HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Friday, January 11, 1991*

The House met at 9 a.m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Create in us new hearts, O God, and put a new and right spirit within us. As these words of the Psalms remind, we pray for hearts open to the leading of Your spirit and eager to walk the paths of peace. We earnestly pray for ourselves and every person that we will experience the harmony and understanding that is our hope.

We remember in our prayers those citizens who stand watch in distant places and the work of every peacemaker. On this special day may each person of every perspective join in prayer and supplication for peace that Your will may be done on Earth as it is in Heaven. This is our earnest prayer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California [Mr. MOORHEAD] will please come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. MOORHEAD led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

THE SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the remaining general debate on the subject of the situation in the Middle East.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] has 3 hours and 56 minutes remaining in general debate and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] has 4 hours and 51 minutes remaining in general debate.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, at this point in the debate it would be well, I think, that we look at the three resolutions that are before us and what they signify with regard to this particular discussion we are having today. Maybe I should go back a little bit in recent history and say that last year, in September and October, there was a mounting feeling throughout the country that the President did not wish to have Congress take action in this field of going to war.

There are those of us who have been to law school, and those of us who took the oath the other day to uphold the Constitution, who feel like we would be abridging or setting aside the Constitution of the United States if we did not comply with the essence of that document where it says that the Congress and not the President would be the people to put our country to war if we were to go to war.

That was very important to our forefathers, who drafted the Constitution. They debated it at some length. They came up with the language that Congress alone should be able to declare war. But behind that there was a discussion in the drafting of the Constitution which showed clearly that they did want to have some exceptions to that, exceptions, however, only in the field of defensive war. They felt the President should be able to bring the troops in to handle a defensive situation, but not an offensive situation.

That was very, very important to our ancestors, and it is important to us today, because it makes it more difficult to go to war. It should be more difficult to go to war.

In history abroad, just prior to the founding of our country, there were many instances of where a king, an emperor, a tyrant of one kind or another, would set about to put his country to war, usually for personal reasons of his own, to strengthen his own hand on the government or something like that. So our Constitution specifically provides that that type of power as far as aggressive offensive war shall be in the hands of Congress, and not in the hands of the President.

With that in mind, on October 6, I wrote the President of the United States and said to him some of the things being said now and implying that the country is about to go to war without action by Congress and that would be unconstitutional. We ought to have action by Congress.

The President in a way has conceded that, because he has now written to Congress and urged that they do take action in this field. That, in a way, complies with the Constitution of the United States.

If you pass the resolution which he sent up here for Congress to pass, although it does not make any observation about the constitutional provision, nevertheless it does ask Congress to act in this field, and that is what we should do.

So the resolution which I introduced on October 19 of last year is a resolution which calls for the recognition of that part of the Constitution and calls for no action on the part of the executive government as far as going to an offensive war is concerned.

In the caucus of the Democratic Party earlier this year, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] led a very interesting discussion and very enthusiastically brought about the tremendous vote in favor of being sure that this sort of thing is carried out. So the gentleman and I have combined together to introduce the resolution which is before us today.

If Members pass this resolution, if it is followed by the thing that the President has sent to the floor, we will be in a situation where the President's action, which will be voted upon, if it is favorably acted upon, will be within the Constitution of the United States. Congress will have taken action in this field.

It is a declaration of war, contingent upon the President calling it into effect. That is what it amounts to as a legal proposition.

So those Members like the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] and myself who are espousing this resolution, as far as this resolution is concerned, are not opting that one way or another with regard to the President's idea. That is another idea. Those two other resolutions, the resolution of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] is one that has to do with waiting for a while until we have exhausted all diplomatic opportunities, economic ones as well. Then the other one is the one that really calls us to go to war just upon the decision of the President, without any further action by Congress.

That lays before us the situation we have. This morning most of the speeches will probably relate to the resolution the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] and I have introduced. I hope each of you will support it.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCHULZE].

Mr. SCHULZE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution providing President Bush with congressional sup-

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

port for American military action after January 15. Anything less would send the wrong message to those around the world wringing their hands in anticipation of thievery, terrorism and plunder.

The crisis in the Persian Gulf is a tragic example of aggression and greed by one nation, Iraq, violating international law and human rights. While our men and women are sweating in the desert to preserve freedom and stop this aggression, some here at home are undermining America's determination to support the will of the United Nations and of the world, to free Kuwait and preserve Saudi Arabia. Mr. Speaker, American men and women putting their lives on the line for freedom need our support. President Bush needs our support. And the Kuwaiti people need our support.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we do not have to fight. If we do, it will be called for by the United Nations; it will be justified under international law; and, it will be a new beginning toward bringing the world's collective power to bear on those who violate international law and order.

In a letter to Congress Tuesday, the President asked that Congress authorize him, and I quote, "to use all necessary means to compel Iraq to withdraw from Kuwait." He goes on to say that "anything less would only encourage Iraqi intransigence; anthing else would risk detracting from the international coalition arrayed against Iraq's aggression."

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for a resolution to support the President in his effort to restore freedom to Kuwait and solidify the international community behind a new world order.

Twenty years from now, we may look back upon this crisis as the turning point toward world peace: where for the first time, the United Nations was truly united against aggression, murder and greed. We may remember this resolution as the day America proved its resolve to secure freedom for all the peoples of the world.

The choice today is clear. We either vote to allow aggression and terrorism to go unchecked, or we vote for a new world order. A world where the United Nations serves its original mission of mitigating world tension, hunger and disaster. A U.N. which has the means and might to represent the nations of the world against those nations that violate international law and invade or plunder other countries. This new world order so eloquently described by President Bush, where the United States and the Soviet Union work together for peace, against aggression, is now a reality. The question is, will America stand firm in support of this new order, or will the Congress give in to fear and partisan posturing and throw a new beginning aside?

The crisis in the Persian Gulf is not about oil; or the Palestinian problem, it is an opportunity to put an end to unilateral terrorism by nation states set out to pillage and plunder. Our presence in the gulf is not a single mission to protect Israel's interests; or our economic interests for oil. We are there in force to stop aggression, to implement the wishes of the United Nations, and to restore freedom to Kuwait.

There are those who will say this is another Vietnam. They will say we are in the gulf at the request of Big Oil. They will ponder why our allies are not sharing more of the burden.

I must remind these naysayers that Adolf Hitler also benefited from dissension and delay and millions of lives were lost, perhaps as a direct result. The comparison of Hitler and Saddam Hussein are very real. Only this time, instead of Poland, we have Kuwait. Instead of inaction and fear, we are responding with determination and resolve to stop aggression and preserve freedom.

□ 0910

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. MCMILLAN].

Mr. MCMILLAN of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the joint resolution in support of the U.N. resolution.

All of us are saddened, sobered, even reluctant, about the action we must now take—none of us wants war.

The United Nations was created to prevent war. That is why it cannot tolerate Iraq's aggression and ongoing rape of Kuwait—all of us support that.

Moreover, the future stability of the Middle East, with its enormous consequences and precedent for a peaceful region and a stable world order, is at stake—few of us disagree. But to succeed, we must be unequivocal now, or we risk disastrous consequences later.

The U.N. resolutions include sanctions, diplomacy, and the threat of military force after January 15 to achieve Iraqi withdrawal and regional stability. The 50 members of the coalition have supported sanctions for 5 months with exhaustive diplomacy and 28 nations are ready to make a military option credible. None of these options is effective alone. Sanctions and diplomacy won't work without the military option.

Our President must have unrestricted latitude to use each simultaneously to achieve successful compliance with the U.N. resolutions—hopefully without conflict.

The primary issue today is whether Congress should restrain U.S. military action in order to test sanctions for a longer period.

That is tempting, but self-defeating. Because sanctions have not and will not remove Saddam from Kuwait. Sanctions would fail in the end and we would then face far greater obstacles to successful military action in the longrun.

While we wait and temporize:

Iraq can hunker down and sustain its position in Kuwait.

The Kuwaiti people will continue to suffer brutal occupation.

Terrorism and anti-American sentiment will grow.

The coalition will disintegrate—possibly both Arab and Soviet support.

Public support at home will wither away.

We will have to sustain a deferred military option at considerable cost in money and human risk.

We might be forced to reinstitute the draft to sustain force levels.

Waiting only compounds the problem with the high probability that we will ultimately be forced to a military option against far worse odds than exist today.

Time is on Saddam's side—not the world's.

The only sensible policy is to support the President in fulfilling the U.N. resolution with the fervent hope that congresional commitment will finally convince Saddam Hussein that the coalition is firm in its resolve and he risks losing all.

My colleagues, if we cannot support this fundamental U.N. objective to resist aggression, the future of the U.N. and the prospects for a New World Order of stability are slim, indeed. Our young men and women know that.

I urge my colleagues to support the Michel-Solarz resolution.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON].

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, when I opened the Washington Post this morning I read the lead editorial on the editorial page and it concluded by saying:

> Our judgment is that Congress, by deciding to authorize the President to conduct war, materially improves his chances of achieving peace.

The Washington Post has come to that conclusion and many other Members of this House have come to the conclusion that the compromise amendment, as it is being called, strengthens the President's hand, and in so doing makes it easier and more possible for us to achieve long and lasting peace without war.

We come to the conclusion based on a number of facts, and the same facts are the facts that are used by those who come to a different conclusion. In fact, we agree on almost everything that is relevant in this debate.

We agree, for example, that Saddam Hussein used an unprovoked kind of aggression when he entered and took over Kuwait. We agree that it was an indis-

putable kind of aggression that he was accustomed to using throughout his entire reign of power, and as one college professor said recently in a magazine article, Saddam Hussein's rise to power was soaked in blood. His tenure in office was equally bloody. He has introduced gas warfare. He has used it against his own people and is attempting to acquire nuclear weapons. We all agree with that indisputable fact, I believe.

□ 0920

We also agree that petroleum and its use, Saddam Hussein's potential use of it, is a major factor here. That may not be the factor that would force or convince one to use military power, but it certainly is a major factor, because Saddam's use of it could be either to blackmail the world if he controls the significant amount that he now controls or more, or he could use it to finance his bloody type of rule. We all, I think, agree on that fact.

We also agree that he has got to go. He has got to leave Kuwait.

So there are broad areas of agreement. We only disagree when we try to determine how to achieve the last goal, the goal that we agree on, whether we should let sanctions work, whether we should restrict the use of power by the President, or whether it takes us closer to peace by passing the amendment that I think we are going to pass today.

If you decide that you disagree with what I believe is the majority opinion in the House and if you decide that you disagree with the editorial this morning in the Washington Post, then you read those facts, upon which we all agree, differently than I do. If you believe that we ought to wait, then you have to decide one important fact, and that is whether or not our alliance with the world is going to hold together while we wait for sanctions to work.

In the Middle East, for example, we know that Kuwait and Iraq were recently allied against Iran for 8 years, and Kuwait loaned the country of Iraq somewhere between $10 billion and $15 billion, but today Kuwait, that very ally of Iraq, is the subject of unprovoked aggression by Saddam Hussein. That is an example of how quickly alliances change in the Middle East.

We know as we are here debating today that Saddam Hussein is trying desperately to put back together his alliance with Iran so he can export oil through that country. It is physically easy to do once that alliance is mended.

What about the relationship with Syria? Today they are on our side. Ask yourself, during the next 6 months or a year, will something happen between Syria and Israel to destroy that part of our alliance?

What about the Moslem influence in Turkey, another one of our allies? Will that change during the next months?

What about Egypt? The president of their parliament recently was assassinated. How fragile is that government? What does that mean to our alliance?

If you are one of those who appears or may be leaning in the direction of saying, "I disagree with the Post, I disagree with most of the folks who think we ought to stick with the President," then ask yourself a question: Sanctions depend on the alliance. Will the alliance hold together?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. EDWARDS].

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I congratulate the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT] for the magnificent contribution that they have made to this important debate.

Mr. Speaker, we are getting down to the last few hours of this debate, and we will be voting tomorrow. The issues have been very clearly defined.

The President Bush resolution authored by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] is really a Pontius Pilate resolution that says that Congress is going to wash its hands of this matter and go home, and if our constituents want to be a part of the national debate they are going to have to write a letter to the White House, perhaps to Mr. Sununu. It is going to be no longer useful in talking to their Congressman or their Congresswoman.

We say that we should be patient, that we should never go to war because of impatience. War is too important to go to war because we are impatient.

They say, the Bush-Michel people say, that the sanctions are not working that, "Look, 5 months have passed and Saddam has not said 'uncle.'" We say nonsense.

After 5 months, look at the progress we have made. When President Bush sent the troops into the Persian Gulf last August, he said he had four goals: First, to stop any possible invasion of Saudi Arabia; second, to release our hostages; third, to protect the world's oil; and fourth, to get the Iraqis out of Kuwait.

In a short 6 months, 5 months, Mr. Speaker, three of the four objectives of our involvement in the Persian Gulf have been effected. What is the hurry? Impatience is no reason to go to war.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] and Mr. Bush and the proponents of their resolution do not talk about the consequences of this war. If we go to war and win the war and destroy the Armed Forces of Iraq, run them out of Kuwait, what will be the consequences? I can tell the Members what the consequences will be. We will have to have troops, occupation troops, in the Middle East. How long? We have had them in Japan, and we still have them in Korea 25 to 30 years after the Korean war. We have had them in Germany for 40 years, and we still have them after the last war.

So, all right, we are going to have American troops occupying the Middle East.

Oil wells, saving the oil wells. I have seen estimates that the bombing will light oil wells that will burn for years, deep underground reserves.

Already there are fears of terrorism. The FBI is on a new program, a very frightening program, of interviewing Americans of Arab descent. We hear the Immigration Service in the paper this morning, the Washington Post, which says that there is a camp somewhere out there that very well might be prepared for dissidents in this war. I did not say that. The Washington Post did this morning.

The consequences of this war are enormous.

While we are preparing for war, what is happening in Europe and in Asia with our allies? Are they meeting like we are, concerned, awakening in the night, worried about this war? Are their legislatures meeting and demanding that the reserves be called up? Are they appropriating extra billions of dollars like we are for the war? No. Their legislatures are not meeting. They are back home worrying about transportation and housing and their children's education and all the things that countries do worry about.

The proponents of the Michel resolution do not talk about the consequences of this war.

Last, Mr. Speaker, our job description here as Members of Congress is not to be a cheerleader for any President. Our job is to be skeptical, to say "Show me."

I was here the day the Gulf of Tonkin resolution was voted on. We were talking about a little country, a little Third World country somewhat like Iraq, 17 million people, North Vietnam, about the same number of people, about the same kind of Third World economy. We were told that we could bomb them into submission, that they would say "uncle," and we were told all of the same things, oh, and the domino theory, that unless we stopped Hanoi, Thailand would fall, the Philippines would fall, Singapore would fall. We hear the same story today, the domino theory of the Middle East.

□ 0930

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, patience is all we are asking for. A few more months. Give the sanctions a chance.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER].

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I would say to my friend who talks about the threat of terrorism, let Members hypothetically assume there are terrorists out there. This Congress, we, here are at risk. Carry that thought to its logical conclusion. What I hear being suggested is that we should not act, we should be paralyzed, we should be blackmailed, because theoretically, at least, there are terrorists out here who might threaten Members.

Goodness knows, this is no basis for our making any decisions. Blackmail is no answer.

Mr. EDWARDS Of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER].

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the joint resolution. This debate is clearly an historic debate. It is a vital debate. I think it is necessary that the Members of the people's House express their individual opinions as to the policies that we are pursuing in the Middle East.

However, I also believe it vital that the outcome be strong support for the President's policy. Ironically, approval of the use of force is the best hope for securing the peace. There is no question, that Saddam Hussein is watching very carefully what we are doing here today and tomorrow, and will be either encouraged to continue to resist or given pause by the actions we take. I respect all of those who believe that the sanctions will work, who believe that more time needs to be allowed for the sanctions to work. I think they are wrong. However, I certainly respect their sincerity.

This debate is between Americans, not between Republicans or Democrats, not people seeking political advantage. We are all sincere in what we are doing here. I don't believe the sanctions will accomplish our goal of forcing Hussein out of Kuwait. There is leakage now, and I submit that the leakage will get worse if we blink at this point.

We all agree, as has been said before, we all agree on the objectives of what we are trying to do, to get Saddam Hussein out of Kuwait without concessions. It is impossible to overstate what is at stake in the effort. Clearly, if we prevail, and we must prevail, we will validate the worth of what is an unprecedented international alliance put together by President Bush as an effective means of dealing with the bullies of this world. This is a very, very important point. It will establish a model, in my view, for future crises.

Let Members make no mistake about it, there will be future crises. In some ways, the superpowers confrontation has lulled the United States because a predictability was there. We knew what to expect from the Soviets and they knew what to expect from us. We have lost that predictability. We need a new model to deal with these crises that will develop. There will be unpredictable eruptions in the future. It is clear the United States is no longer able, nor does it want to be the policeman for the world. The hope of being able to join in an international way to address future crises as only one of many partners to deal with these eruptions, can only be furthered if we prevail in this event.

Conversely, the failure to prevail will be devastating. The credibility of the United Nations will be destroyed, and with it a chance to expand and to build on the present alliance. The credibility of the United States will be destroyed and the stature of Saddam Hussein in Iraq and the Arab world will be enormously enhanced.

There is no question about what is at stake here. The only question is how do we prevail.

The sanctions, as I have indicated, are not working now. We know there is leakage. We know, for example, the standard of living in Kuwait and in Iraq today is about 10 times the standard of living in Egypt. As the majority whip said yesterday, the sanctions might take years to work. Do we have that kind of time? If we blink now, it is clear to me that our allies in this effort are going to begin to cut their own deals. If we are perceived as not having the stomach to go forward, I think others are clearly going to say the United States is not reliable. We better look to save our own skin. They are already moving in that direction.

Syria, a very weak partner in this alliance now, is very likely to cooperate with Hussein to enable Iraq to beat the embargo and the sanctions. I have just come back from a meeting with the European Parliamentarians, and there is great dismay. There is great interest in what we are doing here today. But I can tell Members this, if we fail to strongly support the President now there will be a lot of our European allies who will run for cover. They will begin to cut their own deals and when that happens Saddam Hussein wins.

Therefore, I will vote for this resolution not because I relish the coming battle. I think anyone who watched the recent series on the Civil War that played on PBS knows that there is no glory in war. There is only death and destruction. But sometimes, sometimes force is necessary to ensure peace. This is one of those times.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER].

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, America is a nation based upon the Judeo-Christian ethic. Jewish and Christian theologians, over the centuries, have struggled with the issue of war and peace, because it obviously involves the use of force on one's fellow man, contrary to what our Lord said. St. Augustine has written eloquently about this. Other theologians have.

I am grateful in this instance to the Christian Life Commission of the Southern Baptist Convention, Richard D. Land, who sent an analysis of the seven elements that Christians should consider when faced with the reality of war.

One, is it a just cause? War is only permissible to resist aggression and defend those victimized by it. Only defensive war is defensible. I think it is clear here that what the issue is, whether we will roll back aggression, nor initiate a war of conquest on the part of our forces in that nation or that area of the world.

Second, just intent. The only acceptable motive must be to secure justice for all involved. Revenge, conquest, and economic benefit are insufficient, illegitimate, and unacceptable motives. Justice for all involved. I believe that President Bush has said clearly that withdrawal from Kuwait, restoration of the stability of the area, and release of the hostages certainly speaks to that element clearly.

Third, last resort. Resort to arms can only be morally legitimate when all other avenues of conflict resolution have been rebuffed or have demonstrably failed. I don't know what more the leaders of the world, the United Nations, and President Bush and Secretary Baker could have done in exhausting our diplomatic initiatives to resolve this crisis.

Fourth, legitimate authority. The use of military force is only the prerogative of governments. Consequently, only the duly constituted civil authority can legitimize military action. However helpful a U.N. Security Council vote may be, for Americans the duly constituted authority is the government of the United States and the authorizing vehicle is a declaration of war. We in Congress under our system are the entity that has the responsibility of addressing this, and we are today.

Fifth, limited goals. If the purposes is peace, then annihilation of the enemy or total destruction of a civilization is not acceptable. Total war is beyond the pale. Also, unless one's survival or liberty are imperiled, it is not acceptable to resort to war unless the goals are achievable. Here our President has said we have as a goal, the removal of Iraq from Kuwait, restoration of that govermment, reinstatement of the status quo, or rather stability of that region of the world.

Sixth, proportionality. Will the human cost of the armed conflict to both sides be proportionate to the stated objectives and goals? Does the good gained by resort to armed conflict justify the cost of lives lost and bodies maimed? I don't know that anybody can make a judgment call that would cause any Members to agree on that

unanimously, but I believe that given the goals that President Bush has stated, we pass that test.

Seventh, noncombatant immunity. No war can be just which does not disqualify noncombatants as legitimate military targets and which does not seek to minimize collateral, inadvertent civilian casualties. No one has the right to make war on civilians. I do not know any person who has suggested here that America or any of the 28 nations allied in the Middle East today are stating as their purpose the annihilation, or to make war on noncombatants in that region of the world.

□ 0940

For these reasons, I believe that we pass the test of a just war, a defensive war, and I am prepared to vote for the bipartisan resolution and in support of it.

In my closing comments, let me just say a little bit about the cost. It is not ordinary when war is involved that the countries that are victims of the war have the wealth that these Persian Gulf countries have. I have an analysis here that so far they have pledged $15 billion and we have received $4.2 billion. That is a good step, but I think the President and the Secretary of State should work diligently to convince the Persian Gulf countries to be more responsive in burden sharing for this exercise.

The Saudi Arabian Government has received excess revenue beyond the base price of $21 per barrel which prevailed on August 2, 1990. During the balance of calendar year 1990, this come to $8.7 billion. To me that is windfall income.

It is true the Saudis have paid substantially for different costs, but I think their windfall income is still in excess of their fair cost of burden sharing for the operation.

Also the Arab Emirates received about 40 percent of that total, or about $3.2 billion.

My point is that burden sharing is an important responsibility of our political leadership in this exercise.

[From the Christian Life Commission of the Southern Baptist Convention, Dec. 21, 1990]

THE CRISIS IN THE PERSIAN GULF AND "JUST WARS"

[By Richard D. Land, Executive Director]

Americans and others around the world have been terribly concerned these past few months about events in the Persian Gulf and the Middle East. Will there be war? For Christians, the question of the morality of war in general, and in this situation in particular, should be paramount.

The first question Christians should ask is whether resort to armed conflict is ever justified, and if so, under what circumstances? While there have been persistent elements of pacifism within the Christian tradition which have rejected all use of violence, for most Christians, in most places, at most times the answer has been that, yes, resort to military conflict by legitimately constituted civil authority is justifiable under certain circumstances. A useful tool employed by Christians for many centuries in discussing such issues of war and peace has been "just war theory." This theory was adapted by early church leaders, particularly St. Augustine, to deal with the reality of war in a fallen, sinful world. It must always be remembered that just-war theory is not, and never was intended to justify war. Instead, it tries to bring war under the sway of justice as understood by Christians and to insure that war, when it does occur, is hedged about by limits which reduce its barbarity. In fact, if all parties accepted just-war criteria, then there would be no wars, since the theory's first rule clearly states no war is just unless it is a defense against aggression. If everyone adhered to just-war theory, aggression would be eliminated.

When then, are the criteria of just-war theory?

1. Just cause. War is only permissible to resist aggression and defend those victimized by it. Only defensive war is defensible.

2. Just intent. The only acceptable motive must be to secure justice for all involved. Revenge, conquest, and economic benefit are insufficient, illegitimate and unacceptable motives.

3. Last resort. Resort to arms can only be morally legitimate when all other avenues of conflict resolution have been rebuffed or have demonstrably failed.

4. Legitimate authority. The use of military force is only the prerogative of governments. Consequently, only the duly constituted civil authority can legitimatize military action. However helpful a United Nations Security Council vote may be, for Americans the duly constituted authority is the government of the United States and the authorizing vehicle is a declaration of war.

5. Limited goals. If the purpose of peace, then annihilation of the enemy or total destruction of his civilization is not acceptable. "Total war" is beyond the pale. Also, unless one's survival or liberty are imperiled, it is not acceptable to resort to war unless the goals are achievable.

6. Proportionality. Will the human cost of the armed conflict to both sides be proportionate to the stated objectives and goals? Does the good gained by resort to armed conflict justify the cost of lives lost and bodies maimed?

7. Noncombatant immunity. No war can be just which does not disqualify noncombatants as legitimate military targets and which does not seek to minimize collateral, inadvertent civilian casualties. No one has the right to make war on civilians.

These are the criteria which armed conflict must meet to be considered just. How do these apply to the present crisis? Is America's motive to help erect a stable, just peace in the post-cold-war world in which all people have a reasonable expectation that aggressors will be restrained by the world community of nations? If so, then perhaps this is a just cause.

In the attempts to bring to bear historical analogies, perhaps the best one to employ in the present crisis is Mussolini's invasion of Ethiopia in 1935. The League of Nations imposed an embargo which failed to deter Mussolini's aggression, and Ethiopia was conquered.

Quickly, the world became a much more dangerous and unstable place. The League of Nations' impotence was exposed, and the allies' appeasement had begun. In short order, Hitler reoccupied the Rhineland, Hitler and Mussolini blatantly intervened in the Spanish Civil War, and Austria was annexed by Germany. Then, at Munich, the Allies surrendered the Sudetenland and within a short period of time the world had disintegrated into a worldwide conflict which cost tens of millions of lives.

Mussolini, like Hussein, did not initially pose a threat to the survival of the great world powers. But his undeterred aggression encouraged and abetted the unleashing of powerful forces in other lands which ultimately threatened the survival of civilized humankind.

Let it be stated here emphatically that jobs and oil are not a sufficient or legitimate motive.

Is our goal in the Persian Gulf to roll back aggression and to bring relief and justice to the Kuwaiti population victimized by Iraqi aggression? The horrors of the Amnesty International reports of widespread Iraqi atrocities are particularly relevant at this point.

Is it further our goal to neutralize Hussein's military power and in so doing seek justice and peace for the entire region? If so, then perhaps our goal is just. A mere restoration of the status quo ante which leaves Hussein's military capability in place is not a sufficient goal and would not justify the loss of life, American, Kuwaiti, and Iraqi.

Can such goals be achieved without disportionate American, Kuwaiti and Iraqi bloodshed? Are there no effective alternatives to armed conflict to achieve these goals? Are there procedures in place to insure the minimizing of noncombatant casualties?

The American citizenry does not have the information to answer many of these questions. We have the responsibility to ask them, however, and to demand that our elected leaders assess the crisis light of them, and to provide affirmative answers before resorting to armed force—always a last resort.

President Kennedy said in his inaugural address that "a new generation of Americans had risen to leadership ready to pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe, in order to assure the survival and the success of liberty." Subsequent events revealed that we were willing to bear some burdens, meet some hardships, support some friends, and oppose some foes.

Now another generation has risen to leadership, one that has learned the bitter lessons of the limits of American power and resolve. President Bush said in his inaugural address that "surely the status of limitations has been reached on Vietnam." In terms of bitterness and recrimination that is hopefully true. But the lessons of Vietnam endure. For many of us, with the names of friends, relatives, and playmates inscribed on the onyx marble of the Vietnam memorial embedded in the hallowed ground near the Lincoln memorial—a promise has been made, a vow taken—"Never again!"

Never will we allow our soldiers to be placed at the uncertain end of a long tether without sufficient support and resolve at home to give them all necessary means to do the job. If it is worth American soldiers dying, it is worth winning. And unless our survival or liberty is at stake, it must be winnable. If it is not worth winning (including the just-war criteria), it is not worth shedding of our citizens' blood.

For this Christian, for this American, for this father, these are serious questions with the gravest repercussions. To our elected leaders, I say, "If you send our young people to war, you must have firm, acceptable an-

swers to these questions. We are accountable for asking. You are accountable for your answers."

CONTRIBUTIONS TO OPERATION DESERT SHIELD

[In millions of dollars]

	Direct payments		In-kind services		Foreign assistance	
	Pledged	Received	Pledged	Received	Pledged	Received
Saudi Arabia	[1] 4,000–5,000	760	[1] 4,000–5,000	227	5,000	Unknown.
Kuwait	[2] 5,000	2,250	[2] 5,000	3	[2] 5,000	Do.
Japan	[2] 2,000	376	[3] 2,000	50	2,000	Do.
European Community					2,000	Do.
West Germany	[3] 2,000	272	[3] 2,000	65	95	Do.
United Arab Emirates	[4] 1,000	250	[4] 1,000	30	[4] 1,000	Do.
South Korea			120	4	100	Do.
Italy		(3,908)		(379)	[5] 150	Do.
Canada					75	Do.
France					40	Do.
Iceland					2.5	Do.
Australia						Do.
Percent	15.120	4.287	28.4		1	

[1] Total amount pledged was $4,000—$5,000 million, but the breakdown between direct payment and in-kind services was not available.
[2] Total amount pledged was $5,000 million, but the breakdown between the three categories was not available.
[3] Total amount pledged was $2,000 million, but the breakdown between direct payment and in-kind services was not available.
[4] Total amount pledged was $1,000 million, but the breakdown between the three categories was not available.
[5] It is unclear if this is in addition to the European Community contribution.

NOTE.—As of November 30, 1990, the Defense Cooperation Account which contains the direct payments received from foreign government contributions totaled approximately $3.9 billion.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 9, 1991.

BURDEN SHARING IN THE MIDDLE EAST IS SOUND PUBLIC POLICY

DEAR COLLEAGUE: The U.S. Congress will soon be called upon to vote on several resolutions relating to the prospective use of force in the Middle East. Among other things, we may have to vote upon one or more resolutions clarifying our position with respect to the President's multilateral initiative to halt the march of Saddam Hussein through the oil fields in the Gulf.

As you know, Americans of all political and ideological persuasions have debated the merits of U.S. involvement abroad, with some favoring swift military intervention to protect vital U.S. interests there and others raising serious reservations about the nature of the U.S. interests involved. Although I share many of the reservations expressed, I will support the use of force provided: (1) all reasonable diplomatic alternatives have been pursued; (2) the U.S. commander of the multilateral force in the Gulf has clear authority over the forces there; (3) if the President directs that military action take place, and the Congress endorses such action, our military leaders have authority to prosecute the war with *no* interference from political authorities, as was the case in Viet Nam; and (4) our allies contribute to an equitable burden sharing arrangement.

No matter how one views the current conflict, I think we can all agree that the interests we are defending are international in nature and demand an international response.

What does this mean with respect to the U.S. role in this impending conflict?

At a minimum, it means that the United States must demand a full and fair level of participation and support from all of our allies. Saudi Arabia and other Middle Eastern oil exporting countries have reaped enormous profits from the upsurge in oil prices since August. According to my calculations, while the Saudis have realized a total windfall of almost $9 billion since the August invasion, they have contributed only $760 million to the multilateral effort in the Gulf. Others estimate the total Saudi windfall to be in excess of $15 billion, and the windfall for the United Arab Emirates at 40 percent of the Saudi total.

ESTIMATED SAUDI WINDFALL FROM GULF CRISIS

Month	Increase beyond base Aug. 2, 1990 price of $21 per barrel	Total Saudi production (millions of barrels/day)	Total windfall
August	$6.00	5.80	$1,078.8
September	8.00	7.75	1,860.0
October	10.00	7.75	2,402.5
November	8.00	8.00	1,920.0
December	6.00	8.00	1,488.0
Total			8,749.3

Clearly, our friends in the Gulf should contribute more to the success of Operation Desert Shield. Similarly, Japan, Germany, and other Western nations derive a much greater portion of their imported oil from the Middle East than does the United States, yet their contributions to the effort to date do not reflect that fact. As supporters of the United Nations resolution justifying the use of force in the Gulf, these nations must also assume a greater share of the responsibility in this venture.

In addition to Saudi Arabia's parsimonious contribution of $760 million, the United Arab Emirates has added a mere $250 million to the military effort in the Gulf. The contributions from Germany ($272 million) and Japan ($426 million) have been similarly inadequate. Only Great Britain appears to be holding its own in this regard.

When we vote on Operation Desert Shield, I hope you will support the inclusion of language directing the State Department to seek additional financial, material, and human contributions from both our Western allies and our friends in the Gulf. Saddam Hussein's actions threaten the peace and stability of the whole world, not just the United States. The overwhelming support in the United Nations for Operation Desert Shield indicates that our allies recognize the nature of the threat posed by Hussein. But we deserve more than mere rhetorical support from our friends. Our allies should assume responsibility for this massive undertaking in proportion to the benefits they derive from it.

I hope you will support efforts to increase the participation of our allies in this risky venture.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM E. DANNEMEYER,
Member of Congress.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER], a Member of the Republican leadership.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I have been listening over the last several minutes and yesterday to a number of statements to the effect that we should go the long run. We should have some endurance in this case and we should have some great patience and time should work in our favor. I think in fact that is not the case.

For those who feel that they are doing a favor to our American military people who are in the Middle East right now waiting to take action, I think if they could speak to this debate I believe that their statement might be, "Please, United States Congress, don't do us too many favors."

Let me speak to my greatest concern, and I have done some study on this as a member of the House Armed Services Committee. I have talked to a number of experts. I know a number of us in the House are concerned about this issue. A number of members of the executive branch have done some work on this. But the point is that the clock is ticking not only with respect to Saddam Hussein's continued construction of chemical and biological weapons, but also nuclear weapons. We have a somewhat fuzzy picture of exactly what he has right now. I think if there is any consensus it is that we do not know precisely what he has, but we do know some basic facts about the materials that he has in fact acquired that have been seen by inspection teams as recently as last year.

Saddam Hussein has 27 pounds of enriched uranium. That is enough uranium to build at least one nuclear weapon and possibly several.

He also has 250 tons of uranium oxide, which if enriched would produce many, many weapons.

A number of our very fine scientists have pointed out that there is a good chance that he also has plutonium and tritium, and if he has tritium that is

going to increase the yield of his nuclear devices greatly and expand greatly our estimate of the force and destruction and casualty causing capability that Saddam Hussein has.

So as this clock ticks away and we take no action, Saddam Hussein is racing, just as Adolf Hitler was racing in World War II, to build a nuclear system.

Now, I think we are going to see because of the liberalization of technology transfer that has now been manifested by votes in this Congress and in parliaments and governments around the world, we are seeing a liberal flow of technology, much of which is used in the development of nuclear systems in many Third World countries. I think over the next several years it is going to be impossible even assuming Saddam Hussein does not have everything he needs right now to build a nuclear system, it is going to be impossible to keep him from acquiring the other elements that he needs.

But let me take some statements from experts who are considered to be middle-of-the-roaders on this particular issue who addressed the Armed Services Committee in the hearings we had.

Let me first give a statement from Leonard Spector who is a senior associate, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. He says this:

> In the end I do not believe that Iraq's nuclear potential should necessarily push us into war, but I believe it poses a threat of considerable gravity that must be taken into account by Congress and the administration as they determine our next moves in the gulf.

Now, here is a gentleman who is obviously not considered to be a hardliner or a hardcore conservative or a hawk on this issue who understands and appreciates the fact that Saddam Hussein is moving toward the acquisition of a nuclear system.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUNTER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman makes obviously a very good point about our concern over Saddam Hussein and whether or not Iraq under his leadership, if we can use that term, or under his control would acquire nuclear weapons.

As the gentleman knows, a number of us were in the Middle East just this last week. In discussing this with various Israeli officials, they made it very clear that they did not believe that he could complete the nuclear circle and acquire weapons without the help of the Europeans.

I guess what is distressing, and I assume it distresses the gentleman in the well also, is that here we are with 430,000 of our troops and our treasure on the front line and we continue to read of German firms and possibly French firms that are still engaging, or trying to engage in commerce with Iraq.

I think the gentleman and the Armed Services Committee and others are concerned that if we cannot get a pledge out of these nations that they are not going to police their firms, I find it very difficult to extend our young people's lives to stop this nuclear menace with this fanatic in control, and yet they are not even willing to interrupt their commerce. I just wondered if the gentleman knows what we are doing about it.

Mr. HUNTER. Let me address that issue, Mr. Speaker.

As the gentleman may have seen from recent debates on technology transfer, I think that we transfer far too much technology. I voted against the last bill that we passed in this House that I considered to be a liberalization of technology transfer. We have to stop our allies from doing that. We now have some consensus that they are not going to do it anymore; but the fact remains that if you analyze Saddam Hussein's present inventory, he has 27 pounds of enriched uranium, he has 250 tons of uranium oxide. He has already purchased most of the ingredients that he needs.

Talking with one scientist yesterday from a national laboratory, he stated it is his opinion that Saddam Hussein has everything he needs or can get anything else he needs on a commercial level. The only thing that stands between Saddam Hussein and building a nuclear device, not a very sophisticated device, but a nuclear device capable of killing a lot of Americans or other allies is time, the other two resolutions would give that time to Saddam Hussein. Time is something we cannot give this madman with respect to his nuclear development program.

□ 0950

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS].

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, war is not just a word. In today's world it refers to massive death, destruction, and annihilation; hardship, food and medical shortages; economic disability, and countless other forms of disaster. Yet, through his uncompromising rhetoric and actions that it seems the President of the United States is eager to start one. The conclusion I am left with after the recent weeks and months of Presidential statements and directives is that perhaps the President does not really want to look at the consequences of his actions.

Do we really believe that we can go into war action against the Iraqis without sustaining an extreme number of casualties? Do we believe we can prevent any harm from being inflicted within the borders of the United States by the terrorists committed to the holy war which Saddam Hussein has promised? Do we really believe that the provocations are severe enough to ask many Americans to make the ultimate sacrifice while asking many more to endure great hardships?

Now although estimates vary widely, many experts maintain that the United States would suffer tens of thousands of casualties if we go to war. Numbers like that scare me. They mean that millions of Americans will be personally affected.

Consider also that many of these casualties will be women. I talked to some of the Members who were in the Persian Gulf over the past few days and they said they saw many women who were there because they believe in supporting their country. But these are also women who are mothers, who have young children who have been left behind, who are going to need them. They want them to come back. We in America are not used to seeing our women—our female military personnel—dismembered and maimed in war. And that is a reality that I do not believe we are eager to see.

Now the loss of all kinds of military equipment—ships, tanks, planes, guns, et cetera—we know is going to be a crippling and costly effect of the war. Such a substantial loss of America's defense potential will severely weaken us against any other threat in coming years. But we can deal with that sort of thing to some great extent.

But it seems to me that we must remember that these are very serious times. It is not about whether or not we are going to be tough guys or tough women; it is about whether we are going to be rational in deciding whether to put our people through the destruction of war.

I consider myself a fairly young woman although I am middle age in many respects. But for all of my life I have lived in periods of war. When I was a young child I heard on the Jack Armstrong radio show—which was interrupted for a special announcement—that our country was at war. I did not want to believe that. I was frightened, scared to death, thinking that war was going to be right outside my door in the apartment in which we were living at the time.

And then when I became a high school student the fellow I was dating and all of our friends went to war in Korea. Then as I became older there was another war, this time in Vietnam, and I was concerned that my son would be drafted to defend this country and possibly lay down his life.

Now we call ourselves a peace-loving people in this country. And yet every decade or so we find ourselves shouldering the gun, marching off to war, jeopardizing the lives of 17-, 18-, 19-, 20-year old men and women.

I believe it is time for us to stand back and look at what we are doing, look at the lives we will be destroying, look at the devastation that we will bring to our country and to our people here in the United States in a time of war crisis, economic crisis as well.

It seems to me we ought to let the sanctions work, we certainly ought to embrace the Durbin-Bennett resolution which says that Congress must first approve any offensive military action against Iraq before such action may be initiated. Inasmuch as it appears that the President does not have peace on his mind, we here in Congress—the people's representatives—must be the only triumphant voice and insist that all other diplomatic means be taken in order to avoid war. That is our constitutional duty. I, therefore, encourage all of my colleagues to use that constitutional power to vote for peace and to support the Gephardt-Hamilton resolution.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HENRY. I thank the gentlewomen for yielding.

I just would make a little intellectual distinction between peace-loving and sometimes being required to be peace-keeping and peace-making.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Peace-loving and peace-making are both very good. However I think we are responsible for our actions. We can rationalize anything we want to, but that does not eliminate the fact that blood will be shed and that blood will be of 17-, 18-, 19-, 20-year-old young men and women of our country; and I for one will not vote for any kind of resolution that is going to do that unless I see for myself that such action is needed, and I do not see it now.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COBLE].

Mr. COBLE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, some Americans continue to portray themselves as insoluble enigmas. Earlier this week, for example, one of my constituents approached me in my district and announced, "I wish I trusted President Bush more."

I look at him incredulously and asked, "Are you by implication suggesting that you trust Saddam Hussein?"

He did not respond.

My point, Mr. Speaker, is that so many Americans are quick to point accusatory fingers at our own Government but reluctant to, in any way, criticize our adversaries.

To extend the time to keep sanctions in place in my opinion is foolhardy. It merely affords Hussein additional weaseling time. One significant issue before us, Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, is who initiated the crisis in the desert that plagues the world today? Who started it?

Hardly we; obviously they.

The Iraqis continue to exclaim that the United States wants war. They continue to attempt to portray this matter as the United States versus Iraq. This, as a practical matter, Mr. Speaker, is the world versus Iraq. This cancerous problem must be resolved, it seems to me, in a timely manner. Saddam and the world are watching today and tomorrow what transpires in this, the people's House.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS].

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I think that our country has a checkered past when it comes to indignation about aggression.

For example, when China did the same thing to Tibet that Iraq has done to Kuwait, the reaction from this administration or the first part of this administration was not to say that we had to go and kill a lot of our young people. Although China was also developing nuclear capability the reaction was for President Reagan to come to Congress and ask for authority to sell nuclear technology to Red China.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACOBS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, Hafiz al-Asad of Syria is doing the same thing in Lebanon today. He is taking over Lebanon without protest.

Mr. JACOBS. I did not get to that yet. I am glad the gentleman took care of that.

If you want to talk about large nations that invade weaker neighbors, our skirts are not exactly immaculate, are they? If anybody remembers Grenada, it was a weak neighbor. We are a strong nation. We invaded. Of course, we are right and everybody else is wrong when we invade other countries.

But that is the crazy-quilt pattern of American history certainly in the last decade or so. It seems to me the administration has a hard time making up its mind.

Let us take the brutality, the undeniable brutality of the Iraqis against the Kuwaitis.

When it comes to El Salvador, we finance the brutality against their own people.

What is this selective morality that justifies our pulling the lanyard of war and blowing away—I do not mean blowing away—does anybody understand if you get a piece of shrapnel in your backbone, does anybody understand a poncho oozing blood wrapped around a dead body? Does anybody understand that? Must we all believe that we are playing Rambo, that we are playing war games here?

It is forever, it is total war for the kid who gets blown away.

In a civilized country, when war is an option it is by definition not the option.

In World War II, you will find this in Manchester's book called "Goodbye Darkness." Some Marine general's in the Pacific recommended that we bypass an island and, in effect, have an economic boycott to starve them out. They recommended that to Washington. There was an American naval officer up in Canada visiting who countermanded that order, and in retrospect thousands and thousands of young Americans were unnecessarily slaughtered just because some fellow sipping tea was casual about being a hero on somebody else's time.

□ 1000

Mr. Speaker, I think, if we go to war, it should be because we have to, not just because we have a chance to. I believe that the American people ought to know by now that there is human folly, as Barbara Tuchman put it—The March of human Folly and borrowing money to borrow trouble in other people's wars.

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HENRY].

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, this is a somber and difficult debate. Each Member of Congress had hoped that Saddam Hussein and the Government of Iraq would not lead us down this path of terrible consequence. Each of us wishes that in the waning hours of the timeframe established by United Nations Security Council Resolution 768, Saddam Hussein will yet choose to withdraw from his illegal occupation of Kuwait, and fully comply with the demands of the world community as expressed in no less than 12 resolutions adopted by the Security Council.

Each Member of Congress stands in opposition to what Saddam Hussein has done. Each Member of Congress stands firm in the belief that Saddam must leave Kuwait, and restore the principle of law in the conduct between sovereign nations. And hopefully, each Member of Congress understands that international military actions of this sort cannot be allowed to succeed without gravely affecting global stability.

Before us now is the question of what means should be used to secure the ends of our convictions. First comes the question of whether or not the President, as Commander in Chief, has the constitutional authority to strike Iraq militarily without explicit congressional assent and authorization. Is the power to "declare" war granted to Congress under the Constitution merely a formal act of declaration distinct from the power to "conduct" war

granted to the President as Commander in Chief? It is clear that under many circumstances, the President has the constitutional right to take a military action on behalf of the national interest. But I would argue strongly that in this instance, congressional assent to do so is not only constitutionally mandated but also a political necessity.

The nature and magnitude of the military operation being contemplated and the fact that U.N. Security Council Resolution 678 gives us foreknowledge of the time at which U.N. member states may exercise "all necessary means," including military force, certainly require Members of Congress to either explicitly authorize or deny the President the authority to act in this instance. Further, any military engagement that may be necessary will be helped, not hindered, by the demonstration of domestic political support.

For the record, then, I would like to make clear that I believe that the President is required to have congressional authority in this instance, and that such authority is part and parcel of the bipartisan Solarz-Michel resolution that is now before the House of Representatives. The intent of this resolution is to explicitly authorize the United States to use force to implement the United Nations Security Council resolution on Iraq's invasion of Kuwait.

Mr. Speaker, a second question remains: Should the Solarz-Michel resolution be passed in favor of the alternative Hamilton-Gephardt resolution, which calls for continuing economic and trade sanctions against Iraq and postponing the question of using military force?

Mr. Speaker, I very strongly support the bipartisan Solarz-Michel resolution authorizing the immediate implementation of Security Council Resolution 678. I do so not because I have any less desire to see a peaceful, diplomatic resolution to the conflict in the Persian Gulf than any other Member of Congress has, but I firmly believe that passing the Solarz-Michel resolution will provide us the last best hope for peace in the days leading up to January 15.

Mr. Speaker, I support the Solarz-Michel resolution for the following reasons:

First, to delay in this matter only gives Saddam Hussein the wrong message. Surely, he will interpret delay in the implementation of the United Nations resolution as a lack of will, and not just as a disagreement over means.

Second, all the questions about postponing military actions reappear when a proposed extension expires. The questions will be the same, and Saddam Hussein will only believe that, having postponed implementation once, we shall be willing to postpone implementation yet again.

Third, the safety of our troops demands expeditious resolution of the current crisis in the Persian Gulf. The climatic factors will change very dramatically in the next 8 weeks, and will place our military position at a disadvantage in relationship to that of the Iraqi troops.

Fourth, the morale of our troops demands an expeditious resolution of this crisis. Calling up of Reserves, in particular, has our military personnel stationed in the gulf and their families at home expecting 180-day tours of duty. If it is possible, we ought to seek to honor that expectation, given the hardships this callup has placed on families here at home. Right now, our troops' morale is extremely high. We should not pursue any policy that could undermine that strength.

Fifth, postponing the U.N. Security Council resolution will only give Saddam Hussein more reasons to try to split the U.N. alliance that currently stands against him. Just as our own nation contains a broad spectrum of political opinions on this matter, domestic disputes are present in other nations of the alliance as well. To allow Saddam Hussein to play these disputes against one another, and to play nations now allied together against each other, portends nothing but further political fragmentation of our efforts if we do not demonstrate firm resolve today.

Sixth, and finally, Mr. Speaker, I support the resolution for the simple reason that the U.S. Congress ought not put itself at odds against the United Nations, or question the considered opinion and actions of the Security Council. For the United States to turn against the United Nations in this instance would strike a blow against the struggle to refine and strengthen international peace-keeping institutions that will be so important in the post-cold-war era.

Mr. Speaker, allow me also to use this opportunity to express my strong support and agreement with the substance of the President's policy in this crisis. This is the first major test of how the world community will handle threats to global peace and stability in the post-cold-war era. The President and the world community through the United Nations have rightly understood that to allow Saddam Hussein to succeed with his aggression would encourage him to continue his regional aggressions and hostilities, and would encourage others to attempt the same. How the world community responds in this instance sets peace-keeping patterns in a world political environment that is dramatically different from the one we have known for many years.

In conjunction with that fact, the President has rightfully understood that the U.N. peace-keeping machinery is a very important part of any expression of national interest in this serious matter. We must not forget the outstanding progress that has been achieved through the peace-keeping machinery of the United Nations and the Security Council in particular. And I wish to commend President Bush for his foresight in this matter and for working through and with the Security Council in conducting our national policy.

Mr. Speaker, I hope and pray for a diplomatic resolution to the crisis. But we cannot show any hesitancy in our determination to fulfill commitments we have made to and through the world community—to the allied nations joined with us in the Persian Gulf, to the United Nations, which joins with us in this effort, to the Kuwaiti people, or to the principles of law upon which peace between the nations ultimately rests.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I listened to one of the most poignant speeches that I have ever heard. I listened to my good friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT] reveal what must have been a most soul-searched confession. He talked about the fact that he had been in the Congress for 43 years, that he had cast approximately 15,000 votes, and, after reviewing this entire congressional career and the votes that he had made, there was one vote that he was sorry he had cast and that he wished that he had it back again. That was the vote that he made in favor of the Gulf of Tonkin resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I can sympathize with my good friend from Florida. Every Member of the House voted for that resolution. Only two Senators, as a matter of fact, voted against it when it was before the Senate, but every Member of the House voted against it, which was understandable because the vote on that resolution came hard upon an attack the President said had been made by North Vietnamese torpedo boats against American destroyers *Maddox* and *Turner Joy* in the Gulf of Tonkin. The President sent up to the Congress a request asking them to support him in the use of our Armed Forces in repelling North Vietnam's aggression. The House, caught in the fervor of replying to the torpedo boat attack gave him that power by a unanimous vote.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT], my good friend, and I came to the House together, in the election of 1948. I was not in the Congress in 1964 when the Gulf of Tonkin resolution was voted on. I had tried unsuccessfully to become a Senator in 1962 and was out of Congress for one term. I often wonder how I would have voted on that resolution. I think, may

I say to my good friend from Florida, in the heat of the circumstance with which that resolution was presented, I probably would have voted with him, but I would like to think that perhaps I would not have voted that way. But everybody was caught up in supporting the President in repelling that dastardly Communist attack.

Then, Mr. Speaker, a few months later the Department of the Navy admitted there had been no attack upon our destroyers by North Vietnam torpedo boats. The report there had been such an attack was in error.

It is not too much to say that the Solarz-Michel resolution may be compared to the Gulf of Tonkin resolution. Both embodied Presidential requests for congressional approval to use our Armed Forces. I do not think that President Bush has made a case for using our Armed Forces. His letter to all of us in which he asks us to support him says that Iraq threatens our vital interests. What vital interests of ours is threatened by Iraq? He did not specify any vital interests that had been placed in jeopardy by Iraq's invasion of Kuwait. It would appear that this was a presidential exaggeration in order to garner votes for the resolution which would give him congressional authority to use our Armed Forces in the Middle East.

□ 1010

But what is it, Mr. Speaker—what is it that has changed the administration's favorable treatment of Saddam Hussein and Iraq of wooing him seeking to nourish his friendship by favorable trade and arms deals up to the time of his invasion of Kuwait. Suddenly the administration recognized the evil character of their erstwhile friend. Now they are trying to remedy their error by mobilizing the world against Iraq. Now the President wants the Congress to authorize use of an armed force against Iraq.

It could be argued that Saddam Hussein acted upon what can only be interpreted as an invitation offered by our administration to attack Kuwait. That is revealed in the transcript of the meeting between Ambassador Glaspie and Saddam Hussein before his invasion of Kuwait. Actually, under the Secretary of State's instruction, our Ambassador told Saddam we had no interest in his border dispute with Kuwait when he raised the question.

The truth is, Mr. Speaker, that Presidents have not always told the truth to the Congress when they seek to get their assistance. The President says our vital interests are threatened. I have yet to hear of any of our vital interest that has been threatened. That is why I propose to give a chance for the sanctions to work by voting for the Hamilton-Gephardt bill and against the Solarz-Michel resolution to give President Bush war-making powers in the Middle East.

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, the focus of this debate for all parties should be how we best find a peaceful solution to the Middle East crisis. The chance for a peaceful solution is enhanced, in my view, by the use of all of the available options—sanctions, diplomacy, threatened military action—backed by a solid national resolve. In the final analysis, should other alternatives not be effective, military force to expel Saddam Hussein from Kuwait, unconditionally, is the final option. And the willingness to use that option is the only reason to believe the others might succeed.

To negotiate in these final tense days, we must have the firm resolve of this Congress to get Saddam Hussein, a world terrorist, out of Kuwait. There does not seem to be great division on that goal.

Consideration and backing by the Congress of the U.N. resolution should have come months ago. Instead, Congress dodged this important vote. If only those service men in the gulf can dodge bullets as easily as this Congress has dodged hard questions and challenges.

The reasons for our involvement have crystallized into a multifaceted and critical explanation: The menacing threat of a military-oriented dictator's potential command of the world's economy by controlling much of the world's energy supply; Hussein's record of aggression and his military capacity for mass destruction—including chemical and nuclear weapons; the violence done to thousands of Americans and our allies as human shields or living targets of war; the terrorist threats risked on our own soil; the spectacle of the end of the 40-year cold war being interrupted by naked aggression and brutality to a neighboring country; and the prospect of an explosion of tensions in the tremendously unsettled Middle East, eruptions that would be felt throughout the world. The reasons for our involvement seem to be clear.

The question before us is a simple one. Do we support the President and give him all the options that are necessary to carry out the U.N. resolution supported by at least 28 nations, as well as the commitment made in this country? Or do we, in fact, play the card Hussein wants us to play by showing division, demonstrating weakness, undermining all the long, hard-sought efforts that have been made by men and women apparently more courageous than we?

Some argue that the military option should be denied the President and that economic sanctions and diplomacy should be continued. I agree that every avenue of diplomatic and economic solutions should be explored. I very much want those efforts to continue. The January 15 deadline doesn't require that military action begin. Sanctions are helpful and no doubt have brought some economic discomfort to Iraq. It is increasingly clear that sanctions alone will not bring about withdrawal from Kuwait, nor will diplomacy be effective if military force is removed as an option.

This vote will be a test of the system—the ability of a democracy to give its leaders the strong support necessary in making the kinds of decisions that a superpower must make in world diplomacy?

No one wants war—the question is, what is our best route to find a peaceful settlement? In dealing with a personality like Saddam Hussein, I think the answer is clear. There will be no movement on his part unless he is persuaded that the United States and the United Nations are firm in their resolve and that whatever means necessary will be used for his unconditional withdrawal from Kuwait.

Peaceful, diplomatic solutions have been and are being pursued. But if Hussein believes he has a window of opportunity demonstrated by Congress, or in his eyes, America's lack of resolve, those efforts of peace will be lost. We must be strong in dealing with Hussein. This vote is the time to show it.

The President needs our support. Four hundred thousand United States service men and women in Saudi Arabia need our support. This country needs our support. It is time for us to come together and put it on the line.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, the Pentagon ordered 16,000 human remains pouches. Now, if all the so-called experts around here are correct that they are predicting 1,000 dead Americans, then why did the Pentagon recently order 16,000 human remains pouches.

The truth of the matter is, plain and simple, these are body bags. They have gone to a day when shovels have becoming entrenching tools, copper wire has become remote rotor antennas, and now body bags are human remains pouches. And let me tell you what: There are going to be a lot of dead Americans, because it is basically Americans in the front line.

Now, I understand the political rhetoric, and there is an old saying in America, "When the going gets tough, the tough get going." Well, let me tell Members what you are voting on today. There is a saying that our allies have, from Japan, to Germany, and any and all around the globe. They say, "When the going gets tough, send in

Uncle Sam. Congress won't object to it. They will even pay for the damn thing."

Now, let me tell you what: The American people overwhelmingly voted for George Bush, but the American people do not want Congress to grant him the power of King George. You believe me when I tell you that. If they were informed as to what was going on in the constitutional responsibility, and they really were able to participate in a debate of constitutional law, they would 95 percent stand up and say, "Congress, if you capitulate to this President, attempting to seize the constitutional power of a monarch, then you are a bunch of wimps."

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, the statement was made by the Speaker before that we ought to support the President. It is wrong to support the President where his policy is against our national interest. During the Korean war in 1951 when I was in Congress, one of those who was most critical of President Truman was Senator Robert A. Taft of Ohio. You remember Senator Taft. He was the minority leader of the Senate. He was known as Mr. Republican.

He was criticized for objecting to what President Truman was doing. Senator Taft, said this, a statement with which I agree:

> As I see it, Members of Congress have a constitutional obligation to reexamine constantly and discuss the foreign policy of the United States. If we permit appeals to unity to bring an end to that criticism, we endanger not only the constitutional liberties of the country, but even its very existence.

Every Member of the House has his own responsibilities and his own conscience to observe, especially on grave matters like war or peace.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. To my friend I would say this: regardless of our respective feelings on the President's right to declare war, to wage an offensive action without permission of Congress, we are engaged today in making the decision as to whether or not we are in fact going to give him in this case authorization to move offensively in the gulf. We have analyzed the situation. We are debating that. So this is not a question on whether or not Congress has a say. We are having our say today.

It is my estimation, and most of the polls that I have seen reflecting on the American people, most of the polls that I have seen, and I think most of my constituents have really looked at this thing and read all of the available information, most of the American people support this action by the President.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I have heard all of that discussion. I have heard talk that today we are sending signals to Mr. Hussein. Let me tell you what, folks: We do not work for the railroad. We do not send signals. We pass legislation. And we are confined and constricted by the fine line of the Constitution. That is what we do here, if anybody wants to figure that out.

□ 1020

Let me tell you what, let us talk about the polls. Here is what has happened in this country. Supposedly Congress sets policy. A Chief Executive carries it out. The court may decide the difference.

Not anymore. The court makes the law through precedent cases in the court. The President, he has his polls out there, and through news conferences he determines what the law is going to be and Congress, they go along, herded like a group of lemmings passing laws that stink, from the budget, to trade, to a lack of energy policy, economic policy. Now we are into the fiber of the Constitution itself, 18 paragraphs listing the powers of Congress, six of those paragraphs specifically dealing with the warmaking powers of Congress, three paragraphs for the President, two of them dealing with treaties and the appointment of judges, and they even have to be approved by the Senate.

He is a Chief Executive only. He carries out the policies of the board of directors. You are the board. You answer to the people. The people run the government, not one man.

I am not against George Bush. I hope to God he goes down in history as one of our greatest Presidents. But our Constitution makes sure that no man, no man or woman can set this Nation to war or can hurt our policies, and I am not going to be a part of it.

You take a look at this whole debacle. We canceled a $7 billion loan to Egypt. Where are our allies? Are they going to be placing America's dead into body bags and shipping them back to us? Half of them will not attack Iraq. I will be damned if the people from my district are going to go over there and die. And to tell you the truth, it is the poor from districts like mine that are in the front lines.

I do not like it. Stand for the Constitution.

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to one thing the gentleman said and point out to my colleagues that of the total force structure over there in Saudi Arabia now, 250,000 are troops of our allies, not American troops, almost half of the force structure, and 75 percent of the cost to us of being there has been paid for by others.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LAGOMARSINO].

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 62 the bipartisan resolution authorizing the use of U.S. Armed Forces pursuant to U.N. Security Council Resolution 678. I feel strongly that if Saddam Hussein believes we will not use force, he will never withdraw from Kuwait and will continue to directly threaten vital American national security interests. Passage of this resolution is absolutely critical to convincing Saddam.

The crisis in the Persian Gulf is of paramount importance to the United States. I have long supported Congress taking legislative action, that is fulfilling its constitutional responsibility as a coequal branch of Government. While I believe we should have taken action earlier, and we had the authority to come into session and do so, I believe the appropriate, and much needed action, is passage of House Joint Resolution 62. Our bold, yet responsible, policy, as directed by President Bush, is the right one with the best change of achieving our goals peacefully. As so well stated in the liberty song of our own American Revolution, "Then join hand in hand, brave Americans all! By uniting we stand, by dividing we fall." This wisdom is still very benefiting today. As during other times of grave threat to our nation and with hundreds of thousands of American military personnel deployed in the gulf, now is the time to put our differences aside and strongly stand up for our interests by supporting the President through this truly bipartisan resolution.

Contrary to the erroneous claims of some, this is not a war resolution. It is not a declaration of war. Rather it is a declaration of support for U.N. resolutions to date. No one wants war. As a World War II veteran myself, I know the horrors of war. I very much hope conflict can be avoided. Secretary of State Baker, who has a son deployed in Saudi Arabia, certainly doesn't want fighting to occur. But, if Saddam is not stopped now, if his aggressive designs are not frustrated, peacefully if possible, or if necessary by force, we will all pay a higer price later, especially after Saddam develops nuclear weapons.

It should be pointed out that this resolution requires the President to make a determination that prior to committing United States forces to battle, that the United States has exhausted all appropriate diplomatic and other peaceful means to obtain Iraq's compliance with U.N. Security Council resoutions, and to report to Congress on the basis for that determination. Clearly, the use of force is only a final

option after all others have been used and failed.

This is not an easy vote for me or anyone else. It is one of the toughest decisions I've made in my 17 years in Congress. In voting for this resolution, I am fully aware that one result could be armed conflict in which people including American servicemen and women, could die. Yet, so much is at stake here. As the President has said, there are multiple causes, multiple dangers and multiple threats. Standing alone, each is compelling. Put together, the case is overwhelming.

Over the past year, incredible events have occurred around the globe. Democratic revolutions in Latin America and Eastern Europe coupled with positive changes in the Soviet Union and the historic conventional arms reduction treaty recently signed in Paris, indeed mark the beginning of a new, promising era. For the first time in my life, the prospect for an era of genuine peace, stability and prosperity, free from war and oppression, exists. I volunteered for World War II at age 17 to bring about such an era. My generation and those that followed made great sacrifices so that our grandchildren wouldn't have to. Saddam Hussein jeopardizes all of this success.

I strongly believe that this era was achieved because we stood by our allies, principles and national security concerns. Just as Hitler, Togo and others presented a dangerous threat to our principles and national security concerns and left a world to struggle against evil and tyranny for 50 years, Saddam Hussein and others who will follow in his footsteps if he is not stopped pose the same threats. It is said that those who do not learn from history are condemned to repeat it. I've done my homework and learned we cannot jeopardize all that we have achieved and our positive hopes for a much better future by ignoring or appeasing this aggressive dictator.

During his testimony before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Secretary Baker said it best in describing Saddam Hussein as, "a very dangerous dictator—armed to the teeth—who is threatening a critical region at a defining moment in hsitory * * * we must act so that international laws, not international outlaws, govern the post-cold-war world. We must act so that right, not might, dictates success in the post-cold-war world." We must act so that innocent men, women and children are protected, not brutalized, in the post-cold-war world.

What the world, including the United States, is requiring of Iraq is not unreasonable. It is only to reverse a grave injustice, caused 100 percent by Iraq, and behave as a civilized nation rather than a terrorist one. Without warning or provocation, Iraq invaded and seized Kuwait, a small peaceful neighbor on August 2. This aggression came just hours after Iraqi Dictator Saddam Hussein specifically assured numerous countries in the area that there would be no invasion. Following the occupation of Kuwait and Iraqi threats to Saudi Arabia and other gulf countries, and knowing that Iraqi Dictator Saddam Hussein's assurances are absolutely meaningless, we along with other nations, deployed forces to Saudi Arabia at the Saudi's request. As President Bush elaborated in his address to the Nation from the Oval Office on August 8, the following four principles guide our policy:

First, we seek the immediate, unconditional, and complete withdrawal of all Iraqi forces from Kuwait.

Second, Kuwait's legitimate government must be restored to replace the puppet regime.

Third, my administration, as has been the case with every President from President Roosevelt to President Reagan, is committed to the security and stability of the Persian Gulf.

Fourth, we are determined to protect the lives of American citizens abroad.

President Bush and others have compared Saddam Hussein's aggression and expansionist plans with those of Hitler's in the 1930's. I believe this analogy is fitting. Appeasing Saddam Hussein by letting him annex Kuwait and bully the rest of the region will not work. And, today Saddam Hussein has more tanks, artillery, airplanes and other weapons than Hitler had to start World War II! Hitler did not stop with Czechoslovakia and if not deterred, I strongly believe that Saddam Hussein—and other like him—will not stop with Kuwait either. Saddam has made it clear that he has other targets including Saudi Arabia, other gulf emirates, portions of Turkey—(A NATO ally). Don't forget that prior to invading Kuwait, Saddam threatened both Kuwait and the United Arab Emirates. Long before invading Kuwait Saddam threatened to annihilate Israel. That very real and dangerous threat has been repeated, already beginning the Middle East down the road to possible nuclear war—something that would inevitably draw in the United States.

Keeping the Persian Gulf secure and stable, that is keeping a free flow of oil from Saudi Arabia is very critical to America—for that matter Western—economic stability and national security. Since the Franklin Roosevelt administration, we have maintained a naval presence in the gulf and a close alliance with Saudi Arabia. Recognizing the strategic importance of the region, the Carter administration threatened to use nuclear weapons if necessary to defend it.

With its seizure of Kuwait, Iraq now controls 20 percent of OPEC's oil production. Saudi Arabia, the largest OPEC producer, controls 21 percent making it a prime target for Saddam Hussein. If Saddam were allowed to seize Saudi Arabia's main oil producing facilities which are located close to the Kuwait frontier, he would control 45 percent of the world's known oil reserves! The United States has only 2.6 percent of the world's proven oil reserves. Saudi Arabia is the most important and influential oil producer. Whoever controls its vast reserves is able to dictate world oil prices and, basically, control world economies. We cannot allow a tyrant like Saddam Hussein to dictate our interest rates, inflation rates, unemployment and so on. We cannot sacrifice our economic independence to dictator Saddam Hussein.

Today, we import 56 percent of our oil with over 15 percent of that coming from Saudi Arabia—that's more than 7 percent of our daily consumption. 8 percent of our imports formerly came from Iraq and Kuwait—the Saudis have made up the difference with increased production for the United States. I vividly recall the long, long gas lines and greater, as a percentage, price increase during the last oil crisis when only 5 percent of our oil from Iran was cut off and we were importing only 46 percent of our needs. While I believe this crisis further underscores the need to find alternative sources of energy—something I have long supported, for today and the near future petroleum is the lifeblood of our economy.

It is also very important to note that other major United States trading partners, like Japan and Europe, are far more dependent on gulf oil. If their economies slide into recession or depression ours could follow right behind. That means inflation, job losses, business slumps and negative growth. Today's world is very much an interdependent one.

We should have no doubts, Saddam Hussein is a very brutal, aggressive dictator. He invaded Kuwait after demanding ransom, $40 billion and strategic portions of Kuwaiti territory. He is in the process of stealing and destroying every facet of Kuwaiti statehood. Innocent Kuwaits, whole families at times, are shot at random, babies have been thrown out of incubators which are then stolen, and patients have been thrown out of hospitals which are then looted, among other inhumane actions. Excerpts from the Amnesty International report I am submitting for the RECORD provide many more examples of Saddam's barbarity. It is obvious, by these examples, that Saddam Hussein continues to intend to use his military muscle to force the other gulf nations to kowtow to his demands for cash and higher oil prices, all at our expense.

At home in Iraq, Saddam came to power through a bloody coup and has personally shot scores, some say hundreds, of opponents. His gestapo-type secret police ensure through murder and terror that his regime has no dissension. Even the pressures of today's sanctions, which could stir up local op-

position, are mitigated because Iraqis would rather do without some food and consumer goods than be shot by Saddam's secret police.

Saddam Hussein has used chemical warfare on numerous occasions against both the Iranians and his own people in Iraq. Without reservation he gassed entire Iraqi villages indiscriminately killing innocent men, women and children, most of whom belong to Iraq's sizeable Kurdish minority. He has made no secret of his desire to literally annihilate Israel, which includes Jews, Christians, and Moslems, with chemical and nuclear weapons. Again, there are many frightening similarities to Hitler.

Saddam Hussein is trying, at a feverish pace, to develop nuclear weapons. According to unclassified intelligence testimony, Saddam could have atomic bombs within 5 years. Imagine the threat—the nuclear blackmail—Iraq could, and in my opinion would, pose to us and our allies in just a few years if not contained today. Iraq has already deployed short and medium range ballistic missiles, reportedly capable of carrying chemical warheads. These are also the preferred delivery systems for nuclear bombs. Furthermore, Iraq is working on even longer range missiles. These developments are a direct threat to the United States and the American people. Iraq has never developed a weapon that it has not used.

Putting all of these factors into perspective, like I said at the outset, if we do not stand up for what truly are our strategic interests in this region against such a clear and explicit threat, then we invite others with aggressive motives today, like Kim Il-Sung in Korea, and the new dictators of tomorrow, to subvert our allies and interests elsewhere around the globe returning us back to the cold-war type era of conflict and confrontation, not the new world order we have strived so hard to achieve.

Immediately following Iraq's imperialistic invasion of Kuwait, we initiated action on all fronts to support our four guiding principles. I support these actions by President Bush. On the economic front, the President ordered an embargo of all trade with Iraq. Congress enacted sanctions legislation. As a senior member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I cosponsored this sanctions measure, helped move it expeditiously through the House and, of course, voted for it. All Iraqi and Kuwaiti assets were frozen.

I am opposed to the Hamilton/Gephardt measure that would remove the threat of force to give sanctions more time because while I recognize that sanctions are an important tool, they are only one part of our strategy. Sanctions alone will not work. A recent CIA finding has confirmed this. Iraq has quite a self-sufficient agricultural sector, particularly in basic foodstuffs, meaning the Iraqi people are in no danger of starving therefore removing a pressure on Saddam to change his ways. Yes, the embargo is denying Iraq spare parts for its weapons. But, without the very real credible threat of force, Saddam doesn't need spares because he won't be using his weapons. Besides, Iraq has billions of dollars in hard currency and gold looted from Kuwait to sustain illegal sanctions-busting, black-market trade for key goods. Iraq has learned to live with hardship through 8 years of war with Iran.

The fact that many Soviet and Bulgarian technicians in Iraq have opted, despite the security threats, not to leave because they note there are more consumer goods and food in Baghdad than in Moscow or Sofia, indicates that sanctions are not totally effective. So too, is the fact that fresh kiwifruit, a perishable item not grown in Iraq, are available in Iraq and occupied Kuwait.

Today's sanctions are hurting the poorest countries and Eastern Europe's newest democracies the most—more than they are hurting Iraq. For example, sub-Saharan Africa which cannot even afford to feed itself, certainly cannot afford paying twice as much for oil. Yet, like everyone, these countries need oil for basic functioning. The result is less growth and development, larger debt, and greater poverty, starvation, and suffering.

All of the incredible achievements of Eastern Europe's new democracies are at risk due to sanctions. Times were hard enough when these countries were cut off from cheap Soviet energy and forced to buy oil and gas at market prices, despite their lack of hard currency or ability to generate it. As an offset, these countries entered into barter agreements with Iraq. In return for Eastern Europe's manufactured goods—products which are so inferior they cannot compete in any marketplace—Iraq provided oil. The embargo ended these deals. Now, many Eastern European countries are worse off economically then they were under communism, threatening a return of past evils. Unfortunately, Iraq most likely can hold out longer then they can. Yet, the fact Eastern Europeans are willing to risk so much to defeat Saddam Hussein is very telling. Those who have finally cast off 45 years of oppression recognize Saddam Hussein for what he really is and the dangers he presents. Having finally eradicated such cancer from their lives at great cost, Eastern Europe is dedicated to making sure it does not spread again.

Time, especially the long time needed for sanctions to work against Iraq, is on Saddam's side. Sanctions are hurting some of our friends like the new democracies in Eastern Europe more than Iraq. Over time, vulnerable countries like Syria and Jordan which cannot sustain the embargo may become lax in enforcing it or abandon it altogether, making sanctions even less effective. Today's international coalition exists because of American leadership. The passage of House Joint Resolution 62, signals critical resolve and leadership without which I fear our coalition will crumble.

As we wait for sanctions to work, Saddam can rest and better prepare his armies. Like all tyrants, he will deny his people resources to ensure his armies remain strong. And, when sanctions don't force him to leave by some later deadline, we'll face an even stronger Iraqi army with, perhaps, less international support. The expense of waiting through higher American casualties is ours. In the meantime, we must rotate troops. In order to keep sufficient forces in the area, we will have to either call up hundreds of thousands of reserves or reinstitute the draft. Both of these are very unpopular actions that will hurt our economy, increase our budget deficit and reduce domestic programs like education, housing, and drug control while, once again, increasing defense spending.

There is danger also that the Arab coalition against Saddam Hussein will falter if it appears the United States will not be willing to use force. Then where will the U.S.S.R. be? Foreign Minister Shevardnadze in his resignation speech alluded to opposition to his Persian Gulf policy.

On the diplomatic front, we have and continue to work with the international community to deny Iraq any benefits from its naked aggression. Iraq's actions are, indeed, a world problem and we have seen an unprecedented, unified global reaction against Iraq. This is not America against Iraq, it is the world against Saddam Hussein. The Arab League made up of Iraq's friends condemned Saddam Hussein's illegal actions. The U.N. Security Council, with which we work very closely, without dissent condemned Iraq and called for Iraq's immediate and unconditional withdrawal from Kuwait. All in all, the U.N. Security Council has passed 12 resolutions against Iraq.

The U.N. Security Council also approved, for the first time in 23 years, mandatory sanctions fully compatible with international law. The United Nations further passed a resolution to enforce those sanctions and the U.N.-mandated embargo through the use of force if necessary. On November 29, the U.N. Security Council passed a resolution authorizing the use of force after January 15, 1991, to implement all its previous resolutions demanding Iraqi withdrawal from Kuwait.

Showing we are serious about trying to achieve a diplomatic solution, President Bush offered to meet with top Iraqi officials in Washington and send Secretary of State Baker to meet with Saddam Hussein in Baghdad. We offered any date up to January 3—even

Christmas Day—to Saddam. Yet, he refused to schedule this very important meeting leading me, along with President Bush and others, to question Saddam's interest in seeking a diplomatic resolution. In yet another effort to obtain a diplomatic solution, President Bush sent Secretary Baker to Geneva, Switzerland, to meet with his Iraqi counterpart, Foreign Minister Aziz. The question remains if Iraq is willing to listen to reason. From the outcome of this lengthy meeting, I am very concerned that Iraq is not. Clearly, we've gone out of our way to be accommodating.

On the military front, we have deployed the finest military organization ever fielded. From my own personal inspection of American forces in Saudi Arabia, I know that we have enough forces with enough superior equipment to effectively do whatever job is necessary. The morale of our forces is excellent in part, I believe, because of the realistic training they previously received in places like Fort Irwin, CA. Interestingly, the closer to the frontlines and the more primitive the living conditions, the better the morale of our forces. It is very important for Saddam Hussein to realize what he is up against. If he forces a conflict, he will lose. I hope this will convince him that a peaceful settlement is the best option.

The deployment of our military forces to Saudi Arabia and the gulf region are not unilateral. Half of the ground forces in the region are non-American. Joining us in a true multinational effort are military forces of many Arab countries including Egypt, Morocco, Syria, Bahrain, Oman, Qatar, the United Arab Emirates and free Kuwait—those who escaped. These Arab forces, not American ones, are deployed on the front lines against Iraq.

Other ground, naval, and air forces from over 28 countries including Britain, France, Canada, Belgium, Australia, The Netherlands, Argentina, Bangladesh, Pakistan, and Italy are deployed in the region. Others, like Japan, Germany and Taiwan, which for sensitive legal and political reasons have not deployed military forces are, instead, contributing with supplies and financial support. For example, Japan has provided thousands of 4x4 jeeps. I must admit, I did find it strange to see United States soldiers driving around the Saudi desert in Toyotas! The Saudis are providing vast amounts of local support, much more than they receive credit for as I learned first hand during my trip to the gulf. In fact, in 1990 about 75 percent of our additional costs were covered by international contributions.

Of course, I believe that our allies, particularly our wealthy Arab, European and East Asian allies, must continue to share more of the burden. I support the continued efforts by the Bush admininstration to get even more direct support from these partners. Hence, our actions on all fronts are not unilateral, they are part of the broadest international campaign ever.

I believe we should continue to work and hope for the best—a speedy, peaceful resolution that guarantees future security and stability—but, knowing the grim track record of Saddam Hussein be prepared for the worst. The future of our world, and therefore, our country is at stake in this crisis. Simply put, it is a choice between right and wrong. It is time for Congress, the representative of the American people, to stand up for what is right and give the President the explicit authority to defend our national security interests which the implementation of the U.N. resolutions would do, with the use of force.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 11, 1991]

CONGRESS AND WAR

Iraq, says Speaker Foley, is an "issue of conscience." But that's to say that only one answer is possible. In fact, Iraq is an issue of judgment. Conscientious legislators have different views about it. That is what makes the congressional debate on Iraq so excruciatingly difficult.

That the United States has large stakes in the outcome of the Gulf crisis is no longer a contentious issue. The threshold argument in Congress is how best to pursue those stakes—by the threat of war or by further reliance on sanctions, diplomacy and the military buildup. On this matter, as we say, conscientious people can differ. There are expert analyses to support several courses. It is a close call.

But Congress is not dealing merely with this essentially tactical question. Having chosen to wait until this late moment to address the crisis in a formal this-counts way, Congress finds itself pinned up against the Bush administration's determined, United Nations-sanctioned effort to enforce the U.N.'s Jan. 15 deadline for Iraqi withdrawal from Kuwait. So a second argument—what we would call the more urgent argument—necessarily comes into play: whether to try to make the Bush enforcement strategy work. This is not simply a matter of supporting the president, although it is partly that. It is a matter of supplying the president with the vote of confidence, the showing of support, to strengthen his hand at the moment when conceivably this powerful sort of strengthening of his hand can influence the calculations of Saddam Hussein and win him over to the withdrawal that is favored by almost everyone in America.

