

The threat posed by Iraq is a threat which confronts the entire world, not just America. The voice of the community of civilized nations and the legitimacy to act on their collective word reside in the United Nations. It is through U.N. resolutions, crafted in substantial measure by the U.S., that we have the license to compel Iraq's compliance. And it should be through the U.N. that we should seek to enforce such compliance.

This resolution before us gives the President authorization to send American troops into Iraq to strike unilaterally and, indeed, to strike first when he deems it appropriate. Congress has never before granted this extraordinary power to any previous President. We can address the threat posed by Saddam Hussein without expanding Presidential authority beyond constitutional standards.

The Framers of our Constitution wisely assigned the power to commit America to war not to the President but to the people's democratic representatives in Congress. Our Founding Fathers knew from experience and we should remember today that a declaration of war is the ultimate act of humankind. It presumes to endow the declarant with the right to kill. In many instances, it amounts to a sentence of death, not just for the guilty but for the innocent as well, whether civilian or soldier.

The President should approach Congress and ask for a declaration of war when and only when he determines that war is unavoidable. The resolution before us leaves the question of war open-ended by both expressing support for diplomacy and authorizing the President to use force when he feels it is the correct course of action. Yet, in his own words, President Bush indicated that war is not unavoidable. So why, then, is he insisting on being given now, today, the power to go to war?

We are the lone superpower economically and militarily in the world. Our words have meaning, our actions have consequences beyond what we can see.

The implications of a unilateral first strike authorization for war are chilling. A unilateral attack could lead the world into another dangerous era of polarization and create worldwide instability. It would also set a dangerous precedent that could have a devastating impact on international norms.

Consider India and Pakistan, Armenia and Azerbaijan, Russia and Chechnya, Cyprus, Taiwan, Colombia, Northern Ireland, Central Africa. How might the people or the government in any of these countries which are engaged in or at the brink of hostilities interpret this resolution today? Why should not other countries adopt the President's unilateral and first strike policy to address conflicts or threats?

Would not a unilateral attack galvanize other potential enemies around the globe to strike at the United States and our interests? In our efforts to focus on what the President described as a "grave and gathering danger" ten thousand miles away in Iraq, let us not lose sight of the dangers which are grave and present,

not gathering but present, here at home: the al Qaeda plots targeting our airports, our water treatment facilities, our nuclear power plants, our agricultural crops.

Just this Tuesday, CIA Director George Tenet told Congress that Saddam Hussein, if provoked by fears that an attack by the United States was imminent, might help Islamic extremists launch an attack on the United States with weapons of mass destruction. We must consider how our actions may impact on the safety of the American people. The answer may not always be what we expect.

We must also ask: will the death and destruction it takes to eliminate a sovereign, albeit rogue, government (what the President has labeled "regime change") lead to goodwill by the Iraqi people toward America and Americans?

Well, let us look at the record. During the Persian Gulf War of 1991, we dropped some 250,000 bombs, many of them "smart" bombs, over a 6-week period on Iraqi forces. That is close to 6,000 bombs per day. We deployed over 500,000 troops. The war cost over \$80 billion. None of that money was spent on reconstruction in Kuwait, and certainly not in Iraq. And all of this is what it took simply to expel Saddam Hussein from tiny Kuwait, which has one-tenth the population and one twenty-fourth the landmass of Iraq.

Today we are told that it would cost the U.S. \$200 billion or more if we were to go to war with Iraq. That does not include any costs for reconstruction of post-war Iraq. No matter how "smart" or "surgical," bombs will kill civilian non-combatants—children, mothers, the elderly. Two billion dollars in bombs, death and destruction does not sound like the wisest prescription for engendering Iraqi goodwill.

I am eerily reminded of the infamous quote by an American military officer in the Vietnam War that "we had to destroy the village to save it." Are we contending today that we need to destroy Iraq to save it?

And what is our, and for that matter the world's, recent record on supporting postwar reconstruction? Ask the people of Bosnia and of Kosovo, and now ask the Afghans.

Certainly there are situations where the United States must prepare or be prepared to act alone. I voted in September 2001 to give the President that power to punish those who attacked this nation on 9/11. But the question is, are we at the point on the question of Iraq to go to war without international support? Because that is precisely what the resolution before Congress would authorize the President to do.

Mr. Speaker, the President was clear in his speech to the nation on October 7. There is no doubt that Saddam Hussein is leading Iraq down a dangerous course. That is why the world should come together to confront this destabilizing situation and the United States should do all it can to encourage that effort. It is time for us to recognize that if we do this, we do it together.

