Madam Speaker, I cannot

resist responding to the previous

speaker’s comments.

I am appalled frankly by some of the

statements that were made from that

podium just a few short minutes ago.

The United States of America is not

acting alone. The United States of

America has not failed in diplomacy. It

is the United States of America by the

use of force through the United States

of America and its allies, including the

British, the Spaniards, the Italians and

many other countries on the European

continent, that have forced Saddam

Hussein to come up with the weapons

that he has come up with so far for destruction.

The United Nations has tried unsuccessfully,

unsuccessfully year after

year after year after year, through inspections,

through economic sanctions,

through criticism, through 16 or 18 separate

resolutions, and yet the fine lady

stands up in front of this House and

says that the way we need to start this

is with discussions.

What has been happening the last 12

years? I will tell you what has been

happening the last 12 years. Saddam

Hussein has been very methodically

building up his arsenal, and I intend

later this evening to go over not just a

broad allegation that he has got additional

weapons of mass destruction,

not just an additional, not just a broad

allegation that he has utilized these

weapons of mass destruction because

we know, in fact, he has. He has gassed

his own citizens. He used them in his

attack against Iran. He had prepared to

use them when he occupied Kuwait .

What did he do these last 15 years, 12

years? That is exactly what he has

done. He has very methodically, as I

said, built up an arsenal. And now we

have some people in our own Chambers

that stand up and say, we ought to go

talk more. We ought to start the inspection

process and eventually kind of

ramp it up a little.

Where have they been? With all due

respect to my colleagues, when does

this end? When are we going to say

enough is enough?

I hope this evening I am able to

present you with some remarks, with

some convincing evidence, persuasive

remarks that will show you just how

evil this guy is.

It is amazing to me as I look out at

the worldwide press, I do not think by

the way the worldwide population, but

as I look at the worldwide press, their

media is slanted towards building up

the good character of Saddam Hussein

and destroying the good character of

George W. Bush and America. What my

colleague failed to mention in her previous

statements here is she blames

the United States for problems with

our allies. Let me tell you, take a look

on the our allies. We have good, strong,

solid allies out there and we have good

relationships with many of our allies

out there, but the fact is we also are a

leader. We are the strongest Nation in

the world. We are not going around

boasting about it, but sometimes it

falls upon the shoulders of the strongest

person to pull that wagon up the

hill. You know, if you have horses on a

team and you are trying to get that

wagon up the hill and you have some

weak horses, at some point you have

got to replace them with strong horses.

That is not to say anything bad about

the weak horses. It may be, in fact,

that those horses were not built to pull

a wagon up the hill. That is what we

have happening here.

We have the French who for political

reasons because they do not have much

of a military, who for political reasons

have decided to advance their causes

by being the worst critic of the United

States, by being the worst critic, you

find very few words in the rhetoric on

the fine island of France, and I say island

because they are isolating themselves

within the European continent,

you find from their fine words horrible

criticism of the United States of America.

You never hear the French leaders

talk about what the United States does

for the world. Do you know if you take

a look we have no reason to apologize

for this country. This country feeds

more hungry people than any other

country in the world. This country educates

more people and educates them

to a higher level than any other country

in the world. This country exports,

it overflows with freedom compared

with any other country in the world.

This country produces the greatest inventions

known to man in the greatest

quantity of any other country in the

world. This country allows more private

property rights than any other

country in the world. Our Constitution

allows more rights for our judicial system

than any other country in the

world.

We have the best medicine. Some of

the best medicine ever known to mankind

is developed in this country. Open

heart surgery. You take a look at what

you have. Root canals. You take a look

at it. It is the United States of America.

And yet we have Members of our

own body up here apologizing and condemning

our own country for perceived

shortfalls. And what is their source?

What do they use as their source? They

use as their source the spokesman for

the French. They use as their source

the spokesman for the Germans.

Why do they not use as a source the

Americans who have been able to realize

the dream that only America offers

and that America on many occasions

has gone to battle throughout the

world to give other countries the opportunity

so that they too can enjoy

the life we have enjoyed.

If you want to apologize for being a

leader, if you want to apologize for

being strong militarily, if you want to

apologize for taking tougher action

against Saddam Hussein, then move

aside, then move aside, because the

majority of the people in this Nation

want this Nation to prevail when it

comes to freedom. They want the

United States of America to prevail

when other countries need our assistance.

They want this country to prevail,

to stop the spread of weapons of

mass destruction.