It is no longer seriously disputed that Saddam Hussein is a menace to regional peace and global order and had best be reined in sooner so that he does not become an even greater menace later. This is what the American government has attempted to do. Now comes the squeeze. Can there be any question as to how Saddam Hussein would read a congressional vote that denied President Bush the authority he seeks to use force in conformity with international mandate and national policy alike? Does anyone think he would not take heart from such a vote?

A war in the Gulf could have incalculable and horrible effects, and we are not calling for the country to launch an attack. But we do support putting in the hands of the president—a president who personally knows something about war—the authority to make a more plausible threat in these eleventh-hour circumstances of President Hussein's pre-deadline countdown. Our judgment is that Congress, by deciding to authorize the president to conduct war, materially improves his chances of achieving peace. It is a risk, and we would take it.

[From Amnesty International, Dec. 19, 1990]

IRAQ/OCCUPIED KUWAIT—HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS SINCE AUGUST 2, 1990

METHODS OF TORTURE AND ILL-TREATMENT

The following are details of allegations of torture and ill-treatment which have been made to Amnesty International since 2 August, some of which are supported by medical evidence and photographic material [see Appendices C and D]. These reports are entirely consistent with methods of torture and ill-treatment known to have been used in Iraq over many years, and some of which are also supported by medical evidence [see in particular Amnesty International's report entitled "Torture in Iraq 1982–1984", published in April 1985, and the organization's annual reports].

It should be noted that not all of the methods listed below are said to have been widely used since 2 August. Those methods which have been alleged only in a few cases brought to Amnesty International's attention are marked with an asterisk (*).

1. Beatings on all parts of the body, involving punching, slapping, delivering Karate-style blows and kicking with heavy army boots. Implements used for beating include canes, metal rods, whips, steel cables, hosepipes, rubber truncheons and rifle butts.

2. Falaqa: prolonged beating on the soles of the feet. Sometimes the detainee is than forced to walk or run.

3. Suspending the detainee by the feet, or by the arms which are tied behind the back.

4. Beating the detainee while suspended from a rotating fan in the ceiling.

5. Breaking of the arms, legs or ribs; dislocating elbow and shoulder joints.

6. Lifting the detainee high up in the air and then dropping him, sometimes resulting in the fracturing of bones.

7. Applying pressure to the fingers with a clamp-like instrument.

8. Slashing the face, arms or legs with knives.

9. Extracting finger and toenails.

*10. Boring a hole in the leg, apparently with a type of drilling tool.

11. Cutting off of the tongue and ear.

12. Gouging out of the eyes.

*13. Castration.

*14. Hammering nails into the hands.

15. Piercing the skin with pins or staplers.

16. Shooting the detainee in the arm or leg at point blank range, followed, by deprivation of the necessary medical treatment.

17. Rape of women (including virgins) and young men.

18. Inserting bottle necks, sometimes when broken, into the rectum.

*19. Tying a string around the penis and pulling it tightly.

*20. Pumping air using a pipe through the anus, particularly of young boys.

21. Applying electricity to sensitive parts of the body, including the ears, lips, tongue, fingers, toes and genitals. Sometimes the detainee is doused with water prior to the administration of electricity. The electrical instruments used include electric batons as well as wires fitted with clips (like those used to recharge car batteries but smaller in size).

22. Burning various parts of the body, including the genitals, with domestic appliances such as electric irons, with heated metal rods, or with a naked flame.

23. Extinguishing cigarettes on the eyeballs or on various parts of the body, including the genitals, nipples, chest and hands.

24. Pouring hot and cold water alternately over the detainee.

25. Placing the detainee in a cold, air-conditioned room for several hours, and then immediately into a heated room.

*26. Pouring an acid-like substance onto the skin.

27. Pouring caustic substances onto the eyes, causing blindness.

28. Plucking facial hair, particularly the beard, with pincers or pliers.

29. Placing heavy weights on the detainee's body.

30. Spitting into the detainee's mouth.

31. Exposing the detainee to the sun for several hours at a stretch without water.

32. Subjecting the detainee to mock execution. This includes holding the head below water to the point of near suffocation; going through the motions of execution by firing squad; and holding a gun to the head or in the mouth and pulling the trigger.

33. Forcing the detainee to watch others being tortured, or to hear their screams.

34. Raping or torturing the detainee's relatives in his or her presence; threatening the detainee with such acts.

35. Threatening the detainee with torture methods such as the electric chair [*al-Kursi al-Rajjaj*], or with death by immersion in an acid bath.

36. Deprivation of medical treatment.

37. Deprivation of sleep, food, water, fresh air and toilet or washing facilities.

38. Degrading the detainee by using obscene language or insults.

A REALLY BAD WEEK

(By David S. Broder)

Every day now tests the nerve, the fiber and the judgment of Washington. You can see the strain etched deep on the faces of the people who are struggling with the question of war and peace in the Persian Gulf.

When he came into the White House briefing room to comment on the failure of the Iraqi-U.S. meeting in Geneva, the president's skin looked pasty, the twist in his mouth exaggerated almost into a grimace. Standing unobserved to the side, Secretary of Defense Dick Cheney's head slumps a bit toward his chest, and you are reminded that this man has a history of coronary troubles.

On Capitol Hill, House Speaker Tom Foley's hard-won slimness—the product of a rigid diet—suddenly leaves him looking not trim, but gaunt. And Senate Minority Leader Bob Dole shows his age too. The arm and shoulder shattered in World War II fighting appear to be acting up, shooting pain through his nerve ends as he talks of the battles to come.

January in the capital is normally a time when the people in power look sleek and tan and rested, back from their holiday relaxation in Florida or Texas, California or Hawaii, swapping tales of the bowl games they saw, the hunting and fishing they enjoyed, the golf courses they tamed. But not this year. There was no real rest, not at the Camp David presidential retreat and not at the customary watering spots for the others in government.

There hasn't been a year that began with such a burden of bad news since the January of 1942, when the Japanese were marching through the Philippines and advancing on Singapore, the Germans were deep in the Ukraine and FDR was worrying about how to protect the West Coast from invasion while he rebuilt the Navy that had been sunk at Pearl Harbor the previous month.

This time, it is the threat of war rather than the reality of conflict that has cast a pall on the capital. But even before that threat grew imminent, it was a bad week, a really bad week. The Bank of New England was taken over by the government after a run on its deposits. Pan Am, the company that represented glamour in air travel since the days of the Clippers, was forced into bankruptcy. The accelerating recession pushed the Federal budget $50 billion deeper into deficit and played havoc with the budgets of one after another of the newly inaugurated governors.

To top it all, the Soviet Union was dissolving before our eyes, and Mikhail Gorbachev—the laureate of what must be the most premature and misjudged Nobel Peace Prize ever—was sending in the troops in a futile attempt to quash the nationalist forces that have emerged from the Baltic republics to central Asia.

All this was in people's minds as they gathered around television sets to watch Secretary of State James A. Baker III's news conference from Geneva on Wednesday afternoon. The longer his meeting with Iraqi foreign minister Tariq Aziz lasted, the more hopes grew. This was not a perfunctory exchange of positions, the phone calls from supposedly informed people said, but serious, substantive talks.

At lunchtime in the capital, the word spread that the talks had ended, and Baker would soon announce the results. He came onto the TV screen poker-faced, giving no hint of his mood. The first five sentences of his statement were studiedly neutral in tone and substance—a recital of previously known principles.

Then he said: "Regrettably," and even before the rest of the sentence followed, a collective sigh was heard as thousands of dashed hopes were swept away by one adverb. By the time Baker, the consumate pro, described what Bush later called the "total stiff-arm" he had received from Saddam Hussein's envoy, the gloom was thick enough to cut.

Aziz's subsequent news conference—part obfuscation, part bluster, part chilling fatalism—demonstrated exactly the quality of obduracy Baker had described. Bush's own nervous and occasionally erratic meeting with reporters added to the gloom—"I can't misrepresent this to the American people. I am discouraged"—while doing little to clarify his next steps. It simply showed the strain of crisis of him.

Now the issue moves to Capitol Hill, where the ruling Democrats present their usual spectacle of disarray. The chairmen of the House Foreign Affairs and Armed Services committees are supporting the president, but they cannot persuade their own leaders—that their judgment is correct. The situation among Senate Democrats is less confused, but essentially tells the president only to check in again for further instruction.

Through the strain, the fatigue and the gloom, one principle stands clear: The president, speaking for an international coalition and armed with the authority of the United Nations, has defined U.S. policy from the only place in government where it can be set. The best hope of salvaging peace is a strong statement of congressional support for his policy, so that Saddam Hussein can understand the terrible alternative he faces.

And then the United States must be prepared to pay the price world leadership requires.

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY,
Washington, DC, January 10, 1991.

Hon. LES ASPIN,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your letter of January 9, 1991, in which you ask for an updated assessment of the impact of sanctions on Iraq and on the policies of Saddam Hussein subsequent to my testimony before your committee in December. In that testimony, as you accurately noted, I observed that the sanctions were effective technically and that they were being felt economically and eventually would be felt militarily in some areas. I also testified that there was no evidence that sanctions would mandate a change in Saddam Hussein's behavior and that there was no evidence when or even if they would force him out of Kuwait.

You now ask me to: (1) address the impact of the sanctions on the economy and populace of Iraq and on the operational effectiveness of its military if left in place for another six to twelve months; (2) address the question of how Iraq's defensive abilities might be affected by the sanctions on the one hand and by having additional time to prepare on the other if sanctions are allowed to work for another six to twelve months; and (3) address the likelihood that sanctions, again if left in place for another six to twelve months, could induce Iraq to withdraw from Kuwait.

UN sanctions have shut off nearly all Iraq's trade and financial activity and weakened its economy, but disruptions in most sectors are not serious yet. The impact of sanctions has varied by sector. The most serious impact so far has been on the financial sector, where hard currency shortages have led Baghdad to take a variety of unusual steps to conserve or raise even small amounts of foreign exchange. For the populace, the most serious impact has been inflation.

The ability of the Iraqi ground forces to defend Kuwait and southern Iraq is unlikely to be substantially eroded over the next six to twelve months even if effective sanctions can be maintained. This is especially true if Iraq does not believe a coalition attack is likely during this period. Iraq's infantry and artillery forces—the key elements of Iraq's initial defense—probably would not suffer significantly as a result of sanctions. Iraq can easily maintain the relatively simple Soviet-style weaponry of its infantry and artillery units and can produce virtually all of the ammunition for these forces domestically. Moreover, these forces will have additional opportunity to extend and reinforce their fortifications along the Saudi border, thereby increasing their defensive strength. Iraq's armored and mechanized forces will be degraded somewhat from continued sanctions. The number of inoperable Iraqi armored and other vehicles will grow gradually and the readiness of their crews will decline as Baghdad is forced to curb its training activities. Iraq has large stocks of spare parts and other supplies, however, which will ameliorate the effect of these problems. On balance, the marginal decline of combat power in Baghdad's armored units probably would be offset by the simultaneous improvement of its defensive fortifications. While the military, especially the army, has been protected from the impact of sanctions by stockpiling

and minimal usage, during a military action the impact would be more profound as equipment and needed parts are expended.

Iraq's Air Force and air defenses are likely to be hit far more severely than its Army, if effective sanctions are maintained for another six to twelve months. This degradation will diminish Iraq's ability to defend its strategic assets from air attack and reduce its ability to conduct similar attacks on its neighbors. It would have only a marginal impact on Saddam's ability to hold Kuwait and southern Iraq. The Iraqi Air Force is not likely to play a major role in any battle for Kuwait.

In December, during my appearance before the House Armed Services Committee, I noted that while we can look ahead several months and predict the gradual deterioration of the Iraqi economy, it is more difficult to assess how or when these conditions will cause Saddam to modify his behavior. Our judgment remains that, even if sanctions continue to be enforced for an additional six to 12 months, economic hardship alone is unlikely to compel Saddam to retreat from Kuwait or cause regime-threatening popular discontent in Iraq. The economic impact of sanctions is likely to be increasingly serious, with conspicuous hardships and dislocations. Nevertheless, Saddam currently appears willing to accept even a subsistence economy in a continued attempt to outlast the international resolve to maintain the sanctions, especially if the threat of war recedes significantly. He probably continues to believe that Iraq can endure sanctions longer than the international coalition will hold and hopes that avoiding war will buy him time to negotiate a settlement more favorable to him.

We have seen little hard evidence to suggest that Saddam is politically threatened by the current hardships endured by the populace. Moreover, Saddam has taken few actions that would indicate he is concerned about the stability of his regime. Assessing the populace's flash point is difficult, but we believe it is high because Iraqis have borne considerable hardship in the past. During its eight-year war with Iran, for example, Iraq endured a combination of economic difficulties, very high casualties, and repeated missile and air attacks on major cities without any serious public disturbances.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM H. WEBSTER,
Director of Central Intelligence.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I certainly find it very difficult to be here at this time when we are assembled here considering the effect of having a declaration of war.

In the recent past it has been our practice to defer to the Arab League to mediate conflicts and situations of theirs. All of a sudden we find a great departure.

I was shocked to find 200,000 U.S. troops in Saudi Arabia on August 4, 2 days after the invasion. I think that the decision to stop the aggression that would have gone into Saudi Arabia was correct. I think that we should expect and insist that Saddam Hussein move back to his rightful border in Iraq. But I think that as we talk about military strikes on January 15 or thereafter, we have to weigh very, very carefully what we are getting into.

We did that in Korea some years ago and we still have troops there. The Soviet Union decided to go into a Third World country without much modern equipment, into Afghanistan, and the tremendous military machine of the Soviet Union was bogged down there for so many years that they retreated, just as we did in Vietnam. So we talk about this country of 15 million people and we talk about our tremendous military might, and yes, we could probably blow that country off the map.

□ 1030

But we will have a heavy cost. We will have to think very carefully.

I am very disturbed, as I went to Saudi Arabia and saw the number of young people, over 35 percent African American in the Army, and close to 25 percent of the Marines, those who will have to go in on the ground.

In Vietnam, of the 58,000 persons who died, a disproportionate number of those were African-Americans from my city, and once again, we are finding that those who are least treated with first-class citizenship, those who the President of our country talks about vetoing the civil rights bill, a country that Vice President QUAYLE finishes going to an all-white golf course, to go over to the Persian Gulf to tell the men to stay the course, the same country that says we have got to watch for quotas in the workplace because we cannot be sure that we are going to discriminate against the white male in the workplace as JESSE HELMS did in his ads, that we find out that no one is concerned about why we have no quotas then in the military. Why do we have a disproportionate number?

So all I am saying is if numbers are so important in one area to keep them out, why then we allow conditions to exist in this country so that young people have to join the military?

I think that we should let sanctions work. I think they have worked. I think that CIA Director Webster said it clearly when he came several months ago and said sanctions were working. Of course, lately we have heard that he said, well, now, he is not so sure, but I am not surprised at that change.

It will be Iran next time. It will be perhaps water 20 years from now.

Why should the United States be the ones to bear the burden of the loss of lives?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OBEY). The Chair would announce that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] has 3 hours and 24 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] has 4 hours remaining.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentleman who just took the well for whom I have deep respect that I returned from Saudi Arabia less than 36 hours ago. I had a chance to meet with our troops over there, and many of them were of the ethnic and racial background of the gentleman in the well. They were from New York City and from my area.

Thirty-seven of them, including four women, all black, said to me, "Mr. SOLOMON, please back the President. Please let us do what we have to do so that we can come home."

You know, this gentleman right here is a man I worshiped. I used to be a Democrat back in those days. If Harry Truman were here today he would vote to back this President of this United States of America.

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I agree. I was in Saudi Arabia also, and when I spoke to those same young people, they said the same thing.

African Americans, from the Revolutionary War on, have died, have sacrificed during World War II, during the Korean war, during the Vietnam war and in this war.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the thing that is very disturbing is that after they do this and they come back to Newark, they still cannot find a job. They still cannot find a house to live in. They still cannot get an adequate education. They still have to be victimized by violence and crime in the inner cities because of the lack of opportunity. That is my point.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, according to the rule, it is possible for the minority leader and the majority leader to request additional time, and since we are getting a number of additional requests, and since we do want to accommmodate every Member's ability to be able to talk in this debate, I would now ask unanimous consent that 1 hour of additional general debate time be added to each side, so that the time will go on into the early evening.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished cosponsor of the resolution of which I am a cosponsor, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ], be given 2 hours of our time to be apportioned as he sees fit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL].

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, I like many of my colleagues, have agonized over the Middle East crisis.

There are many questions, and I don't profess to have all the answers.

But, I do know this. For over 5 months, President Bush has led this Nation, as well as most of the world, in organizing world-wide condemnation of the senseless invasion, rape, and pillage by Iraq of a peaceful and virtually defenseless Arab nation. Economic sanctions were put into effect, catalysed by the leadership of the President. A massive movement of American Armed Forces were also dispatched to the Middle East by the President, thereby preventing Saddam's invasion, and probable annexation and pillage, of Saudi Arabia also. Ultimately, the President sought and obtained a U.N. endorsement of a deadline authorizing member nations to use force against Saddam if Iraqi troops did not withdraw from Kuwait by January 15, 1991.

This Nation, this Congress, and most of the world have looked to and accepted the President's leadership. Perhaps acquiesced to such leadership is more accurate. I do not say that critically. No other nation but the United States could have filled such a leadership role. And Congress, with its 535 Members, was, and is ill-equipped to do so—this is, to have led such a unique and delicate foreign policy effort. No other person, aside from President Bush, had the willingness, or is it fortitude, or the office and the resources to accept such a precedent-setting challenge for our fledgling post-cold war world: That challenge was to galvanize the society of nations of this post-cold war world in order to condemn, and use counterforce if necessary against, any nation which would attempt to forcibly annex and exterminate another nation.

Mr. Bush asked the question no one else asked: What happens if we do nothing? He saw roughly 60 percent of the world's oil supplies coming under the sway and intimidation of a ruthless dictator backed by the world's seventh largest army; a dictatator who is amassing a force of long-range missiles that could hit every state in the Gulf with chemical, biological and, in a few years, nuclear weapons. Indeed, such weapons of mass destruction could, in the not-so-distant future, be a global threat. Moreover, Saddam had demonstrated his willingness to use these weapons in war and even on his own people. It makes no difference to him. If Saddam's rape of Kuwait went unchallenged, President Bush saw that every tyrant who wanted to redraw the map of the world by force in this new post-cold war era, could do so. For better or worse, Mr. Bush took that challenge.

I don't wholly endorse all that the President has done along the way. Some of his rhetoric was ill-advised and his diplomatic efforts could be less on the "demand" side and more on the inducement—conflict resolution—side. Even with a thug like Saddam, psychology sometimes works.

Today we are not so much debating the authorization of United States military force as we are attempting to determine intricate ongoing foreign policy efforts to secure the peaceful withdrawal of Iraq from Kuwait. That's something we all want. And we all hope that a peaceful solution shall, and may, be the result of the diplomatic efforts of our President, the United Nations, and our allies during the final days leading up to the January 15 deadline.

I am persuaded that now is not the time for hundreds of Members of Congress to call audibles at the line of scrimmage, and change the President's and the United Nations' game plans by extending this crisis to some undetermined time in the hope that the unique but fragile international coalition will hold together for another year or two. The Iraqi menace must be faced, if not now, then later, and at probably a greater cost to all, including our young men and women in our armed forces.

I had been one of those saying that enforcement of trade sanctions and an international embargo, combined with vigorous diplomatic measures, was the preferable way to pressure Saddam to withdraw from Kuwait. After watching Saddam and Foreign Minister Aziz for the last few weeks, I no longer believe that.

I also question the coalition's resolve for a continuous trade embargo if the U.N. deadline authorizing the use of force is eviscerated. I sense that Saddam's resolve to wait out the sanctions, no matter what the hardships which may befall the Iraqi people, will exceed the coalition's commitment not to trade with Iraq. This is especially true of nations such as Poland, Turkey, Jordan, and other Arab nations experiencing economic distress as a result of the trade embargo.

If sanctions fail to drive Iraq out of Kuwait, as I believe they will, then force will ultimately be needed to dislodge the aggressor from Kuwait. In the view of those who cannot support the use of "all necessary means" at this time, the threat of force is needed later rather than now. However, if the United Nations, America, and the coalition back down from enforcement of U.N. Resolution 678, Saddam would be given ample time to become so entrenched in Kuwait that use of force by the U.S. and its allies would be far more costly. In fact, according to CIA Director William Webster, it has become clear that over the past 5 months, there has been ". . . no evidence that sanctions would mandate a change in Saddam Hussein's behavior and that there was no evidence when or even if they would force him out of Kuwait."

And, finally, what impact will prolonged sanctions have on our own troops? In that regard, I would like to read portions of a letter from a constituent of mine from Naperville, IL, a major in the Marine reserves who has recently been called to active duty in Saudi Arabia.

"Dear Congressman Fawell,

I am a major in the Marine Corps Reserve. I have just received orders placing me in an active duty status destined for the Persian Gulf. I am happily married and am blessed with five healthy sons. I'm a general contractor by trade. I have watched virtually all the Senate Arms Congressional hearings on the subject of our presence in that area. There is almost unanimous agreement that it's in our nation's vital interest to drive Iraq from Kuwait. I am very alarmed at the prospect of giving sanctions additional time to work. I've heard nothing that indicates that the sanctions will force Iraq out of Kuwait. On the contrary, most Senators and experts seem to agree that the sanctions in and of themselves will not drive Saddam Hussein out in the near future. What seems to be emerging is a consensus that we should give the sanctions time to work. The time frame suggested is 1 year to 18 months. It is suggested this will demonstrate to the nation and world that we are willing to go that "extra mile." Further that by waiting it will deplete Iraq's spare parts and reduce their military capability. Again, Senators and experts seem to agree that armed conflict will ultimately have to be used anyway!

I sincerely believe that our greatest and quickest chance for peace lays in authorizing the President to use force. Only then will our threat be credible! Please do not support any program that advocates waiting. It will only prolong the emotional and financial hardship of those making the sacrifices.

Sincerely,

[NAME WITHHELD UPON REQUEST.]

This is not easy for me—for anyone, I would assume. All I can do is share with my colleagues my best reasoning on the matter. I believe we should stay the course set by U.N. Resolution 678 and authorize the President to use military force if, after January 15, 1991, in his best judgment, he believes it necessary to force Iraq to withdraw from Kuwait.

Now is not the time to change strategies deemed best by a world consensus, difficult as that may be.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OBEY). The Chair will take this occasion to announce pursuant to the agreement and pursuant to the unanimous consent request of the minority leader and the majority leader, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] now has 4 hours and 23 minutes and 30 seconds remaining, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDWARDS] has 2 hours and 53 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ],

who has been yielded 2 hours of the minority time, will have 2 hours available.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS].

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I will also be speaking later on the issue before Members. I simply want to take this moment to indicate that this is a very sober and somber act that we are engaging in. I simply want to express my frustration with the process, not designed to challenge any Member. However, if Members observe these proceedings, to use the term "debate," is a euphemism. It really stretches the definition, because there is literally no exchange taking place here.

Maybe that is a product of how we are here, but we are simply parading into the well, giving each other speeches.

The previous gentleman in the well made a statement. I would have loved to have asked the gentleman one simple question. In his reference to the Congress of the United States with 535 secretaries of state, he made the assertion that Congress is incapable of making a judgment. What I wanted to ask the gentleman in the context of this discussion was in making that assertion, was the gentleman attempting to read out of the Constitution article I, section 8, paragraph 11 of the Constitution, which vests all powers in making war to the Congress of the United States, so that people observing this discussion would at least see Members exchanging with each other.

All Members feel passionately, or at least should, one way or the other on this matter, and feel enough courage and enough integrity that we are all able to expose our respective points to each other's scrutiny and question. That is what this discussion ought to be about. It can go forward with dignity. It does not have to go forward with partisanship or rancor, but there ought to be some exchange.

We are talking life and death, war and peace. It is not enough, Mr. Speaker, for each Member to proceed into the well without exchanging. There has to be enough time here where we step back and are prepared to engage each other with honest debate before we send our children to march off and die several thousand miles away.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I think it is good to have an exchange. I want to make the same point with the gentleman from California, that I tried to make with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT]. We are, regardless of our respective positions on the balance of authorization in warmaking, and war leading between the Congress and the executive branch, we are making a decision today. Every Member is voting today. The President is not voting on this. We are voting on it.

Today, every Member has a chance to analyze the situation and make his determination and cast his vote. So, this is not a question on the division of power right now. This is a question on a specific situation, are we going to stop Saddam Hussein? Are we going to give it more time? Which of the resolutions are we going to go with?

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUNTER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DELLUMS. Can I draw from the gentleman's statement, that this debate is indeed a debate about a declaration of war, and a decision as to whether that power shall or shall not be used.

Mr. HUNTER. I would say it is definitely a debate about taking offensive action, a species of offensive action that is short of total war, like the war against Japan or against Germany, but it is certainly a debate about the taking of military action against Saddam Hussein, no doubt.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN].

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, there is no more serious decision, no more difficult decision, and no more thought provoking decision than that of committing our troops—our citizens' lives—to a hostile action. This may be the hardest vote most of us will cast in our careers, yet it is a responsibility we have as Members of Congress.

I have had many sleepless nights in the last few weeks as January 15 approaches. On several occasions, I have visited with Guard and Reserve units as they were shipping out to Saudi Arabia, and I found them well prepared for the task they face and proud of their service to this Nation. I also saw the agony of their families and listened to their expressions of utter fear. It has been a sobering experience.

Earlier this week, I held town meetings in my district where the majority of people came with only the Persian Gulf on their minds. Most were supportive of the President and some were not. But they all agreed that the loss of one American life will be a terrible thing, and I share that view completely.

I have listened to my constituents, to my President, and to my colleagues who disagree with the President. I am scared by the potential for American deaths, but I have concluded after much soul searching that we must support the President and the U.N. resolutions and our allies in this venture who voted for those resolutions.

There are many who question the United States involvement in the whole Persian Gulf affair. And I have no doubt their questions are not unlike those of other Americans who before World War II asked why should we defend Great Britain, why should we go to the aid of France. But can you imagine the world today if we had not?

Our aim in this crisis is not to declare war on Iraq but to remove an aggressor from the soil of an ally. Already, the United States has succeeded in checking that aggression. I have no doubt whatsoever that Saddam would have already entered Saudi Arabia had President Bush not deployed troops to defend against further militancy.

Many are concerned about the President's constitutional authority to involve American troops in military action. The President was elected by the majority to be our Commander in Chief. In that capacity, he should not be constrained by having to seek the permission of 535 people who are not diplomats. Would it have been wise to engage in a debate on the Panama invasion and let Noriega know of our plans? Would Mu'ammar Qadhafi now be virtually silenced if we had compelled President Reagan to publicly justify his attack on Libya? Do we want our President when attempting to comply with international agreements to have to tell the United Nations that he must first call Congress together to ask their permission?

I do not want this country to go to war. Period. It is not too late to avoid that eventuality. But if we convey to Saddam Hussein that we are cowardly, that we are divisive, then, my friends, it is indeed too late. Imagine yourself as a soldier hearing his Member of Congress say that his country is not behind him. And we all know that Saddam is a student of American public opinion. He has persistently tried to manipulate our attitudes. He will interpret Congress' reticence as weakness.

In supporting the Michel-Solarz resolution, I want to send a strong message to President Bush. That message is this: If we must use force, make it decisive, make it conclusive, and make it quick. I have voted for billions upon billions of dollars to make sure we are prepared militarily, so I know we have the capability to do the job swiftly. Mr. President, do not make our fine men and women remain in the desert sands—bring them home as rapidly as you can. We want this thing to be over with.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Michel-Solarz resolution.

□ 1050

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. APPLEGATE].

Mr. APPLEGATE. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say, I find it very ironic that in World War II the United States saved Japan and Germany and Europe from a future of despair and

agony. We restored them to a position of economic stability and respectability, and now they refuse to come forth only with a pittance to save themselves. They want the United States to do it all over again, and the United States is in a recession. They stand to gain the most from American sacrifice.

Where are our United Nations friends who voted war?

The United States, make no mistake about it, is going to pay dearly. They are going to pay at least 90 percent in either money or lives, and every other one of these countries are going to profit by American sacrifices.

I supported the deployment of troops in Saudi Arabia and I was proud to do it. We succeeded and we kept Saddam Hussein from the Saudi Arabian oil fields. He knows our commitment and he knows that we are going to stand behind that commitment.

The United Nations has placed stringent sanctions, but President Bush, who initiated them, is not willing to let them work to force Saddam Hussein out of Kuwait. President Bush insists on war, and I say why? Because Saddam Hussein is a despot who committed heinous crimes? We know that. There are a lot of people down through history who have done that.

When we talk about despots and heinous crimes, I think of Idi Amin. Idi Amin, what did we do about him? He killed 500,000 of his own people and now he is living the life of Riley in Saudi Arabia.

And what about El Salvador where they are committing crimes down there and we are funding that? Is this a principle to free Kuwait or what is it?

Well, Kuwait, if they restore the Emir, that is a virtual dictatorship.

Where are we and where have we been when we want to keep nations of the world free?

Did we threaten the Soviet Union with invasion if they did not get out of Afghanistan or China or Indonesia?

And what about if you talk about a matter of principle when Iraq invaded Iran? I know Iran was our mortal enemy, but Iraq invaded Iran and they could not beat them, either, and yet who did we come down on the side of? We came down on the side of Iraq and we supported them.

The United States has already lost 100 young people. That is more than the combined total of what we lost in Panama and El Salvador. Is it going to be worth another 1,000, 5,000, or 10,000 to get one despot?

And after him, who is the United States going to be called upon to dipose of then?

I would go to war at the drop of a hat to protect America, but the Persian Gulf is not World War III and Saddam Hussein is not Stalin and he is not Adolf Hilter.

America's national societal and economic stability is not threatened, my friends. It comes down to this and this is the bottom line. Is Saddam Hussein worth the sacrifice of American life and blood? And I say, hell no.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, whether you support the Solarz-Michel resolution or the Hamilton-Gephardt resolution, I hope that every Member of this House of Representatives will consider the fact that there is a third vote that will be taken. That third vote on the Bennett-Durbin resolution is a validation of what we are doing this very moment. That third vote is a ratification of a constitutional principle which is absolutely essential and one which this group now serving in the 102d Congress must respect.

Article I, section 8, requires this debate. It does not allow it. It requires it.

For those who fancy themselves as conservatives and those as liberals, those who call themselves strict constructionists and those who look for the broadest interpretation of the Constitution, please consider the Bennett-Durbin resolution as a validation of what we are about today, a debate which not only consumes our time and attention, as it should, but draws the American people into this debate.

Pick up a morning paper, turn on the television set or radio, and the reference is being made to the people's Chamber, this House of Representatives and our responsibility to speak to the critical issue of war and peace.

I would beg each Member of the House to seriously consider this resolution as an affirmation of why we are here and why we took the oath of office.

There are many close calls as to when the war powers clause may be brought into consideration. There are many ambiguities, but Operation Desert Shield is not ambiguious.

The President of the United States is gathering the largest United States military force since Vietnam, and he has stated expressly that he would use it for an offensive purpose. Even the President's critics concede that his intent and strategy are clear.

Under our Constitution, this body, this House and the Senate as well are required to declare war, to make that determination as to whether or not we are willing to sacrifice the lives of young men and women across this Nation. We cannot meet this responsibility after the fact by inference or silence, and I beg each Member to please vote in favor of the Bennett-Durbin resolution as a reaffirmation.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURBIN. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman knows, I have been very outspoken in support of the rights of the Congress to make these decisions, and I would agree with the gentleman and I think anybody who reads the Constitution carefully would agree that the President of the United States is not empowered to be the authority to decide whether or not we will go to war.

What we are talking about today and tomorrow is the Congress giving authority to the President to do that. That is properly constitutional.

I might say that when I first heard about the Bennett-Durbin resolution, I was going to vote for it, because I completely agree with asserting the fact we have the war-making power in this body.

□ 1100

But if you read your resolution, you know, after you make that assertion which is clear and with which we all agree, after you read it, you then get into great vague ambiguities about what the President may or may not do. If there are missiles loaded and aimed at Israel or Turkey or any place else, we would be precluded, under the way the gentleman has written his resolution, from a preemptive strike to prevent the firing of those missiles.

I am saying to the gentleman I do not disagree at all with what he has said he wants to do, but his resolution does not do it.

Mr. DURBIN. I would beg my colleagues, Mr. Speaker—and I respect the gentleman from Oklahoma as a matter of principle—I would beg them not to consider every ambiguous possibility, but rather the very real facts which are presented to us. President Bush as Commander in Chief has authority to defend out troops, he has authority to deter and defend against Iraqi attack. That is not a question.

The question is whether he can initiate offensive military action. If we cannot see an analogy or parallel between a declaration of war and an initiation of offensive military action, the gentleman from Oklahoma will have read out article 1, section 8, clause 11 of the Constitution. That would be a sad commentary. It would not guarantee to this body or to any of our successors an opportunity for the very debate in which we are engaged.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to reclaim my time, if I might. I waited patiently this morning so that I may make two points on the subject.

Mr. Speaker, beyond the constitutional question which gives us the right to debate what we will do in the Persian Gulf, a critical and important right, we must debate as well the substance of what our policy will be.

I have heard arguments made that those who do not support the bipartisan resolution by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] are somehow not behind the President.

We have a responsibility as our own branch of government to conduct the policy of war, make the determination as to whether we go to war. We can work with the President and share his goal of removing Saddam Hussein from Kuwait and bringing as many of our troops home as safely as we can as quickly as we can. It is not a question of supporting the President for us to engage in the very debate this body was created to perpetuate.

The other question that has been raised is whether or not a vote in favor of the Hamilton-Gephardt resolution which calls for sanctions as opposed to the use of military action is somehow not supporting the fighting men and women who are overseas now in harm's way, prepared to risk their lives.

I would suggest that that is not the case at all.

Like one of the previous speakers, I attended a sendoff of a National Guard unit and Army Reserve unit in my hometown. I looked into their eyes, I embraced the mothers and fathers, who were in tears, begging us to do all in our power to bring them home safely, to try to avoid a war.

I sense that those of us who are supporting Hamilton and Gephardt have just as much compassion, respect, and gratitude for the fighting men and women as those who are supporting the other resolution.

That is not the issue.

The question is there, and the final question is simple: Will we have exhausted every reasonable possibility before war is started? Those of us who support the Hamilton/Gephardt resolution believe that sanctions and diplomacy should be allowed to work for at least some additional period of time, a reasonable period of time.

Then if the President decides that it is fruitless and hopeless, return to the Congress and seek authority to take offensive military action.

During that period, we can satisfy ourselves that we have done everything in our power to avoid a war, everything to avoid the casualties, the death and the suffering that necessarily would follow.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON].

Mr. WELDON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] would step back into the well, I would like to ask a question as a point of clarification.

In the gentleman's resolution he refers specifically to actions against Iraq.

In the history of this country there have been 216 instances of this country taking offensive action, many of them by Presidents of both political parties.

Only five acts of Congress declaring war have been taken.

Why does the resolution of the gentleman only apply to Iraq? Is the gentleman saying that other acts of aggression against other nations are in fact allowed? I know we are debating this now, but why does it not include any offensive action which would cover those 216 instances which have taken place over the history of this country?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELDON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain the gentleman would not like to give the President a blank check for any possible military action. What we are addressing is the instant crisis, the one which we are debating on this floor. What the aggression of Saddam Hussein has done to the world and brings us to this chamber is the subject matter of this resolution.

Mr. WELDON. Does the gentleman agree that there are instances where the President should be able to take actions such as Grenada, such as perhaps Panama, without the approval? Is that what the gentleman is saying? I think we need to clarify that point.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong support for the Solarz-Michel House Joint Resolution 62, expressing support for United States policy to reverse Iraq's occupation of Kuwait, and I commend my colleague on the Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ], our distinguished Republican leader, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], our distinguished chairman of our Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL], and the ranking Republican on the Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD], for their diligent, timely, and bipartisan response to our President's request for congressional support of his initiatives.

On August 2, 1990. Iraq perpetrated an act of brutal aggression against the sovereign Arab State of Kuwait. 140,000 men, of the Iraqi armed forces entered Kuwait and within days were arrayed on Kuwait's border with Saudi Arabia, poised for further aggression. This despicable, unprovoked act of naked aggression is a violation of all principles of international law. The shameless, brutal occupation of Kuwait which ensued is indicative of humankind's ability to perpetrate the most barbarous of acts.

Many of our constituents question, why are we in the Persian Gulf? The answer lies partly in the history of the last century and partly in the reality of the present. Since World War II, United States security interests in the Persian Gulf region have been apparent to every American President—indeed the Allied Powers of the Second World War recognized the importance of keeping the resources of the gulf out of Axis' hands.

In the post-World War II period, it became clear that energy resources in the Persian Gulf are essential to the political and economic freedom of the world. In 1950, President Truman recognized that premise when he advised Saudi Arabia's King Abdul Aziz that "no threat could arise to your kingdom that would not be of immediate consequence to the United States." That commitment was reiterated by President Jimmy Carter in 1980 when he pledged that "an attempt by any outside force to gain control of the Persian Gulf will be regarded as an assault on the vital interests of the United States of America, and such an assault will be repelled by any means necessary, including military force." President Bush made his views on our rationale for being in the Persian Gulf unequivocally clear when he said: "We're in the gulf because the world must not and cannot accept aggression. We're there because our vital interests are at stake."

Mr. Speaker, this resolution does not call for the President to initiate aggressive military action against Kuwait. But more importantly, it allows the United States Congress to demonstrate its resolve to stand by the U.N. resolutions and authorizes the President to implement U.N. Security Council resolutions to use force to make Iraq get out of Kuwait, if all else fails.

None of us want war, particularly those of us who have experienced such conflicts. But if Saddam Hussein does not believe that the consequences of his remaining in Kuwait will result in a military action, which he could not sustain, and if he will not leave Kuwait, his miscalculations will bring us to war.

The opponents of this resolution, by creating an impression of discord within Congress, will actually bring this Nation closer to war by withholding from the President in these last few days of sensitive negotiation his most important tool: unified congressional support for military action, in the event that diplomatic initiatives do not succeed.

Saddam Hussein believes that time is on his side, believing that if he waits long enough, the unprecedented coalition that our President and Secretary of State have worked so hard to forge will erode.

Mr. Speaker, we all recognize the broad ramifications and seriousness of the issue before us to get the Iraqis out of Kuwait, and we want to bring to an end the despicable human rights abuses being perpetrated against the Kuwaiti

people. Not just our constituents, but the entire world is looking at this body, Mr. Speaker, including Saddam Hussein. Some of our allies question whether this body has the courage to stand by U.N. Security Council resolutions which our own Nation has been instrumental in formulating.

Our Nation has been exhausting every diplomatic and economic means at our disposal to force Iraq to withdraw. Unfortunately, all of our efforts have resulted in only increased intransigence by Iraq.

My colleagues I urge you to strongly support this bipartisan resolution. If today we do not demonstrate our full support for our President, we will be doing a disservice—a disservice to our brave loyal men and women serving in operation "Desert Shield," a disservice to our 34 allied nations and a disservice to our firm commitment to a new world order of respect for international law and norms of behavior.

□ 1110

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLILEY].

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, yes, this is a very, very difficult vote for each and every one of us. But make no mistake. We really have no choice. If we do not adopt the Solarz-Michel resolution, and we rely on sanctions, we are only kidding ourselves, for in the eyes of the world Saddam will have won. The United States will have blinked.

We had a letter dated January 9, from William Webster, Judge Webster, head of the CIA, saying that in his opinion a year from now Saddam would still be there because the sanctions would not work. But there will not be any sanctions if we vote down Solarz-Michel. The road to Baghdad will be jammed with diplomats cutting a deal, supplying him with whatever he needs. The people will see that the United States has blinked, we have backed off, our coalition will fall apart, and we will be left with egg all over our face.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think we want to do that. I think the best way and the only chance to preserve peace is to vote Solarz-Michel, send a strong message, and Saddam will know that he is in a blind alley, there is no escape. Only then will, I think, he pull out. Otherwise we are only kidding ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, we, the Members of Congress, are here today saddled with the single most difficult decision of our lives. The eyes of the global community are on this body as we debate the crisis in the Persian Gulf. The international community is watching this debate searching for the leadership the United States has provided in the past. We have the responsibility, as Members of Congress and as the representatives of the people of this Nation, to show an undivided commitment to the President's initiatives, to our allied partners, and to our troops who are stationed on the sands of Saudi Arabia.

The Persian Gulf is our first experience in the new unchartered waters of the post-cold-war era and the United States has demonstrated world leadership by forming a multinational front, consisting of both historic friends and foes. This support has been achieved through our decisive actions and leadership history. We have not ignored the United Nations and its traditional means of international pressures. Instead, we have worked through the United Nations to achieve the forces and the personnel which has prevented Hussein's continued aggression through the Middle East. The United States has not acted as a policeman, but as the pilot for international policies in new waters and a new crisis. This leadership role requires great and often difficult responsibilities and decisions.

Saddam Hussein has continually failed to step in line with internationally accepted standards. He has failed to comply with any of the 12 U.N. resolutions, pursued the development of nuclear weapons, and chosen to hold American's hostage. Iraq has continued to develop atomic bombs for which deployment is estimated to be as close as 1 year. If we do not act now to immediately deter and eliminate Iraq's nuclear capability, our new world will be faced with a ruthless madman in control of a nuclear arsenal.

Th ultimate goal in this crisis is a peaceful resolution. The passage of the U.N. resolution setting a deadline for Hussein to remove troops from Kuwait has forced him to come to the table for negotiations. Regrettably, Iraq remains inflexible on its illegal and aggressive invasion of Kuwait, and seems resolved to prevent any peaceful end to the crisis in the Persian Gulf.

As we struggle with the responsibilities required by our role in this crisis, we must be grateful for the sacrifices of our troops and their families who have accepted the international community's call to the gulf. We must be grateful for the courage they have demonstrated in their personal commitment to this Nation. Each man and woman in the gulf has relinquished the security of friends and family for the desert of Saudi Arabia. I have spent many a sleepless night hoping that this crisis would be resolved before coming to the decision we face today. It is a brudensome, sobering decision we must make and I do not relish the fact that we may be testing the resolve of those stationed in the gulf and that of their family and friends here. We owe a great debt to the sacrifices they have already made and as a nation we should aspire to their courage and be duly proud of their commitment.

I would eagerly embrace a peaceful resolution to the crisis, yet I will not accept concessions which permit linkage to the Israeli-Palestinian issue or which permit partial Iraqi withdrawal or which do not comply with the resolutions that have been laid out by the U.N. Security Council's 12 resolutions. If we give in to Hussein's demands, his invasion of Kuwait, his blatant disregard for the world order and his disrespect for international law, then we are ultimately rewarding him for his aggressions and his contemptible, unacceptable behavior. We must stand firm in our resolve against him. We have the responsibility, as does the global community, to restrict this relentless pursuit of power by a ruthless madman. He is too close to deployment of nuclear weapons for a responsible world community to sit back and reward his advances. As we have witnessed in the past, and his Kurdish population as well as the Iranians know all too well, Hussein does not hesitate to use any weapons he has at his disposal.

I cannot condone the brutality Iraq has demonstrated. As world policies make monumental changes, we must set standards against aggression to which the international community must adhere. The global community must not tolerate nor condone acts of aggression or human rights violations. President Bush has said, "Lasting and meaningful peace must be founded upon principle." The alliance must defend, through whatever means are necessary, the principles on which the international community stand and the way it will operate in the future.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Congress is the single loudest voice of the American people and must show its commitment to our troops deployed in the gulf. We must show them that we support them in their efforts. In order to send them that message, in order to send Saddam Hussein the message that we are a united front committed against his behavior we must stand together in support of the President. I urge my colleagues to prove our undivided commitment by voting in support of the President and his initiatives. In uniting together behind the President, we will prove to Saddam Hussein, to our allies, and to our troops our resolution to end this aggression in the gulf.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH].

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, almost all of the previous speakers have observed that the vote we will be casting tomorrow on the use of military force against Iraq will be the most important vote they will ever cast during their House career, and I humbly agree.

Mr. Speaker, I come from a military family. Two of my brothers were West Point graduates. My dad, a career Army officer, taught at West Point, and my grandfather, also a career Army officer and a doctor, was in the medical corps. One of my brothers gave his life at Anzio, and I can remember the day my mother was notified of my brother's sacrifice. It was a day that was permanently etched in my memory.

With this clearly in mind, do I look forward to casting a vote which could mean the loss of even one life of an American man or woman in the gulf? No, of course not. I am sure none of us do. The decision to cast this vote should be made only after each of us examines our innermost conscience. I think we need to reflect what the consequences will be, however, if we do not stop Saddam Hussein now. There can be no reward for brutal aggression. If we do nothing and Saddam Hussein pays no price for swallowing up the

country of Kuwait, destroying people's property, torturing, raping, and killing innocent men, women, and children, we are as guilty as he is.

Mr. Speaker, with each passing day the consequences of Hussein's aggression grow. Saddam is developing the most sophisticated weapons of mass destruction known to man—nuclear and biological weapons.

Like many of my colleagues, I recently visited our troops in the gulf. I was impressed with their courage and their willingness to fight for the same principles upon which our own country was founded. We owe it to these brave young men and women to stand up today and say with a united voice that if peaceful efforts to solve the crisis fail, the United States will use force to back up the United Nation Security Council's resolutions and force Saddam out of Kuwait.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot allow Saddam Hussein to delay any longer. January 15 is the deadline, and we must stand firmly behind that deadline. I urge my colleagues to support House Joint Resolution 62 authorizing the use of force to implement the U.N. resolution. Nothing less will do.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. BOXER].

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] for this time.

Mr. Speaker, every time I sit down to try to collect my thoughts about this issue, I keep coming back to this haunting verse in a song that Bette Midler sings, and I want to share those lyrics with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. It goes like this:

From a distance the world looks blue and green, and the snow-capped mountains white. From a distance the ocean meets the stream, and the eagle takes to flight. From a distance there is harmony, and it echoes through the land. It's the voice of hope, it's the voice of peace, it's the voice of everyone.

From a distance we all have enough, and no one is in need, and there are no guns, no bomb, and no disease, no hungry mouths to feed. From a distance you look like my friend, even though we are at war. From a distance I just can't comprehend what all this fighting is for.

From a distance there is harmony, and it echoes through the land, and it's the hope of hopes, it's the love of loves, it's the heart of everyone.

And God is watching us, God is watching us. God is watching us from a distance.

□ 1120

Mr. Speaker, in this Chamber today we have to make this world look better up close. That is our job. It is not about egg on our faces, as my colleague from the Republican side of the aisle has said. It is not about egg on our faces; it is about blood on our kids. That is what it is about.

Have you ever seen a body that is shot apart? Have you ever seen it up close? From a distance, from very far away, it may look still and peaceful. But up close you see the violence, the pain, the suffering, the horor. I have seen the weapons that are arrayed against Iraq. I have seen them up close in the Persion Gulf. They are awesome. We can inflict the ultimate pain on the people of Iraq. Make no mistake, we will win this war quickly, maybe in 2 weeks, maybe in 2 months. That is quick. Maybe at most it will take 6 months. That is quick, I guess.

But I say to my colleagues that it will not come free. There is a huge price if we choose this route, even in the best of circumstances. The price is in body bags, in babies killed, in an uncertain, unstable Middle East even after the crisis. In a decade that will be lost as we once again have put our resources into war and weapons and robed our people of what they need in this country.

I had a community meeting in my district. I had two in 1 day. A thousand people came out. I have never seen anything like it. We voted. The vote was on how they would vote on a resolution to go to war, and 95 percent voted no. That is my district in California.

But a woman from Kuwait was in the audience, and she was very effective. She stood up and said, "America, you need to help us. We are already at war. We are a tiny country. You need to help us. Saddam Hussein and his people are hurting my people." She said, "They are raping our women."

Then she sat down, and a gentleman in my district stood up with pain in his face, and he said to her. "Ma'am, I feel in my heart for you, I hurt for you, but I want you to understand that people are being raped in this country every day, every hour, and we don't have the resources to prevent it or to treat it or to stop it."

Then the place was silent.

This debate today is crucial to the future of this great Nation. If we do not handle this crisis in the right way, what kind of a signal does it send? From up close, from a distance, any way that you look at it, from a distance it is the world versus Saddam Hussein. Let us look at it up close. Let us see if it is the world versus Saddam Hussein.

The Netherlands gets 100 percent of its oil from the Persian Gulf, no ground troops; Japan, 63 percent of its oil from the Persian Gulf, no ground troops; Spain, 59 percent percent of its oil from the Persian Gulf, no ground troops.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OBEY). The time of the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. BOXER] has expired.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. BOXER].

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Speaker, to continue, France gets 38 percent of its oil from the Persian Gulf, 8,400 ground troops; Italy, 36 percent of its oil from there, no ground troops; Australia, 22 percent of its oil, no ground troops; the United Kingdom, 16 percent of its oil, 24,000 ground troops; Germany, 11 percent, no ground troops; the United States of America, 11 percent of its oil, 300,000 ground troops and a lot of our treasury and our budget.

Are we, as my friend the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] would say, Uncle Sam or Uncle Sucker? I ask the Members that question.

This is wrong for America. This is not right for America.

What about our Arab allies? I was in the Persian Gulf. They told me not one of our Arab allies would fight side-by-side with our people in Iraq. Is that fair?

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOXER. If the gentleman gets his own time, but I would be happy to yield when I have finished. I have only a minute and a half left.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman has misspoken.

Mrs. BOXER. I will repeat what I said. I said I sat next to President Mubarak, and we asked him if his ground troops would go into Iraq, and he said, "No." And he said, "Syria may not even go into Kuwait."

Let us face it, we are a one-man band. It is our kids as the drumbeat of war starts.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOXER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

We mentioned about body bags, and everybody has talked about the Washington Post article but not the U.S.A. Today article, which points out that the Pentagon has ordered 16,000 body bags already. When asked why they were doing it, they said that is the first order and it is likely the beginning number of those who will be coming back in those body bags the gentlewoman is talking about.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. BOXER] has again expired.

Mr. BONIOR. I yield 1 additional minute to the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. BOXER].

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentlewoman yield for that purpose?

Mrs. BOXER. No, Mr. Speaker, I cannot yield, because I have only 1 minute left.

Mr. SOLARZ. Then I will not interrupt.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Speaker, I say to my friends there is a better way. We should hold the line in Saudi Arabia with a truly multinational force. We

should let the sanctions work. That is what the Hamilton proposal says.

If we go this other route, what kind of a signal would we send to the Middle East? Let me give the contrary view. In thousands of years in the Middle East we have seen terrorism, we have seen war, we have seen killings, we have seen atrocities, but we had one breakthrough and that was called Camp David. And who led the way to Camp David? This great Nation under President Carter did that. Israel and Egypt were at peace for years while there was war all around. That is the model for the New World order.

That is what we must be doing. We did not use our bombs; we used our brains, we used our leadership, and we brought two countries together. Surely we can resolve this.

This administration and the Reagan administration dealt with Saddam Hussein as one of their best friends in the region. Surely they can figure a way to once again sit down with him and figure this out and spare the lives of our children and the innocent victims of war, because let me say to my friends that this is a tough vote for everyone. It is absolutely a tough vote for all of us.

Mr. Speaker, let us make the world look better from a distance and from up close. Let us support the Hamilton resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would announce at this point that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] has 4 hours and 2 minutes and 30 seconds remaining; the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDWARDS] has 2 hours and 35 minutes remaining; and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ] has been yielded 2 hours of time from the minority, none of which he has yet used.

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, I gather there was a unanimous-consent request that was approved which yields 2 hours to me for the purpose of making time available to those Democrats who support the bipartisan joint resolution?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, I will be asking the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON] to manage that time over the next 2 hours.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON] will be recognized for that purpose.

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, on the yielding of time, am I correct that the majority yielded no time for the members of their party who support the bipartisan compromise?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is not a parliamentary inquiry. The Chair has stated the facts. The distinguished minority leader is recognized.

Mr. WELDON. My question is, has the majority not yielded any time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not propounding a parliamentary inquiry. The minority leader is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, first of all, the answer to that question is no, and out of deference and certainly respect for the significant number of Democratic Members who joined with us in a bipartisan effort, there has been a total of 14 hours now authorized, 7 on that side and 7 on this side, 2 of which have been allocated to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ].

Now, in answer to the gentlewoman from California—and we also heard this from the gentleman from Ohio earlier—railing against the fact that Arab nations would not be invading Iraq, we have no territorial designs on Iraq. We want them out of Kuwait at the border. There will be no Arab incursion on Iraq. Our war is not with the people but with Saddam Hussein, and if we were to permit or even think in terms of Syria and anybody else taking a little slice of the action, our whole effort would fall apart.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. So when you give us this business about "I have talked to Mubarak and he is not going to send his troops into Iraq," of course not. They are ground troops, and they are going into Kuwait, as far as the Iraqian border, as I understand it. That is where we stop and draw the line, and I think we ought to be very clear about that.

□ 1130

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM].

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, Members should make no mistake about it: There will be terrible consequences if we do not pass the Solarz-Michel resolution and if we fail to get Saddam Hussein to withdraw from Kuwait and to abide by the United Nations resolution. There will not only be dire economic consequences for us and our allies, but Saddam will be free to develop nuclear capabilities, others will be emboldened to follow his lead as an aggressive dictator, willing to use chemical and biological and nuclear warfare, and terrorism will grow and spread throughout the world.

If he is stopped, the threats that I just described will be much less, and it will be much less likely that other dictators will follow his footsteps.

I do not believe that sanctions will work. I believe that even if we follow that course, that matters will only worsen. By waiting months or years on sanctions to work in such a faint hope, we will simply be allowing our troops' morale to deteriorate and giving Saddam Hussein the opportunity to prepare his nuclear capability, and I would say that even the poorest quality nuclear capability will be a threat to our troops, something that we simply cannot afford to allow to happen.

Winston Churchill said, "Dictators ride to and fro upon tigers they dare not dismount." Saddam Hussein is riding a tiger. I am convinced that he believes that Americans have no stomach for war, that this Congress will not support the President, and that he will prevail if he simply waits out the sanctions.

Consequently, our vote for the Solarz-Michel resolution is absolutely essential, to support the President, to support the U.N. resolution, and to take that one last vote that we can take and do that one last thing that we can do to avoid war if at all possible.

The very bottom line of this whole process is if we are going to avoid war, we have to send a message to Saddam Hussein. It is as simple as that. That message has to be that we stand behind the President, and if indeed it comes to D-day, whatever day that is, January 15 or the day after or 2 weeks later or whatever, then we will go to war. If he believes that, I think that he will withdraw. At least there is a good chance that he will.

If he does not believe it, he will not, and we are much more likely to be in a war than we would otherwise if we passed this resolution.

That is the importance of this resolution. The message we send if we vote it down is a message that says to Saddam Hussein that we do not have the stomach. It is a message that will give him encouragement. It is a message that is likely to leave our troops in the desert for not only months, but years, and is likely to lead to more terrorism and the possibility of more dictatorships around the world doing the same sort of thing.

That is the seriousness of this resolution. That is the seriousness of this vote. That is the importance of sending this message out.

I have long held the view that if there is any hope that we will avoid the conflict, that it will lie in the fact that at 5 o'clock on whatever day that Saddam Hussein believes is D-day, that on 5 o'clock that day, when he believes it, he just might withdraw from Kuwait and abide by the U.N. resolutions. But I can say with some great certainty in my mind that if he does not believe that, he is not going to withdraw, he has no reason to withdraw, and we surely will see problems far greater than we have today.

If we are talking about the loss of lives of Americans, I do not want to see that any more than you do. And I do not want to see any greater loss of life than necessary. But I believe that we must commit ourselves to authorize the President of the United States to conduct war if necessary if we have any hope of avoiding it, and we must be willing to carry it out quickly, fully, and completely, to destroy Saddam Hussein, if necessary, should he not have the common sense to withdraw from Kuwait and abide by the U.N. resolutions.

I urge Members for peace, for the great interests of our country, for the saving of the loss of life, and for what we believe in, to stop future aggressions in this world, vote for the Solarz-Michel resolution.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I wanted to say to the minority leader [Mr. MICHEL], because he would not yield time to me, that if he is so sure that our Arab allies, Syria and Egypt, will fight side by side with American troops against other Arabs in the area, I hope the gentleman will amend his resolution to say that U.S. troops can only go where our Arab allies will go. Because, I will tell you, I have a very different view of the role of those troops after talking with Middle Eastern leaders in Egypt, Saudi Arabia, and in Israel.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the Pentagon now estimates that 30,000 U.S. deaths could occur in the first 2 weeks of combat. Forty-five thousand body bags have been ordered by the Pentagon for this conflict. That is a reminder of what is at stake.

This is not about politics. It is not even about what is good for the Congress. It is not about what is good for liberals or conservatives, Republicans or Democrats. It is about protecting our sons and daughters, protecting our Constitution, and protecting the country we love. It is about keeping this Nation out of a war that we do not need to enter.

Make no mistake about it, Solarz-Michel gives a green light for war. Not at some time way out in the future, but in 4 days. The President is ready to plunge this Nation into war. He has doubled our troop strength. He has forbidden troop rotations. He said that sanctions are a failure, after 4½ months. He has written off diplomacy after 6½ hours.

The question is whether or not we need a war to achieve his aims. He says that we are there for four reasons: We are there to stop the aggression; we are there to stop the nuclear threat; we are there to protect the free flow of oil; and we are there to help our Kuwaiti and Saudi friends.

If we are there to stop the aggression, I would suggest that 200,000 troops in a defensive posture in Saudi Arabia accomplished the policy goal.

If we are there to stop a nuclear threat, the Israeli Government taught this Nation and others around the world how you deal with a nuclear threat from Iraq. You do not need 450,000 troops to be committed to war to accomplish that.

He said we are there to protect the free flow of oil, but the fundamental facts are that OPEC has made up for the loss of oil from Kuwait and Iraq.

This country, and every Member in this Chamber, ought to be willing to look at themselves in the mirror and say whether or not we are here to protect some way of life that allows us to drive cars that get minimum gas mileage, that allows us to live in houses that are energy sieves, that allows us to work in buildings such as this one that are energy sieves, in order to protect some notion of a conservative aspect of our history that says that that is capitalism.

□1140

Capitalism does not mean inefficiency, and if this country just made our energy policy an efficiency policy we would not have to worry about the free flow of oil.

Lastly, we are there to help our so-called Kuwaiti and Saudi friends. Need I remind the Members in this chamber what the Kuwaits and the Saudis did to this country in 1973, did to us again in 1979? We are there to protect these so-called friends? Ladies and gentlemen, these fickle friends have never proven that they are worth the kind of price that President Bush has committed.

It seems to me that if what we are there to do is to protect people that refer to us now as white slaves and create a situation where our forces are caused to hide their crosses, hide their St. Christopher medals, hide their Stars of David, that they are there because we are to defend a nation that does not believe in democracy, I would suggest that we look at what our true foreign policy aims are.

Ladies and gentlemen, we should give sanctions a chance. Seven out of the eight former Secretaries of Defense say that sanctions will work. The two former Chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff say that sanctions will work. We are told in recent days that now the CIA Director has changed his testimony, that he is now saying that sanctions will work, but they will not force Iraq out of Kuwait.

But we heard Secretary Baker, and we heard Secretary Cheney the other day tell us that when General Wallach told us that the troops would not be ready to fight on January 15, that he was making a mistake because it was his first time before the press, that in fact he was a rookie. In other words, he told the truth. And I would maintain that the CIA Director was telling the truth just 3 weeks ago when he testified that sanctions would work.

Better to achieve our goals by reducing the flow of goods, not increasing the flow of blood, and better to keep talking than start shooting.

There is a misguided machismo mentality in America that says somehow or another this is the John Wayne aspect, this is the way we ought to conduct foreign policy. We ought to be the bully boys. We ought to get out there and be the policemen of the world. The fact, folks, is if we want to take that battle to every single conflict around this world with this country, we will not be just morally bankrupt, but we will be bankrupt economically as well within 6 months, and it is time for us to question the fundamental policies that George Bush has articulated that mean that he is asking the Members of this Congress to commit themselves to war in just 4 days.

I implore Members to think of what it is going to be like to face up not to the phone calls of support that are received today, but to face up to the tears of the mothers and the fathers of the children that are in the Middle East today, to face up to the tears that will exist when their sons and daughters start coming home in body bags or when their fathers come home in flag-draped coffins. Ask yourselves whether or not we have truly exhausted all the possibilities to avoid war before we commit to it.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] to respond to the last speaker.

Mr. SOLOMON. My colleagues, we have just heard from a member of the Kennedy family, a family we all respect. Now let me read a quote from another Kennedy.

On October 22, 1962:

> My fellow citizens, let no one doubt that this is a difficult and dangerous effort on which we have set out. No one can foresee precisely what course it will take, but the greatest danger of all would be to do nothing. The 1930s taught us a clear lesson: aggressive conduct, if allowed to go unchecked and unchallenged, ultimately leads to war.

John F. Kennedy, a great American. If only he were here today!

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MCMILLEN].

Mr. MCMILLEN of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the bipartisan Solarz-Michel resolution. By debating and voting on whether to give the President the authority to use force, this body is fulfilling its constitutional responsibility. This is an affirmation, an assertion not an abdica-

tion, of Congress' role. And it is important to note that this is not a blank check for the President for war; rather, the circumstances are very clear to each of us. If we vote for this resolution, we are empowering the President to use force if and when he deems necessary and if diplomatic efforts fail. This is a definitive step, a step, I might add, that was missing in many other conflicts in which the United States was engaged, including the Korean war.

First, I support the resolution because I believe the alternative Hamilton resolution will not accomplish the objective of removing Iraq from Kuwait. There is no evidence indicating that sanctions will succeed in achieving this goal. Once we extend the deadline, the force of sanctions will be lessened, as Saddam will demobilize his military, conserving his resources and precious spare parts for the next deadline. While the citizens of Iraq may suffer because of the sanctions, I doubt very much whether the soldiers on the Iraqi frontline will go hungry.

Second, the United States does have vital interests in the Persian Gulf. With the engulfing of Kuwait, Saddam Hussein has captured for himself a choke hold on the world's oil market, dominating almost 70 percent of the world's oil reserves. Certainly Iraq will be hurt if sanctions are extended, but the economic dislocation to the free world of extending the deadline will be astronomical. The war premium on oil costs the world economy as much as $1 billion a day. Already, it is estimated that the crisis has resulted in $100 billion of damage to the free world economy. Can our fragile economies afford another $100 or $200 billion shock? Although decisions of war and peace should not be based on economics, as more Pan Am's of the world go bankrupt citizens lose their jobs, the citizens of America and the free world will understand the debilitating economic consequences of not stopping Saddam Hussein.

Since the Hamilton resolution retains war as a future option, the war premium and the economic uncertainty will continue. With our banking industry in turmoil and our energy-dependent industries teetering, can we pursue a protracted, draining strategy where war may still need to be waged to force Iraq out of Kuwait.

Third, we cannot ignore this brutal invasion of another nation, without respect to international law. Mr. Speaker, I'm sure many of my colleagues have read excerpts from the Amnesty International human rights report on the victims of Saddam's brutality. This is a dictator who is accumulating weapons of mass destruction—chemical, biological, nuclear weapons—and has used them against his own people. Saddam Hussein has devoured Kuwait and is ravishingly eyeing the rest of the Middle East. Will we stand up to him now or another day?

Fourth, I support the resolution because extending the deadline may risk eroding the world support arrayed against Saddam Hussein. Our tenuous alliance may fragment, and American public support may diminish.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for 1 minute.

Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman from Maryland realize that he is voting, when he votes for the Solarz resolution, that he is voting for a declaration of war?

□ 1150

Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland. As I said before I understood, if the gentleman heard my earlier remarks, that, in fact, we are empowering the President to go to war if and when he deems it is necessary. That is not a de facto or de jure declaration of war.

Mr. GIBBONS. It is a de facto.

Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I reclaim my time.

The civilized world understands that diplomatic overtures have been extended and this institution failure to pass the Solarz-Michel resolution will only give Saddam Hussein a victory.

There are those who argue that there are serious geopolitical repercussions to war. I would argue that there are greater consequences to rewarding Saddam Hussein for his naked aggression, his brutal atrocities, and for holding the world hostage.

Last, let me concur with those who regret that our Nation has not had the foresight to develop a long-term energy policy, particularly in light of two very clear warnings in the 1970's. Unfortunately, that neglect will not remedy our need to maintain our oil lifeline for the immediate future.

In closing, let me paraphrase what Winston Churchill said on the eve of another conflict during this century. He was referring to Adolf Hitler, but the same could he said today about Saddam Hussein. Mr. Churchill said of his adversary:

> If (he) does not want war, then there will be no war. Therefore if war should come, there can be no doubt upon whose head the blood guiltiness will fall.
>
> We must strive to frame some system of human relations in the future which will bring to an end this prolonged hideous uncertainty, which will let the working and creative forces of the world get on with their job, and which will no longer leave the whole life of mankind dependent upon the virtues, the caprice, or the wickedness of a single man.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge the adoption of the Solarz-Michel resolution.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS].

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, while the gentleman from Maryland is on the floor and while other Members are paying attention, I want to quote the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ]. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ] says that his resolution is a declaration of war, and he does not want any Member of this body coming back a few weeks later and saying it is not a declaration of war. That is a conversation I just had less than 5 minutes ago with the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ] right here on the floor.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak for peace. The decision that we are about to make is too much to be made by one mortal. The representatives of the people must participate in this decision.

These are very difficult times for each of us. Yet we have a moral obligation to do what we can to prevent war. In our time, we have seen too much violence, too much conflict, and too many killings in the Middle East. We have an opportunity to slow down this rush to war.

I realize that the struggle for peace is as old as the dawn of civilization. Yet, it is fresh as a simple step to meaningful dialog. The path to peace may be a little longer. But I believe the path to war may create more problems than it will solve.

I happen to believe that war is obsolete as a tool and as a means to conduct foreign policy.

During the past year and a half, we have witnessed a nonviolent revolution in Eastern Europe. We have seen people in Africa, South America, and Asia moving toward democracy, using the discipline and philosophy of nonviolence. These people weren't inspired by our bullets and bombs. They were inspired by our Constitution, and by our Declaration of Independence.

We should give peace a chance in the Middle East, not the instruments of destruction and death.

As a nation, as a people and as Members of this body, we must accept the idea that means and ends are inseparable. If we are going to make real the idea of a new world order, which is at peace with itself, then the means by which we struggle must be consistent with the ends we seek. If peace is the end we seek, then the means must be peaceful.

I think what I am trying to say is that there is a better way. There is a more creative way. I am convinced that the American people did not send us here to commit our limited resources, and our men and women to a bloody battlefield in a distant and faraway land.

The conflicts and problems in the Middle East were not created overnight

and they will not be resolved with a fast food quick-fix mentality.

My colleagues, the bombs that we drop and the guns we fire will not only be heard in the Persian Gulf, but they will be heard in every State, every county, every city, every town and hamlet in this Nation for many years to come. Remember that for every bomb dropped and every gun fired, they steal from our children, the elderly and those in need of health care.

We must vote for a resolution that will not divide, but will bring us together; it must not oppress, it should uplift; it must not bind us to use force, it should allow peace to blossom.

War is bloody. It is vicious, it is evil, and it is messy. War destroys the dreams, the hopes, and the aspirations of people. It breaks up families; it produces widows and causes hardship.

Whatever we do as a Congress, it will happen on our watch. Both the spirit and judgment of history will be on us.

I urge you to heed the words of the spiritual:

I am going to lay my burden down. Down by the riverside. I ain't gonna study war no more.

We should follow the wisdom of that song.

Mr. Speaker, I must say that in good conscience that I cannot and will not vote for a declaration of war.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HUCKABY].

Mr. HUCKABY. Mr. Speaker, January 1990 t'was the best of times. It seemed as though peace was breaking out everywhere. America's twin pillars—capitalism and democracy—were being emulated everywhere.

January 1991, t'is the worst of times. War hangs heavy in the air. A bit player on the world scene, Saddam Hussein, backed by a million-man army is attempting to destroy the new emerging world order by seizing Kuwait. The United Nations in an unprecedented show of unity, established a date certain, January 15, for Hussein to withdraw, or he would be subject to military force. The date approaches rapidly. Tomorrow, this body, the American peoples' body votes to determine if it supports the position taken by the United Nations or if it prefers to continue the sanctions.

War. The horror of war. Nerve gas, germs, bombs will rain on American troops, as well as on such place as Tel Aviv and Jerusalem. Thousands, perhaps tens of thousands, of people will be killed. Young American men and women will not live to see their children enter first grade, to play baseball, to be cheerleaders, to graduate from high school, to see all the wonderful things we take for granted in this country. We are about to ask untold numbers of our young people and their families to make the ultimate sacrifice. It is a hard vote. The choices are terrible. It is a decision we will live with and will be remembered for, for the rest of our lives.

Even with the nightmare facing us, I deeply believe the right choice is to proceed now and support our President, and to support the U.N. sanctions are destined to fail if we think they might somehow force Hussein to leave Kuwait. If he doesn't withdraw as a result of the enormous pressure that is now being applied, it is, in my opinion, naive to think that he will withdraw as a result of his economy winding down. Keep in mind that this spring he will plant a new food crop and will harvest this fall. If his food is short, there can be little doubt that a man who would release nerve gas on certain segments of his population will also deprive part of his people of food in order to maintain his army indefinitely. This is a path with little likelihood of success. To me, the choice is clear. It is time to act.

America is the surviving superpower. It is proper that we take all actions necessary to restore world order. Then, perhaps, the world can have generation after generation of peace. To those we ask to sacrifice, we honor you.

□ 1200

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 20 seconds to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] who quoted my uncle, President Kennedy, as suggesting that somehow or other there would be a tone of appeasement if he had not responded in the way he did to the Cuban missile crisis in 1962. I would just point out that President Kennedy established an embargo against Cuba in 1962. That is exactly what we are advocating on this side in 1990, to create an embargo that will work.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN].

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the Persian Gulf debate is framed in this Chamber by something as relatively simple: good versus evil, strength or weakness, war or peace. However, it is not that simple because this is not another lifeless debate about numbers, revenues, taxes, budgets, on the floor of the House.

This debate is to authorize the President to commit American troops to a war in the desert 10,000 miles away. The decision is about life and death, the blood of our children, and also about patience.

A rancher came up to me in western North Dakota a while ago and gave me a verse, and it went like this:

10,000 men march off to fight when 40 statesmen call it right. But had the statesmen fought instead, their impatience would have cost but 40 dead.

The question is not, should we respond to the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait; we should respond. We have done that. We stopped the march of Iraqi aggression. They are stopped. We have imposed a tough economic blockade. Iraq can sell no oil. Their GNP has fallen 50 percent and their economy will collapse. Time and sanctions will not strengthen Iraq. Time and sanctions will weaken Iraq. Everyone in this room knows that.

Now, the President and some of our colleagues say, "We must do more. We must authorize offensive action. We must authorize American troops to fight in the Persian Gulf to send a message to Iraq." Well, Mr. Speaker, that is not only sending a message to Iraq, that sends a message of war to American soldiers.

I have, and I do support the President's goals. The question here today is not of goals, but of methods. Do we need to go to war on January 15 to achieve our goals? I do not believe so. Have we exhausted every opportunity through diplomatic pressure and through economic sanctions, to resolve this without going to war? No, we have not.

So, then, what is the hurry? What is the rush? I feel in my heart, deep in my heart, that for this country to involve itself now in a war in the Persian Gulf would be a disastrous mistake. We need to resolve today to do two things: First, we need to continue patiently to apply high-level diplomatic pressure and air-tight, economic sanctions to strangle the economy of Iraq to achieve the goals we have set in that region; second, we need to decide that whatever happens, we must ask our allies to begin picking up their fair share of the burden. It is a fig leaf to call this a multinational force. It is an American force, and would be an American war, and we will decide to spend money we do not have, borrow it from our allies, to send American kids to risk their lives to protect allied oil. Instead, we should move to put the coalition forces under the U.N. flag and then fairly share those costs.

When will we understand it is time for America to ask our allies to bear their fair share of the defense burden whether in the Persian Gulf, Europe, or Asia.

Let me finally say today I am concerned here not only about war with Iraq and our role in the world, but I am also concerned about America choking on debt and being threatened with an economic crisis from within. I see a President and a Congress standing tall, exhibiting steely resolve, to stand up and talk tough to a tinhorn dictator in the Persian Gulf, willing to borrow money from abroad, and risk our troops' lives to protect our allies' oil. With all of that courage, I ask, Democrats and Republicans, the President and Congress, where is the courage to

deal with the threat from within—the growing budget deficit and a looming recession? Where is the courage to decide we have to start taking care of things here at home? When, O, when will we do that? I pray it is soon.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HUTTO].

Mr. HUTTO. Mr. Speaker, this is a difficult time for all of us. None of us want war and, indeed, I pray that Saddam Hussein will still come to his senses and realize that he and his country have nothing to gain and everything to lose if he doesn't get out of Kuwait.

The preliminaries are just about over in this standoff of Iraq against the world. The clock is ticking and winding down to kickoff time. Another phase of this world struggle on January 15 begins. On that date the U.N. resolution allows but doesn't require the use of force to accomplish what diplomacy has not been able to do—and that is to free Kuwait from the brutal aggression of the Iraqi forces of Saddam Hussein and the continued devastation of that nation.

Ours is a peace-loving Nation, and we do not relish participation in the violence and destruction of this awful game called war. But we cannot stand by and let Saddam Hussein, a menace to the world, get by with blatant aggression that threatens the peace, security, and freedom of people around the globe.

In my view, the American people do not want us to engage in this conflict by waging a long-drawn-out land war. However, we applaud our forces in Operation Desert Shield who, by their presence and vigilance, have already checked the aggression of this madman of the Middle East in his quest to overrun Saudi Arabia and perhaps other nations. But, if we must engage in hostile action, as we may be forced to do, we must use our best resources to win it quickly and decisively with a minimum loss of life. The use of air power, special forces, and the latest technology will bring us the victory.

In the last year or two we have seen marvelous changes in the Soviet Union and the Eastern bloc nations as they have moved toward democracy and sought to emulate this, the greatest of all nations with liberty and justice for all. We rejoice with these people as they continue toward the goal of freedom from oppression. It is a rocky road as witness the current problems in the Soviet republics.

There is one thing that has become abundantly clear in the last 6 months. There are threats other than the Soviet Union. Who would have thought, only a short time ago that a small country like Iraq could challenge the world with behavior such as that of Saddam Hussein. This is all the more reason that the time has not yet come for the free world to disarm. Although we support an orderly drawdown, America must retain a strong defense to be able to defend against the despots of the world.

America, through its history, has been willing to sacrifice to be and remain a free nation. Thousands have made the supreme sacrifice, and it's encouraging to know that we still have those who are willing to fight and die for our freedom and security.

Whether through diplomacy or by force, the game plan of Saddam Hussein must be stopped now or he will be an even greater threat to world peace in the future. If he chooses war, and it's his choice, he cannot win.

For us to win quickly and decisively we need to be together in unity. The President has done a good job of mobilizing world support. Now, we need to put aside partisanship and show Saddam Hussein that the Congress and the American people are with the President of the United States of America and the United Nations in an all-out effort that will prevail for the future good of all the world.

Vote for Solarz-Michel to enforce the U.N. Security Council resolutions.

□ 1210

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OBEY). The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, we have a situation developing over here where some of us who feel as keenly about this as any Member in the House are finding there is no oppportunity for time to speak. With one Member after another getting up to say this is the most important vote they will make in 5, 10, 15 or 20 years, and I agree with that, how do we suddenly get into a position where Members who have been to the gulf three times, or Members like myself who spent 5 hours yesterday in Intelligence hearings——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not propounding a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, the parliamentary inquiry is, What is the procedure to get the debate extended for Members on both sides of the aisle?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman knows that the proper procedure is to discuss that question with the minority leader and the majority leader.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, may I be heard on the parliamentary inquiry?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond because I think the gentleman does raise a very important and a very good point.

It was not the intention at all of the Rules Committee or the leadership to restrict this debate. In fact, we will bend over backward to make sure that every Member of this body is heard to the fullest extent possible. To that end, we did include in the rule, I would suggest to my colleague, the gentleman from California, a provision that will allow the majority leader in conjunction with the minority leader to extend the debate for additional time when and if that is necessary.

Mr. DORNAN of California. Excellent, and I commend them for their foresight.

Mr. BONIOR. And those conversations, by the way, are going on right now.

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA], the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, before I get into the substance of these remarks, I first want to pay tribute to the leadership on both sides and to all of you who are participating in this debate. I truly believe it is in the best tradition of our House and of our democracy that we fully debate and reflect the concerns of the American people as to the direction of this Nation in the future.

As this debate goes on, I think it is important to stress two messages: One, to the American people that they ought not to be afraid of the differences that are shown here and that they ought not to fear the kind of strong feelings that are expressed on the floor of the House. This debate is the best of what our democracy is all about and ultimately we will make a choice.

The other message, it seems to me, has to go to Saddam Hussein: That he not misjudge our differences, that ultimately we will make the choice and we will unify behind that choice. Whether it is sanctions or whether it is war, he will lose.

The choice today is not one of whether or not we support the overall goals established by the President in the Persian Gulf. The choice today is how best to accomplish those goals, whether we should continue the policy and the strategy of sanctions, or whether we should go to war. That is the choice.

In making that choice, we are also making decisions about the future of this Nation, whether the United States will continue to be the sole policeman in the world for the future, or whether we will exhaust every effort to truly build the kind of new world order that assures that other major powers face up to their responsibilities in the world of tomorrow. Make no mistake about

it, if we go to war within these next few days or weeks, 95 percent of the military burden falls on our shoulders, as it did in Korea, as it did in Vietnam, and 95 percent of the cost will be borne by the American people.

If we continue the strategy on sanctions, not only do I believe that militarily it can continue to weaken Saddam Hussein, but I also believe that it provides us the opportunity to truly strengthen the coalition of nations that are essential if we are to confront these kinds of bullies and tyrants in the future.

