Thank you very much, Chairman Gilman; and my

dear friend, Mr. Gejdenson; my colleague on Judiciary, Mr. Berman;

and, of course, Barbara Lee, who I have worked with for

years; and Members of the Committee. I am delighted to be here.

You have my prepared statement. I wanted to just take a few minutes

to summarize where we are going, because I heard the ending

part of the Chairman’s opening remarks, with which I agree.

Before I start, I wanted to thank the Chairman and Ranking

Member for all they have been doing in trying to get Haiti’s elections

on the right path. That is a very important issue for me, and

I would like to praise you for that. You were going down there before

I was, Mr. Chairman, and we enjoy your staff accompanying

us and helping us out. Now, the question here is that after we have

had resignations from two Assistant Secretaries General for United

Nations Humanitarian Relief, Halliday and Von Sponeck, the pressures

are now rising. Today I noticed we have increased the

amount of food-for-oil ratios. I think it has been doubled, and I am

happy about that.

But there is a fundamental problem, which is that 23 million

people cannot recover from a wrecked infrastructure, no matter

how much we raise those levels. What I am here to suggest to you

is that the UNICEF figure of 5,000 children dying every month has

raised us to a point where this is trading our integrity and our belief

in human rights. As a matter of fact, we are undermining them

by continuing the oil-for-food transaction.

I would like to suggest to you, and maybe I am the first witness

you had who would take into account that maybe the time has

come for us to abandon this plan. It is too complicated to administer.

The U.N. has not been effectively doing it. I think that what

we are doing here, Mr. Chairman and Members, is committing war

by yet another means.

So it is my hope that we will consider that the main problem

with oil-for-food is that it does not generate sufficient funds to

begin the process of rehabilitating Iraq’s infrastructure, which is

now at a very, very low level and condition.

Children are dying from diseases that would otherwise be treated.

The long-term danger of economic sanctions goes beyond the

crisis of dying children. There are many other problems as well.

The point that I have arrived at, thanks to Bishop Thomas

Gumbelton and Reverend Ed Rowe of the Methodists, Denis

Halliday, whom I have met with, the Institute of Policy Studies

staffer Phyllis Dennis, and many others, has led me to suggest to

you that we consider doing a couple of things.

As long as there is a temporary program, it is not going to work.

If we lift it altogether, the economic sanctions altogether, do away

with the oil-for-food restrictions, and replace it instead with monitoring

from both the inside and the outside, with the U.N. watching

the borders, I think with UNMOVIC we will be able to move

much further down the line. The reason that we would be able to

move away from the humanitarian problem, of course, is that we

would be able to bring in medical supplies and food.

Also, in the dual-use area, I would beg you to look at that in

terms of some of the things we can do with chlorine and incubators

that could be monitored carefully enough so that we would not run

into a problem. So increasing the allocation is not enough. Temporarily

lifting the ban is not enough. I think that we would begin

to strengthen ourselves, in terms of building up a citizenry for the

objective that you and I all are working toward. I think Hussein’s

burned a lot of bridges behind him with the OPEC countries as

well. I think there could be a quid pro quo for lifting these sanctions.

I think Tariq Aziz would support monitoring with a new kind

of cooperation, if there were a lifting of this ban.

So I think that this ought to move in that direction, because we

cannot achieve democracy by undemocratic means. We cannot inspire

respect for human rights by undermining them. I beg that

you consider the fact that the killing of 500,000 children because

we have not been creative enough to create another way to prevent

the possibility of an unknown potential future threat, is simply unacceptable.

I thank you for this time. My detailed remarks are, of course, included

in my statement.

There are a couple of considerations, Mr. Berman.

One is that there is a maldistribution of what is going on between

the north and mid-south, a very serious one that has been brought

to my attention, in terms of the supplies and equipment.

To the north; yes, sir. But over and beyond that,

what we are doing is that we are becoming the oppressors. Obviously,

we are reducing the possibility of the people from ever becoming

organized and increasing their resistance because obviously

they are blaming us. It is our policy, although I have heard arguments

both ways.

By changing this formula drastically, as I have suggested, we

would then be allowing Iraq to make major financial investments.

There is no way they can do that now, because they cannot develop

their oil resources any further and because nobody will invest there

at this point.

That is why I think that the foreign minister has agreed to comply

stringently with the requirements that we would put on. Most

importantly, the food and the medicines would have to be going to

the people. That would encourage them.

As a matter of fact, it has been predicted that they would then

begin to invest more in their own people themselves than they have

been, since they did that after the Iraq-Iran war. We think that

would resume again. Right now they are just blaming us. That is

why I recommend that there be a departure, a drastic departure,

to help the Iraqi people.

There was some of that. But the people that have

told me that they would be able to employ more resources. Whether

they would or not, I cannot defend against any arguments.

Mr. Conyers, I share concern, as we all do, about the loss of life

for children, and women and men in Iraq, but especially for the

children. I am frankly torn about the efficacy of the sanctions.

