Mr. Speaker, Members

who were not here during the first Persian

Gulf War, the next few days will

probably be some of the most serious

time that we have served in the House.

The consequences of the action of our

Nation will be consequences that will

go down in history. I think it is a good

time this evening for us to sit back and

take a look at what are our responsibilities.

What are our responsibilities as Republicans?

What are our responsibilities

as Democrats? On what issues

should we act in a bipartisan fashion?

On what issues should we go out and be

willing to stand up for the issues, for

the very standards that this country

stands for? I think in the next 48 hours

or so, our country, it is pretty obvious,

will engage in a military conflict; and

I think it is for the right reasons.

President Bush’s speech last night

was simple, not a lot of fancy language.

It was straightforward. He did not

mince any words; but more than anything

else, it was appropriate. It spoke

of the responsibility of the Commander

in Chief. It spoke of the responsibility

of the United States of America. It

spoke of the responsibility of the allies

and the willing coalition that has the

gumption, has the foresight to stand up

to one of the most vicious men and one

of the most vicious regimes in the history

of the world. It is time for us to

stand united.

When we speak about responsibility,

let us talk about what another President

thought about responsibility. Let

us talk about Bill Clinton, the former

President of the United States. He recognized,

and whatever issues Members

have with Bill Clinton, he recognized

what Iraq was about and what Saddam

Hussein was about. Unfortunately, in

the last few days I think the former

President has violated kind of an

unspoken rule and that is past Presidents

do not interfere or try to interfere

or play politics on foreign matters

especially at a time of war. But President

Clinton and, of course, former

President Jimmy Carter have decided

to speak out.

But I want to relate to Members and

show exactly what President Clinton

recognized; he recognized what the responsibility

of this Nation was against

the horrible regime of Saddam Hussein.

This is what Bill Clinton said about it

on February, 18, 1998. President Clinton

on Saddam Hussein and Saddam’s

threat: ‘‘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 ignore

the solemn commitments that he

made? Well, he will conclude that the

international community has lost its

will. He will then conclude he can go

right on and build an arsenal of devastation

and destruction.’’ Bill Clinton

1998.

That President recognized the responsibility

of this country, and President

Bush and his team at the White

House have correctly recognized and

stood up for the responsibility of this

country and our willing allies. I want

to talk about what are the responsibilities

of the United Nations; what can

the United Nations do and what should

we expect from the United Nations; and

what can they not do or what would be

defined as an overexpectation of the

capabilities of the United Nations.

Let me say first of all, we have to

look at the structure of the United Nations

to understand why, when it

comes to standing up militarily or taking

a tough police action which involves

military engagement, we can

see why the United Nations the way it

is structured cannot possibly come to

an agreement on how to do that. They

could not come to an agreement in

Kosovo where we had clear and resounding

agreement on Slobodan

Milosevic. They could not come to an

agreement on the Cold War or on Somalia.

The United Nations, time after

time when we take a look at particular

actions that require military engagement,

the United Nations cannot come

to a decision. Why can they not come

to a decision? Because of the makeup

of the United Nations.

The United Nations has 192 separate

countries. The United Nations has chosen

to put Libya as head of the Human

Rights Commission; and they actually

had Iraq to chair the U.N. conference

on disarmament. Mr. Speaker, Iraq was

chairing the United Nations conference

on disarmament. How can we expect

much more from the United Nations.

The United Nations has failed to act.

The United States and its willing coalition

has stood up to its responsibilities.

The United Nations, unfortunately,

was bulled over, as they always

are, in my opinion, in part by the

French. And the French, the only success

that I have seen in the last month

or 6 months or 12 years, frankly, the

only success I have seen from the

French and the Germans and the Belgians

is to successfully isolate themselves.

It is interesting to think that the

members of the United Nations like

North Korea, Libya, Iraq and Iran consider

the French their ally. Who could

have ever imagined, who could have

ever imagined that the French, the perception

out there in the country of renegade

nations, that those nations

would recognize France as their ally?

We all grew up with the understanding

that the French were a democratic

society, a society that stood

strong with the United States, although

the French never really led the

battle. Keep in mind in World War II, it

was the French, and frankly when we

look at it, take a look at where they

were. It was the French that adopted

the constant policy negotiate, negotiate,

negotiate, talk, talk, talk. In

World War II some of these countries in

Europe wanted to do everything they

could to get rid of Adolph Hitler, except

for one thing. They did not want

to fight him. They did not want to take

him head on.