Would the gentlewoman or some of

my other colleagues here, it would be

interesting to pull out our comments

about what you thought about Saddam

Hussein when he invaded Kuwait. I

would be very interested to see what

your comments were about the French

when they went down to the Ivory

Coast last year, by the way, without

the authorization of the United Nations,

without even going to the United

Nations to say they were going to the

Ivory Coast with their military and the

overthrow they did on the Ivory Coast.

Where were my good colleagues when

the French did that?

How can you stand up here on the podium

and defend the French? The

French are our allies somewhat. Keep

in mind they are the ones that did not

help us when we asked for overflight

rights on our actions with Libya. Keep

in mind, too, to my good colleague

from the other State, keep in mind who

built that military facility in Iraq. It

was the French. Remember the one

that the Israelites took out in a bombing

raid, a very daring bombing raid

about 15 or 20 years ago? That was

built by the French.

I am amazed that Members of this

body will stand up and act as if the

United States of America is the black

sheep, as if the United States of America

should be shunned instead of talking

about the great things this country

has done, instead of talking about the

bravery of 250,000 troops over there and

a couple other hundred thousand

throughout the world and all the

troops at home that are supplying

those troops over there, their dedication

and their patriotism, to talk

about a threat that is an imminent

threat.

And do not kid yourselves, Saddam

Hussein and his regime, it is a cancer,

and you can go to the doctor and you

can tell the doctor, Doc, I do not want

to hear this announcement. I do not

want to hear your prognosis that I

have cancer. That is not what I want to

hear, Doc. Let us start from the beginning

and see if you can leave out the

cancer part of it when you give your

prognosis to me.

The doctor says to you, look, you can

couch it any way you want. You can

paint it any way you want. You can

blame all your neighbors. You can have

your neighbors blame you, but the fact

is there is cancer out there and you

better deal with it, because if you do

not deal with it all you are doing is not

eliminating the problem, you are passing

the problem on to the next generation.

Do not all of us wish, even the gentlewoman

who just spoke, do not all of

us wish that we would have resolved

this issue in 1990 or the first Persian

Gulf War when we had the opportunity?

And what stopped us from resolving

the issue, from destroying that regime

or taking out that regime in 1990 when

we had the opportunity? What stopped

us? It was not George Bush, Sr., that

stopped us. It was the United Nations

that said do not go into Baghdad. Stay

out of Baghdad. Leave Saddam Hussein

in power. And now look what we did.

We have passed it to another generation.

I happen to be in the generation that

it was passed to. And as a Member of

that generation, I do not want to see it

passed to the next generation. I want

us to face up to this problem and our

President has done a darn good job.

Remember, this country retains its

sovereignty, despite what Annan says

over at the United Nations, despite

what he says, the sovereignty of the

United States remains with the United

States.

We have never shifted our sovereignty

to the United Nations, and I

want to speak a little more about the

United Nations here in a moment, but

the United States did not need to go to

the United Nations. The French did not

go to the United Nations for their recent

action on the Ivory Coast. We

were not required to go to the United

Nations. In fact, many of my constituents

have said why did we even go to

the United Nations? Why did we not

just go out take care of the problem

and move on?

The fact is that our President,

George W. Bush, who has been unfortunately

roundly criticized by some of

my colleagues, it was his decision to

take this to the United Nations. It is

George W. Bush, who I happen to think

is doing a remarkable job in his leadership,

he is our Commander in Chief. He

is the one who has led the pursuit of

every diplomatic and reasonable, he

has got to be reasonable, but every diplomatic

channel.

While my good colleagues were enjoying

the weekend, where was our

Commander in Chief? He was on the

telephone talking to China. He was on

the telephone talking to Japan. He was

on the telephone talking to Russia. He

wants this resolved diplomatically, but

at least he has got enough guts that if

it is not resolved diplomatically, he

will resolve it militarily.

Thank goodness we have got the

team that we have down there at that

White House. Everybody in this Chamber,

in my opinion, would take a second

seat to a Condoleezza Rice. Everybody

in this Chamber, with due respect

to my colleagues, I include myself

there, would take a second seat to Dick

Cheney, our Vice President. Everybody

in this Chamber would take a second

seat to Colin Powell. Everybody in this

Chamber would take a second seat to

Donald Rumsfeld.