My friends, the bitter reality is that whatever choice we make, whether it is to continue sanctions or whether it is to go to war, we cannot afford to do this alone. That is the bitter reality. We simply cannot afford to be the world's sole policeman in the future and expect to remain a great power in the 21st century.

Look at the state of our economy at the present time. Look at the state of our economy. We are in a recession. The Congressional Budget Office and the Office of Management and Budget will confirm that. In the last quarter we dropped over 3 percent in negative growth. In the first quarter of this year we are looking at probably a 2-percent drop. We are in a serious recession.

In addition to that, unemployment now is well over 6 percent and expected to go higher.

The deficits that we confront are record deficits, record deficits. We are looking at deficits that are somewhere in the vicinity of $330 billion, if you include the Social Security surplus. If you take Social Security out of it, we are $400 billion in deficit.

When we went into the Korean war, we had a $3 billion deficit. At the height of the Vietnam war, it was $6 to $8 billion deficit that we had in this country. We now have deficits of $330 billion for this year and next year.

□ 1220

In addition to that, we are looking at the costs of the thrift situation, probably somewhere in the vicinity of $90 billion this year, not to mention what may happen with the banks, and our need to respond to the problems of the FDIC.

Our national security is not just a matter of flexing our military muscle; our national security is also a matter that relates to the strength of our economy, to the depth of our resources, to our capacity to meet needs within our own society.

That is the lesson of what is going on in the Soviet Union today. The whole thrust of what is going on in the Soviet Union today is that they recognize that they cannot be a first-rate military power and a third-rate economic power when it comes to dealing with their own society.

The essence of our national security is both military and economic strength.

Now, I recognize that there are broader foreign policy issues and broader defense issues that are, obviously, going to be involved as we determine the course of action. But we have a responsibility here, as we make these choices, to look to the future and to look to the price that is involved in what we do today.

Regardless of what your feelings may be about the power of the President to start a war or not, regardless of that dispute, there is no question, there is no constitutional question as to who ultimately pays the bill. We do.

We have to ultimately pay this price, whatever it is.

Unfortunately, and I say unfortunately, we have not been able to get from the administration testimony as to the cost estimates involved here and what our allies have contributed.

For months the Budget Committee and I have asked the administration, the State Department, the Defense Department for testimony as to what are the costs involved here.

We set a hearing in early December. They said they could not provide the information because they needed more time.

We set a hearing on January 4. They were prepared to testify and then ordered not to testify.

That is not only true for the Budget Committee, it is true for other committees on both the House and Senate sides.

The fact is the administration is now asking us to pay a price but they do not want to tell us what the price is. We need to know the full costs that are involved here—in human lives and in dollars.

That is the essence of our democracy—is the partnership between Government and people that make decisions knowing all of the risks involved.

We need to know that information. When we talk about the lesson of Vietnam, there is no question that one of the lessons of Vietnam is that when you commit forces, you had better commit them to win, to victory. But the other point is that you cannot achieve victory unless you are willing to sustain the cost in dollars, in lives, in equipment in resources, and in the support of the American people. That is the essence of the lesson of Vietnam.

We cannot be afraid to confront these costs, particularly in times of recession and particularly in times of the kind of deficits that we face.

Further, this is not supposed to be our fight alone. The President, to his credit, has established an effort to try to unify other nations behind this strategy. But the new world order today is more a slogan than a reality, we all know that. Countries who will benefit the most from what we do in the Middle East and who can best provide troops and money are standing on the sidelines. We are talking about nations that are not recovering from the devastation of World War II; we are talking about major economic powers. They are full partners, full partners when it comes to competing with us on the economic front, full partners. They are out there beating us every day.

But they are not full partners when it comes to the kind of military and dollar commitment that you need to make when you confront this kind of crisis. They are standing on the sidelines.

Now, what are the costs of Desert Shield, as best as we can determine without the help, unfortunately, of the administration? Let me refer you to this chart that I have before you. This is the best information that we have from the GAO and the CBO.

The costs to date of Desert Shield for fiscal year 1990 amount to $2.7 billion. For fiscal year 1991 it amounts to about $30 billion.

There are estimates that range somewhere between $23 billion to $30 billion. We think $30 billion is probably most accurate.

What are the costs of armed conflict? That is what we face, obviously, within these next few days. The costs per day of conflict obviously depend on what kind of war we in fact are engaged in. The Arab-Israeli war—the 6-day war—which is probably one of the best to focus on, was $750 million a day. The costs that other experts tell us could range as high as $2 billion a day.

So we use an estimate of about $1 billion per day and assume, hopefully, that if we do go into war it will not last beyond 30 days.

And if you do that, the costs we are looking at, of a military conflict, are approximately $60 billion. If you talk about the costs of continued presence and the necessary assistance following any war and everything else that has to go beyond it, it goes even higher.

We have basically lost the savings in the budget agreement established last year, which was $42 billion, not to mention the impact all of this will have on an economy in recession.

Now, if you look at the commitment of our allies to date, they have committed approximately $15 billion to $20 billion in pledges, but all we have received in the Defense Cooperation Account is $4.3 billion; that is all. Our wealthiest allies are on the sidelines of this conflict.

So, for those reasons, and again I recognize that while we discuss costs, there are other defense and foreign policy issues that we have to consider.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PANETTA. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GIBBONS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I inquire of the gentleman, how much has Japan contributed to date?

Mr. PANETTA. Japan, which receives and is dependent upon for 70 percent of its oil from the Persian Gulf, has only paid about $400 million in this effort at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize there are defense and diplomatic issues that are important here. But I also think it is important for us to look at the future costs of this Nation. We have to decide what kind of Nation we want in the next century.

If we go it alone, we will pay the price alone. If we try to work together with these other nations, we can build the kind of world order, the coalition that is needed to truly establish the kind of partnership that can take on Hussein or take on any other bully in the world.

What I see now is that we are following the path that we followed since Korea, taking on every war on our own.

The British Empire had countless wars, fighting every enemy in the world that was threatening its colonies and eventually eroding its own security, eventually destroying its own power as a consequence.

We must be an effective force for the future. So the choice today is the choice between whether or not we will indeed erode those resources for the future or whether we will build a partnership that will not only protect international security for the future but will protect the security within our own society.

That is the choice. I urge you to vote to continue the policy of sanctions because it will give us the opportunity to establish the kind of partnership that we need to provide true peace in the future.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS].

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, before this week is out each of us will cast what may well prove to be the most important votes of our lives.

I earnestly believe that what we will decide in the coming days goes far beyond the price of gas or the reestablishment of a desert sheikhdom, as I have heard alleged. No, what hangs in the balance here is nothing less than global order, the legitimacy of recognized boundaries around the world and the primacy of international law.

My friends, a new world is forming in the post-cold-war collapse of communism: New free nations are struggling for life, and this new world is still a fragile thing. Indeed, it can be dealt a mortal blow by a predatory despot who is willing to act recklessly and without conscience in a dangerous place and time.

He must be stopped now, peacefully if possible, but he must be stopped. For that reason, I will support legislation that I believe offers the greatest chance of a peaceful resolution to the crisis in the Persian Gulf; that is, the bipartisan resolution offered by my colleagues, Mr. BROOMFIELD and Mr. SOLARZ.

We in this Chamber would like nothing better than to believe that Saddam Hussein will be convinced by economic sanctions to leave Kuwait in peace. However, I have seen absolutely no evidence of this in the past 6 months, and without the threat of armed force being used against him at any time, I do not foresee Saddam altering his course of pillage, murder, rape, and destruction.

As one who believes deeply in the sanctity of human life, I do not make this decision lightly, but neither do I believe that Kuwait and the people of Kuwait can last another 6 months without a resolution to its occupation by Iraqi forces.

Mr. Speaker, I have here a report on Iraqi human rights violations in Kuwait. This report was issued by Amnesty International on December 19, and it documents every manner of vile and wretched abuse imaginable. I am thorougly revolted by account after account of beatings, torture and molestations, not to mention the systematic looting and hauling off to Iraq of everything of value to be found.

These accounts and the recent events in Geneva convince me that Saddam will stop only when he is stopped. By passing the Broomfield-Solarz resolution today and strengthening President Bush's hand at this critical time, we may finally convince Saddam that we are in deadly earnest when we demand that he give up his imperialistic obsession and withdraw his troops.

The far-flung countries of the world, through their representatives at the United Nations, have clearly seen the danger of an unchecked Saddam Hussein and have overwhelmingly voted to support U.N. Resolution 678. A clear and unmistakable message must be sent to him and others like him around the world.

This weekend we can reaffirm our support for this U.N. resolution by passing the Broomfield-Solarz legislation, but firmly and in the strongest possible terms opposing this first, critical threat to the post-cold-war peace. If Saddam is not stopped here and now, he will be back—and he will be stronger.

We must give the President the tools and the leverage today to turn back Saddam at this juncture if we are to have any hope of peacefully resolving this crisis. In so doing, we may avoid a far, far greater calamity tomorrow.

I urge my colleagues to pass the Broomfield-Solarz resolution and to do so by a wide margin.

□ 1230

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN].

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Gephardt-Hamilton resolution and in opposition to the Solarz-Michel resolution. I do so reluctantly. I vigorously supported the President in this initial action. In recent weeks I have felt that Congress should conduct itself in a way that will not undercut the chances for successful discussions.

Now, with the deadlock at Geneva and the issues squarely before Congress, I have spent the last days looking for the balance of argument to continue to support the President. I simply have not found that balance. I do not rely on procedural issues by congressional authority or arguments about giving a blank check to the President.

Indeed, in my judgment the ink reads very clearly here. Under Michel-Solarz that would be Presidential authority to commit American personnel in a massive offensive action against a very specific enemy.

For me the basic question boils down this way: In early November the President made a fateful shift in direction from reliance on sanctions backed by the threat of force to a massive offensive capability within a timetable so tight that there was no chance that economic sanctions could work. That fateful shift was undertaken without congressional consultation or approval.

Congress is now faced with the consequences. The massive show of offensive strength has not forced Saddam Hussein out of Kuwait, and Congress is now asked to support the next step in a policy of escalation.

Supporters of war authorization at this time urge that represents the best weapon to force Saddam Hussein to withdraw peacefully. I acknowledge that possibility, but so must its proponents acknowledge that war authorization is indeed a two-edged sword which could become an instrument of war instead of one of peace.

So, Mr. Speaker, these last days I reviewed carefully to the fullest available information on potential loss of life, and I have done so as one who believes that there are indeed occasions for the legitimate use of force. I would like to believe the most optimistic scenarios about potential American troop casualties, but because of the sobering advice of some of the experts with whom I have talked, and because of the value of human life, I believe that we must assume, if not the worst case, somewhere in the middle, and that would be the loss of at least several thousand American men and women. I have asked myself then how I would vote if the several thousand might include one of my own four children. Because in this vital instance I did not

answer in the affirmative for my own family, I must answer in the negative for others.

It is said that whatever the past, we are where we are. I have weighed that argument carefully. I have concluded that the admitted difficulties of regrouping around economic sanctions with the continued possibility of the use of force at a later date, that those difficulties simply do not outweigh the risks of the potential loss of life at this time. Reaching that conclusion, I now have no choice but to vote for Gephardt-Hamilton and in opposition to the Michel-Solarz resolution.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. OWENS].

Mr. OWENS of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I approach the opportunity to address this House today, and to participate in this historic debate, with great concern that my contribution be serious and thoughtful, and that it contribute, however inadequately, to a rational and wise result. I believe, as many have said and as probably all of us feel, that tomorrow's votes will be the most important and far reaching of our congressional years.

I remember reading that Winston Churchill once defined war as that event when young men are sent to die for old men's honor. That statement, more than any other that comes to mind, reflects my own cynicism about our generation making this fateful decision for those 20 and 30 years our junior. It is their future, and whether they will have one, balanced against the national and human values to be won by sending them out to do our bidding, which is at issue here.

Mr. Speaker, I came to this House for the first time just 18 years ago this week, having been elected on the absolute promise that I would vote to end the Vietnam war. The war was then in its 12th year, with 50,000 Americans among the more than 1 million dead. The fateful vote came on May 13, 1973 when the House finally found adequate resolve to cut off funding for that fruitless, divisive, and painful struggle. I remember the vote clearly, the celebration here in the well, and the tears of relief and gratitude which, in the privacy of my office, I shed that afternoon.

And I promised myself then that I would never vote for a war where America's vital interests were not at risk, or where there was an honorable alternative, and that is the test which I have applied to determine how I shall vote.

So this has been a difficult decision, though the correct answer is clear to me, because here there is an honorable alternative. Sanctions are working, they promise to cost few lives, require only patience and determination.

My vision of the new world order is different from that of the President. I see a world where American policy need no longer be determined by what is anticommunistic, nor, at least initially, that which is militaristic. The world's countries, so diverse in character and in resources, can now unite when world order is threatened, as we have done in the Persian Gulf, unite to apply economic and political pressures, and thereby avoid resorting, in many instances, to the ultimate brutality of war.

One man recently said that I should support the President, that he was the only national leader, and that I am just a Congressman. If, as he promised me, my vote to keep consistency with my judgment and my conscience by disagreeing with the Commander in Chief costs me the opportunity to sit in this body, so be it. I am at peace with that issue.

A unified world has, in Iraq, applied economic sanctions which, in the judgment of America's chief of intelligence, CIA Director William Webster, are working. Secretary Baker told us at a small Foreign Affairs briefing just 5 weeks ago that sanctions, in his words, "are beginning to bite." Director Webster, just 3 weeks ago, provided the details to our Armed Services Committee. The America led embargo around Iraq has closed off more than 90 percent of its imports and 97 percent of its exports. Its foreign exchange reserves will be nearly depleted by spring. Iraq will not have the capability to be self-sufficient in food production this year, and will produce, in fact, less than one-half the grain they need. Major repairs to Iraq's sophisticated aircraft will be crippled because of the exodus of foreign technicians.

So why are we rushing headlong into war, with the specter of many young men and, yes, young women, dying in the sands of Kuwait and Iraq—British and French and Egyptians as well as Americans? And what of the bystander victims? What will be true costs of this war, in human terms? No one knows the suffering which unleashing the dogs of war will bring. The administration refuses to discuss it.

Who are we to believe about the war's costs in blood and pain? Will it be a few hundred Americans, as some reliable sources have argued just this week, or will it be, as Defense Department sources earlier leaked several months ago, from 10,000 to 30,000?

We have heard much in this debate about body bags. Last weekend, a friend gave me a copy of a document published by the Department of Commerce on December 26, 1990, entitled "The Commerce Business Daily." This publication is, as its subtitle indicates "a daily list of government procurement invitations and contract awards."

Page 32 of that document for December 26, 1990 lists awards of four contracts to purchase 40,000 body bags, or in the official terminology, "pouches, human remains."

Mr. Speaker, the United States and the entire international community have been struggling against two evils since the second of August. The first is Saddam Hussein's unprovoked, brutal, and intolerable aggression against Kuwait. The second is the clock—for as every day passes without a resolution to this crisis, more innocent people suffer under Iraqi occupation, and more members of the international coalition suffer from economic sanctions they must enforce.

There is a point at which the waiting must end. It may be that economic sanctions will not produce the results which, until 2 months ago, the President and Secretary of State assured us would follow, but the time to abandon sanctions has not yet come. When that point is reached, it will require, in my view, a new decision, because it is one thing to invoke economic sanctions, and it is another to invoke military action with its resultant and incalculable death and suffering. That is what the Hamilton-Gephardt resolution provides, and that is why I will vote for it.

When we ended the Vietnam war, I promised myself that I would never support a war effort for this country unless our vital security interests were threatened. President Jimmy Carter first recognized that free flowing oil through the Persian Gulf was a vital security interest of this country. Never mind the stupidity that allowed the death a decade ago of efforts which he and many others supported to free us from the economic bondage of dependency on Middle Eastern oil. The plain truth is that we face war in the Persian Gulf today because we—and most of the world—have allowed ourselves to rely for economic vitality upon crude oil produced on the Arabian Peninsula.

The world faces war today for the noble cause of a new world order. But that high sounding phrase is, in fact, bottomed on the world's need for oil and America has stepped forward once again to play the role of world's policeman to make everything right. No one else, we are told, will do it. All the world is behind us, in this selfless undertaking, but, as someone mentioned last night, they should be at our side.

I have praised, as many others, the President's brilliant leadership in bringing world powers into alliance to impose the sanctions on Iraq, and in seeking U.N. support. But it can legitimately be asked why America is not one of many forces of more equal proportion, under a U.N. flag, and why the huge new resources pouring into the treasuries of those Persian Gulf countries, whose very existence we defend, are not, in fact, paying the costs of that defense. A war effort in the Persian Gulf could cost, we were told yesterday by the House's budget chairman, a billion dollars per day.

This global alliance, we are told by the administration's spokesmen and by Members debating today, will begin to disintegrate if we do not go to war now. Others assure us that the alliance will begin to break up if, in fact, war is undertaken and it takes more than a few days. In fact, as all Members know, the alliance is a couple of old friends, principally the British and the French whose numbers are very small in comparison with ours, and Arab countries whose existence is directly dependent upon the success of America's efforts. This war will be basically an American action and our allies, most of them, are simply holding our coat. The two greatest world economic powers, both of whom depend, as we do not, upon Middle Eastern oil, are not present militarily nor, in any significant way, economically. They are figuratively averting their eyes, pleading preoccupation with their own problems.

So we appear on the verge of an American war in the Persian Gulf. I still have hopes, though I cannot base them on anything except my normal optimism about the ultimate triumph of man's better instincts—in this case avoiding an absolutely unjustifiable, intellectually and morally indefensible war effort.

Our hopes and prayers go with U.N. Secretary General Javier Perez de Cueller, with whom I visited briefly last Monday in New York. The French and the European Community are making a last effort. It is said that King Fahd and King Hussein, whom I am proud to call a friend, and President Benjadid of Algeria are making efforts. Others will try.

But when I contemplate what will result if they fail, my optimism fades. I see the probability of a bloody war which will claim thousands of lives and destabilize the region for years to come, putting back America's—and Israel's—abilities to live at peace with the Arab world for generations.

We are told that if we make any compromise with Saddam Hussein at all, that we resort to appeasement, and that nothing can be traded for Iraq's withdrawal from Kuwait. Like all in this Chamber, I pray he will realize how poor his chances are, and foreseeing the destruction of his war capability, much of his country and many of his countrymen, will choose to begin to leave Kuwait.

Mr. Speaker, the President's decision to direct the Secretary of Defense to ensure an offensive option, his decision to increase the deployment to nearly 450,000 men and women, and his implied intention to move quickly after the U.N. January 15 deadline, all set the United States on a collision course with Iraq. This date, selected arbitrarily, has come to represent the seminal moment when peaceful efforts have either succeeded or failed to resolve this crisis. This is not the case.

I may eventually support the U.N. resolution authorizing all necessary means, and I do not preclude the eventual use of force to remove Saddam Hussein from Kuwait. But I do not now believe that is necessary. The President—in hopes of making our military threat credible—has attempted to preclude the strategy of sanctions upon which he initially introduced troops into the Persian Gulf, and in the process, undermined the prospects for a peaceful resolution of this conflict.

Mr. Speaker, I reject the linkage of this act of aggression with the Palestinian problem. I reject rewarding Saddam Hussein in any manner whatsoever. However, we are apparently headed for war after January 15, and I will not be a party to imperiling the lives of our troops in the gulf without the conviction that all peaceful alternatives have been exhausted.

As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and its Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East, I have traveled widely throughout the Middle East over the last 3 years. I pretend no expertise, but I have become acquainted with leaders of the countries of the region and have tried to understand, in particular, the struggle between Israel and her Arab neighbors. In fact, I returned just 3 weeks ago from a visit to Israel and six Arab countries.

While there I visited, like many of the members of this House have, with the troops in Saudi Arabia. While visiting the First Marine Division just 20 miles from the Kuwaiti border, I met three young men from my State of Utah. One of them asked me: "Will you send us to war?" The question haunted me, and still does. It was asked without fear and without apparent apprehension. Both emotions are present today as I contemplate the impact of the votes we will cast tomorrow.

Opinions on how this crisis should be resolved are widely varied in the Middle East, but all agree that war will transform and destabilize the region for years to come. It will imperil moderate Arab governments. It will feed the fury of hatred and intransigence, and drive the rampant growth of Islamic fundamentalism. Undoubtedly terrorism will increase. These destabilizing forces are clearly not in the interest of the United States, or of our closest ally in the region, Israel.

I found that many of those leaders with whom I visited in the Middle East do not believe sanctions will work. This is partly true because the administration has downplayed sanctions, have changed earlier representations, and in recent months have been saying sanctions simply will not do the job alone, and, anyway, you don't want Saddam to come out of this with his military machine in workable condition.

There were three components in the allied response to Saddam Hussein: Sanctions, negotiations, or threat of war. The administration's decision to engage in brinksmanship has placed us in an untenable position because they have eliminated sanctions, leaving those who are trying actively to avoid the war with nothing but linkage to negotiate, and linkage is unacceptable. We should not be in that position. Sanctions are, in fact, a viable alternative. It is the administration's own ineptitude which has placed us in this intolerable situation, and that is very regrettable indeed.

In a totalitarian country such as Iraq, the decision to go to war is a relatively easy one. Such are the benefits of dictatorship.

That is not, I am happy to say, the case in this country, nor in any true democracy. This vote, as difficult as it may be for all of us, is a tribute to our democracy. The President may not be able to show Saddam Hussein that the Congress is unanimous in its support for war. But an open society's strength is based on its process of consideration for the views of all, and this country is genuinely divided on this issue. Americans believe, correctly so in my view, that we have not exhausted every peaceful alternative.

I commend my colleagues on the seriousness of this debate, and the solemn manner with which the Congress approaches this awesome task. When this immediate task is over, and the current situation concluded, one way or another, whenever that time will be, there will still remain the seemingly interminable conflict between our valued ally Israel and her Arab neighbors.

It is my sincere hope that, at that time, the Congress will show the same interest and seriousness in search of a comprehensive peace in the Middle East. That is the only way that a lasting peace with hope can come to this, the most troubled of regions, an area where peace is required for the well-being of the rest of the world.

□ 1240

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. CHANDLER].

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Michel-Solarz resolution.

I think as we discuss this issue, it is important to say that I believe we are all trying to avoid a war, and the question is how best to accomplish that.

First, I think we need to understand our adversary. Let me quote Saddam Hussein. I think it says it all in one sentence. These are his words;

> I struggle for the realization of Arab unity and if necessary, through the use of force, because I am determined to consolidate a single Arab state.

Hussein's objective is very clear—one Arab state with Saddam Hussein at its head. What that would mean is two-

thirds of the world's known oil reserves would be under the control of one man. The Suez Canal, the transportation crossroads of the entire world, would be under the control of one man. Key allies of the United States and the free world would be threatened by one man, and the fate of the world's economy would be in the hands of one man.

I do not believe any amount of delay or attempts at negotiation, no matter how well intentioned, will stop this man or change his mind. All his gains have been by the use of force, including murder and torture. Regrettably, that seems to be what he understands.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. CHANDLER. No, I do not have enough time. I am sorry.

I wish to emphasize a second important point.

Supporters of the continued use of sanctions characterize their policy as peaceful, benign, nonviolent, and without the cost of lives. I think they are compelled to answer this question: With sanctions, will there be suffering, hardship, and death in Iraq? Well, if sanctions are to be effective, I think the clear answer to that question is clearly yes.

If the answer is no, then sanctions could not possibly succeed.

Now, who will suffer? Will it be Hussein, his leaders, his troops? No, the suffering will fall on the old, the young, the sick, and women. Will the rape, the murder, and the torture of Kuwaitis stop? No.

I think we face terrible choices. But when you propose a policy, I think you are compelled to be forthright about its results.

Suppose we use sanctions for a year and Saddam Hussein is backed into a corner. Is he going to be any less desperate, any less ruthless? He likely faces the destruction of his country no matter what policy option we choose. War will very likely be the result. Time, though, serves Hussein and his purposes. To give Hussein time would be to send him the wrong message.

There is a terrible sickness in the Middle East. We have tried every conceivable treatment, and nothing has worked. We must now lance the infected area and remove this tumor. Hussein has the option to render this tumor benign. It is his choice. But I think we all know that it is malignant and we must remove it before it is given a chance to spread.

Mr. Speaker, to carry that analogy further, we must give the surgeons the tools to carry out their task. Short of the use of nuclear weapons, or chemical or biological weapons, we must give our fighting men and women every means they need to accomplish their task.

No more Vietnams!

If conflict becomes unavoidable, give our men and women what they need to prevail quickly, then bring them home.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 11, 1991]

CONGRESS AND WAR

Iraq, says Speaker Foley, is an "issue of conscience." But that's to say that only one answer is possible. In fact, Iraq is an issue of judgment. Conscientious legislators have different views about it. That is what makes the congressional debate on Iraq so excruciatingly difficult.

That the United States has large stakes in the outcome of the Gulf crisis is no longer a contentious issue. The threshold argument in Congress is how best to pursue those stakes—by the threat of war or by further reliance on sanctions, diplomacy and the military buildup. On this matter, as we say, conscientious people can differ. There are expert analyses to support several courses. It is a close call.

But Congress is not dealing merely with this essentially tactical question. Having chosen to wait until this late moment to address the crisis in a formal this-counts way, Congress finds itself pinned up against the Bush administration's determined, United Nations-sanctioned effort to enforce the U.N.'s Jan. 15 deadline for Iraqi withdrawal from Kuwait. So a second argument—what we would call the more urgent argument—necessarily comes into play: whether to try to make the Bush enforcement strategy work. This is not simply a matter of supporting the president, although it is partly that. It is a matter of suppling the president with the vote of confidence, the showing of support, to strengthen his hand at the moment when conceivably this powerful sort of strengthening of his hand can influence the calculations of Saddam Hussein and win him over to the withdrawal that is favored by almost everyone in America.

It is no longer seriously disputed that Saddam Hussein is a menace to regional peace and global order and had best be reined in sooner so that he does not become an even greater menace later. This is what the American government has attempted to do. Now comes the squeeze. Can there be any question as to how Saddam Hussein would read a congressional vote that denied President Bush the authority he seeks to use force in conformity with international mandate and national policy alike? Does anyone think he would not take heart from such a vote?

A war in the Gulf could have incalculable and horrible effects, and we are not calling for the country to launch an attack. But we do support putting in the hands of the president—a president who personally knows something about war—the authority to make a more plausible threat in these eleventh-hour circumstances of President Hussein's pre-deadline countdown. Our judgment is that Congress, by deciding to authorize the President to conduct war, materially improves his chances of achieving peace. It is a risk, and we would take it.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS].

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate it if my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. CHANDLER], would remain in the well. I would like to propound a question to the gentleman.

As I understand it, the administration's policy options have been threefold—an economic option, a diplomatic option, and an offensive military option. The gentleman began his remarks—and I respect the gentleman—by saying that this is not really a march to war but an effort to try to avert war. Yet I listened very carefully to the gentleman's argument.

With respect to option 1, economic sanctions, the gentleman, giving us his own assumptions, gave a brilliant explanation as to why sanctions will not work. So let us take that off the table.

Then the gentleman said in the course of his remarks that diplomatic efforts, no matter how well intentioned, will not work, so let us take that off the table.

So what the gentleman is really saying is in direct contradiction to what he started out suggesting, because if he is saying the economic option will not work and diplomacy will not work, then is the gentleman not saying that what this debate is about here is going to war with Iraq, straight and simple, so let us strip all the other discussion away from it, because what this really is all about is going to war with Iraq?

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the gentleman yield so I may respond?

Mr. DELLUMS. Unless I misheard, that is what the gentleman said.

Yes, I yield to the gentleman for a response.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. Speaker, I think there is great risk of war no matter which policy is adopted. I think, though, that Saddam Hussein is more likely to respond to an immediate threat of destruction of his country than he is likely to respond to an extension of time, which I believe he will interpret as a sign of weakness on the part of the allies, most notably the United States.

Mr. DELLUMS. So the gentleman is saying that the vote today is a vote to go to war with Iraq? The gentleman says that is the option, and he thinks that is the only one left on the table?

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. Speaker, I think there is grave risk of war, no matter what option we adopt. What I think, though, is that paradoxically, the threat of war is more likely to yield the result of peace than the threat of sanctions, which I think I just heard the gentleman say will not work either.

Mr. DELLUMS. I did not say they would not work. I said, if we were accepting your assumptions. The gentleman discarded sanctions, but I am not in that position. I do not agree with that. I am just saying that was the gentleman's viewpoint.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLPE].

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, the decision we and the President are in the process of making will affect real lives, real people, real families. We must not let that fundamental truth be sanitized

away in the technical jargon of military strategy and war gaming. The decision we are about to make is literally a matter of life and death. That is of course why this is such a difficult decision for all of us.

Let it be clear that there is no disagreement in this Congress on one essential point: Saddam Hussein's ruthless invasion of Kuwait cannot and will not be allowed to stand. The world simply cannot permit a dictator as ambitious and ruthless as Hussein to seize control of the region's critical energy resources. Moreover, international acquiescence to Hussein's act of naked aggression would only encourage similar acts by other tyrannical regimes.

It needs also to be said plainly that there are indeed times when lives must be risked in the struggle against tyranny and for freedom. We Americans understand that very clearly. That is why, following Iraq's invasion of Kuwait, most Americans applauded the President's quick and effective deployment of American troops to Saudi Arabia to deter further aggression by Saddam Hussein's forces. That is also why Americans supported the President's decision to use military force, if necessary, to secure an international economic blockade of Iraq. These decisions were not without risk or cost, but they were recognized by most Americans as prudent and necessary responses to Iraq's aggression. And they received the broadest possible bipartisan support in the Congress.

But now we are being asked to abandon these policies and to launch offensive military action. We are being told it is time for war. Why? Why the rush to war? Why abandon a strategy that has been largely successful for an infinitely more costly and risky initiative that will inevitably mean a huge loss of life, and is very likely to produce a wholly unpredictable spiral of violence and bloodshed and increased international instability?

Clearly, if there should be a war, there is no doubt about the ultimate military outcome. If we fight, we will prevail and Saddam Hussein will suffer a crushing defeat. But at what cost? And at what consequences for the Middle East, for America, and for the world.

Yes, war is an option. But war must be a last resort, to be initiated only when it is clear that sanctions and diplomacy have failed, and when we can be reasonably confident that military success will yield more than a pyrrhic victory. War must be a last resort. Surely our impatience is not a sufficient reason to put the lives of young American men and women at risk. Nor is the failure to meet an arbitrary, self-imposed deadline a sufficient reason to conclude that diplomacy has failed.

Two central arguments are being advanced by those supporting the Solarz-Broomfield proposed declaration of war. First, it is claimed that the economic sanctions that have been imposed are not working and will never succeed in expelling Iraqi forces from Kuwait.

Mr. Speaker, it is simply wrong to say that the initial strategy to stop Saddam Hussein is not working. Just look at what has been accomplished in less than 6 months;

Saudi Arabia is now defended against attack, and Hussein's fantasy of gaining control of the region's energy resources has been shattered.

The safety and freedom of American and other hostages have been secured.

The energy market has been stabilized and the world has discovered it is able to do without Kuwaiti and Iraqi crude.

Inside Iraq, the sanctions are biting, and they are biting deeply. The Director of the Central Intelligence Agency and other analysts report that more than 90 percent of Iraqi imports and 97 percent of its exports have been curtailed, that the international embargo is depriving Baghdad of approximately $1.5 billion of foreign exchange earnings monthly, that Iraq's inability to export its oil is costing over $70 million daily, and that Iraq's GNP has already been reduced by 50 percent.

Does that sound like a failed sanctions policy? According to CIA Director Webster, even Iraq's military, particularly its air force, is being weakened by the sanctions. Major repairs to sophisticated aircraft like the F-1 are increasingly difficult because of the exodus of foreign technicians. In addition, a lack of spare parts and lubricants will, over time, take an increasingly severe toll on Iraqi ground forces.

The bottom line is that Saddam Hussein is now virtually alone in the Middle East—politically, militarily, and economically isolated. Listen to the words of former Secretary of Defense James Schlesinger:

> Saddam Hussein staked Iraq's position on a roll of the dice—and lost. Only if he has a deeply masochistic streak can he regard himself as rewarded. To allow our political rhetoric to obscure the severe punishment that has already been meted out or to suggest that our current policy is in some way unsuccessful * * * strikes me as misconceived.

It is true that one critical objective—Iraq's expulsion from Kuwait—has not yet been achieved. But most experts have insisted from the beginning that it would take a minimum of 12 to 18 months for sanctions to begin to have a politically significant effect within Iraq. What is remarkable is how much the sanctions have achieved in less than 6 months. It is not the failure of sanctions that we should be heralding, but their extraordinary success.

The second argument of those supporting a declaration of war is that time is on the side of Saddam Hussein because the coalition allied against him is too fragile to be counted on to sustain effective international sanctions. Mr. Speaker, if this is in fact true, why should we believe the coalition will hang together in the far riskier exercise of war. No one has addressed this issue more incisively than the former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Adm. William Crowe. Testifying before the Senate Armed Services Committee, Admiral Crowe observed:

> I cannot understand, Admiral Crowe writes, why some consider our international alliance strong enough to conduct intense hostilities but too fragile to hold together while we attempt a peaceful solution. . . . I sense more nervousness among our allies about our impetuousness than about our patience.

Mr. Speaker, there is no one in this body that can say with absolute certainty that sanctions and diplomacy will eventually succeed in expelling Iraqi forces from Kuwait, or that further reliance on sanctions and diplomacy will be without risk or cost. But what of the risks and costs inherent in the decision to go to war?

The cost in human casualties: If a ground war becomes part of the battle plan, we are told that American casualties could be as high as 10,000 to 20,000.

The cost to an already weakened American economy.

The risk of an uncontrollable spiral of violence and terrorism.

The risk that military expenditures, and the possible reinstitution of the draft, will force the continued deferral of urgently needed domestic investments.

Given all of the uncertainties and risks of war, does it not make sense to stay the course with a policy that is manifestly working and that has already accomplished a great deal. Again let me quote Admiral Crowe:

> I firmly believe that Saddam Hussein must leave Kuwait. At the same time given the larger context I judge it highly desirable to achieve this goal in a peaceful fashion, if possible. In other words, we should give sanctions a fair chance before we discard them. I personally believe they will bring him to his knees, but I would be the first to admit that is a speculative judgment. If in fact the sanctions will work in 12 to 18 months instead of six months, the trade-off of avoiding war with its attendant sacrifices and uncertainties would, in my view, be more than worth it.

Admiral Crowe concluded his testimony with these words:

> It may be that Saddam Hussein's ego is so engaged that he will not bend to an embargo or other peaceful deterrents such as containment. But I believe we should thoroughly satisfy ourselves that that is in fact the case and that hostilities would best serve our interests before resorting to unilateral offensive action against Iraq. It would be a sad commentary if Saddam Hussein, a two-bit tyrant who sits on 17 million people and possesses a GNP of $40 billion, proved to be more patient than the United States, the world's most affluent and powerful nation.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we will heed this wise counsel of one of America's most

distinguished military leaders. It is not yet time to write off the effectiveness of sanctions and diplomacy in rolling back Saddam Hussein's aggression. The rush to war is premature. I urge passage of the Gephardt-Hamilton resolution.

□ 1250

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER].

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, much of the debate on these three very different resolutions now being considered revolves around the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of economic sanctions, particularly trade sanctions.

Let me mention a few words about my vantage point and my perspective. I serve on the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. I serve on the House Select Committee on Intelligence. Accordingly I focus intensely on this issue. I want to remind Members and reassure my own constituents that this Member has been willing to stand up alone in his party and against intense pressure from the White House, if necessary, when I have been convinced of the merits of my position.

With these words about perspective, it is perfectly clear to this Member that economic sanctions or an embargo cannot alone reverse the status quo and will not cause Iraq to withdraw from Kuwait. Therefore, I have concluded that our only chance to force that withdrawal without war is to maintain a very credible and immediate military threat of force.

This Member will not deprive President Bush of that very credible and immediate threat of force. The Michel-Solarz resolution maintains that credible and immediate military threat, and, as such, is the key to success with, if at all possible, peace. It reaffirms U.N. Resolution 678, which is the express resolve undergirding the multinational force arrayed against Saddam Hussein's aggression and brutality, and against his very real, ultimate, threat to our national interests, and that of the whole civilized world.

Accordingly, I want to make just a few points about the ineffectiveness of economic sanctions. The governments of all of the countries bordering Iraq have agreed to honor the embargo. In theory, all trade with Iraq should have ceased and Saddam Hussein's supply of critical materials should have been exhausted. Clearly, however, the sanctions have not been effective as envisioned, and the Iraqi military regime has not been crippled.

I will give you three quotes directly from the January 10 letter to House Armed Services Committee Chairman ASPIN from the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, Judge William Webster.

First:

> The ability of the Iraqi ground force to defend Kuwait and southern Iraq is unlikely to be substantially eroded over the next 6 to 10 months.

Second, he says:

> Even if sanctions continue to be enforced for an additional 6 to 12 months, economic hardship alone is unlikely to compel Saddam to retreat from Kuwait or cause regime-threatening discontent in Iraq.

Third:

> We have seen little hard evidence to suggest that Saddam is currently threatened by the current hardships endured by his populace.

Mr. Speaker, we have many examples from the news media of leaks in our export embargo to Iraq. I asked for a detailed list of the firms, foreign and domestic, that are leaking this material, services, and important other items.

I saw a partial list. It is highly classified because of the collection techniques so I asked for a declassified version. The CIA response to me last week is very general, but here is what came back to me:

> The efforts to circumvent sanctions have been largely unsuccessful. At this point most governments are actively enforcing sanctions and plan to continue enforcement efforts. Since the imposition of the embargo, private firms have been involved in trying to sell goods to Iraq. Industrial and agricultural products constitute the bulk of the items offered to Iraq. Military, chemicals, transports, electrical, and oil-related items are also being offered.

The sanctions are leaking, already at this early date, at a disturbing rate. The borders of Iran, Syria, Turkey, and Jordan are hotbeds of smuggling. Large shipments of foodstuffs have made the journey to Baghdad.

Overhead satellites reveal heavy traffic over makeshift desert highways.

> Iran, for example, has doubled its imports of beef, an indication that they may be supplying meat to Iraq. (Wall Street Journal, December 5, 1990.)

In Baghdad, there are large supplies of beer that had been bottled in Jordan months after the sanctions took effect.

Now, I am frankly not much concerned about food smuggling, but if Iraq can effectively import bulky food to sell on the open markets, clearly Iraq can import critical spare parts and equipment. And, it is!

> There are numerous other examples that have been revealed in the press. It is known, for example, that truckloads of chemical additives for water purification have entered the country. (Washington Post, January 1, 1991.)
>
> The International Maritime Bureau is investigating a Honduran-flag vessel carrying chemicals from Europe that never reached Aqaba. This ship faked engine troubles, sneaked into Beirut harbor, and off-loaded its shipment of critical chemicals. These critical chemicals then were able to make their way to Iraq. (Wall Street Journal, December 5, 1990.)
>
> We know that there are Iraqi brokers who have settled into plush Jordanian hotels, ordering a whole range of equipment by telex and paying top price to those who are willing to breach the embargo. (Wall Street Journal, December 5, 1990.)

Regrettably, we now know that a significant number of Western companies are aiding and abetting the smuggling of critical materials. Recently unclassified data from the intelligence services indicate that numerous foreign firms have been involved in trying to sell goods to Iraq. Industrial equipment, military, transport, electrical and oil related items are also being bartered.

Yesterday, a distinguished, senior member of the Select Committee on Intelligence, Mr. SHUSTER explained that literally hundreds of companies and individuals have provided critical assistance to Iraq. As a member of that committee I can regrettably affirm that situation. We have, of course, no air embargo.

As we exercise our awesome responsibilities here today, it is entirely appropriate for us to consider well the lessons of history. Perhaps the definitive source on the subject of economic sanctions is a book written by Gary Clyde Hufbauer and Jeffrey J. Schott in 1985 for the Institute for International Economics. It is entitled "Economic Sanctions Reconsidered: History and Current Policy." The authors, after having considered the application of economic sanctions in approximately 150 different wars which stretched in time from the Peloponnesian Wars of 400 BC to Grenada, gave the following three relevant reasons why sanctions sometimes are of limited success:

> First, sanctions imposed may simply be inadequate to achieve the objectives sought—the goal may be too elusive, the means too gentle, or cooperation from other countries when needed, too tepid.
>
> A second reason for failure is that sanctions may create their own antidotes. In particular, economic sanctions may unify the target country both in support of the government and in search of commercial alternatives.
>
> A third reason for failure is that economic sanctions create their own backlash, abroad and at home. Allies abroad may simply not share the goals of the sender country. As a result, they may, in the first instance, ask exasperating questions about the probability of a successful outcome; in the second instance, they may refuse to take stern measures against the target country* * *.

These reasons for failed sanctions are all too likely to be relevant to the current situation with Iraq.

It has been said in arguments for extending the economic sanctions for a long period that "patience is a virtue." But patience is not always a virtue. Can anyone really believe that an effective embargo and the coalition supporting it will survive for 24 months or even a year? It cannot!

Unfortunately, Saddam Hussein will leave Kuwait only if he believes the United States and the multilateral coalition really has the resolve to use force. He clearly is not yet convinced

of our resolve. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to strongly support the passage of the Michel-Solarz, bipartisan resolution. It will assist President Bush in demonstrating that America and its allied nations do indeed have the necessary resolve to exercise force in removing Iraqi forces from Kuwait. At this point that credible resolve and this Michel-Solarz resolution are our best hope for a successful and peaceful conclusion to the current crisis in the gulf.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DONNELLY].

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Solarz amendment and in favor of the Gephardt amendment. Mr. Speaker, I have been a Member of this institution for 13 years. I have taken the well of this House on many occasions to speak out on issues, both domestic and foreign policy, but never in my service as a Member of the House have I taken the well with such sadness and rage.

□ 1300

Sadness and rage because it seems this institution in less than 24 hours will authorize our President to take offensive action and to start a war in the Middle East.

Let met say to my friends that if they thought the Vietnam war was unpopular, wait until the American people find out why and for whom and for what our kids were sent off to die. To restore the legitimate Government of Kuwait, a monarchy, a feudal monarchy, a group of people that will not fight for themselves. Can you imagine in your wildest estimation if the United States of America was vanquished in battle, and we survivors were chased into Mexico, that not every red-blooded American would take arms to retake our land?

To defend Saudi Arabia, a nation that has no draft, a nation that has continually used foreign nationals to do their dirty work. Their able-bodied men and women will not stand every one of them in defense of their country and the restoration of the Government of Kuwait. They expect Americans to do it.

Let me disabuse everybody here that this is an international coalition. Yes, my friends, it is an international coalition when they vote in the United Nations. But when they have to put their sons and daughters on the line to restore the legitimate Government of Kuwait, where are they?

The Soviet Union, the other great world superpower, not one Soviet soldier in Saudi Arabia. One battleship, but not one soldier in harm's way. The European Community. Granted, France and England deserve some credit. Where are the rest of them? A warship here, a minesweeper there.

The European Community. Twice in this century we have sent our children, sons and daughters, to defend the countries of the European Community. The success of the Marshall plan, in my estimation, has made a lot of European nations wealthy and has created a lot of ingrates.

Japan, a few yen, Japan which gets almost all of its oil from Kuwait.

And worst of all, worst of all, who have we taken as an ally? Hafiz Assad, the dictator of Syria, Hafiz Assad. If any of my colleagues had a constituent that died on Pan Am 103, look yourself in the mirror to have an ally like Hafiz Assad.

When they strike Israel and Israel strikes back, will the Arab so-called allies fight with us or fight against us?

My friends, we are not just jumping into the quicksand of the Middle East, we are diving in head first.

Let me say finally to my friends on the Democratic side, I have always prided myself as a member of a party that represented and stood for the interests of the working class and the poor. I need not remind anybody in this Chamber who dies in wars. It is the working class and the poor. And at the end of the day, if this terrible war commences, each one of us is going to have to walk up to a mother or a father, or a son or a daughter and say that your daddy, your mom died in a necessary, just and noble cause. And if you vote to authorize the President to send our kids into battle, I hope you will be able to look them in the eye and say that they gave their life, 90 percent American, in a necessary, just and noble cause.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot say that to my constituents. I hope that those who vote for the so-called bipartisan resolution can say that to theirs.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. ROYBAL].

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, during this debate I have heard on various occasions Members of this House tell us that this is the most difficult vote that they will ever cast in their political career. With that, Mr. Speaker, I agree. It is the most difficult vote that we will cast in our entire political career.

But I have listened to both sides and I still have to find someone who gives me some specific reason why we are there, what our interests are in the Persian Gulf. This has not been specifically outlined as far as I can see.

We are told instead that Saddam Hussein is an evil man, that he must be stopped. With that I agree. But the truth of the matter is that Hussein has not changed one bit. He was evil when we were supporting him, when he was our friend. So there has been no change insofar as that individual is concerned.

No one has given any real reason I believe why there is any justification as to why we must sacrifice thousands of young lives before all other alternatives have been exhausted.

Mr. Speaker, many decades ago Americans fought a war to end all wars, but wars have not ended, only the names have changed to police action and so forth. The truth of the matter is that the battlefields of the world still have our men dying and young families continue to mourn their loved ones as widows and orphans live their lives in poverty and deprivation.

Our national leaders tell us now that they want only peace, but they launch us into war as we find ourselves debating now whether or not to grant the President of the United States a declaration of war. Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that we must not give the President this unbridled reason for him to go into battle. Congress I believe must provide a cooler head and warmer hearts and tell those who wage war that a strong application of sanctions, when given time to work, will prevent war, destruction and death. We must tell those that wage war that the history of the world clearly has demonstrated that the power of the sword only brings suffering, and history, that same history also tells us that the intellect, when given its time, can bring peace. It can prevent the destruction of nations and it can bring about a tranquility throughout the world as a whole, our leadership as well as theirs.

But may I say as well that as the Congress of the United States will be tested in the next few days as all Americans and the people of the world watch and history records and judges, most of those who will vote on this matter do not know what war really is. They never had on a uniform, they never faced an opponent and so they do not know.

I for one cannot condemn thousands of young lives to an untimely death on a foreign battlefield, specifically when there is, in fact, another alternative. A few more weeks can make a difference. I believe that sanctions, given a chance, can work, and it can in fact prevent war and its terrible consequences.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLO].

Mr. GALLO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding the time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bipartisan concurrent resolution sponsored by Republican leader MICHEL and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ] which provides support to the multinational forces now determined to remove the military forces in Iraq from the nation of Kuwait.

I believe that President Bush deserves a great deal of credit for his leadership in building a strong international coalition to make it clear to Saddam that he is facing worldwide op-

position to his invasion of Kuwait. With the support of the United Nations and our allies, this international force has shown Saddam Hussein that he stands alone against the world, even though he seems to be slow in getting the message.

If Saddam Hussein respects anything, Mr. Speaker—and I emphasize the word if—it is strength of will and unity of purpose. For these reasons, I support this bipartisan resolution.

This is not a partisan issue, Mr. Speaker, nor is this a step which any of us take lightly, when so many lives are at stake. But, we must demonstrate our unity of purpose in support for international efforts to stand firm against Saddam Hussein's naked aggression against Kuwait, a member in good standing of the United Nations.

I support our President and I support our troops who are in the gulf defending our critical international resolve at this important time in world history.

□ 1310

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak for peace, peace under the rule of law.

It was Franklin Delano Roosevelt who had the dream during the final years of World War II that the rule of law would set the standard on this globe after that conflict. He was the guiding light of the bold idea of the creation of the United Nations. Today we are seeing that dream of Franklin Roosevelt put to the test based upon a U.N. resolution against the tyrannical aggression of Saddam Hussein upon his neighbor.

Our country leads the way toward a resolution of this crisis under the rule of international law.

Mr. Speaker, the issue is whether the dream of Franklin Roosevelt will be fulfilled by reliance on the United Nations and the rule of law. This is a grave issue. It is, however, but a replay of the past. The faces are different, but the issues and the challenges are the same.

The question is: have we learned anything from the lessons of history? In 1936 Adolf Hitler entered the Rhineland. Those great powers of the day, Great Britain and France, did nothing. In 1938 Adolf Hitler demanded part of Czechoslovakia and got it based upon a promise of no more territorial demands. It was Great Britain's Chamberlain, the Prime Minister, who returned from the Munich meeting with Adolf Hitler proclaiming "peace in our time." How wrong he was. The lesson in history of which I speak is found in the phrase, "We should have stopped him when we could."

How many British, French, and, yes, American families said that about Adolf Hitler after World War II? Applying that sad lesson of history, we must stop Saddam Hussein now. We must stop him by sending a clear and convincing message from this Congress of the United States that, "This is the last chance for peace. Get out of Kuwait."

This is not a declaration of war. It is a demand for him to comply with the U.N. resolutions or risk the consequences.

Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to commend those allies whose troops, sailors, and airmen are standing shoulder to shoulder with those in American uniform in the Middle East. It is one thing for a country to send a check to pay for this. It is clearly a greater contribution for a country to send its young men and its young women into harm's way.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I note that there are countries who are benefiting from our efforts who have not given their full measure of support, whether they hide behind a constitutional reason or otherwise. Should a hair on the head of one American be harmed as a result of this crisis, the American people will long remember who stood with us shoulder to shoulder and who was absent.

Mr. Speaker, the question is asked: What are America's interests in this? Saddam Hussein threatens the interests of our country and the interests of the free world. If he prevails in this crisis, he will pose a direct threat to the entire world. His tentacles would eventually cover this globe. Soon he will have a nuclear arsenal. He already has long-range weapons. He is working on an intercontinental ballistic system. He has developed chemical and biological weapons. He is a direct threat to our economy and the economy of the industrialized and free world.

Give him his desires, and he will continue to engulf other regions and other countries, and soon he will have his hand on the world's energy valve. His demands will continue to grow, and there is no appeasement.

Saddam Hussein should understand that America means business. The well-executed sanctions would take years to have a telling effect on him and on his regime. By that time the alliance could break down and the embargo might turn into a sieve, and Saddam Hussein wins over the rule of law.

Five months have elapsed. The sanctions have caused no movement from Saddam Hussein.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, let us learn from the past. Let us put our country's strength behind the rule of law, behind the U.N. resolution.

Let us not say as, lo, those who lived through the fire and disaster of World War II, that, "We should have stopped him when we could."

Mr. NEAL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SKELTON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. NEAL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate what the gentleman has to say, and I agree with everything he said about the need to stop Saddam Hussein. But is it not true that he has been stopped? Unlike Hitler in the 1930's, who was appeased, Saddam Hussein has been stopped under the outstanding leadership of President Bush and Secretaries Baker and Cheney; he has been stopped. He was not allowed to go into Saudi Arabia. Yes, he is still in Kuwait, but he is not able to enjoy any benefits. In fact, it is costing him, and the question is not whether he is to be stopped or whether he has been stopped. It is how, it seems to me, but I say to my friend, he has been stopped. It has been an enormous success.

Mr. SKELTON. Reclaiming my time, I say to my friend how wrong he is. He is enjoying the benefits of being in Kuwait. He has Kuwait under his rule of thumb, under his rule of his army, and he is able to take its resources, rape its women and ravish that land. He must not just be stopped. He must be put back into where he came from.

Mr. NEAL of North Carolina. I agree. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN].

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in the last 40 years, we have fought two land wars in Asia—with thousands of Americans dead, thousands maimed, and with lives demolished. Here we go again. Another Asian land war.

What for? To reestablish the legitimate Government of Kuwait—a feudal country with a self-indulgent life style and no democratic process? And what for? To protect the kingdom, which is what the Saudis call their country, a society with no concept of human rights, and with $50 billion spent on military purchases and unable, or unwilling, to defend themselves, and compared to Israel, with a population half that of Saudi Arabia and facing far greater threats, has never asked us for manpower in five wars. And what for? To save the kingdom so that it can continue to provide free housing, free health, and free education anywhere in the world for all its people. Or so that the kingdom can continue to be the world's largest public works project, and of course, to continue its subjugation of women?

And what for? To protect the oil supplies of Japan and Germany? How terribly short are our memories. The Persian Gulf has been compared to Munich, but Iraq is not pre-war Germany with a powerful military-industrial base. Iraq has no base but has to import its weaponry. That is why long-term sanctions, strongly and doggedly enforced, will erode Iraq's military machine and nuclear capability.

And what for? To promote Syria's regional interests as a base for terrorism,

and to continue to expand its power over Lebanon without world condemnation.

And what for? To protect our energy sources from a region that provides less than 10 percent of our energy—less if we had an energy policy.

What we need is an energy policy, not a war. What we need is better health care, not military casualties.

What we need are safe streets in Miami and Washington, DC—safe from criminals at home before we take on criminals 5,000 miles away.

WHAT WE NEED IS MORE INFORMATION

Is it not inevitable that Israel will be brought into the conflict. We do not know anything about the posture of the United States or the allied gulf forces when they are caught in a conflict between Israel and Iraq. To hold the fragile coalition together, we have no indication that plans have been worked out when Israel, as it will be, is brought into the conflict.

WHAT WE NEED IS PATIENCE, NOT BELLIGERENCE

Saddam Hussein should and will get out of Kuwait, but is our vital security right now at stake, and if so what is the best way to protect our security? Patience can be tougher than irreversible force, and wiser.

It is true that the Solarz-Michel resolution sends a stronger, more immediate signal to Saddam Hussein than the Hamilton resolution. But it also comes closer to committing troops into combat, into death in some unknown numbers.

Let us not, as Mark Anthony did 2,000 years ago, cry havoc and let slip the dogs of war. Death is so irreversible—patience is not.

The Hamilton resolution continues sanctions, encourages patience and more diplomacy. It does not exclude the military option. The Solarz resolution brings us a dangerous step closer to war. Vote for the Hamilton resolution.

□ 1320

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OBEY). The Chair would remind our guests in the galleries that we are happy to have you here, but the rules clearly provide for no expression of either support or resolution to any remarks made on the floor. Those rules will be enforced.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD].

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, when economic sanctions were placed upon Iraq immediately following the invasion of Kuwait, each of us carried high hopes that the sanctions would quickly resolve the situation and force Saddam Hussein out of Kuwait. Now, 5 months later, time has shown that the sanctions do not work.

Today, a resolution is offered to express the sense of Congress that continued sanctions against Iraq is the wisest course. This simply is not true. While the sanctions have created an economic hardship on Iraq, the sanctions will not drive the Iraqis out of Kuwait.

If the sanctions are extended for 6 to 12 months, it will simply give Hussein 6 to 12 months to stand down his troops, to increase his chemical and nuclear capabilities, and to destroy the delicate Arab coalition. Supplies will continue to leak into Iraq, Iraqi troops will be well rested with high morale, and military buildup will continue. While among the allies, costs to support our troops will continue to soar, the sustenance and rotation of Reserve units will become increasingly difficult and morale will plummet. In other words, the United Nations resolution to drive Iraq out of Kuwait will fail.

A second resolution has been offered to require the approval of Congress before an offensive military action is initiated. We are not here today to debate whether or not Congress has the authority to declare war. The War Powers Act has clearly given that authority to Congress. I paraphrase international law scholar, Thomas Franck quoted in the San Diego Union on December 30, 1990.

Congress does not have a constitutional obligation to declare war before the United States joins in a U.N.-sponsored police action in the Persian Gulf.

The U.N. Charter prohibits war-making by Members except in self-defense. In seeking to abolish war it substitutes a different mechanism, police action, for defending countries against illegal aggression.

Will we act independently and without regard to United Nations policy as some would have us do, or will we support and sustain a united, multinational effort to oust Iraq?

Therefore, recognizing that staying the course for another 6 months or 1 year will not work, and that the U.N. Charter provides an alternative to a declared war, our only option is to support the President according to the U.N. resolution. Therefore, I wholeheartedly oppose resolutions offered by Mr. GEPHARDT and Mr. BENNETT and support the resolution introduced by Mr. MICHEL and Mr. SOLARZ to authorize the use of force if Hussein does not withdraw by January 15. We must send a strong and clear signal to Hussein that his only option is a complete and unconditional withdrawal. Anything less calls for strong and decisive military actions.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK].

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Hamilton-Gephardt resolution and in opposition to the President's resolution which asks Congress to declare war against Iraq.

Those who support the declaration of war resolution do so largely on the basis that Congress must support the President.

I supported the President when he led the world in declaring our Nation's opposition against Iraq's invasion of Kuwait, and when he mobilized against the potential threat of an invasion against Saudi Arabia. President Bush must be commended on his rapid and decisive action in this regard. Furthermore the President moved the matter to the United Nations, and was precisely correct in obtaining the support of the United Nations. International world order is the precise business of the United Nations. It is their forum. The burdens of enforcing order must be borne by all nations, not just the United States.

The United Nations is dedicated to preserving peace among nations. Conflicts are supposed to be resolved through diplomatic actions and international negotiations. The United Nations is supposed to mobilize peacekeeping forces. The United Nations is supposed to represent world reason opposed to the use of force. No matter how highly desirable our objectives, the answer is supposed to lie in the arena of sanctions and diplomacy, and not in the use of military force.

Strangely the United Nations has abrogated its fundamental mission as a peace-keeping organization. In its Resolution 678, it has authorized the use of force.

The United States sought that abrogation and it was wrong in doing so. No matter how tough the road to peace appears, threat of war should not be the United Nations choice of options.

The U.N. vote authorizing economic sanctions were appropriate instruments of persuasion. They are working. They will work if we give them our vigorous support.

I served in the Congress from 1965 to 1976, almost the entire period of my service was during the Vietnam war. It was a terrible time for our country. I still agonize over my inability to have done more to end it. Every single person who died in that war was a loss I felt personally and still do. I cannot let history repeat this mistake.

I received a letter the other day from a Vietnam veteran who wrote to me telling me how hard he fought for his country in Vietnam, and that he did everything that his superiors ordered him to do, but when it was all over and he went home, he struggled to understand what his buddies gave their lives to defend. He urged me to look at this Persian Gulf crisis in the same light. Surely there are brave men and women willing to answer the call of the President, surely we have the might and strength to win a war, but this veteran asks the simple question, after it is all over:

What were our country's goals which justified war and the loss of American lives? What was our country's security interest

that was so critical that it was necessary to send our children to die?

You argue that if we do go to war now, we will win a quick and swift victory. But what will we win? A safer world with Iran poised to take over Iraqi territory; or a more stable Middle East with Syria in charge? Is this the result we will use as justification of the loss of thousands of American lives?

War is the final act of a nation that surrenders its future to violence by admitting that it has lost its intellectual capacity to solve its problems through peaceful means.

I refuse to surrender my country to violence. I believe with all my heart and mind that there are still ways to enforce our global commitment to honor peace without going to war.

I am not a pacifist. I could send my daughter to war if I felt that our borders were under attack. I would myself take up arms to defend my home or my country.

Kuwait is not any of these things. The attack on Kuwait was a despicable act which must be condemned. It is condemned. The guilty country, Iraq, is under penalty of an economic boycott. We must stick with this penalty. We must make it work. We must enforce it more stringently. We must help innocent nations who are suffering from its effects.

Our military response must fit the incident. The countries who have more at stake must be made to pay their proportionate share. It cannot be our price to pay, and our war to wage. We did that in Vietnam. Let the other countries who have more at stake make a larger commitment before we even think of war.

Those who argue that we must go to war now, because if we delay we might lose our fragile coalition cannot seriously believe that this coalition will stick with us after the onset of war. It will be an American war in the beginning and in the end.

Before we commit our children to this violence I ask that Congress tell our children why declaring war against Iraq is necessary for peace in the world, and that Congress advise our children that they go to war because their Government has exhausted all other avenues to peace.

I can say neither to my children nor to your children, and so I must vote no against war, and yes for a greater effort for peace.

□ 1330

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MINK. I yield to the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the gentlewoman on her speech and her historical perspective.

I think the point the gentlewoman made is very important. How can we possibly believe that the coalition would hold together for war, but it would never hold together for peace?

We are being asked to vote for war because otherwise the coalition might not hold together. That is the craziest coalition I every heard of.

I think the gentlewoman has made some excellent points and I am really delighted that she is back in this body.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I will control the time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ] from 1:30 to 2:30, and I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, let me read a letter I have from veterans' organizations and also military associations and we have a number of military experts in these associations.

This is what they say:

We, the undersigned, unanimously support the prompt action previously taken by President Bush. We continue to support his efforts to resolve the crisis in the Persian Gulf and urge the Members of Congress and the American people to give the President the latitude to take any action necessary to insure that Iraqi aggression in Kuwait is reversed and that the country be restored to its rightful Government.

Now, that is signed by the American Ex-Prisoners of War, Non-Commissioned Officers Association, the Catholic War Veterans, the Polish Legion, the Fleet Reserve, the Legion of Valor, the Retired Enlisted Association, the Marine Corps League, the American Legion, the National Association of Uniformed Services, the Military Order of the Purple Heart, the National Guard Association of the United States.

I will ask the other names to be put into the RECORD with their statements.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Washington, DC, January 10, 1991.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The American Legion urges you to vote for legislation authorizing the President to take any necessary actions to resolve the crisis in the Persian Gulf.

As an organization of three million men and women who have experienced first-hand the pain and sacrifice of wartime service, The American Legion hopes that a peaceful solution can be found. However, we know that diplomacy cannot succeed if our nation's leadership is divided.

Any failure by Congress to offer its full bipartisan support to the President could have catastrophic consequences. We are convinced that Saddam Hussein, the world community and other members of the multinational force in Saudi Arabia would see such disunity as a lack of U.S. resolve.

Additionally, a divided national leadership would produce a serious morale problem among our own troops who have been deployed in Saudi Arabia. I had the privilege ten weeks ago to visit those men and women, and I was impressed by their patriotism, confidence and resolve. They accept the potential risks of their mission, but they need to be assured that the Congress and the American people fully support them in carrying out that mission.

This international crisis is clearly a test of our national will. The upcoming congressional debate will be scrutinized by the entire world. It is critical that the decisions Congress reaches show the world, particularly the Iraqi aggressors and all potential aggressors, that the United States is willing to set aside partisan interests to endorse the President's authority as our nation's Commander-in-Chief.

We urge you to vote for legislation authorizing the President to take any necessary actions to deal with the crisis at hand and supporting the implementation of the United Nations Security Council Resolution 678, for which the United States has already expressed its support.

Sincerely,

ROBERT S. TURNER,
National Commander.

ASKING SUPPORT FOR ACTION TAKEN BY PRESIDENT BUSH

We, the undersigned, unanimously support the prompt action previously taken by President Bush. We continue to support his efforts to resolve the crisis in the Persian Gulf and urge the members of Congress and the American people to give the president the latitude to take any action necessary to insure that Iraqi aggression in Kuwait is reversed and that the country be restored to its rightful government.

Francis W. Agnes, Cmdr., American Ex-Prisoners of War; Walter K. Krueger, Pres., Non Commissioned Officers Asso.; Raymond J. Williams, Svc. Dir., Catholic War Veterans, USA Inc.; Edmund Janiszewski, Leg. Dir., Polish Legion American Vets USA; Norman E. Pearson, Exec. Sec., Fleet Reserve Association; James D. Doughtie, Dsc., Wash. Rep., Legion of Valor of the USA Inc.; George A. Smith, Msg USA (Ret), Pres., The Retired Enlisted Association; E. Bud Randall, Svc. Dir., Marine Corps League; James C. Pennington, Mg. USA (Ret), Exec. V.P., National Association Uniformed Services; Leonard A. Carlton, Cmdr., Military Order of the Purple Heart of the USA Inc.

OPEN LETTER TO PRESIDENT BUSH IN SUPPORT OF U.S. PERSIAN GULF POLICY

President GEORGE W. BUSH,
The White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We strongly support your outstanding leadership in organizing the worldwide coalition dedicated to the purpose of defending nations in the Persian Gulf area from Iraq, getting Iraq out of Kuwait and restoring peace and security in the region.

The passage of United Nations Security Council Resolution 678 demanding that Iraq get out of Kuwait on or before January 15, 1991, or face overwhelming action by member states was the result of extraordinary leadership.

For the United Nations Security Council Resolution to work without war, Saddam Hussein must understand that you are steadfast and will use the approved military option if necessary.

Regrettably, Suddam Hussein has noted some United States domestic opposition to your use of military option and apparently believes that all he has to do is wait until your resolve or your right to act is eroded.

We have complete confidence that our armed forces have developed a strategy which will make use of maximum power

within our technological capabilities, in order to win decisively in the shortest possible time.

Thus, to strengthen your hand, we submit this resolution to demonstrate that there are countless organizations and individuals who have rallied to your support.

Sincerely,

Partial list of signers:

Hon. Ronald W. Reagan, Former President of the United States; Rear Adm. Dudley Carlson, USN (Ret.), Executive Director, Navy League of the United States; Gen. Monroe W. Hatch, Jr., USAF (Ret.), Executive Director, Air Force Association; Gen. Jack N. Merritt, USA (Ret.), President, Association of the U.S. Army; Maj. Gen. Evan Hultman, AUS (Ret.), Executive Director, Reserve Officers Association of the U.S.; Lt. Gen. Vern Weber, Executive Vice President, National Guard Association of the U.S.; Lt. Gen. Lawrence F. Skibbie, USA (Ret.), Executive Director, American Defense Preparedness Association; Norman Pearson, Executive Director, Fleet Reserve Association; Col. Lawrence R. Gaboury, USMC (Ret.), Executive Director, Marine Corps Reserve Officer's Association; Master Chief Manny Ratner, USNR (Ret.), National Executive Director, Naval Enlisted Reserve Association; Hon. Gerald R. Ford, Former President of the United States; Gen. Richard L. Lawson, USAF (Ret.), President, National Coal Association;* Richard D. Murray, Executive Vice President, American Logistics Association; Richard Castor, Executive Secretary, U.S. Coast Guard Chief Petty Officers.

Walter Murphy, Executive Vice President, American Civil Defense Association; Maj. Gen. James C. Pennington, USA (Ret.), Executive Director, National Association of Uniformed Services; Frank Jensen, Jr., President, Helicopter Association International;* Carl T. Johnson, President, Compressed Gas Association; Robert A. Roland, President, Chemical Manufacturers Association;* Hon. Richard M. Nixon, Former President of the United States; Tom Burch, Chairman, National Vietnam Veterans Coalition; Lt. Gen. James McInerney, Jr., USAF (Ret.), Vice-President, American League for Exports and Security Assistance; E.J. Criscuoli, Jr., Executive Vice President, American Society for Industrial Security; Gordon W. Spencer, Executive Director, American Maritime Officers Service; John M. Fisher, Chairman & CEO, American Security Council; Dr. Richard Lesher, President, Chamber of Commerce of the United States;* James L. Henry, President, Transportation Institute; John M. Swihart, President, American Institute for Aeronautics and Astronautics; Dr. Glenn Campbell, Counselor, Hoover Institution;*

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAY].

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Solarz-Michel resolution and the U.N. Resolution 678. Saddam Hussein invaded Kuwait over 5 months ago. President Bush, in my opinion, acted decisively and wisely. He garnered the cooperation of 28 countries, and obtained the endorsement of the Security Council of the United Nations to use military force to expel Saddam Hussein and his forces by January 15, if he did not withdraw or initiate a withdrawal action by that date; 82 percent of Americans approved of his initial action according to polls.

There have been a number of initiatives to encourage Saddam Hussein's peaceful withdrawal before this January 15 deadline, and we remain hopeful that these will work. President Bush offered Iraq 15 different dates for a meeting in Baghdad, or elsewhere, between Secretary Baker and Saddam—none were accepted, and time is running out.

On January 3, President Bush made his last attempt to avoid war by inviting the Iraqi Foreign Minister, Tariq Aziz, to meet with Secretary Baker in Geneva. The meeting took place on Wednesday, January 9. This meeting was made subject to the same conditions, which are: no negotiations; no compromise; no attempts for an Iraqi face-saving; and no rewards for aggression. To date, there has been little if any movement on Iraq's behalf. Minister Aziz even refused to take President Bush's letter back to Saddam Hussein, which was delivered in Geneva on January 9.

Secretary Baker and Secretary Cheney on Wednesday, January 2, briefed several Members and myself on the current status. Secretary Baker has publicly said that he is not optimistic about peace in the gulf. The leadership of the House and Senate has said that full-scale debate should not occur until after the Baker-Aziz meeting and we are now engaging in that debate, which in my opinion is timely.

In this briefing, Secretary Cheney and Secretary Baker told the Congress that the coalition of 28 countries is holding together—currently there are 280,000 American troops and 150,000 prepared to embark or already underway, with 200,000 foreign troops in place. Our allies have committed $23 billion toward support in 1990, and Secretary Baker is requesting additional funding for 1991. I agree very strongly with the administration that America cannot and should not bear the major financial burden of this conflict.

On Friday, January 4, I was visited by former hostage Miles Hoffman from Columbus, GA. He was the only American wounded by Iraqi soldiers, held captive, and thankfully was released. In this meeting, Mr. Hoffman was accompanied by three other former hostages—Mr. and Mrs. Christopher Folsom of New York, and Mr. Cecil Brown of Atlanta, who were released in December.

I had a very interesting conversation with this group. The former hostages advised me:

First, that we should not drag the negotiations out. We should strike forcefully in Baghdad, or other areas of Iraq, and temporarily ignore Kuwait where Iraqi troops are amassed; we should destroy Iraq's communication and command centers, and cut off their supply routes—in effect, isolate Iraq's forces in Kuwait.

Second, it is their impression that the Iraqi troop morale is not high, and that they will largely collapse in the face of a massive strike—a small number have already defected. Intelligence sources have publicly repeated expectations that up to 200,000 Iraqi defections will occur.

Third, according to them, sanctions are not working—and will not work. Food and other supplies are entering Iraq unrestricted from Jordan and Iran, and goods are being smuggled in through Turkey. It is suspected that Libya and other sympathetic countries are sending hard currency to Saddam as a share of their oil profits. This money enables him to buy needed goods. In addition, Iraq does have an agricultural capability, which they are accelerating.

Mr. Speaker, there are those who want to give sanctions more time to work, and there are those who believe that if we were to wait for more time we would be giving up an essential edge to our strategy. In my opinion, each view on this very important matter is sincerely held, and debate on this issue should occur.

Miles Hoffman pointed out that Saddam will not understand the concept of democratic debate. Mr. Hoffman said that the people of Iraq do not understand "the debate that goes on * * * because in Iraq, anything against Saddam Hussein is a death sentence." So it is very important for us on the floor today and tomorrow to show our resolve, and to show America's will to carry out the U.N. sanctions.

However, I would suggest to my colleagues who are raising the specter of thousands of U.S. casualties and body bags coming home that they are rendering a serious disservice to the families who have loved ones deployed in the Persian Gulf. My colleagues, I would urge that we refrain from the use of such rhetoric. Our service people and their loved ones know the risks—let us not make their lives even more uncomfortable than they already are.

My view is that the President has the authority to engage American troops in an offensive action without a declaration of war from Congress. There have been over 105 offensive military actions in our Nation's history and only 5 declarations of war.

However, I concur in the fact that the Congress should debate the issue as we are doing now, and at a minimum endorse the U.N. Security Council's action. That Resolution, No. 678, authorizes an offensive action against Iraq

*Titles listed for identification purposes only.

after January 15 by United States and United Nations forces. I hope that such a measure is accepted here in the House, and it will be my intention to support the Solarz-Michel resolution and to work for a strong vote in support of the President.

I do believe, very strongly, that we should move positively after January 15 if Saddam has refused to cooperate. The perception of the constituents in the Third District of Georgia is that the President and the United Nations have drawn a line in the sand, and that this commitment must be respected. President Bush and the United Nations have not waivered from the statement that "Iraq must withdraw with no rewards for aggression," and I would support our carrying through on this demand.

If the Iraqi forces do withdraw, and this appears doubtful at this time, it is most likely that U.N. forces will remain in sufficient numbers indefinitely to assure that no further aggressive activity will occur by Saddam Hussein. There is no doubt that he will be up to further mischief in one form or another in the future. However, that issue will require debate on another day.

□ 1340

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. GOODLING].

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, first I would like to respond to the gentleman who said a little while ago that no one has ever told him why we are in Saudi Arabia.

But I can guarantee him had we not gone when we did and had the President not moved as quickly as he did, we would not need to debate the issue today, we would not have to vote tomorrow, we would have a full-scale war going on there right now.

How quickly Americans forget. How easy it is for us not to be realistic if it does not suit us to be realistic and how quickly we forget history.

Now, if it makes you feel any better, it is not only Americans who do that, because, of course, the French and the British did exactly the same. There was one voice during the 1930's crying out in the wilderness. No one paid much attention. Eventually he became a powerful leader, a great statesman in Britain.

That voice was Winston Churchill's. In 1935 he said:

> Want of foresight, unwillingness to act when action would be simple and effective, lack of clear thinking, confusion of counsel until the emergency comes, until self-preservation strikes its jarring-gong, these are the features which constitute the endless repetition of history.

When Chamberlain finally said, "Poland, we are with you," Churchill said:

> Still, if you will not fight for the right when you can easily win without bloodshed; if you will not fight when your victory will be sure and not too costly; you may come to the moment when you will have to fight with all the odds against you and only a precarious chance of survival.
>
> There may be even a worse case. You may have to fight when there is no hope of victory, because it is better to perish than to live as slaves.

Now, I would love to dance around this issue by supporting a longer time for sanctions. My constituency would like that. But, how long? And who are we hurting with those sanctions?

We are hurting Jordan, we are hurting Poland, we are hurting Egypt, we are hurting Turkey, we are hurting all of those countries. And so we cannot continue to wait and wait and wait. But I can assure you of one thing. I can assure you that there is one possible way to force Saddam Hussein out of Kuwait peacefully, and only one way I see at the present time, and that is to support that bipartisan resolution.

If we do not, of course, Saddam Hussein says, "I won," and then we say to Saddam Hussein, "And what is your next target? And when will it be?"

Will we stay there? Some say sanctions are working. Others say we stopped him. Do we stay there forever? And how much does that cost?

We had an opportunity in 1956 to do something about the cold war when we were powerful. We did not do it. We waited, we waited, and, boy, was that a costly period.

And so I would say now, we have one opportunity to move him out peacefully, and that is to give overwhelming support to the resolution sponsored by Mr. BROOMFIELD and Mr. SOLARZ.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of clarification, I yield myself 1 minute.

I would like to clarify, Mr. Speaker, the procedural situation.

As we originally began this debate, the Members on this side of the aisle had one-half the time, the Members on the other side of the aisle had the other half of the time. Subsequent to that, by unanimous consent request, my distinguished colleagues on the other side of the aisle yielded 2 hours of their time to Members on this side of the aisle who are in support of the so-called bipartisan resolution.

I would simply suggest that we are being disadvantaged at this point if we are only being recognized after you recognize the gentlemen on that side of the aisle and the gentlemen on this side of the aisle who are in an alliance with them. We then over the next period of time are receiving one-third of the allocation when we ought to be appearing on the floor 50 percent of the time. And I would suggest that, in alternating between those two, we continue to have speakers in between rather than after the two sides speak.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEAL of North Carolina). Does anyone else desire to be heard on this question?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELLUMS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we do not have any problem with that. We only have 2 hours, and we are going to spread our time out anyway.

Mr. DELLUMS. Well, we only have 2 hours as well as on this side.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. But the gentleman had more than that.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELLUMS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WELDON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the majority saw fit to grant time to its own Members who supported their own individual wishes, and yet the majority was able to gather an equal amount of extra time on our side allocated to the majority side Members on that side of the aisle. So, in effect, the gentleman has additional time to compensate for the time that his side will be speaking on behalf of the bipartisan resolution.

Mr. DELLUMS. If I may reclaim my time, I am not part of the leadership, and I think the gentleman raised an issue that this gentleman is not raising. This comment was simply procedural.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes that the majority and those on the Democratic side supporting the Solarz resolution are taking the same side of the question. So they will be treated as one block of time. The gentleman will be recognized accordingly.

Mr. DELLUMS. I appreciate the clarification of the Chair.

With that admonishment, Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SHARP].

Mr. SHARP. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I think it would be a grave mistake for the United States to launch into warfare in the Persian Gulf at this time.

Mr. Speaker, therefore, I think we should not authorize a resolution of war.

We should, instead, stay the course with strength, diplomacy, and with strong economic sanctions.

I realize there are those who hope that by authorizing war we will be able to avoid it, that he will strengthen the message to Saddam Hussein, that we will back down and back out and, therefore, war will be avoided.

If their resolution passes, I certainly hope they are right, and I will do all I can to help them in their cause.

But I think it only heightens the risk that our President, who feels compelled to use force if he sincerely cannot

achieve peace otherwise, will find himself pressured to do so, and I think that that is a mistake for the United States, a mistake for the Middle East and a mistake for the world.

Saddam Hussein is in great need of buying spare parts from abroad for his planes and for his other military equipment. He needs to buy chemicals and he needs to buy additives to make his transportation fuels the quality that will run his military.

He needs, most of all, to sell his crude oil by the millions of barrels in order to get the money to pay for his regime, to pay for his military, and to be the leader of his country.

Our sanctions are blocking him on all of these fronts. And they are having an impact.

We know our sanctions are hurting his economy. We know our sanctions are depriving him of desperately needed money to run his war machine. And we know that his military will continue to weaken if he does not have access to parts from abroad.

We also know that our sanctions have the greatest chance of working precisely where his need is greatest, and that is in the sale of his crude oil, because of the limited outlets that he has and our ability to monitor them and our ability to stop them and, indeed, in the Hamilton resolution we authorize the use of force in order to make sure the sanctions are effectively working.

Now, I cannot be sure and nobody can be sure that those sanctions will oust him from Kuwait or oust him from power, as many of our colleagues have asked and which seems to drive their argument.

I do not know for sure. But I do know this: The sanctions are having an impact. And I do know that if we choose a course of war, we can be certain that there will be many thousands dead on our side, on his side, and many thousands of civilians dead, and we cannot be sure that it would produce a glorious result for this country or for the Middle East.