But back to the United Nations. How

can the United Nations function when

it is 192 separate countries from 192 different

economic levels from a variety

of different types of governments within

those countries, whether it is democracy,

communism, socialism, dictatorship

or run by a bunch of thugs

like we saw in Somalia? Those 192 different

countries have different economic

levels and cultural environments

that they have adopted over the

years, and different treatments of

human rights. Take a look at the

treatment of women in Iraq or the

treatment of children in Iraq and the

so-called theory of education in Iraq,

and the starvation and prejudice that

we see in North Korea; but yet all of

those countries are standing members

of the United Nations, and I am being

told that we can expect the United Nations

to come together on an issue of

serious consequences such as the engagement

of a military conflict? We

can understand why it has taken the

United Nations 12 years to reach a decision

that they cannot reach a decision.

The United Nations is in fact on

military engagement a paper tiger.

Does the United Nations have an appropriate

location and what is their responsibility?

One, their responsibility

right now at the very beginning, and

the responsibility of the French and

the responsibility of the Germans and

the responsibility of the Belgians, they

should all adopt resolutions supporting

the troops of the willing coalition.

They should all put out a resolution

supporting a regime change of Saddam

Hussein. The door has closed on the so-called

diplomatic relations as stated by

the President.

If the Germans and French want to

continue what I think were good allies

or at least an alliance that withstood a

lot of pressures through the years, they

need to come out and support the

Americans troops and the troops of

their neighbors, the troops of Spain

and Italy and the British troops. The

French, the Germans, and the Belgians

need not go any further to be identified

as allies of North Korea, as allies of

Libya, as allies of the regime in Iraq,

and as allies of Iran. They need to distinguish

themselves, and all they have

done in the last several months is to

isolate themselves in a corner with

those rogue countries.

We have had the debate and discussions.

We are going to engage in a military

conflict, barring some miracle in

the next 24 hours. The French, it is

time for our allies to stand up. We are

not asking for much, they would not

give us much, but they at least ought

to stand up and support the American

troops, and that is the responsibility I

think; and I am not asking too much of

those allies who I feel this time

around, as in the past, have let us

down.

But going back to the United Nations,

where does the United Nations

fit in this puzzle? How can the United

Nations be an effective institution? I

think they can be an effective institution

as long as we focus very narrowly

on the responsibilities. Again coming

back to the responsibilities, one, responsibilities

that they can handle;

and, two, responsibilities that they can

effectively carry out.

As I have made clear in my statements,

the United Nations cannot effectively

handle nor can they come to

any kind of decision when it comes to

military conflict in the world. They

just do not have the structure to do it.

We cannot have 192 nations with that

kind of diversity with those different

kinds of governments come to an

agreement.

But the United Nations can play a

role. What role do I see them play? I

see the United Nations as a social institution,

as an institution that can

probably effectively deliver food to

starving countries such as Ethiopia,

maybe even help under certain circumstances

to deliver what human aid

they can to North Korea, what human

aid will not go straight to the military,

what will go to the people.

I see the United Nations as a social

institution which can help facilitate

and lead the world’s fight against

AIDS, and be a leader against breast

cancer and prostate cancer and health

in general. I think they can be effective

in those areas. But it is a huge mistake,

and it has been proven in the last

several weeks, for us to assume that

the United Nations can really play an

effective role in standing down a regime

like Saddam Hussein.

To me the United Nations is kind of

like Chamberlain was in 1938 with Hitler.

I have a well-written article, and

let me give credit to the author,

Alistair Cook. Throughout the ceaseless

tide, there was a voice of an old

man, Prime Minister Chamberlain,

saying instead of taking on Hitler, I believe

it is peace for our time. When he

made that statement, instead of going

to war to stop Hitler from taking

Czechoslovakia and other countries, he

said, I believe it is time for the peace

of our time.

The entire House of Commons applauded.

They stood up. They gave him

a standing ovation. Only one old

grumpy man in the back of the room

said much of anything, and he said, ‘‘I

believe we’ve suffered a total and unmitigated

defeat when we look at

somebody like Hitler and say it is,

Peace for our time. Appease him.’ ’’

That grumpy old man happened to be a

guy named Churchill. The scene concluded

in the autumn of 1938 with the

British Prime Minister’s effectual signing

away of most of Czechoslovakia to

Hitler, the appeasement. The rest of it,

within months, Hitler went ahead and

walked into it and conquered it. ‘‘Oh,

dear,’’ said Mr. Chamberlain, ‘‘he has

betrayed my trust. Oh, my gosh, Hitler

has betrayed my trust.’’

What do you think you are dealing

with when you are dealing with a Saddam

Hussein? That is why in my opinion

the United Nations really, I think,

have tremendously weakened themselves.

I do not see any circumstances

whatsoever. I mean, we have a history

of 12 years of the United Nations, and I

have got a poster over there that shows

resolution after resolution after resolution

after resolution, appeasement

after appeasement after appeasement

after appeasement. And where has it

gotten us? It has not gotten us anywhere.

Frankly, I think, in fact, it has

gotten us into a war.