Yet, many in this Chamber think

they know it all. I am not being overly

critical. I am just trying to say after

these remarks that I hear condemning

the United States, maybe not condemning

the United States, but saying

that we have led the worst diplomatic

disaster in history, oh my gosh, it is

clear there is not an in-depth study of

history in those kind of remarks.

Where is the United Nations? I want

to talk a little bit about the United

Nations. I want to talk a little bit

about the French and Germans, and I

want to answer some of the questions,

and most of all, I want to read an article

that I think is right on point.

I actually went through it the other

night, but many people asked that I go

through it again, and I look forward to

that, but first of all, let me talk about

the United Nations. Let us face it. Let

us take a look at what the United Nations

is all about.

It has 191 member representatives in

it, 191, and not being critical of the

other 190, but if we take a look at that

pool, just by the nature of our culture,

just by the nature of the environments

that we grew up in, just by the nature

of our traditions in our particular

countries, just by the nature of the

governments that are within our country,

we are different people. There are

inherent conflicts.

There are a lot of things that we can

do together, and I am one of those people

that, while I think the United Nations

is a paper tiger when it comes to

military action, I think the United Nations

has a proper place in our society.

What is a proper role for the United

Nations to play?

Let us start out, I think the United

Nations can be kind of the centralizing

authority to give us the help and the

distribution we need to assist countries

that have starving populations. For example,

when we have a problem in

Ethiopia, I bet the United Nations can

help us with that problem. When we

have a problem in Somalia, after they

drag our soldiers through the streets,

we cannot call on the United Nations.

They do not have that capability. We

have overestimated, we have exaggerated

the role of the United Nations and

its capability to carry anything on of

substance, even in a diplomatic forum,

with the exception of some very specific

duties, and let me give my colleagues

another example.

The President covered it very well in

his State of the Union Address. We

have a horrible plague of AIDS

throughout the world. We need to conquer

that disease. The United Nations

is a good institution to lead that battle.

The United Nations is a good institution

to help with resources for advice

on farming, to provide agricultural resources

and so on.

But do my colleagues not understand,

the United Nations, not because

it is inherently evil or incompetent or

incapable, but the United Nations, just

by the fact of its structure, just by the

way it is built, just by the way it is

built, is not designed to be able to go

into a country of mass destructions

and face them down. The United Nations

does not have the capability because

of its membership to face them

down. We cannot get that membership

all put together.

Take a look at the United Nations.

One of the biggest problems in the

world that we spend a lot of time and

resources on is human rights. This

country leads the world in human

rights, but what does the United Nations

do? One of the countries that is

one of the worst abusers of human

rights and makes list after list year

after year is Libya. What do they do at

the United Nations? They name the

Libya representative as the head of the

Human Rights Commission. That is

why they are ineffective when it comes

to this type of international geopolitical

action. We should understand

that their role needs to be more targeted

towards the things of which I

spoke.

Let me say just a couple of words

about the French and the Germans. I

think the French are the shining example

of hypocrisy. Let me quote from a

recent Wall Street Journal editorial:

But before we move on to war, says the

editorial, let us pause to honor the

grandeur of French hypocrisy on ‘‘the

unilateral’’ use of military force.

France seldom bothered to ask the

United Nations or anyone else when it

concludes its own interests are at

stake. When a failed coup in the Ivory

Coast last fall, and many of my colleagues

probably do not even realize

this, many of my colleagues probably

could not identify with, and I am not

being derogatory, but could not identify

where the Ivory Coast is, but last

fall the French sent troops down to the

Ivory Coast because they had a failed

coup, and let me go back to the quote:

When a failed coup in the Ivory Coast

last fall blossomed into a rebellion

that threatened civil war, France never

did get around to asking for a Security

Council resolution. President Jacques

Chirac also forgot to ask George W.

Bush for his permission. Rather, he dispatched

hundreds and eventually thousands

of paratroopers and French legionnaires

to contain the violence, to

protect French citizens and to prevent

the rebels from overrunning the country.

I would ask my good colleague, who

had just previously spoken, would my

colleague call the French’s action on

the Ivory Coast, would my colleague

give them the same criticism she has

just given the United States of America,

that it is the lead example of the

most horribly failed diplomacy or

whatever the quote was? The French

act when it is in their own interest.

How ironic that they criticize the

United States when the United States

and its allies act in our interests, and

I keep saying the United States and its

allies.

