. But

what are we doing about it? Who are

the Turks? They are our allies, they

are our friends. They get military assistance.

The American people are paying

the Turks to keep their military

up. So we are responsible for that.

This policy makes no sense. Some

day we have to think about the security

of United States. We spend this

money. We spent nearly $100 million

bombing nobody and everybody for who

knows what reason last week. At the

same time our military forces are

under trained and lack equipment, and

we are wasting money all around the

world trying to get more people, see

how many people we can get to hate us.

Some day we have to stop and say why

are we pursuing this. Why do we not

have a policy that says that we should,

as a Congress, defend the United

States, protect us, have a strong military,

but not to police the world in this

endless adventure of trying to be everything

to everybody. We have been

on both sides of every conflict since

World War II. Even not too long ago

they were talking about bombing in

Kosovo. As a matter of fact, that is

still a serious discussion. But a few

months ago they said, well, we are not

quite sure who the good guys are,

maybe we ought to bomb both sides. It

makes no sense. Why do we not become

friends to both sides?

There are people around the world

that we deal with that are equally repulsive

to Saddam Hussein, and I believe

very sincerely that the founders

of this country were on the right track

when they said stay out of entangling

alliances. And we should trade with

people; we would get along with them

better. We have pursued this type of

policy in Cuba for 40 years, and it has

served Castro well. Why do we not go

down and get rid of Castro? Where do

we get this authority to kill a dictator?

We do not have that authority,

and to do it under one day of hearings,

mark it up, bring it up the next day

under suspension; I do not understand

why anybody could vote for this just on

the nature of it.

We should not be doing this. We

should stop and think about it and try

to figure out a much better way.

I, for instance, am on a bill to trade

with Cuba. Oh, how horrible, we should

not trade with Cuba, they are a bunch

of Commies down there. But we should

be selling them rice and we should be

selling them our crops. We should not

be bombing these people.

As my colleagues know, at the end of

this bill I think we get a hint as to why

we do not go to Rwanda for humanitarian

reasons. Now there is some

atrocities. Why do we not clean that

mess up? Because I believe very sincerely

that there is another element

tied into this, and I think it has something

to do with money, and I think it

has something to do with oil. The oil

interests need the oil in Iraq, and he

does not, Saddam Hussein does not,

comply with the people of the west. So

he has to go.

But also at the end of this legislation

it tells us something about what might

be going on. It is they are asking to set

up and check into the funds that Saddam

Hussein owes to the west. Who is

owed? They do not owe me any money.

But I will bet my colleagues there is a

lot of banks in New York who are owed

a lot of money, and this is one of the

goals, to set up and make sure Saddam

Hussein pays his bills.

All I do is ask my colleagues to think

about it, urge them to go slowly. Nothing

is so pressing that we should give

the President this much authority to

go to war.

Under the appropriations it is endless,

it is open, endless, and here we are

concerned about saving Social Security.

Any amount of money spent on

this bill comes out of Social Security.

Yes, there was yelling and screaming

about a tax cut. Oh, it is coming out of

Social Security. Well, this money is

not appropriated, and it is such sums

as necessary for military and economic

benefits. After we get rid of one thug,

we are going to have it in. I hope we

make a better choice than we did with

Bin Laden. I mean he was our close

ally.

Please think twice, slow up, vote

against this bill. We do not need this.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of

my time.

Mr. Speaker, how much

time do I have remaining?

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself

such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana

makes some very good points indicating

that he is not convinced that

this is workable. So back to the practicality

of the bill. Even though one

might argue there is a lot of good intentions

here, even a Member that is

supporting the bill is very uncertain

whether it is workable.

In some ways, even if it is workable,

it is going to be working against us and

working against the United States and

working against the taxpayers of this

country.

But I would also like to challenge the

statement that this does not change

policy, because on section 3, it says it

should be the policy of the United

States to seek to remove the regime

headed by Saddam Hussein from power

in Iraq and promote the emergence of a

democratic government to replace that

regime.

That sounds pretty clear to me. As a

matter of fact, I think it sounds so

clear that it contradicts U.S. law. How

do you remove somebody without killing

them? Is it just because we do not

use our own CIA to bump them off that

we are not morally and legally responsible?

We will be.

So we are talking about killing Saddam

Hussein, a ruthless dictator. But

how many ruthless dictators do we

have? We have plenty. So how many

more should we go after?

So the real question is, why at this

particular time, why would we give our

President more authority to wage war?

He has way too much authority already

if the President can drop bombs when

he pleases. This of course has occurred

not only in this administration but in

the administrations of the 1980s as well

where bombs were dropped to make

some points. But generally speaking,

the points are not well made. They

usually come back to haunt us.

This is more or less what has happened.

This is part of a policy that we

have been following for quite a few decades.

Yet, the problems continue to

emerge.