I think if the United Nations would

have taken just their first resolution

and followed through with what they

said they were going to do, if they

would have put inspectors in there that

really meant something, if they would

have enforced that, we could have done

it diplomatically. The United Nations

probably could have done it during

that period of time diplomatically. But

instead they adopted the doctrine of

appeasement. They adopted the doctrine

of the French. Negotiate, negotiate,

negotiate, negotiate. Do whatever

you can to get rid of the problem

except fight it.

The policy that was adopted by the

United Nations, the policy that has

been adopted by the French and the

Germans and the Belgians is the policy

of going to the cancer doctor, and when

he tells you that you have cancer, you

say, ‘‘Doctor, I don’t want to believe it.

I’m going to go out of this room and

hope I can talk to some friends about

what a horrible thing it is, and it’s

going to go away on itself. Don’t talk

to me about cutting my foot off, Doctor.

There’s got to be some other way

to handle this cancer, maybe some

warm talk or maybe prayer.’’ Prayer

helps, by the way, but it usually does

not get rid of the cancer. ‘‘Maybe there

is some other alternative other than

going in there under the knife, Doc, to

attack this cancer.’’

The fact is that had you attacked the

cancer when you first went to the doctor,

the next time you go to the doctor,

it probably would not be all over your

body. The fact that here in the United

Nations, had the United Nations not let

the world down, had the French and

the Germans been as insistent on the

United Nations enforcing their first

resolution as they are insistent on the

United States and its allies not enforcing

1441, the 16th or 17th resolution, we

would not be here today. We would not

have a war.

It amazes me that the French stand

out to the world as the peacemakers of

the world, as if they are the Chamberlains.

Where were they in 1993 and 1994

and 1995 and 1997? By the way, those

were years that Saddam Hussein was

using mustard gas, nerve gas and anthrax

against his own population.

Where were the French? Where were

the Germans?

I honestly think we could have avoided

war today had we tackled that cancer

back then, but they did not do it.

The United Nations has, as the President

says in dealing with the French,

the United Nations has played their

hand. They are not fit. They are not

structurally designed to do this. They

do not have the gumption or the leadership

to do this. They cannot get the

votes to do this. They are not a military

institution. They are not an institution

that can issue resolutions and

then back it with discipline.

It is kind of like going to school. I

knew some teachers that became principals.

They were not successful as

principals. They were great teachers.

In fact, in most cases they were too

nice to be a principal. They could not

bring it upon themselves, one, to discipline

other teachers, and they could

not bring it upon themselves, even

though we were friends with the principal,

we knew we got away with misbehavior

because the principal was too

nice, he just could not bring it upon

himself in this particular case to discipline

us. We read that like a clock,

just like a clock.

Saddam Hussein can read the United

Nations like a clock. It is not complicated,

by the way. You figure it out

pretty soon. It is like going to the

cookie jar. You find out pretty soon

whether you are going to get in trouble

or not for getting your hand in the

cookie jar. If you are not in trouble,

you tend to find your hand going to the

cookie jar a little more frequently.

I think the United Nations unfortunately,

or maybe fortunately, now that

I think about that, maybe it is good

that this has occurred so we really can

figure out what focus the United Nations

should take. Maybe it is good in

that we can understand, look, we have

overassigned the United Nations, we

have expected too much from a structure

that simply cannot handle the responsibility

that is handed to it. With

that vision, I think once we resolve

this situation in Iraq, there will be

other problems. There is going to be

the North Koreas. There is going to be

the Irans. There are other problems out

there. But I think we are best, I guess,

situated or to our advantage to approach

those problems understanding

that the United Nations really should

not be the vehicle, the wagon that we

put all our gear in and expect the

United Nations’ horses to be able to

pull that wagon up the hill. They cannot

do it.

But as I said earlier, there is an appropriate

spot for them, to help us in

the worldwide fight on AIDS, the

worldwide fight on starvation, to help

education throughout the world. Those

are passive, social science issues that

are very, very important to the international

community and very, very important,

whether my colleagues are Republicans

or Democrats, very, very important

for the whole world. Our Nation

can help in that, but I think the

United Nations is appropriate in that

location.

I want to switch from the United Nations.

I think I have made it pretty

clear. I think they have dropped the

ball on this. I think it was the Wall

Street Journal today, and I may even

have a copy of an editorial out of the

Wall Street Journal. They are right.

The Wall Street Journal said today,

‘‘The fighting will likely soon commence,

but it is not in fact the start of

this war. It is the beginning of the end

of the war that began when Saddam

Hussein invaded Kuwait on August 2,

1990.’’

Keep in mind that the reason Saddam

Hussein remained in power is not because

Bush, Sr., did not want to go into

Baghdad, it is because Bush, Sr., frankly

listened to the advice and the demand

from the United Nations that the

regime be left standing; that the only

mission out there was to free Kuwait,

to push Iraq out of Kuwait, but to leave

Saddam. We could not go into Baghdad.