With the worldwide media now, it is

almost laughed off the table by my colleague

who spoke before me. She says,

well, these little countries, these little

countries in Europe that are allied

with the United States, I forget exactly

what she said, but the effect of it was,

does not mean much. Look at the big

players. Let me tell my colleagues,

those little countries in Europe mean a

lot to us, and those little countries in

Europe, they happen to think they are

pretty important to this. After all,

their continent is pretty important.

Let me tell my colleagues, if we want

to go just by geographical size and by

population size, let us take a look in

that order of the allies that I speak of

when I say the United States of America,

that the worldwide media has

largely ignored as a coalition of the

willing. Start off with the United

States of America. Put on to it Great

Britain. Put on to that the Spanish,

Spain. Put on to that the Italians.

Then we start talking about Hungary.

We can start talking about Poland. We

can start talking about many other

countries.

In fact, I think the coalition that

will be put together for this action, if

Saddam Hussein does not unilaterally

disarm, I think that coalition will

come very close or, in fact, exceed the

size of the coalition for the first Persian

Gulf War. This is not, as my colleague

said, and I did write this down,

the U.S. against the world. What a

misstatement. That is a misstatement.

It is not the United States against the

world. It is the United States for the

world, and a big part of the world is

with the United States of America.

In the United States of America we

can take any example we want in history,

no country in history has ever

gone beyond its borders, as the United

States has, for other countries. We can

take a look at World War I. We can

take a look at World War II. We can

take a look at the Persian gulf. We can

take a look anytime there is a disaster

in the world, what kind of relief do we

see? United States of America.

When people are starving and we are

allowed to get aid in there, what do we

see on those bags of flour? United

States of America. We have got an

awful lot to be proud of, and frankly,

we can be proud of our President and

this administration. He is our Commander

in Chief, and I can tell my colleagues

frankly, over the weekend I listened

to people like Sean Penn, a

movie actor. I listened to Neil Young,

big time singer in my generation. I listened

to one of my favorite actresses,

Julia Roberts. These are very talented

actors, and I am appalled that all of

the sudden they think they have doctorates

in foreign policy, and they

think that the President should take

second seat to them.

I looked at one of the papers today,

the New York Times perhaps or maybe

it was the Wall Street Journal, full

page ad from people who call themselves

writers, ‘‘We are against the

war.’’ Those people have not spent a

fraction of the time that even my colleagues

here on the floor have spent on

what we are dealing with here, and I

hope they are paying attention this

evening. I am sure they are not, but I

sure wish some of them were paying attention

this evening to explain away

just exactly what Iraq is going to do

with these weapons of mass destruction.

We elected our President, and President

after President we put confidence

in our administration and our leadership.

They know a lot more than we

know. My colleagues know a lot more

than their constituents generally, simply

not because we are brighter but because

we have had classified briefings,

because it is our job to know more. It

is the President’s job to know a little

more about these foreign issues than

some of our good actors that come out

of Hollywood who stand up there on a

stage and condemn this country, a

country that has given them all the

privileges that they enjoy. Tell me

that Sean Penn could go anywhere else

in the world and fulfill the American

dream. We have got to act as a team

here.

In regards to the Germans, I mean

the French are getting a lot of political

hay out of this. Jacques Chirac, his

popularity polls have gone through the

roof. He is able to dance on the stage

without paying the band. He is able to

enjoy the fruits, as he has for a long

time, of the labor that the United

States of America has put out there.

The French really are not a significant

military power anymore. Where

they have their power is in the Security

Council. That is why they want to

go through there because they have a

veto, and frankly, I just came from

Paris, I just came from visiting NATO

meetings, and by going out and talking

on the street, a lot of people in Germany

and a lot of people in France,

they think terrorism, the big threat is

the United States. They do not see it

as such a big issue, and I understand

that if the French want to stand out of

the battle, as they often do when the

going gets tough, the French do not

want to play. I can understand that.

That is their nature. That is their

character. I can understand that.

The Germans, a little different story,

but I can still understand that, but

there is a big difference between standing

aside, stepping out of the fight, and

standing aside and cheering on the opposition.

That should not happen.

A lot of people want to do everything

they can to get rid of Saddam Hussein

except fight him. Everybody wants to

think they can sweet talk Saddam out

of his regime. It is not going to happen.