Thus I do not think we should take those unacceptable risks at this time.

It is true he may be a Hitler's twin in his brutality and in his ambition. But this is not Europe of the 1930's. If we had time to develop the argument, I think we could document that.

This is not Munich.

There certainly is no Chamberlain in our White House who is buying the excuses of Mr. Saddam Hussein, and there is no Chamberlain in this Congress who is buying his excuses and accepting his views about the Palestinians and all the rest of the excuses and goals that he claims to be achieving.

We are hurting him, we must hurt him, and we need not at this point sacrifice the blood of Americans or of anyone else in order to achieve our results.

If history teaches us anything, it is rare that a war is just, it is far rarer that any war produces the results that those who launch them think they will get. It is always certain people will lose their lives, that families are shattered, and many other people are made more desperate.

□ 1350

My colleagues, let us vote for a strong diplomacy, strong economic sanctions, to stay the course. We Americans can show our strength, we can show our determination, we can show our leadership. We do not now have to resort to war.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Maine [Ms. SNOWE].

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, when the year 1990 began, this Nation and the world had every belief that it was the dawn of a decade of hope. In Eastern Europe, in Central America, and around the globe, freedom and liberty were on the rise. There was an embrace of American ideals and values as the cold war ended.

But now, that decade of hope is threatened in its infancy. We are faced with a serious threat to the continued spread of our ideals.

That threat comes from the brutal regime and cynical aggression of Saddam Hussein. And it would be an ultimate irony if the hard-won legacy of the end of the cold war is to make the world safe for regional despots and tyrants.

It is to that threat which we, the Congress of the United States, must now decide how to respond.

The gravity of the threat is unmistakeable. That's why we have seen the formation of the unprecedented international coalition against Iraq. The unlikely allies in the gulf and around the world have joined together precisely because they recognize in Saddam Hussein a ruthless dictator with the will to use any brutal means to achieve his own aggrandizement.

For me, the magnitude of the vote we now face is greater than any other I have or likely will cast in the Congress. As I wrestled with this decision, reflected on it, and discussed it, I couldn't help but think of the extraordinary American men and women deployed in the gulf.

I saw many of them interviewed on television again Wednesday night, and was extremely impressed with their professionalism, their resolve, and their courage. I was particularly struck by one young man who, when asked what he thought about some people protesting back in the United States, responded "Well, that's freedom—that's why we're here, isn't it?"

Mr. Speaker, we owe it to these valiant Americans and to our constituents to vote our consciences.

Tomorrow, I will vote to support the U.N. resolution and preserve all of our options against Iraq. I will do so not because the military option is inevitable, but in order not to undermine the President's efforts to achieve a peaceful outcome to this crisis—efforts which require that a credible military threat be maintained against a brutal aggressor who only understands the language of force.

A credible threat is necessary against a man who has raised one of the world's largest armies, used chemical weapons against his own people, invaded two neighbors, and is developing nuclear and biological capabilities. We are hardly dealing with a man of peace in Saddam Hussein.

Diplomatic initiatives bear this out. It was not only the Baker-Aziz meeting that failed, or that a diplomatic low point was reached when the Iraqis refused to accept President Bush's letter. Remember that Saddam Hussein refused 15 different dates for a meeting with Secretary Baker, despite finding time to meet with seemingly everyone else who asked. There have been 12 U.N. resolutions. An earlier effort by Secretary General Javier Perez de Cueller failed. European Community efforts failed. The Soviets failed. The Arab League's efforts failed.

It is thus clear that eliminating the threat of force means that Saddam Hussein, who has never been known to bend to political or economic threats, would get a clear message that the world's resolve to reverse his aggression is nothing more than tough rhetoric; that, in the final analysis, democracies will no longer fight for freedom, collective security, and the rule of law.

Why should we expect that the lack of a credible threat increases the chance of diplomacy succeeding?

After all, as our experiences over the last decade with the Soviet Union, Nicaragua, and Libya showed, there are times when the serious threat of force motivates positive change.

And if we vote to exclude the military option, what then are the consequences—what are we left with?

Essentially, it leaves us with sanctions alone. But I have yet to hear anyone assert that sanctions in and of themselves will force Saddam Hussein out of Kuwait.

The goal of sanctions, remember, is political, not simply economic. It is not enough for sanctions to cut into the Iraqi economy. To succeed, sanctions must also force a significant change in behavior in Saddam Hussein, a change that his past cannot lead us to expect.

As CIA Director Webster wrote on Wednesday, Saddam Hussein is apparently willing to permit a subsistence economy in his country. He has shown little regard for the welfare of his people. In all likelihood, Saddam believes he can endure sanctions longer than

the coalition can, and that the hardships sanctions will cause are not likely, on balance, to undercut his ability to fight.

So to preclude our military option now and rely exclusively on economic and diplomatic means will not, ultimately, serve the cause of peace.

Mr. Speaker, it is essential to point out that we do not today face a choice between sanctions and war. By supporting the President's request, we do not discard sanctions or diplomatic options. We do not require the immediate use of force or the use of force by any date certain. If anything, this vote increases the burden on the President to seek a peaceful solution, and makes it vitally important for our country to go the extra mile for peace, as I urged him to do on Wednesday. The Solarz-Michel resolution explicitly requires the President to report back to Congress that all peaceful means against Iraq have been exhausted before he resorts to force.

As the President said this morning, the more united we are, the better chance we have for a peaceful resolution.

I don't think anyone here desires war. The President doesn't, I certainly don't, my constituents in Maine don't. History teaches us, though, that the stated willingness to go to war can be an effective means of avoiding that outcome. We have but one way of doing so today, and that is to vote in favor of House Joint Resolution 62, the Solarz-Michel resolution. To do otherwise may represent a far heavier burden for our Nation to bear.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5½ minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. AUCOIN].

Mr. AUCOIN. Like many of you, I did not sleep much last night. My mind was on what we are about to do here—on the possibility of a rash decision to have Americans kill and be killed in a desert war that serves the interests of other countries more than it does us.

But something else disturbs me almost as much: The view of the President on who has the power to make war.

For months the President and his spokesmen have said it does not matter what the legislative branch of Government does, that the President can send thousands of Americans into combat if he alone decides to. I think that is outrageous. This week the President sent us a formal resolution, but yesterday his House minority leader said that we can serve our country only by rallying around the President and his resolution. And over in the Senate this morning I read that a powerful friend of the President threatens to filibuster any resolution other than the President's.

What this means is that on the decision to make war or peace the President's position is that he supports the constitutional right of the Congress to agree with him. If it disagrees, tough luck. This should deeply disturb the American people.

I would like now to turn to the President's resolution itself, offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL]. In speech after speech yesterday, advocates set this issue up politically as your chance to "send Saddam Hussein a message" Hey who does not want to send Saddam Hussein a message?

As a matter of fact, when a message should have been sent was in July, before the invasion, when the President's Ambassador to Iraq, April Glaspie met with Saddam Hussein himself. With war tensions on the rise, the President's Ambassador met with Saddam Hussein, and looked him in the eye and said: "America has no defense treaty with Kuwait."

What a message from the President's own Ambassador. Within days, Iraqis were in Kuwait.

Now here comes the White House, asking my colleagues to send a message to Saddam Hussein. But here is the problem: Its resolution is not merely a message. It is a declaration, an authorization, for war. Read section 1. It is 10 times clearer than the Gulf of Tonkin resolution ever was.

So make no mistake. If you vote for Solarz-Michel, you might have only wanted to send a message to prevent war. But if war comes, you will have authorized it. That's the trap you are in.

In contrast, Gephardt-Hamilton, which I support, also sends a message, a strong message. But it reserves the use of military attack until all other options have been exhausted and only after an authorization by the Congress of the United States. No less a hawk than Caspar Weinberger in his celebrated six-point speech on the use military force said, "The commitment of U.S. forces to combat should be a last resort." My colleagues, this is not the last resort.

Finally, let me call attention to a report written by and released this week by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ASPIN]. In it, he estimated that a gulf war would cost 3,000 to 5,000 casualties and approximately 1,000 deaths.

Let me say it is very difficult for me to agree that that is an acceptable cost. Moreover, my analysis is that the losses will be far in excess of his numbers.

But my real point is this: Did any of my colleagues notice what the report of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ASPIN] said about the loss of German lives? French lives? Any European lives? Any Japanese lives? It did not say a thing.

Those losses will not even be measurable, and is that not ironic? Europe and Japan depend on Persian Gulf oil to a far greater extent than does the United States of America. Where are the European troops? Where are the Japanese finances?

My colleagues, figure it out for yourselves: Our partners in the international coalition are prepared to fight to the last American.

Meanwhile we now here in the Congress are being asked to undertake this effort when Desert Shield is costing $30 billion a year before the first shot is fired. If the war you now vote for should occur, you can multiply that cost 10 times over.

Does the President of the United States feel so strongly about the issues at hand that he is prepared to raise taxes to finance it? You know he does not. Neither do you. So, we will blow the deficit out of sight at a time when American's banking system is buckling at the knees, when major corporations, such as Pan Am, are going bankrupt, when we are sinking to a recession, when the unemployment insurance compensation plans in six States are now insolvent and when the Japanese and Germans are taking markets away from us. All this when we are being asked to spend American lives to protect their oil.

Mr. Speaker, the day may come when American use of offensive force is called for. That day is not now. Sanctions are working. Our hostages are out because of them. Iraq's GNP has beem cut in half. I ask my colleagues to follow the advice of seven former Secretaries of Defense and give those sanctions the chance to work.

For the love of God, defeat Solarz-Michel, and support Gephardt-Hamilton.

□ 1400

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. VALENTINE].

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Speaker, many Americans felt a surge of pride and a patriotic thrill when President Bush dispatched the first United States troops to Saudi Arabia. Decisive action to counter Saddam Hussein's invasion of Kuwait and defend other Persian Gulf states against the Iraqi threat rightly commanded strong support from the American people.

That initial enthusiasm, however, has largely dissipated and given way to more sober calculations as the world faces the grim prospect of a bloody conflict.

Now, a mere 4 days before the United Nations deadline for Iraqi withdrawal from Kuwait, the Congress confronts what may be the most difficult and critical votes of our careers. With the eyes of the Nation upon us, we are about to take actions that may define the United States role in the world for

years to come, that may place the lives of more than 400,000 American military personnel, thousands of allied soldiers, and millions of Arabs and Israelis at risk, and that may decide fundamental constitutional issues.

On the constitutional question, no debate is really necessary. The U.S. Constitution is clear, and no hair-splitting explanations or rationalizations can change it. The Congress alone has the authority to declare war.

Only a tortured interpretation of the Constitution would conclude that its authors intended for the President to have the sole authority to send a half million American soliders, along with major Navy and Air Force contingents, halfway around the world to launch an attack—no matter how justifiable—against another nation.

President Bush claims to believe otherwise, and until recent days appeared set on a course toward war without even the benefit of congressional debate. Had he persisted on that course, he would have made a serious mistake and would have assumed most of the political risk and all of the moral responsibility for his policy.

That risk and responsibility should be shared, and today we are being asked to share it. Unfortunately, we are being asked to share the risks without full knowledge of even our own policies.

But there are so many unanswered questions. We do not know our precise national objectives—whether we seek only to drive Iraq from Kuwait, to destroy Iraq's warmaking potential, or to set ourselves up as the permanent, frontline defenders of authoritarian regimes in Saudi Arabia and Kuwait.

We do not know how a Persian Gulf war will be financed or what sacrifices the President will expect of all Americans.

We do not know what commitments we have from other nations for military or financial support.

We do not know what agreements, open or secret, will be required to secure such support.

We do not know whether we are to assume responsibility for rebuilding what is destroyed by war.

We do not know what long-range commitment we are undertaking to maintain troops in both the Middle East and Europe or whether we can at least count on a long-overdue reduction in our military presence in Europe.

Mr. Speaker, the American people and their representatives are entitled to full disclosure before accepting hardships and serious risks. The resolution backed by the White House should detail the purposes and implementation of the President's policies.

But it does not, and it is clear that we are not going to have the benefit of essential facts. The President has presented us with an unacceptable choice at an unacceptable time. Nevertheless, we must decide.

In these circumstances, I have come to the conclusion—with extreme reluctance—that the Solarz-Michel resolution should be passed. I believe that only force, or the credible threat of the imminent use of force, will compel Saddam Hussein to give up what he has taken.

At the insistence of President Bush, the United Nations has set a deadline. That was probably a mistake. But having come this close to that deadline, talking of grave consequences for Iraq at every opportunity, it is likely that a last-minute extension of Saddam Hussein's grace period would severely diminish the future threat of force. We might eventually be required to take military action at a time when the allied coalition may be weaker and Iraq stronger. Backing away from the deadline would also require us to maintain a large military force indefinitely in difficult conditions.

Mr. Speaker, this may be the most reluctant vote I will ever cast in the House of Representatives. It is painful to cast a ballot that puts American lives at risk, but I believe that the risks are even greater in allowing Saddam Hussein to conclude that the deadline is a bluff.

Whatever the House decides, there should be a clear message in this debate for Saddam Hussein. Dictators often do not understand our democratic system, believing that disagreement and debate signal a lack of resolve. The Iraqi dictator should understand, however, that this debate is only about the best way to deter him, to drive him from Kuwait, and to defeat him. He should take no comfort from our deliberations.

Mr. Speaker, I have expressed strong reservations about some aspects of the President's policy, and I hope that war can still be averted. But if it is not, I believe that we all should make a commitment to support our Armed Forces unequivocally. Once the first shot is fired, once the bullets, bombs, and missiles are flying, my reservations about the President's actions will take a temporary back seat to giving total support to Americans in combat. They deserve no less.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS].

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I will vote against authorizing the President to conduct war in the Persian Gulf and I will do so for the following reasons.

First is the nature of war, itself.

War is not, as some armchair generals would have us believe, just another diplomatic tool.

War is bloody, brutal, unpredictable and—far more often than not—useless. Yes, we can probably win on the battlefield. But that victory will not remove the underlying causes of conflict in the region. It will not ease our addiction to foreign oil; or reduce the inequalities of wealth among nations in the Middle East; or promote democracy; or end the threat of terrorism; or produce a deeper understanding between Israel and the Arab world. We know not, therefore, whether this war will resolve anything; whether it will end war in the Persian Gulf, or serve merely as a prelude to more war; whether, by killing, we will end the killing or ignite, instead, further explosions whose power we can neither gauge nor control.

Second, I am unwilling to put my faith—or American lives—in the hands of those who tell us so confidently that a war will be quick, easy and successful. Yes, as I have said, we can probably win. But we do not know how long it will take to win; we do not know how many American soldiers and innocent civilians will die; we do not know how many young men and women and children will be left without homes, without parents, without arms or legs or eyes, without the capacity to live a normal life. No computer, no politician, no so-called expert, not even our best and brightest, can do more than guess at the human costs of this war.

Third, we cannot predict the economic costs of violence in the Persian Gulf. Those who today offer us war have spent the past decade mismanaging our balance of trade, our budget, our banking system and our entire economy. War will only finish the job. It will mean higher—and perhaps far higher—oil prices for God knows how long. The reason we are in the Persian Gulf is oil—to protect our economy. By surrendering to war we will, in that sense, surely defeat ourselves.

Finally, if we go to war now, we will never know whether that war was necessary. Think about that. Think about the lives that will be cut short, the families that will be shattered and the heartbreak that will be endured, and ask yourself how much greater the pain will be if we are not certain whether those sacrifices had to occur.

As long as I have been in Congress, I have argued in behalf of international law, supported the United Nations, and defended human rights. I cannot and do not underestimate the enormity of the crimes committed by Saddam Hussein.

Saddam Hussein must be stopped. But the fact is that he is being stopped. Because of the sanctions, his power is diminishing day by day. He is losing his wealth, his military power, his political standing, and his control over the future. As for oil, he has us not—as some have said—by the jugular, but by a capillary.

Whether the sanctions will ultimately beat him, I do not know. Neither do you, and neither does the President of the United States.

By waiting, we do not lose the option of going to war. But by going to war

now, we will lose forever the chance to achieve our objectives without war.

So let us not, in our eagerness to reassert American power, lose sight of American values. Let us not permit our impatience to damage our economy and end thousands of American lives. And let us not, in the name of every lesson history can teach, pretend that we can build a new world order on a foundation of skulls.

Mr. Speaker, our choice today is whether to persevere on the path of patience and determination and peace; or to stray from that path into the wilderness of war. Whether to walk together the extra mile—or the extra 2 miles—in pursuit of a bloodless resolution to this crisis, or to declare war and fight war and count the bodies and bury the bodies and never know whether a single American soldier really had to die.

I urge my colleagues, given what is at stake, given who is at stake, to resolve any uncertainties you may have by giving peace the benefit of the doubt. I urge you to vote "no" to war, and "yes" to patience and peace in the Persian Gulf.

□ 1410

Finally, Mr Speaker, may I observe that some of the most moving speeches I have ever heard on the floor of this House were delivered by Members who served here during the debate, if it can be called that, the one hour of debate on the Gulf of Tonkin resolution. This in a sense is a Gulf of Tonkin resolution. We might call it a Gulf of Oman resolution. In the most critical sense of that, it is not that. A Member should know that.

I have heard Members take this floor and say if there is one vote I could have back in all my years of service in this Congress, it is the vote for the Gulf of Tonkin resolution. Had I known what the President meant, had I known what would be done in the name of my vote, God almighty, I would want that vote back.

We do not have that excuse this time, my colleagues. This is no President that can be accused of deception. He is quite clear in what he wants. We will never be able to hide. We will never be able to pretend we knew not what we did. We know very well what we do, and I hope to God we do the wise and humane thing.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RINALDO].

Mr. RINALDO. Mr. Speaker, during my tenure in the House, I have cast thousands of important votes. But no vote was more important than the issue before us now. I have spent days reflecting on this decision, listening to the supporters and opponents of the administration's position and analyzing the situation in the Persian Gulf.

I did this because this is a critical vote, and I take my responsibility very seriously.

We are voting on this resolution not because President Bush sent troops to the Persian Gulf. We are here because Iraq has decided that it will not be bound by international law.

Five months ago, Iraq invaded a sovereign nation without provocation. Repeatedly since then, it has been called upon by the international community to withdraw.

The world has waited patiently, waited for a signal from Iraq that it would heed the international call to withdraw. But as we have waited, Iraq has plundered, looted, and brutalized a country which has been a sovereign state for over two centuries, a country which has been a member of the Arab League, a member of the United Nations since 1961, and a nation whose government was recognized by the Republic of Iraq.

Over the last 5 months, there have been the most disturbing reports imaginable of the treatment of Kuwaiti citizens:

Saddam Hussein's troops have systematically looted the country, stealing everything from its national museum to the contents of its stores.

Kuwaiti buses have been driven north to serve in Baghdad, and medical supplies and equipment have been ripped out of Kuwaiti for shipment north.

Premature babies were pulled from incubators and left to die on cold stone floors so that medical equipment could be transferred to Iraq.

Entire families including children have been murdered for sheltering westerners.

Amnesty International details literally dozens of cases of torture, rape, murder and brutality against people in Kuwait. From the tanks that carefully drove over wounded Kuwaiti soldiers, to soldiers who repeatedly raped Kuwaiti nurses, to police officials who casually tortured and then shot anyone remotely suspected of opposing the Iraqi occupation, the report presents a picture of unrelenting brutality and total disregard for human life.

For the first time, the nations of the world are united to punish a violation of international law. In an action that is without precedent, the entire U.N. General Assembly has voted overwhelmingly to condemn Iraq's invasion, and over 30 nations have sent troops and equipment to Saudi Arabia. These range from Britain to Bangladesh, and from Senegal to Norway to Australia.

Hopefully, this unity will eventually lead us closer to real world peace. Let us also remember that the object of this unity is not just some tinhorn dictator. This is a man who has not hesitated to use chemical weapons against his own people.

This is a man who threatened to attack Israel if any action is taken to remove Iraqi forces from Kuwait and warned of missiles pointed at Cairo, Riyadh, Damascus, and Ankara and suggested that he would not hesitate to use them.

Even if Iraq does not have nuclear weapons now, it does have a crash program to develop them. Can anyone seriously doubt that Saddam Hussein, a man who ordered his brother-in-law's execution and personally shot a cabinet minister, would hesitate to use an atomic bomb to achieve his aims?

We have the choice of stopping him now, or facing an even stronger Saddam Hussein in a few years. If we sit and wait, how many more lives will it cost then?

Many sincere people have said we must not approve this resolution because if we do, people will die.

But people have already died. People are dying today. And they are not dying because of the United Nations, or the United States. They are dying because of the aggression and brutality of Iraq.

To those who ask why we are in the Persian Gulf, my answer is this: Not to start a war, but to end a war that began on August 2. And we have been waiting since then to see whether Iraq would stop.

This Nation, other nations, and a host of international bodies have tried time and time again to deal with Iraq through diplomatic channels.

All of us want this crisis resolved peacefully. I do not believe even now, at the 11th hour, that war is inevitable. If Iraq wants peace, it can put an end to this crisis immediately.

Even as we debate this resolution today, people in the Baltic Republics are fighting to regain the freedom they lost 50 years ago.

We not only have the chance to halt another such act of aggression; we have the responsibility to do so.

A noted church leader in my State has written that war must always be the last resort. I could not agree more. He has also written that there may exist an obligation to come to the aid of a neighbor who is attacked by an unjust aggressor. I also agree. I hope and pray that a peaceful solution to this crisis can still be found. But, if not, it will prove far more costly for us and for the world community if we do not have the strength to stand and fight.

I will vote for the Michel-Solarz resolution to authorize the use of force to implement the United Nation Security Council resolutions on Iraq's invasion of Kuwait.

It is not an easy vote to cast, but I am convinced it is the right one.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON].

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, the other night on the evening news a young American soldier was asked if he was troubled by the debate in the U.S. Congress, the House, and the Senate. The soldier turned to the newsman and said that is why he was there. He was there, it was clear, to ensure that not only our debate could continue here, but that choice for others around the globe, that the democracy that we so cherish in America, was something others could look to.

This is a difficult debate, because it is complicated by concerns of what message we send to Saddam Hussein. But indeed in reality it is not difficult, because the message there is a difference between our system of government and the system that Saddam Hussein runs. That if you want a country where there is no debate of the President's decision to move forward, that country today is Iraq. It is thankfully not here in the United States.

Prior to August 2 the United States and most of our Western allies were subsidizing the government of Saddam Hussein. On this floor, on July 27, Members in the House, colleagues of mine, joined together to try to stop American subsidies of the Iraqi Government through American subsidies of grain sales to Iraq. Our administration opposed us.

So when we asked how did Hussein get as powerful as he is today, it is not simply to look to Europe, it is to look to the mistakes we made here, subsidizing the cost of his food so he could continue to buy arms. France and Germany were selling him the technology that enabled him to join the nuclear club and develop chemical and biological weapons.

We do not need to invade Iraq to prevent Saddam Hussein from having chemical weapons. We just need to be assured that the Western world will have the restraint to sell him the technology to make those weapons.

We have achieved a great amount of progress through the leadership of the President. The worldwide embargo of high technology items and spare parts to Iraq has made a difference.

There were those who argued to go in while he held the hostages as shields against an American attack. Well, diplomacy did work. The American hostages are home, and the embargo continues to hold.

□ 1420

Some of our friends like to argue that this is the Sudetenland of the Middle East and the modern world. I would argue that we crossed the Sudetenland when Saddam Hussein killed 5,000 Kurds and not only the rest of the world but our Government was silent.

When we look at the choices of focusing on history, look at the Sudetenland and also look at the mistakes of Vietnam. There is no draft today apparently in Saudi Arabia. Saudi princes are at the casinos in Monaco and elsewhere when American farmers and workers in eastern Connecticut are being called up and sent there to defend their country.

We are worried about if the coalition can hold together. If the Saudis do not want us there to defend them, I am not sure that we have a place in the Middle East. If the Saudis think it is all right to have Saddam Hussein as their neighbor, then maybe we have to see that our friendship with the Saudis for so long is wrong.

The lessons that we have to learn from in history are very clear. If we initiate military action without broad support from those countries that are on the line, we are going to fail. The lessons of Korea and Vietnam are not simply that force works and does not work, but the fact is that in both instances it was expected that virtually on its own, Americans would resolve the crisis. Let us make sure that our Saudi friends and allies have their men and women at the front lines and not just American men and women there.

No one can be certain of what the right policy is and what the failures and downside of each option are. The downside of moving militarily now is the potential for massive, unnecessary casualties. The downside of waiting and giving the economic sanctions the time that this administration argued for is that those casualties may occur at a later date, because despite the CIA's new letter on the gulf region, the fact is that the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency argued successfully, I believe, to convince us not a month ago that if you wait 6 months the air force of Saddam Hussein will be 40 percent less effective, his mechanized divisions would be 20 to 25 percent less effective as spare parts do not get through the embargo and the blockade.

If we wait and we are wrong we will face the challenge of war at a later date. If we act now we will squander an opportunity for a peaceful resolution of this conflict because the critical issue here is if we resolve this the old way, with arms, it will ensure that this new era and its new relationship with the Soviet Union really changes nothing, that we will have to use arms elsewhere, and I can guarantee you that we will not muster 400,000 troops to put Lebanon back together or solve the problems in Angola, Ethiopia, and the Sudan. If we can solve this diplomatically and through the embargo it will give us hope to repair other places in the world without massive death and carnage.

Last, it heartens me to see the administration reading the reports of Amnesty International. They are reports we ought to read not just when it is politically helpful to us. They are reports we ought to read all of the time, and we might not find ourselves in the well of this House today facing an emboldened Saddam Hussein.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself ½ minute.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bipartisan Solarz-Michel resolution, which I am proud to cosponsor. I think it is important to support our President in this crisis.

I am thoroughly convinced that if we don't show strong action against Saddam, he is never going to get out of Kuwait. I am concerned about the message he will get if we approve the Hamilton resolution, which delays military action and gives him more time to strengthen his defensive positions.

Anyone who has been to Saudi Arabia in the last 3 months can see that our forces are at full readiness. I think we have assembled the most capable American military force I have ever seen. If we choose to continue sanctions for 6 months or a year, we will have to start rotating American troops. That will weaken our fighting capability. And if you stay in the desert too long, the conditions have a tendency to destroy equipment.

Another concern I have if we wait, is that the U.N. coalition could fall apart.

I have received letters from the American Legion and other veterans' groups, as well as from several military organizations. Many have bought full-page ads in newspapers to show support for this bipartisan resolution. Most who have signed the ads are military experts in their own right. They ask that we stand with our President.

Sanctions are not going to force Saddam out of Kuwait no matter how long we wait. Eventually war will start and there is no way our forces will be as prepared then as they are now. So I ask you to support the Solarz-Michel resolution and let's get our American troops home as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ERDREICH].

Mr. ERDREICH. Mr. Speaker, the decision facing all of us today is not an easy one. The consequences are far-reaching and could alter the shape of our world for years to come. This decision none of us takes lightly.

This conflict was provoked by the attack of Iraq upon its neighbor, Kuwait, followed by a systematic brutality of the Kuwaiti people and a dismantling of the resources of that country. Neighboring nations and world stability were immediately threatened by this act of aggression.

The United States has led an organized response to the attack of Iraq on Kuwait. The unparalleled effort has been worldwide in scope and includes economic sanctions, a naval blockade, and military preparations, supported by 12 resolutions of the United Nations.

We all want a solution to this conflict without military action. The use of force must always be a last resort. Yet I believe that if Saddam Hussein knows with certainty that military force is an option, then the intense diplomatic efforts being conducted may be successful—as we all hope and pray. Under the Constitution, the President is charged with the conduct of our foreign policy, and Congress must authorize the deliberate use of Armed Forces. The successful conduct of that diplomacy is enhanced by this Congress authorizing the use of force at this time, in this situation.

For this reason I support the Michel-Solarz resolution. I believe that the adoption of this resolution is the last, best hope for a peaceful resolution to the Iraqi confrontation.

Voting for the Michel-Solarz resolution does not mandate the use of force, but authorizes that if diplomatic efforts fail. And it tells Saddam Hussein that it is possible that such action can occur unless Iraq complies with the U.N. resolutions.

History has shown that giving additional time to aggressors who prey on other nations ultimately results in greater human misery. For Congress not to act elevates the possibility of military conflict, I believe. Let us support Michel-Solarz to provide the best chance for peaceful resolution of this conflict.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLECZKA].

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, when I first sought to represent the people of Wisconsin's Fourth Congressional District nearly 7 years ago, I never envisioned that one day I would be called upon, through my vote, to send our sons and daughters into a war.

The vote tomorrow will surely be the most important I will cast in my congressional career. It will be the one vote for which each of us will be held most accountable for the rest of our lives, and rightly so.

Make no mistake about it. The Solarz-Michel resolution is a backdoor declaration of war. Congress will not revisit this issue if we authorize Presidential discretion on the use of force.

The Solarz-Michel resolution will not have my vote. I cannot—and will not—support authorizing President Bush to invade Iraq over the issue of restoring the monarchy in Kuwait.

To Members who say that the Solarz-Michel resolution does not do so, I would simply say, "you are wrong."

Those of you who support Solarz-Michel will be placing hundreds of thousands of young Americans in harm's way. You will bear the responsibility for any casualties.

I urge you to vote for the Bennett-Durbin resolution, which states that "the Constitution vests all power to declare war in the Congress of the United States." It further states that "any offensive action taken against Iraq must be explicitly approved by the Congress of the United States before such action may be initiated."

As we approach January 15, the war drums beat ever louder. Preparations for hostilities quicken on all sides.

Much has been made of this well-publicized date, January 15. What is so magical about January 15?

Know full well that this arbitrary date was set by our President and rushed through the U.N. Security Council.

Why not take more time to explore the path of peace? Surely we have not exhausted all diplomatic efforts.

In Geneva this Wednesday, the United States and Iraq took one small step on the path to peace. Would it not be in everyone's interest to take a few more steps?

President John Kennedy once made a wise observation that bears repeating today. He said: "Let us never negotiate out of fear, but let us never fear to negotiate."

Let us encourage and support the efforts of the U.N. Secretary General and the French and Arab leaders who are trying to find a diplomatic alternative to war.

Mr. Speaker, my strong feelings on this issue are reflected in the Bennett-Durbin and Hamilton-Gephardt resolutions.

My views are shared by 90 percent of the constituents I represent, as measured by their letters and phone calls to me. Let me quote a few of them.

"The loss of human life in an unjustifiable war is an offense against civilized humanity," said one Milwaukee church group.

The letter's many cosigners object to the U.S. military presence in the gulf because of what they see as a lack of a clear rationale by our President for being there. "Reasons seem to change day by day," they state.

My constituents' frustration with respect to the ever evolving justifications for gulf involvement are well grounded.

I supported the President's initial decision to deploy troops to defend Saudi Arabia against an attack by Saddam Hussein, although I continue to question whether Hussein ever intended to do so.

When our posture changed from one of defense to one of offense, I could no longer support this administration's policy.

A couple from Greendale, WI, conveyed their feelings well when they wrote that:

> Saudi Arabia asked for our help in controlling an aggressor. We responded to that call. We've been successful in stopping Saddam Hussein. Having done this, we must resort to negotiations to suppress the Iraqi threat.

The Hamilton-Gephardt resolution responds to this family's hope for increased diplomatic efforts. It also supports continued sanctions as urged by a Waukesha, WI couple.

They advised, that:

> It is very crucial that Congress take all actions to let sanctions work. You must give them time instead of going to war.

In the gulf region today, it is our American troops who are bearing the heaviest burden in carrying out U.N. Resolution No. 678 which authorizes force in the gulf.

What troubles me the most about the countries that voted for this resolution, which is the basis for the Solarz-Michel authorization of force, is their lack of commitment to sending their sons and daughters to the Saudi desert.

Let me read you a list of these nations and their military commitment in the gulf: Canada: 1,800, Colombia: Zero, Ethiopia: Zero, Finland: Zero, France: 14,300, Ivory Coast: Zero, Malaysia: Zero, Romania: Zero, Soviet Union: Zero, United Kingdom: 35,000 Saudi Arabia: 65,000, Zaire: Zero, and the United States: 430,000.

These numbers speak for themselves.

Japan and Germany receive the bulk of their oil from this region but none of their sons and daughters are at risk.

Why should thousands and thousands of young Americans put their lives at risk when so many other countries which have a large stake in this region have contributed so little?

For the sake of our young men and women who are in the Persian Gulf region, for the sake of peace and not war, I beg you to pass the Bennett-Durbin and Hamilton-Gephardt resolutions and to defeat the Solarz-Michel resolution.

□ 1430

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG].

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Speaker, this is the first time that I stand before this House as a new freshman, and no matter what the issue would be at hand, this will be an especially important time for me, but given the severity of the issues we face today, I think this will be likely one of the most serious votes I have to take in my career, no matter how long or how short it might be in the House.

I want to extend my thanks today to the President for his extraordinary courage in leading the alliance to stop Saddam Hussein, an alliance endorsed by the United Nations. We are on the right side of the moral equation, and that is why I believe there are 27 nations with us in the gulf supporting Desert Shield.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to support the Solarz-Michel legislation, because I believe that a vote against this resolution would be interpreted by Saddam Hussein as evidence of both division and potential paralysis in our Government. If this were the case, I believe

that war in the gulf would be inevitable, and there would be no way to stop it.

But at the same time, Mr. Speaker, I must state rather frankly that while I support the resolution, I do so with both serious reservations and serious concerns. I said that the President had shown great courage in his determination to stop the aggression in Kuwait, but I also believe it will take great courage at this critical time to pause and think carefully before launching any offensive military action.

I will not support the President's request intending that it be interpreted as a signal for, or as any endorsement of, war. War must be the absolute last resort, and it is clear to me at this time that we have not reached that point.

I will support it in the hope that it will strengthen the President's hand and give him one more card to play in the hope that it is a card he will never have to play.

I believe strongly that economic sanctions should be given more time to work and that we should show greater patience on the diplomatic front, whether it is the Algerians, the French, the Swiss, or the United Nations, which manage to put together a workable plan. Let us make sure that we are willing to listen and that we are willing to wait. I am hopeful that a strong statement of support from this House will create options for the President that are as of yet unseen.

Whatever the risks that a continued commitment to diplomacy and a policy of economic sanctions might entail, and I understand fully that there are some risks, they can surely be no greater than the terrible uncertainties of war.

Mr. Speaker and my fellow Members in this House, we must have a clear sense of our economic, our military, and also our strategic objectives before the first shot is fired. We cannot ad lib as the war goes on. Do we merely want Iraq out of Kuwait? Do we want Saddam Hussein's war machine destroyed? Do we want his nuclear capabilities or his economic capabilities neutered? Those are all very different goals and very different missions which require very different wars. Let us make sure we know exactly what we want up front.

I only can support the stated U.N. goals which are simply to get Iraq out of Kuwait.

Mr. Speaker, I listened to 1,000 of my constituents at a meeting at the University of Wisconsin the other night expressing strong reservations about our course of action. I intend to forward a letter to the President tomorrow which sets out my concerns, the concerns of many of my Wisconsin residents in Madison and the second district, and expressing my strong hope that he will act with continued patience and restraint. It is a letter that I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to sign on to.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. McCathran, one of his secretaries.

THE SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLEMAN].

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, as difficult as it may be for us to accept, history will condone only one course of action by this House: The approval of the bipartisan Michel-Solarz amendment to support the President as he leads the world against the dictator Saddam Hussein.

More than half a century ago there were those who thought peace could be purchased by appeasement and turned a deaf ear to the cries of those who had fallen victim to tyranny. They sacrificed weak and peaceful nations to ruthless dictators while murmuring "peace in our time." But they did not buy peace: They bought time for the dictators to grow stronger and bolder. And they earned for themselves the condemnation of history.

Mr. Speaker, more than 5 months ago Iraq invaded Kuwait and that little nation has since suffered unspeakably at the hands of Saddam Hussein. During that time, the United Nations has passed one resolution after another condemning Iraqi action and demanding its withdrawal. Through the United Nations, the world told Saddam that he must withdraw by the 15th of January or be forced to do so. Saddam has chosen to stay.

Our President, who remembers vividly the cost of appeasing dictators, has given strong and determined leadership to the nations of the world who stand in opposition to Saddam. Clearly, the United Nations has expressed its approval of the President's leadership and judgment in this crisis; this Congress can do no less. Now is the time for us to act. Now is the time for us to give the President the support he deserves and needs to remove Iraq from Kuwait. Now, while the international coalition remains strong and determined, is the time to show Saddam that he will not be allowed to benefit from his aggression.

Saddam has had more than 5 months to read world opinion and withdraw from the little country his troops have viciously plundered. He has refused to do so. He has responded with threats against innocent people and nations. He has shown his contempt for world order and peace. He continues his race to acquire nuclear weapons. Does anyone question that a man who has gassed his own people will use those weapons when he has them?

We do not act in haste today. We are acting only after unprecedented international efforts to dislodge a brutal occupation through peaceful means. In acting we are not giving up our hope that peace may still be preserved. We will be standing with our President and the vast majority of the world against a ruthless dictator whose aggression must not be rewarded.

Fifty years ago, the failure to stand up to Hitler led to the most destructive war in human history. Now, in our own time, we must not repeat that great mistake.

Mr. Speaker, the world is watching what we do here today. Neither Hussein nor history must find us wanting. I support the bipartisan resolution because I believe it is the only choice before us that generations to come will have cause to praise.

□ 1440

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DARDEN].

Mr. DARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the bipartisan resolution which authorizes the President to use military force to secure the withdrawal of Iraq from Kuwait.

This is not an issue of whether there will be war or peace in the Middle East. Iraq has already broken the peace. Rather, this is an issue of whether we will have world order, world stability, and world security. This is an issue that crosses many boundaries. It has crossed partisan boundaries. It has crossed regional and geographic boundaries. And, it has even crossed philosophical and ideological boundaries.

The Middle East is the most volatile region in the world. Even when the entire world is at peace, we always have an eye on this region as an area with the potential to ignite a global war. Over the last decade, there have been conflicts that were containable and not upsetting to the overall world order. The Iraqi invasion and conquest of the tiny and helpless Kuwait violated the fragile status quo in the Persian Gulf. And, in addition to this violation, was the violation of human rights on a massive scale as outlined by Amnesty International, the taking of hostages, and the senseless murder of innocent children. We cannot afford to jeopardize world stability and our role as an international leader by inaction.

Mr. Speaker, nobody wants war. We all have constituents serving in Saudi Arabia. We all have friends, and children of friends, who are stationed in the desert. Each of our communities has been directly affected by the activation of National Guard and Reserve units. We all share the pain, frustration, and anxiety of this ordeal. But, it

is now time to act—to authorize our Commander in Chief to bring this crisis to a prompt, successful, and hopefully peaceful solution. We can only avoid war by convincing Saddam Hussein we are capable of and prepared to use military force.

American soldiers have been deployed in the desert environment since last summer. They have been training daily, and are ready to take whatever actions our President, their Commander in Chief, deems necessary. I have recently returned from visiting our men and women in Saudi Arabia. There is no question in my mind they are ready and even anxious for a solution. In short, Mr. Speaker, we are at the height of our military readiness. Throughout our history we have tried sanctions, and they have proven ineffective. We cannot continue to keep the fragile coalition of nations supporting the U.N. resolutions together much longer.

Mr. Speaker, the Middle East situation must be resolved now. Accordingly, I believe it is imperative that we support the President and approve the Solarz-Michel resolution.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY].

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, in an extraordinary session tomorrow, Members of this body will be called on to cast an extraordinary vote. It is likely to be the most momentous vote we will cast during our careers. Some of us came to our positions rather quickly, others over a longer period of time, but all with thoughtfulness and reflection. All of us appreciate that there is no more solemn and weighty act than the act of going to war.

We are moving rapidly toward war, no matter what the outcome is tomorrow. Saddam Hussein is a ruthless man, and he has the power to demonstrate that repeatedly on the world stage. He demonstrated that power to Iran which we supported and he is demonstrating it to Kuwait which we oppose.

As has often been said during this debate, Saddam Hussein must get out of Kuwait. No matter what the vote is tomorrow, he must leave. It is not his land. It is not his oil. It belongs to the Kuwaitis to do with as they wish.

The only argument that is going on today is whether to continue our attempts to dislodge him by embargoes and diplomacy or use military force. I believe at this point in time there still can be an alternative to war. I do not believe economic sanctions have run their course. I hope by continuing them Saddam will see Kuwait is not worth the price he is paying and will accept the demands of the world community to withdraw.

President Bush was correct in his initial reaction to the invasion of Kuwait, and I don't know of any member who would disagree. Economic sanctions, deterrence of further aggression, and diplomacy were all correct actions. But for the last 2 months that policy was shed for one which places a premium on the threat of offensive military action. We are now engaged in determining whether to stick with the President's first policy, or accept his second.

The arguments have been laid out time and time again. What I find most disturbing, however, is the lack of planning for what happens next. If economic sanctions work, then the Arab world will need to develop some form of containment, certainly with our help. But if we resort to war, what next? Do we stop at the Kuwait-Iraq border, or do we drive on to Baghdad? If we stop at the border, why should Iraq agree to end the war? If we drive on to Baghdad, how do we occupy an Arab country that size and at what cost? And if we destroy the Iraqi Army, will the fruits of our victory be the resurrection of Iran in concert with Syria as the dominate powers in the Persian Gulf.

Any course is fraught with uncertainty. Any course will have unintended consequences. And any course could involve us deeper in the region rather than lead to a solution that brings peace to the Middle East.

So we must make our decision.

History is indeed the summation of individual human choices. And as I look down the alternative paths where these choices might lead us, I think here and now we must choose to continue down the road of applying every economic and diplomatic pressure the world community can muster. The time for the use of military force has not yet arrived. Let us be patient. Let us pursue our shared goals, but by economic and diplomatic means.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, this is an important debate not only for this House, but for the Nation we were elected to serve. The issues before us present a difficult mix of constitutional law, international law, and statutory construction. Perhaps most importantly, we also must consider the very practical strategic implications of this difficult situation, as we analyze the legal and policy questions.

At the outset, it should be stressed that the President and Congress are, in large part, unified on the essentials of the Persian Gulf crisis. Certainly, we are in complete agreement that Saddam Hussein's August 2 invasion of Kuwait was a clear violation of Kuwait's sovereignty, international law, and the U.N. Charter. Similarly, we are in full agreement with President Bush as to our objectives in this confrontation with Iraq. President Bush has articulated specific goals as follows: First, the immediate, unconditional withdrawal of Iraqi Forces from Kuwait; second, the restoration of Kuwait's legitimate government; third, the restoration of security and stability in the Persian Gulf region; and fourth, the release of all persons held against their will by Iraq.

Furthermore, we also recognize that the international community is unified to a remarkable degree. Unified to an extent, perhaps, unprecedented in world history. A number of countries, including certain Islamic nations, have contributed military units to the United Nations multinational force now serving in Saudi Arabia and throughout the gulf region.

Mr. Speaker, the real meaning and purpose of this debate should not be misunderstood by our allies or distorted by our potential adversaries. The United States is a free and democratic society, where political power is diffused and shared—so as to better protect the rights of our citizens. Full and free public debate—even where the subject is as difficult and momentous as going to war—is fundamental to our political process. Congress has a legitimate constitutional role to play in this decision.

We must take care that this debate does not give aid, comfort, or encouragement to Saddam Hussein in any way. There should not be any confusion as to the position of the United States regarding the illegality of Iraq's invasion of Kuwait. Congress fully supports the U.N. Security Council Resolutions, starting with U.N. Resolution 660 and leading to U.N. Resolution 678; hopefully, this House will soon adopt a resolution to that effect. Along with President Bush and the international community, Congress demands that Iraq unilaterally withdraw from Kuwait.

At this point, I would like to briefly examine certain constitutional and legal issues that are pertinent to this debate. Specifically, I propose to address the role of Congress in the President's determination of necessary military action.

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution grants to Congress the power "to declare war". In addition, Congress has the power to raise and support Armies" and "to provide and maintain a Navy". Further, article I of the Constitution grants Congress the power "to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers." At the same time, article II, section 2, clearly establishes that the President is the Commander in Chief and has the primary authority to conduct foreign relations on behalf of the United States. The President also has the responsibility to "take care that the laws be faithfully executed". Article I, section 3.

Thus, the legislative branch and the executive branch have shared responsibilities in the war powers area. De-

spite the passage of over 200 years, the current state of constitutional law remains vague and ambiguous as to how these powers are properly divided between the two political branches of government. Since the courts have traditionally deferred on these questions—treating them as "political questions"—there is no Supreme Court or lower court decision precisely defining the allocation of this responsibility between the two branches. In fact, many constitutional scholars have speculated that it was an ambiguity intentionally left in the Constitution by the Framers.

An instructive footnote from the Constitutional Convention helps to define our responsibility. An early draft of the Constitution talked in terms of Congress being empowered "to make war". This phase was later changed at the Constitutional Convention to read "to declare war". It is generally accepted that this was done in part to make it clear that the conduct of war was vested in the President and that the President should have the flexibility to respond to and repel sudden attacks on the United States without having to wait for a prior authorization from Congress. Most constitutional scholars concur that a formal declaration of war, or other form of congressional authorization, is not a necessary legal prerequisite for the President to take defensive military action. Nor, in my view, does the War Powers Act of 1973 affect this authority. The key and unresolved question is whether this extends to offensive, as well as defensive, military action—such as the use of force from a standing start in the Persian Gulf.

The President's power to station the Armed Forces outside the country is not dependent on prior congressional authorization. American military forces have often been dispatched abroad to protect American lives and property. Some argue, based on past events, that U.S. military forces can be validly sent overseas to support the broad interests of American foreign policy and as a participant in international police actions, without prior congressional approval. A close analogy to our situation today is that which occurred during the Korean conflict.

As my colleagues know, there was no formal declaration of war with respect to Korea. The legal justification for the United States military involvement in Korea was based upon actions taken by the United Nations Security Council. It was characterized as a police action and not a war—although the practical difference has always escaped me.

The legal argument is made as follows: The U.N. Charter is a treaty of the United States. It is therefore law of the United States. Under the Constitution, it is the President's duty to take care that the laws be faithfully executed. By that treaty, it is argued, the United States undertook to carry out decisions of the Security Council under chapter VII of the U.N. Charter. The charter contemplated that U.N. military action would be taken with forces provided by member states pursuant to article 43 agreements concluded in advance, but nothing in the charter prevents the Security Council from calling for, or authorizing, the use of force by states under other arrangements. This is what happened in Korea in 1950 and this is also true of Security Council resolutions adopted concerning Kuwait in 1990.

Today, we again have the Security Council using chapter VII of the U.N. Charter as the basis for authorizing "all necessary means" to restore the legitimate government of Kuwait and to restore international peace and security to the entire gulf region. The most recent U.N. resolution numbered 678, adopted by the Security Council on November 29, states that on or after January 15, the cooperating members' states "can use all necessary means" to expel Iraq from Kuwait. It has been argued by some that this is a sufficient basis under international law for the President to take such military actions as he determines necessary, without congressional concurrence. I do not believe that is either a wise or persuasive constitutional-legal view.

In 1945 Congress passed the United Nations Participation Act (22 U.S.C. section 287 et seq.) which governs our treaty obligations under the U.N. Charter. By that act, Congress expressly authorized the President to carry out Security Council resolutions calling for economic sanctions (section 5). Further, under section 6 of the Participation Act, the President is authorized to negotiate "Article 43 agreements" with the Security Council to provide forces to the United Nations, subject to approval of the agreements by the Congress. With such approval, the President could then make the agreed upon military forces available for use by the Security Council without further approval of Congress. Importantly, section 6 of the U.N. Participation Act also explicitly declares that nothing in the act shall be construed as authorizing the President to make forces available to the Security Council for U.N. action other than pursuant to article 43 agreements.

The U.N. Participation Act, then, clearly contains nothing by itself that would authorize the President to wage war against Iraq. There have not been any article 43 agreements approved by Congress with respect to Kuwait. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the U.N. Participation Act could read as prohibiting the President from using U.S. Armed Forces for that purpose.

Mr. Speaker, in my judgment, congressional authorization is constitutionally required before offensive military action can lawfully be taken by U.S. Armed Forces. The fact that congressional authorization has not occurred in numerous prior instances, does not mean that our law does not require it in this case.

Earlier, I mentioned the War Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1541–1548) which was passed by Congress in 1973 in reaction to the Vietnam experience. It was intended to better define the proper role of Congress in the war powers area. The law requires Presidential consultation with Congress and Presidential notification of Congress, when U.S. troops are deployed abroad. Ironically, however, the very language of the War Powers Act itself seems to presume that there can be situations where the President has validly committed troops without prior congressional authorization. See: 50 U.S.C. 1543(a); 50 U.S.C. 1544(b). Section 4(a) of the War Powers Act talks about the requirement of the President to notify the Speaker and the President pro tempore of the Senate in writing within 48 hours after U.S. Armed Forces are involved in hostilities in another territory in the absence of a declaration of war. Similarly, section 5(b) presumes that the President can commit the U.S. Armed Forces for a period of up to 60 days even though there has been no declaration of war or specific congressional authorization for such action. But even given these confusing defects, the fairest reading of Congress' intent in the war powers law was to assure that a President could not undertake and maintain an undeclared or unauthorized war.

The appropriate role of Congress in the war powers area has still yet to be clearly defined by Congress itself. Perhaps amendments to the much criticized War Powers Act should be considered, at some later date. Of course, Congress can refuse to appropriate the necessary funds to finance a military action or can restrict the uses of such funds. Congress also has the power to impeach a President, where it is felt that the president has exceeded his lawful authority. But these actions typically taken after-the-fact or, are unrealistic or inappropriate alternatives.

This week we consider resolutions with respect to the necessary congressional authorization for the President to engage in offensive military action in the Persian Gulf. This is the constitutionally correct way to resolve this debate. We need no formal declaration of war but we do need congressional authorization.

I believe, given the facts surrounding Iraq's illegal invasion and occupation of Kuwait and the ongoing threat to world peace posed by Saddam Hussein, that this House should adopt the resolution—House Joint Resolution 62—providing that authority to the President. Specifically, the President would

be authorized to act pursuant to U.N. Security Council Resolution 678 and take all necessary means to end Iraq's occupation of Kuwait. In the early post-cold war era, we and the world community should take this opportunity to side with law, security and stability against invasion, aggression and force.

It is to be fervently hoped that a congressional resolution, demonstrating a unified U.S. position, will strengthen the hand of the President and the Secretary General in their efforts to obtain Iraq's peaceful withdrawal from Kuwait. Like all my colleagues, I am hopeful that before any hostilities are entered into that the leaders of Iraq come to their senses and realize how resolute America and the free world are on this situation.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER].

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my support for the Solarz resolution. I believe it is the proper action for Congress to take. If the President determines that sanctions are not and will not work, them military force is necessary and the President should have the authority to use such force as necessary to get Iraq out of Kuwait. I believe we all agree that in no way should we allow the atrocities committed at the behest of the butcher of Baghdad go unnoticed. I strongly supported the sanctions and hoped they would be successful in convincing Saddam Hussein to pull out of Kuwait. I would maintain this position if I truly thought the sanctions would result in this conclusion. I will not support military force until the President has assured us the sanctions will not work. That is exactly what the Solarz resolution requires.

This is by far and away the toughest decision I have been required to reach since first being elected to Congress in 1976. I have given great and careful thought to my decision and I still pray that a peaceful solution could be possible. I think all of us debating this issue today should pray that none of our troops will give their life in this cause, but I also believe that none of us want to look the other way when a mad man such as Saddam Hussein invades a country that was no threat to his country whatsoever. I believe we all agree we cannot ignore the pillaging of Kuwait's wealth, the rape of Kuwait's women and the vicious slaughter of Kuwait people.

To bring this terrible crisis to an end, I urge my colleagues to unite in support of the President by voting for the Solarz resolution.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, the President has gone the extra mile. He has done all in his power to achieve a diplomatic and peaceful solution to the crisis brought on by Iraq's naked aggression against his innocent neighbor, Kuwait; but still does Saddam Hussein thumb his nose at our President, our Nation, the United Nations, and the civilized world.

Invasion, kidnaping, terror, rape, torture, and murder, these are the tools that Mr. Hussein has employed to exert brute dictatorial force over his unwilling victims; yet some in this Congress while deploring his actions still look for any excuse to avoid confrontation and shrink from enforcing world opinion against him.

We were right in sending troops to Saudi Arabia, they say. We were right in imposing sanctions, they say. We were right in mobilizing world opinion and various U.N. resolutions against him, they say; but we should not now use force to expel him.

Let our troops remain in the desert without a mandate for force, regardless of the cost in human and material resources. Let the sanctions which have not worked for 5 months, and have not compelled a withdrawal, remain indefinitely; let Saddam Hussein know that the United States will not stand behind its President, its allies, and the United Nations, and that all we really want to do is talk, not fight.

In short, they say, let Saddam Hussein, the instigator of one-half million deaths in the Iran-Iraq War, the user of chemical weapons against 5,000 Iraqi Kurds, the executioner of many of his own soldiers and generals; the invader, kidnaper, rapist, torturer, and murderer of thousands of innocent Kuwaits, let this tyrant remain in Kuwait without punishment.

I cannot accept this reasoning. Does anyone want war? No!! Of course not!!

Do we want to risk the loss of even one American life unnecessarily? No! I do not!

But when all the facts are considered, do I believe that appeasement now is worth the possibility that thousands more, maybe millions more of people, may later be killed—simply because we would not now stand up to this tyrant? No—emphatically, no!

Mr. Speaker, a Congress united behind our President provides us with the greatest possible hope that Saddam Hussein will take President Bush at his word, accept our position, and withdraw from Kuwait.

A divided Congress most assuredly tells him that time is on his side, and that if he hangs tough and refuses to budge, the world—and the United States—will forget Kuwait, United States troops will grow tired and go home; the consensus our President has created will collapse, and Hussein's unwarranted aggression against a civilized world order will pay off!

We cannot allow that to happen. We have the world on our side. We have the forces available to us, and we should be prepared to punish Hussein now, while we can, and not at some indeterminate date in the distant future.

Mr. Speaker, only by standing with our President—by agreeing to the bipartisan Michel-Solarz resolution, will we truly have a chance at a meaningful peace. Only then will we convince tyrants that aggression bears a heavy price; and only then will we stand a chance at getting Saddam Hussein out of Kuwait without firing a shot.

Vote for Michel-Solarz.

□ 1500

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUSSO].

Mr. RUSSO. Mr. Speaker, many here in this body have argued that it is important for our Nation to speak with one voice. I agree that after a decision on war or peace has been made, it is important for our Nation to stand united. The freedom to debate, however, is an intrinsic part of the framework of this great Nation. Democracy necessitates the open discussion of differing ideas, and the foundation of the democracy which we hold so dear lies in its informed citizenry. Open debate on war and peace in the Persian Gulf is not only essential, but it is our constitutional responsibility.

Historically, when the President asks for the authorization of war, he must state compelling reasons for committing our men and women to certain death.

Today we are being asked to give the President a blank check to wage war, to trust his judgment that war is the only option that will prevail over Saddam Hussein rather than the stranglehold of economic sanctions. Yet, administration policy in the Mideast has been a series of mistakes which have led us to this perilous junction in history.

It has been reported that in February, Assistant Secretary of State John Kelly ordered our Ambassador in Iraq to apologize for a strong Voice of America editorial on human rights. One week before the invasion, Kelly killed a July 25 broadcast warning Iraq that "the United States remains strongly committed to supporting the self-defense of its friends in the gulf." And when Hussein threatened terrorist response to any U.S. pressure for restraint, Kelly ordered our Ambassador to be soothing. This administration virtually gave him a blank check to invade Kuwait. This was a mistake.

The President says now that he is concerned about Hussein's human rights abuses, use of chemical and biological weapons, future nuclear capa-

bilities, and terrorism. Yet, Iraqi human rights abuses did not start August 2 when Hussein invaded Kuwait. Amnesty International has been reporting the horrific practices of Iraqi torturers for years. Under Hussein children have suffered through beatings, whippings, sexual abuse, electric shock treatments, the extraction of fingernails, and starvation. To ignore those warnings until such time as they serve our interests to justify war is unbefitting a democracy. This was another mistake.

On July 27, 1990, the House debated a Glickman amendment to the 1990 farm bill which denied agriculture export guarantees and subsidies to Iraq because of its abysmal human rights record, its support of terrorism, and for its acquisition of chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons. While this amendment passed 234 to 175, this administration opposed the amendment. This was another mistake. Six days later Iraq invaded Kuwait, and then this administration became concerned with human rights, terrorism, and chemical and nuclear weapons.

This administration and the Reagan administration have given Iraq hundreds of millions of dollars of economic and military aid over the past 10 years. This was another mistake. With the invasion of Kuwait, a convenient ally became an instant enemy.

Iraq imports 75 percent of its food. Until the embargo, one-third of Iraq's imports came from the United States. Much of these food imports were subsidized by the United States. In fact, Iraq never paid its bills for agricultural products we sent it. Iraq owed us $2 billion in unpaid loans and was listed by the Agriculture Department as "high-risk." A November 1990 GAO report said:

> It seems that the United States desire to build a strategic and agricultural trade relationship with Iraq outweighed the apparent financial risks involved and discounted evidence of Iraq's human rights violations.

Another mistake.

Today, I want to help the President not make the biggest mistake of all—a mistake that will cost the unnecessary loss of American lives.

President Bush is a man for whom I have a great deal of respect. I am sure that he has agonized and wrestled with this decision—just as we all have. The Constitution charges us all—not just the President—with the responsibility of making this decision. It was the President's responsibility to decide to take specific actions in defense of American interests following Iraq's invasion of Kuwait. It is now the Congress' responsibility to determine if we shall commit America to war.

I sincerely believe that time is on our side. Time is expendable but the loss of American lives is not. I am not arguing that the United States should never take military action, but I am saying that given the heavy costs of war, the United States has everything to gain by giving sanctions more time to work and everything to lose if we don't.

Given events of the past year, the crumbling of the Berlin Wall, independence and elections for Eastern bloc nations, the dismantling of communism as we knew it—we must surely believe that democracy is the wave of the future. If diplomacy and international cooperation is not an alternative we embrace, why do we have a State Department, why do we have the United Nations, and why do we sign treaties? Diplomacy does work. Our decision to contain communism, rather than physically confront it, left that form of government to fall of its own inertia rather than pay the tremendous price of the loss of human life that would have accompanied another world war.

The United States is confronted with a golden opportunity to set the stage for a new world order. And order where the United Nations and international condemnation of aggression, coupled with intelligent and forceful use of economic measures will set a precedent for the resolution of conflicts in the next century.

The question that I pose to each and every Member of the Congress is this: If you had a daughter or son on the frontlines who went in to liberate the feudal state of Kuwait, and was killed and delivered home to you in a flag-draped coffin, could you look into that coffin and say: "It was a terrible sacrifice but you died for the right reason." If you can say that, then vote for the Solarz resolution. However, if you cannot, then do not put other American parents in that agonizing situation.

Mr. Speaker, support the Gephardt-Hamilton resolution.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LEACH].

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, perspective is always difficult to apply to events of the day, but it would appear that in the last 6 months a watershed development in international politics has occurred. Largely due to the sapient diplomacy of the administration, the Security Council adopted a panoply of resolutions demanding Iraqi withdrawal from Kuwait and sanctioning civilized countries to employ all appropriate means to achieve that objective.

□ 1510

Mr. Speaker, for the first time in modern history a credible system of collective security appears on the threshold of being born, and here I would observe that, if one political party identifies disproportionately with advocacy of collective security, it is the Democratic Party. Collective security was the watchword of Woodrow Wilson who literally drove himself to death defending the principle against his critics. Franklin Roosevelt, arguably the greatest President of this century, insisted that collective security be espoused in the Atlantic Charter and be the linchpin of the U.N. Charter, yet today it is a Republican President who, in opposition both to the isolationists and go-it-alone interventionist themes that have ambivalently hallmarked much of this century's conservation tradition, who was in the vanguard of collective security endeavors. In paradoxical contrast liberal leadership in Congress appears in the verge of repudiating the philosophical heritage of Wilson and Roosevelt, as well as Truman and John Kennedy, in favor of the more flocculent wait-and-see nostrums that lack historical and philosophical perspective. What is the morality of congressional leadership's wait-and-see approach?

Mr. Speaker, Saddam Hussein has conducted 2 wars in the last 10 years which resulted in 1 million casualties. He has made rape a daily instrument of coercive state policy. Executions are of epidemic proportion, frequently with family members asked to witness and pay for bullets.

In this context, is it moral to stand by? Can we allow Saddam's models of behavior to be rewarded or replicated elsewhere? Do we want to wait to confront a leader with a nascent nuclear and biological warfare capability?

I stress in particular biological weapons at this time. Despite the horrors of Auschwitz and the inhumanity of the Soviet gulag, neither Hitler, nor Stalin threatened the usage of biological agents. Saddam Hussein has. And let me stress biological weapons are a poor man's weapon of mass destruction. They are far easier to develop and far more destructive to employ than nuclear arms.

Confronted with Saddam's threat and weapons development potentialities, it is impossible for this Member to conclude that a wait-and-see approach fits either the times or the circumstances.

On questions of war and peace there is a societal imperative for caution, but it must be understood that ambivalence is not synonymous with statesmanship and that anxietyship is no substitute for leadership.

I am personally convinced that Saddam has no choice except to blink before the 15th, unless America blinks first, but if this Congress sends a message of no confidence to the executive branch, it will be sending a message of no mandate to Secretary General de Cullar and the historic mission that he is currently on to Baghdad. In this context, congressional vacillation makes peace less, not more, likely.

The President and his policy of collective security are the last best hope in this century for establishing a security system which makes aggression, and thus war, obsolete. Support the President, not because he is the leader

of this great Nation, but because he is in the vanguard of bringing reality to the dreams of Woodrow Wilson and Franklin Roosevelt, because he is right, that a new world order is only possible if nations under the rule of law accept the obligation to keep the peace.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. THORNTON].

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. Speaker, I think that the situation in the Persian Gulf has gone off course. It was appropriate to have an immediate, decisive response to Saddam Hussein's acts of naked aggression, and I applauded the President's insistence upon adhering to the rule of law.

However, beginning last fall the President began a series of military buildups and ultimatums which culminated in the setting of a deadline of January 15. Setting deadline is not in the interest of achieving a diplomatic and peaceful solution. However, we now find ourselves with our forces deployed and an ultimatum aimed at convincing Saddam Hussein that the United States and the coalition of nations mean business.

Long-term peace in the Middle East must be grounded upon adherence to the rule of law. Saddam Hussein's aggression has violated every principle of law.

I believe the overwhelming sentiment in this country would be to achieve a peaceful resolution of this crisis through diplomatic means.

Our original strategy was based upon economic sanctions supported by an unprecedented worldwide coalition, backed by an overpowering military force and the willingness to use it—plus the patience to allow diplomatic and peaceful solutions to be developed.

Today, there are many who would abandon some of the building blocks. Some would expect a peaceful resolution to be achieved if we deny to the President the option of using all necessary means to restore international peace and security, casting into doubt our willingness to use force.

Others are suggesting that we should abandon the building blocks of patience. They are urging that immediate use of force is necessary.

I do not believe that we should abandon either patience or the possible use of force. We need to authorize the use of all necessary means to achieve the goals of the U.N. resolution, and we need to have the patience to refrain from using military force until all peaceful means have been exhausted.

The Hamilton resolution is, in my view, wise in calling for patience, but mistaken in the supposition that Saddam Hussein will be interested in a peaceful solution once the possible use of force is restricted.

Mr. Speaker, in order to convince Saddam Hussein to accept a diplomatic solution, it must be clear to him that the alternative to a diplomatic solution could be a decisive and forceful response.

The Solarz proposal contains language approving the option of using all necessary means to restore international peace and security in this area after "all diplomatic and other peaceful means to obtain compliance" have been exhausted.

Calling for patience in its application—and based upon my conviction that the best hope for a peaceful solution depends upon the building blocks of economic sanctions supported by a worldwide coalition, backed by an overpowering military force and the willingness to use it, and the patience to allow diplomatic and peaceful solutions to be developed—I ask that you join me in support of the Solarz resolution.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON].

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, given the tremendous significance of events in the Middle East, I wanted to add my thoughts to today's historic debate. The crisis in the gulf has dominated my thinking since the early days of August. I do not take lightly the commitment of American forces. I have strong personal views on this subject. I fought in World War II, as an infantry company commander, and was overseas for nearly 3 years. I was in two combat landings, one in North Africa and one in Italy. I knew then and know now that our commitment of forces in that conflict was vital to our security, indeed, to the security of the world. On the other side, I served Congress during Vietnam. From that experience, I learned the lesson of what can result from the commitment of troops to a conflict where our interests are not so clear, where objectives are not defined.

I have given events in the Persian Gulf serious and continuing thought. My conclusion is that our national security is greatly threatened. I plan, therefore, to support the Solarz resolution authorizing the use of U.S. Armed Forces pursuant to U.N. Security Council Resolution 678. By debating and voting on this resolution, the U.S. Congress is fulfilling its obligation to the American people and to our Nation's Constitution.

I support the Solarz resolution because congressional endorsement of the U.N. resolution keeps the U.S. position consistent with the position of the community of nations. It does not put us ahead of the game.

Keeping our national position consistent with that of the United Nations is important. The significance of the concerted U.N. action to future world peace is incalculable. For the first time in world history, the nations of the world, acting together, have told an aggressor nation that its aggression will not stand. If such a precedent had been taken in 1939 when German troops invaded Poland, million of lives might have been saved.

Perhaps the only differences between Hitler's invasion of Poland and Hussein's invasion of Kuwait is that Hitler did not have a standing army of more than 1 million men. He did not have deadly chemical weapons and the ability to deliver them. Nor was he on the brink of a nuclear weapons capability. Saddam Hussein has all of these. It is in the interest of the United States and the nations of the world to stop Hussein now, to let him know that such naked aggression against another nation will not be allowed to stand.

I commend President Bush and Secretary of State Baker for going the extra mile to achieve a diplomatic resolution to the Persian Gulf crisis. The rebuff of Secretary Baker by Iraqi Foreign Minister Tariq Aziz in Geneva was a disappointing moment for all of us who desire peace. It is my sincere hope that the path to peace remains open in the Middle East and that U.N. Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar will not be similarly rebuffed by Iraqi officials in his efforts to enforce the U.N. resolution.

President Bush has been firm in his actions and has not faltered. The President has not acted alone and has not attempted to put the United States in the role of world policeman. He has sought support from the world community and has received that support. His decision has been and remains to get Hussein out of Kuwait and he has applied a program of mounting pressure. Indeed, the risks are great and they increase daily as we approach the January 15 deadline. However, I believe the risks are greater if we allow Hussein's action to stand.

We all want peace—I honestly believe the quickest way to peace is for the Congress to support the Solarz-Michel resolution and let Hussein know the Congress stands behind and alongside the United Nations—the coalition of nations, and the President and that aggression will not be tolerated. Then and only then will Hussein back down.

□ 1520

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HATCHER].

Mr. HATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Solarz-Michel resolution. Our President has done a tremendous job leading the nations of the world in resisting further aggressive action by Saddam Hussein.

The United Nations has resolved that after January 15, 1991, there should be a creditable threat of force for the removal of Iraqi forces from Kuwait.

It appears that Saddam Hussein will not leave Kuwait without force or a credible threat of force.

The President needs and deserves our support. To fail to pass the Solarz-Michel resolution will be to diminish the credibility of the threat of force—and to make it even less likely that Hussein will voluntarily leave Kuwait.

I say we should support our President by passing the Solarz-Michel resolution.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as I have listened to this debate, one point has been stressed again and again. It is a point that needs to be answered.

The point is: Have we done enough to avoid war? Have we exhausted every avenue of diplomacy?

In casting our votes, we are making ourselves accountable for the lives and well-being of hundreds of thousands of young American men and women in uniform.

No one in this House would want to authorize the President to use force if there were any hope that a resolution of this crisis could be handled diplomatically.

But a look at the record shows that the President has done all he can to find a peaceful solution.

From the very beginning, he has brought his case to the United Nations.

On 12 separate occasions, the Security Council has voted to condemn the Iraqi invasion and demand a complete withdrawal from Kuwait.

But the overwhelming condemnation of the world's nations has failed to move Saddam.

The nations of the world have tried economic sanctions. Have they forced Iraqis to tighten their belts? They certainly have.

Will they force Saddam to leave Kuwait? From the reports of many people who have visited the area, there appears to be little likelihood that the sanctions will have any effect on Saddam's occupation of Kuwait.

Most recently, President Bush offered Saddam a chance for face-to-face diplomacy. Saddam's failure to settle on a mutually acceptable date showed that he is unwilling to come to terms with the serious nature of the crisis he has created.

Practically every foreign minister in Europe, and many in the Arab countries, have urged Saddam to abide by the U.N. resolutions.

He has been besieged by a veritable parade of former world statesmen—many of whom I suspect told him of the gravity of the situation.

Some people will not listen to reason. The hearts of some people have been deadened to moral persuasion.

Such people cannot be persuaded, but only cowed. This resolution does not commit President Bush to use military arms, it only gives him that option. In the President's hands, it will be a very credible and powerful negotiating tool, particularly at this late hour.

The President has done everything he could do to convince Saddam through diplomatic channels to leave Kuwait. It is now time for Congress to make the Iraqi leader understand that America stands behind the President and that his recent letter was not an idle threat, but a credible warning.

We must give the President the power he needs to convince Saddam that he has no other alternative but to leave Kuwait. This will be a vote of confidence in the President and a message to Saddam that America is fully united against his aggression.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. NOWAK].

Mr. NOWAK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Hamilton-Gephardt resolution.

At this time, I support continued enforcement of the economic sanctions against Iraq, and oppose any congressional authorization or support for Presidential discretion to launch offensive action in the Persian Gulf.

The standoff at the Kuwaiti-Saudi border does not pose any immediate threat to the national security or economic stability of the United States.

World oil supplies are adequate, with Iraqi and Kuwaiti sources replaced by increased production elsewhere.

Oil prices have increased and fluctuated but have stabilized without reaching alarming levels that would cripple the international economy.

The economic sanctions against Iraq have not had enough time to work to achieve all our objectives. Nevertheless, sanctions already have proven their effectiveness.

First, the aggression has been contained.

Second, American and other foreign nationals once held hostage in Iraq have been released.

Third, Iraq cannot sell its major exported product—oil—and it is only a matter of time before it goes bankrupt.

Time, however, is something we—the international coalition against Iran—have in abundance.

We can afford to be patient.

The international coalition has not yet exhausted the sanctions remedy, thus we should not move hastily to the final alternative—a devastating war with unknown consequences.

Unless severely provoked or attacked, the world community should continue to tighten the economic noose whenever and wherever possible around Saddam Hussein, and refrain from immediate irrevocable offensive military action.

It has been suggested that our international coalition forged in the United Nations would unravel, if we continue this policy of open-ended enforcement of the sanctions.

However, I must ask, if we can muster the skill and courage to fight, can we not also generate the skill and courage to sustain a meaningful embargo?

The same question can be asked about diplomacy.

Does 6 hours of high level, United States-Iraq, face-to-face discussion exhaust international diplomacy?

Isn't there more we, along with the international community, could do in the diplomatic arena before we ask our troops to make the ultimate sacrifice?

We should also use this period of extended enforcement of the sanctions and expanded diplomatic effort to intensify our discussions with our allies about increasing their contributions—both monetarily and in terms of military manpower—and their national risk in the Persian Gulf.

It is estimated that it will cost our country $30 billion a year—without actual hostilities—to maintain U.S. forces in the gulf.

Before we go to war, we should have a bolder, firmer commitment from our allies, especially the Arab States, Japan, and Germany.

Nations more oil-dependent on this region than we, must be induced to accept more of the burden in this crisis.

The United States is already the world's greatest debtor nation.

It is blatantly unfair and intolerable that we continue to borrow and go deeper into debt to finance our military involvement in the Persian Gulf, when it is our foreign creditors who will benefit most from our sacrifices.

In summary, the administration, the Congress, and our allies must do more before we commit to war.

We must be patient, without flinching.

We must be resolute in pursuing the sanction-diplomacy routes. Saddam Hussein can take no solace or comfort, in this alternative to war at this time, for his country will soon be bankrupt, his industrial and military capabilities eroded drastically by the shortages of personnel and spare parts.

He will suffer all the consequences.

In the short term, it may be harder to show restraint and to contain, but it is wiser and better than lashing out prematurely.

We are ready for and preserve, any alternatives in the future, with the Hamilton-Gephardt resolution.

□ 1530

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, it is my deepest hope that the crisis in the Persian Gulf can be resolved peacefully, without resorting to the use of force.

I trust and believe that every member in this Chamber shares this hope.

In like manner, I trust and believe that the President wants peace. Yet, in the current confrontation with an absolutely vicious tyrant, in the face of unbridled tyranny, a viable U.S. military option serves to buttress diplomacy and advance peace.

The question then is, while no course of action is foolproof, what is the most likely path the United States can embark upon to both achieve our objectives and to do so peacefully?

After much thought, I am persuaded that the Michel-Solarz resolution is the best choice today.

Mr. Speaker, since Iraq's brutal invasion of Kuwait last August, President Bush has forged an unprecedented international consensus via the United Nations to reverse this aggression and establish a sustainable peace in the region.

Having served as a U.S. Representative to the United Nations last session, I can well appreciate the special difficulties inherent in unifying the disparate nations of the world. Yet, at least for now, we are united.

Mr. Speaker, recognizing that Hussein's occupation of a sovereign nation must not stand, that the pervasive atrocities, including rape and murder, committed by Iraqi troops against Kuwaits must be stopped, and that the thousands of hostages had to be freed, the United Nations has approved a dozen substantive resolutions—including the imposition of broad economic sanctions and an authorization to use force, if necessary.

Saddam Hussein's substantial military capability—1 million men in arms, and his prior use of weapons of mass destruction including chemical weapons, and his aggressive nuclear and ballistic missile programs—clearly poses an ever-increasing threat to regional and world peace. Sadly, since August, Kuwait has felt the sting of some of these weapons.

Given this threat and the United Nation's January 15 deadline to withdraw from Kuwait, I encourage Members to vote for the Michel-Solarz resolution authorizing the use of force if the President determines that "the United States has used all appropriate diplomatic and other peaceful means" to obtain Iraq's withdrawal from Kuwait and "that those diplomatic efforts have not and would not be successful in obtaining such compliance."

Mr. Speaker, the language of the resolution makes crystal clear that the onus is on the President to exhaust diplomatic efforts that "force" be a last resort option. Significantly, this resolution authorizes the use of force but does not require it. I would respectfully suggest that a diplomatic solution is tangibly enhanced—it is made more probable—with passage of the Michel-Solarz resolution and its companion legislation in the Senate.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4½ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, each and every one of us are elected by our constituents to make decisions in the best interests of our Nation to the best of our abilities. Many of these decisions are extremely difficult. The judgments we must make today and tomorrow are the hardest and most painful and significant we have faced since coming to Congress.

This debate has made clear the many points of agreement here in Congress. The debate has left no doubt over the total opposition of every Member of the body to Iraq's invasion of Kuwait, to the Iraqi threat to Saudi Arabia, to the Iraqi chemical and nuclear weapon programs and to any Iraqi effort to dominate Saudi Arabia and the Persian Gulf. Moreover, the Congress is united in the belief that the life of each and every soldier, sailor, airman, and marine is precious and any commitment to use force is not to be taken lightly.

The most profound lesson of the Vietnam war is that American lives must only be risked where our most vital national interests, not abstract concepts, are at stake. Saddam Hussein's objectives are as clear as they are ruthless. They include control of the oil fields, possession of nuclear weapons, dominance of the Arab world, and control of the world economy. If Saddam Hussein achieves any of these objectives there can be little doubt that he would utilize these powers for other barbaric actions. There can be little doubt that his pursuit of these goals would pose new and significant risks for America and the American people. Success for Saddam Hussein is a direct threat to the United States and world peace.

Let this Congress be clear, as the United Nations has been clear, this is a struggle between civilization and barbarism. America does not stand alone in this struggle against a modern day Attila, the entire civilized world stands alongside us in the struggle. It is our choice today if the rule of law or Saddam Hussein's rule of the jungle will prevail. If we fail to confont aggression today the future consequences could be devastating.

Over 60 years ago a great depression fathered dictators on the foundations of collapsing democracies—dictators who plunged mankind into a world war. Those dictators like Saddam Hussein, did not have to answer to their people. Those dictators totally lacked any shred of the democratic concern for human life and support of peace, a democratic concern manifest to anyone listening to today's debate. Saddam Hussein's objective is control of the oil fields which will give him the power to plunge the world into a new depression. Saddam's depression would come at a time when freedom is still a fragile phenomenon. Saddam's depression would come when democracy is being reborn in Europe, Latin America, and Asia, reborn in nations whose millions of citizens have lived their entire lives without any democratic experiences. A depression orchestrated by a successful Saddam Hussein could father many more tyrants, wars, and threats to peace and America.

Let us also not forget the most profound lesson of the 1930's—the failure of the democracies to confront Hitler and the other dictators early on—the futile effort to buy "peace in our time." Had the democracies confronted Hitler over the Rhineland, over Austria, over the Sudetenland, or over the remainder of Czechoslovakia there can be little doubt that countless millions of lives, and hundreds of thousands of American lives, would have been saved. Tragically, we know that was not to be the case.

The failure to confront Hitler was a product of twin failures—the failure of will and the failure of judgment. Hitler's ambition's were limitless because he believed that the democracies lacked the will to confront him. This belief was reinforced with every success which saw the democracies capitulate to preserve peace at a price. The failure of judgment was most apparent in Neville Chamberlain's deeply felt conviction that reasonable men could always reach agreement. Chamberlain believed he had achieved a great success at Munich. He did not realize that Hilter, like Saddam Hussein, was not a reasonable man and that Hitler's ambitions were limitless and Munich the beginning of a feeding frenzy.