People blame the Vice President, DICK

CHENEY, whom I think is one of the

outstanding leaders of this Nation.

People say, ‘‘Why didn’t you guys kill

him 10 years ago?’’ It is because we listened

to the United Nations, and the

United Nations insisted, demanded

that the United States not go in and

kill Saddam Hussein. That was the

United Nations. Just another example.

They cannot do it.

I am critical of the United Nations,

but I also understand. It is kind of like

getting mad at a child. You know they

misbehaved, but you have also got to

look at all the circumstances around

it. Does that child have some reason

that they cannot behave, that they

cannot really control? It is the same

thing with the United Nations, structurally

the way it is built. You think

North Korea? You think Iraq who is

head of the disarmament convention,

or you think Libya which the United

Nations just installed as the head of

the Human Rights Commission are

going to come to some kind of agreement

to restore human rights, for example,

in any country in the world?

Let me move off the United Nations

and talk about something else. I have

heard time and time again, in fact, I

was surprised, over the weekend, time

and time again I heard commentators

who know better talking about the

United States’ war against Iraq, the

United States’ effort against Saddam

Hussein. The United States. I have

heard this so often, it almost makes

me ill. The United States acting alone.

I used to be a police officer. Somebody

asked me the other day, my friend,

Fred Cheney, ‘‘What is it you took out

of your police career? What is it that

you took that was the most benefit to

you being a police officer?’’

I said, ‘‘I can’t tell you how many

times I rolled up to the scene of an accident

or rolled up to the scene of a

crime, made an assumption as to what

happened there only to find out later I

was completely wrong once we looked

at all the facts.’’ I guess the best case

is the Smart case in Utah. Take a look

at that. Everybody probably assumed

that the deceased suspect was the one

who kidnapped her. They found stolen

goods in his car, everything pointed to

him, so it must be him. Once the facts

are looked at more carefully and more

carefully, we find out, in fact, that he

was an innocent man.

It is the same kind of thing here. Before

these journalists start making the

statement that the United States goes

it alone, or they somehow downplay

the fact that the Brits, Tony Blair, who

stands up as a profile in courage, they

downplay the courage that he has

shown, they downplay the United Kingdom

as if it is not much of a country,

and so the fact that they are joining

the United States really is not of much

substance because, after all, who is the

United Kingdom? The responsibilities,

again coming back to that word responsibilities,

the responsibilities of

the national media and the worldwide

media are to look at the facts.

Let me show you the facts on the coalition,

the willing coalition, as President

Bush puts it. To my left are the

member countries that are joining the

United States, joining the United Kingdom,

joining the Spanish, joining the

Italians, joining the Turks, joining the

Polish, joining the Hungarians. Look

at all of these countries. These countries,

even Poland, the Polish are sending

200 troops into this action. You tell

me that any of those commentators

that talk about the U.S. going it alone

or the U.S. and the Brits going it

alone, this does not take a lot of intellectual

ability to figure out what this

coalition is. You can pull this list right

off the Internet. Take a look at these

countries that are supporting us in our

effort. Denmark, Afghanistan. I will

just jump around. Hungary, Japan,

Lithuania, Nicaragua, Rumania, Turkey,

Slovakia, Philippines, Macedonia,

South Korea, Iceland, Ethiopia, El Salvador,

Colombia, Albania, Australia,

they are sending forces in there, Czech

Republic, Georgia, Italy, I talked about

Italy earlier, the Netherlands, Poland,

I talked about them, Spain. This is

what that coalition looks like, and the

momentum is building by the day. The

momentum is building by the day.

Why are these countries doing it? Because

they understand the word ‘‘responsibility.’’

We cannot afford to

shirk our responsibility. We cannot

walk away from this fight. This is a

cancer you cannot walk away from and

hope it is better tomorrow. This is a

cancer that you cannot go away and

say, if I sleep on it and wake up tomorrow,

it is actually going to recede.

That cancer is going to go in remission

because I simply sleep on it and give it

a little time. Give cancer a little time,

and it will go backwards. It will go into

remission. That is not what happens.

You have to reach out and attack it.

I was at a town meeting not too long

ago, actually a group meeting, not an

official town meeting. Somebody said,

the United States, what is our responsibility

as a government to protect this

government from terrorism, and are

they tied together? I said, of course

they are tied together. A lot of these

people feed from the same trough,

frankly. They have the same coffee together.

Of course it is tied together.

But the fact is in order for us to protect,

we cannot have security at every

mall in America. We cannot have armored

guards and meters and checkpoints

when you go to some theater

somewhere, you go to a mall, you go to

a restaurant somewhere in this country,

you go to a football game, a high

school football game.