I have been going back and forth in my own mind about what

is being achieved when you have a malevolent dictator like Saddam

Hussein, who in my view, and I think you would agree, and maybe

you might want to say it for the record, compounds the problem by

not allowing, by impeding, the flow of medicines and food so that

more children do die so then he can turn around and say, look, see

what the sanctions are doing.

I think we have to be very cognizant of that lethal game that he

employs. Just a couple of very brief comments: A 1999 UNICEF

study found an increase in child mortality since 1991. It noted that

Iraq had not allowed implementation of the food-for-oil program

until 1996, too late to have a substantial impact on the child mortality

statistics measured by the study, which were for the period

1994 to 1999.

Again, if there are ten children who are dying, that is ten too

many. If there is one child dying, that is one too many. But the

5,000 figure, just so we know, is that accurate as of today? Every

month are 5,000 kids still dying?

This is a UNICEF figure.

For clarity, I can repeat that UNICEF still stands

by their astounding estimate of about 5,000 children dying every

month.

Yes.

It is an incredible figure; I agree with you. By the

way, I want to underline my support for everything you have said

about Hussein getting the better end of this deal. We are in a

quandary. If this were easily resolved, we would not have to hold

a hearing.

I would really like to continue to urge you, Mr. Smith, to think

about another mechanism, because the oil for food program does

not promote enough, even with the 100 percent improvement in allotments,

to make really a serious difference. I think that we have

to help the U.N. craft another way.

Thank you.

There are people on both sides of it. Let me just

put it to you frankly. It is our approved policy that is doing this.

The fact that Hussein is aggravating, manipulating, taking advantage

of it, and playing it as a crude political tool at the expense

of his own people, should not in any way dissuade us from reconsidering

the policy.

What I am suggesting is that the damage that is being done is

so great that there is no way within the oil-for-food program that

we can ever turn these numbers substantially around. What we are

doing, in my judgment, is committing war by another means. It is

on the most helpless of a civilian population. I would like to help

these people buildup. You know what that is doing, for those of you

who have been over there, what this is doing for our relationships

with the people themselves, who keep asking, why are they doing

this to us?

I think it would give us a new way to go in there. I would be

the first to say if for any reason it does not work or they are so

duplicitous that it will not ever happen, then I would be willing to

withdraw. We have enough creativity to not get hooked on a program

that has led two administrators of the program to throw up

their hands in disgust.

Yes, the South African anti-apartheid regime, but

that model will not work in this case because, there, the African

people were totally united with ANC. There was a coming together,

which of course Hussein has skillfully prevented from happening in

Iraq. His people are not only not united, but they are seriously divided;

thanks to him. So he has made it impossible to follow that

model.

With our pursuit of this plan, we are also taking on the angst

of the Iraqi people. It is clear to them that they have no allies outside

of Iraq. It only aggravates the problem, from my view. That

is why I want to reiterate what you said, what Barbara Lee said:

continue the military sanctions. As a matter of fact, we might be

able to tighten them. I think we could come around on the other

hand and begin to show to the people that we are revising our position

on this policy. It is a U.N. policy. It is not American made, but

is American supported, and we must be willing to revisit this policy.

Of course, there is not any private sector. It is a

different dynamic going on in Iraq. This is the problem.

Good morning.

Yes. His credibility would then legitimately come

under the attack that it has escaped.

Yes, sir. That’s not an impossible belief. The fact

of the matter is, the lifting of the economic sanctions in no way

interferes with stopping them from their nuclear and military capabilities,

because military sanctions would continue. We will be giving

ourselves an advantage that we have never enjoyed before, one

of preventing civilian deaths, while also preventing military capabilities.

If anything, Howard, I would be for increasing military sanctions

in exchange for lifting of the economic sanctions. We had indications

from at least the second in command, if that means anything,

that this could be a way out of our dilemma. It would give them

the chance that they need to create massive capital to buildup their

oil reserves and production capability, which will always be kept

down, the way we are doing it. Plus we have this hugely immoral

policy, that to me does not square us with our role in the United

Nations and around our country.

That is why I said that we may have to strengthen

our military sanctions, and that would include revisiting them to

develop something that might be more effective. So I am not asking

that we do anything but continue and maybe even strengthen

those. But as to this other part, Mr. Sanford, the humanitarian

part, we are losing the war with the people. This compares with

South Africa, where they had a feeling that many people in America

and its government, finally, and other governments, were in the

struggle with them.

That feeling does not exist in Iraq and cannot exist with the tactics

that Hussein is using, which may be considered far more vicious

than the ones that were applied in South Africa.

So I do not have a strategy for the military sanctions, but I do

think they should be continued or tightened. By the way, I do not

know how long Mr. Delahunt was sitting over there, but I commended

the Chairman and Ranking Member for their participation

in our efforts to get free and fair elections in Haiti. I want to include

his name in that for the record.

I am honored to be before the Committee. Thank

you so much.