The President raised an additional point in his remarks of October 7, and that is that con-

fronting the threat of Iraq is crucial to winning the war on terror. Indeed disarming Iraq and neutralizing Saddam Hussein's ability to share weapons of mass destruction with those who would do us harm is critical. However, should the President take us to war against Iraq, we will find ourselves fighting battles on three fronts: in Iraq, in Afghanistan and other terrorist "hot spots" where elements of al Qaeda and evidence related to 9/11 leads us, and finally, here at home. Do we have the resources to carry such a heavy commitment? Does Iraq divert us from winning the fight against terrorism and securing for the American people the safety they seek at home?

Today, as we speak, in the neighborhoods immediately surrounding our nation's Capitol, parents are deciding whether to send their children to school. A calculating, cold-blooded murderer who has already killed 9 people and wounded 2 others in 2 weeks is roaming the streets. One of his victims, a 13-year-old boy, lies in critical condition from a bullet which savaged his abdomen. We must be equally committed to act to safeguard Americans from threats within our borders as we are from threats beyond our borders.

Mr. Speaker, there are few votes as solemn and challenging to each of us and our democracy as a vote to declare war against another people. Can I look at my Maker, my family and the good people who elected me to speak for them and say: this is the cause for which I will cast my vote to sacrifice American lives? . . . the lives of innocent non-combatants? Is this truly the time to ask for the ultimate sacrifice from our men and women in uniform? In Bosnia and Kosovo, I could answer yes. Genocide was being committed as we breathed. On September 11, 2001, and indeed on December 7, 1941, America suffered premeditated, cold-blooded attacks which took thousands of mothers, sons, brothers and sisters from us. We needed to search for justice. But Mr. Speaker, I cannot with clear conscience answer the same way in regards to this resolution. That is why I cast a "no" vote. I urge my President and my country to move deliberately and in concert with our partners in the community of nations as we address the threat that is Iraq.

ACCESS TO QUALITY HOSPITAL
CARE

HON. TED STRICKLAND

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 2002

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to call for action on legislation to ensure that my constituents will continue to have access to quality hospital care. Unfortunately, hospital reimbursements and payments under Medicare and Medicaid are at risk because, despite strong bipartisan support on these specific issues, Congress has failed to

complete work on legislation that will provide the necessary relief and avoid rising costs. Therefore, I call on my colleagues in the leadership of the House to pass H.R. 854 or other provider reimbursement legislation now in order to ensure my constituents continue to have access to quality health care.

The Disproportionate Share Hospital (DSH) program is an essential piece of our country's health care safety net, protecting children's, public, and other safety net hospitals that care for a much larger volume of Medicaid patients than typical hospitals. The DSH cuts were first enacted by the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 but were postponed by the Benefits Improvement and Protection Act (BIPA) in 2000. Despite 190 bipartisan cosponsors on H.R. 854, which would reverse these cuts, they are now scheduled to take full effect, creating financial ruin for public hospitals across the country that provide uncompensated care to those in need.

The scheduled cuts in Medicaid DSH is expected to amount to about \$53.2 million for Ohio hospitals in fiscal year 2003 alone. This cut skyrockets to \$108 million through fiscal year 2004 and \$279 million over the next five years. As a result, hospitals will lose an average of 15.7% in payments from Ohio's Hospital Care Assurance Program (HCAP).

Hospitals in my district cannot afford these cuts. Already, the program reimburses hospitals for less than half of the uncompensated care they provide. Reductions in DSH will hurt my constituents, who will be forced to pay for overall higher health care costs.

I also call on my colleagues to complete our work on relief for hospitals in rural and other small communities. These hospitals face unique challenges compared to those in larger urban areas. Specifically, we should standardize the rural/urban disparity in the Medicare Inpatient Prospective Payment System (PPS) so that all hospitals receive the same payment levels as those in large urban areas. We should also expand Medicare's Critical Access Hospital (CAH) program to allow more hospitals to qualify for CAH status, enabling them to provide care to communities, such as those in rural parts of Ohio, where these health care services are desperately needed. In addition, I support a full inflationary update for Medicare PPS payments to sole-community hospitals. I am glad the Medicare legislation that passed the House included several important provisions that are a good first step to the funding problems of rural health care. I hope my colleagues will do all they can to ensure these provisions are enacted before the end of this session.

And finally, I conclude with a legislative success story. This year, Congress passed and the President signed into law the Nurse Reinvestment Act, which has the potential to address the current nursing workforce shortage by establishing grants and initiatives to encourage students to enter nursing school, increase the number of nursing school faculty and mentors, create scholarships for nursing students who agree to serve in underserved areas, and provide career ladder opportunities for current nurses. Although the nursing workforce shortage is just one part of the health care workforce shortage, passage of this bill is a huge success for both nurses and hospitals who are struggling to meet our health care demands.