The fact is our responsibility, and

frankly, Democrats, it falls on you as

well, but our responsibility is to reach

out. We cannot defend this country

completely. We have got to go out and

attack the terrorists, in their field. We

cannot sit, and every country in this

list to my left understands, you cannot

sit and let that cancer grow. We have

let Saddam Hussein flaunt his weapons,

flaunt the United Nations, flaunt the

international community for over 12

years and many, many resolutions.

By the way, I find it somewhat appalling

when we talk about responsibility.

I listened over the weekend, and

I am not trying to be partisan here, but

I am talking about facts. Howard Dean

stands in front of the Democrats at

their convention in California. They

give him a standing ovation as he

blasts the leadership of this country, as

he blasts this antiwar stance. My response

to Howard Dean, my response to

Martin Sheen, my response to Sheryl

Crow and my response to some of these

other people is, don’t walk away from

the cancer. You better figure out how

you are going to handle this thing. It

will not go into remission on its own.

Frankly, these countries have come

together in a willing coalition to do

whatever is necessary to take care of

the threat that Saddam Hussein has. I

think this coalition will come close to

the size of the coalition that we had in

the first Persian Gulf War.

My particular point here is when you

listen to the media, understand clearly,

it is not the United States acting

alone. It is not the United Kingdom

acting alone. It is a coalition of the

willing.

I give a lot of credit to our President.

I think he has done an admirable job.

Anybody that thinks they would like

to have his job, look at what he faced

in his first term. He comes into an

economy that is going south on him.

We had two down quarters before he

even came into office. He has got an

economy that seems to barely be hanging

on. He loses a space shuttle on a

weekend. He has got the problem with

the Middle East, with the Palestinians

and the Jewish community fighting.

We have got this situation with Iraq.

We have got the situation with North

Korea. He had the international incident

with the Chinese when they went

on the aircraft equipment. That is a

full-time job. These people that criticize

it, I find it interesting that people

like Martin Sheen, who has probably

had all of 5 minutes’ education on foreign

affairs and certainly, certainly is

not able to access any classified briefings

at all that we get or any kind of

knowledge on the subject, criticizes

our President, has spent, many, many,

many times more, same with Howard

Dean, criticizing our President than

they have Saddam Hussein.

Where is the responsibility? I think

it is a freedom, a part of democracy,

that we stand up and voice our opinion.

I absolutely agree with that. But at

some point, it does become unpatriotic.

And let me issue a challenge right

now to my colleagues on the Democratic

side because frankly I have not

heard it on the Republican side, but I

am pointing to some of my colleagues

on the Democratic side, to Howard

Dean, to Martin Sheen, to Sheryl Crow,

to some of these movie stars out there

that have become all of a sudden experts.

Although they are wonderful actresses

and actors, they have become

experts in foreign affairs, they do become

unpatriotic. And mark my words

here. They do become unpatriotic when

this action begins if they do not support

the troops of the United States of

America and its allies. They ought to

throw that sign they have been carrying

or those T-shirts they have been

wearing or, in Sheryl Crow’s case, that

guitar band she likes to wear around;

and they ought to throw that in the

trash and replace it, Sheryl Crow, with

a band that says ‘‘I support the troops

of the United States of America.’’ And

if they cannot find it upon themselves

to do that, in my opinion, they have in

fact crossed that line from patriotism.

Regardless of how they debate the

issue, they can still be patriotic. They

have crossed that line to be unpatriotic.

They have shirked their responsibility.

They have dropped their responsibility

to this great country.

George W. Bush has done a good job.

DICK CHENEY has done a spectacular

job. The President leading this team,

putting this team together. How could

we have been so lucky as to find somebody

like Condoleezza Rice? Take a

look at Colin Powell. Take a look at

Rumsfeld. Take a look at that team.

We have got the A-team down there on

Pennsylvania Avenue. We have got a

team that most countries only dream

of; and we have got a team that when

it has come time to stand up and accept

the responsibility, they do it. And

this Congress, frankly, and to the credit

on both sides of the aisle, we did it

in a bipartisan vote. Although we had

some dissent and we heard some very

harsh language, especially at the

Democratic convention in California,

the fact is most of the Democrats and

all of the Republicans stood up and

supported this.

We are standing up to our responsibility,

and it is not the United States

going alone. These countries in their

own way, even if it is only 200 troops

from Poland, in their own way with the

resources they have, they have stood

up. They stood to be counted, and

counted they will be. And every one of

these people, the contribution they

make to this effort, even as small as it

may seem to others, it is big to them;

and, frankly, in the overall picture it is

very, very important. When we fight a

cancer, we had better take all the assistance

we can get from every friend

we can find.

That is the only way we are going to

conquer it. And I want them to know I

appreciate it, and any of my colleagues

here who have family over there, come

from these countries, know people, the

next time they see somebody or the

ambassador or one of their representatives

or just a citizen from this country,

they ought to tell them thanks.

