

In addition to the Payson land, this legislation facilitates the Diamond Point land exchange. The Forest Service will acquire a 495-acre parcel, known as the Q Ranch, in an area where previous acquisitions have been completed and Federal land has been consolidated.

In exchange, the Diamond Point Summer Homes Association will acquire 108 acres of Federal land that have been occupied since the 1950's by the association's 45 residential cabins.

The land exchanges in this legislation are supported by the town of Payson, the Gila County Board of Supervisors, the Rim County Regional Chamber of Commerce, the Payson Regional Economic Development Corporation and the National Park Service.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation benefits local communities, the Federal Government and the American taxpayer. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation for the First District of Arizona.

#### RIGHT TO LIFE ACT

### HON. DUNCAN HUNTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 5, 2003*

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation that, if passed, will once and for all protect our unborn children from harm. Over 1.3 million abortions are performed in the United States each year and over 38 million have been performed since abortion was legalized in 1973. This is a national tragedy. It is the duty of all Americans to protect our children—born and unborn. This bill, the Right to Life Act, would provide blanket protection to all unborn children from the moment of conception.

In 1973, the United States Supreme Court, in the landmark case of *Roe v. Wade*, refused to determine when human life begins and therefore found nothing to indicate that the unborn are persons protected by the Fourteenth Amendment. In the decision, however, the Court did concede that, "If the suggestion of personhood is established, the appellants' case, of course, collapses, for the fetus' right to life would be guaranteed specifically by the Amendment." Considering Congress has the constitutional authority to uphold the Fourteenth Amendment, coupled by the fact that the Court admitted that if personhood were to be established, the unborn would be protected, it can be concluded that we have the authority to determine when life begins.

The Right to Life Act does what the Supreme Court refused to do in *Roe v. Wade* and recognizes the personhood of the unborn for the purpose of enforcing four important provisions in the Constitution: (1) Sec. 1 of the Fourteenth Amendment prohibiting states from depriving any person of life; (2) Sec. 5 of the Fourteenth Amendment providing Congress the power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provision of this amendment; (3) the due process clause of the Fifth Amendment, which concurrently prohibits the federal government from depriving any person of life; and (4) Article I, Section 8, giving Congress the power to make laws necessary and proper to enforce all powers in the Constitution.

This legislation will protect millions of future children by prohibiting any state or federal law

that denies the personhood of the unborn, thereby effectively overturning *Roe v. Wade*. I firmly believe that life begins at conception and that the preborn child deserves all the rights and protections afforded an American citizen. This measure will recognize the unborn child as a human being and protect the fetus from harm. The Right to Life Act will finally put our unborn children on the same legal footing as all other persons. I hope my colleagues will join me in support of this important effort.

#### CONGRATULATING COLONEL FRANK STEER

### HON. NEIL ABERCROMBIE

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 5, 2003*

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to extend my heartfelt aloha and congratulations to Colonel Frank Steer, United States Army, retired.

Colonel Steer, 102 years young, is a member of the United States Military Academy Class of 1925 and holds the distinction of being the oldest living graduate of West Point.

Frank Steer has a long record of outstanding service to the United States. He enlisted in the Army in World War 1, attained a commission after the war, and served as Provost Marshal of the Army's Hawaiian Department during World War II. Having responsibility for enforcing martial law in Hawaii, he is widely credited with a human touch and sense of fairness during that difficult time.

Having been commissioned an honorary major general in the Association of Washington Generals, Frank Steer is eminently qualified for honorary promotion to provost marshal of the United States Army and United States Air Force, and I am delighted to extend such recognition to him.

Frank Steer is one of Hawaii's living treasures. He is part of our island history and played a major role in making our state a unique and special place. I join Frank Steer's legion of friends and admirers in congratulating him on a life well lived and for his unparalleled service to our nation.

#### KEEPING SADDAM HUSSEIN IN A BOX

### HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 5, 2003*

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have a great deal of respect for the intellectual capacity of those making policy in the Bush administration—so much respect that I find it very hard to believe that they themselves really believe the rationales they have put forward for their two current major policy initiatives: a major tax cut, including an abolition of the tax on some dividends, and a war in Iraq.

Specifically, I do not believe that the top economists in the Bush administration really think that enactment of his latest tax relief package will have any significant near term stimulus effect on our sputtering economy.

Similarly, I do not think that the administration's foreign policy and defense experts really believe that Iraq is a significant threat to the United States. There are broader, philosophical, ideological and political reasons behind both proposals.

In an extremely well argued, comprehensive essay published in the *New York Times* for February 2, John Mearsheimer and Stephen Walt very forcefully refute the argument that we must to war with Iraq because it is a threat to our security, and point out cogently what the negative effects of such a war will be on us.

Because Mr. Mearsheimer and Mr. Walt do a very good job of making clear a case against going to war in Iraq, and because that is the single most important question now facing this country and this Congress, I ask that this essay be printed here.

[From the *New York Times*, Feb. 2, 2003]

KEEPING SADDAM HUSSEIN IN A BOX

(By John J. Mearsheimer and Stephen M. Walt)

The United States faces a clear choice on Iraq: containment or preventive war. President Bush insists that containment has failed and we must prepare for war. In fact, war is not necessary. Containment has worked in the past and can work in the future, even when dealing with Saddam Hussein.

The case for preventive war rests on the claim that Mr. Hussein is a reckless expansionist bent on dominating the Middle East. Indeed, he is often compared to Adolf Hitler, modern history's exemplar of serial aggression. The facts, however, tell a different story.

During the 30 years that Mr. Hussein has dominated Iraq, he has initiated two wars. Iraq invaded Iran in 1980, but only after Iran's revolutionary government tried to assassinate Iraqi officials, conducted repeated border raids and tried to topple Mr. Hussein by fomenting unrest within Iraq. His decision to attack was not reckless, because Iran was isolated and widely seen as militarily weak. The war proved costly, but it ended Iran's regional ambitions and kept Mr. Hussein in power.

Iraq's invasion of Kuwait in 1990 arose from a serious dispute over oil prices and war debts and occurred only after efforts to court Mr. Hussein led the first Bush administration unwittingly to signal that Washington would not oppose an attack. Containment did not fail the first time around—it was never tired.

Thus, Mr. Hussein has gone to war when he was threatened and when he thought he had a window of opportunity. These considerations do not justify Iraq's actions, but they show that Mr. Hussein is hardly a reckless aggressor who cannot be contained. In fact, Iraq has never gone to war in the face of a clear deterrent threat.

But what about the Iraqi regime's weapons of mass destruction? Those who reject containment point to Iraq's past use of chemical weapons against the Kurds and Iran. They also warn that he will eventually get nuclear weapons. According to President Bush, a nuclear arsenal would enable Mr. Hussein to "blackmail the world." And the real nightmare is that he will give chemical, biological or nuclear weapons to Al Qaeda.

These possibilities sound alarming, but the dangers they pose do not justify war.

Mr. Hussein's use of poison gas was despicable, but it tells us nothing about what he might do against the United States or its allies. He could use chemical weapons against the Kurds and Iranians because they could