I hope that Saddam Hussein takes

the chance, the last chance that is now

being given to him by the United

States of America and its coalition,

and I hope that he disarms, but I kind

of doubt that he will. I think it is possible

he may go into exile, but the fact

is it is the United States of America

that has forced the United Nations to

do something about it, and the United

Nations in November accepted. They

adopted 1141 that did something about

it, but when it came time to call in the

chips, the United Nations, because in

my opinion of the makeup of the

United Nations, could not stand up and

carry its own weight, and at that point,

once again, the United States and the

allies that can carry the weight need to

step in.

Madam Speaker, I want to read a letter,

and I spoke to this the other

evening; but let me, first, Madam

Speaker, get a time check.

I understand I have 35

minutes remaining, and I will yield

back 10 minutes; so in my remaining 25

minutes let me begin by reading a letter,

and I am quoting from Alistair

Cooke. And as I mentioned the other

night, I do not like to read from somebody

else’s script. I like to pull in

quotes, and I hope I give credit to the

quotes that are out there, but this is a

very moving article.

We all know that history is a good

study. It does not tell us exactly what

will happen in the future, but any good

history teacher will tell us that the

failure to understand past history will

certainly be a significant handicap to

any kind of understanding of how to

prepare for the future. There is no

crystal ball out there that tells us

about the future, but history gives us

an advantage. This article, I think, reflects

very accurately some history

that I hope all of us will think about.

Let me read this, and I will quote

throughout the article. I will leave the

article periodically to make a comment,

but I will tell my colleagues

when I do that.

Mr. Cooke: ‘‘I promised to lay off

topic A, Iraq, until the Security Council

makes a judgment on the inspector’s

report, and I shall keep that

promise. But I must tell you that

throughout the past fortnight I’ve listened

to everybody involved in or looking

on to a monstrous din of words,

like a tide crashing and receding on a

beach, making a great noise and saying

the same thing over and over and over.

And this ordeal triggered a nightmare,

a daymare, if you like. Throughout the

ceaseless tide I heard a voice.’’

This is Mr. Cooke talking about his

dream. He heard a voice. ‘‘I heard a

voice, a very English voice of an old

man, Prime Minister Chamberlain,

saying: ‘‘I believe it is peace for our

time,’’ a sentence that prompted a

huge cheer, first from a listening street

crowd and then from the House of Commons

and next day from every newspaper

in the land. There was a move to

urge that Mr. Chamberlain should receive

the Nobel Peace Prize.

‘‘In Parliament there was one unfamiliar

old grumbler to growl out: ‘I believe

we have suffered a total and unmitigated

defeat.’ He was, in view of

the general sentiment, very properly

booed down. This scene concluded in

the autumn of 1938 the British Prime

Minister’s effectual signing away of

most of Czechoslovakia to Hitler.’’

So leaving the text for a minute, in

1938, Chamberlain signed over Czechoslovakia

to Hitler, much like Saddam

Hussein. Give him what he wants. Appease

him. Back down to what is good

for the world. Back down in your own

interest. But you need to cover that. A

politician cannot back away without

giving it some kind of cover, and Prime

Minister Chamberlain said, ‘‘I believe

it is peace for our time.’’

Now, going back to the script again,

let me start: ‘‘This scene concluded in

the autumn of 1938 the British Prime

Minister’s effectual signing away of

most of Czechoslovakia to Hitler. The

rest of it, within months, Hitler walked

in and conquered. ‘‘Oh dear,’’ said Mr.

Chamberlain, thunderstruck, ‘‘He has

betrayed my trust.’’

‘‘During the last fortnight a simple

but startling thought occurred to me.

Every single official, diplomat, president,

prime minister involved in the

Iraq debate was in 1938 a toddler, most

of them unborn. So the dreadful scene

I’ve just drawn will not have been remembered

by many listeners.

‘‘Hitler had started betraying our

trust not 12 years but only 2 years before,

when he broke the First World

War peace treaty by occupying the demilitarized

zone of the Rhineland. Only

half his troops carried one reload of

ammunition because Hitler knew that

French morale was too low to confront

any war just then, and 10 million of the

11 million British soldiers had signed a

so-called peace ballot. It stated no conditions,

it elaborated no terms, it simply

counted the numbers of Britons

who were ‘for peace.’

‘‘The slogan of this movement was

‘against war and fascism,’ chanted at

the time by every Labour man and Liberal

and many moderate Conservatives,

a slogan that now sounds as imbecilic

as ‘against hospitals and disease.’ In

blunter words, a majority of Britons

would do anything.’’