Not thanks that they came to the assistance

of the United States of America,

but they ought to thank them for

standing up to the responsibility that

the entire world ought to be standing

up to, that they are filling the void

that the United Nations could not

stand up to, that they are taking on

the issue head-on for the good of their

country and for the good of the rest of

the world. They are not doing it as a

favor to the United States or as a favor

to the United Kingdom. They are doing

it as an obligation of responsibility to

this fine world that we live in.

Now I want to talk about our forces.

I am so proud of those young men and

women, and not only the young men

and women right now that are on the

desert floor waiting for the final order,

not only the men and women that have

now actually instituted in one way or

another the beginning of the military

action, but also the young men and

women, and not just young, by the

way, but the men and women of our

military forces that are stateside as

well. Keep in mind it takes a lot of logistics.

It takes a lot of men and

women to prepare all of the things.

I was talking to somebody yesterday.

I said, just imagine, we have got 250,000

troops out there. Somebody in the

United States has to figure out about

every other week how to get 250,000

tubes of toothpaste to these people,

250,000 meals times three or probably

four a day considering the energy that

they are using, how to get the fuel to

the trucks. This is a nationwide effort

by a lot of citizens of the United

States.

I taught a class in Montrose, California,

yesterday. I had a young man

ask me, and I hear this question quite

often, ‘‘Are we ever going to see the

draft again?’’ And I think this action

that we see today illustrates why the

draft will not work. Why will it not

work? I said to this young man, ‘‘What

do you want to be?’’ He wanted to be a

songwriter. Frankly, I think the kid

probably will be a songwriter one of

these days and probably a pretty good

one, but he wanted to be a songwriter.

I said, ‘‘How would you like to have

graduated from college in music, beginning

your songwriting career, and the

United States Government calls you up

and says, ‘One, we are not only going

to put you in the military but instead

of going to the Army band, for example,

you are going to be washing trucks

or doing something that you cannot

stand. We are forcing you to do it and

you are going to have to give up 2

years of your life’?’’

What we have today is not a force at

all like that. Today our force, regardless

of the branch of the military, is an

all-volunteer force, and our morale is

the highest it has been in decades. Our

people are serving this country because

they want to serve this country; and I

know that by far the majority, not all

of us on this floor, but the majority of

us support these troops 100 percent.

And I am embarrassed and I am going

to be really embarrassed and angered,

by the way, if people like Martin Sheen

cannot, and the debate is over, Martin,

and Sheryl Crow, who, by the way, a

lot of us country music listeners like,

and the Dixie Chicks kind of stepped on

their own toe last week too, put it

aside and support the troops.

Put down the signs, protesters, that

are giving more credit to Saddam Hussein

and have expressed more hatred

towards their own President than they

do one the most vicious men in the history

of the world, the worst murderer,

by the way, who killed more Muslims

than any other man in the history of

the world. Put down the signs that are

supporting him and trashing our own

President. Put those signs down and

pick up a sign that says to the troops

of the United States of America ‘‘We

are behind you. You are our people,

you are our boys, you are our men and

women and we support you.’’ Regardless

where we stand on the issue of the

war, whether or not we like the United

Nations or do not like the United Nations,

whether or not we like SCOTT

MCINNIS or do not like him, whether or

not we like the President or do not like

the President, the fact is the time has

come for every so-called peace protester,

although I happen to think the

way we secure peace is to make sure we

do not let Saddam Hussein out there,

the way you stop cancer is to attack it,

not to ignore it. But all out there who

have carried those signs, I challenge

you, and colleagues of mine here on the

floor, I challenge each and every one of

you to pick up a sign or make a sign

tonight that says ‘‘We support the

troops of the United States of America,’’

whatever those troops need.

Tomorrow many of us will go on with

our daily routine, but the real sacrifice

is going to be carried by several hundred

thousand of our people in the military

forces and civilian employees that

support them; and we ought to at least

take a little time in our day, regardless

again of where we stand on the issue,

to say thanks, to pat those people on

the back and to give them every prayer

we can possibly give them, to give

them every thought of hope we can

give them. Our government and our

President and this administration as

previous administrations have provided

them with the weapons and the assets.

We have given them everything they

can get out there. But what will get

them over the hump, what they really

need the most is to know that people

at home support them.

Martin Sheen, what do you think it

says to our military forces or to those

Democrats that stood and applauded at

the Democratic convention in California

this week, the anti-war attitude

of that party, what kind of message do

you think it sends over to these people?

Put it aside. Stop. Put it aside.

And just for a while come out here and

help send a word of praise, a word of

encouragement, a ‘‘go get them’’ to our

forces that, by the way, are the ones

that will really make the sacrifice.