Delay will just whet Hussein's appetite. Hussein, like Hitler before him, questions the will of the Western democracies. He views his willingness to sacrifice a million countrymen as a sign of strength, rather than barbarism, and our concern over life as weakness, rather than basic humanity. Passage of the Solarz resolution should open his eyes to our seriousness and provide the last best chance for a peaceful Iraqi withdrawal from Kuwait. Passage of any other resolution will merely reinforce his misperceptions and push us further down the path of war which will only become more bloody and tragic with the passage of time.

Do we confront Saddam Hussein today, or wait until he controls the oil field, Do we confront Saddam Hussein today, or wait until he has a nuclear bomb? There can be little doubt that delay means a stronger Saddam Hussein and a higher cost. The eyes of the entire world and most importantly, the eyes of Saddam Hussein are upon us today. Winston Churchill stated that Neville Chamberlain's:

* * * All-pervading hope was to go down in history as the great peacemaker; and for this he was prepared to strive continually in the teeth of facts, and face great risks for him-

self and his country. Unhappily, he ran into tides the force of which he could not measure, and met hurricanes from which he did not flinch, but with which he could not cope.

Let us not repeat Chamberlain's delusion. Let us send a clear and unmistakable message to Saddam Hussein. You cannot win. A free and civilized world will not let you. Vote for the Solarz resolution.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MOODY].

Mr. MOODY. Mr. Speaker, "Send an unmistakable message to Saddam Hussein." That has been the common cry of the Members opposing the Gephardt amendment and supporting the Solarz amendment.

Sometimes I think this debate is more designed to impress Saddam Hussein than anything else, on the theory if we are unified here in this Chamber, he will blink.

□ 1540

My colleagues, my experience from living in and working in the Middle East for a year is that as rational as it is to our mind, he will not blink. When a Middle Eastern leader of this variety is faced with what he sees as a choice between war and a humiliating backdown, he will choose war. At this late date, Saddam Hussein will not do what he should do, cave in and withdraw. He will go to war, and the Solarz amendment will bring us very close to war indeed, in my judgment, given what the President has vowed to do if he has that support.

We do not have perfect foresight and we do face uncertainty as to either of these two courses, either Solarz or Gephardt, but I think we are facing at least, count them, eight certainties or near certainties.

No. 1, if we go to war a minimum of 18,000 U.S. casualties, 3,000 dead if fighting does include a ground war, which many say we will have to and it could go far higher. One credible estimate capped it at 45,000 American casualties, and about a fifth of those would be deaths.

If we vote yes tomorrow, thousands of young Americans will spend the rest of their lives in hospital beds and wheelchairs with shattered hopes and shattered dreams. That is cost No. 1 and certainty No. 1.

Certainty No. 2, a minimum of 50,000 Iraqi deaths, probably far higher, particularly civilian deaths if we bomb Iraqi infrastructure as we say we will do if all-out war starts. Our ally in the region, Israel, will also suffer many casualties, probably huge casualties if in fact the war spreads. That is near certainty No. 2.

Near certainty No. 3, there will be tremendous divisions within the American society, turmoil and division at home. Congress might be united and many are calling for that, but the public is not united. These deep divisions will only increase as the cost of the war goes up.

Certainty No. 4, a $60 billion to $90 billion cost of the war on top of a $333 billion deficit projected next year, not counting the S&L bailout, and not counting the Social Security transfer. It will be over $400 billion. If those are counted in, it will be well over $400 billion, so we have a $60 billion to $90 billion cost on top of a $400 billion deficit. Plus, higher oil prices and higher taxes, and/or higher interest rates if we decide to borrow the money instead of raising it through taxes.

Certainty No. 5, increased commercial and economic strength of Japan and Germany as our economy takes a heavy hit while they stand aloof, even though we will be fighting for their oil. The result will be more lost American jobs and a lower standard of living in this country.

Certainty No. 6, increased animosity against America in the entire Middle East, especially if we do bomb tens of thousands of Iraqis to their deaths.

Certainty No. 7, destabilization in the region. Iran and Syria, two countries with dangerous long-term ambitions in that region, will be immeasurably strengthened by our destroying Iraq. These two radical regimes will directly benefit from that policy. The moderate Arab governments, on the other hand, countries like Egypt, Jordan, Morocco and so forth will be put under huge political pressure from street demonstrations and other demonstrations.

Certainty No. 8, we will have to occupy Iraq after the war, assuming we win it, which I believe we would, and the more devastating the war the higher the cost of occupying Iraq.

I ask my colleagues and I ask all concerned, are all of those costs, and I have only listed eight of them, are all of those costs worth the desire that many have to go to war now rather than let other pressures, sanctions and economic pressures work?

I know it is psychologically satisfying, and I know we want to finish Saddam Hussein, but are we willing to bear these kinds of monumental costs for our society and the world and the region to satisfy that desire?

A few days ago William Webster, head of the CIA, testified that the mounting shortages caused by the sanctions were likely to shut down all of Iraq's energy-related and military industry by spring or as late as by summer. There is a risk that the sanctions will not work as rapidly as we want and that is possible. But they are inflicting a terrible cost on the Iraqi society, and they are weakening Iraq's warmaking capacity in case we eventually decide we do have to go to war. So why go to war now, my friends? Why undertake the staggering cost of war unless absolutely required?

I believe that the more intelligent, rational decision is for us to apply the sanctions, ratchet them up, stay the course, follow the initial Presidential policy and initial U.N. policy and vote for the Gephardt-Hamilton amendment.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. GRADISON].

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Speaker, this is a momentous and historic debate. I weigh my words not alone by how they will be viewed by my constituents today, but also by how they will be viewed by my grandchildren tomorrow.

The Congress has before it questions which will decide the course of American policy in the present crisis in the Persian Gulf. The immediate issue is the act of naked and unprovoked aggression committed by Iraq against Kuwait and the continuing brutal occupation of that country in clear violation of every standard and norm of international conduct and law. However, how the Congress treats these questions will also decisively influence the role the United States can be expected to fulfill in the future to meet threats to international peace and security that almost surely will come. The end of the cold war did not mean the end of history and the end of the cold war has surely not meant an end to the ambitions of tyrants.

I have listened intently to the debate which has taken place in this House. There is no question that oil and the strategic importance of Kuwait are both critical factors in the conflict between Iraq and Kuwait and in the concerted response of the international community to the events of August 2.

If there had been no effective international response to the invasion and annexation of Kuwait, Saddam Huseins hegemony in the region would have been guaranteed. This would have given Baghdad immediate and enormous leverage over OPEC production and pricing policy. This leverage would accrue not necessarily from further Iraqi conquests in the gulf, although they could not be ruled out, but merely from the threat such an outcome would represent to Saudi Arabia and the gulf states. The negative ramifications for the West and the global economy would be quite serious.

Yet, in the broader and more important context of international stability, the Iraqi invasion and annexation of Kuwait represents a grave threat. Iraq's regional ambitions and the character of its weapons program are well known. If the international community were to fail in opposing the wholesale erasure of a nation by a regional military power, the result, over the long-term, could well be chaos and anarchy with unpredictable consequences. If powerful states are encouraged to settle their disputes by force, peace cannot be secured.

Order, peace, and justice depend on adherence to law. This is no less true in the international arena than it is at home. For international law to have force, we must be prepared to defend it when it has been so egregiously violated. If the post-cold-war era is to hold a promise of order and peaceful change, the United States and the international community have little choice but to oppose Iraq. If we fail to reverse Iraq's aggression, when it clearly is in the strategic interest of the United States to do so, and when that aggression has done fundamental damage to accepted standards of international conduct and law, then where will we be willing to stand?

I believe that all members of this body accept this logic. The ends of American policy and the necessity to reverse Iraq's affront to human decency are not in question. We do have, however, an honest disagreement on the means which need to be employed and the extent to which the President should be given the necessary authority to deal with this crisis. That is democracy and this debate is in the best traditions of our republican form of government and the open society which we represent.

As for me, I have nothing but praise for the handling of this difficult crisis by the President. It has been measured and firm. At this critical juncture, I believe it would be most unwise for Congress to appear to restrict the President's ability to meet this challenge.

No one in this chamber wants war. The President does not want a war. Nevertheless, if the House votes out a resolution short of authorizing the President to use all necessary means to compel Iraq's withdrawal from Kuwait, in concert with our allies and in keeping with the resolutions of the United Nations Security Council, I believe it will strengthen the hand of Saddam Hussein and increase the chances of war.

Those who urge a continued reliance on sanctions alone to resolve this crisis and delay the immediacy of the military option have yet to demonstrate, to my satisfaction, that the policy will work. The Director of Central Intelligence has already indicated his view that the ability of Iraqi forces to defend Kuwait and southern Iraq is unlikely to be eroded substantially over the next 6 to 12 months even if effective sanctions can be maintained. There is little evidence to suggest that Saddam Hussein is politically threatened by the hardships imposed on Iraqi society by the current sanctions, or that he was, in any way, threatened by the hardships imposed by 8 years of war with Iran.

If history teaches one lesson it is that dictators only understand the language of force and the threat of force. Only a policy with credible diplomatic, economic, and military components, conducted in concert with the international community, can succeed. In my judgment, only the Michel-Solarz alternative can effectively maintain a credible policy against Iraq. The President must have the flexibility to deal with all contingencies. Diplomacy may yet succeed, and I sincerely hope and pray it does, but I believe it can only succeed if the President has that flexibility.

We are engaged today in a solemn debate in fulfillment of our constitutional responsibilities. The tension between any President and the Congress over the direction and conduct of foreign policy, and certainly over fundamental questions of war and peace, is as old as the Republic.

As the Constitution was being framed, the argument was over whether the country required a standing army and whether it might be a threat to democracy. The debate was resolved by giving the Congress the power to raise and maintain the military, and the power to declare war, and gave the President the responsibilities of Commander in Chief. Alexander Hamilton, in the 25th Federalist, argued in favor of these provisions noting that no nation could be put in a position where "we must receive the blow before we could even prepare to return it." He noted that even then formal declarations of war had fallen into disuse.

Much has been made of Congress' role in declaring war. On each occasion in this century when war was declared, a state of war already existed when Congress took up the essential question. The Congress in most, if not all, of the military actions in this century has acquiesced in the President's decision to wage war. Ultimately, Congress' power emanates from the power of the purse and Congress has already excluded the costs of Operation Desert Shield from budget deficit reduction targets. I raise this not to make light of our debate. Quite the contrary. Congress has already made critical decisions with regard to our policy in the Persian Gulf. Congress now has an opportunity to speak to the policy of this Nation at a critical juncture in history. Our judgment will reverberate for decades to come. We can choose a path which, in my judgment, best averts war or we can choose a path which may lead ultimately and irrevocably to conflict.

Since the first deployments of American forces to Saudi Arabia in August to assist in the defense of that nation against attack by Iraq, American forces have been in harm's way. War has been a possibility ever since the first Iraqi tank rumbled across the Kuwaiti border. This, in the end, is a question of judgment. I find myself in agreement with the Washington Post which wrote this morning that "Congress, by deciding to authorize the President to conduct war, materially improves his chances of achieving peace. It is a risk, and we would take it." I submit, Mr. Speaker, to my colleagues that it is a risk this House should take.

□ 1550

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ROWLAND].

Mr. ROWLAND. Mr. Speaker, shortly after Saddam Hussein launched his invasion of Kuwait, I visited Turkey to discuss issues relating to trade, health, and NATO. Naturally, my conservations with governmental leaders also focused on the crisis created by Hussein's ill-conceived aggression.

Turkey borders Iraq, of course. And the Turkish Government has a very informed and realistic view of Iraq and the Hussein regime. Based on our talks, I became convinced that Hussein had no intention of stopping with Kuwait. If the United States had not responded quickly and dramatically, there is little doubt in my mind that Hussein would have continued to try to militarily expand his influence and control over the region and, in fact, over much of the world.

Fortunately, President Bush moved quickly. His containment policy was the correct policy. Few of us would disagree with that. It was certainly consistent with the Carter doctrine, which has been reaffirmed by Presidents Reagan and Bush.

Unless Hussein is evicted from Kuwait, I believe he will resume his policy of aggression. Hussein now controls 21 percent of the world's oil reserves. If he gained control over other neighboring countries, he could control up to 62 percent of the reserves. He could then control the economic lifeline of much of the world and cripple the military capability of our own country and other countries of the free world. The issue is not just oil. The issue is Hussein's potential for creating economic and military destruction throughout the world.

It is therefore imperative for the allied forces to prove that aggression in the Middle East will not be allowed to stand.

Many people in the area of Georgia that I represent believe we should give sanctions more time. If sanctions and other diplomatic pressures could eventually succeed, that is certainly the preferable course. It goes without saying that we should do everything possible to avoid war.

A few weeks ago, I was more optimistic about sanctions. Historically, economic pressures have sometimes produced positive results. Unfortunately, I am much less optimistic today. Based on what I learned from Turkish leaders and more recently from former Iraqi hostages and a number of informed sources available to Congress, I do not believe the sanctions are currently ef-

fective enough to influence Hussein. And they may never be.

Mr. Speaker, I support the Solarz-Michel resolution because it gives the President the authority to continue to a pursue a peaceful solution from a position of strength. it is not carte blanche authority to wage war. It authorizes offensive military action only if every reasonable opportunity to achieve a peaceful solution is exhausted. That is a solemn part of this Congressional mandate.

New peace initiatives are underway and we all pray they succeed. Under the Solarz-Michel resolution, giving the President our backing will help them succeed.

If the crisis drags on, however, we have to ask whether time is on Hussein's side. If Hussein's position were strengthened by a prolonged stalemate as the President thinks could happen, and this encouraged Hussein to resume his efforts to expand, the allied forces could eventually pay an even higher price in lives and resources. Failure to be forceful enough now could lead to more severe consequences later on. Under the circumstances that now exist, I do not believe Congress should deny the President the options he needs to help achieve the U.N. mandates.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. LENT].

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, events across the globe cause us to gather here today to literally determine the course of human history. For what Congress does today serves as a message to not only Saddam Hussein, but to the world: A message that demonstrates our concern as Americans, our commitment as individuals, and our resolve as a people.

On August 2, 1990, the forces of Saddam Hussein unilaterally and without provocation invaded and plundered the sovereign nation of Kuwait. Subsequent reports have outlined in graphic detail the unspeakable horrors that have been visited upon Hussein's opposition, including the killing, rape, and torture of innocent civilians.

Outraged by this flagrant disregard of the tenets of human decency and of international law, the United Nations, at the urging of President Bush, condemned Hussein's actions and ordered that he withdraw his troops by January 15, just 5 days from now. In addition, they ordered an international force to Saudi Arabia and sanctioned the use of military might in the event that Hussein disregarded the United Nations resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the world stands in condemnation of Saddam Hussein. We are joined by the nations of the world, both East and West, rich and poor, Moslem, Jewish, and Christian, in our goal of the restoration of stability to this troubled region of the world.

President Bush deserves our gratitude for his leadership in bringing together the coalition that exists against Hussein. For 5 months, the President has established in clear and concise terms the path to peace: Hussein must withdraw completely from Kuwait. It is now up to the Congress to add our voice in support of our President and the rights of all individuals who look to us for freedom.

The actions we take today and tomorrow will demonstrate America's willingness to act against aggressors who attempt to enforce through military might what they cannot achieve through the political process.

Our actions will indicate whether we as a people have shed the myopic view that blinded our foreign policy in the 1960's and 1970's. We have it within our power today to reaffirm to the world that America and Americans will not return to the days of malaise and that we are willing to take any and all actions needed to protect our interests.

Our brief post-cold-war experience has proven that America must be vigilant in protecting its freedom, not merely by looking toward the Soviet Union, but at other threats to our security as well. The world community has spoken with one voice: Hussein must be stopped now, for to do so later would be at a tremendous cost in the lives and freedom of countless thousands of people.

Once before in our Nation's history we witnessed the actions of one man who sought to impose his will on weaker neighbors. I can recall, as a boy, when America stood idly by while first the Sudetenland and then the sovereign nations of Austria, Czechoslovakia, and Poland simply ceased to exist. We tried to deceive ourselves with the belief that by negotiating with Hitler, peace was at hand. After a World War that resulted in the death of millions of men and women both on and off the battlefield, we vowed that never again would we allow such circumstances to repeat themselves.

Today, some 50 years later, we face a new set of problems, but we may still learn from history. The time has come to fulfill the pledge our Nation made at San Francisco to preserve the world order. I urge my colleagues in the House to stand together with the President, not as Republicans or Democrats, but as Americans, in enforcing the U.N. resolution. Saddam Hussein must be stopped now, before it is too late.

Mr. Speaker, I, therefore, urge passage of the Michel-Solarz joint resolution that President Bush has endorsed.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS].

Mr. OWENS of New York. Mr. Speaker, let us make no mistake about what we are debating here. The President will interpret passage of the Solarz-Michel resolution as a mandate to attack. The President has told us that we must join him in his rush to war, because the United Nations has endorsed such a mandate already. We are told not to second-guess the decision of the United Nations.

But the United Nations was wrong. They should not have set a date. You can have the option of the use of force without setting such a date.

The costs in human terms of a war with Iraq are terrible to contemplate. They are so terrible, in fact, that the Pentagon has refused to make any estimate at all of the potential American casualties in such a conflict. Other experts such as Jack Anderson, citing Pentagon sources, have estimated that 30,000 Americans will be killed in the first 20 days of the war.

Disproportionate numbers of those who will be slaughtered in the desert will be African-Americans. Nearly one-third of our soldiers in Operation Desert Shield are African-Americans, many of them with families in districts like mine, the 12th Congressional District of Brooklyn. My district is the 10th poorest district in the Nation. My district has the second-largest number of African-Americans.

Young African-American men and women are three times more likely to be in the Armed Forces and involved in this impending war in the sand as young whites are. There is a reason for this. When people cannot get jobs, they find the Army and the Navy and the other military units to be an opportunity to be utilized.

There are many very bright young people who never look for jobs, but who are recruited from high school and told that "You can go to college after you go through the military and get those advantages," and there are quite a few African-Americans who are officers. Quite a number are officers who are African-American men and women who went to military academies or they used the benefits of the ROTC as the only way they could make it.

□ 1600

For this reason, we have this disproportionate number. These are the same people who are penalized when President Bush refuses to pass a civil rights bill because it has a quota. He claims there is a quota. There is some kind of ugly reverse quota operating when one-third of the troops on the front line are poor and African-American.

Mr. Speaker, the Vietnam War Memorial is a magnificent monument because it makes war a personal matter, and I think our decisionmaking should be considered to be very personal. Never again should we erect monuments with the Tombs of Unknown Soldiers. Dead heroes should not remain unknown. One by one, we should know their names. This is what the Vietnam Memorial does. All American

generals, and I think perhaps all the Congressmen, Senators, and other officials who make life and death decisions, should be required to spend some time each year reading some of the names on the Vietnam monument. It is a pity that only the dead are listed. There are many, many more who should also be there. They should also list the names of the wounded, the amputees, and those who were driven mad by the horrors of combat.

Our men and women on the front lines in Iraq also have names. They have families. They have hopes and dreams. From my district there is a high percentage on the front lines, numbers as high as any one of the 435 districts. Here are some of their names: Anna Marie Robinson, who enlisted in the Army Reserve 5 years ago because the money was needed to help pay her tuition to get a master's degree at Hunter College; Stanley Arjune; Andrew Edmondson; Anthony Griffith, the brother of Michael Griffith, who was killed when a racist mob chased him in front of a car at Howard Beach a few years ago. These are living human beings. These are living human beings I value highly. I believe I am supporting them when I vote against giving the President a mandate to attack Iraq. I am standing solidly behind those on the front lines. They are in the military now and will do their duties. African-Americans are loyal, and as patriotic as any Americans. I am voting against a mandate to go to war, a mandate to attack, because I do not want to see the bravery, the loyalty, and the dedication of these soldiers trashed. We should not be casual and nonchalant about risking human lives. Only as a very last resort, after all other means have clearly failed, should we contemplate the use of force. Every life must be given only for the highest cause, and only as a last resort. Every human being is sacred. Every life is sacred. Certainly the lives of all of our soldiers on the front line are sacred.

The time has come for every Member of Congress to think in these personal terms. We have a personal responsibility. We are decisionmakers in the most powerful country in the world. We have a personal responsibility in this particular conflict, for each death and each casualty. Each Member of Congress must vote his or her conscience. We heard that clearly. This is not a partisan issue. I wish it were. I wish the Democratic Party would take a clear stance. That is not the case. My conscience tells me that to go to war at this time would be monumentally irresponsible. To go to war is squandering human lives. My conscience tells me that if I vote for all of this unnecessary killing, this mass murder, I become an accessory to murder.

I vote yes for the continuation of sanctions. I vote yes on reaffirming the fact that only Congress has the right to declare war. I vote no on going to the President with a mandate to attack.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the vice chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON].

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I support House Joint Resolution 62.

Mr. Speaker, I support bipartisan joint resolution House Joint Resolution 62. This will be the most significant vote I will have cast during my 24-year tenure in the Congress. It explicitly authorizes use of force by the United States to implement U.N. Security Council resolutions concerning Iraq's invasion of Kuwait.

The President is carrying as heavy a burden as has any modern Commander in Chief. It is time for the Congress to play its role in going on record sending the clearest possible message to Saddam Hussein that he must withdraw without condition or delay from Kuwait. It's late in the day but there may still be time to back up the U.N. Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar's effort to communicate our position to Saddam Hussein.

Such a message from the Congress would help dispel any belief that may exist in the minds of Iraq's leader that the United States lacks the necessary unity to act decisively in response to Iraq's continued aggression.

It is now clear that sanctions will not achieve the withdrawal of Iraq from the occupied nation of Kuwait.

The joint resolution I support and have cosponsored:

Requires the President to make determination, prior to committing U.S. forces to battle, that the United States has used all appropriate diplomatic and other peaceful means to obtain Iraq's compliance with U.N. Security Council resolutions, and to report to Congress the basis for that determination;

Places no limitation on deployment of U.S. forces or the use of force; supersedes 60-day clock provisions of the war powers resolution (section 5(B)) by constituting express congressional authorization for use of force; and

Requires the President to continue to report to the Congress at least once every 60 days on the administration's efforts to obtain Iraq's compliance with the U.N. Security Council resolutions.

This joint resolution is bipartisan, having many Republican and Democrat sponsors.

Mr. Speaker, everyone in this House knows that the Constitution states both that "Congress shall have the power to declare war" and that "the President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy." Exactly who has the authority to order U.S. troops into battle and under what condition remains one of the most hotly contested questions of constitutional law. Congress in the past and also today consistently maintains that we alone retain the power to declare war. I would note that the Congress has only declared war five times in contrast to the hundreds of times the President has ordered military action.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that if the President had not immediately reacted to Saddam Hussein's barbaric invasion of Kuwait, then Iraqi forces would have moved on into Saudi Arabia. Seventy percent of the world's oil reserves underlie Iraq, Kuwait, and Saudi Arabia. Iraq has only 10 percent. If President Bush had not moved immediately both militarily and diplomatically, then Hussein could have been allowed to control those reserves. He could have fixed world oil prices, which likely would have soared to a doubling of even today's price, causing economic chaos and probably depression worldwide. The huge infusion of cash generated by such a monopoly would have allowed Hussein to further expand his military arsenal including his development of nuclear warheads and his delivery capability of those as well as chemical weapons.

If Hussein had grabbed Saudi Arabia, that would have been only the beginning of his territorial ambition. The further instability of the Middle East region affects the stability of Europe and in fact the entire world.

President Bush has moved with skill and promptness in coordinating and leading supporting actions from other nations of the world through the legal auspices of the United Nations. They were almost unanimous in their endorsement of removing Iraq from the invaded member of the United Nations, Kuwait, by whatever force is necessary. House Joint Resolution 62 says that Congress joins them and supports our country's endorsement of the U.N. Security Council Resolution 678.

There are now forces in the Persian Gulf from 27 other countries. Some are admittedly only token in size, but represent a major commitment from some of the smaller countries. But the Saudis, the Egyptians, the British, the French, and Syria are there with substantial forces.

In fiscal year 1990 75 percent of the incremental costs of the military action in the gulf have been covered by countries other than the United States. As to forces, the United States and allies as of today have around 600,000 men and women in the region—350,000 U.S. and 250,000 allied.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for us in this Congress to send a signal to Hussein that the legislative branch of our democracy can act forcefully and resolutely join the rest of the world in a solid commitment that would ensure that capture and rape of a free sovereign nation will not be tolerated.

Mr. Speaker, the passage of House Joint Resolution 62 moves in the right direction to assure our children and theirs that they will inherit a better and more peaceful world.

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Joint Resolution 62.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress of the United States should take advantage of this historic opportunity to show its strong support for President Bush's efforts to reverse the brutal invasion of Kuwait. The President has demonstrated extraordinary skill in gathering an unprecedented international coalition condemning Iraq, instituting economic sanctions, and assembling a multinational military force

to take action if necessary to implement U.N. Resolution 678.

Diplomatic efforts to persuade Iraq to withdraw began immediately after the invasion, but Saddam Hussein has repeatedly refused every diplomatic initiative. Economic sanctions given time, will hurt the women, children, and elderly of Iraq, but will not force Hussein to withdraw from Kuwait. Further delay will only allow Hussein time to conserve his military resources, fortify his position in Kuwait, and make it much harder to force him out sometime down the road.

It is clearly in the interest of the nations of the world to force Iraq to leave Kuwait. In today's world, civilized countries cannot allow a ruthless terrorist to dismantle a sovereign nation to capture the latter's resources, and threaten other countries in the region. The threat of massive destruction or terrorist attack through Hussein's manufacture and use of chemical weapons, long-range missiles, and the potential development of nuclear weapons should not be tolerated by the nations of the world.

This conflict is not between Iraq and the United States. It is between Iraq and the world. There could be no clearer demonstration of the strong international political front opposing Hussein than the U.N. resolution, calling for the use of all necessary means to force Iraq out of Kuwait. Over 20 nations have sent troops to the Persian Gulf, amounting to nearly one-half the total multinational force opposing Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I fervently hope and pray that President Bush's extensive diplomatic efforts will lead to Hussein's immediate peaceful withdrawal from Kuwait. However, I also believe that Congress should confirm the President's prerogative to authorize military action to force compliance with U.N. Resolution 678, and restore Kuwait as a sovereign nation.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I approach the well today with a feeling of irony. This is one of the most important occasions that I have ever risen to speak, and here I am suffering through a bout of laryngitis.

It is also ironic that the United States managed to prevail upon its friends and allies in the Security Council of the United Nations to support a series of resolutions over which the U.S. Congress is now so divided.

Congress is actually debating whether it should support a series of resolutions that it forged, with a lot of effort, in the U.N. Security Council. What an irony.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder what our allies around the world would think; I wonder what our credibility would be? I wonder what we could expect from our allies in the future if after the United States implores them, to go on record in support of a particular position the Congress turns its back and votes to the contrary. Where would our leadership be? Where would our credibility be? The possibilities boggle the mind.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot said about sanctions. We are told that sanctions will work, just hold on. I wonder if any Member remembers Rhodesia, a country which had sanctions imposed on it and whose government stayed in power for years. Mr. Speaker, the sanctions will not work. Rhetoric will not work. What we need is an affirmative vote on the bipartisan Michel-Solarz resolution.

Mr. Speaker, contrary to much of the rhetoric we've been hearing during this debate, this is really not a decision about war. What we are debating, and what we will be voting on tomorrow, is whether or not this House is going to allow President Bush and the international coalition he has lined up against Iraq, to credibly threaten the use of military force if necessary. The President and our allies may never exercise the military option—everyone in this Chamber hopes this is the case. However, if we have any hope for a diplomatic settlement in the days and week ahead, Congress has no choice but to support the President and authorize him to use force, pursuant to U.N. Resolution 678. Neither diplomacy nor sanctions will coerce Hussein to leave Kuwait if Congress equivocates on the military option. The Hamilton resolution equivocates, the Solarz-Michel resolution does not.

We all want the use of military force to be a last resort, the President as much as any of us I imagine. I believe, however, that we are fast approaching last resort time in this crisis. After months of discussion, trips to the Persian Gulf, and an intensive series of hearings in the Armed Services Committee last month, I am convinced that sanctions will not compel Hussein to withdraw from Kuwait. I agree with Chairman ASPIN's assessment that diplomacy, not sanctions, provide the best chance of securing a peaceful solution to this crisis. President Bush, the United Nations, the European Community, the Arab world have relentlessly pursued diplomacy for months, only to be rejected by Saddam Hussein. If the outcome of this week's Baker-Aziz meeting is any indication, Hussein has not been convinced, through diplomacy, to retreat from Kuwait.

I, along with President Bush, still believe that there is hope for a diplomatic solution. This is true, however, only if the threat of military force is real. The only way that the House can help to assure that the threat of military force remains credible is to adopt the bipartisan Solarz-Michel resolution. Nothing less will do.

It will be a sad day for this institution if it cannot muster the courage to support President Bush and the United Nations. More importantly, not supporting the President at this critical juncture will undermine the very thing we all want—a peaceful solution.

The Solarz-Michel resolution is, indeed, the last, best hope we have for peace.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN].

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, in the spirit of comity, this gentleman is happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN].

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, the greatest and saddest irony of this war, should it occur, is that it never have been fought. Had a vigilant world leadership, had a sensible American policy taken note of the obvious—that a dangerous dictator, a bloodthirsty tyrant, ruling Iraq by police state methods was pursuing a policy of aggression and domination—American lives would not now be at risk. We would not be undertaking this momentous debate.

After 6 hours of discussion with Iraqi Foreign Minister Tariq Aziz, Secretary Baker went to great lengths to point out that Saddam Hussein miscalculated every step of the way in judging the American and world response. Yes, Mr. Secretary, he did miscalculate, and how understandable that miscalculation was.

Let us look at the history: When Abu Nidal was masterminding terrorist bombings and assassination attempts in Europe and throughout the Middle East, and Abu Ibrahim was planting suitcase bombs while headquartered in Baghdad, both using Iraqi passports and Iraqi diplomatic pouches, the Reagan administration removed Iraq from the list of countries supporting terrorism, and vigorously opposed my efforts and other efforts to restore them to that list. When Abul Abbas, the organizer of the *Achille Lauro* hijacking was given sanctuary in Baghdad, we still could not convince the administration to reverse course.

The Reagan-Bush administration encouraged the French to supply arms to the Iraqis during the Iraq-Iran War, even as we claimed to adhere to our own arms embargo during that war. The Reagan-Bush administration, pursuing policies continued by President Bush, licensed computers, helicopters, other sophisticated technology and equipment with a clear military capability, all the time successfully resisting congressional efforts to ban the sale of dual-use equipment to Iraq. When Iraq initiated the use of chemical weapons in its war with Iran, our protests were perfunctory and pro forma.

After the cease-fire, Saddam ordered chemical weapons attacks on Kurdish cities, killing at least 5,000 Iraqi citizens. Once again, the Reagan administration issued a rebuke and spent the rest of its time fighting congressional efforts to sanction Iraq for that barbarous conduct. To Congress' shame, the 100th Congress adjourned without acting. The Bush administration continued its opposition to Iraq-specific sanctions.

□ 1610

Less than a year ago, in the face of abundant evidence of illegal Iraqi smuggling of nuclear technology, heightened concern about Iraq's ballistic missile program, the return of terrorist operations to Baghdad, threats to destroy half of Israel, threats against Israel, the Bush administration fought relentlessly against efforts to deny Iraq dual-use equipment, export-import banks subsidies, agricultural commodity credits, and IMF loans.

Our shameful pre-August 2 policy culminated in our Ambassador's disgraceful meeting with Saddam several days before the Iraqi invasion, the sum and substance of which, consistent with previous administration policy, was to signal our acquiescence in Iraq's invasion of Kuwait.

But we cannot turn the clock back. We cannot start again. We cannot base our vote on this issue on recriminations, on anger over these half-baked, ill-founded policies. Policy must proceed from its past mistakes. We cannot make this judgment on the fact that the American people in the last three Presidental elections have elected administrations that have had no interest in aggressively pursuing alternative energy sources and creating an energy-independent America. We cannot vote on the basis of our anger at those failures.

Policy must proceed from its past mistakes, though from time to time it would be well to learn from them.

We do not authorize this war in the abstract. We do so only in reference to our assessment of war's ultimate aims and the strategy undertaken to achieve these aims.

It is characteristic of real life that we cannot always select from which options we may choose in these important matters.

The President and his administration have issued war aims like so much buckshot. Is it our purpose to defeat aggressors wherever and whenever they appear, to restore monarchies, to control oil prices, to contain proliferation, to protect jobs? I reject some of these aims.

Yet I support authorization of offensive action against Iraq and I do so for two pre-eminent reasons. First, I think if we do not now confront Saddam Hussein, he will govern the Middle East region in a way that requires us to confront him later as a nuclear power at a much greater human cost.

I do not think it is necessary to exaggerate the imminence of Saddam Hussein's nuclear capability, as some have done. It will not materialize in one year, but we must assume its existence in 5 years or 10 years.

He has five ballistic missile programs, missiles that can hit Europe. He is working on missiles that can cross oceans. His growing chemical weapons' capability is known to all now; he has an active biological weapons program—these are fierce enough threats to warrant our immediate concern.

There is a second reason. This resolution, the Solarz-Michel resolution, authorizing the President to go to war with Iraq, offers the greatest proof to Saddam Hussein that his only rational option is to do what is necessary to reach accommodation with the rest of the world.

I cannot define by my vote what choice will be made as to which war aims to pursue. For me, Kuwait is not the main issue. Vital American interests are not at stake there to the point I would risk American lives. Yet because I believe the elimination of the worst of Iraq's offensive capabilities will be among those aims the Bush administration will pursue, I think offensive action is justified by reference only to this American interest.

While I cannot myself constrain the real consequence of this authorization, I do wish to convey to this administration one thing for which I do not think it is worth the spilling of American blood, and that is the immediate liberation of Kuwait. That is an end to be desired, but one which must be weighed carefully against its cost. This is not due principally to the nature of that regime. Aggression and invasion are wrong.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OBEY). The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 20 additional seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. BERMAN. Just to close, Mr. Speaker, I do want to leave with the point that notwithstanding the situation in Kuwait, the problem of Saddam's intentions remain. Its brutality, its belligerence, its misjudgment warrant the immediate attention of the world. It has the seventh largest army in the world and it is on the move. It is in our interests and it is our responsibility to confront the aggression of Saddam Hussein.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to my colleague, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and for his leadership on this important issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Hamilton-Gephardt resolution and in opposition to the Solarz-Michel declaration of war.

Before making a decision of such import, a decision on which hang the lives of thousands of Americans, we have the responsibility to ask, why should they die? What are the broader objectives of this decision?

In the course of this debate today, and in fact up until the last speaker, we have heard a variety of objectives. The previous speaker, the gentleman from California, said Kuwait was not enough reason to go in, but taking out the potential nuclear capability of Hussein was, and earlier this morning we heard those proponents of the declaration of war saying we definitely were not going into Iraq.

Have we thought this through? Should we rush into a major war with such a scandalous and astounding lack of goals and direction?

This Nation should never wage war over an illusory policy. Rather, if war is to be our decision, its objectives must be clear, consistent, and widely supportable. They are not.

How did we get to this point? How did we get to the threshold of war?

Others have referred to Secretary Baker's remarks. He said that Hussein made several miscalculations. One was that Hussein miscalculated the reaction of the world community. Perhaps Hussein was led to that false impression by the statement of the U.S. Ambassador to Iraq when, days before the invasion, she said to Hussein, "America has no defense treaty with Kuwait." Maybe Hussein got that false impression when the administration fought against sanctions against Iraq days before the invasion.

It is encouraging now today to hear our colleagues referring to Hussein's human rights violations in Kuwait; but we were all aware of Hussein's human rights violations in Iraq where, among other atrocities, he used poison gas against the Kurds in his own country long before the invasion of Kuwait.

This point was stated so eloquently by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUSSO] earlier. Mr. RUSSO has been a champion of human rights throughout the world.

Through his behavior in Kuwait, Hussein has place himself outside the circle of civilized human behavior, and he must be stopped; but he should have been condemned long ago and perhaps then he might not have miscalculated in the way Secretary Baker suggested.

And so because of the failure of our foreign policy vis-a-vis Iraq and because of the failure of diplomacy of which our country shares some blame, we are now faced with the ultimate failure, war and its deadly consequences.

Make no mistake, this is no police action. This is total war at its most devastating, made ever more horrible because it would become a holy war, a Jihad.

And if we win, what will we have won? The further destabilization of the Middle East? The destruction of our fragile national economy? Another generation of debilitating debt?

Secretary Baker has called this a defining moment in history. It is a defining moment, and I hope we define the future as one with peace based on détente, rather than peace based on mobilization and the use of force.

We heard this morning in some of the debate that we have to go to war now because we are there. If we had not gone there, we might not have to go to war, but we must because we are there.

For those who do not have the patience for peaceful resolution of conflict, I again ask, what if we win?

We were told that we must go to war to insure the stability of the region. Can anyone who supports Solarz-Michel guarantee that war will insure stability, or will it lead to further chaos in that region?

To those who wish to declare war, I ask, is it a good idea for us to go further in debt to our economy competitors in order to protect the oil they use?

I believe that our great country is strong enough to be patient, strong enough to seek other paths than this dark, dark passage that now lies so ominously ahead for our country and for the world.

□ 1620

As we seek to find a better solution to these problems, I urge my colleagues to support the Hamilton-Gephardt resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the poet Shelley once wrote that, "The greatest force for moral good is imagination." This is especially true when it comes to the moral good of avoiding war.

We must draw upon our intellect and our moral strength to find a way to maintain peace without the use of force.

This last Sunday night in San Francisco over 6,000 people jammed and overflowed the Roman Catholic Cathedral of Mary Our Queen to pray for peace, to pray for the President, to pray for the Congress, to pray for each and every one of us that we may find a peaceful settlement to this situation.

It was a beautiful sight. I bring before the Congress thousands of resolutions from those people for a peaceful solution, a settlement based on imagination, intellect, and strength.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OBEY). The Chair would point out to our guests in the gallery that it is specifically against the rules of the House for anyone to manifest support or opposition to any action taken by the House.

The rules will be enforced, and persons who do not choose to follow the rules will be removed.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY].

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, we have been debating for many hours now and I believe all the arguments whether or not we should support the President in using all necessary means to drive Iraq out of Kuwait have been heard. I'm sure we could go on for days or even weeks debating, because this is not an issue to be taken lightly. It is, in fact, probably the most important vote most of us will make while we are in Congress. But, the talking must stop and the decisions must be made because we have a deadline of January 15.

Now some say, "Why hurry? The deadline isn't important." However, I think there are good reasons to hurry.

The longer we wait, the longer our young men and women will have to sit in the desert knowing Iraqi forces are digging in deeper, amassing their forces and becoming more prepared to put at jeopardy the lives of our people in the region. We can't allow this to happen. In addition if we hesitate too long there may be no Kuwait to liberate.

Oh, how I wish I could believe that more diplomacy or sanctions would work. We have done everything possible diplomatically, and have made no progress. Most agree that sanctions will not achieve the goal of making Hussein go home and leave his neighbor alone. We have all seen the letter from William Webster which states economic sanctions won't stop Suddam Hussein even if they are in effect for a year or more. The truth of the matter is, sanctions will hurt the innocent citizens of Iraq and the Iraq economy, but will not do the job.

We have also seen the report by the most respected human rights organization in the world, Amnesty International. The report has incident after incident of brutal inhumane torture and the systematic killings of hundreds perhaps thousands of Kuwaiti citizens, including women and children. Some of the vicious torture methods used include pulling out finger and toenails, cutting off the tongue and ears, hammering nails into hands and beating the soles of the feet until they split open and swell. Most are too gruesome to mention, and the atrocities go on and on.

Just yesterday I visited with an American who was in Kuwait at the time of the attack and has been hiding out in Kuwait City for 6 months. He told of what a horrifying experience the Iraqi invasion was. He returned to the United States just several weeks ago, and related the account of his witnessing an entire Kuwaiti family who lived next door to him being executed in the frontyard of their home for hiding a westerner. He then collected the bodies and helped to wash, dress, and prepare them for burial. This is just one eye witness example of the systematic pillaging and terror going on in Kuwait. He also said the sanctions aren't working, smuggling is rampant, the blockade is leaking like a sieve and that the only way to get Iraq out is to use force.

I wish that sanctions would work or that we could come to a peaceful diplomatic solution, but a deadline was set by the United Nations and unless there is a last minute change on Hussein's part, then we must act with our allies and the coalition countries. The longer we sit the less prepared and ready our troops become and greater losses could be inflicted. We can't give Saddam Hussein a signal of divisiveness by Congress. We must unite behind the President. I strongly urge my colleagues to support the Solarz-Michel resolution and support our troops in the gulf and stop this madman now.

To do less is to dishonor our country and the cause of freedom in the Middle East and around the world.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I take this time so that I may insert in the RECORD a letter which has been referred to me from Judge Webster, head of the Central Intelligence Agency.

Mr. Speaker, since the brutual invasion of Kuwait by Iraq in August, the world has watched and waited and acted, hoping against hope, that further war in the area and attendant bloodshed, could be avoided.

The United Nations Security Council has passed 12 resolutions condemning Saddam Hussein's grisly activities and calling for him to remove himself and his troops from Kuwait. As a matter of fact, the United Nations has sanctioned the use of all necessary force if he does not quit Kuwait by the 15th of this month.

We in Congress, at this point, are being called upon to deal with a number of resolutions concerning the situation to include authorizing the use of force on our part in support of the U.N. resolutions if, in fact, Saddam Hussein does not quit Kuwait by January 15. For my own part, I wish the Congress would have been called upon earlier to speak, rather than now, because an overwhelming endorsement of U.S. resolutions weeks ago might well have brought more pressure on Suddam Hussein to understand that America and her allies do have the resolve to evict him from Kuwait by force, if necessary.

I have heard many of my colleagues on the radio, seen them on television and read their comments in the various papers professing their total opposition to war. I suppose that is most commendable. I would hasten to add, however, that I know of no one serving in Congress who is actually in favor of war, and there are very few in this country who would favor war. Frankly, anyone who would find war anything other than the last alternative, in my opinion, requires psychiatric help.

I have heard many of my colleagues and others search for plausible alternatives to giving President Bush the authority to use force, if necessary, in removing Hussein and his marauding troops from Kuwait. As a matter of fact, there is a good percentage of the American public who feel that somehow, if we wait a little longer, the sanctions, in and of themselves, will do the trick. I would also observe that such an argument is also politically the line of least resistance for the present, but, in my opinion, that reasoning is little more than wishful thinking. My opinion from the outset in this situation has been that no way will sanctions, in and of themselves, begin to cause Saddam Hussein to pull out of Kuwait much less pay reparations, or return the legitimate government to power or, as a few have even suggested, cause Suddam Hussein to see the error of his ways and terminate further development of chemical and biological weapons and the means of delivery or to cease his headlong efforts to produce nuclear weapons. As we debate here, not as a matter of rumor or guess, but as a matter of fact, he continues to produce more chemical weapons and the ability to deliver those weapons of mass destruction.

The sanctions and the embargo have been in place for five months now, and to my way of thinking, it has been more successful than I would have guessed. There are indications, however, that the embargo is starting to leak, and I would think it would leak further. Even if it were air tight, my friends, it is not going to cause Hussein to change.

To suggest that the United States and our allies should sit tight is to give Saddam Hussein just what he wants; time to consolidate and to chip away at the resolve of the United States and her allies, which is, as I said back

in September, a big question in Saddam Hussein's mind. And rightfully so, as allied resolve and, in particular, American resolve, is not given much weight in that area of the world, or other areas of the world for that matter.

I have felt, and perhaps others have felt, that the best possibility for a peaceful resolution and rollback of this horrendous and internationally condemned plunder of Kuwait would be not only the use of sanctions, but the political alignment of the civilized world to exert political pressure on Suddam Hussein. That political alignment, incidentally, has been successful beyond any expectations. But that must be combined with a completely credible military force of such magnitude that Suddam Hussein would know, that if unleashed, could force him out of Kuwait and, in fact, destroy his considerable military might. Such a force has been assembled, but the question in Hussein's mind, and a legitimate question, given the debate, is whether we have the resolve to use that force with international approval to remove him from Kuwait. I agree with my colleagues. No one wants war and, in particular, those who have experienced its horrors. But, in my opinion, the surest way to ensure such a war, and perhaps down the line, against more sophisticated weapons of mass destruction, including nuclear capability, is to send mixed signals around the world from Washington, DC and to deny the President the option of force as he walks mile after mile down the road seeking a peaceful and diplomatic solution which must absolutely require Suddam Hussein's removal from Kuwait.

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY,
Washington, DC, January 10, 1991.

Hon. LES ASPIN,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your letter of January 9, 1991, in which you ask for an updated assessment of the impact of sanctions on Iraq and on the policies of Saddam Hussein subsequent to my testimony before your committee in December. In that testimony, as you accurately noted, I observed that the sanctions were effective technically and that they were being felt economically and eventually would be felt militarily in some areas. I also testified that there was no evidence that sanctions would mandate a change in Saddam Hussein's behavior and that there was no evidence when or even if they would force him out of Kuwait.

You now ask me to: (1) address the impact of the sanctions on the economy and populace of Iraq on the operational effectiveness of its military if left in place for another six to 12 months; (2) address the question of how Iraq's defensive abilities might be affected by the sanctions on the one hand and by having additional time to prepare on the other if sanctions are allowed to work for another six to 12 months; and (3) address the likelihood that sanctions, again if left in place for another six to 12 months, could induce Iraq to withdraw from Kuwait.

UN sanctions have shut off nearly all Iraq's trade and financial activity and weakened its economy, but disruptions in most sectors are not serious yet. The impact of sanctions has varied by sector. The most serious impact so far has been on the financial sector, where hard currency shortages have led Baghdad to take a variety of unusual steps to conserve or raise even small amounts of foreign exchange. For the populace, the most serious impact has been inflation.

The ability of the Iraqi ground forces to defend Kuwait and southern Iraq is unlikely to be substantially eroded over the next six to twelve months even if effective sanctions can be maintained. This is especially true if Iraq does not believe a coalition attack is likely during this period. Iraq's infantry and artillery forces—the key elements of Iraq's initial defense—probably would not suffer significantly as a result of sanctions. Iraq can easily maintain the relatively simple Soviet-style weaponry of its infantry and artillery units and can produce virtually all of the ammunition for these forces domestically. Moreover, these forces will have additional opportunity to extend and reinforce their fortifications along the Saudi border, thereby increasing their defensive strength. Iraq's armored and mechanized forces will be degraded somewhat from continued sanctions. The number of inoperable Iraqi armored and other vehicles will grow gradually and the readiness of their crews will decline as Baghdad is forced to curb its training activities. Iraq has large stocks of spare parts and other supplies, however, which will ameliorate the effect of these problems. On balance, the marginal decline of combat power in Baghdad's armored units probably would be offset by the simultaneous improvement of its defensive fortifications. While the military, especially the army, has been protected from the impact of sanctions by stockpiling and minimal usage, during a military action the impact would be more profound as equipment and needed parts are expended.

Iraq's Air Force and air defenses are likely to be hit far more severely than its Army, if effective sanctions are maintained for another six to tweleve months. This degradation will diminish Iraq's ability to defend its strategic assets from air attack and reduce its ability to conduct similar attacks on its neighbors. It would have only a marginal impact on Saddam's ability to hold Kuwait and southern Iraq. The Iraqi Air Force is not likely to play a major role in any battle for Kuwait.

In December, during my appearance before the House Armed Services Committee, I noted that while we can look ahead several months and predict the gradual deterioration of the Iraqi economy, it is more difficult to assess how or when these conditions will cause Saddam to modify his behavior. Our judgment remains that, even if sanctions continue to be enforced for an additional six to 12 months, economic hardship alone is unlikely to compel Saddam to retreat from Kuwait or cause regime-threatening popular discontent in Iraq. The economic impact of sanctions is likely to be increasingly serious, with conspicuous hardships and dislocations. Nevertheless, Saddam currently appears willing to accept even a subsistence economy in a continued attempt to outlast the international resolve to maintain the sanctions, especially if the threat of war recedes significantly. He probably continues to believe that Iraq can endure sanctions longer than the international coalition will hold and hopes that avoiding war will buy him time to negotiate a settlement more favorable to him.

We have seen little hard evidence to suggest that Saddam is politically threatened by the current hardships endured by the populace. Moreover, Saddam has taken few actions that would indicate he is concerned about the stability of his regime. Assessing the populace's flash point is difficult, but we believe it is high because Iraqis have borne considerable hardship in the past. During its eight-year war with Iran, for example, Iraq endured a combination of economic difficulties, very high casualties, and repeated missile and air attacks on major cities without any serious public disturbances.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM H. WEBSTER,
Director of Central Intelligence.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. NICHOLS].

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I realize a freshman Member of Congress normally is seen and not heard.

But there will probably be no issue more important in this entire Congress than the one we debate today, and I feel compelled to say just a few words about our responsibilities.

Last week, 55 people from Kansas came to the swearing-in ceremonies and we did some sightseeing together around town.

Among the most heartrending stops was the Vietnam Memorial.

Once again, we saw the haunting looks of those three GI's cast in bronze looking across at that black marble wall.

Those three infantrymen are looking at the names of their fallen comrades who gave their lives in the service of this Nation.

I looked at those names: Loyd S. Rainey, William R. Finn, Sharon Anne Lane, Terry Lee Brown, and on and on they go.

Those sound like the boys and girls who grew up next door or down the block or in the next section, don't they?

Today we are engaged in a great debate. Whether or not to back the President and the international community in authorizing the use of our Armed Forces to restore international peace and security in the Persian Gulf.

We know perhaps too much about Saddam Hussein. How he was a contract murderer by the age of 14—how his trademark was shooting them in the back—how he used poison gas against his own people.

How he is assembling chemical, biological, nuclear, and conventional weapons that can only make decent people everywhere cringe.

The difference between this and other wars is that we have a chance to step in now, with far less cost in lives, to halt the ruthless path of this man. I firmly believe those people listed on that black marble memorial would understand our decision.

Delay can result in an increasing loss of life, not a prevention of any loss.

I am a veteran, a member of the Veterans Affairs Committee, a father, and a grandfather; and I am deeply and personally involved in this decision.

Don't the great endeavors and struggles of mankind always have those who are not quite ready?

Let us postpone, wait, delay; perhaps later, they say.

The time for firmness of purpose is now. The choice of war or no war is up to Saddam Hussein.

Let's stand up with the people and nations around the world who condemn this ruthless aggression.

I urge my colleagues to support the President and the United Nations.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, like many of you I too am a child of the cold war. The principal events of all of my life have been punctuated by crises.

Born during Korea, remembering first the horrors of the Cuban missile crisis, educated during Vietnam. Indeed, 200 different wars in the span of only 39 years of my life.

During all that time, my most fervent hope, my one single ambition for my life has been to see the world change, to see a time of peace for my children, which has escaped my own life.

Mr. Speaker, I never believed that perhaps I would live to see the time but that time has come; in a very fundamental way, the future can be different than the past.

The future can indeed be different than the past. The end of the cold war allows the nations of the world to work together, to give the concept of international law meaning, to provide sanctions for violators, security to the weak and order among the strong.

These, my colleagues, are not new ambitions, these are the things for which Wilson gave his life in fighting for the League of Nations. They were the most fervent hope of Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Collective security, international order, they indeed are the concepts upon which the Democratic Party of two generations was built.

And now, in our time, though tragically not in theirs, there is a chance.

Arguably, my friends, George Bush has assembled the most impressive international coalition in history, united not for the concept of anyone but for the justice, and not only that coalition but indeed the concept of international coalition is being tested.

It is a defining moment in the post-cold-war period, as important for our future as the Berlin crisis or Korea were for the cold war of another time.

This result has implications not simply for the Persian Gulf or Saddam Hussein but for every despot and dictator in every corner of the world who would change international order, for all the remainder of our lives.

This is the issue: Will the future be different, or, in the lives of our children and their children, will their lives be punctuated by war and conquest? Will another 200 border fights and wars follow the 200 of our lives?

I know your frustrations. America justifiably is tired. We have handled the burden of international peace and the defense of freedom for so long. Indeed, history is not fair. We are so few, but our burdens so many and for so long.

But as has been said so many times, so much has been given to America. We have lived as a free people longer than any nation in history. We have prospered, we have known more security than any people at any time.

And as much as has been given, much is expected. This is not to suggest that others cannot do more. They must, and they must learn, for this is not the last crisis of the postwar period, it is the first. Today, as Germany is handling the principal burden with the economic revival of the Soviet Union, as Japan has become the principal provider of foreign assistance to the world, now they must learn to bear these burdens too, lest America not have to do so alone any longer.

Mr. Speaker, last year another superpower was tested. Its ideology, its basic character failed.

Now America is tested. The world will discover whether or not there shall be one superpower in the future or none.

A world without American leadership, a world without the same America that defeated fascism and protected the freedom of the world against communism will see a very different future.

Mr. Speaker, we are no less than those who came before, we are no less than the generation before us that rose from a Depression to fight a previous world war. Our character is not less, and we can rise to this occasion.

□ 1630

We are told, if I remember, by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] that sanctions will be sufficient, that 160 members of the United Nations are wrong, the Security Council has erred, the President's judgment is wrong, the sanctions will bring peace and justice. How I wish they were right.

But I know something of Iraq, as each of these nations and our President knows. Saddam Hussein sent 1 million men of his own nation to death or injury, and he never compromised with Iran. He saw Baghdad hit by missile after missile, bomb after bomb, and he never sacrificed or compromised with Iran. He saw his people live in utter desperation from the sanctions, from the blockade of Iran, long lines for basic foodstuffs, and he never compromised with Iran.

Mr. Speaker, Iraq is among the most fertile nations in the world. It was once the cradle of civilization. I wish I, too, like the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], could believe that Saddam Hussein will abandon his ambition because of sanctions, however I say to my colleague, "You know better. The nations of the world know better."

This Congress has justifiably exercised its prerogatives under the Constitution to decide between war and peace. With it comes a great responsibility. Mr. Speaker, exercise that constitutional responsibility wisely. There is still hope for peace, but only in national solidarity. Stand with the President, stand together. The one hope to save lives is for Saddam Hussein to understand our collective strength. There is our victory.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RITTER].

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, we all seek peace, but we differ on how to achieve it. I just have trouble understanding why we are engaging in divisive debate a few days before a critical life and death deadline. I ask, "Couldn't we have done this a little earlier?"

Mr. Speaker, Saddam Hussein is watching us on television. He is gauging our resolve.

Let me share with my colleagues some of the things we learned during our congressional delegation this week to the Persian Gulf. First, be assured our men and women in the gulf are superbly prepared. They have had an unprecedented buildup there, and they are insured of full equipment, and the morale is high. We had the opportunity to speak with many of our soldiers.

Let me tell my colleagues this. We heard from the U.S. service men and women and the officials we spoke to about what might happen if we simply sit around and wait. Yes, our men and women would like to get the job done quickly, if at all possible, and come home as soon as possible. But they also know that further delay will strengthen Saddam Hussein and further endanger themselves.

Mr. Speaker, that is what they believe in, and I believe we should listen to then because they are the ones who are most at risk.

My colleagues, the basic message we brought back from the gulf was that time is not on our side, nor all the intelligence that we heard in our talks with officials attesting to the weakness of sanctions alone. We now understand that sanctions would probably take 2 to 3 years to force an Iraqi withdrawal from Kuwait. Many experts believe that sanctions would never force Saddam Hussein to withdraw and that sanctions are effective only when the real possibility exists that force can be used at any time, and that is the United Nations, Bush-Solarz-Michel position. Why? Because the real effectiveness of sanctions occurs only when Saddam's military is engaged and the stocks of spare parts are drawn down quickly, or at least the threats exist

that his military would have to be engaged. Otherwise, without that threat or that engagement, the stockpiles can be built up over the years. They can be cannibalized. The training missions and deployment can be relaxed in a climate of sanctions alone, and, when that is added to this Saddam call for a linked solution to the Palestinian problem, one begins to see how the attractiveness of Saddam's position is enhanced day by day with the Arab masses.

That is what we have learned from our discussions with leaders across the Middle East and the Persian Gulf. That is what happens when this thing drags on.

Perhaps the most important thing here is the human element. Saddam, we were told many times in our travels, considers himself a modern Saladin. My colleagues will recall Saladin is the one who defeated the Crusaders. Every day he holds out, this self-styled Saladin wins new respect from the Islamic masses. He holds out against the superpower alliance, the great satans from the West. His reputation grows as a hero of the masses. Political instability looms throughout this region, and with continued standoff, mass demonstrations and the fury of subversion, it endangers our position and the position of our men and women in the gulf. That is what we have learned.

The more it drags on, the more we will be described by our adversaries as an occupying force, not a liberating force.

And what about the Soviet participation in the coalition? We have seen the reversals in recent weeks. Can it be said that 6 months or a year from now the Soviets are still going to be in this coalition as firm allies? We do not know. It is uncertain.

We all want peace. The best possibility for peace is solidarity with the President, with the United Nations. That is what Bush-Michel-Solarz, the U.N. resolution, does.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR] for the purpose of engaging the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RITTER] in debate.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RITTER] just mentioned the Soviet Union.

What happens if we lose the Soviet Union? Is the gentleman concerned about what the Soviet Union is doing as we speak to the Baltic nations, to Lithuania?

Mr. RITTER. Absolutely.

Ms. OAKAR. You are?

Mr. RITTER. Absolutely.

Ms. OAKAR. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RITTER] condone that?

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, as the chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Baltic States and the Ukraine, I am very concerned.

Ms. OAKAR. The gentleman from Pennslyvania shares that concern.

Why are we not speaking out on that issue? Why do we wish to maintain this delicate hold on the Soviet Union who, in fact, is regressing into their past human rights violations?

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman will continue to yield——

Ms. OAKAR. I mean what is the point of holding on to this very great coalition with the Soviet Union who, as we speak, are violating human rights of people in their own entity?

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR] completely.

Ms. OAKAR. I believe those countries are separate countries.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman would continue to yield, were we to be in a position of solidarity with our President at this time, were we America speaking with one voice, we would not be here 3 days before a deadline of life and death. What are we doing here after all?

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I say I am not in solidarity with the Soviet Union today. I am not in solidarity with them today.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to know how much of the 2 minutes are remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OBEY). Fifteen seconds.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, let me respond to my colleague because frankly I am a little tired as well of the parade of speeches. We are not engaging each other. I would like to engage my distinguished colleague.

Mr. RITTER. Yes?

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RITTER] on several occasions in the last couple of moments raised the question: Why are we here debating 3 days before January 15? My response is because we are a democracy. We are a constitutional form of government.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? Why were we not here 2 months before?

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, in a moment I will yield.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] has the time.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I will yield at the appropriate moment. The gentleman from Pennsylvania does not have to harass me. I will debate him.

Mr. RITTER. The gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] is very good at that.

Mr. DELLUMS. I appreciate that.

Mr. Speaker, we are here because we are a constitutional form of government. Article I, section 8, paragraph 11 of the Constitution vests all power to make war in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I will yield in a moment, and I have said that.

Mr. RITTER. I thank the gentleman from California.

□ 1640

Mr. DELLUMS. We are here because we are exercising our responsibility to make a judgment, and we have that right. That is what this is all about, the right of the people to make those decisions.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELLUMS. When I finish.

Mr. RITTER. I have no problem with what the gentleman is saying. I only have a problem with the timing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OBEY). The gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] has the time, and he controls the time until he yields to the gentleman from Pennsylvania. The gentleman from California may continue.

Mr. DELLUMS. I thank the Chair.

Mr. Speaker, let me say to my colleague before we go further, let us continue to respect each other. I do not stand here to harass any Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I will yield to the gentleman at this point. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

All my concern is not that we debate; it is simply the timing of the debate. We had time since August 2, to debate this. We have had a military buildup going on, we have had sanctions, and we have had the U.N. resolution. Why were we not here earlier? Why are we leaving it until the last moment, the last second almost to the clock of history to come down here and act divisively in front of Saddam Hussein, who watches us on CNN? Frankly, I do not question the right to debate whatsoever, and I believe the gentleman makes a valid point, but I am just concerned about the timing of it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] has expired.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. Speaker, it has also been asserted that Saddam Hussein is watching us on television. What finer picture can we take than going about our business as a constitutionally formed government? What better picture can we send, that we in this country have a right to dissent, that we have a right

to our relative perspectives, that Members can talk about war and peace in an open forum, and that the RON DELLUMS of the Congress can stand up and oppose the insanity of war? What better statement can we make to Saddam Hussein than the fact that this is a democratic form of government based on the rule of law, and that a constitutional form of government is the wave of the future and not the wave of the past?

Mr. Speaker, I yield back my time.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] is recognized.

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I take this time in order that I may yield to the distinguished majority leader for what has previously been agreed to. I have reference to our mutual opportunity for extension of time and whatever else the majority leader might want to alert the membership to.

I think it is very important, particularly as we will undoubtedly go into a late hour this evening and tomorrow, and with the weekend approaching, that we have an explanation of what the leaders together have summarily agreed to.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I am happy to yield to my distinguished friend.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As the Members know, the two leaders under the rule have the responsibility to ask unanimous consent for more debate time if we feel that that debate time is needed. Our collective judgment is that we do not have enough debate time approved by the House under the rule, and, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the debate time be extended for 4 more hours, 2 hours on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, could I receive some explanation from the majority leader and the minority leader as to how members of the majority who are in favor of the Solarz-Michel position might be allocated time under this arrangement?

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I would say to the gentleman that we will endeavor to work out an arrangement so that all Members who are endeavoring to have further debate time, including proponents on our side of the Solarz amendment, will have the opportunity to do that.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, it is the majority leader's intention, then, that the time that would potentially be allocated to members of the majority might be divided among those of us in the majority who are in support of the President's position?

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, let me consult with the Member. I am sure we can work this out in consultation with the minority leader.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I shall not object, but I simply take this time for the purpose of making an inquiry.

Can the gentleman tell us, Mr. Speaker—or perhaps the Chair could tell us—what the practical effect of the unanimous consent request would be with reference to the total time that would accrue to the proponents of the alternative, the President's proposal, under the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, there is no precise formula. We have been operating informally, and we have been trying to work out the needs of the Members. We intend to stay here for as long as it takes to give everybody the opportunity to speak. I hope we do not go past midnight, because that is what we are asking for now, but we are committed to get this debate finished and give everybody a chance. We will continue to work informally. I will be here through the evening to see if it works out.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I say to the majority leader and the minority leader that I would like to thank them for their cooperation in this regard. I would simply like to say to them that there are an extraordinary number of Members who wish to speak, and the original thought that Members could get on at a particular time, 5:30 or 6 o'clock, just is not working out, particularly since, rather than two positions, we now have three different groups having opportunities to speak. So everything has fallen back, and some Members who have alerted their constituents that they are going to speak between 5:30 and 6 must realize they may not get on until 9 tonight.

I just wanted to be very clear about that. This gentleman certainly in no way wants to restrict the debate, but Members have to realize that this list here is getting longer and longer. We do appreciate that, and I just want the Members to know that.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the majority leader, the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I might just respond to the gentleman's inquiry.

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, if I may respond to the gentleman's inquiry, I would try to give the Members a sense of what is going to be required over the weekend.

When the House finishes the votes tomorrow—and again we hope those votes will occur in midday—it will be necessary for the House to stay in session and for Members to be prepared to be here tomorrow afternoon and maybe into the evening, because we do not know at this point when the Senate will act and what resolution will pass the Senate and, of course, how that fits with whatever passes in the House. Therefore, in a moment I intend to ask for recess authority for tomorrow, and I intend to ask not only for that but that we have the opportunity to convene the House on Monday and then through the next week. It is our intention not only to be here at noon on Monday in case there needs to be further action of the House, depending on what the Senate does and what the House does, but we want to stay in at least pro forma session on every day of next week. So to that extent I intend to ask for unanimous-consent authority.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE RECESSES ON TOMORROW

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Speaker be authorized to declare recesses on Saturday, January 12, 1991.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING FOR SESSIONS FROM MONDAY, JANUARY 14, 1991, TO FRIDAY, JANUARY 18, 1991

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the order of the House of January 3, 1991, establishing convening times for the House until January 23, the House convene at noon each day from Monday, January 14, 1991, to Friday, January 18, 1991.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished majority leader, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO].

□ 1650

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, during the Revolutionary War, the great American patriot, Thomas Paine, said,

"These are the times that try men's souls." Today, we here can share that concern expressed more than 200 years ago. For as we stand here today, these are now the times that try men's souls.

At the end of the Civil War, President Abraham Lincoln, in his Gettysburg Address said "* * * the world will little note nor long remember what is said here * * *." Lincoln was wrong, for the world has long remembered his historic words, just as the world will long remember what we are about to do.

We have a decision to make that must be made not only the right way, but it must be made right the first time. We do not have the luxury of test marketing our decision but we do have the ability to move slowly. It the vote is "war," we cannot change that vote 2 weeks or 2 months after the shooting starts and we realize that we have made a mistake. A war vote can be made at any time, but a vote to let economic sanctions have more time to work can only be made now. If we fail to vote for economic sanctions tomorrow, then we lose that option forever. But if we vote for continued economic sanctions tomorrow, we do not lose the ability at a later date to vote for military action.

When we consider these resolutions we must look at the human side of our decisions. Too often we tend to look only at the so-called glamorous side of war—the flagwaving, the parades, the good triumphs over evil belief. But war is not an abstraction. War is body bags, torn and crippled bodies. It is real blood being shed and real people being killed. It is the arrival of daily flights at Dover Air Force Base in Delaware to unload the coffins of our dead sons, daughters, husbands, wives, loved ones, and friends. Are we in such a rush to start the flights to Dover that we can't give sanctions a chance? Do not throw away our last chance to avoid war without giving sanctions a fair chance to work.

The world will note and long remember what we do here tomorrow. We cannot make the wrong decision.

President Bush and his supporters in the Congress have offered us hours of rhetoric in support of their cause. Yet, if this headlong rush to war in the gulf is the wisest course to follow, why hasn't the President asked for a declaration of war?

Numerous expert witnesses have testified before this body that economic sanctions are choking off Saddam Hussein's ability to maintain his conquest of Kuwait.

Our allied effort on sanctions with most of the civilized countries of the world has produced a 90-percent drop in Iraq's imports and a 50-percent decline in its gross national product. And these successes have come after only a few months of sanctions.

The economic embargo has undermined Saddam's ability to make war with his 1-million-man army. We have heard experts testify that Saddam's war machine is beginning to run short of spare parts for aircraft and tanks. This trend will almost certainly continue if we have the strength to persevere with sanctions as the Gephardt-Hamilton bill provides. We have recently seen gasoline prices begin falling as a result of the stabilizing effect brought by the sanctions. This has helped to minimize the suffering of Americans as they struggle with the ongoing recession. Our hostages also have been freed.

The success of the economic sanctions to date has convinced me that there is no need for the United States and its allies to rush headlong into war.

Finally, we as a Congress are nearing historic crossroads as we debate whether or not blood will be spilled on the desert sands of the Middle East. None of us in this Chamber will ever ask for a greater sacrifice of the nearly 400,000 United States service men and women who are poised for an assault on Saddam Hussein's Iraqi war machine. Moreover, if the President's request for a free rein on military action prevails, all of us will close ranks and pray that this Republic has embarked upon the correct course.

But after the casualties of this conflict are counted and reflected on, I believe this body will have miscalculated. I urge my colleagues to support the Hamilton-Gephardt bill.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee [Mrs. LLOYD].

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, we return to Congress faced with what is likely to be the most important decision of our careers. We must decide whether or not we should grant the President the authority to use force, if necessary, in the gulf. We must do so with the understanding that war is possible.

I say this with the hope that force will never have to be used. No one wants a war. I believe that the President's strategy in the gulf can succeed, but not without the help and support of Congress. By granting the President the authority to use force Congress can strengthen the President's hand in the gulf by sending Saddam Hussein a very clear signal that the United States and the international community are committed to enforcing the United Nations resolutions which call for a complete and total Iraqi withdrawal from Kuwait.

The sovereignty of Kuwait is not the only issue at stake in the gulf. The United States and its coalition partners must also be concerned with Saddam Hussein's ultimate ambitions and the means by which he is willing to achieve them. Saddam Hussein sees himself as a modern day Nebuchadnezzer; as the ultimate ruler of the entire Middle East. He has taken his country to war twice in the past decade to realize this goal. He has amassed a large arsenal of chemical and biological weapons and demonstrated a willingness to use them. More ominously, he is engaged in a quest to acquire nuclear weapons.

Permitting Saddam Hussein to retain Kuwait will only whet his appetite for more conquest. And when he returns, perhaps with a nuclear arsenal, the cost of confronting him will be much higher than it will be on January 15. That is why the international community, led by the United States, has chosen to act now. There is an opportunity to stop Saddam Hussein today, just as there was an opportunity to check Hitler's move into Czechoslovakia. We ignore this opportunity at our own peril. This is true, not only because Saddam Hussein's ambitions threaten the peace and stability in the Middle East, but because the outcome of the gulf crisis will effect global relations for years to come.

Saddam Hussein's invasion and annexation of Kuwait occurs at a crucial time in history. The cold war has ended and with it passes the rules that have governed relations among states for over 40 years. It was hoped that in their place a new world order could be constructed; an internal system in which the rule of law and cooperation governed relations among states. The conclusion of precedent setting arms control agreements and the progress toward a settlement of decades long regional conflicts confirmed the hopes for a new, peaceful world order were not misplaced.

Paradoxically, the conclusion of the cold war also unleashed powerful forces previously held in check by the world's ideological division. The challenge for the global community is to hold these malignant forces in check. If they are allowed to prevail the rule of force will replace the rule of law and the strong will terrorize the weak.

Saddam Hussein's invasion and annexation of Kuwait, as the first crisis of the post-cold-war era, represents a direct challenge to the peaceful, prosperous new world which appeared within reach after the collapse of the Berlin Wall. If he is allowed to succeed because the United States and its coalition partners back down or compromise, other states will be encouraged to pursue claims against their neighbors through force of arms. It is naive to imagine that the United States can remain isolated and uneffected by the turbulent events of a world where military might is the equivalent of right.

The President has responded forcefully to the threat Saddam Hussein poses in the Middle East and to the global community at large. The President's efforts to bring the crisis to a peaceful conclusion rests upon making it clear to Saddam Hussein that he has

no choice but to withdraw from Kuwait. The last best chance for peace is in our hands. Congress should support the President and authorize the use of force while we stand shoulder to shoulder with the entire international community against Saddam Hussein.

□ 1700

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. MOORHEAD].

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bipartisan resolution which authorizes the President to use military force in the Persian Gulf in order to achieve implementation of the various U.N. Security Council resolutions adopted since Iraq's brutal invasion of Kuwait last August. This resolution requires the President to report to Congress when he has used all appropriate diplomatic and other peaceful means to obtain compliance by Iraq before force is implemented. The U.N. Security Council has endorsed 12 resolutions condemning Iraq for its unprovoked invasion and brutal occupation of Kuwait. The resolutions, which include implementing tough economic sanctions and authorizing the use of force if necessary after January 15, are historic. Never have so many nations acted together to condemn hostile aggression. This crisis has marshalled international support that is unprecedented in history moving the United Nations to the forefront as the world peacekeeping force.

Iraq has so far given no indication that it will back down, leaving Congress no choice but to take a stand on whether it will support the U.N. resolution. Saddam Hussein has twice in the past decade led his country into war, first against Iran and now against Kuwait, there is no question that he is determined to dominate the entire Middle East and he has shown that he will employ whatever means are necessary to achieve his goal. Saddam Hussein has proven to the world that he is more concerned about the maximization of his power than the well-being of his own people. If we allow this dictator to prevail in the current crisis, we will eventually be forced to confront him directly when his challenge may be far more formidable. A hostile Iraq armed with chemical, biological, and eventually nuclear weapons represents a clear and present danger to American security.

On August 2, 1990, Iraq brutally invaded Kuwait and began dismantling its infrastructure. Since that time there have been thousands of documented cases of human rights abuses, torture, rape, hostage taking, and other violations of international law. The destruction of Kuwait continues. Iraqi forces continue to fortify their position and Iraq's dictator continues to threaten our forces in Saudi Arabia.

Sanctions will not work without the threat of force to back them up. A just released CIA report concludes that even if sanctions continue to be enforced for an additional 6 to 12 months, economic hardships alone are unlikely to compel Saddam to retreat from Kuwait. The Iraqis have borne considerable hardships in the past. During its 8-year war with Iran, Iraq endured a combination of economic difficulties without serious disruption. Without the implementation of military force against Iraq's Army, it is unlikely that the next 6 to 12 months of sanctions will cause any substantial erosion of Iraq's military strength.

The key to peace is maintaining a credible military threat. If we are to have any chance of getting Iraq out of Kuwait, military force and sanctions must be linked together. It we deny the President the authority to use force, if necessary, we will convince Saddam that he can stay in Kuwait, outlast sanctions and survive. We may delay war, but we will not avoid it.

Diplomatic efforts to persuade Iraq to withdraw began immediately after the August invasion and are continuing in spite of Saddam Hussein's refusal to respond. We are giving him every opportunity to pursue a peaceful diplomatic settlement. As we approach the January 15 deadline set by the United Nations for Iraq to get out of Kuwait, more nations and leaders from every part of the world will continue to try and reason with him. Efforts are being waged by the European Community, the Algerian President, the Soviet Union, the French, and the nonaligned nations.

How we resolve this first crisis of the post-cold war will have profound historical consequences. If we do nothing at this critical turning point in our history, we will be forfeiting American security in the gulf, America's standing in the Arab World and any future possibility for a stable post-cold war order throughout the world. The United States must stand with the international community and on the side of law and decency. We must also dispel any belief that the United States lacks the resolve to act decisively in response to Iraq's continued aggression against Kuwait. The U.S. Congress and the President must be united in their efforts at this critical time. This is our last hope for keeping peace in this troubled region of the world.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN].

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Michel-Solarz amendment.

Mr. Speaker, last August, Saddam Hussein launched a quick and cruel invasion of Kuwait. President Bush, the Congress, and the United Nations, as well the rest of civilized nations of the world responded that Saddam's decision must be reversed, and accordingly, called for economic sanctions and boycotts to emphasize their position on immediate Iraqi withdrawal from Kuwait.

With the failed discussions between Secretary of State Baker and Iraq's Foreign Minister Aziz earlier this week, the Congress, the American People, and the rest of the world has been faced with a most difficult decision: The decision to use force if necessary to liberate Kuwait.

We do not face this decision lightly. None of us wants any armed conflict at all, but we seem to be exhausting every shred of opportunity to reach a peaceful settlement.

Now the hard choice comes for us as to whether we really mean what we say—and that's a choice not only for the President and the United Nations, but for the Congress as well.

All of us are students of history. This fine institution has been around for 200 years and if history has taught us anything, it's taught us that we cannot let unprovoked aggressions go unchecked. If Hitler's troops had been stopped early on, World War II may well have been prevented.

The United States has acted to keep Saddam Hussein's aggression in check. We are perhaps the only Nation in the world that could stop his aggression. In fact, we already have. Now he must recede from Kuwait, peacefully or by force. His choice.

Our allies look to us for leadership, and we must provide it. If the United States doesn't take a stand for the principle of freedom from tyrannic aggression, who will?

Since the end of World War II, we have maintained our defense in a high state of readiness, and we have prevented an all-out worldwide conflict. Our strength has helped keep the peace throughout the world. In the Persian Gulf, our strength has placed a temporary halt to Saddam Hussein's fanatically inspired and ambitious aggression.

We are not acting alone in this endeavor. The U.N. Security Council has already approved a resolution of force. In their deliberations, as in ours, members considered all alternatives and concluded that force may be necessary to liberate Kuwait, if all other alternatives fail.

Members of the Congress must consider these same facts. Perhaps one effect of Saddam Hussein's aggression has been the forcing of Congress' hand of leadership—one way or the other.

And that's why we're here today. Do we mean and believe what we say? Are we, or are we not world leaders—with the conviction to support that position; in peace if possible—with force, if necessary.

Vote for Michel-Solarz.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW].

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I believe very strongly that perhaps our last hope to avoid war is the immediate threat of war. I ask all Members to join with me in supporting our President and vote yes on the Solarz-Michel resolution.

Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues have told us that time is on our side in this Persian Gulf crisis. My colleagues have said, "be patient, give sanctions a chance to work." Well Mr. Speaker, I am here to tell you that this is not the case. Time is not on our side.

The fact is that the sanctions of the past five months are not working, and that even if they were, they will not force Saddam Hussein out of Kuwait. The President has said time and time again that ours is not a quarrel with the Iraqi people. Yet this is the unintended result when we continue on our path of sanctions. Saddam Hussein has no problem with letting his own people suffer, as he did when he ordered the massacre of 20,000 Iraqi citizens. Instead, Saddam will funnel his limited resources to his military machine and starve his own people. So, even in the best-case possible solution, sanctions cannot work.

Yet, this best-case situation does not even exist. The Director of the CIA William H. Webster, recently testified that, in his opinion, sanctions will not lead Saddam Hussein to change his policy towards Kuwait. The Washington Post recently reported that, "Shops, markets and stores throughout Baghdad are brimming with goods produced both locally and abroad."

Many of our allies have already started to cheat and have attempted, some successfully, to break our international boycott and send goods to Iraq. Recently a Soviet ship carrying goods to Iraq was turned away. According to the Post, beer marked "Brewed and canned by Jordan Breweries, Amman" sits on the shelves of Baghdad stores. The longer we wait, the more Soviet ships and Jordanian goods will slip through our blockades and find their way into Iraq.

Time is definitely not on our side.

Right now, we have 360,000 of our young men and women sitting in the deserts off Saudi Arabia ready and eager to go. How much longer can we leave them sitting there? A constituent of mine, Capt. Phillip Hartsfield of Pompano Beach, FL, called my office and said, "morale is so important to our troops. The longer they stay there, the more the morale decreases. Right now, our soldiers are wiling to do anything for our President. Saddam will not back down. Please support the President and don't take away his option of using force to remove Iraq's troops from Kuwait." I agree with him.