However, Congress must fully fund this new law through appropriations if its passage will

have any positive effect on the nursing workforce shortage. I strongly support full funding and hope these appropriations are committed soon. Ohio hospitals and the patients they serve are depending on it.

RECOGNITION OF NATIONAL DISABILITY EMPLOYMENT AWARENESS MONTH

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 2002

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, each October we observe National Disability Employment Awareness Month, and I rise to ask that all Americans consider what they can do to reduce the unacceptably high level of unemployment that exists among people with disabilities. No other minority group in this nation faces the level of joblessness experienced by such individuals.

Much of the problem is based on outdated myths and stereotypes, and each of us must consider what he or she can do to learn more about people with disabilities and how we can more fully integrate such individuals into the American work force.

As part of this year's observance of National Disability Employment Awareness Month, October 16th has been designated as National Disability Mentoring Day. This day is being coordinated by the American Association of People with Disabilities with the support of the U.S. Department of Labor and several corporate sponsors throughout the country. It is designed to bring students and job seekers with disabilities into the workplace where they can learn firsthand about employment opportunities. This is an activity that should be ongoing throughout the year, and I urge my colleagues, all employers and employees who wish to volunteer as mentors to learn more about this initiative by contacting the American Association of People with Disabilities at 800-840-8844, or view the National Disability Mentoring Day link on its web site at www.aapdc.org.

As we observe National Disability Employment Awareness month, I also want to recognize three initiatives in my district that are making unique contributions to both local and national efforts promoting greater independence and economic opportunity for people with disabilities. As the sponsor of H.R. 3612, the Medicaid Community-Based Attendant Services and Supports Act, a bill that will enable people with disabilities to participate more fully in the workplace and community life by eliminating the institutional bias in our long term care system, I have learned much and benefited greatly from the support of Chicago ADAPT and its national affiliate, Americans Disabled for Attendant Programs Today. Their efforts to reform our long term support system and change our concept of disability from one of tragedy and dependence to one that recognizes disability as a natural part of the continuum of a life that can be fully enjoyed, is deeply appreciated.

I also wish to acknowledge the Access Center for Independent Living in Chicago. The Access Center, along with the National Council on Independent Living is also leading the way in the effort to break down the barriers people

with disabilities face in obtaining equal access to housing, transportation and employment opportunities. The CEO of the Access Living Center, Marca Bristow, was appointed by President Clinton to serve as Chairwoman of the National Council on Disability, and her term has just expired. Her leadership in Chicago and on the National Council is deeply appreciated. The residents of Illinois and our entire nation owe much to this outstanding leader.

Another initiative I wish to mention is one that focuses solely on creating employment opportunities for people with severe disabilities. There are several nonprofit organizations in the Chicago area that participate in the Javits-Wagner-O'Day Program, a federal procurement initiative that uses the purchasing power of the Government to generate employment opportunities for people who are blind or have other severe disabilities. These organizations include the Ada McKinley Community Services Center, the Chicago Lighthouse for the Blind, the Lester and Rosalie Anixter Center, the Jewish Vocational Services and Employment Center, the Chicago Association for Retarded Citizens and the Community Counseling Centers of Chicago.

These organizations, along with over 600 other community nonprofits across the nation work with National Industries for the Blind and NISH, a national nonprofit serving people with a range of severe disabilities. These groups train and employ over 37,000 people with disabilities to furnish office supplies, mail room and janitorial services, grounds maintenance, switchboard operations and a host of other administrative support services to both military and civilian agencies. By simply purchasing office supplies and support services from nonprofits such as these, federal workers can help reduce the high level of unemployment among people with disabilities and push the doors of opportunity open a little wider. More information about the Javits-Wagner-O'Day Program can be found at www.jwod.gov.

Whether a child is born with a disability, an adult has a traumatic injury or a person becomes disabled through the aging process, the need to participate actively in community life and earn your own way in the world is universal. I urge all Americans to consult the National Disability Employment Awareness Month resources I have mentioned and to determine how you can contribute to lowering the unemployment rate among people with disabilities throughout the year.

AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE AGAINST IRAQ
RESOLUTION OF 2002

SPEECH OF

HON. GEORGE R. NETHERCUTT, JR.

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 2002

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate that we discuss fully here the most serious responsibility entrusted to Congress, authorizing the President to use force in defense of our nation. The decision by Congress to authorize the deployment of the U.S. military requires somber analysis, and sober consideration, but this is not a discussion we should delay. The President has presented to