And let me leave the script here. This

is probably the most important paragraph

of what I am reading, or one of

the most important:

‘‘In blunter words, a majority of Britons

would do anything, absolutely anything,

to get rid of Hitler except fight

him. At that time the word preemptive

had not been invented, though today

it’s a catchword. After all, the Rhineland

was what it said it was, part of

Germany. So to march in and throw

Hitler out would have been preemptive,

wouldn’t it?

‘‘Nobody did anything and Hitler

looked forward with confidence to gobbling

up the rest of Western Europe

country by country, ‘course by course,’

as the growler Churchill put it.

‘‘I bring up Munich and the mid ‘30s

because I was fully grown, on the verge

of 30, and knew we were indeed living

in the age of anxiety. And so many of

the arguments mounted against each

other today, in the last fortnight, are

exactly what we heard in the House of

Commons debates and read in the

French press.

‘‘The French especially urged, after

every Hitler invasion, ‘negotiation, negotiation.’

’’

Let me leave the text. Let me repeat

this paragraph. The French especially

urged, after every Hitler invasion,

every time Hitler invaded a country,

the French would stand up and say negotiate,

negotiate.

‘‘They negotiated so successfully as

to have their entire country defeated

and occupied. But as one famous

French Leftist said, ‘We did anyway

manage to make them declare Paris an

open city. No bombs on us!’.

‘‘In Britain, the general response to

every Hitler advance was disarmament

and collective security. Collective security

meant to leave every crisis to

the League of Nations. It would put

down aggressors, even though, like the

United Nations, it had no army, navy

or air force.

‘‘The League of Nations had its

chance to prove itself when Mussolini

invaded and conquered Ethiopia. The

league didn’t have any shot to fire.’’

Some comparison. I leave the text.

Some comparison to the United Nations.

‘‘But still the cry was chanted in the

House of Commons, the League and

collective security is the only true

guarantee of peace. But after the

Rhineland, the maverick Churchill decided

there was no collectivity in collective

security and started a highly

unpopular campaign for rearmament

by Britain, warning against the general

belief that Hitler had already built an

enormous mechanized army and a superior

air force.

‘‘But he’s not used them, he’s not

used them, people protested. Still, for 2

years before the outbreak of the Second

World War you could read the debates

in the House of Commons and

now shiver at the famous Labour men.

Major Attlee was one of them who

voted against rearmament and still

went on pointing to the League of Nations

as the savior.

‘‘Now, this memory of mine may be

totally irrelevant to the present crisis.

It haunts me. I have to say I have written

elsewhere with much conviction

that the most historical analogies are

false because, however strikingly similar

a new situation may be to an old

one, there’s usually one element that is

different.

‘‘And it may well be so here. All I

know is that all the voices of the ’30s

are echoing through 2003.’’

Take a look at the history of the

League of Nations. Take a look at what

happened in 1938, when Churchill had

to stand up and tried to convince the

people that these weapons were being

developed. Take a look at 1938 and see

if you do not think you are seeing a replay

when the French stood up every

time Hitler invaded a country and said,

negotiate, negotiate.

Well, now let us just move from that

and let us just show some of the facts

that I want to present. People have

said, including the previous speaker,

that, well, we need to start these negotiations.

We need to be patient. We

need to work through this. This is 13

years. Every resolution here, 678, 687,

707, clear down to 1284, every one of

these resolutions Iraq has violated.

Every one of these resolutions the U.N.

stood up as if this was the last resolution

because it was going to resolve it.

You know, if you signed a contract

with somebody and you had this many

contracts with an individual, and that

individual broke every contract, every

one of those you had with them, do you

think that would give you a little history

as to the next contract and how

effective it might be?

We hear people say, well, Iraq is not

a dangerous country. We have got Iraq

contained. How contained did the world

have Iraq when it gassed its own communities,

the Kurds? How contained

did the world have Iraq when it invaded

Kuwait? Were they able to stop them?

We were able to. The United States of

America, leading the coalition, was

able to push them back. But we could

not stop the initial invasion. How

about Iran, when Iraq started the war

with Iran?

Take a look at these and take a look

at the weapons he used. These are

weapons of mass destruction. These are

weapons that yesterday Saddam Hussein

said he had, but today he denies he

has them; and tomorrow, frankly, he

will use them, in my opinion. He has

the history.