At this point in our dealings with Saddam Hussein, we have learned one thing about him—he is unpredictable. World opinion lined against him doesn't seem to effect him. Economic sanctions don't seem to effect him. Talking with him doesn't seem to sway his opinion. The only thing that seems to effect him is threat of the use of force. By voting against the Solarz-Michel resolution, we are cutting off the one weapon that we have that seems to scare this man. The threat of the use of force seems to be our last best hope to remove Iraqi forces from Kuwait without the actual use of military force. Perhaps ironic but true, the threat of immediate war is our last chance to avoid war.

Support our President—vote yes on the Solarz-Michel resolution.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KYL].

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KYL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

I would like the gentleman from Arizona and any other Member in the Chamber who would like a top secret briefing on Saddam Hussein's plans of terrorism for the whole world to come at 5:30 up to room 405. I think it might significantly affect some Members who are on the fence on which way to go.

It is Members only, no exceptions, no staff. Ask in our Cloakrooms where room 405 is.

This is the most stunning briefing that many of us have had in 14 or 15 years around this Hill.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bipartisan resolution to grant President Bush the authority to enforce the U.N. resolutions.

Mr. Speaker, most of the arguments that have been raised against the bipartisan resolution and in support of the alternative resolution have relied upon the notion that sanctions could work to achieve our objectives. And while an issue like this certainly involves the emotions of all of us, I think we also must be analytical about it.

We would all like to avoid war. But if the real objective here is to get Saddam Hussein to withdraw from Kuwait, then we must analyze the three possible scenarios that could result from the resolutions that are now before us.

Under the first scenario Congress would pass the bipartisan resolution convincing Saddam Hussein to withdraw. That achieves the objectives and it does so quickly.

Under the second scenario, Congress passes the bipartisan resolution, but Saddam Hussein still does not withdraw. We utilize the U.N. and congressional authority to remove Hussein from Kuwait by force.

This solution again is quick. It meets the objective, but there is an unknown cost. So some have asked is there a better alternative.

The third scenario is that the Congress passes the Gephardt-Hamilton resolution calling for continued reliance upon sanctions to effect an Iraqi withdrawal. Under this scenario we must wait to see if the policy will work. Unlike the first two scenarios, we do not know whether sanctions will work, we do not know how long it would take them to work, and we do not know what the costs would be.

In short, Mr. Speaker, we know that military force will achieve the objective, either used as a threat or applied operationally.

What do we know about sanctions? Experts disagree. Some say that they will not work. Some say they might, but will take a long time. None say that they would work quickly.

I submit that the potential for sanctions, Mr. Speaker, does not inspire confidence.

Here is a sampling of some testimony that was presented to the House Armed Services Committee and other statements that people have made.

Dr. Phebe Marr testified before our committee and said: "Sanctions alone will not force Saddam Hussein to leave Kuwait. He is a survivor who must feel a direct threat to his military power base or political life before he can be expected to change his behavior."

Dr. Jerrold Post, former CIA Center for Personality Analysis and Political Behavior, said this about Saddam Hussein: "The only language Saddam Hussein understands is the language of power."

CIA Director Webster, who has been much quoted here, said: "Saddam Hussein will not withdraw from Kuwait until he is convinced he is in peril of imminent military attack."

"The success of sanctions must ultimately be measured not by the degree of trade restriction or even the degree of pain inflicted on Iraq, but by Iraqi actions which comply with the U.N. objectives," said the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, LES ASPIN.

And Israeli Foreign Minister Levy said: "Waiting for sanctions to work represents a victory for Saddam Hussein. It increases his stature among the Arab masses because he is seen as having faced the strongest Nation in the world and survived."

No witness testifying before the House Armed Services Committee believed that a people's revolt to overthrow Saddam was feasible, and all felt that the probability that the army would revolt was very small.

Mr. Speaker, there has been comment about CIA Director Webster's testimony, and I just would like to clarify something. CIA Director Webster has not changed his testimony. Some people were parroting what they thought they heard him say when he testified in December before the House Armed Services Committee, but I would like to tell Members what he really said on that occasion.

We see no indication that Saddam is concerned, at this point, that domestic discontent is growing to levels that may threaten his regime or that problems resulting from the sanctions are causing him to rethink his policy on Kuwait. The Iraqi people have experienced considerable deprivation in the past. Given the brutal nature of the Iraqi security services, the population is not likely to oppose Saddam openly. Our judgment has been, and continues to be, that there is no assurance or guarantee that economic hardships will compel Saddam to change his policies or lead to internal unrest that would threaten his regime.

Mr. Speaker, sanctions are certainly the policy of hope, but one cannot be confident of their success, particularly against a dictator who is not subject to the same popular pressures as our democratic leaders, and whose people have been subjected to great deprivation in the 8-year war with Iran, without any protest, at least from anyone who lived to tell about it. And ironically, sanctions would be relatively more costly for the alliance against Saddam Hussein in terms of the effect upon public policy, and that in the long run is all that matters.

We have heard testimony about the tremendous effect upon all of the Arab allies, upon the State of Israel, and of course the costs to the United States. My suggestion here is that should we rely upon economic sanctions it is very possible, indeed I would suggest probable that the alliance would blink before Saddam Hussein who was not subjected and is not subjected to the same popular pressures.

Moreover, and finally, once sanctions have been in place a long time, the military option becomes less and less credible. So I would refer Members to the testimony of Dr. Henry Kissinger before the Senate Armed Services Committee to this effect. He said that sanctions and military actions "are being presented as it they were successive phases of the same policy. In fact, they will prove to be mutually exclusive, because by the time it is evident that sanctions alone cannot succeed, a credible military option will probably no longer exist."

Mr. Speaker, these are the unfortunate facts about sanctions. Alone they simply will not bring Saddam Hussein to comply with the U.N. resolutions and do what all of us would like to have done.

I have reached the same conclusion that respected Washington Post columnist David Broder has, who wrote in today's Post and said:

> The best hope for salvaging peace is a strong statement of congressional support for the President's policy so that Saddam Hussein can understand the terrible alternative he faces.

That is the appropriate policy and, therefore, I urge my colleagues to support the bipartisan resolution.

Mr. Speaker, Our votes tomorrow may well be the most important we will ever cast as Member of Congress.

No one wants war.

Our dilemma from the beginning has been how to achieve a peaceful solution to the gulf crisis with a dictator who seems to understand only force.

I have studied the issue closely; I have traveled to the Persian Gulf; sat through hours of congressional hearings and read widely on this issue. I have visited with the troops, with families of the troops, and with hundreds of other constituents. Reluctantly, I have concluded that our best hope, if not the only hope, of avoiding war in the Persian Gulf is to be prepared, and committed, to go to war if necessary.

Possessing the power to wage war and the commitment to do it if necessary has prevented conflict in the past. Peace through strength has been the foundation of this country's bipartisan foreign policy for decades, and it has worked, most notably to prevent Soviet aggression and help bring an end to the cold war. In all probability, convincing Saddam Hussein that we can and will defeat him militarily is the only way to influence him to withdraw from Kuwait and leave his neighbors alone. If we say we won't use force against him, he will do neither.

So today, we must support the bipartisan resolution requested by the President. As respected Washington Post columnist David Broder wrote today:

> The best hope for salvaging peace is a strong statement of congressional support for [the President's] policy; so that Saddam Hussein can understand the terrible alternative he faces.

To understand why United States interests are sufficiently at stake to be prepared to commit our forces to combat against Iraq, we should ask what would happen if we were not prepared to do so.

First, brutal unwarranted aggression would have been rewarded. That is bad as a matter of principle, but as important is what it portends in this case. Saddam Hussein has already shown a penchant for exerting influence, and taking what he wants, through military action—we need not speculate about it. There is every reason to believe that, if unchecked, he will do it again, and again, until he is finally stopped. At that point, it is likely to be much more costly in lives lost than it would be to stop him now. And by acting now, we will have prevented more horrible casualties of his aggression. In short, to allow him to continue to murder, rape, torture and pillage because "it is not our business" is contrary to everything we stand for. The analogy to stopping Adolph Hitler is not inappropriate, especially since Hussein has already been responsible for over a million dead in his invasion of Iran and Kuwait, for more than Hitler before the United States declared war on Germany. So, the second, and perhaps most important reason is to prevent further aggression and the human suffering it involves.

The third reason is related and focuses on the type of unconventional warfare he is likely to conduct. The United States cannot be policeman of the world. So, we act only in certain very important situations. Not all aggressors have the ability to cause massive destruction of lives and property and disrupt regional, let alone world order. While we may be concerned in such cases, they often do not warrant direct U.S. action. Unfortunately, Iraq is fast becoming a major threat. With ballistic missiles, chemical and biological weapons, and a rapidly developing nuclear capability, not to mention the sixth largest army in the world, Iraq is now a very potent force, and, if unchecked, will soon be totally dominant in the region, capable of forcing its will whether by aggression or intimidation. This type of weaponry with which Iraq could conduct unconventional warfare, plus the brutality Iraq's forces have visited on all whom they have attacked—as well as their own people—has been one of the key reasons the world community, acting through the United Nations, has supported military action against Iraq if it has not complied with the U.N. resolutions by January 15, 1991.

Were the United States, as the moral, economic and military leader of the world, to back down now, we would lose all credibility and have a very difficult time ever standing up to aggression or otherwise prevailing in difficult foreign policy situations in the future. Arab states in the Middle East, as well as oil consuming nations throughout the world, would have to make their own accommodations with Iraq and every outlaw nation that might follow its example.

This fourth reason, a loss of credibility, and, thus, capability to influence world events in the future, might not have occurred if we had never sent forces to the Middle East in the first place; but we did, with the overwhelming support of the Congress and the American people. It is also a reality that we cannot ignore what happens around the world—our own self-interest demands that we be able to act with credibility. If friends cannot depend on the United States, we won't have friends for long; bullies will dominate the world scene.

The fifth reason relates to the implications of Iraq's continued presence there as well as domination of neighboring countries. As noted, the United States cannot move to stop all aggression; but it does move to stop it where the threat is of major significance and where our vital interests are jeopardized. Oil is vital to the United States. And, while we should have a better energy policy and while other countries should be doing more—because they are even more reliant on oil from the Middle East—the United States cannot duck responsibility for doing something it should do; that is try to prevent world economic disorder by allowing Iraq to control a majority of the world's oil through military aggression. While the United States does not get most of its oil from the Middle East, we must remember oil is a world commodity, so the price goes up all over the world—including in the United States—whenever the supply is cut anywhere in the world.

We are not in Saudi Arabia to protect the profits of the oil companies, as some have asserted—remember, the price of oil and gasoline was less before the invasion of Kuwait and will go down again if a stable peace is restored to the region.

The Middle East is important for another reason—it is the most unstable and potentially most dangerous area of the world; no less than six wars have been fought there since the end of World War II. The United States cannot unilaterally keep the peace there, but, in concert with others, we can try to minimize the potential for more widespread conflict by helping to stop a man like Saddam Hussein before he embroils the region—and, thus, possibly the world—in further conflict there.

None of these reasons may be sufficient alone to warrant U.S. military action; but, taken together, they suggest to me a compelling case. Only once every several generations does a man like Saddam Hussein develop the kind of military force and use it like he has. Like a serial killer, he will keep on until stopped. We certainly risk casualties in

trying to stop him, but it is a virtual certainty that waiting will result in greater casualties among both civilians he brutally attacks and the soldiers we and others will have to send to stop him.

I say virtual certainty because we cannot know anything in the future for a certainty. But, leadership is about making hard decisions when the facts are not all clear, when the outcomes are uncertain. It is frequently too late to do the right thing after all the facts are in. This is the reason most experts are reluctant to rely on economic sanctions alone to cause Hussein to pull out of Kuwait, let alone dismantle his powerful military machine, forgo development of nuclear weapons, and forswear use of chemical and biological weapons and, indeed, the use of any weapons against his neighbors.

Hussein is a man who respects one thing: force. This fact was made clear in the outcome of the meeting between Secretary of State Baker and his Iraqi counterpart in Geneva on January 9. Once again, Saddam Hussein demonstrated his disdain for diplomatic efforts to resolve this crisis peacefully. It is for this reason that I believe only a strong show of force is likely to convince him to leave Kuwait.

President Bush has been very firm in order to try to convince Hussein that he has to leave Kuwait or face probable military action. Without that threat, I am convinced that Hussein would not leave. I am convinced this is the best course of action. We have averted other crises in our past by convincing our adversaries that we will use force if necessary—that is the Cuban missile crisis. I believe it may work with Hussein if Congress backs the President. Hussein must know we are united. That is why I intend to support the President. That is why I became an original cosponsor of House Joint Resolution 62, authorizing the use of force by the United States in order to implement U.N. resolutions regarding Iraq's invasion of Kuwait.

Reasonable people will differ in their conclusions about all of this. As one who has part of the responsibility for making the critical decisions, I have done my best to be informed, to listen, and, in the end, to act responsibly. I intend to support the bipartisan resolution and oppose the others.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BILBRAY].

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, many Members have said today what a difficult decision this is, and I think that is probably the understatement of the decade. For days I have been anguishing over which side of this issue I would take.

I have the utmost respect for Mr. GEPHARDT and Mr. HAMILTON who I believe are two of the most intellectually honest and moral people in this Congress. At the same time, I remember the testimony that I have heard over weeks and months in the Armed Services Committee which I have the honor to serve on.

□ 1710

As the gentleman from Arizona has stated, over and over again the experts that came before us told us from August on that sanctions would not work and will not work. I think that is evident today, that nothing we can do can dislodge Saddam Hussein and the Iraqi forces from Kuwait.

My decision was one that was made in anguish, not wanting to commit hundreds of thousands of young men and women of the United States to a combat and seeing young people coming back in body bags. I know, because as a parent I have lost a child. That was in 1983, and the hurt still is there. I do not want anyone to feel that anguish and that hurt.

But, on the other hand, I believe the best chance of peace is by being strong, and if we send a message to Saddam Hussein that we do not know what we want to do, that maybe sometime in the future the United States Congress will reach out and give a resolution to the President authorizing him to use force, he will never leave Kuwait. He is resolved that we do not have the resolve to resist his aggression, and that he watches CNN as has been stated, and he hears the discussion and he does not believe that this Congress or the American people have the will to resist aggression after Vietnam.

My own family disagrees with me on this vote. My daughter who is a junior in high school last night spent an hour at dinner telling me what a bad vote I was making. My daughter who is a senior in college spent 15–20 minutes just a few minutes ago telling me this was the worst vote I would ever make. I understand their anguish. I understand the anguish of my parish priest who walked out of mass this week and told me, "Please, let us not give the President the power to fight."

I believe that if we spit in the President's face and that we deny him the ability to use whatever weapons are at his disposal to achieve peace, then we are going to cause war. Our only hope is that by giving the President the right to use force he will not have to use that force.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RAVENEL].

Mr. RAVENEL. Mr. Speaker, in the current crisis our country has emerged as the natural leader of the family of nations. Our administration, ever consulting closely with the leadership of this Congress, has deterred further aggression on the Arabian Peninsula, encouraged the United Nations to condemn that which occurred and set a deadline for its reversal—or else, that else being the military ejection of the arrogant aggressor, an action never cherished by the lovers of peace but often found necessary for its maintenance. That the world, under our leadership, could have come so far so fast is, in itself, an amazing event.

So now why, today at the 11th hour, when the successful resolution of this grave world disorder is at hand, are we here at all? How satisfied and gleeful must Saddam Hussein be as he observes these proceedings, which are, with variations, mouldy rehashes of two centuries of the same endless debate. What must our coalition comrades think as they observe us possibly voting to wait and not wait, authorize and deny, fight and not fight, all at the same time! And what must the American people think of this possible paradox?

Of course we should not be here, but, as unfortunately we are, a vote for the bipartisan resolution and against the others is the only rational course for this House!

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS].

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, Saddam Hussein is watching this debate on television. What he is seeing is a free and open and democratic society in action. I want to make certain that he does not misunderstand what to him must be a bewildering variety of views.

Since some of our finest and most respected members of this distinguished body have lined up on opposite sides of the question we are debating today, it is important, Mr. Speaker, that Saddam Hussein understand where the differences between our Members lie.

The debate we are engaged in today is not about peace or war—that would be an easy debate. We would all opt for peace.

In this debate we are all united in our opposition to terror and tyranny. We are all united in our determination that Saddam Hussein not prevail in his brutal rape of Kuwait nor in his vicious intimidation of his neighbors in the Persian Gulf. We are all united in our concern for the welfare of all of the people in the Persian Gulf and the Middle East.

We are all united in our judgment that we will use force only as a last resort if that is what is necessary to achieve the objectives of defeating tyranny and dismantling the tyrant's military might. We differ only on timing and short-term tactics, not on long-term strategy.

We are all united in our eagerness to put this crisis behind us and move on to the serious issues that face our Nation here at home—stimulating a sagging economy, housing our people, educating our children, improving our transportation and infrastructure, assuring health care for all, and helping our senior citizens. We want to deal with the truly historic changes that are unfolding in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe.

Mr. Speaker, the bipartisan resolution is clearly our best chance of preserving peace and getting on with our agenda. I strongly support that resolution.

I have reached my decision on the basis of my many years of experience of living under and dealing with police states and totalitarian regimes. That experience taught me that we must never appease tyrants. If we had stopped the Japanese in Manchuria, if we had stopped Mussolini in Ethiopia, if we had stopped Hitler in the Rhineland, then tens of millions of innocent men, women, and children around the globe would have been spared the untold agony of war and the tragedy of death.

This is not the time to sound an uncertain trumpet. This is the time to keep all our options open. This is the time to send Saddam Hussein the clear message that this great democracy is not paralyzed and that it will not be intimidated. We were not intimidated by Hitler. We were not intimidated by Mussolini. We were not intimidated by the Japanese militarists, and we were not intimidated by Stalin, or Mao Tsetung. And we shall not be intimidated by Saddam Hussein.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GILLMOR].

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Michel-Solarz resolution.

Mr. Speaker, no issue we confront on the House floor is as difficult as the question of war and peace. It is an issue that affects the lives of our troops, the security of the United States, and the future of other nations. It is an issue that demands the most serious possible consideration.

Today, we debate whether the President should be authorized to use force if Iraq does not leave Kuwait by January 15. We should make our decisions calmly, with our emotions and anger aside, and on the facts of the case. Here are the facts as I see them:

Iraq is a nation that has gone to war twice in a decade, invading two countries and threatening more with weapons of mass destruction. It is Iraq's dictator, Saddam Hussein who has used chemical weapons on its own people. It is a nation that 5 months ago brutally crushed and annexed a small, peaceful neighbor. It is a nation that feels it is not bound by international law or the principle of self-determination. It is a nation that seeks the wealth and technology to threaten countries around the world with nuclear bombs and ballistic missiles.

What we have seen since Iraq's invasion of Kuwait has been a remarkable display of international unity. Twelve Security Council resolutions have demanded that Kuwait leave Kuwait and restore its legitimate government. For only the second time in its history, the United Nations has authorized the use of force. Why is the world so united? Because from England to Egypt, from Moscow to Malaysia, the lessons of history are being heeded.

And that lesson is: Brutal dictators cannot be permitted to profit from aggression. Because when they do, they will surely be back. They will soon want more. Their appetites for conquest will not be satisfied, and their dreams for more power will know no limits.

Saddam Hussein is this brand of dictator. For the long term, he seeks control of one of the world's most important natural resources, so he can use the profit to build an even stronger military while his neighbors grow weaker. He seeks to acquire the weapons that will make him an Arab superpower.

For the short term, he has only one desire: He wants the world to forget about Kuwait. He wants to break up the international forces arrayed against him so that he can continue pursuing his designs for power. He wants January 15, the United Nations line in the sand, to wither away.

President Bush hopes we will give him the authority to thwart Saddam Hussein's wishes. The President wants us to send the message that the United Nations has sent: That the use of force is a legitimate option for the United States and the United Nations coalition if Saddam Hussein does not leave Kuwait by January 15.

I was disappointed when the Iraqi Foreign Minister snubbed Secretary of State Baker at the Geneva talks. I have hoped, as we all have, for a peaceful solution. As a veteran, there is nothing more I would like than to see all American troops return safely from Saudi Arabia.

But we must stick to our principles and defend our interests. And Saddam Hussein must make a choice about his own principles.

If we pass the use-of-force resolution, we will help make Saddam Hussein's choice even more clear than it already is. Will he stay on the road of aggression and brutality, or will he respect the will of the people of Kuwait, the Arab League, and the United Nations. Or put more bluntly, will Saddam Hussein choose war, or will he choose peace.

I am afraid that if we require the President to continue to rely on sanctions, as some suggest today, we will make the choice for Saddam less clear. It would increase the chance for a greater conflict later. Saddam will see it as more time to hold on to Kuwait, more time for the U.N. coalition to crumble, more time to fortify his army and weapons, more time for our men and women to linger in the desert. Regrettably, that would not be in the best interest of peace and security now or in the future.

Of course, we all wince at the horrors of war, and yearn to avoid it. But we must also wince with equal horror at a dictator who waits for the world to forget that he swallowed a small nation, who waits for a time he can move ahead in his quest for dominance in his region and power in the world. Some say it will not happen, that the world would not look the other way. My friends, it has happened before. It resulted in World War II, and it resulted in a level of death and destruction far beyond what we wince at today.

Today, we take a step to prevent a greater conflict in the future. We must give the President the ability to act now, while the United Nations coalition is united, determined, and focused.

For these reasons, I support the Michel-Solarz use-of-force resolution.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON].

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the issues before us today are without question the most difficult of our political career. The outcome of our deliberations will affect the entire world and the lives of thousands of Americans. It is, as well, a vote each of us must carry with us the rest of our lives.

As we begin this debate, let us clearly consider the function and role of our deliberations. Many, in the Congress and the American public believe we are here today to provide the President clear authority on the use of force in the gulf crisis.

Unfortunately, I do not believe that is our role at all. The Congress has two specific and different responsibilities regarding war. The first, is to raise and fund an army. In the last session of Congress, we passed legislation to authorize the commitment of troops to the Persian Gulf. As a part of our appropriation process for fiscal year 1991, we provided open ended funding for the Desert Shield operation. Thus, under both the provisions of the War Powers Act and the Constitution Congress has met its initial responsibilities. In retrospect, I regret that the authority is open ended. We should have set an expiration date before the end of this fiscal year. Our failure to do so runs the risks similar to the results of the Gulf of Tonkin resolution years ago.

The second perception is that we are here today to consider an official declaration of war, believing such action is necessary before the President can use any force in the Persian Gulf. History will show that is not the role of a declaration of war. Five times in American history, the Congress has passed a declaration of war. Each time, military hostilities had been engaged and the President then came to Congress seeking an official declaration of a state of war between two nations. The result of such action is the total breakoff of all diplomatic relations, freezing of all national assets, and the registering of foreign nationals. For any of us who still hope for a diplomatic solution, a declaration of war is the absolute wrong thing to occur at this time.

Thus, I believe, and most constitutional experts believe, the President already has the clear authority under the Constitution and the previous acts of Congress last fall to take any and all actions he deems necessary regarding the use of force. Thus, our role is twofold. First, the Congress and the American people want the Congress to make a statement regarding the use of force. While, this may satisfy our emotional desires, I must say that if Congress desired to reject the presence and use of American troops in the gulf, Congress should have considered such issue first last August when troops were initially deployed or secondly when the Presi-

dent ordered a major buildup last November.

Our second role in considering this issue today is to contribute to the international response to the brutal invasion of Kuwait. In particular, we are considering whether the Congress endorses the provisions of the 12 United Nations resolutions in response to the crises, in particular the authorizing of the use of all means to accomplish the withdrawal of Iraq from Kuwait after January 15.

In this regard, I am most disappointed by the procedure before us. We in the House will be considering three different resolutions. Indications are that all three might pass, which sends a totally contradictory signal to Saddam Hussein and the world. Second there is serious consideration of whether the Senate will even pass a resolution, and if so by a very narrow margin. The end result of congressional deliberations could be one, not of authorizing force but rather sending the message to Saddam Hussein that America is totally split on our resolve; that he should simply wait us out; and over a period of time Americans will more desperately want their troops home than we want him out of Kuwait.

Earlier this week, I held nine different town meetings in my district. The primary purpose was not only to discuss the Persian Gulf issue with constituents, but more importantly to hear from the families of the troops stationed over in the gulf. No family wants war or the loss of life. No American does. But the families were very clear in making two points: First, either support the troops in the gulf or bring them home. Second, they do not want their loved one still sitting in the gulf a year from now. If we are not going to resolve the crisis, then bring them home as well. Thus, part of our purpose here today must be to determine how we can contribute most positively to a quick and hopefully peaceful resolution of the crisis.

At this point, we must ask ourselves what is the justification for even having American troops in the gulf. And while there are reasons to and not to be there, let us focus today on the reasons for an American presence.

I believe the leader of the free world carries special responsibilities. First, among them is to respond to requests for help when nations either become the victims of or are threatened by blatant, naked aggression. The basic tenet of any civilized society must be a respect for an international order built first and foremost on the right of nations to exist.

In this case, our intelligence and that of Saudi Arabia indicated that Saddam Hussein was not about to stop with the blatant invasion of Kuwait. Saudi Arabia asked for our help to prevent further aggression. Kuwait asked for our help to impress upon Hussein the magnitude of world condemnation in hopes of reversing his aggression.

Second, there must be no doubt that Saddam Hussein left to his own wills and public statements, wants to create one great pan-Arab nation. The later implications of such action are obviously to destroy Israel. All Americans must recognize that if such actions were to occur we would go to the defense of our ally. It is by far in the interests of America that we do not allow him to amass either the land or the resources of one great Arab nation and the temptations and threats that would surely follow.

Third, while he does not possess today a nuclear weapon, there is no doubt that he intends to have one in the near future. And we know he possesses the enriched uranium to do so. Is there any doubt among any of us that a man willing to rule by terror and death, willing to use chemical weapons on his own people, would not hesitate to use nuclear weapons to accomplish his goals? In this context it becomes especially important for the world community to not allow the creation of one great Arab nation under his rule. It is for these reasons that the Arab League has taken the dramatic steps to oppose his actions diplomatically and commit their resources and troops to oppose the actions of an Arab nation. The major impact of this simply cannot be overstated.

But it does present to us a picture of the new post-cold-war world order and the importance of the world's response to this crisis. As dangerous as this crisis is, can anyone even begin to imagine the danger that would loom were this 5 years ago and the Soviet Union were on the other side? Today, the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe stand side by side the world community in condemnation to his actions. Second, the crisis has resulted in a division of the Arab world into two factions; the moderate Arab nations and the radical Arab States. Never again will the Middle East geopolitical situation be the same. Likewise, at the end of this crisis there must be little doubt the moderate Arab nations will demand and achieve world cooperation in resolving the longstanding Middle East dispute regarding the Palestinians and the occupied territories. Third, unlike even previous American administrations, the Bush administration has chosen to assist in making the United Nations a viable entity in resolving world crises. If the United Nations response to the Kuwait invasion is successful, we will see a renewed sense of international diplomacy and the reduction of military solutions. The simple fact that the United States and the Soviet Union will no longer be participating in competitive arms sales will prevent the regrettable circumstances we find today where we both, along with France, are guilty of selling arms to Iraq that have contributed to today's crisis.

For these and other reasons, I believe most Americans are united in their condemnation of Saddam Hussein and his brutal aggression, rape, murder, and pillaging of Kuwait. Most Americans are united with the world community in the initial defensive measures to defend against further aggression, and to pressure for Hussein's withdrawal from Kuwait. That includes the use of sanctions and other economic tools, the many diplomatic tools of the United Nations and elsewhere, and some use of a military presence.

The question we face today, frankly, is how can we now contribute further to a successful resolution of this conflict at minimum risk to the lives of American citizens and the world community. Mr. Speaker, I have concluded that this is the basic question. Will the threat of force, or the use of force increase or decrease the risk to American lives?

The answer to this question must begin with an assessment of whether or not present actions seem sufficient to accomplish our goals. Such discussion begins with a careful assessment of Saddam Hussein, himself. Unfortunately, it appears the only thing he understands is force. And even more unfortunate, he seems totally willing to allow force to be used against his people as long as it does not bring risk to himself and his power. Thus, the major risk of this congressional debate is that we will only hurt our goals by sending the signal to Hussein that he can wait us out.

Second, we must assess the question of whether sanctions and diplomatic pressure will sufficiently cause the withdrawal from Kuwait. While the sanctions are generally working, the question of their effectiveness is suspect. In a letter, dated January 11 to Congressman LES ASPIN, Judge Webster of the Central Intelligence wrote:

> In December, during my appearance before the House Armed Services Committee, I noted that while we can look ahead several months and predict the gradual deterioration of the Iraqi economy, it is more difficult to assess how or when these conditions will cause Saddam to modify his behavior. Our judgement remains that, even if sanctions continue to be enforced for an additional 6 to 12 months, economic hardship alone is unlikely to compel Saddam to retreat from Kuwait or cause regime-threatening popular discontent in Iraq. The economic impact of sanctions is likely to be increasingly serious, with conspicuous hardships and dislocations. Nevertheless, Saddam currently appears willing to accept even a subsistence economy in a continued attempt to outlast the international resolve to maintain the sanctions, especially if the threat of war recedes significantly. He probably continues to believe that Iraq can endure sanctions longer than the international coalition will hold and hopes that avoiding war will buy him time to negotiate a settlement more favorable to him.

What signal do we send by our actions here today? In light of this assessment our message becomes even more important. This returns us to the question of endorsing the U.N. resolution endorsing all means to accomplish the withdrawal from Kuwait. In so doing, we must carefully consider the implications of such action.

First, I want to emphasize we are not automatically committing the allies to the use of force. Rather, we are sending the signal to Saddam Hussein that the Congress will endorse the possible use of force as one of many means envisioned by the U.N. resolution. If we are dealing with a man who only respects force, then perhaps raising to him the possibility of using force will obtain the peaceful withdrawal by Iraq from Kuwait that we all seek.

It is not new either in history or in recent times that the threat of force was used to keep the peace. The most obvious example is the creation of NATO following World War II. Through the use of this organized threat of force, Europe has now enjoyed the longest period of peace in history. Second, the decision by this Congress and the Reagan administration to upgrade the quality and size of our nuclear forces during the 1980's has resulted in the most comprehensive and dramatic series of arms control treaties ever, resulting for the first time in actual reduction of nuclear weapons on both sides.

Second, I want to emphasize that authorizing the use of force does not automatically mean a major use of force, especially that of troops. More and more I am becoming convinced that the combination of economic and diplomatic efforts plus the possibility or actual use of limited force in the version of target-controlled air strikes is now our best hope to achieve our goals in the region without major risk to American lives. This does not, and in my opinion should not, include a major land offensive. Recent history has shown two occasions where such actions have accomplished our goals. First, our targeted bombing of Libya has resulted in the restoration of civil conduct by Qadhafi. Second, Israel's bombing some years ago of Iraq's nuclear production facility prevented the world from today sitting on the brink of nuclear war. Both actions were limited, targeted, controlled, and accomplished with minimal risk to the lives of our respective military.

Frankly, I prefer a very limited use of such force aimed only at one or more army weapons production facilities. It should be used only to communicate to Saddam Hussein the resolve of the world community to demand his withdrawal. Other experts suggest a more comprehensive air strike aimed at Iraq's air-defense forces—the integrated radar networks, antiaircraft missiles systems, airfields, and perhaps even their electric systems.

I admit the terrible risks of any such use. Yes, there is the possibility of a limited strike evolving into a full-scale war. No one can predict the actual outcomes of such actions. And we all will, and we all must, be ready to bear the burden for such decisions. But Saddam Hussein has a history of miscalculation. And I believe we must again prove to him his miscalculation of world resolve, and unfortunately we may have to threaten or even possibly use force to convince him of this fact.

But I do not believe this man, who lives and thrives on maintaining his own political power, will risk losing that power in the face of a serious threat of force. Second, I do not believe he will actually attack Israel. For by doing so, he will incur a military response from Israel in a magnitude and manner, frankly, the Western World would hesitate to use. There is no doubt in anyone's mind that Israel has the military ability to literally wipe Iraq off the map. He must know better than to run that risk.

So the question today, really, is not one of goals, but of strategy. It is not one of authorizing force but rather of sending a message. Thus, I must conclude that 4 days before the U.N. deadline for a peaceful withdrawal from Kuwait, we in the Congress have no choice. A vote to limit or deny the possible use of force will stop neither the President or the United Nations. But it will send the fateful signal to Hussein that if he stalls, he can outlast American resolve and the world alliance against him. Thus, the Congress must stand today with the other 30 nations who have committed troops and arsenal to the gulf. And we must do no less than the United Nations, the world peacekeeping body, has resolved.

In doing so, we contribute yet to a possible peaceful solution. We give new meaning to the diplomatic initiatives of Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar. We give new meaning to the Algerian effort to establish an Arab resolution of the crisis. Frankly, either of these efforts can provide a linkage to resolving the Palestinian issue that we cannot, and should not, do.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to mislead anyone by saying that all families involved in the gulf support the Solarz-Michel resolution before us. Quite the contrary. But I do want to share two messages which have affected me.

On Christmas Day, a constituent, stationed in the gulf wrote me these words:

I am a soldier in the United States Army, serving proudly in Operation Desert Shield, somewhere in Saudi Arabia. I'm here because I wanted to be. Things are well here, and our morale is good. However, I am concerned that things back home aren't going right. It concerns me that the Executive Branch has gotten so much power that one man can declare war—if President Bush wants to go for it after January 15th, then we, America, will go to war.

What happened to the division of power? How about democracy? While the President pushes and orders, Congress is meekly sitting by, nodding its head, and doing whatever Congress does, perhaps arguing the legality of burning the flag, and what type of law should or should not be passed. Why don't you, Mr. Congressman, show that Congress still has the power that our founding Fathers intended it to have? Don't let our country go to war unless Congress also approves.

I as a serviceman am proud to fight for what my country feels I should fight for. I am both a single American with one voice and one vote, and a soldier, an instrument of foreign policy. As a soldier, I am here serving my country. As an American citizen, I am writing my elected voice in Congress to express my fear that our democracy is slipping.

American voices need to be heard. It is American lives that are at stake. Mr. Gunderson, please remember that you, too, have a dual role in our democracy, both as a single American citizen like myself, and as a Congressman, elected by the people of Wisconsin as the best person to voice our concerns. To speak and to act in our best interests. Somewhere along the line our great country has gotten off track. One man has become all powerful. Our Congress listens only to corporations that don't vote but do pay for reelection campaigns. And our judicial branch, I'm afraid, is in a state of permanent recess.

Mr. Congressman, I want you to know that I am willing and proud to fight in a war with Iraq, if that is what our country wishes. But our country is made up of several hundred million people, not just a single power hungry man. Before we go to war, please be sure, sir, that war is in America's best interest. By allowing the President alone to make war is to set a very dangerous precedent. Let Congress take back its share of the power, and once again America may be led by the voice of the people, the land of the free, and so on.

Happy holidays from the Kingdom.

Mr. Speaker, this young man and 400,000 others in the gulf are watching this Congress and our actions here today. They are asking for a message. And I believe that message was clearly layed out in another letter I received, this one from the father of a young man in the gulf, when he wrote earlier this year to me:

Now I ask of you a favor. Our son * * * is a soldier in Operation Desert Shield. He understands he is in the Persian Gulf area because he is a soldier and is subject to the orders of his Commander-in-Chief. He is doing the best he can.

On his behalf and that of the other men and women in our Armed Forces please use your considerable influence in Congress to either fully support the Administration or to withdraw all U.S. Forces from the area.

To ask our sons and daughters to risk their real lives, not their political lives, while some in Congress posture and confuse Saddam Hussein is unforgivable.

I urge you and your colleagues in Congress to promptly support the mission of our Armed Forces or get them out now.

Mr. Speaker, we each must vote our conscience today and live with the results of our action. But for me, I must pursue the one strategy I believe holds

out the best hope for accomplishing our goals with minimal risk to our soldiers. I must stand with the U.N. actions through the Solarz-Michel resolution. And in so doing I only hope to God, that through this action, we might yet achieve peace.

□ 1720

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA].

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, we are here today engaged in the exercise of one of the great strengths of democracy—the elected representatives of a free people are openly debating and voting on the future course of our country at a time of national crisis.

The words spoken in this debate will soon fade from memory, but the votes cast on the Persian Gulf resolutions will be forever etched in history.

From the very start of this crisis, my goal has been to help find a way to peaceful settlement. No one wants to avoid war more than those of us who have been in war. Having been wounded twice in Vietnam, I know firsthand the horrors of war, and will always try to prevent war. We are all praying for peace and the best way to achieve that goal.

We join here not to debate whether Saddam Hussein has committed unfathomable atrocities against the people of Kuwait—we all know he has. We join here not to debate whether Saddam Hussein must leave Kuwait—we all agree he must. We are here to debate what is the most effective method of achieving that goal, and to find the best route to a peaceful settlement of this crisis.

There are those who say economic sanctions alone will force Iraq to withdraw from Kuwait. As we are all aware, the intelligence community has concluded "there was no evidence that sanctions would mandate a change in Saddam Hussein's behavior and there was no evidence when or even if they would force him out of Kuwait." Also, Mr. Speaker, there are innumerable examples in history of the failure of economic sanctions to achieve the desired effect.

Mr. Speaker, only when Saddam Hussein is convinced that the nations arrayed against him may use force, will there be a possibility of peace.

In an address in August of 1939, Winston Churchill said the following about the House of Commons:

> This House is sometimes disparaged in this country, but abroad it counts. Abroad, the House is counted as a most formidable expression of the British national will and as an instrument of that will in resistance to aggression.

This statement also applies to the role of the U.S. House of Representatives. I am confident that the House will vote to support the President. When it does, the world will know, and Saddam Hussein will know, the American people are united behind their President and supportive of the American and allied troops deployed in the Persian Gulf region.

Mr. Speaker, in a radio address to his constituents in June of 1941, former Senator Claude Pepper of Florida spoke on the rising threat of nazism. He stated that:

> America's strength is not great unless it is a united strength. Our power is not determining unless it is mobilized. America's will is not decisive unless it is one irresistible will.

America is the principal member of the coalition opposing Hussein's aggression, and we in the Congress must now confirm our support for United Nations Security Council Resolution 678.

Mr. Speaker, while mankind has made great strides in so many areas in this 20th century, it has also been a century of great tragedies:

This has been the most violent century in the history of man; tens of millions have died in armed conflicts in the 20th century; the unspeakable horror of the Holocaust occurred in this century; and weapons of mass destruction have proliferated in recent decades.

What lessons have we learned from the tragedies that have occurred in this century? I believe the most important lesson we should have learned is that the appeasement of expansionist, dictatorial regimes results in the eventual occurrence of armed conflict on a large scale.

We are all familiar with the failure of the League of Nations to maintain global peace and its inability to check the ambition of dictators. For many years the effectiveness of the United Nations was impaired by the two superpowers conflicting policies on the world stage.

Today, as we deal with the first crisis of the post-cold war era, we are at a crossroads of history. We stand with an opportunity to make the United Nations a truly effective instrument in the maintenance of international law and order.

There are those who say that Saddam Hussein is just another Third World dictator and that he is no threat to America's global interests. I disagree.

The world knows of the human suffering and distress that he has already wrought: 1 million casualties in the Iraq-Iran war; his use of chemical weapons against both Iran and the Kurdish minority in his own country; and the nation of Kuwait has been invaded, occupied, pillaged, and devastated.

Mr. Speaker, I have met with Kuwaiti citizens who have told me of the incredible suffering their citizens have been going through.

Amnesty International has documented in chilling and grotesque detail the torture, mutilation, murder, and rape of innumerable Kuwaiti citizens.

But beyond the issue of the invasion and devastation of an innocent nation, is the broader issue of the potential impact of Saddam Hussein on the world stage if his ambitions are not countered.

Had President Bush not acted to deploy our troops shortly after the August 2 invasion, Saddam Hussein could have easily deployed his troops into Saudi Arabia and captured their oil fields.

He then would have controlled half of the world's known oil reserves.

The greatest concentration of resources in the world would have been in the hands of a ruthless dictator who not only possesses chemical weapons, but is developing even more threatening nuclear and biological weapons.

Mr. Speaker, this man has demonstrated his willingness to use whatever weapons are in his arsenal in order to achieve his geopolitical ambitions.

We cannot have this debate without addressing how proud we are of our young men and women serving in Saudi Arabia. I've visited the front-line troops twice. The conditions are harsh, but their dedication is solid.

Last month, I wrote to many of the soldiers, from the area I represent, who are in Saudi Arabia. I received this note back from Sgt. Brian C. Marcnitello:

> Thanks for your support in our mission in Saudi Arabia. I have received a lot of mail from fellow Pennsylvanians. Without family, friends, and new fans, I don't think I could survive this crisis. I am a crew chief of a C-130 aircraft and have been flying a lot of missions since my arrival back in August. We are all tired but strive to accomplish our true mission and our job. We are proud to be here and proud to be Americans.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote from a congressional debate of August 12, 1941, on the eve of World War II. In that debate, John McCormack, a young Congressman from Massachusetts who later became Speaker of the House said:

> We are the trustees of the present and future of our country. That is our job. It is our duty to perform it without fear of the consequences. The question that confronts us is not what we would like to do, but what we must do under the conditions that exist throughout the world today.

Mr. Speaker, I believe what we must do under the conditions that exist in the world today is vote to support the U.N. Resolution 678, the President of the United States, and the servicemen and servicewomen deployed in the Persian Gulf.

A vote for the Michel-Solarz resolution is a vote to oppose aggression.

A vote for the Michel-Solarz resolution is a vote to voice support for the world's community's opposition to an expansionist dictator.

A vote for the Michel-Solarz resolution is a vote to tell the world and Sad-

dam Hussein that America stands by its principles.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ACKERMAN].

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, this is not why I came here, to vote for war. Yet over the last several weeks, I have found myself at war with my own conscience. All my life I have decried violence and all who commit it. All my life I have been and I am a peacemongerer. I opposed Vietnam and even Grenada. I oppose the death penalty. I do not think boxing is a sport. I am even against killing animals without purpose. Toy guns and war games have always been banned from my house.

I am a father who wants his children to grow up in a world at peace. The last thing that I came here to do was to participate in something that would injure someone or take the life of even one human being. But what am I supposed to do? Instinctively I should vote to do nothing, maintain the status quo, give peace a chance, no artificial deadlines. I can explain that easily to my past, to my philosophical soul mates, and to my constituents. However, having done that my hands would be no less free from blood, because I really know that the world is not filled with only peacemakers. I think that there are those who act as if devoid of reason, and who are committed to nothing but power and violence. I am in conflict because I really know that, and we all know that Saddam Hussein is not a good person. He caused a million deaths in trying to take over Iran. He gassed tens of thousands of Kurds. He threatened to burn half of Israel. He devoured neighboring Kuwait. He moved hundreds of thousands of aggressor forces toward Saudi Arabia. Why has he temporarily stopped? Not because we said "please." Not because of sanctions. Not because of condemnations. Not because of group prayer. Not because we threatened him with the negotiations. Not because we threatened to send a committee of diplomats carrying umbrellas. He stopped temporarily for the same reason that all bullies stop—force, or the threat of force.

He is a murderous, international runaway train, and he has to be stopped. If Members want to stop a bully, they have to let him know they are willing to step up to the plate. Why the rush? Why the deadline? Without a deadline, he stays and he wins. No one moves without a deadline. We do not even vote on bills without a deadline. We would not even be here wringing our collective hands and expressing our legislative will today if we did not have a deadline.

For years, we have been espousing our constitutional turf, rightfully insisting unto ourselves the authority to declare war. We cannot have legal authority without exercising moral responsibility.

There were lessons in Vietnam. Saddam Hussein thinks he has learned one, that the United States has no national resolve that Americans will do anything, short of shedding blood, that the Congress will pick apart the President and undermine our troops and our strategy, and let him have his violent way.

Mr. Speaker, let the United States learn him a new lesson. The best chance for peace that we have is for a message to be sent from here today that the American people, through their Congress, is behind their President and their soldiers and are willing to stand up for this vicious aggression.

Mr. Speaker, we fought wars that we have never declared. We have declared wars that we never fought. The war on hunger, on drugs, on poverty and homelessness. Let this be one of them.

Mr. Speaker, I will not cast this vote with any sense of joy. I tremble at the thought of playing God and having to cast it. The only thing I fear more would be sitting on the rocker on the porch, if God grants me the years to reach retirement, and having some little girl who hopefully would look a little like her grandmother, look at me and ask, "Grandpa, why didn't anyone stop him?"

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Gephardt-Hamilton amendment and oppose the declaration of war amendment.

War, and the inevitable death of thousands of Americans, must be a last resort and must be undertaken only for the gravest reasons, for the most important national interests. We have not exhausted our other options, and our national interest in removing Iraq from Kuwait is less significant than the President claims. I cannot at this time vote to authorize a declaration of war.

What is Kuwait? Why is its survival of the highest importance to the people of Michigan and the United States? Not because it is a democracy. Even South Vietnam for whom 58,000 Americans died, could make plausible claims that it was a democracy threatened by communism. But Kuwait is a monarchy. Its rulers suspended the country's parliament in 1986 in the face of a movement for democratic reforms. Not because Kuwait is a friend of the United States. Kuwait voted against us 9 out of 10 times in the United Nations over the last 10 years. We have no treaty obligation to defend Kuwait.

Clearly, Kuwait's independence and the restoration of its ruling family are not worth the loss of American lives, let alone the enormous expense of our Nation's wealth.

Is Iraq such a threat to the United States and our people that its aggression against Kuwait justifies war? It is not such a threat now, and the continued crush of world-wide economic sanctions will make Iraq less of a threat with the passage of time.

No one should forget that Iraq invaded another, larger neighbor 8 years ago and received our country's support. When Iraq invaded Iran the President did not threaten war, far from it. When Iraq invaded Iran, we provided Iraq with food, arms, and intelligence support. Its aggression was not seen as a threat to world peace or vital American interests then. Iraq's annexation of Kuwait is no more a threat to the American people now than was the invasion of Iran then.

Vice-President QUAYLE claims that Iraq is developing a nuclear weapon whose use would threaten the entire Middle East and, eventually, the world. In fact, however, that threat is so distant as to be negligible. There is no way that Iraq will pose a nuclear threat to anyone during the life of the economic embargo. We lose nothing, and Iraq gains nothing if the world continues to crush Iraq economically for another 12 months. If we go to war, the situation will be very different. Our losses, in blood, treasure, and diplomacy will be enormous and unjustifiable.

I do not want an American war against Iraq. If there must be war, I want it to be a U.N. war against Iraq, or, at least, a war in which we are joined by all our allies and the Mideast nations that Iraq threatens. I want to know today what every American will ask when the body bags come home: where are our allies?

Why have Germany, Italy, Spain, Australia, Japan, and so many others done nothing and left the fighting and dying to the Americans? If Saddam Hussein is such a threat to the world, why have our troops been joined by only a relative few from Great Britain and France? President Bush's rush to war has American lives too far out in front.

A battlefield victory for the United States over Iraq will not end this crisis or bring stability to the Middle East. We cannot occupy Iraq, or even Kuwait, and we cannot control the hatred that will boil over in the Arab world if Israel is drawn into this conflict. Until our goals are clearer than they are today, Congress should not authorize a declaration of war or any offensive action by United States forces.

I served in Congress during the Vietnam war and shared responsibility for the commitment of troops we made in 1965–67. When I turned against the war, it was because I realized we had been lied to about its purposes and chances for success. I learned that the decision to send American soldiers to war—and some to their death—is the heaviest responsibility of a Member of Congress, one that should never be made easily and without the total support of the American people. Nothing in this conflict with Iraq makes me willing to send young men and women to their death.

Finally, let no one question my support for and faith in our soldiers stationed in the Persian Gulf. If we go to war, I have no doubt that we will ultimately emerge victorious from the battlefield. President Bush's request for additional funding for Desert Shield, which will come before us in February, will overwhelmingly pass the Congress, with my support. While I reject the President's justification for this war, I would never vote to deny additional funding for the job we have undertaken or risk tying the hands of our men and women in uniform. I would rather see them come home

today, but if they must fight I want to win and win swiftly.

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the Democratic caucus chairman, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Hamilton-Gephardt resolution. I do so in a belief that though military action may be the only alternative available in the near term—at this time, further diplomatic efforts and the continued imposition of strong sanctions may avert the necessity of war.

There is a consensus on our goal: Saddam Hussein must leave Kuwait. The world must not tolerate nor reward his illegal and violent aggression. The Congress and the American people are in agreement with the President on this principle.

But we have contained Saddam Hussein. If he moves one step further, the Gephardt-Hamilton resolution provides for the immediate and full scale use of force to protect our troops and our allied interests in the gulf.

Continued enforcement of the sanctions may or may not lead to the removal of Saddam Hussein from Kuwait. But there is no question that the sanctions are weakening Iraq. Admiral Crowe, former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, stated:

> The embargo is biting heavily. * * * Iraq's civilian production has declined by 40%, exports earnings have sharply dropped, and economic flexibility is rapidly disappearing. Military industry will likewise be hit. It is the most effective peacetime blockade ever levied.

At the same time, I do not believe that Saddam Hussein will ever back down if doing so is perceived as backing down to the United States. The threat of force, no matter how credible, will not change this. I therefore do not agree with arguments being made that Saddam Hussein will retreat in the face of an implicit declaration of war by the Congress. But there may be a chance that Saddam Hussein understands that he cannot win a war with the United States and its United Nations allies. Surely, if he doesn't understand that, he should. And if he does, he may be looking for a way out of this crisis without appearing to back down to the United States. And if he is, then removing the threat of what the world perceives to be a United States deadline, may allow for a diplomatic solution which achieves the same goal—the full withdrawal of Saddam Hussein from Kuwait.

From the time of St. Augustine, people of principle have unanimously agreed that war must only be waged as a last resort. I am not convinced that all options have been exhausted.

There are no national strategic interests immediately at stake. Therefore, the United States has the option—and the Congress the opportunity—to pause and be certain of our course. The United States can and should continue to work with the United Nations to accomplish our shared goals. At the same time, the President and the United Nations can work to increase the commitment of both troops and money of other nations to bring together a truely international force to accomplish our ends. And the public support can be strengthened through the certainty that all options have been exhausted before unsheathing the sword of war.

The Gephardt-Hamilton resolution does not preclude the future use of force to accomplish our goal.

Let me repeat that Saddam's aggression must not be sustained or rewarded. But I do not see the urgency for action on the arbitrary date of January 15.

I believe that the international coalition imposing the embargo will continue to be effective. I believe that Iraq will continue to suffer greatly under the embargo. And I urge Saddam Hussein to take advantage of diplomatic efforts—from whatever source—and remove himself from Kuwait. If he does not, then he should make no mistake, that the world and this country are united in the belief and commitment that he will be removed, by use of force if necessary.

The resolution by Mr. GEPHARDT and Mr. HAMILTON clearly allows for this option. The President may request at any time the use of force against Iraq to accomplish our purposes.

For now, I will vote for a pause in our race to war. The chance to accomplish Hussein's peaceful exit from Kuwait and an opportunity for the saving of American lives is worth, and indeed requires, such a pause. I will, therefore, vote in support of the Gephardt-Hamilton resolution.

□ 1730

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HERTEL].

Mr. HERTEL. Mr. Speaker, you know, the vast majority of this Congress certainly support the present policy of sanctions, but congratulations should be given for what has already been accomplished. The deployed forces were there fast enough to protect Saudi Arabia, that is very much in our interest. The hostages, I believe, were freed before Christmas because the forces were properly deployed there.

Finally, that grand alliance of a hundred nations joining together in the sanctions has held together very effectively, to the extent that 98 percent of all exports to Iraq have been stopped; 98 percent of all imports to Iraq have been stopped.

General Schwartzkopf told us when we were in Saudi Arabia last month that every day, every month, the Iraqi forces are weaker. That means they have no spare parts coming in. That means, as he said, in the weeks and months ahead they will have less planes, less tanks arrayed against our forces in any possibility that might occur.

With modern weapons today, you cannot fix them with baling wire. You need the real thing, and they are not getting any of those spare parts whatsoever.

So our policy today presently of the sanctions is working very, very strongly.

What goal do we have that remains? That is to free Kuwait. Unfortunately, the people of Kuwait are suffering very, very severely; but if there is a war, then many more of them will die.

The alliance, as I say, is holding together very well, but on the first day of war we have different nations in our alliance saying they will go in different directions. That has not happened with the sanctions, but it will with war. The French say they will only go into Kuwait, not Iraq. The Syrians will not tell us what they are going to do. The Egyptians say maybe Kuwait, but they will not go into Iraq. It will be our forces alone fighting the brunt of this war, and it will be an American war.

But the sanctions, let us have an alliance that is international.

Last month General Powell told our Armed Services Committee in hearings that we can stay the course. We can stay in the field as long as it takes to let the sanctions operate properly.

He said also that we have no deadlines imposed on ourselves because of weather changes, the time of year, or religious holidays.

Our policy today of sanctions is no Munich. Saddam Hussein cannot profit from his invasion.

The sanctions stop exports. His nation is suffering virtually totally because we are stopping his imports.

Our alliance is secure. The policy is working today.

A war policy divides the alliance on the very first day.

Many people here have said we should support the President. That is how we lost so many lives in Vietnam. People said they were supporting the President, rather than looking at the policy.

We have a responsibility under the Constitution. We all have a choice. We must face that responsibility and not just say that we are going to follow somebody else's policy, but to vote for the policy that we believe in here on the floor of the House.

A great nation like ours needs more than great power. A great nation like ours needs patience and it needs great wisdom. Should we have a war and lose some of our young men and women, or should we have patience to pursue the present policy and operate our sanctions for a longer time and have our people alive and walking home on those transport planes. If it is worth a

war to free Kuwait, then it is worth the time to make the sanctions work.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY].

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding President Bush's pathetic utterances that the language in the Constitution dealing with war is ambiguous, the Constitution of the United States in unequivocal terms confers on the Congress the exclusive right to declare war.

Notwithstanding our President's irrational statements about Iraq being a threat to world order, there is no sufficient justification to involve the United States military in armed conflict over the invasion of Kuwait. Despite President Bush's illogical rantings and ravings about the need to use force without allowing economic sanctions to play out their course, it would be a tragedy of great proportion to sacrifice the lives of American men and women in this misguided cause.

Mr. Speaker, when will the American people ask our President to define the American interest in the Kuwaiti, Iraqi, Saudi Arabian conflict? Certainly it is not to defend liberty and democracy, for Saudi Arabia and Kuwait are two of the most undemocratic, oppressive nations on the face of the earth. Hopefully, our President is not contending that the occupation of Kuwait threatens the flow of oil to American industrial machinery; there are no long lines at the gas pumps and there is no threat of the excessive consumption of our own vast oil reserves. Americans remember the long lines at the gas pumps in the 1970's, and we should not forget that they occurred as a result of Kuwaiti and Saudi Arabian OPEC Policy.

If, Mr. Speaker, the President is correct in this interpretation that the situation in the gulf is a threat to the world order, then where is the rest of the world community? Especially those nations which really depend on oil from Kuwait? We don't see Japan and Germany committing any troops to fight. We don't see France, Belgium, and England amassing hundreds of thousands of their young men and women on the border of Kuwait. And perhaps the greatest irony of all, is that we don't see Saudi Arabia and Kuwait armed at the border to suppress the Iraqi aggression.

I am unalterably opposed to sanctioning the use of force by the President to evict Iraqi troops from Kuwait, until it is demonstrated beyond a shadow of a doubt that such occupation is a threat to the world order. Our mighty military machine would probably win a war with Iraq, but the cost will be astronomical in terms of Iraqi and American lives lost.

Over the past several months I have worked with some of my colleagues in an effort to forestall the very war mongering that is presently taking place in this body today. We have argued that economic sanctions, accompanied by genuine efforts of diplomacy, should be given ample opportunity to work. But those sanctions have not been given that opportunity, and God knows that the stubborn, intransigent, abrasive attitudes of President Bush and Secretary Baker were intended to effectuate the precise war mood that exists on the floor of this House today.

In addition, I cosponsored the resolution of concern about the President's policy and requested the administration not pursue any offensive military action without the full deliberation and declaration of Congress. Further, I joined with other Members of Congress as a coplaintiff in the lawsuit which sought a Federal injunction to prevent offensive military action in the gulf without express congressional authorization.

Mr. Speaker. Diplomacy is the art of give and take. Over the years, I have criticized most militaristic foreign policy initiatives. I believe U.S. foreign policy is too often directed toward a military solution and not often enough directed toward a diplomatic resolution.

Today we have the technological power to destroy every nation on this earth—but we also have the technology to help create real dialog among all the nations of our planet. A wise Missouri legislator—Harry S. Truman—once said, "The responsibility of great states is to serve and not to dominate the world." I believe our Nation would gain much more if we would heed this advice and use our power and influence to serve others by creating viable diplomatic solutions to world problems.

A war with Iraq promises to serve no one. War is a nonsolution. The U.S. military presence in the Middle East has already acerbated the serious regional problems and turmoil which plague the nations of the Middle East and typify so many developing countries.

Mr. Speaker, today we have the opportunity to make an historic change in U.S. Foreign Policy. We have the power to pursue diplomatic solutions to world problems and we must exercise it. I implore this body to vote against war. I urge my colleagues to approve the Durbin/Bennett resolution confirming that our Constitution has vested in Congress all power to declare war and I encourage passage of the Hamilton/Gephardt resolution authorizing the defense of Saudi Arabia and the enforcement of the U.N. embargo against Iraq.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BALLENGER].

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the bipartisan Michel-Solarz resolution authorizing force to implement the U.N. Security Council resolutions concerning Iraq's unlawful invasion of Kuwait. I do not take this position easily or lightly.

I have heard from hundreds of residents from my district. Many urge support for the U.N. resolution and President Bush—many have urged caution, wanting our Government to give sanctions more time to work. And a few have gone as far as to say the United States has no business whatsoever being in the gulf.

I have concluded that congressional support of the Michel-Solarz resolution will send a clear signal to Saddam Hussein that this Congress stands solidly with the President and the international community demanding he must withdraw from Kuwait or risk being expelled by force.

I read with interest a recent article by a freelance writer, Marc Wilson, entitled "This Vietnam Protester Won't Be Quick to Oppose Gulf War." This writer is a self-proclaimed pacifist, a champion of liberal causes, and was an outspoken Vietnam protester. Yet his views on the Persian Gulf conflict are quite different from what you might expect.

I would like to read a few passages from his article.

> The Persian Gulf is not Vietnam. We would be fighting to protect the lives of millions of noncombatants whom Hussein, without losing a wink of sleep, would self-righteously gas to death on a moment's notice.
>
> We would be fighting to prevent the inevitability of nuclear weapons devolving into the hands of a man who would surely use them indiscriminately and without provocation.

Mr. Wilson goes on to say that

> The moment we * * * of liberal inclination * * * hear "war", our knee jerks quicker than our mind scrutinizes. Before we mindlessly shout "Another Vietnam!" and get swept up in heady anti-war rhetoric, we need to ponder again, when the all-compelling quest for human harmony can be actualized only by waging battle against those forces that are maniacally bent on disrupting it.

No one wants war. Certainly not I. Nor do any of my constituents. Still, the choice we have is waiting for an undetermined amount of time to see if sanctions will work or forcing Hussein out of Kuwait. The United Nations has said 5½ months is long enough to wait before resorting to other options.

I continue to have in mind the thousands of citizens in the 10th District serving in the Armed Forces; and the 1451st Transportation Company of Boone, the 540th Quartermaster Battalion and the 1450th Transportation Company, both of Lenoir, that have already been deployed. These soldiers are sons, daughters, brothers, sisters, and parents.

Passage of this resolution may help prevent a war. It is a risk, but I believe it is a risk worth taking. Make no mistake about it, any military action should be quick and decisive. The American people will not stand for American casualties mounting month after month from a prolonged conflict. The reasons we are involved in the gulf region are justified, but we should accomplish our mission and bring our young men and women home.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTON].

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, each of us will cast the most important vote of our congressional careers. The consequences of our actions will be far-reaching. World order, economic security and, literally, the life and death of thousands are at stake.

In a paradox, the most militant vote—to support the Michel-Solarz resolution—which authorizes the use of force, is, in my opinion, the vote most likely to avert war. As long as Saddam Hussein believes we will not risk war, he will not peacefully resolve the crisis. Only when he is convinced that the American people, through their elected representatives, are firmly committed to using force, if necessary, will Hussein move away from war himself.

I will vote for the Michel-Solarz resolution. I would vote for a formal declaration of war, if such a declaration was being considered, to send the most unambiguous signal possible to Sad-

dam Hussein that his aggression will not pay.

Of course, voting to authorize force, as difficult as that may be, is not nearly as difficult as the decision to use force. All of us pray for President Bush if he must make that decision. If it must be made, however, I for one hope that we decisively and overwhelmingly employ all force necessary to win, and minimize American casualties. If left unchecked, Saddam Hussein's appetite for power and conquest will only grow. To paraphrase a popular television commercial, we can stop him now, or we can stop him later.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I have cochaired the Congressional Human Rights Caucus for the last 8 years. During that time I have attended dozens of hearings and listened to hundreds of witnesses outlining human rights abuses all over the globe. Much of the testimony has been graphic and disturbing. But none has approached the horror described during the hearing I chaired in October outlining the atrocities the Kuwaiti people have suffered at the hands of the Iraqi invaders.

The witnesses—many eyewitnesses—described the most sadistic, cruel, barbaric, brutal, and vicious program of torture and repression against the people of Kuwait that can be imagined.

The litany of horror perpetrated on the Kuwaitis by the Iraqi soldiers boggles the mind: Mutilation—including castration, gouging out of eyes, pulling out of fingernails and toenails, cutting out of tongues and slicing off of ears, ripping out of hair and beards with pliers, and the application of electric shock, red-hot irons, and lighted cigarettes to sensitive parts of the body;

Rapes and sexual assaults on women of all ages, including the brutal rape of young teenage women in front of their mothers and fathers;

Murder of babies in the neonatal wards of Kuwaiti hospitals by stripping the wards of incubators and other equipment essential for the babies' survival; and

Murder and summary execution of men in front of their entire families, and the random murder of innocent civilian Kuwaitis for the most minor reasons or for no reason at all.

One witness, Mr. Speaker, said that the Iraqi soldiers' respect for human life is so negligible that they make bets on how many breaths a Kuwaiti will take between the time he is shot and the time that he dies.

A female Kuwaiti doctor testified to the barbaric rapes and to the fact that the Iraqi soldiers stole her hospital's blood supply and she watched helplessly as a young woman bled to death shortly after childbirth. She said:

As a mother, I can share each woman's horrors; as a doctor, I abhor the forced destruction of medical capabilities which has cost human lives; as a human being, I am enraged to know that other human beings possess such brutality and willingness to inflict pain and suffering on others. My heart goes out to those courageous people still in occupied Kuwait who must deal with the savage behavior of Saddam Hussein and his troops. The pain and anguish of these people must be alleviated. In a world that cares about human rights and standards of civilized conduct, how can we stand by and watch this continue?

Mr. Speaker, there is no nation on Earth more firmly committed to the cause of human rights than the United States of America. We are looked to as a beacon of hope for oppressed people everywhere. We do not, as do many others who claim to be civilized, look the other way as the rights of our fellow human beings are trampled in the dust. And we cannot and will not look the other way now.

Mr. Speaker, the President has repeatedly and correctly warned that if the United States fails to stand by and implement the resolutions of the United Nations to repel Iraqi aggression, the ability of the United Nations to prevent any future aggression will be destroyed and that organization, like its predecessor, the League of Nations, will be consigned to the dustbin of history.

Mr. Speaker, the United States is the beacon of hope to create a future world dedicated to the rule of law and the protection of the basic rights of every single human being. If we now turn our backs on the suffering of the courageous people of Kuwait, our chance to lead the world toward that future will be destroyed and the barbarism and brutality of all the Saddam Husseins, which has dominated so much of human history for so long now, will prevail. We must not allow that to happen, Mr. Speaker, we must support our President.

□ 1740

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. TAUZIN].

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, today we debate, as constitutionally we must, the issue of congressional authority for our Commander in Chief to make war—to use the great forces of our Armed Services in support of the U.N. Security Council's demand that Saddam Hussein abandon his illegal invasion of Kuwait.

As we individually and collectively weigh this awful decision, I believe it important to examine the genesis of this controversy—and I am reminded of the admonitions of the most distinguished gentlemen from California, to feel passionately, as we debate. He is correct. While we must act carefully and deliberately we cannot escape the deeply felt and often conflicting emotions which weight the hearts of every American today. Let us strip this thing down to its basics.

Saddam Hussein did not invade, Kuwait to capture its cotton fields. He launched his aggression to capture its oilfields and its oil wealth.

And we did not deploy our military forces to the Persian Gulf to protect Saudi Arabia's great cotton fields. We deployed to prevent Saddam Hussein from gathering under his unreliable control those massive Saudi and Arab Emirate oil fields that would have effectively provided to this one man, control of over one-half of the entire world's supply of oil.

The U.N. Security Council and 27 other partner nations have joined us in the Persian Gulf for one overriding reason—and it is not the price of cotton or even the price of oil: It is the security of oil—like it or not—the fuel that drives the economies of both the free and not-so-free world.

And so today men and women from Louisiana and from across America stand poised on the edge of war to fight for oil—men and women from Louisiana who would much prefer to be working in the oil and gas fields of Louisiana helping to provide our Nation with a homemade energy security are instead in battle gear defending someone else's oil fields.

And so here is my passion. To each of you who with me agonize over the best way to settle this thing peacefully, I ask you—where were the votes when it was time to decide whether we would produce here at home the energy supplies we required? When it was time to decide on moratoria against offshore drilling in America, did you not see the danger of reliance on Persian Gulf Oil? When it was time to consider exploration of our Alaskan Arctic National Wildlife Reserve [ANWR], did you turn a deaf ear—preferring to heed, instead, the voice of America's environmental extremists? When it was time for a sensible nuclear energy policy for America, did you instead applaud the decision to shut down the $5 billion, newly constructed, Shoreham nuclear facility? When it was time to write tax policy did you join in efforts to penalize domestic drilling—to make it more profitable for America's companies to drill for oil in the Persian Gulf rather than in the Gulf of Mexico? Did you prefer to see our Louisiana workers unemployed. So desperate for work that many—many more proportionately than any in America—surrendered their steel work helmets and donned instead a military one.

Is it more than wrong that Louisiana now fields more reservists and National Guard troops proportionately than any other State? Men and women—who, with just a little help with a rational American energy policy, could be in-

stead working here in America and daily building an energy security that did not depend upon Saddam Hussein or the sheiks in Kuwait or Saudi Arabia.

How sad it is that we never seem to learn. That the oil embargo of the 1970's and the Persian Gulf crisis of the early 1980's are so quickly forgotten. How many young people will we now sacrifice because somebody valued an Alaskan caribou over our own energy security and over our own children?

I will vote to stand with the President and the United Nations. I believe a united America and a credible threat of force is still the best chance for peace—the best chance to convince Saddam Hussein that he cannot succeed. But I am passionately angry that it has come to this. And I am more than ever determined that this time we learn and that we act so that maybe it will never come to this again.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS].

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, first, a personal observation. Some years ago, I had the privilege of speaking at the dedication of the Viet Nam Memorial at Fort Hays State University. Sitting in the audience were the parents and loved ones of the Fort Hays alumni who lost their lives in that conflict.

I told them that their young men did not die in vain, for this country had learned a tragic lesson—that never again would we go to war and commit American troops in combat in foreign lands where military victory was ruled out and where that commitment was not supported by the American people and their elected representatives.

I further went on to say that virtually every President has had to weigh the terrible burden of commiting troops to war and that Congress should also assume the responsibility and gravity of that judgment should such a situation arise again.

Mr. Speaker, albeit much too late in this Member's judgment, we are assuming our constitutional responsibilities and I believe this debate and vote has been and will be historic and will serve this institution well.

My colleagues, it is obvious that no Member of this body wants war and that we hope and pray that any late diplomatic efforts will prove successful. While we do not want military action, what if that is the only way to achieve our goals in the Mideast?

The President's ability for advancing the case for American involvement notwithstanding, what are the stakes so important as to endanger American lives?

Simply put, we must stop Saddam Hussein. We are not starting a war, Saddam Hussein has already done that. This was 1930's style aggession in the heart of the world's energy supplies. Additional time for sanctions and diplomacy perhaps but that same time buys Saddam credibility and we are already seeing cracks in the free world alliance. The French may be willing to put a Mideast summit and the Palestinian issue on the negotiating table.

And, the American people are hesitant to go to war unless they can see a clear and present purpose and danger in their daily lives. For instance, if we delay and sanctions and so-called diplomacy do not work—the chances are dramatically increased that Saddam may control half of the world's oil reserves and the power to manipulate production, shortages, economic panic and extortion of the free world. The potential for misery and human suffering is tremendous.

Understandably, I'm not sure we should not adopt a policy of blood for oil. To be sure, this country has a lot of soul searching to do about our lifestyle and our consumption of foreign oil. But, my colleagues, let's change the definition of "oil" to what it really is—the gasoline and diesel that enables us to produce food and fiber for this country and a troubled and hungry world.

One of my constituents in the trucking business told me last weekend that he has already paid $210,000 more in fuel prices during the past several months; that is a tax levied by Saddam Hussein for him in turn to build his war machine in an even more deadly force for international blackmail.

The Overseas Development Council has estimated that if stability is not returned to the gulf, 137 countries around the world could see their annual fuel—not oil, fuel—bills rise anywhere from $100 to $300 billion. That would have devastating effects especially in the Third World.

If Saddam consolidates power and diesel gasoline and fuel doubles and triples in price, the cost of putting a crop in the ground, harvesting it and providing it to our farm to market chain becomes questionable. My friends, we are talking about: Rationing of essential fuel supplies and food; a tremendous increase in the cost of food to our disadvantaged and poor; and an abrupt halt to our ability to prevent malnutrition and hunger throughout the world and here at home.

These are not economic problems, these are problems of human misery and suffering, food stamps will not purchase the basic needs of poor families. The American farmer, hard pressed today, will be denied essential fuel tomorrow.

It does not take much imagination to see that Hussein could line up other Arab oil producing countries and with the European Common Market supplying the food and Hussein being the Nasser of the 1990's supplying the oil, Third World countries would have no option but to rely on that axis for their food supply. And, what do we do for a farm policy with the Asian market dependent upon Arab oil, the Third World blackmailed and the Soviet Union in a free fall?

My colleagues, these downside risks, this potential for human suffering and misery, must be considered. How do we avert this?

Now, some of my colleagues said the choice is war now or patience with sanctions and diplomacy. Sanctions are not working now to the extent they will prove effective in getting Saddam Hussein out of Kuwait. And, according to the CIA report by Director William Webster and the information that has been provided to us by Chairman ASPIN, it is highly doubtful they will work in time. Time is not on our side. We already see the possible breakup of the alliance of nations which brings us to diplomacy.

And, here we have a paradox of enormous irony, people in this body who wish to negotiate do not want and should not want to even consider or discuss what Saddam wants to put on the table—a Mideast summit on the future of Palestine. If you are going to solve the gulf crisis by diplomacy, what do you talk about? Saddam's price is the future of Israel. Do we really want to go down that road? The French may already be taking that road. Do we want that debate, those diplomatic efforts?

It would be my preference, that in the spirit of Camp David and past peacemaking efforts, this Congress should and will do what we can to bring about peace in the Mideast and that means considering options different than the status quo. I don't know how else we will help solve the Palestinian question.

But, not now, not negotiating with Saddam Hussein of all people. If we delay for sanctions that have very little if any chance to work and for so-called diplomacy that for all practical purposes simply means selling out Israel, we will increase the chances of war and loss of life on a massive scale. If I thought patience and sanctions and negotiating with Saddam Hussein on the Palestinian issue would bring peace and save American lives, I would support it.

I do not question the integrity or conviction of those that do. But, someone must consider the practical effect of what may happen as a consequence of those actions and assume responsibility. The President of the United States has and he merits our support as the best chance for peace.

□ 1750

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ATKINS].

Mr. ATKINS. Mr. Speaker, when a nation is on the brink of war, her leaders search for just the right words of inspiration to give comfort to the mothers and fathers who must send

their children to a far off place, knowing that many of them might never return. You hope you can make the cause sound just and you try to find a way to explain why still one more generation must be haunted by the memory of war.

Those who would have us go to war in the Persian Gulf promised us that war is necessary to establish a new world order. But what good is it for us to emerge from a 40-year-long cold war if our new world order consists of an endless series of conflicts in the Third World where the expectation is that America will commit her troops and her resources to each war? If Americans begin to die to make an example of Saddam Hussein, can we honestly say that a more peaceful and more stable Middle East will rise from the ashes? Can we really defend the premise that all other means to finding a solution in the Persian Gulf have been exhausted and that our only recourse is death and destruction?

Saddam Hussein has indeed committed heinous acts. His acts of genocide and his acts of cruelty predate the invasion of Kuwait. This man is barbaric. He ought not to govern. He ought not to be accorded the respect of civilized nations anywhere. Most of all he ought not to have been rewarded with U.S aid while he was killing his own people. But, as we set about destroying Saddam Hussein, let us not delude ourselves. Thousands upon thousands of innocent civilians—women, children, farmers, workers—will perish violently long before we get the retribution we seek. And, just how many of our own citizens must die because we lost the patience for diplomacy or because we doubted the resolve of our allies or because economic sanctions didn't work fast enough.

I am fascinated when I hear military experts talk of surgical strikes; of an air force that can wreack havoc without doing ourselves much injury. But, the harm we do will haunt us for many, many years to come. The destruction, the bitterness, and the confusion will linger long after our planes fly home and the cost will be enormous far into the future.

The Middle East is an arena fraught with rivalries and shifting alliances that have bedeviled us for years. Eight years ago we thought we would bring order to Lebanon. We were so sure that we could put our battleships, cruisers, and destroyers off the coast of Beirut; station a contingent of Marines near the city, fly in fighter aircraft and that we could prevail. Those Marines had the latest maps and night-vision equipment just as our troops in Saudi Arabia do today. We were so sure American morality and a desire for peace would win out.

But, we know what happened. Two hundred and forty-one Marines died. We exited Lebanon stunned, anguished, and, without a peaceful resolution with which to honor their memory. And, today we find ourselves allied with yesterday's madman—Asad of Syria. For it was Asad, who brought on so much of the destruction of Lebanon because, like Saddam Hussein, he laid claim to his neighbor's lands. And, today, that land is virtually his. While we focus on today's enemy in Iraq, we ally ourselves with yesterday's enemy in Syria. This is a world that cannot be corrected by the sheer might and optimism of America we ought not to let more people die before we learn that awful lesson.

The nightmare that exists for many in the Persian Gulf cannot be fixed by a war we wage. We could go in and do enormous harm to Iraq. But, at the end of the day, it is our resources and our troops and our resolve that will be needed to rebuild the country. And, it will cost us dearly. It will be an American President who comes to this Congress to ask for billions of dollars to rebuild the country we have decimated. We will conclude that the region will be that much more unstable with the preeminance of Syria or Iran absent a strong Iraq. But, there is no Konrad Adenauer waiting in the wings to rebuild a ravaged nation after the allies withdraw.

And, at the end of the war, when our quarrel was with Saddam Hussein, will he in fact suffer a just end? I think not. Marcos. Duvalier. Idi Amin. The world is littered with dictators who brought their nations to ruin, who did grave harm to their people and, paid no price for their cruelty. Yet, we would destroy a nation and sacrifice countless American lives to get at a single criminal.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to military warfare and in support of continued economic warfare in the Persian Gulf.

I commend Speaker FOLEY for responding to the requests of myself and several other members in debating this vital issue and asserting the constitutional responsibility of Congress to decide whether or not to declare war.

I object to the Bush administration's characterization of January 15, as a deadline in which all diplomatic and sanction options must cease and military deployment and confrontation becomes inevitable. In my judgment, the U.N. resolution authorizes the use of force—it does not mandate a war and neither should we, but the authority sought in the House this week by the Bush administration seeks to use such language as an affirmative declaration of war by the Congress.

The Iraqi military takeover of another nation, Kuwait, is a violation of the most basic tenets of international law and human decency. But engaging and responding with an offensive military aggression at a possible cost of hundreds or thousands of lives when other options have not been provided the time to work is wrong. Offensive military action should be the last resort, the very last resort.

Economic sanctions is certainly the more humane and rational approach today for resolving this crisis. Economic sanctions will bring us closer to a more permanent resolution of the conflict without the tragic results of armed conflict. In 5 months, sanctions have already cut off over 90 percent of Iraq's imports and nearly 100 percent of its exports. Iraq is suffering a 50-percent reduction in its GNP as a result of the sanctions. If Iraq has no foreign currency how will it buy anything, especially replacement parts on new weapons? No country can survive isolation of this severity for a prolonged period of time. We must curb the temptation to seek instant solutions, immediate gratification and stay the course, allowing sanctions the time to work. As history has shown, easy answers don't provide lasting solutions. Success in achieving world peace demands patience and fortitude.

We can learn from our brave American soldiers in the desert who have demonstrated such patience and restraint in the face of imminent hostilities. As long as they remain, they have our prayers and support.

Mr. President, we have been patiently awaiting your leadership in developing a national energy policy. As we head into the 21st century, we cannot afford the economic and international ramifications of dependence on foreign oil. This failure to achieve energy independence is a serious national security liability. We cannot allow the loss of thousands of American lives simply to maintain a supply of oil for us and our allies. Indeed, it is the United States and other nations in the United States' coalition whose oil dollars have been key for Saddam Hussein and Iraq to build and equip the fourth largest army in the world. These recycled oil profits are now deployed against the United States because of the failure to have an energy policy and importantly to stem the proliferation of advanced conventional weapons in any meaningful way, to unstable governments such as Iraq. Worst yet the United States and other Western nations sold Iraq the weapons—an incredible irony.