Most people tomorrow in this country

will go to McDonald’s; they will go to

the grocery store. Their life pretty well

will run on pattern, but in the next 2 or

3 days, hopefully not very many but we

have to expect there will be some

deaths in this engagement and the next

few days those people will sacrificing,

and they at least ought to know that

the people of America unanimously,

not part of the people, but the people of

America unanimously support the

troops of the United States of America.

Let me move on to another subject

that I think is awfully important. I

have several times during my comments

talked about Saddam Hussein

and his vicious regime; and let us not

kid ourselves, his sons are as deadly as

he is; and I want to just read some of

the firsthand experience. A lot of people

have come up to me and said, How

do you know he is such a vicious guy?

That is what some people say. How do

you know he has these weapons of mass

destruction? For two reasons: One, we

have got the proof of the horrible

things he has done; and, two, the fact

that these weapons that he now says he

did not have, he said he did have. But

I want to read this comment, and this

is from an Iraqi expatriate. The reality

of Saddam’s Iraq.

This is not a Martin Sheen. This is

not a Sheryl Crow. This is not Howard

Dean, the ex-Governor of Vermont

talking. Those people have never been

there. In fact I would bet that Sheryl

Crow, Martin Sheen, the Dixie Chicks,

some of these people like that have

never felt hardship, have never felt

hardship like the person that I am

talking about. My guess is they have

never been on a foreign visit other than

playing in a concert somewhere or

playing in a movie somewhere. My

guess is they have never been on the

ground firsthand to witness what this

person talks about.

Let us read it: ‘‘You will be

hardpressed to find a single family in

Iraq which has not had a son, a father,

or a brother killed, imprisoned, tortured,

or disappeared due to Saddam’s

regime.’’ And I note here not just Saddam

but Saddam’s regime. The majority

of Iraqis inside and outside Iraq

support the invasion action because

they believe they are the ones that

have to live as things are. They believe

they are the ones that have to live as

things are.

The President, in his speech last

night, very accurately said we will liberate

the people of Iraq. There are a lot

of people like the Martin Sheens and

the Sheryl Crows and people like that

in the world that are protesting in our

own country that have no idea how oppressed

those people are. They have no

idea how happy those people will be

when they see American forces.

Take a look at Afghanistan 2 years

ago and take a look at Afghanistan

today, the liberation that took place

there. Take a look at the people in the

villages running up and hugging the

soldiers, people offering the soldiers

food, applauding them, cheering them.

Take a look at Iraq a year from today.

As a challenge, take a look at that,

where the people will be a year from

today versus the oppression that they

are under today under this regime. Do

my colleagues think we would have

gotten there through negotiations with

the United Nations? Do my colleagues

think we would have gotten there with

the French or the Germans or the Belgians

that love to negotiate and talk

and have coffee and negotiate and talk

and have coffee and negotiate and talk

and have coffee? No way. They have

tried it for 12 years. The Wall Street

Journal said very accurately this war

started 12 years ago. It is not beginning

in the next few days. It started 12 years

ago.

And, finally, there is a coalition of

countries throughout this world that

are willing to stand up and liberate the

people that have faced this kind of oppression.

Name one other leader in the

world that has used mustard gas or

nerve gas to wipe out between 5,000 and

50,000 of his own citizens.

I was corrected. Remember Kent

State years ago in the Vietnam War

and the protests and this country’s

armed forces, I think it was the National

Guard shot, I think, four students

at Kent State and the country

was outraged. How could a Nation’s

military kill four people of its own?

And yet the very people that I am sure

would have been leading the protest,

objecting to that kind of action, are

the very people that unfortunately,

tragically, incorrectly stand by silently

as this population of people suffer

from the regime of Saddam Hussein.

I am pleased to say that our fine

President, our President and this administration

and this Congress and

this country, is not going to allow that

to go on for very many more hours. I

did not say years.

I cannot tell you how proud I am to

stand here and look to the next generation

behind us, to my kids, to the

young people, to the people that we

serve, and say we are about to end a regime

within the next few hours, the

next couple of days at the most, 3 days,

but certainly within hours. The country

of Iraq will be liberated from one of

the most horrific animals, one of the

most vicious men ever known to mankind.

I wish some of you that were carrying

those protest signs, and I wish

some of you who had been so vehemently

opposed to George W. Bush,

personally attacking our President, I

wish you could be in this young lady’s

presence when she finds out, when she

gets the word that Saddam Hussein and

his regime are dead and gone, that they

are out of power. I wish you could be in

the family room of some of these people

when these families find out that

the horrible monster that they have

dealt with has been put down by a coalition

of the willing, by some people

willing to accept the responsibility

that this cannot stand, that this cannot

continue to go on.

I also hope, those of you that witness

this, keep in mind and let your memories

keep in mind those people who

would not join the willing coalition,

those people who stood by and said,

leave him alone, we have no right.