Again, going back in history, again

reflecting on history. Date: August

1983, mustard gas kills 100 people; October

1983, mustard gas kills 3,000 of his

own people; February 1984, mustard gas

kills 2,500 Iranians; March 1984, mustard

gas, or Tabun, 50 to 100; March

1985, mustard gas; 1986, mustard gas;

1986, mustard gas; 1987, mustard gas;

1987, mustard gas; 1988, mustard gas

and nerve agents.

This guy has got a history. This is a

horrible individual we are dealing with.

I am telling you, from the bottom of

my heart, this is a cancer on our body.

And we have different people telling us,

look, do not take it off. Just ignore it;

it will go away. I wish we could pray it

away, I wish we could hope it away, I

wish diplomatically we could negotiate

it away. It did not work in 1938 with

Hitler, and it is not going to work in

2003 with Saddam Hussein, in my opinion.

We tried to make it work. We

spared his life through the direction of

the United Nations in 1990. We spared

Saddam Hussein. We listened to the

French; we listened to the United Nations

to let his regime exist. Do not destroy

his regime; he has learned his lesson.

Just like Hitler, negotiate, negotiate.

People said let us do anything we

can except fight him. We are seeing a

repeat of history.

Thank goodness we have a leadership

team that understands this and is not

willing to let history repeat itself and

is willing to stand up not only for the

security of the United States of America

but for the security of those countries

that are not able, that do not

have the capability of our great country

and our allies to go in and stop this

from occurring. We have the capability

today to stop that cancer. We have the

chemotherapy treatment. We think we

can make this patient do a lot better.

And yet members of our own family are

trying to convince the patient to walk

away from the doctor’s office, to deny

that the cancer exists, or to admit that

it exists and pretend it will go away

and to try to negotiate with cancer.

You cannot negotiate with cancer.

You must deal with overwhelming superiority

if you have got it. And if it is

too late, there is not much you can do.

Cancer wins the battle a lot of times. It

is the same thing here. We have got the

tools. We have got the capability. If we

do not do it, who will? If the United

States of America and its allies do not

stand up to this kind of stuff, who will?

Do you think the French will ever

stand up? Do you think the Germans

will ever stand up?

Many countries in the world will not

stand up because they do not have the

tools. There are a lot of people that

would like to join the fight, that would

stand up if they had the tools. We have

it and we have an inherent obligation

to the next generation to do everything

we can to stop it while we can.

I am the generation that got it transferred

to me. We could have stopped it

in 1990. We did not do it. And I will be

darned if I am going to stand by and let

my generation pass on this problem of

mass weapons with this horrible, horrible

individual. I will be darned if I am

going to stand on the sidelines and pass

that to the next generation.

Madam Speaker, I hear some peace

people say what weapons, he does not

have weapons of mass destruction or he

is not a danger to us. I just answered

what kind of danger exists.

This is a document of weapons that

Iraq has: Mustard gas, 2,850 tons; sarin

nerve gas, 795 tons; VX nerve gas, 3.9

tons; tabun nerve agent, 210 tons. This

is deadly stuff. Anthrax, 25,000 tons,

and we all saw what a few sprinkles of

anthrax dust did in the United States

Capitol. Take a look at what this will

do. Imagine if there were 25,000 tons.

Where did our Nation come up with

this list? We did not just create it. This

is a list that Saddam Hussein produced

for us. This is the list that Iraq admitted

they had. Today they said trust me,

despite the fact that for 12 years I have

broken resolution after resolution, despite

the fact that I invaded Kuwait

and Iran, despite the fact that I gassed

by nerve agents my own citizens, the

Kurds, trust me, I do not have these

weapons any more.

What did the United Nations do? The

United Nations is willing to sit by and

say, let us trust him.

Madam Speaker, it is the end of the

line. We cannot continue to let this

cancer spread.

I do not want Members to think it is

a partisan effort up here. It is bipartisan.

Let me conclude my remarks

with a quote, and I want Members to

read this quote with me. ‘‘What if Saddam

Hussein fails to comply and we

fail to act, or we take some ambiguous

third route which gives him yet more

opportunities to develop his program of

weapons of mass destruction and continue

to press for the release of sanctions

and continue to ignore the solemn

commitments that he made. He

will conclude that the international

community has lost its will. He will

then conclude that he can go right on

and continue to build an arsenal of devastating

destruction. President Bill

Clinton, February 19, 1998.’’

Madam Speaker, let us not make it a

replay of 1938. Let us stand by the

President of this country and the bipartisan

resolution this Congress authorized.

We are a can-do country. Our

allies are can-do allies, and we can get

this job done.