Mr. Speaker, soon we

hope to have hearings on the pending

war with Iraq. I am concerned that

there are some questions that will not

be asked and maybe not even allowed

to be asked. Here are some questions I

would like answered by those who are

anxious to start this war: Is it not true

that the reason we did not bomb the

Soviet Union at the height of the Cold

War was because we knew they could

retaliate?

Is it not also true that we are willing

to bomb Iraq now because we know it

cannot retaliate, which just confirms

that there is no real threat?

Is it not true that those who argue

that even with inspections we cannot

be sure that Hussein might be hiding

weapons, at the same time implying

that we can be more sure that weapons

exist in the absence of inspections?

Is it not true that the U.N.’s International

Atomic Agency was able to

complete its yearly verification mission

to Iraq just this year with Iraqi

cooperation?

Is it not true that the intelligence

community has been unable to develop

a case tying Iraq to global terrorism at

all, much less the attacks on the

United States last year? Does anybody

remember that 15 of the 19 hijackers

came from Saudi Arabia and that none

came from Iraq?

Was former CIA counterterrorism

chief Vincent Cannistraro wrong when

he recently said there was no confirmed

evidence of Iraq’s links to terrorism?

Is it not true that the CIA has concluded

there is no evidence that a

Prague meeting between 9–11 hijacker

Atta and Iraqi intelligence took place?

Is it not true that northern Iraq,

where the administration claimed that

al Qaeda was hiding out, was in control

of our allies, the Kurds?

Is it not true that the vast majority

of the al Qaeda leaders who escaped appear

to have safely made their way to

Pakistan, another of our so-called allies?

Has anyone noticed that Afghanistan

is rapidly sinking into total chaos,

with bombings and assassinations becoming

daily occurrences; and that is

according to a recent U.N. report, the

al Qaeda ‘‘is, by all accounts, ‘alive and

well’ and poised to strike again, how,

when and where it chooses’’?

Why are we taking precious military

resources away from tracking down

those who did attack the United

States, who may again attack the

United States, and using them to invade

countries that have not attacked

the United States?

Would an attack on Iraq not just confirm

the Arabs’ worst suspicions about

the United States, and is this not just

what Osama bin Laden wanted to have

happen?

How can Hussein be compared to Hitler

when he has no navy or air force,

and now has an army one-fifth the size

it was 12 years ago, which even then

proved itself totally inept in defending

itself?

Is it not true that the constitutional

power to declare war is exclusively

given to Congress? Should presidents,

contrary to the Constitution, allow

Congress to concur only when pressured

by public opinion? Are presidents

permitted to rely on U.N. permission to

go to war?

Are you aware of a Pentagon report

studying charges that thousands of

Kurds in one village were gassed by

Iraqis, which found no conclusive evidence

that Iraq was responsible, that

Iran occupied the very city involved,

and that evidence indicated, according

to this Pentagon report, the type of gas

used was more likely controlled by

Iran, not Iraq?

Is it not true that between 100,000 to

300,000 soldiers have suffered from Persian

Gulf War syndrome from the first

Gulf War, and that thousands may have

died?

Are we prepared for possibly thousands

of American casualties in a war

against a country that does not have

the capacity to attack the United

States?

Are we willing to bear the economic

burden of a $100 billion war against

Iraq, with oil prices expected to skyrocket

and further rattle an already

shaky American economy? How about

an estimated 30 years occupation of

Iraq that some have deemed necessary

to build democracy there?

Iraq’s alleged violations of U.N. resolutions

are given as reason to initiate

an attack, yet is it not true that hundreds

of U.N. resolutions have been ignored

by various countries without

penalty?

Did former President Bush not cite

the U.N. resolution of 1990 as the reason

he could not march into Baghdad,

while supporters of a new attack assert

that is the very reason that we can

march into Baghdad?

Is it not true that, contrary to current

claims, the no-fly zones were set

up by Britain and the United States

without specific approval by the United

Nations?

If we claim membership in the international

community and conform to its rules only when

it pleases us, does this not serve to undermine

our position, directing animosity toward

us by both friend and foe?

How can our declared goal of bringing democracy

to Iraq be believable when we prop

up dictators throughout the Middle East and

support military dictators like Musharaf in Pakistan

who overthrew a democratically elected

President?

Are you familiar with the 1994 Senate Hearings

that revealed the United States knowingly

supplied chemical and biological materials to

Iraq during the Iran-Iraq war and as late as

1992—including after the alleged Iraqi gas attack

on a Kurdish village?

Did we not assist Saddam Hussein’s rise to

power by supporting and encouraging his invasion

of Iran? Is it honest to criticize Saddam

now for his invasion of Iran, which as the time

we actively supported?

Is it not true that preventive war is synonymous

with an act of aggression, and has

never been considered a moral or legitimate

U.S. policy?

Why do the oil company executives strongly

support this war if oil is not the real reason we

plan to take over Iraq?

Why is it that those who never wore a uniform

and are confident that they won’t have to

personally fight this war are more anxious for

this war than our generals?

What is the moral argument for attacking a

nation that has not aggressed against us nor

is able to, even if it so wished?

Where does the Constitution grant us permission

to wage war for any reason other than

self-defense?

It it not true that a war against Iraq rejects

the sentiments of the time-honored Treaty of

Westphalia, nearly 400 years ago, that countries

should never go into another for the purpose

of regime change?

Is it not true that the more civilized a society

is, the less likely disagreements will be settled

by war?

Is it not true that since World War II Congress

has not declared war and—not coincidentally—

we have not since then had a clearcut

victory?

Is it not true that Pakistan, especially

through its intelligence services, was an active

supporter and key organizer of the Taliban?

Why do those who want war not bring a

Declaration of War Resolution to the floor?