Today, in fact, I heard a previous

speaker here on the House floor a few

minutes ago say that we are violating

some international concept he has. In

his opinion, from what I drew from his

remarks, I am not quoting him, but

from what I drew from his remarks, it

was let it be. Kind of like the Beatle’s

song, ‘‘Let It Be,’’ to let it go.

Keep in mind, those people that were

willing to let this regime stand, that

after 12 years of breaking resolution

after resolution, after killing tens of

thousands, not tens, not hundreds, not

thousands, tens of thousands of his own

people through poison gas, and these

people stood there and talked about,

well, let us have another cup of coffee

and negotiate, while people like this

expatriate’s family suffered.

God knows how many people in that

country we are going to discover have

suffered horrible acts of violence. I

read yesterday on the I think it was

the AP wire about the shredding machine,

one of the torture chambers

they have. One the ways they have of

torturing is a shredder. If they are

kind, they put you in head first, because

it kills you instantly. If they do

not want to do that, they put you in

feet first, so you know what happens.

This kind of stuff we are going to find

out.

The Sheryl Crows and the Martin

Sheens and the people that are saying

we are going to use the Oscar ceremonies

to protest the war, I hope you

are watching your TV. I hope you are

paying as much attention to what Saddam

Hussein has done, when the facts

come out after we militarily bring

down that regime, as the time you

have devoted to condemning our President

and our team down there on Pennsylvania

Avenue, and, in fact, this

United States Congress.

Responsibility, that is what it is

about. Every one of us in this House

was elected to accept responsibility.

We have more responsibilities than the

average person on the street. But the

average person on the street has responsibilities.

It is not an overused

word. It is not an overused word.

Responsibility is a character. It is a

standard of character, in my opinion.

Responsibility, acceptance of the responsibility

and carrying out the mission

of responsibility.

I stand here with a great deal of

pride, one acknowledging the responsibility

and the great sacrifice our American

forces have made. Once again I

renew my challenge to every protester,

to every Congressman, to every movie

star, to every singer, the Sheryl Crows

and those out there. I challenge you tomorrow,

or as soon as we take that action,

for you to stand up and sing a

song for the forces of America.

This responsibility that we carry on

our shoulders, nobody ever said pulling

that wagon up the hill was going to be

easy. But it is our responsibility to get

that wagon up the hill, and not just for

the United States of America, not just

for our willing coalition of 30-some

countries, but for the world, for the

goodness of man. There is no country

in the history of the world that has

represented more goodness and protected

more goodness and accepted the

responsibility of helping other people

than the United States of America.

This Nation has nothing to apologize

for, and I as a United States Congressman

will never apologize for the United

States of America. I stand here with

pride, because I think in part we as

Congressmen, although we do not

carry, are not there in the field, I

would like to be. I wish I were 20-some

years younger. I would like to have

them drop me in the center of Baghdad.

I know many of my colleagues would,

too.

In a small way as Congress people,

and the administration in a big, big

way, a lot of people in this country

have stood up to the responsibility,

have acknowledged it and have put

that pack on their back. They are willing

to help get that wagon up the hill.

A few have dropped off.

When I went camping as a young

man, I always used to get upset with

the people that sat by the fire but

never helped gather the firewood. A lot

of people deserve to sit by the fire, because

they have helped get the firewood.

It is time for those who have not

helped gather the firewood to get out

there and get some firewood. Then

they, too, can sit by the fire.

But we have an inherent obligation,

an inherent obligation, to our generation

and to the generations that follow

our generation to make sure that tyrants

like Saddam Hussein, to the extent

that we can stop it, that we carry

out the mission of our responsibility,

that we carry out the mission of our

duty to the United States of America,

that we make the people who have

fought for decades and generations

under the Stars and Stripes, that we

carry out our part, that our generation,

too, can be spoken of in the future

as one of those generations that

stood when the challenge came forward

and proudly took those colors and

proudly took those colors to the next

generation and delivered to that generation

a country strong in will; a

country strong in freedom; a country

that represents democracy, the model

of democracy; a country that is militarily

strong; a country that has a

good, solid justice system; a country

that has an educational system second

to none; a country that has a medical

system second to none. Those are big

challenges.

In the next few hours we are going to

see who is going to be counted, and I

hope every person that is listening to

me on this floor, I hope every one of us

unanimously, not one dissenting vote,

unanimously supports the forces of the

United States of America in their mission

to accept that one word, responsibility.

I hope with Godspeed that all our

forces are safe. I hope with Godspeed

the citizens of the United States and

all of our allies, and, in fact, the whole

world, can be freed of this tyrant so we

can all live in at least some type of

peace.

But from the bottom of my heart, I

want to thank all my fellow citizens,

and I want to thank those forces that

are out there in the time of need and

the time of danger that have stood up

and accepted that responsibility.