Clearly, all diplomatic avenues must be exhausted and economic sanctions must be allowed to become fully effective before we should even consider the use of offensive military force. The fact that Saddam Hussein is intractible is not an adequate reason for offensive action when other means are available and working, not immediate gratification, but given a reasonable amount of time we can attain the goal of moving Iraq from Kuwait with proportionate action and measured reasonable actions, not an easy path but one that is consistent with our values and commitment.

It is vital to our Nation and the world that we exercise patience and courage at this critical point in our history. Now is not time to abandon the path of diplomacy and attempt a dangerous shortcut through the thicket of confusion and death that exists in the deserts of the Persian Gulf.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, all of us have remarked about the seriousness of this debate and discussion. I cannot think of a finer example of democracy at work than the people's representatives carrying out their responsibility in an open debate such as today's. Our democracy provides an opportunity for its elected officials to be heard on issues of such serious importance. One has to consider all aspects of our Government's decisionmaking, and the influence of the people, our constituents, of families and friends who have watched this debate and who will continue to watch this debate who have been moved in a variety of ways depending on their experiences, their relationships, and their desires.

Mr. Speaker, the common thread with all of us is that we eschew violence, now and in the future. We all hope to resolve this crisis peacefully.

□ 1800

I am as an elected Representative and a first generation Member. Most of our families were immigrants at one time or another and came to this country and made their contributions to the greatness of this country to its values, to the great system of our Government. Their contributions were made by hard work, by vision, by determination, by a commitment to a better life. And they sacrificed. Yes, from the very beginning of this institution people were skeptical about whether or not we the people's representatives would ever have the ability, the determination, and the capability to rule ourselves as a free democracy. The skeptics said we, the common people, would never have that capability.

Yet Americans from all over the world have demonstrated in these 200 years plus of our great Nation that we have done very well. I do not know of a people or a nation that has achieved for its own people more in terms of liberty and values and economics and the things in life that provide for a better future for our families than the American people have, nor who have unselfishly provided of their wealth, and of their lives, through their sacrifices, to try to help other people in the world, whether they were starving or in trouble. I do not believe that in the history of man there is as good a record as the one made by the people of this country.

I am proud of that. All those sacrifices came from the people, starting with the shot that was heard around the world, the great war that pitted brother against brother, World War I, at the time when I was born, and World War II, in which I served.

In each of these conflicts, there were the people who died and families which made sacrifices.

Today, I think of those Americas, as well as those Americans who made it possible for me to be here and not lose the sense of value that we all share with regard to our Nation but also to the kind of world in which we would like to live. This view includes our commitment to freedom, democracy and fundamental human rights. It is a view that contributed to our sense of value that the peoples of Africa, Eastern Europe, and Latin America should not become subjects of colonialism that they should have the right to rise and be independent and sovereign and strike off their shackles and make their own free determinations.

Americans have died and sacrificed to see that our value system and the rule of law exist.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OBEY). The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] has expired.

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, without that sacrifice, the world would be a jungle. It would be unsafe for everybody.

Today, Members can say, "Look, this is a tough decision. We don't want to lose any lives, and we don't want to go to war. Let's not do it today. Let's do it next week. Let's put the siege on, and let's wait. We can let sanctions run. Let's wait and find out."

So sanctions stay in place. So what? All these other things happen. So what? What happens, of course, is that Saddam Hussein becomes even more ambitious, gains monumental strength and perhaps even more emboldened. At some point we are going to have to face the decision that many want to avoid today. It seems quite clear to me that this decision must be made today, and if we are going to use diplomacy, we cannot afford to tie the military aspect of our diplomacy behind our back.

We have been successful in this respect to date because the military threat was credible. We have had and continue to have the manpower there. Saudi Arabia was saved, and the hostages were released. But I guarantee that if we let this deadline go by, nothing will happen. There is no incentive. No matter what kind of sanctions we put in, no matter whether there is starvation, he is going to stay right there in Kuwait and decide what else he can do, because he knows that as far as the United States is concerned, he will conclude that we do not mean what we say. He will just go ahead and do whatever he wants, and at some point in time, I guarantee we will have to act.

This is just based on my own experience, after watching my fellow American soldiers, millions of whom served in World War II, and who suffered and sacrificed because some leaders did not act as decisively as was necessary.

Mr. Speaker, I tell my friends that it hurts me to say this, but the time is now, not 6 months from now and not a year from now. I support the Michel-Solarz resolution to give the President that authority.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress is faced today with a very difficult decision. We must decide whether or not to authorize the President to use military force to implement the U.N. resolutions and get Iraq out of Kuwait. And we must make this decision knowing that if we say yes to force after all other means have been exhausted, this represents our best chance to avoid war. Conversely, if we say not now and maybe later, this could be the appeasement of the 1990's.

I believe that the President's decision, and that of our allies and friends throughout the world, to stand firm against Iraq's takeover of Kuwait was and is necessary and correct. Iraqi aggression has already had negative consequences for the world economy, for the prospect of stability in the Middle East, including a settlement of the Arab-Israeli problem, and puts the ability of the United Nations to play a constructive role in the future to a severe test.

There is no dispute about the gravity of the situation. Twelve U.N. resolutions and the troops of 28 nations camped in the desert attest to the depth of international concern. Everyone from the French to the Bangladeshes believe that we cannot let Iraqi aggression stand.

Most Americans, I believe, agree. Now, however, we must make the most difficult decision of all. We must decide whether we are willing to go use the military force of the United States to get Iraq out of Kuwait.

The United Nations has already spoken on this question. The Security Council has agreed that the members are willing to use all possible means to secure Iraqi withdrawal. But we all know that if military force is required, it is the United States which must be in the forefront. It is therefore crucial that the Congress, representing the American people, be heard.

For the last 5 months we and the other members of the United Nations Security Council have sought to force Iraq out of Kuwait through a combination of economic sanctions, international isolation and the threat of the use of force. However, despite a doubling of the initial United States force deployment to a massive 400,000 and agreement by the international community that it would use force to dislodge the Iraqis, there has been little indication from Saddam Hussein that he is paying attention. I would argue that were we to continue the sanctions for a year, we might find ourselves in the very same position we are in today. But by then, cynical Iraqi offers of all manner of solutions—other than total withdrawal—the expense of keeping such a massive force in the desert and time will have eroded international resolve. Time is on Saddam Hussein's side, and he knows it.

Our best chance of achieving our full objectives and full implementation of the U.N. resolution is now. The days before the United Nations deadline are the moment of peak leverage, if we choose to use it. I believe that a strong statement from the U.S. Congress, that we back the U.N. sanctions, that we back our President, that we back our troops in the desert is the best hope for a diplomatic solution, the best hope for peace.

No one wants to go to war. Least of all, those of us who have seen the horrors of the battlefield, experienced the loss of comrades and friends, and witnessed the devastation of modern armaments can produce. Neither should we fool ourselves into believing that we can count on keeping any conflict brief or the number of casualties low. Military force must only be employed when vital interests are at stake and when all else fails.

What we must accept, is that all else may fail. We simply must face this reality. If we believe that vital American—and international interests are at stake—and I do, we must be willing to fight for them.

The resolution that I and a bipartisan group of colleagues have offered in the House of Representatives is not a blank check. It gives the President the authority to use force, only if the President first determines that he has exhausted all diplomatic means of achieving a solution and if continuation of the process can serve no purpose. It permits the use of American forces, only within the context of the U.N. resolution and consistent with our Constitution.

Our intention is to leave no question in Saddam Hussein's mind as to his options. The American people will not hand him a way out.

I agree with those who define this moment as a determining point in history. This is not a moment for handwringing and half loaves. It is a moment to stand up and state clearly what we believe in and what America stands for. We believe in peace, human rights, and the rule of law in international affairs. If all else fails, we must be willing to fight for what we believe in.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST].

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Michel-Solarz resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I have served in Congress for 12 years, and no decision that I have made during that time has been more difficult than the one I must make this weekend.

After careful consideration, I have decided to vote in favor of the Michel-Solarz resolution, which authorizes the President to use all necessary means to secure Iraq's withdrawal from Kuwait by January 15. This, of course, includes the option of using military force, if the President determines that force is necessary.

I have supported the use of economic sanctions during the past 5 months and have hoped that these measures would be sufficient to convince Saddam Hussein to leave Kuwait. I also have hoped that diplomatic negotiations could lead to a peaceful resolution of this conflict. Neither sanctions nor diplomacy has been successful.

It is now clear that Saddam Hussein will not budge unless he is faced with the imminent threat of military action. It is my hope that passage of the Michel-Solarz resolution will finally convince Saddam Hussein that he has no option other than reaching a negotiated settlement of this controversy. Passage of the resolution will provide President Bush with an enormous club that I sincerely hope will not have to be used.

I think it was appropriate for Congress to act in this matter. The Constitution vests in Congress the authority to commit the United States to war. Some Presidents, in the past, have sidestepped this clear constitutional mandate, but the American people have a right to be involved in any decision of this magnitude, and the way to involve them is through congressional debate and action.

A vote in favor of the Michel-Solarz resolution makes it clear that Congress and the American people support the use of military force and that any commitment of force from this point forward has been done in accordance with our system of law.

It is my sincere hope that war will not occur. I hope that President Bush, armed with a vote of Congress in support of military action—if necessary, will go back to the bargaining table and force Saddam Hussein to withdraw by diplomatic means. Also, I hope that President Bush will now give economic sanctions some additional time to work.

President Bush does not need to attack on January 15 to force Iraq's withdrawal from Kuwait. Certainly, he can now communicate to Saddam Hussein that the American people support the use of military force—if necessary—and Saddam Hussein would need to be deaf and blind not to understand that a diplomatic resolution of this matter is in his own best interest.

Saddam Hussein is a threat to the security of the entire Middle East and is a threat to the political and economic security of the entire world. He cannot be permitted to unilaterally violate the borders of sovereign nations of the world or to intimidate his neighbors through other military threats.

I realize that not everyone in the 24th Congressional District will agree with the vote I am casting this weekend; but, I believe that a vote in favor of the Michel-Solarz resolution is in the best interest of our country and presents the best prospect for a peaceful settlement of this conflict.

I hope and pray that the use of force will not be necessary and urge President Bush to continue to try to resolve this matter short of war.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN].

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Gephardt-Hamilton resolution and to speak to the district I represent in West Texas. It is a district in which the effects of what we do here in the Congress will have an immediate impact. Fort Bliss, TX, has already contributed 8,500 troops to Saudi Arabia and the gulf. El Paso is a city with a long and proud military history. None of us has ever been more aware than we are today of that tradition and the sacrifices it continues to require.

It is because of those associations and because of the seriousness of these decisions that I must be emphatic and clear on one point. I want Saddam Hussein to know that my vote in support of sanctions as our first option today should give him no comfort, satisfaction or advantage. We do not show a weakness of resolve because some of us respectfully disagree with President Bush as to the timing and means of expelling Iraqi occupation forces from Kuwait. No one, least of all Saddam Hussein, should misunderstand what we are doing here in the Congress—we are describing in different voices the inevitable evacuation of Kuwait by Iraq and Saddam Hussein's total defeat, by whatever means.

There is one point that those who are watching this debate must understand, whether they are at home in El Paso or Pecos, TX, or whether they are government officials in another part of the world. This debate is first about the responsibilities vested in the Congress of the United States by our Constitution. The Congress has never before taken a vote the result of which is to remove itself from the debate and at the same time to give one man, the President, the authority to commit our military forces to offensive action at any time in the future. In 200 years, we have never explicitly given away that prerogative, we have never expressly abdicated our responsibility—and there is nothing about this confrontation with Iraq that says we should do so now.

If at the same time this debate is also about going to war, we must consider that issue according to our consciences, but only once we have discharged our duty to those we represent under the Constitution. Those who decide that they must continue to stand with the President while meeting our unavoidable responsibility to act under the Constitution may do so in good conscience. I have decided to disagree respectfully with the President on the tactics for defeating Saddam Hussein. I am not convinced that a congressional resolution that gives the President permission to use force will result in Saddam Hussein leaving Kuwait immediately, before January 15, 1991. If I were so convinced, I would vote with Mr. SOLARZ and Mr. MICHEL.

I took an oath last week that I have been privileged to take solemnly four other times as well—that in discharging the duties of my office, I will "bear true faith and allegiance to the Constitution" and in so doing, defend it against all enemies, foreign and domestic. My personal constitutional responsibility as a Member of Congress is clear—this institution is alone responsible for voting to take the United States, its citizens and its Armed Forces, into war.

I have great respect and admiration for what President Bush has achieved thus far in this crisis. In responding to Iraq's indefensible aggression, the President in just over 6 months has managed a policy which has been effective and which has sought to unify the nations of the world against a common threat. Congress as a whole admires what that policy has achieved. We said last August that the commitment of United States forces to the region was intended to deter further territorial incursions by Iraq and it has. We said that in arraying a multinational force composed of troops from 28 nations and in uniting the United Nations through sanctions and the passage of 12 separate resolutions, we would demonstrate the isolation of this man and his dictatorship, and we have. This policy has achieved the release of the hostages, taken by Saddam Hussein in cowardice. Not least, the policy to date has restored relative stability to the world economy and assured that there is no fundamental disruption in the supply of energy to the industrialized and developing nations.

There is only one objective that the President's policy has not achieved—the evacuation of Kuwait by Saddam Hussein's forces.

By any measure, it should have; by any sane calculation, Iraq should have withdrawn. It faces the starvation of its people and military annihilation. The Government of Iraq is obviously blind and indifferent to that suffering. Perhaps additional diplomacy may help to describe the far more terrible consequences of war. In my judgment, in combination with sanctions and the readiness of the alliance to attack swiftly and jointly, there is still room for diplomacy.

The fact is that Iraq is vulnerable to the economic sanctions the world has imposed against it. The Director of Central Intelligence has stated that the sanctions have already brought about a profound weakening of Iraq's basic industry, its food supply and that they have impaired its military capability. Those sanctions will clearly continue to do real damage to Iraq's economy, more and more every day they are applied. The point of diplomacy is not to negotiate—it is to explain that these sanction will never slacken.

There is another point to be made about sanctions: The blockade and the embargo are supported by all of our allies. If there is war, will our moderate Arab allies be able to continue in that partnership? We represent what the civilized, united nations of the world represent in this crisis, but despite the inordinate contribution of our men and women in the field, we are only one nation.

Iraq's invasion, miscalculated as it was, outrageous as it is, comes amid a history of regional forces which no one understands. Questions of religion and shifting borders go back thousands of years in the Middle East: No military victory by itself, no matter how thorough, will make the post-war Middle East a more secure place. We just exhaust all the other means at our disposal before resorting to force, and in my judgment, we have not yet done so.

The choices we face in Congress are choices at a specific point in time. I can only conclude that while sanctions may not remove Saddam Hussein from Kuwait by themselves, a policy that combines them with continued diplomatic pressure by our allies and the threat of a massive military attack by our forces beginning anytime after next Tuesday, is better now, today, than a policy that relies exclusively on war.

The option of striking immediately has one undeniable aspect. Once a war is started, it cannot be stopped at the exact time and place we may want it to stop. In fact, if it is the will of the Congress that the President should exercise his discretion in favor of an offensive strike, everything that is important to us, beginning with the lives of our men and women in service to their country, says that we must go all-out, to the finish. I cannot vote to go to war today. I may very well conclude at some later date, perhaps soon, that all other options have been exhausted and that I must vote to commit us to the use of force.

This leads me to a last point: To those who have said that the passage of time works against a peaceful withdrawal of Saddam Hussein's forces from Kuwait, I must disagree. The resolution I am supporting says continue the sanctions. It does not say that President Bush may not return to the Congress to ask for a declaration of war, nor even that he may not do so very soon, after some new provocation or any new turn of events. The meeting in Geneva, discouraging as it was to all of us, was not the last, best chance for peace. At least until tomorrow, this vote is a last, best chance for peace. I urge each of you to vote for the Hamilton-Gephardt resolution, which keeps the sanctions in place—and which is consistent with our responsibilities under the Constitution.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS].

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Hamilton-Gephardt resolution.

Mr. Speaker, many issues arise in the face of the crisis in the Persian Gulf: the immediate, tangible issue of life, lost or altered; the more distant issue of the makeup of a post-conflict Middle East; and the intangible issue of the United States place in the eyes of the world as we enter a new century.

We must be clear that Iraq's invasion of Kuwait is intolerable in the eyes of the civilized world. And we must be equally clear in maintaining that there will be no linkage between one man's hubris and the Palestinian issue.

Saddam Hussein did not invade Kuwait to achieve peace in the Middle East. Saddam Hussein first murdered when he was 20 years old, and he has been murdering in ever greater numbers since. He invaded Kuwait out of frustrated self-interest and paranoid sense of self-preservation. We must reverse this brutal and illegal action. The Hamilton resolution insists on that reversal.

To this point in time, I am proud of the way our Nation has conducted itself in the face of aggression, and I applaud President Bush for his display of statecraft in uniting the world to bring sanctions against Iraq. The President has been firm but patient, and I rise today to urge him to continue that course.

Mr. Speaker, the patience and courage required to allow the sanctions adequate time to work should pay great dividends. The additional time should be used to insist that our allies play an equal role. The unfairness of a world solution sealed solely in American blood will divide our Nation and dilute our resolve at home and in the international community. The Hamilton resolution supports this course of action.

The additional time will also allow for this body and the American people to weigh the costs of conflict. In victory and in defeat, the costs of armed conflict are high. The cost in terms of human life is obvious, but the economic costs must be raised as well. I serve on the Veterans' Committee, Mr. Speaker, and I will tell you that we are not adequately taking care of our veterans from past wars. What promises can we fulfill to a new generation of veterans? I am afraid of the answer if we do not know that specific course our President wants us to take. And the Hamilton resolution does not rule out military force, but it asks the President to inform Congress of the specific course.

Everyone agrees that we should do whatever is necessary for those who sacrifice, but many veterans in my district will tell you that those promises sometimes ring hollow. Words don't buy health care, dollars do. And the American people deserve to be told how many dollars will be required and where they will come from.

No American will turn from a just cause, Mr. Speaker, but this must be thought out before it is fought out. We do not teach our children that the first degree of resolution is force, and we do not condone it in other nations. Let us have the patience, the wisdom, and the courage of our convictions to lead by example.

Let tomorrow's generation look back and say that America led a new world order into the 21st century bravely and proudly, a beacon of justice and freedom. Let them say that we met the threat of war with a promise of peace. Let them know that we were willing to bear any burden and pay any price, but that we lifted the burden without human sacrifice. Let them say that we met violence with intelligence and intelligence won.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SYNAR].

Mr. SYNAR. Mr. Speaker, let us make no mistake about it. The Solarz-Michel resolution is a declaration of war, a war without announced limits on length or means, a war whose consequences we cannot know and whose costs we cannot calculate. Though the resolution skirts around the words "declaration of war," is there a Member on this floor who doubts that, with this vote, we are delegating to the President the authority to commit the lives and fortunes of the American people in a war against the Iraqi nation.

The Constitution imposes no more solemn and terrible obligation on the elected Representatives of the American people in Congress than the power to declare war. The Constitution entrusts us with an authority, which when exercised, has as its inevitable consequence the death of Americans whose number we know not now, the destruction of the cities and the farms of people with whom we have no quarrel, of children left without parents, the widower bereft, and the widow weeping.

But this is not the place for a statement on the horrors of war. There are times when the press of events leaves us with no choice other than to fight. This House, after due consideration, committed this Nation to years of long and bloody warfare in the cause of freedom against the Nazi menace and when the Japanese treacherously attacked us at Pearl Harbor. There the choice was stark, the lines were drawn, the alternatives unacceptable and the national interest allowed us no other course of action.

On Friday, January 11, 1991, the President of the United States has not persuaded me that we are now similarly situated and I do not intend to abdicate my obligations under the Constitution of the United States until I am persuaded beyond doubt that we have no other choice.

We are not under attack; Iraq has not claimed a single American life; it occupies not a single square foot of American soil; we do not need its oil and I have yet to meet a mother or father who would send their son and daughter into battle for a 20-cent differential in the price of regular unleaded.

Without a shot fired in anger, we have succeeded in obtaining the release of the American hostages. The best information available to this House tells us that the sanctions are slowly, but surely, eviscerating the Iraqi economy and thus its capability to wage war. Diplomatic initiatives are continuing and we still have opportunities to talk to the Iraqi government. Who among us now can say that they will end without result? I share the frustrations of everyone in the lack of results to date, but I will take weeks of inconsequential talk anytime over weeks of a brutal and bloody war.

In the months and years to come, I, like everyone else in the Chamber, will return to my district to the VFW and Memorial Halls, to the town meetings, the churches, to the living rooms, to the covered dish suppers and fireman's halls. I do not want to see names on bronze tablets beneath the words "In Memoriam," I do not want to meet the Gold Star mothers, I do not want to hold in my arms the orphaned children of the reservists now in the desert, I do not want to push the wheelchairs into the spaces held at the front of the hall, until I can say, with my head held high, "We had no other choice. Your sacrifice was for this Nation."

□ 1810

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON].

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the majority leader for yielding time to me. Of course, I rise in support of the Gephardt-Hamilton resolution.

The Gephardt-Hamilton resolution is the product of several meetings this week among Members of the House, including the Democratic leadership, and with several Senators who are working on a similar resolution in their body.

CONTENT OF THE RESOLUTION

This resolution is a short and simple statement:

Paragraph (a) commits Congress to ending Iraq's occupation of Kuwait.

Paragraph (b) authorizes the use of force in certain instances which we all recognize as important and for which the President needs flexibility.

Paragraph (c) puts the Congress firmly behind a strategy of staying the course with current policy.

Paragraph (d) pledges full and continued congressional support for economic and diplomatic pressure against Iraq, for maintaining military options, and for insisting on greater burdensharing; and

Paragraph (e) is a statement that: The Constitution requires authorization by Congress of war; Congress does not rule out at a later time a declaration of war or other authorization of force; and Congress will consider any Presidential request for such an authorization expeditiously.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution, then, is: A statement of support for the President's objectives of August 8, 1990; a statement of support for the strategy the President has articulated over the last several months to try to achieve these objectives through: (a) tough economic sanctions; (b) diplomacy; and (c) developing a credible military option; and finally, a statement of support for staying the course with the current strategy.

THE ISSUES BEFORE THE CONGRESS

Congress and the President are united in their determination to see Iraq dislodged from Kuwait. We differ today not on the ends of U.S. policy, but on the means to achieve those ends.

Those of us who support the Gephardt-Hamilton resolution are just as serious about reversing Iraq's aggression as are proponents of the President's resolution. I have no doubt that Iraq will eventually be forced to leave Kuwait one way or another. Our goals in the gulf are sufficiently important to warrant the use of force, if our strategy of economic and diplomatic pressure and the threat of war do not convince Iraq to leave Kuwait. Our current strategy is working, and we should not shift to a far more costly military strategy until we are convinced that the current strategy has failed.

Congress and the President have agreed that force should not yet be used. As late as Wednesday, Secretary Baker stated in Geneva following his meeting with Iraqi Foreign Minister Aziz, and President Bush later confirmed, that no decision has been made on the use of force.

What is remarkable today is that the President is working to reverse this strategy that he put into place with strong support from the Congress and the American people. The President today is asking for prior congressional approval to change this common strategy at any time, and under any circumstances, without coming back to the Congress.

What does this mean? I am led to the conclusion that the President is not serious about his own strategy. He certainly conveys a sense of impatience with his strategy. What disturbs me is that he and his resolution point us toward war.

I see two principal differences between the resolution supported by President Bush and the Gephardt-Hamilton resolution.

WHO MAKES THE DECISION TO WAGE WAR?

First, the issue before Members is not whether we resort to the use of force, but who decides when we use force;

The resolution President Bush supports would leave this decision solely to the President. The only constraint on the President's potential use of force would be that he must report to the Congress that all other alternatives to force have been exhausted. This judgment is left solely to the President;

Under the President's resolution, Congress could play no role in the decision to use force after January 15. Congress would remove itself from the decisionmaking process on that date. To give the President this kind of total discretion would be an evasion of our constitutional responsibilities;

A vote for the President's resolution means Congress gives up the right to decide if, when, and how force will be used. It means we will authorize the President to wage war before even he has made a decision to do so. Should Congress give the President unlimited discretion to start a war at a future time, and under circumstances that cannot be foreseen? I do not think we should.

The Gephardt-Hamilton resolution states that Congress must participate in any decision to initiate hostilities at the time when that decision is made. It states that this decision must be made jointly by the President and Congress. We have a constitutional responsibility to participate in that decision when and if the President concludes force is necessary.

If the President concludes that offensive military action is necessary, he and Congress together can address the facts at that time and make a joint decision. He should not make that decision alone. Nor should Congress, prior to the moment of decision, give the President an open-ended authorization to use force at a date, and under conditions, of his choosing;

It is true that Congress has not exercised its constitutional power to decide to go to war since World War II. The fact that this power has fallen into disuse does not mean that it has ceased to exist;

It is also true that Presidents have sent U.S. forces into combat without prior congressional approval more than 200 times in our history. Most of these cases involved actions to protect U.S. citizens or property. Congress recognizes that Presidents must have the ability to respond rapidly to such threats, to repel attacks on U.S. territory, or to respond to other emergencies.

We face an entirely different set of circumstances in the gulf. The situation in the gulf confronts us with circumstances and issues whose significance clearly rival those we faced on the five previous occasions when Congress declared war:

Massive armies confront each other.

Armed conflict would require sustained and massive operations involving several nations.

Conflict could result in thousands of casualties on both sides.

Weapons of mass destruction might be used; and conflict would have enormous implications for our relations with the Arab world and the security of Israel.

We may yet decide that Iraq cannot be forced out of Kuwait without military action. Yet, given the scale of military action necessary to achieve this objective; the human and diplomatic implications of war; and the absence of an imminent threat to American lives, Congress' constitutional right to participate in a decision to go to war can and should be respected at the time the President seeks to go to war.

SHOULD WE STAY THE COURSE WITH CURRENT POLICY?

Second, there is the question: Do you stay the course with current policy or not?

I believe there are three arguments for staying the course with current policy.

First, U.S. strategy is working. It has produced results.

Iraq has been isolated. An impressive international coalition has been arrayed against Iraq and behind the current three-pronged strategy of sanctions, diplomacy and threat of use of force. Twelve U.N. Security Council Resolutions have been passed in support of this strategy since August 2, 1990. Twenty-eight countries have joined an international coalition arrayed against Iraq based on this policy;

Hostages have been released.

The original threat of an Iraqi invasion of Saudi Arabia has disappeared.

Oil continues to flow.

Domestic public opinion is united in its support for the current strategy. Where differences arise—and domestic support begins to fray—is on the question of changing current strategy and setting an artificial deadline for war.

Economic sanctions have begun to bite, albeit slower than we would like.

Iraq is a vulnerable, one-product economy. It is isolated and landlocked. Experts believe that sanctions will reduce Iraqi GNP by an estimated 70 percent;

CIA Director Webster testified before the House Armed Services Committee on December 5, 1990 that sanctions were seriously damaging the Iraqi economy. More than 90 percent of imports and 97 percent of exports to Iraq have been stopped; although smuggling exists, it is small relative to Iraq's precrisis trade; Iraqi commercial and civilian industrial production is down 30-40 percent; Factories are closing; and sanctions have choked off Baghdad's financial resources. Iraq is losing some $1.5 billion of foreign exchange earnings monthly.

Director Webster, in a January 10, 1991 letter to the Congress, does not alter his earlier assessment that sanctions are working. Where the January 10 letter differs from Webster's December testimony is in its assessment of the likelihood that these hardships will force Iraq to withdraw from Kuwait.

Webster has stated that economic hardship "alone" is unlikely to compel Saddam to retreat from Kuwait. No one has ever said that sanctions alone are guaranteed to get Iraq out of Kuwait. However, there is no evidence to suggest that they cannot play a major role in helping to achieve our objectives.

These are the most comprehensive and effective international sanctions in modern history. By all accounts they are having a significant impact on the Iraqi economy. They stand a reasonable chance of success. We should stay the course.

Second, our current strategy is better than the alternative of war.

We should not base our policy on the most optimistic military scenario; There are no guarantees that a war will be won quickly or easily. A decision for war must take into account the risks that conflict will be drawn out, with all the implications involved;

An extended conflict of several weeks or months would involve a high loss of life, including American lives; threaten to divide the nation and the international coalition we have pulled together in support of present policy; send oil prices soaring and rattle international financial markets; put a severe strain on the U.S. budget; and threaten upheaval throughout the Middle East.

War at this time would substitute the international policy of sanctions with a largely U.S. operation. The U.S. has three-quarters of the fighting forces in the region.

War at this time would place the United States in the midst of a conflict without the full support of many of its coalition partners. Some coalition partners will fight only in Kuwait, and not in Iraq; other coalition partners will rethink participation if Israel becomes embroiled; still other coalition partners will not involve their ground troops or military assets in offensive warfare; and still other coalition partners have refused to send ground forces.

In short, support for the United States from coalition partners will be questionable in the case of hostilities.

U.S. interests are not the only ones at stake. It is a fair question to ask: Why should this be an American war?

When and if we go to war it should be crystal clear that Iraq is going to war with the international community, not only with the United States. Not just American lives should be lost in combating Iraqi aggression; and

The international character of the current strategy has heightened Iraq's sense of isolation. It has undermined Saddam Hussein's efforts to portray the crisis as a crusade against the United States. War, at least at this stage, would do the opposite.

War will have unintended consequences. Those consequences pose unknown—and perhaps grave—risks for the United States.

There are no guarantees that war will enhance stability in the region. The administration has not addressed the difficult question of what happens in the Middle East after we win a war;

There is in the Middle East something called the law of unintended consequences. War will change the map of the region. Even victory will be accompanied by many destabilizing consequences;

War promises no neat solution. A limited war that left much of Iraq's military capability intact would only inflame future crises with a heightened sense of Iraqi grievance. An all-out war that destroyed Iraq's military potential could create a destabilizing power vacuum in the region;

A conflict involving Americans killing Arabs will have a strong impact on Arab populations throughout the region. Anti-Americanism will rise, terrorism will increase, and radical Islamic forces will be strengthened. Such a conflict may threaten the stability of key U.S. allies in the region. These scenarios become even more likely if Iraq attacks Israel and Israel is drawn into a war;

If war comes, it will be difficult to imagine where Americans will be safe in the Middle East for some time to come;

Even if we are victorious in battle, we will not win the psychological war. We may devastate Iraq, but we will have sown the seeds of resentment that are likely to come back to haunt us in the future; and

Whether we go to war or not, a framework for future security and stability in the Persian Gulf is necessary. That framework will involve extended diplomacy between members of the international coalition and countries in the region. War is likely to complicate, rather than enhance, the prospects for a new security framework.

War will be costly and will place an enormous strain on an already shaky U.S. economy.

Our Federal budget deficit may reach over $350 billion this year. We are entering a recession. The fragile state of our economy will be threatened further by the start of armed conflict in the Gulf;

Oil prices are likely to soar if a war lasts more than a few days; and

The cost to the U.S. Treasury of Operation Desert Shield will skyrocket

once we are on a warfooting. Our budget deficit will climb. Efforts to get further burdensharing from our allies in the gulf have not been successful: there is no reason to expect that this will change once we go to war.

Finally, war will jeopardize the domestic and international consensus upon which current policy has been based.

The administration argues that the coalition is threatened if sanctions are drawn out too long. I agree that the coalition is under stress. In fact, the outbreak of war is much more likely to strain the coalition than a policy of continuing current strategy.

In his testimony before the Senate last year, Admiral Crowe stated: "I cannot understand why some consider our international alliance strong enough to conduct intense hostilities but to fragile to hold together while we attempt a peaceful solution".

Most of our allies do not believe that diplomatic options have been exhausted.

Public opinion and the Congress are deeply divided over the question of war. A war that risks high casualties also risks public support for that policy.

Third, diplomatic options have not been exhausted. Saddam Hussein is a classic Middle Eastern potentate. He is isolated from the outside world and insulated from opposition. You do not get a message through to him if you do not convey it directly. How can we claim that all diplomatic options have been exhausted if we are not, at the highest levels of our Government, speaking to Saddam Hussein?

The Baker meeting in Geneva Wednesday was the first high level contact between the United States and Iraq since the crisis began on August 2. Messages have been transmitted between the two sides largely through the media for the last 6 months. Six hours of diplomacy after nearly 6 months of stalemate does not exhaust diplomacy.

According to this morning's New York Times, Arab diplomats at the United Nations believe that Saddam Hussein is preparing to accept "in principle" a settlement that would involve Iraqi withdrawal from Kuwait and a simultaneous call for an international conference on the Palestinian issue.

This news may represent a potential opening for diplomacy. While linkage of these issues and an international conference at this time are unacceptable to the United States, this is the first indication we have had that Saddam Hussein may be willing to withdraw from Kuwait and negotiate a peaceful settlement of the crisis. In the coming days, this possibility will be explored further by the European Community and U.N. Secretary General de Cuellar, who is travelling to Iraq. The United States has reportedly given its approval to these diplomatic initiatives.

To act now to encourage war is to preempt these efforts to advance diplomacy.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, let me quote one of our leaders:

> We believe this coordinated and comprehensive international isolation of Iraq is the only peaceful path to meeting the objectives set by the President. Our efforts will, however, take time and that is what we ask most of the American people: Stand firm, be patient.

Those are the words of Secretary Baker. He said them: I support them.

Today we are being asked to change policy. It is the President's statements, and his resolution before us which are undermining our current, and successful, strategy.

The resolution the President seeks leaves the decision to wage war to his sole discretion. Some of the President's supporters call his resolution the last best chance for peace. But two of the chief sponsors of the President's resolution in the House have called it the "functional equivalent of a declaration of war" and the "practical equivalent" of a declaration of war. There is no clear message in these statements. They send mixed signals.

The Gephardt-Hamilton resolution states that Congress must participate in any decision to initiate hostilities at the time when that decision is made. We have a constitutional responsibility to participate in the decision. We should not yield or delegate that responsibility to the President.

The Gephardt-Hamilton resolution will maintain our current, and to date successful, strategy. Important objectives of the President have been achieved. Hostages have been released. Saudi Arabia has been defended, oil is flowing. Iraq is isolated.

You simply cannot make the judgment today that current U.S. strategy has failed. No one is arguing that sanctions alone will do the job. Sanctions, diplomacy and threat to use force can. This strategy maintains broad domestic and international support.

We must exhaust all options before we resort to the use of force. Six hours of diplomacy after nearly 6 months of stalemate does not meet that test. Most of our coalition partners want the United States to stay the course: few feel diplomacy is at an end. Several diplomatic initiatives are underway.

Mr. Speaker, current United States strategy is putting the screws on Iraq. The sanctions are biting. Firmness and patience are working. Events are moving in our direction. This strategy stands a reasonable chance of success. The President has made no decision to wage war. We should stay the course. This, I submit, is simply not the time to write a blank check to the President.

I urge adoption of the Gephardt-Hamilton resolution.

□ 1830

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALSH].

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, in August, just after Iraq's invasion of Kuwait I wrote a letter to the President to congratulate him on his quick response to Iraqi aggression, the effective gathering of world opinion and the mobilization of international sanctions to bring about an Iraqi withdrawal. I said it was necessary to provide a credible threat of force against Saddam Hussein, but that I believed the resources of our Government should be focused heavily on the diplomatic option. I still strongly favor that course of action.

At the same time, we all know the lessons of appeasement. If France and England had acted to stop Nazi aggression in the Rhineland or even in Austria, a world war would have been prevented. All appeasement did was whet Hitler's appetite for more land and give him more time to build his war machine. We all know now that if we don't learn the lessons of history we are forced to repeat it.

Today, in 1991, we are at the threshold of a new world order. Our former adversaries, the Soviets, have conceded defeat in the cold war. Nations are rushing toward democracy. People are hungry for freedom. Saddam Hussein is an aberration, an anachronism who threatens to destroy this promising new order.

I believe the way we resolve this crisis will set a precedent for the next century. In the past, nations have unilaterally resorted to war, disregarding international opinion. Today, the United Nations stand together to resolve conflicts around the globe through diplomatic means. The time has never been better because the world is overwhelmingly united in its denunciation of Saddam Hussein's aggression.

As a student of history, I will admit and agree that the threat of force is essential to the resolution of this conflict. Hussein is a strongman, a despot, a ruthless tryant who is isolated. He will not comply with the U.N. resolutions unless he understands that there will be dire consequences if he refuses. It is only through a demonstration of our strength that we can convince Saddam Hussein of our resolve. He has killed thousands of people in his own country through assassinations, poison gas attacks, and selective executions. He has killed and tortured thousands more Kuwaiti men, women, and children as he looted their country to pay for his war with Iran. He has threatened the existence of Israel and threatens to undermine the stability of Saudi Arabia and other Arab governments in the Persian Gulf.

For these reasons, I will vote to support a resolution that grants the President the authority to use force if he certifies to Congress that all diplomatic means to secure an Iraqi withdrawal have been exhausted. This resolution has broad bipartisan support and is the most effective option for achieving long-term peace and stability in the Persian Gulf.

The irony in this is that in order to have a chance for peace we need to give the President the option to use force. With that option comes our best chance to convince Saddam Hussein he has no alternative but to withdraw from Kuwait. Unless he believes we are serious, he has no incentive to change his policy.

While I have supported and continue to support the use of economic sanctions, I am concerned that the resolution relying solely on sanctions would send the wrong signal to Saddam Hussein. It would effectively preclude the President from the option of using force. It would tell Hussein he is free to continue looting and plundering Kuwait while he develops new weapons and further strengthens the positioning of troops and materials.

Additonally, this delay would give him time to weaken the international coalition. Smoke screens, doubletalk, deception, and threats may take a toll on such a new alliance. Last and most important, sanctions which are meant to hurt the Iraqi war machine will hurt—far more severely—the Iraqi people with whom we have no argument.

Mr. Speaker, colleagues, and fellow Americans, I believe we must face Saddam Hussein now or later—and that now is far preferable.

And as we face him now, as part of a uniquely powerful U.N. force, I believe that only a combination of effective sanctions, diplomatic isolation, and the convincing threat to use force if all else fails offers a real hope that the use of force can be avoided.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY].

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, as I have wrestled with all of the debate, I think we must first ask ourselves: Is it right to be in Saudi Arabia? With very few exceptions, nearly everyone here agrees we have a right and an obligation to join the world alliance in protecting our common interests in the Middle East.

With that answer, I believe that there is only one real issue here today: Will economic sanctions work, and if not, how can we proceed to make it least dangerous for our soldiers over there?

I am one of those who do not believe that sanctions can work. While many of the Members of this House would like to continue the sanctions, and all of us would like to see them work, hear me now, Mr. Speaker, I have been told, and I think it is plausible, that Libya has increased oil production and is using that increased oil production to funnel hard money to Saddam Hussein through the banks in Yemen and other allies of Iraq. That alone should convince each and every one of us that even if the sanctions were to be effective, it would take several years before their impact would be felt. While the sanctions and the mobilization of troops were a prudent first step in attempting to stop Hussein in his tracks, believe me, Mr. Speaker, it is obvious now that Saddam Hussein would make his people eat scorpions and sand before he will let sanctions force him out of Kuwait. Sanctions will not work.

My question is: Is it better or safer to put our soldiers in harm's way now or later? Even our troops believe they have a better chance now than later. The longer we wait, the more dangerous it is. Time makes Iraq stronger.

Have we even considered the sophisticated weapons that were captured out of Kuwait? A westerner who came out of Kuwait witnessed Iraqi soldiers capture four batteries containing 200 Hawk missiles and enough supplies to man those weapons for 6 years. More time will allow Iraqis to be trained to use those missiles against Americans, and more time will allow them to dig in and build bunkers to defend themselves against Americans. More time allows the development of terrorist networks to undermine the resolve of the United States and the world.

If we are going to take this very serious and solemn act, we must give the President, not 535 Commanders in Chief, the authority to do it right.

History has shown us the wrong way. The right way is to give the President the capability, if necessary, to achieve a swift and successful end by removing Congress' control and limiting his ability to micromanage the war as it did in Vietnam.

The President of the United States now asks this Congress to authorize the use of military force as a final attempt to convince Hussein that his military aggression will not be rewarded, that this is his last chance to peacefully withdraw from Kuwait.

An editorial in the Houston Chronicle, my hometown paper, clearly outlines the need to authorize the use of force for the sake of peace. It states:

> For Congress to deny the use of force to back up the world community's demands would make them meaningless. Force is the only credible threat. For Congress to postpone for an extended period the use of force would have essentially the same effect. There is at least the hope that the weight of congressional authority of war could be the tipping point in bringing Saddam to what any reasonable person could call his senses. It may not, but it is worth probing for possible effect before the shooting starts.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO].

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker I rise is support of the Gephardt-Hamilton resolution.

I rise in support of the resolution offered by Messrs. GEPHARDT and HAMILTON, urging President Bush to continue to apply economic sanctions coupled with diplomatic and political efforts to resolve the crisis peacefully.

I oppose the resolution to authorize the immediate use of military force in the Persian Gulf. In my judgment, it is premature and unwise.

Let there be no confusion about what we are doing here. Some characterize this vote as a bargaining chip. But it is much more than that. This is a vote to go to war. And, in my judgment, it is premature.

I supported the President's initial decision to send troops into the region to protect Saudi Arabia from Iraqi attack, but I do not support a shift to offensive military action. We managed a policy of containment in Europe for over 40 years. Why rush in the Persian Gulf? I do not believe we have exhausted all diplomatic means in less than 6 months. At this crucial time we should continue to hold a shield, not brandish a sword.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER].

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, at this stage of a long and difficult crisis, we now face as a nation, and in a larger sense as a world, a defining choice and the opportunity for a last alternative to war. We need to remind ourselves, our allies, and our adversaries that all America stands united behind a common goal: The removal of Iraqi forces from Kuwait now and the restoration of stability to this pivotal station in the balance of world security. This President and the Congress alike have demonstrated consistent support for this purpose.

The question we now address is how to achieve our aim without plunging the world's most fragile region into a horrible war, one that will have corrosive effects on world peace and the long-range interests of this Nation.

We offer a last alternative to war. We must have the courage of patience. And we must have the resolve needed to reach our goal and recognize that the solution may not be simple and it may not be direct. This involves escalating a militarily enforced embargo and taking every multinational measure—to ensure that our allies honor the policy of economic sanctions as well, and to demonstrate that we stand united with the world in this common purpose.

The Hamilton-Gephardt resolution is that last alternative to war. But it does not preclude it. The Hamilton-Gephardt resolution continues to authorize the President to use force to protect American forces in the region and to defend Saudi Arabia. It also advocates that this Nation explore every available and remaining diplomatic remedy.

The Hamilton-Gephardt resolution is the last alternative to war, but it does not propose to eliminate the use of force in the future to achieve our goal. It reinforces it. It does mean, however, that we have decided to exhaust remaining alternatives to war before we commit American forces to battle.

We cannot say with certainty that economic or any other sanctions will work. Today, well

meaning and knowledgeable people are divided on this question. Nor does anyone know with real certainty how much time must pass before we can tell whether they have worked or failed. They may not work at all. But that does not mean that we should go to war today, or tomorrow.

We owe it to our best hopes for a secure and stable future to assure that a militarily enforced embargo, coupled with the imminent and continued threat of the use of force, has had the full opportunity to force a diplomatic solution. We are ready to fight but not while it is still possible that our goal can be achieved through other means. Not while there is a last alternative to war.

In choosing this policy, we must be prepared to summon extraordinary determination and patience in the days or weeks before us. And we must prepare the Nation to act. In choosing this policy at this time, we do not offer concession. We do not offer appeasement. This is an act of final determination. If war is indeed the only option available to us, if the force of international pressure and reason does not prevail, and our best efforts short of initiating armed conflict have failed, then we must be prepared to use the full force of arms. Until then, we should pursue this last alternative to war.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAZZOLI].

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Hamilton-Gephardt resolution, in favor of the Bennett resolution, in opposition to the other pending resolution.

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SISISKY].

Mr. SISISKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Solarz-Michel resolution.

Mr. Speaker, during the last year, we have seen great changes throughout the world.

Most of the changes involved nations like East Germany or the Soviet Union becoming more free.

Unfortunately, there has been one terrible example of someone moving in the other direction.

As President Kennedy once said, "There's always some poor guy who doesn't get the message."

How many of you have seen the Amnesty International report on human rights violations in Kuwait since August 2?

I have and I share the sense of outrage expressed by President Bush about the "rape of Kuwait." Make no mistake, those words are both literal and figurative.

Kuwait has shown that Saddam does not respect the sovereignty of other Arab States—any more than he acknowledges Israel's right to exist.

Listen to Saddam Hussein. His intentions are clear. Postponing the inevitable only allows him to refine more chemicals and develop nuclear capabilities. It exposes moderate Arab States, as well as Israel, to the threat of nuclear, biological, and chemical blackmail.

I think the United Nations was right in giving sanctions time to work. However, their purpose was not only to isolate Iraq, but to display united resolve.

I believe our common purpose has been served by imposing the sanctions. But sanctions alone may not do all we need to do to solve this problem.

An ad on television made the same point: It's the one where an auto mechanic says, "You can pay me now, or pay me later."

Left alone with his sanctions, Saddam Hussein might well destroy Iraq's economy. But by the time that happens, he may well develop the capacity or disposition to wreak even greater havoc on the world.

No one has given up hope for peace. We pray that diplomatic initiatives will lead to Saddam Hussein's compliance with the U.N. resolutions.

But diplomacy will not work unless it is backed by military power. Saddam Hussein will not comply with the U.N. resolutions unless he is convinced that the world means what it says.

Restricting the President's authority to engage in offensive operations, serves to debilitate diplomatic efforts to solve this problem.

It will only ensure that our credibility is damaged, perhaps permanently. What nation would accept a future commitment made by an American President?

Restricting the President's authority will not serve the cause of peace. Nor will it cause a single Iraqi soldier to leave Kuwait.

It will only ensure that any potential adversary or terrorist can watch C-Span or CNN—and be certain the United States isn't likely to stand up for anything.

Restricting the President's authority will tell Saddam that we are not united—and we have no resolve. Our message should be exactly the oposite.

We must show that the United States, in partnership with the United Nations, will not allow aggression to go unanswered.

□ 1840

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SLAUGHTER].

Mr. SLAUGHTER of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, history shows Members that the aggression of a ruthless dictator must be turned back before it becomes uncontrollable, except by means resulting in worldwide economic disruption and staggering loss of human life. The world opposes tyrants, like Saddam Hussein's aggression, and the United States is acting in concert with the entire civilized world, which has spoken through the United Nations in a unified voice in support of force, if necessary, to reestablish Kuwaiti sovereignty.

I am confident that the Bush administration and that the allies of this country have gone to substantial lengths to resolve the crisis peacefully. Sanctions have been made and imposed, and numerous diplomatic efforts have been made in an effort to impress on Saddam the folly in his aggression.

The American people and the United Nations have demonstrated their resolve that the Security Council resolutions must be fulfilled, and I believe that Congress must act now to take advantage of this support of the democratic forces throughout the world. Forty-five years ago, Winston Churchill spoke of the United States as having "awe-inspiring accountability for the future." Churchill foresaw a future in which the United States would have to lead the democratic world against a totalitarian aggression, and the Congress, as the institution most representative of freedom and democracy, must give its support to this effort.

Perhaps more important is the real threat Saddam's aggression makes to our own national security. As a sovereign nation, Kuwait invested billions of dollars internationally, to the benefit of the world. I urge the President and Members of Congress to adopt this.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE].

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Solarz-Michel resolution. I have been listening and hearing people talk now for several hours today, and it is getting somewhat redundant.

There are a couple of things that have not really been addressed. One is the item of linkage. It is to Saddam Hussein's benefit to try to make the world believe there is a connection between the Palestinian and the Israel problem, and the problem at hand today. I listened the other day, I think two nights ago, CNN International News, when Saddam Hussein talked for over an hour. He was talking about how this is God's war. This is a religious war.

It is interesting to note that Saddam Hussein was not even a religious Moslem until August 2. In fact, it is a little reminiscent of Josef Stalin's instant conversion of 1941.

The item of burden sharing, yes, I am offended. The Japanese are probably getting as much out of this as anyone, and yet they have not done anything to speak of. I returned with Chairman LANTOS from the European Parliament meeting, and we expressed to them our outrage on behalf of what they are not doing in Europe, the fact that Germany is hiding behind its constitution, when we all know all it takes is a two-thirds vote for them to override that Constitution and share their end of the burden.

Does this mean that we in this country are going to do nothing, and are going to let this madman over there reach some kind of nuclear capability? I hope, and several people have mentioned Amnesty International, I hope every Member of Congress will read this before they cast their vote. The documentation on the methodology of torture that is going on today, even as

we speak, the extracting of fingernails and toenails, the boring of holes in people's legs with electric drills, cutting out of tongues and ears, gouging of eyes.

I agree with General Schwarzkopf when he said that, "Saddam is Hitler times 4."

I do not believe that we have any other choice. I think anyone who says we have to give peace a chance to work should go over there and talk to our young men and women who are in the trenches and say, do you want to stay over there for 3 more months, or 6 more months? The time is right to support this resolution.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. MACHTLEY].

Mr. MACHTLEY. Mr. Speaker, these are days of decision which history will record. Every legislator, regardless of party or ideology, who comes into this well, and every legislator who will vote tomorrow, understands the excruciating weight of the solemn responsibility that we share. That responsibility is not to make war to be enriched, but to make peace in a warring world.

Today the eyes and ears of the world, not just this country, are upon the United States. Families, fathers, mothers, children are watching. People around the world are watching. Kuwait refugees are watching. Eyes and ears of Israeli citizens who have been targeted for attack by Saddam Hussein are watching these debates today, and the eyes and ears of Czechoslovakians whose new democracies are struggling, are watching our debates, and the eyes and ears of the world are connected to the hearts and souls and the conscience, who are united in a hope for peace.

Every Member who enters this well, I believe enters with the fervent hope, the same hope as our President, that peace can be achieved without war.

No one debates that at the beginning of last year the Berlin wall crumbling down gave everyone a new hope for peace in this world. No one debates it was wrong for Saddam Hussein to take over Kuwait.

Today, we debate how to move forward with a new world order. How to move forward so that we can live in a more peaceful world.

Many like myself have traveled to the Middle East. We have sat through countless hours of testimony in the Committee on Armed Services. We have read and we have studied strategy. We have talked to many of our constituents whose views are as varying as those of Members in this Chamber. Yet we arrive at different conclusions. Honest, different conclusions.

A war in the gulf we all admit would have a devastating effect, and today I do not advocate a war. Today I do not advocate that this country launch an attack immediately after January 15, but by voting for the Solarz-Michel resolution, I believe we are sending a clear message to Saddam Hussein.

I believe, in the words of the Washington Post, "that we are making a more plausible threat in the 11th hour circumstances of President Hussein's predeadline countdown." I am convinced that to rebuke this resolution is to send the message to Saddam Hussein which will commit the United States to war, not to peace.

John Adams was asked why he risked war during the Revolution, and he said, "I study war so that my children can study politics, so that their children can study poetry."

May we each use our God-given talents and energies to make a decision which will permit our children, Kuwaiti children, and children of the world to study poetry.

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the vote that I and all Members will cast tomorrow will, in all likelihood, be the most important vote, certainly the most sober vote that we have ever cast in our careers.

I have, as I know we all have, searched my conscience for the proper course of action. No Member of this body, Mr. Speaker, wants to go to war. Each Member wants to avoid an armed conflict. However, we have deep differences on how to achieve this shared goal.

I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that if the Congress fails to approve a resolution endorsing the actions of the United Nations, and that the President is seeking, we increase the chance of war either now or later. We are faced with a brutal dictator who has repeatedly demonstrated that he is determined to expand his power and influence throughout the Persian Gulf. Every day innocent men, women, and children in Kuwait are being subjected to unimaginable horrors by Saddam Hussein and his army, the same Saddam Hussein who gassed his own people.

Saddam Hussein is nothing less than a monster who has placed himself outside of civilized human society. The situation, Mr. Speaker, in which we now find ourselves did not occur overnight. Sadly, it is the direct result of a decade of misjudgment about Saddam Hussein and his goals, misjudgment in this Capital and in other capitals around the globe. Until the very day that Iraqi tanks rolled across the Kuwait border, this administration opposed efforts sought by a number of Members in the Congress, to impose tough economic sanctions against Iraq.

□ 1850

Many of us on this floor saw Hussein for what he was and time and again when we attempted to achieve economic sanctions against Iraq, our words of warning were ignored.

Tragically, Mr. Speaker, Saddam Hussein interpreted this willingness to acquiesce in his terror as American weakness.

It is sad, but true, Mr. Speaker, that Saddam Hussein understands only one language, the language of force and determination. We must now at least show that we are prepared to speak to him in that language.

We cannot flinch in our resolve to put an end to Saddam's brutal and expansionist dreams.

If Congress today fails to approve a resolution, and we vote on it tomorrow, giving the President the ability to use force to respond to Saddam Hussein if diplomacy fails, we will be sending a very dangerous message to Saddam, which will only whet his appetite.

Now, however we got here, Mr. Speaker, if we fail to give the President the authority he is now seeking, we will be appeasing Saddam Hussein for agression exactly as Neville Chamberlain appeased Hitler. In so doing we will increase the chances of war, either now or later.

If we do not stand up to this threat now, the specter of war will continue to haunt the region for years to come. If we do stand up to it, if we do back up diplomacy with at least this credibility, I believe we have the greatest opportunity of avoiding war.

This is a very wrenching issue for me, Mr. Speaker, as I know it is for so many Members on this floor, because my political education and my political knowledge, if you will, was forged in opposition to the war in Vietnam; but I think that we must be honest with ourselves and recognize that the analogy today is much more to that of World War II than it is to that of Vietnam.

To my very close friends who say, "Let sanctions work," I wish I could agree with them; but CIA Director William Webster testified last month that economic sanctions will not reverse Iraq's occupation of Kuwait and testified that economic sanctions will not undo Saddam Hussein's long-term threat to the region. It is a nice and a well-intended wish, Mr. Speaker, to believe that sanctions will work, but the evidence contradicts the wish.

If I believed there were any real possibility that this alternative would accomplish our goals, I would support it.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe the issue here is returning the Emir of Kuwait to his throne, and I oppose a ground war for that purpose.

While complete and unconditional Iraqi withdrawal from Kuwait is a necessary part of any resolution to this crisis, it will not put an end to the threat posed by Saddam Hussein.

Mr. Speaker, unless we prevent Saddam from using chemical and biological weapons and unless we ensure that he will never have the capacity to initiate a nuclear war, we face the very

real prospect of having to go through this painful process again in the future, this time with an even more formidable and deadly foe.

Let me conclude, Mr. Speaker, by reporting to you the conversation that was repeated to me many times when I visited our troops in Saudi Arabia several weeks ago. A young sergeant came up to me and said:

Congressman, I hope you in the Congress will give us the support we need now if diplomacy fails or to back diplomacy up, rather than wait down the road when we will have to confront this brutal aggressor if he has nuclear weapons.

Passage, Mr. Speaker, of the Solarz-Michel amendment is the only real hope for peace. That is why I support it and I urge my colleagues to join with me.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the delegate from the Virgin Islands [Mr. DE LUGO].

Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, the world watches and waits as the members of this body debate the resolutions offered on the Persian Gulf: Whether to authorize the President to use military force against Iraq as proposed by Mr. SOLARZ and Mr. MICHEL; to continue to enforce economic sanctions and to defend Saudi Arabia from Iraq as proposed by Mr. HAMILTON and Mr. GEPHARDT; or to express the sense of Congress that we must approve any offensive military action against Iraq as proposed by Mr. DURBIN and Mr. BENNETT.

Actually, we must decide whether we will allow this country to go to war in the next few days, or direct the President to continue to explore every reasonable effort to reach a diplomatic solution to this crisis.

At the outset of the United States' military buildup in the Persian Gulf, we believed our presence there was purely defensive, to prevent Iraq from invading our ally, Saudi Arabia, and from continuing conquests of neighboring states. However, in November the President nearly doubled the number of troops deployed in the Persian Gulf and it quickly became apparent that he was seeking to put in place sufficient U.S. troops to launch an offensive military action.

The original goal of moving troops to the Persian Gulf has been achieved: Saudi Arabia is now secure, the expansionist plans of Saddam Hussein have been thwarted; and economic sanctions are in place which are exacting a heavy toll on Iraq.

Nonetheless, the President has decided that the January 15 deadline for Iraq's withdrawal from Kuwait set by the U.N. Security Council under strong pressure from the Bush Administration is a resolution that must be enforced, even though that deadline is an arbitrary one and one that authorizes military force sometime after that date, not on or even near that date.

Mr. Speaker, we are under no obligation whatsoever to initiate military action on or about January 15. In fact, if we are to recall the President's own statements following agreements with Mikail Gorbachov for a new order, we may be morally and politically obligated not to begin offensive action.

Today the United States is the most powerful Nation on Earth, a nation with the mightiest military ever developed, a large portion of which is now assembled in the Persian Gulf. No one at home or abroad questions that. If the President does not use this military power, the United States will continue to be the most powerful Nation, one that could still, at any time, exert its considerable leverage.

However, if the United States does use its military in a war in the Persian Gulf, we will have unleashed an action with enormous consequences, an action that could extinguish thousands of lives, Arab as well as American, an action that will have untold consequences on Arab-American relations for generations to come, an action that will likely involve Israel and could align many nations of the region against the United States, an action that, once taken, will always remain in the annals of history as a war that, given time, may not have to have occurred.

If ever there was a time to define a new order in the world, it is now. If ever there was a time to prove our leadership of a new world order, it is now. Securing a new order that could last well into the 21st century is far more important than scolding a petty tyrant named Saddam Hussein. If there is truly a chance to create a new order in our world, an order that is so welcome and so needed in these times that follow more than 40 years of cold war, we must secure that chance now, before we allow war and its terrible consequences to take its toll on the people of the United States, the Persian Gulf and the world as a whole.

War, if there is to be one, must come only as a last resort, after all sanctions have failed, after all efforts to negotiate have failed, and after a strong majority of Americans have agreed to support the President through their duly elected representatives in this House.

Our Nation is in economic recession. Our national debt swells larger every day. Our needs at home go wanting. Yet, we seem willing to expend billions of dollars on behalf of allies, who now, for the most part, let the United States defend their interests while they watch from the sidelines. Is it fair to ask the American people to sacrifice their lives and their livelihood for those who will make no such commitment? I think not.

Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleagues on all sides of this debate who have spoken their convictions at this critical time in our Nation's history. While the Delegates to the House, of which I am one, have no vote on the floor, we, too, represent the people of this great Nation, people who at this very moment are committed in the Persian Gulf, people who already have lost loved ones there. This is an issue of extreme importance to the people of the Virgin Islands whom I represent, and were I to cast a vote I would do so in support of Mr. HAMILTON and Mr. GEPHARDT, to require the President to continue to seek a peaceful resolution to the crisis in the Gulf and to require the President to obtain the authorization of the Members of this House before initiating offensive military action against Iraq.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES].

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that Congress finally has the opportunity to debate this important issue. As the clock continues to tick toward January 15, the prospect of engaging in a war with Iraq becomes more and more ominous for many Americans. A war in the Persian Gulf raises profound political, constitutional, and emotional issues, which should be addressed.

I am initially disturbed by the zeal and determination of President Bush to expend lives of Americans in order to restore the legitimate government of Kuwait. Let's look at this legitimate government. Two years ago, the billionaire Emir of Kuwait quashed Democracy, dissolved the Kuwait National Assembly, suspended parts of the Constitution, dissolved municipal councils, declared that he would rule by decree, and banned the free press. Less than 7 percent of the country is permitted to vote and political parties are prohibited. Also, women are denied the right to vote. Although the national assembly has again been restored, the fact is that Kuwait is a country where its citizens were pressuring the Government for transition from a monarchy to a democratically elected leadership. Americans should certainly question whether they want to lose Americans on a battlefield to restore this wealthy Emir to his throne.

The threat of war in the Persian Gulf should serve as a valuable reminder that the United States must take the necessary steps to conserve energy and develop alternative fuel sources, so we reduce our dependence on foreign oil. Moreover, we need to examine what a war will do to our own country. This Nation is facing an economic recession, a $3 trillion deficit—the largest in our Nation's history—our banks and savings and loans are on the verge of collapse, 7.6 million people are currently unemployed in the United States, and 28 States face revenue shortfalls in their fiscal year 1991 budgets. Just last week our own Government closed the Bank of New England and 47 banks and credit unions in Connecticut.

The cost of Desert Shield has been estimated at $23 billion for fiscal year 1991. According to GAO, the total U.S. costs of Desert Shield without hostilities could exceed $130 billion in fiscal year 1991 alone. Experts predict that if there is war, the recession will last longer and may be more severe, depending on how long the war lasts.

Much has been made by this administration about widespread abuse of human rights in Kuwait. There is no question that the outrageous violations of human rights reported by Amnesty International defy all standards of basic human decency. But I have to wonder where was the outcry from the administration when three United States servicemen were recently murdered in El Salvador? More than 15 U.S. military personnel and countless civil-

ians have been killed in that country, and the administration has been silent. In Guatemala, China, Kenya, and South Africa, pervasive human rights violations have occurred and continue to occur. But we do not send troops there. If Kuwait has been located in Africa, and had no oil, not a single U.S. soldier would have ever been deployed there. I venture to say that if Kuwait produced bananas, instead of oil, we would not have 400,000 American troops there today.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I listened to CHARLIE BENNETT, a Member of this body for 43 years, say that he was 80 years of age and that after 43 years and 17,000 votes, he regretted only one vote that he will never have the opportunity to go back and correct. That was his wrong vote on the Bay of Tonkin resolution.

Last night my 6-year-old, first grade grandson, Eric, called me. He said, "granddaddy, are you going to vote to have a war or not to have a war?" I told him that I was going to vote not to have a war. When I asked him if that was OK, he said, "yes, because when I go to bed tonight, I'm going to pray that we don't have a war."

Someday when Eric grows up, he and I will talk about this day. When it occurs, I want to be able to look him in the eye and know that on this vote I voted right—that I voted for the Hamilton-Gephardt resolution, that I voted to give sanctions a chance, that I voted to give diplomacy a chance, that I voted to save life, that I did not vote to give a President, one man, the authority to send other people's sons and daughters to war.

□ 1900

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON].

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, since Iraq's brutal invasion of Kuwait, which was only the most ostensible overt act of Saddam Hussein's larger purposes, I have been supportive of the President's prudent and measured response to Saddam Hussein's attempts to hold the world hostage to his arbitrary territorial, dictatorial, and world petroleum supply ambitions. The events of the past 2 days since Secretary Baker and Foreign Minister Aziz met in Geneva have only reaffirmed my belief that Congress must give the President the flexibility to deal with the situation in manner he prudently and advisedly sees fit.

Tommorrow I will vote to give the President that flexibility. There is nothing more atrocious and distasteful than war. I hope and pray earnestly that there will be a peaceful resolution of the crisis in the Middle East. I am hopeful that the several diplomatic efforts of which we are aware will yet succeed.

However, if they do not, elements of surprise and force must be available to the President to pursue the objective that diplomacy will have failed to achieve. We must preserve the opportunity, the emerging opportunities of the world resulting from the demise of communism.

We must not allow Saddam Hussein to get away with this brutal and tyrannical actions lest other regional terrorist thugs will have the idea that they, too may intimidate others and be successful in that intimidation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yea" vote on the resolution in the support of the Solarz-Michel proposition.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes the gentleman from West Virginia, [Mr. MOLLOHAN].

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, it has been said a number of times, in a number of different ways during this debate, that this vote is, in all likelihood, the most momentous vote we will cast as Members of Congress. For every reason, and we have heard many, this is true.

It is important, therefore, that there be no confusion about our purposes. They are not, as some have suggested: To protect a small country against a large country; to protect oil access; to shore up an undemocratic sheikdom; or to support a political system not in our image. I think that a majority of this body, as well as a majority of the world's citizenry, understand that none of these would justify American involvement, or the world's sense of urgency, and the multinational commitment.

Indeed, nothing short of the reality we face would prompt this U.N. undertaking.

Iraq, under Saddam Hussein, represents a clear and present danger to every country in the Middle East. If he were permitted to occupy the region as he has Kuwait—marrying up Iraq's formidable military power with the wealth that controlling half of the world's oil reserves represents—who could deny that he would become a world class military power who would have to be dealt with on a grander scale, requiring greater sacrifices?

Many oppose the Solarz-Michel resolution because they do not want a military option exercised now, but they would approve force after economic sanctions failed.

I have heard them say as much—I have heard them say things like:

> Economic sanctions have had only 6 months to work—before undertaking military action, give them the 6 to 12 months which President Bush initially indicated it would take to convince Saddam Hussein to pull out of Kuwait.

Their reasoning has an initial appeal: If sanctions have been effective for 6 months, perhaps in another 6 months they will work magic and bring Saddam Hussein to his knees.

Well, perhaps they will—but there is certainly no guarantee. The United Nations and an array of experts believe that economic sanctions alone will not work to remove Saddam Hussein from Kuwait. The higher probability is that, without the threat of force, Saddam Hussein will survive the economic sanctions, while the diplomacy will unravel.

The passage of the Solarz-Michel resolution now is what is needed to give the military option credibility. It should be done now because most of the Islamic world continues to welcome the presence of the multinational force.

It should be done now because abundant military resources are committed and even poised, and their morale is high.

It should be done now because Saddam Hussein knows the next 2 months are optimum time for undertaking military operations in the Middle East.

To the extent any of these factors change, the credibility of a military option fades, it erodes—and with that erosion—sanctions are seriously and, I believe, fatally undermined.

Saddam Hussein is a very literal man. What he sees on the surface is what he believes he's got. He needs to know that the military option is real—that even many of those among us who want to "give sanctions a chance to work," will support military action in the final analysis.

It is ironic, I suppose, but we have a greater chance of achieving a peaceful resolution of this matter if we support the possibility of military force now. If we entrust the President with the discretion.

Don't send Saddam Hussein the wrong signal. Don't let him believe that this whole buildup was an exercise in bluff—something he wants to believe. Let him know that the Congress and the American people stand behind the resolve of the United Nations.

Absent the authorization of its use—the formidable military force arrayed against Saddam Hussein represents more an object for his ridicule, serving to enhance his stature, rather than as an incentive which, in conjunction with the economic sanctions, has the best chance of effecting his quitting of Kuwait.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS].

Mr. SANDERS. Madam Speaker, I have thought long and hard for the last few months about the crisis in the Persian Gulf—trying to understand why the President, and some Members of this body, believe that war and violence is the only means by which this crisis can be resolved.

I've heard people say that Saddam Hussein is a cruel and vicious dictator, and I agree with that. I've heard people say that the invasion of Kuwait was il-

legal, immoral and brutal and that Iraq must be forced to completely withdraw from Kuwait, and I agree with that. What I don't agree with, however, is that war—and the potential loss of thousands of young American, lives and tens of thousands of innocent Iraqi women and children—is the only means by which we can achieve our goals.

Madam Speaker; the President and others, now that the cold war is over, have referred of late to the concept of a new world order. Well, let me say this. There is absolutely nothing new about sending young men and women into battle, about bombing civilian targets, and about seeing tens of thousands of human beings killed and maimed as a result of war. There is nothing new about that. War, brutality and mass murder as a means of resolving international conflict are as old as history itself. If the concept of a new world order is to mean anything, it must mean that we begin to resolve international conflict in a new way—in a nonviolent way. That is new.

Madam Speaker, we can make history in this body by showing the entire world that the U.S. Government will not act in a violent manner—that we will resolve this conflict forcefully and stop Iraqi aggression—but that we will do it nonviolently through continued and strong economic pressure, sanctioned by the United Nations, sanctions which slowly but surely are destroying Iraq's economy and its ability to wate war. Madam Speaker, when we accomplish that, then we can honestly speak of a new world order, but not before then.

Madam Speaker, if the President and this Congress really want to go to war, then let me lay out a battle plan that I will be more than happy to join.

If we really want to go to war, then let us stand up and fight against the grotesquely unfair distribution of wealth which exists in this country, in which the richest 1 percent own over one-third of the wealth, and in which the gap between the rich and the poor grows wider. Let us stand up to the big money interests who, to a large degree, control the economic and political life of this Nation, and bring about a fair and just tax system in which the rich start paying their fair share of taxes. Now that is a fight I would like to participate in.

Madam Speaker, if this body wants a war—then let's take on the insurance companies, and the drug companies and the AMA—and fight for a national health care system which will guarantee health care to all of our people without out-of-pocket expense—as almost every industrialized nation on Earth has achieved. Now that's a fight that will take real courage, and it's a fight that our constituents want us to wage.

Madam Speaker, the standard of living of the average American worker is in decline because, among other reasons, the huge industrial corporations have sold out our people, and have taken their factories and their money into the Third World where they're hiring workers at starvation wages. If we really want a fight, then let's stand up to these corporations and demand that they reinvest in America, and provide good paying, environmentally sound jobs for our people. Do we have the courage to wage that kind of war?

Madam Speaker, this Nation now has a $3 trillion debt, and we are facing the largest deficit in our history. The S&L industry has collapsed and some say that the commercial banking system may not be far behind. We have 3 million Americans sleeping out on the streets; 25 percent of our children living in poverty, an educational system which is failing; and millions of Americans who are functionally illiterate.

Madam Speaker, this vote is not just a vote for war and peace—but it is a vote for the future direction of America for years to come. Is the future of our country to be one in which we are known throughout the world simply as being the strongest military power on Earth, the policeman of the world, the muscleman of the world? Is that what our future is all about? Is that the heritage that we leave to our children?

Or rather, Madam Speaker, can we create a different future for this country? A future in which this Nation leads the world in the quality of our health care system, the quality of our educational system, the quality of our housing and our general standard of living; the quality of our respect for the environment and the quality of the culture which we produce?

Madam Speaker, let us say no to war and yes to peace; no to haste and yes to patience.

Madam Speaker, let us defeat the President's initiative.

□ 1910

Mr. McCOLLUM. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER].

Mr. BOEHNER. Madam Speaker, today, by our votes and our words, we will send a messsage to Saddam Hussein—to other nations—and most importantly—to our children.

Will we send a clear message of a new world order based on a respect for the law of nations, enforced by a commitment of strength?

Or will we send a garbled and confused message—one of missteps, timidity and weakness. One magnified by misguided, blind hope.

To my colleagues who see this debate as one of whether we are committing this Nation to war, I must disagree. Rather this debate centers on congressional will and resolve. Does this body have the will and the resolve to commit this Nation to a future of peace—or will we leave for our children an inheritance of uncertainty and world instability?

I do not want to see our Nation at war and I pray that this crisis will be resolved peacefully.

But I can not in good conscience, deny to the President of the United States every power and tool that he is entitled to in his efforts to resolve this crisis.

I will vote to authorize the President to use force as a last resort to implement the U.N. resolutions—not because I think that actual force will in the end drive Hussein from Kuwait—but because I believe the real threat of force will make him abandon his aggression.

If this body fails to make the possibility of force real—then surely we are setting ourselves on a path of great instability in the months and years ahead. What international madman, dictator, or aggressor will ever again pay heed to the words of this Nation if in this moment of crisis, we fail to show the resolve we are now called upon to exhibit.

I am reminded of the words once spoken by Ronald Reagan, "If not now, when? If not us, who?" I have no doubt that if we do not stand up to Saddam this time, we will be faced with his aggression again. And when that happens, surely the stakes will be higher, the consequences more dire.

I again state that by my vote, I do not wish to see war. But by my vote, I hope to give the President access to all other tools he needs to bring about a peaceful resolution to this conflict and a world of peace and security for my children and yours.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from South Carolina [Mrs. PATTERSON].

Mrs. PATTERSON. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the President's proposal and urge prayer as we consider this matter.

Madam Speaker, when I was elected by the people of the Fourth Congressional District of South Carolina, I accepted the honor, privilege and responsibility of serving them with great anticipation and sense of duty.

Never, Madam Speaker, have I had to make a decision as critical as the choice that currently faces Congress.

On August 2, 1990, Iraq invaded Kuwait. Shortly after, President Bush dispatched United States troops to the Persian Gulf with the stated objectives of defending neighboring states from further aggression, protecting American lives, ensuring the continued flow of the world's oil supply and, in connection with the international community, to support the steps necessary for the complete and unconditional withdrawal of Iraq from Kuwait.

Since that time, the world, in near unanimous condemnation of the unprovoked, brutal actions of one man against a small country and many innocent women, men and children, has rejected Saddam Hussein's threats and sought peaceful means of resolving this crisis. The United Nations has adopted twelve sepa-

rate resolutions and diplomatic efforts aimed at reversing the illegal actions of Iraq. Today, however, the illegal forces still occupy Kuwait. The threats to the international community remain and over 430,000 American service men and women are positioned in and around the immediate vicinity of a ruthless and dangerous despot.

In view of the intransigence of the Iraqi President, and the lack of progress in the removal of Iraqi forces from Kuwait, and after the numerous diplomatic efforts by various parties, most recently between Secretary Baker and the Iraqi Foreign Minister, Tariq Aziz, the time has come to strengthen the flexibility of the President of the United States in achieving the objectives of the multinational coalition.

That is why I intend to support House Joint Resolution 62, the bipartisan resolution which authorizes the use of military force after the President has informed the leaders of both Houses of Congress that all diplomatic and other peaceful means of securing Iraqi compliance with the U.N. resolutions have failed. Mr. Speaker, I do not want a war with Iraq, nor do any of my colleagues. There are those who argue that supporting the resolution constitutes casting a vote for war, not peace, for impatience, not measured tolerance, for the destruction of American lives, not the triumphant return of our men and women, for the survival of an economic and political system and way of life that is alien to the principles of our system of democracy and not worth the moral, economic, and human sacrifice that we may be called upon to give. But, Madam Speaker, I believe that this resolution offers the best chance for the very survival of those same noble and most urgently desired goals.

I have heard from people in my district, average Americans, not military and political analysts, but mothers and fathers, sisters and brothers, and other family members who have loved ones in the Persian Gulf. They have a vested interest in this crisis and in the actions taken by the Congress and the President and will be the first to feel the pain and anguish that are inevitable in a state of war and military conflict. They, more than anyone else, understand the costs of an offensive action and the benefits of a peaceful solution, and they have urged me to support the resolution that authorizes the President to use all necessary means to achieve Iraq's compliance with the U.N. resolutions.

We will continue with strong economic sanctions against Iraq. We will continue to seek ways to negotiate a solution to this crisis and I will stand united with the people of my district in our combined efforts and prayers to bring our troops home safely and soon.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McCURDY].

Mr. McCURDY. Madam Speaker, since coming to Congress 10 years ago I have participated in many debates on foreign policy and national defense. But none seems as historic as the one we are hearing today. There is no place in this debate for partisanship or posturing. We confront our gravest responsibility—and I believe it is the responsibility of Congress—to decide whether to commit this Nation to war.

Five months ago, Madam Speaker, we all were reeling with euphoria over the end of the cold war. Democratic revolution had succeeded in Eastern Europe; the Berlin Wall was being hammered into souvenirs; Nicaragua was liberated from Sandinista misrule; South Africa began the process of dismantling the oppression of apartheid; the nightmare of nuclear terror seemed over. Although some have come to sneer at the concept, the end of the cold war offered many of us the hope that a new world order could be established.

But on August 2, Saddam Hussein shattered that euphoria with his brutal invasion and systematic destruction of a defenseless neighbor. With this act, we were cruelly reminded that peace and freedom are something we can never actually possess; they are not something we can take for granted, as though we owned them indefinitely. We must once again face the fact, as a French writer once remarked, that "Freedom is a system based on courage," and that as the Romans used to say, "Let him who desires peace prepare for war."

Madam Speaker, it is terrible to return to such hard, cold truths after a time of such tremendous good will. I can certainly understand why many of my colleagues hesitate to bring themselves to do it. I share their anger and frustration, and I admire their will to find a more gentle and reasonable way of dealing with the challenge facing us. But I have to say that some may have let hope blind them to the truth of our situation.

For the past 5 months, we have been engaged in an emotional debate about how best to respond to and reverse Saddam Hussein's crime in Kuwait. It has been a fascinating exercise in democracy, to say the least, as people of different political stripes find themselves in new alignments.

But the fundamental question which Congress must now answer is whether to give the economic sanctions imposed against Iraq more time to work, or whether to give President Bush the authority to use military force to get Saddam Hussein to comply with the U.N. resolutions.

Madam Speaker, I have concluded that Congress must vote to give the President the necessary authority to use all necessary means to get Saddam Hussein out of Kuwait. I do so not out of any desire to go to war, but because I believe our vital interests to be at stake in the gulf, and we must be prepared to use force to defend those interests if necessary.

Madam Speaker, I have great respect and admiration for those who argue that sanctions must be given more time to work. I believe they are genuine in their commitment to see Iraq leave Kuwait and that it can be accomplished by peaceful means.

But there is no evidence to indicate that 5 months of sanctions have had the slightest impact on Saddam Hussein's thinking. On the contrary, he has treated the international community aligned against him with contempt, he has rebuked the President's efforts to reach a diplomatic solution at Geneva, and he has given every indication that he will stay in Kuwait regardless of how long sanctions remain in effect. In addition, there is nothing to suggest that sanctions will diminish Saddam Hussein's chemical and biological weapons capabilities or inhibit his quest for nuclear weapons—a threat which certainly compares with his occupation of Kuwait.

Furthermore, unless Congress clearly affirms its support for the possible use of force, the world will grow indifferent to the sanctions themselves. Leaks in the embargo will develop and proliferate. The issue is not sanctions or the threat of force, as some have posed it. In my view, one cannot work without the other.