We can hardly be sympathetic to the

Kurds who are being punished by the

Iraqis at the same time we are paying

the Turks to do the same thing to the

Kurds. So there is something awful inconsistent

about this.

There is nothing wrong with a policy

of trying to maintain friendship with

people, trying to trade with people and

influence them that way rather than

saying, if you do not do exactly as we

tell you, we are going to bomb you.

This is a policy we have been following

for way too long. It costs a lot of

money. It costs a lot of respect for law

because, technically, it is not legal.

Waging war should only occur when

the Congress and the people decide

this. But to casually give more and

more authority to the President to do

this and encourage him to bump off

dictators is a dangerous precedent to

set.

I think there is no doubt in my mind

what is best for the United States. We

should not pass this resolution. If there

need to be more efforts made, do it

some other way. But, obviously, this is

not a good way to do it. It is sacrificing

the principle of law. It is sacrificing

the Constitution. It is sacrificing the

practicalities of even the people who

are supporting it are not quite sure it

is going to work.

So I would say give serious consideration

to not supporting this bill. We

need a ‘‘no’’ vote on this.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of

my time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself

such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from

California makes a very good point,

that sometimes we get involved in

these battles and we never fight to

complete victory. He argues the case

for pursuing it and always winning and

take out the dictator that we are opposing.
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There is some merit to that argument,

but there is also a very good reason

why that does not happen and will

not happen. It is because when we fight

a war for non-national security reasons,

when it is limited to protecting

oil or some other interest, then there is

a limitation, there is no wanting to expand

it.

When we fight a war for national security

reasons, we declare the war, the

people join, they are willing to support

it financially, they volunteer to go into

the military, and they fight to win.

But we have not done that since World

War II, precisely because we have this

namby-pamby foreign policy of being

everything to everybody and we do not

even defend our national security adequately

enough.

The gentleman from California

makes a good point also. He is concerned

that somebody like Saddam

Hussein may attack us with weapons of

mass destruction. He is precisely right.

I am concerned about that too. But I

would say that our exposure is about

100 times greater because of our policy.

Why is it that the terrorists want to go

after Americans? Because we are always

dropping bombs on people and

telling people what to do; because we

are the policemen. We pretend to be

the arbitrator of every argument in the

world, even those that have existed for

1,000 years. It is a failed, flawed policy.

So I would say I have exactly the

same concerns, but I think the policy

that we follow has generated this problem,

and it will continue.

Mr. Speaker, let me just close by

talking a little bit about this authorization.

It says, there are to be authorized

appropriations, such sums as may

be necessary to reimburse the applicable

appropriation funds. This is what

the money is to go for: Defense articles,

defense services, military education,

and training. Sounds like getting

ready for the Bay of Pigs. That is

exactly what we did. And then we

backed off, we were not doing it for the

right reason, and of course we have solidified

for 40 years the dictatorship in

Cuba.

So do my colleagues think our policy

over the last 10 years has actually

helped to weaken Saddam Hussein?

Every time he comes out of it stronger.

And then those who say, ‘‘Well, we

should march in,’’ we should all question.

Those of us here in the Congress

who are so anxious to take out this dictator,

they should be willing to march

themselves, or send their children and

send their grandchildren. Is it worth

that? No, no, we would not want to do

that, we have to keep our troops safe,

safe from harm, but we will just pay

somebody to do it. We will pay somebody

to do it and we will make wild

promises. Promise the Kurds something.

They will take care of Saddam

Hussein. And sure enough, the promises

never come through.

I yield to the gentleman

from California.

Mr. Speaker, reclaiming

my time, I think it would be absolutely

proper to do that, as long as it came

out of the gentleman’s wallet and we

did not extract it from somebody in

this country, a taxpayer at the point of

a gun and say, look, bin Laden is a

great guy. I want more of your money.

That is what we did in the 1980s. That

is what the Congress did. They went to

the taxpayers, they put a gun to their

head, and said, you pay up, because we

think bin Laden is a freedom fighter.

Mr. Speaker, again reclaiming

my time, the policy is flawed.

The policy is flawed.

I think the conclusions we have

today are logical. I do not think they

lack logic. I think that if one decides

that we are fighting for our national

security reasons, we never stop short of

victory. So this would go along with

the gentleman’s argument that we

stopped too soon in Iraq. But we were

not there for national security reasons.

They were not about to invade us, and

they are not about to invade us. The

only way we should fear an invasion by

these hoodlums is if we incite them to

terrorism.

We should consider this a very serious

piece of legislation. This is a vote

for virtual war and giving more power

to the President. It has an open-ended

appropriation, and if we spend one

nickel on it, we are going to take it out

of Social Security, the way the budget

works around here.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance

of my time.

Mr. Speaker, on that I demand

the yeas and nays.