

quickly to see if I could find the story, but it is not written in the BBC. I have no reason to believe that my correspondent would not tell me the truth. I believe this Congress should look into this issue.

If we are going to start a war in which we are going after a country and we say they have weapons of mass destruction, we know it, but we have not found any, and now the story comes out that we are getting ready to use them. Remember what happened in Moscow when the Chechnyan rebels took over that theater with all those people in there, and the Russian Army used a nonlethal chemical weapon to stun the people, and they had several hundred die? The question is, are we prepared to use those on civilians in Iraq or how do we keep it only on the military and not on the civilians? When gas is spread, it goes around, and people breathe it.

The United States Congress should be made aware of this. I do not go to the secret briefings because I want to be able to talk out here about what I hear in the general public. I do not think that they will tell Members in a secret briefing whether they will use it, but Congress should demand from the people in the war department and the White House as to whether or not they intend to use any kind of nonlethal chemical weapons. Are they talking about tear gas? What are they talking about? We do not want to be a part of doing the very thing that we accuse the Iraqis of.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Ms. CARSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. CARSON of Indiana addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### THE WAR IN IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I listened to the previous speaker, and I am curious if the gentleman's preference is tear gas or bullets. I think it is a fair request that it be disclosed, what kind of gas or what kind of chemical might be used, but I think it is somewhat of an exaggeration to say the United States is going to use chemicals like those which Iraq possesses, and those are chemicals like nerve gas, ricin, and

anthrax. I can assure the gentleman that the United States has no intention of using ricin, nerve gas, anthrax or those types of weapons.

I think it is entirely appropriate, if we enter into urban combat, which we have to expect is going to happen, if we have an opportunity, primarily because the civilian population is in a particular facility, if we can use tear gas instead of putting a mortar into the building, maybe we ought to use tear gas.

But for people from foreign countries to stand up and say the United States is using gas, they will be disappointed to find out the type of gas, and I do not know whether it would be used or not, but I think it would make sense to use tear gas if we can disarm and minimize our casualties towards civilians. Keep in mind the United States has done an incredible job on minimizing casualties on civilians.

It is interesting to note that the Iraqis care less about their people because they are willing to use their people as human shields than we care about their people. The United States cares enough about their people that on many occasions we will not return fire because of the Iraqi citizen that is being used as a human shield, but not on all occasions. They should not depend on that working every time. They think less of their citizens because they will use them as a shield. We think more of their citizens because we do not want citizen casualties.

I listened today to some comments from some of my colleagues, and there are two things that I want to correct. One, this is the United States against Iraq; and two, Europe is opposed to this.

In fact, if we look at Europe, Members will find that Jacques Chirac likes to pronounce that France is Europe. France is not Europe. France is a part of Europe. It is not Europe.

Jacques Chirac likes to play like he is the king of the kingdom of Europe. Europe has many different countries, and most of those countries in Europe support the United States of America. The United States of America is not acting alone in this action. The United States of America, in fact, has more allies in this action than we had during the entire first Persian Gulf War, not less, more. And on the European continent, look at the countries that are supporting the United States.

First, perhaps it is more appropriate to look at the countries that are opposing the United States. There are six, three of them being in Europe: France, Germany, and Belgium.

Now look at the countries that are supporting the United States. The British, the strongest ally we have had in a long time, the Italians, the Spanish, the Polish, the Hungarians, the Dutch. I can give Members generally the countries, Afghanistan, Albania, Australia, Colombia, the Czech Republic, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Georgia, Iceland, Japan, South Korea, Lithuania,

Macedonia, Nicaragua, the Philippines, Romania. It is not just the United States. It is the United States and the British who are leading the cause, but they have lots of support throughout this world. And when Jacques Chirac speaks about Europe, he ought to be more careful.

It is such a sad case in our history that a long-time alliance and friendship with our old friends in France and Germany has been so denigrated by political leaders in Germany and France who are seizing upon popular opinion to use the United States as a vehicle to bash to continue to increase their ratings in the popularity policy. This alliance and this relationship we have had over there has gone way too many years for it to be trashed by Chancellor Schmidt in Germany and Chirac over in France, but they have done a pretty successful job of doing it.

I can tell Members in my opinion we would not be engaged in military combat today had the French and the Germans, or had the French and the Germans initially in 1992, in 1993, in 1994, in 1995, in 1996, in fact, after the Iraqis gassed 60,000 of their own people, and not with the type of gas like the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) was talking about, tear gas and so on, gassed them with ricin. They killed 60,000. But what did the French and the Germans do? Negotiate, negotiate, negotiate. Let us have meeting, after meeting, after meeting; resolution, after resolution, after resolution. Had the French and the Germans and the country of Belgium, had they decided to get tough back in 1992 or any of those other years, we would not be where we are today.

I note that my colleague says the United States started this war. This war was started back in 1991 when Iraq continually defied the world's demand that he disarm those weapons of mass destruction.

There is not a country in the world, including the French, by the way, including Germany, there is not a nation in the world that denies that Saddam Hussein has these weapons or denies that he is a wicked guy. But there are a lot of them that want to do everything they can to get rid of Saddam Hussein except fight him. That is where the French fall in place.

I think it is important for our population to understand, I think it is very important that there are lots of other reasons that Jacques Chirac and Chancellor Schmidt over in Germany are taking on this anti-U.S. attitude and feeding the frenzy to hate America.

Once this gets resolved, take a look at how many contracts the French have with the Iraqis, business contracts. Mr. Speaker, do you know who approved the building of a nuclear plant in Iraq years ago, and the building of a nuclear plant that was justified because they needed it for energy in the country that has the second largest oil reserves in the world? Jacques Chirac approved it when he was prime minister.