Madam Speaker, I take very seriously my decision to authorize the President to use force. I have not agreed with every step he has taken throughout the Gulf crisis. I was disappointed by some of the macho talk and personalization of the conflict between the President and Saddam. I opposed his decision to forgive $7 billion in debts owed by Egypt and believe that the administration has not sufficiently pressed our allies in Europe, Japan, and elsewhere to increase their financial and military contributions to this effort.

The President, however, has skillfully employed the type of collective security that we Democrats have always respected and argued for. By assembling at the United Nations an international coalition against Iraq, pursuing every reasonable diplomatic option, and by working to build a bipartisan consensus at home, the President has exercised restraint at a very difficult and dangerous time. Now he deserves our support, and the Congress should give it to him by voting for the Solarz-Broomfield resolution.

No Member of Congress welcomes the prospect of committing our country to war. However, in my view if we fail to give the President the authority contained in this resolution, the prospects for peace will be diminished even further.

Madam Speaker, for 10 years I have walked past the statue of Janette Rankin who said in this Chamber before World War I and World War II—"I cannot vote for war." Even though I have great admiration for her courage and conviction, I shudder at the thought of how many additional lives would have been lost had her position prevailed.

I urge adoption of Solarz resolution.

□ 1920

Mr. GEPHARDT. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SWIFT].

Mr. SWIFT. Madam Speaker, first I would like to commend the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] for a most impressive, precise, and complete presentation of the case for the resolution I rise to support.

President Bush was correct to take a stand against Saddam Hussein's aggression in Kuwait. He was correct to marshal broad international support for that policy, and President Bush was correct to try economic sanctions first, supporting them with 200,000 troops prepared to enforce those sanctions.

It was after this impressive start that the President went awry. He increased the troop strengths to 400,000. We cannot long sustain that size troop commitment, and when he sent those troops in, he significantly changed our policy there.

I supported the President's initial policy. There is a great deal of evidence from military experts that the sanctions are working and will work. Further, the American public will support the sanctions strategy, certainly for long enough to give that policy a fair opportunity to prove itself.

If we first try sanctions, we have not narrowed our options. If we first take military action, we cannot return to any other options, including sanctions.

This is not a question of whether we support the President's first reaction to Iraqi aggression. We do. I have, publicly, and strongly, from the very beginning. But this is a question of whether or not we are going to commit American lives in the defense of a changed policy prematurely, before we have exhausted the potential of a nonmilitary policy that shows real signs of promise to resolve the situations and to back Iraq out of Kuwait.

Madam Speaker, the Hamilton-Gephardt resolution supports the President's first instincts. They were his best.

Mr. MICHEL. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that 45 minutes allocated to this side of the aisle be given to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI] for allocation as he sees fit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. UNSOELD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF].

Mr. WOLF. Madam Speaker, today we are debating what is perhaps the most serious foreign policy matter of the past several decades: the crisis in the Persian Gulf. Let me say first that before coming to my position on the President's Persian Gulf policy, I was very hopeful that the latest meeting between Secretary Baker and Foreign Minister Aziz would lead to Iraq's withdrawal from Kuwait.

Unfortunately, we all know what happened in that meeting earlier this week. The Iraqi minister refused not only to comply with the United Nations resolution calling for his country's withdrawal from Kuwait, but he refused to even use the word "Kuwait" in his discussions.

Today, then we are faced with the decision on whether the Congress of the United States will support the President by giving him authorization to enforce United Nations Resolution 678, calling for Iraq to withdraw from its southern neighbor by January 15, or whether we will instead recommend that the economic sanctions in place against Iraq be given additional time to work.

Madam Speaker, I know all my colleagues join me in the hope that a peaceful solution can be found to this world crisis. No one in this body seeks armed conflict. No one in this body want to see American service men and women placed in peril. But as we approach the January 15 deadline in the U.N. resolution, we should speak with a united, bipartisan voice to let Saddam Hussein know that the Congress of the United States stands behind the President.

I call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial in today's Washington Post entitled, "Congress and War." The fourth paragraph of that editorial reads:

> Can there be any question as to how Saddam Hussein would read a congressional vote that denied President Bush the authority he seeks to use force in conformity with international mandate and national policy alike? Does anyone think he would not take heart from such a vote?

It is my belief that the credible threat of force may be the only way of preventing the use of force against Iraq.

It is also important, Mr. Speaker, that we understand what we are facing from Iraq's aggression against Kuwait and who we are facing in Saddam Hussein. I am reminded of the events leading up to World War II with the unchecked aggression of Hitler in Germany who piece by piece, country by country, expanded his domination of Europe.

I want to share with my colleagues a section of a report by Amnesty International on Iraqi human rights abuses in occupied Kuwait so that there can be no doubt in what kind of man Saddam Hussein is. Madam Speaker, I will not go into the details of this report. They are gruesome and sickening to read. I mention them here and will submit them for the record only to demonstrate that we are not dealing with an average individual when we are speaking about Saddam Hussein.

That brings us to the question of the policy of economic sanctions working to drive Saddam Hussein from Kuwait. Sanctions have been in place since last August, shortly after Iraq's invasion of Kuwait. The question we must answer is, are sanctions working?

To help us with that question, I would submit for the record a copy of CIA Director William Webster's letter to Armed Services Committee Chairman LES ASPIN in which Mr. Webster states that there is no indication that the economic sanctions are forcing or will force Iraq to leave Kuwait.

In light of the apparent failure of the economic sanctions to force Iraq to withdraw from Kuwait, and in light of Iraq's refusal to even discuss such a withdrawal with Secretary Baker in Vienna this week, I urge my colleagues to support the bipartisan resolution to uphold United Nations Resolution 678.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 11, 1991]

CONGRESS AND WAR

Iraq, says Speaker Foley, is an "issue of conscience." But that's to say that only one answer is possible. In fact, Iraq is an issue of judgment. Conscientious legislators have different views about it. That is what makes the congressional debate on Iraq so excruciatingly difficult.

That the United States has large stakes in the outcome of the Gulf crisis is no longer a contentious issue. The threshold argument in Congress is how best to pursue those stakes—by the threat of war or by further reliance on sanctions, diplomacy and the military buildup. On this matter, as we say, conscientious people can differ. There are expert analyses to support several courses. It is a close call.

But Congress is not dealing merely with this essentially tactical question. Having chosen to wait until this late moment to address the crisis in a formal this-counts way, Congress finds itself pinned up against the Bush administration's determined, United Nations-sanctioned effort to enforce the U.N.'s Jan. 15 deadline for Iraqi withdrawal from Kuwait. So a second argument—what we would call the more urgent argument—necessarily comes into play: whether to try to make the Bush enforcement strategy work. This is not simply a matter of supporting the president, although it is partly that. It is a matter of supplying the president with the vote of confidence, the showing of support, to strengthen his hand at the moment when conceivably this powerful sort of strengthening of his hand can influence the calculations of Saddam Hussein and win him over to the withdrawal that is favored by almost everyone in America.

It is no longer seriously disputed that Saddam Hussein is a menace to regional peace and global order and had best be reined in sooner so that he does not become an even greater menace later. This is what the American government has attempted to do. Now comes the squeeze. Can there be any question as to how Saddam Hussein would read a congressional vote that denied President Bush the authority he seeks to use force in conformity with international mandate and national policy alike? Does anyone think he would not take heart from such a vote?

A war in the Gulf could have incalculable and horrible effects, and we are not calling for the country to launch an attack. But we do support putting in the hands of the presi-

dent—a president who personally knows something about war—the authority to make a more plausible threat in these eleventh-hour circumstances of President Hussein's pre-deadline countdown. Our judgment is that Congress, by deciding to authorize the president to conduct war, materially improves his chances of achieving peace. It is a risk, and we would take it.

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY,
Washington, DC, January 10, 1991.

Hon. LES ASPIN,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your letter of January 9, 1991, in which you ask for an updated assessment of the impact of sanctions on Iraq and on the policies of Saddam Hussein subsequent to my testimony before your committee in December. In that testimony, as you accurately noted, I observed that the sanctions were effective technically and that they were being felt economically and eventually would be felt militarily in some areas. I also testified that there was no evidence that sanctions would mandate a change in Saddam Hussein's behavior and that there was no evidence when or even if they would force him out of Kuwait.

You now ask me to: (1) address the impact of the sanctions on the economy and populace of Iraq and on the operational effectiveness of its military if left in place for another six to 12 months; (2) address the question of how Iraq's defensive abilities might be affected by the sanctions on the one hand and by having additional time to prepare on the other if sanctions are allowed to work for another six to 12 months; and (3) address the likelihood that sanctions, again if left in place for another six to 12 months, could induce Iraq to withdraw from Kuwait.

UN sanctions have shut off nearly all Iraq's trade and financial activity and weakened its economy, but disruptions in most sectors are not serious yet. The impact of sanctions has varied by sector. The most serious impact so far has been on the financial sector, where hard currency shortages have led Baghdad to take a variety of unusual steps to conserve or raise even small amounts of foreign exchange. For the populace, the most serious impact has been inflation.

The ability of the Iraqi ground forces to defend Kuwait and southern Iraq is unlikely to be substantially eroded over the next six to twelve months even if effective sanctions can be maintained. This is especially true if Iraq does not believe a coalition attack is likely during this period. Iraq's infantry and artillery forces—the key elements of Iraq's initial defense—probably would not suffer significantly as a result of sanctions. Iraq can easily maintain the relatively simple Soviet-style weaponry of its infantry and artillery units and can produce virtually all of the ammunition for these forces domestically. Moreover, these forces will have additional opportunity to extend and reinforce their fortifications along the Saudi border, thereby increasing their defensive strength. Iraq's armored and mechanized forces will be degraded somewhat from continued sanctions. The number of inoperable Iraqi armored and other vehicles will grow gradually and the readiness of their crews will decline as Baghdad is forced to curb its training activities. Iraq has large stocks of spare parts and other supplies, however, which will ameliorate the effect of these problems. On balance, the marginal decline of combat power in Baghdad's armored units probably would be offset by the simultaneous improvement of its defensive fortifications. While the military, especially the army, has been protected from the impact of sanctions by stockpiling and minimal usage, during a military action the impact would be more profound as equipment and needed parts are expended.

Iraq's Air Force and air defenses are likely to be hit far more severely than its Army, if effective sanctions are maintained for another six to twelve months. This degradation will diminish Iraq's ability to defend its strategic assets from air attack and reduce its ability to conduct similar attacks on its neighbors. It would have only a marginal impact on Saddam's ability to hold Kuwait and southern Iraq. The Iraqi Air Force is not likely to play a major role in any battle for Kuwait.

In December, during my appearance before the House Armed Services Committee, I noted that while we can look ahead several months and predict the gradual deterioration of the Iraqi economy, it is more difficult to assess how or when these conditions will cause Saddam to modify his behavior. Our judgment remains that, even if sanctions continue to be enforced for an additional six to 12 months, economic hardship alone is unlikely to compel Saddam to retreat from Kuwait or cause regime-threatening popular discontent in Iraq. The economic impact of sanctions is likely to be increasingly serious, with conspicuous hardships and dislocations. Nevertheless, Saddam currently appears willing to accept even a subsistence economy in a continued attempt to outlast the international resolve to maintain the sanctions, especially if the threat of war recedes significantly. He probably continues to believe that Iraq can endure sanctions longer than the international coalition will hold and hopes that avoiding war will buy him time to negotiate a settlement more favorable to him.

We have seen little hard evidence to suggest that Saddam is politically threatened by the current hardships endured by the populace. Moreover, Saddam has taken few actions that would indicate he is concerned about the stability of his regime. Assessing the populace's flash point is difficult, but we believe it is high because Iraqis have borne considerable hardship in the past. During its eight-year war with Iran, for example, Iraq endured a combination of economic difficulties, very high casualties, and repeated missile and air attacks on major cities without any serious public disturbances.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM H. WEBSTER,
Director of Central Intelligence.

[From Iraqi Occupied Kuwait, Human Rights Violations Since August 2, by Amnesty International, Dec. 19, 1990]

METHODS OF TORTURE AND ILL-TREATMENT

The following are details of allegations of torture and ill-treatment which have been made to Amnesty International since 2 August, some of which are supported by medical evidence and photographic material [see Appendices C and D]. These reports are entirely consistent with methods of torture and ill-treatment known to have been used in Iraq over many years, and some of which are also supported by medical evidence [see in particular Amnesty International's report entitled "Torture in Iraq 1982–1984", published in April 1985, and the organization's annual reports].

It should be noted that not all of the methods listed below are said to have been widely used since 2 August. Those methods which have been alleged only in a few cases brought to Amnesty International's attention are marked with an asterisk (*).

1. Beatings on all parts of the body, involving punching, slapping, delivering Karate-style blows and kicking with heavy army boots. Implements used for beating include canes, metal rods, whips, steel cables, hosepipes, rubber truncheons and rifle butts.
2. Falaqa: prolonged beating on the soles of the feet. Sometimes the detainee is then forced to walk or run.
3. Suspending the detainee by the feet, or by the arms which are tied behind the back.
4. Beating the detainee while suspended from a rotating fan in the ceiling.
5. Breaking of the arms, legs or ribs; dislocating elbow and shoulder joints.
6. Lifting the detainee high up in the air and then dropping him, sometimes resulting in the fracturing of bones.
7. Applying pressure to the fingers with a clamp-like instrument.
8. Slashing the face, arms or legs with knives.
9. Extracting finger and toenails.
*10. Boring a hole in the leg, apparently with a type of drilling tool.
11. Cutting off of the tongue and ear.
*12. Gouging out of the eyes.
*13. Castration.
*14. Hammering nails into the hands.
15. Piercing the skin with pins or staplers.
16. Shooting the detainee in the arm or leg at point blank range, followed by deprivation of the necessary medical treatment.
17. Rape of women (including virgins) and young men.
18. Inserting bottle necks, sometimes when broken, into the rectum.
*19. Tying a string around the penis and pulling it tightly.
*20. Pumping air using a pipe through the anus, particularly of young boys.
21. Applying electricity to sensitive parts of the body, including the ears, lips, tongue, fingers, toes and genitals. Sometimes the detainee is doused with water prior to the administration of electricity. The electrical instruments used include electric batons as well as wires fitted with clips (like those used to recharge car batteries but smaller in size).
22. Burning various parts of the body, including the genitals, with domestic appliances such as electric irons, with heated metal rods, or with a naked flame.
23. Extinguishing cigarettes on the eyeballs or on various parts of the body, including the genitals, nipples, chest and hands.
24. Pouring hot and cold water alternately over the detainee.
25. Placing the detainee in a cold, air-conditioned room for several hours, and then immediately into a heated room.
*26. Pouring an acid-like substance onto the skin.
27. Pouring caustic substances onto the eyes, causing blindness.
28. Plucking facial hair, particularly the beard, with pincers or pliers.
29. Placing heavy weights on the detainee's body.
30. Spitting into the detainee's mouth.
31. Exposing the detainee to the sun for several hours at a stretch without water.
32. Subjecting the detaineee to mock execution. This includes holding the head below water to the point of near suffocation; going through the motions of execution by firing squad; and holding a gun to the head or in the mouth and pulling the trigger.
33. Forcing the detainee to watch others being tortured, or to hear their screams.

34. Raping or torturing the detainee's relatives in his or her presence threatening the detainee with such acts.

35. Threatening the detainee with torture methods such as the electric chair [al-Kursi al-Rajjaj], or with death by immersion in an acid bath.

36. Deprivation of medical treatment.

37. Deprivation of sleep, food, water, fresh air and toilet or washing facilities.

38. Degrading the detainee by using obscene language or insults.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BORSKI].

Mr. BORSKI. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the Solarz-Michel resolution, which, I believe, represents our last best chance for peace in the Middle East.

I am hopeful that support for this resolution will send a strong, decisive signal to Iraqi President Saddam Hussein that his aggression simply will not be tolerated.

Madam Speaker, while most of my colleagues agree on the goals of Operation Desert Shield, there is fundamental disagreement on the tactics we should employ to achieve them. I can certainly understand my colleagues who believe we should wait for sanctions to take effect. And I agree that we must exhaust all diplomatic options available before resorting to force.

However, after returning Thursday morning from a 26-member bipartisan delegation trip to the Middle East and discussing our tactics with foreign and military officials, I am convinced that sanctions could take 2 to 3 years, if not longer, before ever becoming effective.

There is no guarantee that the coalition united against Iraq will last that long. And with each passing day after January 15, Saddam Hussein will grow stronger and his capability of developing and using nuclear weapons will become greater.

The United States has already demonstrated its willingness to solve this crisis peacefully. President Bush proposed 15 dates for a meeting between the United States and Iraq, but none of them were accepted by the Iraqis.

In another attempt to achieve peace, Secretary Baker met with the Iraqi Foreign Minister in Switzerland. Once again, the Iraqis demonstrated no flexibility, and certainly no intention whatsoever, to withdraw from Kuwait.

Madam Speaker, it is my fervent hope we will not have to use force to achieve our objectives. Despite the latest breakdown in diplomacy, it is not too late for a fair and peaceful solution to this conflict. But such a solution is up to Saddam Hussein.

Only he can prevent war from breaking out in the Middle East by withdrawing unconditionally from Kuwait.

As we debate these resolutions on the floor of the House today, Saddam Hussein is continuing to destroy the infrastructure of Kuwait. He continues to call Kuwait a province of Iraq. And now Saddam Hussein threatens American troops, claiming they will "swim in their own blood." These are hardly words of diplomacy or negotiation, and indeed reflect no intent by Saddam Hussein to withdraw.

Perhaps Saddam Hussein believes that Congress is not fully supportive of Operation Desert Shield. Or perhaps his military and diplomacy advisors are misinforming him, giving him only the information he wants to hear. Either way, he is simply not getting the message.

Madam Speaker, my trip to the Gulf strengthened my firm belief that Saddam Hussein must be defeated—either politically or militarily. I believe that supporting the President at this moment represents our best chance to achieve this goal politically. Therefore Madam Speaker, it is important that we reinforce that strong message on the floor of the House.

I believe that at this point, our only chance for peace is to present Saddam Hussein with the strongest, most credible threat possible—one that is supported by Congress and by the American people.

Saddam Hussein is closely watching our debate today. With the approval of this resolution, Saddam Hussein will know that Congress now stands with the President. We must also show our troops in Saudi Arabia that Congress is fully behind them. The troops I talked to seemed frustrated and concerned that Congress may not support the President's actions. We need to support this resolution to demonstrate to our troops that Congress and the President speak with one voice to praise their efforts in the gulf.

Madam Speaker, Iraq's invasion and occupation of Kuwait is a threat to our vital national interests. If we do not stop Saddam Hussein today, his threat will only grow stronger. At this time, only the United States has the ability to stop Iraq's aggresssion. If we do not respond to this dictator's threat now, who will?

Madam Speaker, I don't want war—nobody in this House does. But if we are to have any chance of avoiding war, we must not send Saddam Hussein a mixed signal about our intentions. This resolution provides the President with the leverage he needs to bring about peace in the Persian Gulf.

It is the best means Congress has right now to prevent war.

□ 1930

Mr. GEPHARDT. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WEISS].

Mr. WEISS. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished majority leader for yielding time to me.

What is the rush? Why is the majority in this House so intent on supporting a President hellbent on going to war as quickly as possible?

It seems to me that our prime concern ought to be, assuming that there has to be a war, that it takes place under conditions most favorable and most advantageous to the young American men and women who will be asked to fight it. Every indication that we get from objective sources is that the sanctions are working and that the sanctions are in fact having a tremendous impact on the warmaking capacity of Iraq.

The Iraqi equipment is literally falling apart. We have the testimony of the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, Mr. Webster, that as of December 5, 1990, 5 or 6 weeks ago, some 50 percent of the gross national product of Iraq had already been adversely affected; that 90 percent of their imports and 97 percent of their exports had been cut off; that they are losing $1½ billion a month in hard currency; that within 3 to 6 months their air force, their airplanes, will be beginning to fall apart because of an inability to replace parts.

We know from watching the television pictures what is happening to the equipment that our people are using. They are having tremendous difficulty keeping it operative. We can resupply and repair, and he cannot.

So what is the big rush? Time is on our side. Admiral Crowe testified before the Senate Armed Forces Committee and said that to suggest that Hussein has not been adversely affected, that the sanctions are not working, is both weird and wrong.

Time is on our side. If by giving time a chance to work for us and for the young men and women who are asked to do battle we can save lives, if we can save 1 life, 5 lives, 100 lives, 1,000 lives, is that not worth continuing the effort at sanctions?

We have over 100 nations participating in a genuine coalition on the blockade and the embargo. But we have practically no other nation engaged in a coalition of battle, in battle formation. Outside of the British, who have a couple of divisions there, practically no one is there to be supportive of American forces who will be battling against the Iraqis.

It just seems to me that when our constituents ask us what the rush is, as they constantly do, we ought to ask ourselves what the rush is. When people suggest that they know that sanctions cannot work, that is sheer speculation, flying in the face of every objective indication that we have.

When people tell us, "Oh, American casualties will only be between 500 and 1,000," I ask them, how did they suddenly get to be so omniscient? How can they assure us, themselves, assure the young men and women who are going to be doing the fighting, that that is the case?

If they are wrong and the body bags start coming back in larger numbers,

who will they apologize to, and who will be there to accept their apologies?

The time to have time work for us is now. We must not give a premature declaration of war to the President of the United States who gives every indication that he intends to implement it as early as possible. It just does not make any common sense.

Seven out of the last eight Secretaries of Defense of this country have said to let sanctions work. The last two Chairs of the Joint Chiefs of Staff have said let the sanctions work. Who are we and who is the President to override that, especially in the face of public statements, from commanding officers out in the field, who tell us that our forces are not really ready for combat at this point, that they need more time in any event?

Madam Speaker, it seems to me that we will rue the day that we have decided to give the President this blank check without any conditions on it, which will only lead to death and disaster and to war unnecessarily.

Madam Speaker, the issue before the House today is probably the most important and fateful decision that we as Members of the U.S. Congress will ever consider—the decision to send the men and women of our Armed Forces to war. We will soon cast our votes and fulfill the solemn constitutional responsibility that is solely entrusted to us as Members of Congress.

Before we reach a vote, I want to urge my colleagues first to consider the many issues on which we—and the American people—are united. We are in complete agreement, for example, in our condemnation of Iraq's unprovoked aggression against Kuwait. We agree that more powerful nations cannot be allowed to swallow up their smaller neighbors with impunity. And we are united in our determination to get Saddam Hussein out of Kuwait and to restore that nation's sovereignty.

The American people and the Congress also stand firm with the international coalition which President Bush has assembled in response to this crisis. We strongly endorse the U.N. Security Council's economic sanctions to pressure Saddam Hussein and to add teeth to our policy.

In other words, Madam Speaker, the American people and their representatives in Congress are indeed united in their support for many—perhaps most—of the Bush administration's policies in the Persian Gulf.

The fact that we agree on the goals of that policy, however, does not mean that we agree about the best way to achieve those goals. How can we get Saddam Hussein to leave Kuwait?

When it comes to the means to achieve that goal, our Nation is deeply and passionately divided. Many of us believe that the international community should maintain its policy of economic sanctions and diplomatic pressure. Others believe, with President Bush, that we should go to war to achieve that goal.

These two basic alternatives divide the Congress; they divide the American people; and the resolutions before the Congress today reflect that division. One says we should stay the course and give sanctions and diplomacy a chance to succeed; the other gives President Bush the authority to wage war.

I am convinced that the best course of action—both for the international community and the United States—is to maintain the United Nations sanctions, coupled with active diplomacy to achieve our common goals.

This view is based not only on my desire to keep the United States out of an unwise conflict, but also on the testimony of many widely respected experts, including seven of the eight former

eight former Secretaries of Defense. As Adm. William Crowe, recently testified, economic sanctions can succeed, with sufficient time, in forcing Saddam Hussein from Kuwait.

Listen to the words of the Bush Administration's own Director of Central Intelligence, William Webster:

> All sectors of the Iraqi economy are feeling the pinch of sanctions, and many industries have largely shut down.
>
> More than 90 percent of [Iraq's] imports and 97 percent of exports have been shut off.
>
> The Embargo has deprived Baghdad of roughly $1.5 billion of foreign exchange earnings monthly.

How can these staggering economic consequences not place enormous pressure on Saddam Hussein? It is simply too soon to give up on these sanctions and to short-circuit the possibility of a peaceful resolution of the Persian Gulf crisis. For the sake of the hundreds of thousands of lives that would be put at risk, we must stay the course until every option short of war has been exhausted.

Of course, speculation about the effectiveness of sanctions is just that—speculation. No one can predict with certainty whether Iraq will succumb to the international community's economic and diplomatic pressure. But as Admiral Crowe put it, even if U.N. sanctions require 12 to 18 months, the tradeoff of avoiding war would be more than worth it.

In short, I believe that with patience, determination, and vigilance, this crisis can be resolved peacefully. If we allow the sanctions time to work, we can achieve both of our goals—getting Saddam Hussein out of Kuwait and keeping the United States out of war. But we will only be able to test this policy if we are willing to exhaust every economic and diplomatic avenue. New diplomatic efforts by several parties are already underway, even as economic sanctions continue to take their toll.

As I mentioned, Mr. Speaker, this may be the most important decision that we as individuals, and as an institution, will ever make. Yet no matter the outcome, the United States will remain deeply divided on the issue of war in the Persian Gulf. And a divided nation cannot sustain a war. Until the American people and the Congress are convinced that every peaceful option has failed, the best policy is patience and determination.

I urge my colleagues to support the Gephardt-Hamilton resolution, and oppose the Michael-Solarz resolution.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. TALLON].

Mr. TALLON. Madam Speaker, it is with a somber sense of my awesome responsibility as a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives that I join the debate with my colleagues on the prospect of armed conflict in the Middle East.

For 5 months now the world and the people of this Nation have been united against the uanabashed aggression of Saddam Hussein. The United States under the direction of President Bush has established and maintained a solid coalition to right the evils committed by Iraq against Kuwait.

We are at a critical stage in this crisis. We have trusted President Bush to lead us in this challenge. Thus far, his consistent policy of sanctions and a military blockade have worked to achieve some of our goals. Most certainly, Operation Desert Shield has negated the possibility of an Iraqi attack on Saudi Arabia. And our steady persistence, achieved the release of American and other foreign hostages being held for so long in Iraq and Kuwait.

But we are not finished—acts of heinous aggression must not be rewarded. Saddam Hussein is not yet out of Kuwait and he shows no intent to withdraw. The international condemnation, the sanctions, and the military presence in the gulf have not forced Saddam's hand. More importantly, they have not achieved peace.

I firmly believe that the only hope we have of getting Saddam Hussein out of Kuwait is by giving the President the option to use military force.

This act of Congress does not bring us closer to war. Make no mistake, we are already at the brink of an international catastrophe. The United States and the entire world order is threatened by Saddam Hussein.

We have brave young men and women who are in harms way in the desert of Saudi Arabia. Congressional equivocation at this point would be an intolerable indignity to those soldiers whom we have entrusted so much. In August, Congress unanimously supported the President and the deployment of troops in Operation Desert Shield. In November, Congress and the American people stood behind the President when he ordered the deployment of additional forces to Saudi Arabia.

On the eve of the U.N. Resolution 672 January 15 deadline, it is imperative that this nation continue to speak with a unified voice.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Madam Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. GALLEGLY].

Mr. GALLEGLY. Madam Speaker, as an original sponsor, I rise today in strong support of the Michel-Solarz resolution to give President Bush the authority to use force against Iraq if necessary.

I emphasize "if necessary" because I hope, the President hopes, indeed all of us hope, that force will not be necessary. Nobody wants to commit America to war.

But I firmly believe that Congress must adopt this resolution because it's the last, best hope for peace. That's because the decision of whether there will be war rests solely on one man, Iraq's dictator, Saddam Hussein.

For 5 months now, a truly United Nations has attempted to persuade Saddam Hussein to withdraw from Kuwait.

By diplomacy and a trade embargo, the civilized nations of the world have tried to dislodge Saddam Hussein from his conquest.

Unfortunately, as we all know, diplomacy and the embargo have not worked. For 5 months, Saddam Hussein has refused to seriously respond to diplomatic initiatives. Instead, Iraqi forces have systematically raped and pillaged Kuwait, taking virtually anything of value. At the same time, Iraq has continued to fortify Kuwait, and has continued its program to attain nuclear capability.

Saddam Hussein has been called a madman, but I'm not sure I agree. Evil, cunning, and ruthless, yes, but history indicates he's also a man who cuts his losses if necessary.

Simply put, Madam Speaker, I believe the United States and Iraq are playing a high-stakes game of five-card stud. We hold a full house and Saddam Hussein has only a pair of deuces, but as a master gambler, he's betting he can bluff his way to victory.

By adopting the Michel-Solarz resolution, the Congress will lay another card on the table, and I believe there's a good chance that Saddam Hussein will know his bluff's been called.

But if we adopt the Hamilton-Gephardt resolution instead, I fear we will simply be weakening our hand, and strengthening Saddam Hussein's. He knows our coalition has weaknesses, and he knows the threat of military operations will fade quickly once the desert heat starts building up this spring.

Madam Speaker, as I said earlier, the passage of the Michel-Solarz resolution is our last, best hope for peace. But even if Saddam Hussein doesn't fold, we also know that the principles we would be fighting for are just. Right is on our side.

If, despite all our hopes and prayers, war comes, then let us give our President the tools he needs to wage it quickly, decisively and victoriously. To do otherwise would be to betray our Armed Forces, the American people, and the hope for peace and stability in the world in the years to come.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CARPER].

□ 1940

Mr. CARPER. Madam Speaker, first of all let me make clear that I believe this debate, and the votes we will cast tomorrow, are not some sideshow in the Persian Gulf crisis. Congress and Congress alone, can declare war. The President can take military action to implement U.N. Resolution 678 only with the expressed approval of the House and the Senate.

Two decades ago, I served in a war. I did not want a war then. I do not want a war now. Who among us does. I favor using every diplomatic option available to us to avert war in the Persian Gulf—including new talks between the United States and Iraq if they would be helpful. We should seek a nonmilitary solution for as long as there is a reasonable chance for success, whether that takes 6 days or six months.

The option to use the allied forces assembled in the gulf to remove Iraq from Kuwait should be the option of last resort. But at this late hour, as the U.N. deadline of January 15 approaches, it must now be an option available to the President—not to be exercised on any date certain, but to be used when all else has failed. For Congress to deny at this juncture, the President the authority he needs can only serve to send a confusing signal, both to our allies and to Iraq. The treat Saddam poses today would only grow larger.

Madam Speaker, I would have preferred that this debate had occurred weeks ago when Congress might have played a more constructive role in resolving the gulf crisis. But today I believe Congress has few options left. Ironically, giving the President the authority to use force if it becomes necessary has become, as others have said, our best chance for peace. Perhaps then will Saddam Hussein understand that despite our differences, our country stands together in our resolve that Iraq must leave Kuwait, and leave it now.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Madam Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MATSUI].

Mr. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, first of all I would like to commend both sides of this debate. I think the debate has been very, very helpful to me because I happen to be one Member that had a very difficult time, and I made my decision on this issue, franky, today.

I want to commend Mr. GEPHARDT and Mr. HAMILTON for the very excellent work they did in putting together their package, and certainly those who support the President's position should be commended as well, because it is a very, very close and very, very difficult decision.

The reason I had such a difficult time making this decision was because we are so close to January 15, and I really had a difficult time voting to undercut what I consider to be the President's authority in this particular matter. At the same time, I have come to realize that we are not mere pawns in this debate as Members of Congress, that we do in fact have a constitutional responsibility to deliberate and make an independent judgment on the issue of offensive action or declaration of war.

Let me, if I may, develop about four areas that I have real problems with respect to the Solarz approach to this particular issue.

One is I know there has been a lot of talk about a new world order, and the fact that for the first time the United Nations is in this debate. The fact of the matter is and the issue in the Persian Gulf is that it is not a U.N. operation. We are going to have 400,000 American troops in that region. The Japanese and the Germans have not participated, and many of our other allied countries have not either. In fact, I have been very, very distressed with the fact that the Germans and the Japanese and the French and the English could vote at the United Nations in New York for a declaration of war, and at the same time not commit any possible blood as Americans are.

In addition to that, although the polls are showing that there is support for the President in this effort, I can tell Members as soon as there is one death, the polls will reverse themselves. The reason I raise that issue is because the President has not done a sufficient job in educating the American public of what the issue is, what is involved and what is in fact the vital interest of the United States. And he has that obligation and he has not fulfilled that obligation at this time.

Third, our strategic interest is at stake. In fact, we must isolate Saddam Hussein and perhaps even find some way to advocate internationally a new leadership in Iraq. But why is January 15 such an important and significant date? Why is that date the date when war has to be declared? Nobody has any idea except President Bush, and even he has not made a case for that particular date.

In addition, we have not, as many of our prior speakers have suggested, explored and completed the issue of economic sanctions, and certainly diplomatic courses as well. So it is my belief that it is our responsibility as an independent branch of this Government to support the Gephardt-Hamilton approach, to give this issue more time to develop and allow the diplomatic approach to take its course.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Madam Speaker, for the purposes of reading a list of endorsements, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

Mr. SOLOMON. Madam Speaker, The National Commander of the American Legion, on behalf of the Legion's 3 million members, has sent an open letter calling upon Congress to pass "legislation authorizing the President to take any necessary actions to deal with the crisis at hand and supporting the implementation of the U.N. Security Council Resolution 678 * * *." In short, Madam Speaker, the American Legion endorses the Solarz-Michel bipartisan resolution.

The Legion is joined in this endorsement by the Veterans of Foreign Wars—2,800,000 strong.

Madam Speaker, under leave to include extraneous matter, I insert at this point in the RECORD the text of the American Legion's letter and a list of

other distinguished veterans' organizations which have joined the Legion and the VFW in urging Congress to stand behind the President.

The American Ex-Prisoners of War, Non-Commissioned Officers Association, Catholic War Veterans, USA Inc., Polish Legion American Vets USA, Fleet Reserve Association, Legion of Valor of the USA Inc., The Retired Enlisted Association, Marine Corps League, National Association of Uniformed Services, and Military Order of the Purple Heart of the USA Inc.

Madam Speaker, these 7 million brave Americans know better than all others what the seriousness of this issue is. I urge support of the Solarz-Michel resolution.

Madam Speaker, I include the letter from the American Legion, as follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Washington, DC, January 10, 1991.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The American Legion urges you to vote for legislation authorizing the President to take any necessary actions to resolve the crisis in the Persion Gulf.

As an organization of three million men and women who have experienced first-hand the pain and sacrifice of wartime service, The American Legion hopes that a peaceful solution can be found. However, we know that diplomacy cannot succeed if our nation's leadership is divided.

Any failure by Congress to offer its full bipartisan support to the President could have catastrophic consequences. We are convinced that Saddam Hussein, the world community and other members of the multinational force in Saudi Arabia would see such disunity as a lack of U.S. resolve.

Additionally, a divided national leadership would produce a serious morale problem among our own troops who have been deployed in Saudi Arabia. I had the privilege ten weeks ago to visit those men and women, and I was impressed by their patriotism, confidence and resolve. They accept the potential risks of their mission, but they need to be assured that the Congress and the American people fully support them in carrying out that mission.

This international crisis is clearly a test of our national will. The upcoming congressional debate will be scrutinized by the entire world. It is critical that the decisions Congress reaches show the world, particularly the Iraqi aggressors and all potential aggressors, that the United States is willing to set aside partisan interests to endorse the President's authority as our nation's Commander-in-Chief.

We urge you to vote for legislation authorizing the President to take any necessary actions to deal with the crisis at hand and supporting the implementation of the United Nations Security Council Resolution 678, for which the United States has already expressed its support.

Sincerely,

ROBERT S. TURNER,
National Commander.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN].

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the Michel bipartisan resolution.

No one wants war. No one is happy about this entire situation. I certainly wish it had never come up. But some have said or at least implied that President Bush wants war for some political or hidden or ulterior motive.

Nothing could be further from the truth. President Bush probably wants war less than anyone in this country. He is a good and kind man, and I believe he would feel the responsibility for the deaths of any Americans more deeply than anyone.

To vote against the President now will simply encourage Saddam Hussein. We need to show national unity and strength. We need to show that our word is good, and that the United States is not just a paper tiger, as one of Hussein's advisers recently said.

We need to remember that George Bush did not invade Kuwait. Saddam Hussein did.

This resolution does not require war. I know the President will avoid war if at all possible.

The President of Turkey said yesterday in an interview with the Washington Times, "Only your Congress can convince Hussein."

Let us convince him. Let us do everything we can to support the President.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SARPALIUS].

Mr. SARPALIUS. Madam Speaker, there is no doubt that this is probably the toughest decision that any of us will make in our political career. I cannot think of any vote that a person could make that would be harder than to decide whether or not our brave young men and women should go to war, but there is no question that Hussein must be stopped and he must be stopped now before he has more time to develop nuclear capabilities or to gain political strength in the Middle East.

□ 1950

I, too, went to Saudi Arabia. I, too, stood out there in the desert with those brave young men and women, and I ask them how they felt about this war. They are prepared. They are ready. They are trained. All they ask is, "To give us the opportunity to fight, and do not hold us back. Let us finish the job."

I came home with over 300 names and phone numbers of parents, wives, and loved ones. I finished my last phone calls last night, and every one of those parents and wives believed that we had to do something to stop Hussein. They asked us, as Members of Congress, to support their children and their husbands.

There are some real concerns. What will happen if Israel becomes involved in this war? What will happen after we defeat Hussein? What will then happen to the country of Iraq? But the No. 1 concern that I have is, will the American people support those brave young men and women? They believe that we are behind them. They showed me letters, cards, signs, and flags. They believe that the American people believe in them. I just challenge the Members of Congress and the American people to treat those brave young men with dignity and honor and respect. They do not want to be treated like the brave young men who fought in the Vietnam war. I supported the Solarz amendment, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR].

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, we are poised on the brink of war. Will we vote to send thousands of our fellow Americans off to die in battle, or will we vote for a patient resolve for a peaceful resolution of this crisis in the Persian Gulf?

If our interests in the gulf are economic stability of the oil market, and political stability of the Middle East, we must ask what strategy will best sustain those interests.

The strategy the administration pursued immediately after Iraq's invasion of Kuwait was appropriate: a military deterrent force to stop Iraq at the Saudi border; an economic embargo backed up by a naval blockade to wear down Iraq and force it out of Kuwait.

In August, the administration asked Americans to be patient, that the sanctions would take a year to a year and a half to work. Now—5 months later—the administration says patience is a cop-out.

Yet, the sanctions are working—they are having the predicted effect. Iraq is losing $30 billion a year in foreign exchange, through lost oil revenues its GNP is already down 50 percent; its hard currency reserves are diminishing; its military is experiencing spare parts shortages; imports are down 90 percent; Iraq is economically and militarily isolated; the world has a surplus of oil.

Let us not be brittle idealists—cracking, crumbling at the first sign of trouble or pain. An embargo will be long and painful—we knew that; we were prepared for it. We—and the administration—should not abandon the course before its purpose has been served.

The Solarz-Michel resolution, advocated by President Bush, is, pure and simple, a declaration of war. Worse, it is prior approval by the Congress of authority for the President at some future date, to wage war, before he even asks for that authority. Abdication of Congress' sole suthority to declare war is a cop-out. The real courage is to stand firm for diplomacy and economic sanctions. Congress should not abandon its sole and solemn power to wage war—surely not now, when sanctions have had only 5 months and diplomacy only 6 hours.

July was the time for talking and acting tough. July—when intelligence reports warned of Iraq's preparations for war, and the administration not only did nothing, worse, they gave the wrong signal to Iraq: that we would not intervene. Must we vote now to send young people to die in battle because the President miscalculated in July? Not while there are alternatives.

As a youngster doing a homework assignment, I asked my father for help in writing a definition for war. "Just write 'War is hell,'" he said.

Mr. Speaker, too often we have opted for war. Just once, let us realize that war is hell, and try to win a peace.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ALEXANDER].

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I have spoken on this subject many times over the last several days, but I take this opportunity to rise in support of the Hamilton-Gephardt resolution, in an effort to ensure that every possible option is explored before declaring war.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Hamilton-Gephardt resolution in an effort to ensure that we explore every possible option before declaring war.

In deciding this most serious question, one of the most serious I have faced since being in Congress, I have come to the conclusion that the resolution being backed by the Bush administration is tantamount to a declaration of war, since it grants to the President authority to use all means necessary, including force, to oust Iraq from Kuwait.

War, in my view, should always be the final option.

I believe it is important that we review the stated reasons we committed our forces to Saudi Arabia last August.

Basically, there were three:

First, to protect our oil supply from Saudi Arabia, upon which we have been growing increasingly dependent—particularly during the last decade.

Second, release of our hostages in Iraq.

Third, ousting Iraq from Kuwait.

The first two goals have been achieved and I applaud President Bush and our military for this success.

Aggression has been stopped; a stalemate exists.

I believe that the fine young men and women wearing the uniform of our country—indeed all Americans—deserve a policy as good as they are.

In formulating such a national security policy, it should be understood that this country should only commit troops to battle when the vital interests of the United States are directly threatened—in imminent peril.

With the Saudi Arabian oil supply secure and our hostages free, where is the threat? I see no clear and present danger to the vital interests of the United States.

We are fortunate in that the current stalemate has given us time in which to explore options—other than a shooting war.

Yes, we want Iraq out of Kuwait. Saddam Hussein's naked aggression should be punished. And, I believe that he is being punished now—through the sanctions imposed on him.

War should be the last resort. It should be undertaken only after it is clearly apparent that no other choice is open to us.

Mr. Speaker, I am not convinced today that war is the only choice. Therefore, I cannot support the administration resolution. I was at the White House this morning and listened very carefully to President Bush present his arguments. They were well-reasoned and sincerely presented.

I know that President Bush does not want war, that he is committed to peace—but he believes that, in this case, our options are very narrow.

He told us this morning that sanctions—in his words—"will not do it" in terms of bringing Saddam Hussein to his senses.

President Bush boiled down the choices as he sees them as between good and evil. I sincerely believe the situation is more complicated than that.

The drama playing itself out on the sands of the Middle East represents our first opportunity in the post-cold-war era to examine options other than force in settling international problems—options which will become valuable precedents for this new era.

President Bush has talked often of a new world order.

A new world order means new options—and we should have the courage to explore them, rather than resorting to force—which is the quintessential cold war response.

There are many actions which can be taken by a civilized world to contain Saddam Hussein. In fact, I am of the opinion that other countries should be doing much more than they are today.

It is not fair for the United States to bear most of the burden for this effort, to have a U.S. force under the U.N. flag.

The nations of the world should speak with one voice in branding Saddam the international outlaw that he is, and to step up political and economic pressure to leave Iraq ostracized and bankrupt.

By taking these actions, the world community can show the Iraqi dictator as the outcast he is.

Worldwide condemnation, coupled with economic sanctions, can be expected to produce real political trouble for Saddam, perhaps even forcing him from power.

I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, that we seem to have no clear statement of policy goals "after Saddam."

Perhaps most conspicuous by its absence is the option that would free us from the dependence on oil from an unstable region * * * a region which has displayed a growing hostility to America and the Western World.

The option would be an aggressive effort to mobilize the resources of the Nation to establish an energy security policy which would displace our dependence on Persian Gulf oil.

As a member of the United States Alternative Fuels Council, I have heard clear and convincing evidence that America can become more energy self-sufficient—depending more on its own resources and less on those of foreign nations.

Without an Energy Security Policy, America is doomed to continued dependence on Persian Gulf oil and the continued necessity to protect that supply.

It is mindless for this Nation to remain enslaved by our dependence on Middle Eastern oil. Continued enslavement means the very real possibility that our brave young soldiers will be permanently stationed in the region to keep oil flowing to the Western World.

Mr. Speaker, how long will we allow our military, economic, and foreign policy to be driven by our addiction to oil?

The path our troops took to Saudi Arabia was littered with the good intentions of past generations.

Yes, we would work on energy policy.

Someday.

We would expand the use of alternative fuels.

Someday.

We would reduce our dependence.

Someday.

Well, someday never came, but "D" day is now upon us.

In my view, it is much more important to our long term future to declare our independence from Persian Gulf oil * * * rather than war on Iraq.

We can make our Nation safer for future generations * * * and we can begin today.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 9 minutes, for the purposes of debate.

Mr. Speaker, let us be clear about the lines being drawn in this debate. This is not a choice between those who want to force Saddam Hussein out of Iraq and those who want to talk him out. All Americans agree: Saddam Hussein must be driven out of Kuwait. And driving him out will take more than words. It will take force. I realize that. The President realizes that. All the world recognizes that.

And so the choice is not between action and inaction; it is a choice between two different courses of action—two different methods of applying force. It is a choice between the headlong rush to combat, and the policy of patient strength.

Make no mistake about it: the use of sanctions is the use of force. Indeed, the stranglehold we have placed upon Iraq is more like a medieval siege than the word "sanction." Iraq is under siege, cut off from all the world and all supplies. Saddam Hussein leads a small country against which all the world is arrayed. The question is not whether he will give up, but when.

Sanctions will force him to give up. They are backed up by an armada as fearful and formidable as any ever assembled. America alone has more than 50 warships, 3 aircraft carriers, and thousands of the finest sailors in the world in the region to enforce the U.N. sanctions.

With our allies, American forces have already made 6,662 interceptions, 796 times they have stopped and boarded ships, and 35 times they have forced ships to divert from their planned destination: Iraq. And, when circumstances called for it, they have fired shots across the bow of offending ships. We've already used force—when force was necessary.

And on the land we have more troops facing off against Iraq across the line in the Saudi sand than we had facing off against the Soviet Union across the Iron Curtain in central Europe.

The force of these sanctions is indeed severe. We have cut off food from a nation that imports 70 percent of its food.

We have stopped the shipment of materiel that supports Saddam's war machine. And we have cut off Iraq's only real export: oil, the source of 90 percent of its trade revenue.

The force with which we have responded to Iraq's aggression is truly awesome. The grain embargo and Olympic boycott with which America responded to the Soviet's unprovoked aggression against Afghanistan seem puny in comparison.

The strength of these sanctions is truly historic. The Institute for International Economics recently released an exhaustive analysis of each one of the 115 times which sanctions have been used since World War I. Their conclusion is:

> The current U.N. sanctions are by far the strongest and most complete ever imposed against any country by other nations.

Sanctions are choking off half of the gross national product of Iraq—an amount 20 times greater than the average impact of history's most successful sanctions.

Sanctions can squeeze even the most intransigent regimes into making changes—or the people of those countries will make the changes for them. Again, according to the Institute for International Economics, the U.N. embargo against Rhodesia helped bring about the demise of the regime of Ian Smith. Sanctions helped bring down dictators like Rafael Trujillo in the Dominican Republic in the 1960's, and Idi Amin in Uganda in the 1970's, and accelerated the economic chaos that brought down the Sandinista government. Sanctions are force. Sanctions are effective.

It is said that sanctions alone will never force Saddam Hussein to leave; that the political climate created by this crisis will not allow him to leave. But sanctions far weaker than those faced by Saddam Hussein helped to destabilize Idi Amin and Daniel Ortega. How can you be certain they won't destabilize Saddam—or at least force him to retreat in order to feed his people?

If your concern is over how sanctions will politically allow Saddam Hussein to withdraw, then the answer is that sanctions change the political and economic terrain on which Saddam must operate. That's because sanctions hurt—they cause real pain. And, as we've seen in other cases, even in a dictatorship, the pain of the people eventually gets transferred to the leader.

It is also said that the Moslem world will not tolerate American troops on its soil. If we are worried about Arab resentment against a peacekeeping force in a defensive posture, why are we not more worried about the recriminations that will follow a bloody war on Arab soil?

Let no one misunderstand me—least of all Saddam Hussein. I do not rule out the use of force. And if we must fight, we must ensure that we win as quickly and as decisively as possible. But testimony from a variety of military experts suggests that with each day of sanctions and embargo, the Iraqi war machine grows weaker.

Saddam's war machine has been cut off from spare parts: each bullet fired in training or maneuvers or practice is one less bullet he has if and when war comes.

By contrast, we have the option of rotating troops to maintain a fresh force; our supply lines, although long, are unimpeded; our troops are adapting to the desert, and each training exercise makes them better prepared to engage on that hostile and unforgiving terrain. I've been to the front lines in the desert, and I've talked to our troops. Their morale is high—and I have enough faith in them to know it will remain high. They will not be discouraged as long as they know they have the strong support of the folks back home.

Admiral Crowe, President Reagan's Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff has said that "it's curious that some expect our military to train soldiers to stand up to hostile fire, but doubt its ability to occupy ground and wait patiently."

We owe it to those courageous young men and women to try every other alternative before we sacrifice even a single American life. As former Defense Secretary Robert McNamara has said: "Surely we should be prepared to extend sanctions over a 12- or 18-month period if that offers an opportunity to achieve our political objective without the loss of American lives. Who can doubt that a year of blockade will be cheaper than a week of war."

Yes, sanctions do take time—there's no doubt about it. Can it be that we are not willing to ask the American people to wait for success, but we are willing to ask them to sacrifice their sons and daughters to achieve success? Is our patience really that thin? Is our resolve really that frail?

It is a cruel irony that those who originally designed the policy of sanctions are now the only ones who doubt their effectiveness, and question our resolve. No one else does.

No. It is not the American people who lack resolve.

For 45 years the American people stood eyeball to eyeball with the Communist threat, until finally the bear blinked. For three decades the American people have sent their sons and daughters to keep the peace in Korea—and still their resolve has not waned. It is only the patience and the resolve of our policymakers and our politicians—not our people—that is in doubt. Will we have the strength to stay the course? Will we have the courage to keep slowly applying force? Or will we allow ourselves to be swept up in the frenzy to win this thing quickly—even if the price of victory is American blood?

No one thinks this face-off will last three decades. Many intelligence estimates suggest it's unlikely to last more than 12 more months.

Finally, many of us have expressed concern—bordering on outrage—over the lack of true commitment from some of our allies and trading partners. We believe in fairly sharing the costs and risks of this operation—both in money and manpower—with our allies. But some of our allies are pursuing a policy of burden-shirking instead of burden-sharing. The American people are right to ask why young Americans are risking their lives in the desert, when the sons and daughters of nations far more dependent on Kuwait oil are not.

Sanctions have the advantage of spreading the burden at least somewhat more equitably than combat. If we go to war, it is likely that the lion's share of allied casualties will be American. While we are carrying more than our fair share of the burden of sanctions, the proportion is much fairer than the division of suffering when the shooting starts.

Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleagues, the decision is ours. I am asking you to see the course of sanctions for what it truly is: a course of strength, a course of true force against Iraq, and the course most likely to achieve American objectives without sacrificing American lives.

□ 2000

Mr. Speaker, I believe with all my heart that this policy the President wisely put in place can and will succeed if only we will be patient enough to give it time to succeed, and if it does not, this body and the body on the other side can come back at the behest of the President if we believe this policy has failed and say, "Yes, we give you a declaration of war." I am willing to do that, and I think most Members would be.

I simply ask tonight that you give patience a chance, you give sanctions a chance. We can and we will prevail.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the majority leader yield to me for just 1 minute, or for 30 seconds?

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I would prefer to move on. We have 70 speakers on our side.

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished majority leader undoubtedly is sincere in his expression of concern and belief that sanctions will work, but we have had many speakers giving testimony here today, including Members from his side of the aisle who have recently

been over in the Middle East, that it is going to be 2 or 3 years before those sanctions will work or won't work at all. We have experts like Jean Kirkpatrick who are absolutely convinced of that and are out in print.

We have concerns that all Americans ought to have that our troops will lose their morale in that period of time and we cannot keep our entire coalition together, and we have a very deep concern about our troops if we go on with these sanctions for any length of time, because we know Saddam Hussein is developing at least a crude nuclear device that could be a danger to our troops.

So the sanctions argument is wrong and our Members feel very strongly, I think many on both sides, we must give the authority to use force to the President at this time. We have to stand behind him or we send the wrong message to Saddam Hussein.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MORRISON].

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Solarz-Michel bipartisan resolution. I believe it is the best path toward peace.

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. LOWERY].

Mr. LOWERY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong support for the Solarz-Michel resolution authorizing the President to use United States Armed Forces to enforce the United Nations Security Council resolutions requiring Iraq to withdraw from Kuwait.

This resolution does not represent a call for war. Indeed, we seek to avoid a violent conflict with Iraq if at all possible. If Iraq chooses, it can withdraw from Kuwait and create an atmosphere to address other issues of conflict in the Middle East. However, as of today, all diplomatic efforts by the United States and the international community to achieve a peaceful resolution to this crisis have been rejected by Saddam Hussein. The time has come for Congress to stand with the President and confirm our Nation's resolve to oppose aggression.

We do not seek war, but to allow Saddam Hussein to flaunt the will of the United Nations and succeed in the unjustified, brutal domination of Kuwait will not bring peace. It can only bring the illusion of peace which will ultimately be shattered by his next aggressive act. A clear statement of our resolve to oppose this aggression will be a real contribution to true peace and justice in the world.

Mr. Speaker, as many of my colleagues have said, this vote may be the most difficult one we ever have to make in our careers. I view this decision in the most grave and serious terms possible. I represent San Diego, CA. Thousands of young sailors and marines from my hometown are now in Saudi Arabia and the Persian Gulf. They are the ones who may have to make the ultimate sacrifice to end the aggression of Saddam Hussein. I fervently hope they never have to make that sacrifice. I want every one of them to come home to their loved ones. Nevertheless, they are prepared to do their duty and we must do ours. We must support our military personnel and the President by stating that the United States will not allow Saddam Hussein to occupy Kuwait and cast a shadow of aggression across the entire Middle East. That message is our best hope for avoiding war and establishing a true and just peace in the Middle East.

Mr. Speaker, approval of the Solarz-Michel resolution will demonstrate that the United States will not accept aggression in one of the most important areas of the world. If approved, it may well convince Saddam Hussein to leave Kuwait. If it is rejected, it will convince him he can keep Kuwait and go on to his next aggressive act. We must oppose this thug. Approve this resolution.

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BUNNING].

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. Speaker, in some quarters, this debate is seen as a debate between war and peace.

That is not what it is at all. This is a debate on how best to preserve the hope of peace in the Mideast without rewarding the aggression of Saddam Hussein.

None of us—not one Member here today wants war. I certainly do not.

I have a son in the Air Force. He could be on his way to the gulf any day. No, I dread the possibility of war for my son's sake and the sake of the sons and daughters of America.

But we have to recognize that this whole crisis was created by confusion. Saddam Hussein miscalculated badly when he ordered his troops into Kuwait and threatened Saudi Arabia.

He miscalculated the response of the rest of the world and the United States to his acts of aggression. He misread the willingness of the world community and the United States to stand firmly against his brutality.

He underestimated us.

But now the stakes are higher. We have nearly 400,000 Americans in the gulf—standing at risk.

We cannot afford any more confusion. We cannot afford mixed signals. We cannot afford any more miscalculations. American lives are now at stake.

Our last best hope for peace is a show of strength and unity here today which would send a message to Saddam Hussein—a message that even he cannot misread.

We have to send him a message—in no uncertain terms—that we have the will and the resolve to do whatever is necessary to get him out of Kuwait—even if it means resorting to the use of force.

Our last best hope for peace today is to send a message to Saddam Hussein that he cannot misread. A message saying that the United States means what her President says.

Passage of the bipartisan resolution is our last best hope of peace and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HAYES].

Mr. HAYES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to a great many reasons this afternoon why to oppose the President. None of them are as important as the three that live with me, one of which is 22 and one of which is 19, so I need no more eloquent reasons to oppose a war, and yet I am going to vote for the resolution of the United Nations, because I am convinced that the best way to oppose that war is to place into the hands of this President all the tools necessary in order for him to have the most powerful position from which to negotiate a peaceful settlement.

Only a Member of the House of Representatives can speak on this floor, but it is actually the voice of the one-half million people who send each and every one of us here. I would be totally remiss if I did not echo within my support of the President, the two grave concerns of those people who establish their residence in southwest Louisiana.

The first involves oil. For us to dismiss summarily the idea that this conflict has nothing to do with oil is to tell the people in my district that it has nothing to do with sand. It is ludicrous. There is no question that we would not be taking the same posture were it not for the huge production resources in both Saudi Arabia and the reigning areas of the Middle East.

□ 2010

I think the correct statement we ought to be reflecting is that it involves the economic power of oil, for that is the only way that I can look in the eyes of the people who elected me and tell them the distinction makes the difference because we are more than totally prepared to make whatever sacrifices are necessary to continue the flow of oil to America despite our dependence upon foreign nations. We are more than necessarily making the sacrifices far, far greater by sending our children there. Any economic sacrifice that you would call upon us to make to provide you with a cheap product is meaningless in comparison.

The second involves the participation of those who would call themselves our allies.

I am more than slightly disturbed that the Japanese, with a powerful economy, have managed to commit almost 10 percent as much as they are willing to pay in cash for a film production company in California. There is a word for that, but the rules of the House will not let me say it.

I am even more distressed that the Germans, who owe an obligation to this country, who owe an obligation to the world, upon the moment that they have the possibility of a newly created freedom, find themselves incapable of

making even the smallest economic, much less personal, sacrifice.

I am going to support the President of the United States, and I am going to pray that that leads to peace. If it does not, I am going to do so with the satisfaction that it was the best vote I could cast on January 12, immediately prior to a deadline.

If alternatives are not available, then I would beg that the President come back to this body to give me a second vote prior to an actual assault, to let me then reflect those concerns of that one-half million people, and in particular, my three.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TOWNS].

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Gephardt-Hamilton sanctions resolution. I think we should give sanctions an opportunity to work.

I am staunchly opposed to U.S. military involvement in the Persian Gulf. I have visited our troops in the Persian Gulf—I know that these young people are not faceless, nameless statistics. They are people I talked with, ate with, and laughed with. They are our sons, daughters, husbands, wives, and grandchildren.

We must give sanctions a chance to work. Sanctions are working in South Africa, and if given a chance, they will work in the Persian Gulf. Mandela is out of prison and De Klerk has agreed to sit down at the table to negotiate. All this is because sanctions do work if given a fair chance. Some of you may have voted against sanctions in the case of South Africa. You were wrong then. And if you vote against sanctions you will be wrong now. But unlike South Africa you will not be wrong on an issue that is an ocean away. You will have made a bad decision that costs American men and women their lives. I plead with you to give sanctions a chance. If you do not, you have taken away the best chance these young Americans have.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS of Maine. Mr. Speaker, just a week ago yesterday I was sworn in as a new Member of this body. I can assure you and everyone here that this debate and this monumental vote that will be cast tomorrow is not a baptism by fire, it is a baptism by inferno.

For the past few years before I came here, I directed an education program that gave me the opportunity to work with young people from throughout my State of Maine, from throughout the country, and young people from Western and Eastern Europe.

I could see the excitement and I could feel the hope of these young people as we entered the dawn of a new era of history, with the end of the cold war. I became very aware of the role and of the opportunity of our Nation as a leader in this emerging world.

Today we are confronting the first major international conflict and crisis in the post-cold-war era. It is the first major test of our leadership as a nation in this era. Embedded in the choice that we will make when we cast our votes tomorrow will be some fundamental questions. Among them: What kind of leader are we? What kind of foundation are we building for our children and for the children throughout the world?

Mr. Speaker, the leadership that the young people of America and the young people of the world deserve is the leadership of conviction and commitment to stand up to aggression and brutality. But they also deserve the leadership that has the courage and the vision to use every means possible to resolve conflicts between nations without the use of war.

It is not the leadership of appeasement, through oppression or tyranny, whether it be in the sands of Saudi Arabia or on the streets of Tiananmen Square. It is the leadership of clear, consistent action that builds on a foundation of peace, stability and justice in the world.

Mr. Speaker, we have not exhausted all possible means of confronting this crisis short of war. We are riveted on a short-term arbitrary deadline of January 15, without focusing critical attention on the long-term consequences of our action. It was, Mr. Speaker, this very same short-term, shortsighted mentality that helped to put us in the position that we are in today. It has left us without an energy policy worthy of the name and, therefore, as vulnerable as we are to the events of this volatile region of the world.

It was this mentality that led to our support for Saddam Hussein not long ago, and his quest to become a major power and a major threat to the world. It was this mentality that told Saddam Hussein only days before he invaded Kuwait that we have no interest in a conflict between adjoining Arab states.

Mr. Speaker, we are at the 11th hour of a catastrophe of unimaginable proportions. It is time for America to come to its senses, it is time to reject the short-term shortsighted mentality of bravado and brinksmanship, for the sake of our children and the children throughout the world, and it is time to stand up and lead and stop this headlong rush into war.

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUNDQUIST.]

Mr. SUNDQUIST. Mr. Speaker, 20,000 young men and women from my district, assigned to the 101st Airborne at Fort Campbell, are on duty in Saudi Arabia.

So, this debate today is not an abstraction for me. Like all Americans, I want peace. I want our troops to return home safely.

Because I want peace, I will vote today to support the President. I will vote to give him the authority to use force if necessary.

Saddam Hussein must know that the American Government is united. He must know we are serious.

If Saddam Hussein believes we are ready to fight, he will seek a settlement short of war. But, make no mistake, if he believes we are bluffing, he will dig in and make us prove otherwise.

The irony of the situation we face is that, to best ensure peace, we must convince Iraq that we are prepared for war.

By supporting the President's resolution, we send him that message. We affirm that the United Nations' resolutions have meaning, that the deadline is real, that we intend to have Iraq leave Kuwait, one way or the other.

The alternative resolutions are not practical. The sanctions aren't working. Saddam can live with them longer than we can sustain an army in the desert and, longer than we can hold together the coalition we have marshaled against him.

I'm for diplomacy. Diplomacy will continue. January 15 is not D-Day. We are not going to abandon our efforts to resolve the crisis peacefully. But our diplomacy will carry more weight if Saddam understands that we are prepared to back up our words with deeds.

We're dealing with a despot who takes what he wants and dares the world to do something about it. If we pass these alternatives half-hearted resolutions, if we tell him we won't use the troops we've sent to Saudi Arabia, he has no reason whatever to withdraw. He will have won, not because he is strong, but because we were weak.

I want peace. I pray for the safe return of our soldiers. And I believe in my heart that a vote for the President today is the best way to achieve peace.

Saddam has to get the message. He must know we will fight. He must know that it's in his interest to settle this crisis without war.

Because if he believes we lack the will to fight, he will stay in Kuwait until we show him otherwise.

Support the President. Support our troops. Support only the resolution.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. HUBBARD].

Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, a hostile Iraq armed with chemical, biological and eventually nuclear weapons does represent a clear and present danger to American interests. As our allies in the United Nations fully realize, a lawless Iraq let by the "Butcher of Baghdad," Saddam Hussein, represents a direct challenge to our hopes for a new and peaceful world order.

To my friends and colleagues in the 102d Congress who are urging a con-

tinuation of sanctions, please consider that if your position prevails:

First, the credibility of the United States will cease to exist;

Second, Saddam Hussein will rejoice and his arrogance will multiply;

Third, foreign diplomats, losing faith with the United States, will fly to Baghdad to make deals with Saddam Hussein;

Fourth, Iraq's revenues will be restored;

Fifth, Iraq's necessities will continue to flow through Jordan to Iraq;

Sixth, Kuwait will continue to be destroyed and its people tortured;

Seventh, Saddam Hussein will be positioned to control the world's oil market and threaten the economic security of nations he dislikes.

The Washington Post, the Louisville Courier-Journal, and the Baltimore Sun frequently share the views of some of my colleagues who today are urging a continuation of sanctions.

One sentence from today's Washington Post editorial: "Our judgment is that Congress, by deciding to authorize the President to conduct war, materially improves his chances of achieving peace."

Today's Louisville Courier-Journal editorial: "If the United States and United Nations cannot respond effectively to the rape of Kuwait, others like Saddam in other parts of the world will draw the appropriate conclusion: Aggression pays. Congress can show Saddam that aggression doesn't pay."

An editorial in yesterday's Baltimore Sun: "Strong legislative action may, in fact, be one of the few means left for convincing Saddam Hussein to make accommodations in the interest of peace."

David Broder, the respected syndicated columnist, writes in today's Washington Post: "Through the strain, the fatigue, and the gloom, one principle stands clear: The President, speaking for an international coalition and armed with the authority of the United Nations, has defined U.S. policy from the only place in Government where it can be set. The best hope of salvaging peace is a strong statement of congressional support for his policy, so that Saddam Hussein can understand the terrible alternative he faces."

Finally, I quote 33-year-old Tony Kinne of Paducah, KY, for 6 years a field representative in my Paducah district office who is now on active duty with the Army Reserves' 807th Hospital Unit at Fort Campbell, KY.

Tony and 249 others in the unit are being flown to Saudi Arabia this Sunday. Tony Kinne said at 4:30 p.m. today: "I urge the Members of Congress to support the efforts of President George Bush."

This is one of those times when Democrats, Republicans, and independents—all Americans—should support the President of the United States.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the Solarz-Michel resolution.

□ 2020

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LIPINSKI].

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Hamilton-Gephart resolution.

Mr. Speaker, listening to the debate on the House floor, talking to my constituents, talking to other interested parties, listening to the President at a breakfast meeting this morning, and then debating a long time with myself, I have decided to support the Hamilton-Gephardt resolution. This has been the most difficult decision I have had to make in my 8 years in Congress.

I would like to support the President. I believe he has done an excellent job along with Secretary Baker in putting together United Nations support for his policy in the Middle East. That policy has accomplished a great deal. It stopped the Iraqis from invading Saudi Arabia. It freed all the hostages. It put in place very tough economic sanctions which are working. But, I cannot support a war at this time. I cannot at this time justify the loss of American lives which would result from us driving Iraqis out of Kuwait and Saddam Hussein from his reign of terror.

And I say that, because I believe it's the President's policy not only to liberate Kuwait but to drive Saddam Hussein from power and destroy Iraq's capacity to develop and deliver biological, chemical, and nuclear weapons. These are all very worthy goals, and I desire them also, but not at this time and not at the cost of American lives.

We must give economic sanctions and diplomacy a chance to work. At the same time that economic sanctions and diplomacy are at work, the President must work as hard to gain the support of the American people as he and Secretary Baker have worked to gain the support of the United Nations. The American people do not support a war at this time. They do not understand our mission at this time, and I believe it is absolutely necessary for the people in a democracy to support a military effort of this magnitude if that effort is to be successful.

At the same time the President is working to gain the support of the American people, Secretary Baker must obtain more military and economic support from our allies. Yes, we have a great International coalition in place against Saddam Hussein, but for the most part, it's a paper coalition. Ninety percent of everything is U.S.A.

In conclusion, let me say I believe time is on our side. War can wait for another day. Perhaps we can be more united at home and stronger in the Middle East with greater real participation by our allies. Give economic sanctions and diplomacy a little more time. If my position does not prevail in the House and the Senate, then I will very, very reluctantly support the President's policy because then it will also be America's policy.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I step into the well of the House today to make my first comments as a Member of Congress.

Little did I know on December 1, 1989, when I announced my candidacy, that my first vote would be on the awesome issue of war and peace.

I know all those who will vote on this issue tomorrow are sincere and are acting in good faith.

In the last several months, I publicly supported the actions of the President.

I supported his placing a defensive force on the border between Kuwait and Saudi Arabia.

I supported his magnificent orchestration of much of the Arab world consistent with our efforts.

I supported his success with the United Nations in obtaining resolutions against Hussein.

I saw his policy as movement toward a new world order: One, where military might was to be used defensively to bring about peaceful resolution of disputes in a complicated, dangerous world. With the end of the cold war, we would lead the world with the example of patient use of diplomatic nonviolent solutions to threats against international peace without resorting to war.

On November 8, the President began moving his policy away from defensive use of economic sanctions and toward aggressive military action.

Now I am asked to give him a blank check to start a war when he believes that all peaceful means of resolution of this dispute have been exhausted.

To do so, in my opinion, I give away my responsibility under the Constitution.

The time may arrive when I may agree that all attempts at peaceful resolution have been exhausted. I will then vote for war.

The Solarz-Michel resolution is the substantive equivalent of a declaration of war by this body. After its passage, the President will have the sole power to decide when war is necessary.

A careful reading of the Hamilton-Gephardt resolution reveals the authors support the actions of the President to date. The resolution pledges the full support of Congress for continued application of international economic sanctions and diplomatic efforts to pressure Iraq to leave Kuwait. It pledges maintenance of military options and does not close the door to resort to war if necessary.

If you choose to declare war tomorrow, do so. That is your responsibility. Vote for the Solarz-Michel resolution. If you retain any hope that this dispute can be resolved without the terrible violence of war, vote for the Hamilton-Gephardt resolution.

I urge you to vote for Hamilton-Gephardt; to support the President while retaining your ability to ultimately decide when offensive military action is necessary.

We should not yet give up on the hope of a new world order implied by the initial actions of the President in this difficult situation.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HAYES].

Mr. HAYES of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice the concerns of thousands of Americans that reach far beyond my Chicago district. And what I've been hearing is a call for peace. I have not received one letter or phone call expressing support for this war. Let's not fool ourselves, the American public does not support using aggression against Iraq. It is not the responsibility of America to police the world. It seems that every other year we are engaged in some conflict. Two years ago it was our duty to rid this country of drugs by getting Noreiga out of Panama. Today our enemy is Saddam Hussein, who by the way was a friend of the President a couple years ago. Now we are sending our young men and women to defend a monarchy that is not even willing to defend themselves.

After spending several days in the Middle East, I am convinced now more than ever that we must give sanctions a little more time to work. As this debate continues I become increasingly worried about the imminent loss of life in the Persian Gulf. Many believe that we can just go into combat and be finished in 3 days; this is not the case. Let us personalize this situation before we vote to do something rash. How many young American men and women will be killed as a result of this conflict? One life lost is one life too many. I speak not only for my constitutents but I stand here knowing that two of my nephews are serving in Saudi Arabia. If I vote to give the President the go-ahead to fight, what shall I say to my sisters? We tend to forget that each man and woman serving in the Persian Gulf are products of someone, someone who cares for them. I fear that many of them will lose their lives for something that they themselves do not understand. Some of the troops that spoke to me said, "Congressman please try to get us out of here, we don't want war. We don't understand why we are here." I did not know what to tell them because I just don't know why we are there myself. Why are we spending billions of dollars to protect a monarchy when we have American citizens who cannot afford decent housing or adequate health care.

I worry that when we reach the point at which we are ready to merely accept death, ceasing all potential for any quality of life for hundreds of thousands of this Nation's youth, this country is certainly in dire straits. Moreover, to choose the date on which Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., such a peaceful, God-fearing man, was born, as the day of reckoning for Saddam Hussein should be more than telling for us. It is imperative that this Nation stand up and speak out against any military initiative in the Middle East.

Let's have more compassion for human life. I just don't believe that a bunch of old men should be determining whether or not our young men and women should risk their lives in an attempt to preserve revenue for megarich oil companies and Arab royalty. Yet we are marching toward war and the stakes are horribly high. Military experts are predicting casualties in the thousands. And I am afraid that it will not end there. War would give us something that will haunt us for generations to come. It would be a disaster for us all. We must find a way for peace—it is not a matter of whose right and whose wrong, it is a matter of life and death. Who could claim victory if this happens? No one really wins.

We should not submit to the inevitability of war. Give sanctions more time to work and preserve life. I have said it once and if it will save even one life, will say it again; there needs to be an Arab solution to this Arab problem. If the United States is in a position to provide diplomatic assistance, fine, but if any action must be taken then I am supportive of maintaining the economic sanctions in partnership with diplomatic negotiations. And I mean negotiations not ultimatums. When I was a labor union leader I negotiated with some tough businessmen but one thing that I never did was broadcast my position before I got to the bargaining table. True negotiations take some cooperation from both parties. It is imperative that we try as best we can to make diplomacy work so that not a single life is lost over this conflict.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DeLAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak for the first time before this House of Representatives that today, performs its important and most somber constitutional responsibility: deciding whether to issue a declaration of war.

When I campaigned just 10 weeks ago at senior centers and shopping malls, at plant gates and commuter rail stations in Connecticut, I could barely imagine the challenge that I would confront this day. Just a week ago, I stood in this Chamber as the Speaker administered the oath of office. Those lofty words have so quickly turned into the very real responsibility of each one of us to determine the question of war and peace in the Persian Gulf.

On Tuesday evening, 250 of my constituents assembled at a town meeting to speak their minds on the Middle East crisis. Today and tomorrow we in Congress must speak our minds and reflect the cross section of America that we represent.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the Hamilton-Gephardt resolution because it is a vote for strength, resolve, and peace—as long as peace can be maintained through diplomatic and economic measures. We owe it to those men and women in the gulf, our sons and daughters who are the parents of the next generation, to make every attempt to head off war.

One meeting between Secretary of State Baker and Foreign Minister Aziz is hardly an exhaustive use of diplomatic efforts. Five months of economic sanctions does not even come close to the 1 year that the administration initially estimated would be necessary to cripple Iraq's economy.

I have supported comprehensive economic sanctions against Iraq, I have supported the deployment of American troops to the Persian Gulf and I must emphasize that I support the use of miltiary force to end the Iraqi occupation of Kuwait—if and when diplomacy and sanctions fail to bring about that same just outcome.

This is the first major post cold war regional conflict in which the international community, invoking international law, has asserted itself in defense of national sovereignty. In this new era, it is such solidarity among nations that is the best guarantee of peace and security.

Our efforts to establish new principles to assure peace and security must be genuinely international. Twelve U.N. resolutions cannot become a fig leaf for a U.S. military action whose burden in lives and money are born almost solely by Americans. If it is American men and women who fall in battle and if it is American tax dollars that finance these battles, then no new principle will have been established. America will have missed the opportunity to create new instruments for our security.

With the world united against Saddam Hussein, we have a unique opportunity to make economic sanctions work. But, by their very nature, such sanctions take time. If we rush to war against Iraq we sacrifice the New World order President Bush has so carefully and rightfully cultivated.

It is wrong for war to be predicated on the impatience of the administration, the passage of an artificial deadline for action, or assertions that our troops are bored. Our men and women will not die of boredom in the gulf; they will die from bullets and bombs.

My constituents at home recognize that American policy in the Persian Gulf has—thus far—been based on sound moral and political principles. And they have been making great sacrifices for this policy in the hopes of obtaining peace and New World order which promises security for all nations.

They are trying to understand that the things that they care about, like health care, housing and education must take a back seat on the national agenda so that the President can vigorously pursue his gulf policy. They are proud of the world leadership America has demonstrated in recent months. But by changing his policy—by opting for an early use of force which would damage the objective of a safer world order—the President squanders the sacrifices made and the trust demonstrated by the American people.

Mr. Speaker, we are all united behind a strong policy that offers the prospect of peace and security in a New World order. I am proud on the occasion of my first address to the House of representatives to add my voice to those who would put national strength and long term peace ahead of hasty military action.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HANCOCK].

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Michel-Solarz resolution.

Mr. Speaker, throughout this crisis I have supported the President and his policy of taking a firm stand against the unprovoked aggression of Iraq against the peaceful nation of Kuwait. I have also supported his firm opposition to any form of appeasement or capitulation which would reward Saddam Hussein for his aggression.

If Hussein is not stopped, he will continue to be a threat to world peace and even our own national security—especially when one considers that he now has chemical and biological weapons and is on the verge of developing nuclear weapons. He must not be allowed to prevail.

The only path to true peace—the only path that will deter such acts of aggression in the future—is for the United States to resolutely insist on the unconditional withdrawal of Iraqi forces from Kuwait. The only way to achieve lasting peace is for the American people and the U.S. Congress to present a united front with the President. This is not the time for partisan politics. We must support the President in this critical moment. If Hussein thinks he can divide us, then he will hold out longer and make our job more difficult. But if he is made to understand clearly that we are united and have the resolve to use force, then he will back down.

Therefore, I intend to support the congressional resolution, resembling the final resolution passed by the United Nations, allowing the President to take whatever action is necessary to expel Iraq from Kuwait.

I do not believe that the President needs congressional approval to take action in this crisis. We are, after all, only responding defensively to an attack by Iraq on our allies. And the President, as Commander in Chief, has the constitutional power to use military force to defend our country and its allies.

However, a congressional resolution supporting the President would send a clear signal to Hussein that he cannot divide us. Such a clear signal of resolve and unity might be just what is needed to finally convince him to back down.

If Congress does not pass such a resolution supporting the President, but instead tries to tie the hands of the President, then we are merely helping Hussein succeed in his aggression and increasing the likelihood of war. Those truly interested in a peaceful and just resolution of this conflict will support the President. That is what I intend to do.

□ 2030

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. JAMES].

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, over the past few months, I have wrestled with the decision Congress faces today. I listened to the debate, I studied the statements of the administration, and I read the letters of my constituents. Earlier this week, I spent part of 2 days calling constituents who had written to me, so that I could discuss their views in greater detail.

On one point, nearly everyone agrees. An armed attack on Iraq's forces in Kuwait should be our last resort.

In my firm judgment, a compelling case for that last resort has not yet been made. However, I believe that an imperative case for granting the President the authority to launch armed attack has indeed been made.

Here is where I think the distinction lies. The question of when an attack would be necessary is a question of how to wage war. Selecting the manner of waging war, of course, is the prerogative of the Executive.

Would an armed attack, if we launch it, cost the fewest lives in January, or in March, or a year from now? I wrestled with that decision over and over before realizing that Congress constitutionally has neither the mandate nor the mission to decide it. Congress has no generals, no diplomats, no war plans, no spies.

The vast majority of us in this House agree that armed force must be used eventually if Iraq fails to withdraw from Kuwait. Our difference is over timing. Timing, I contend, is a question for the Commander in Chief.

The decision on the timing of attack is a decision about the waging of war, a function assigned by the Constitution to the President. I can only pray he has the wisdom to exercise it.

The decision before this House is whether we should give him the authority to wage war. I fear that we must.

This morning, a letter from our colleague from Wisconsin, the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, Mr. ASPIN, touched a key point. Mr. ASPIN suggested that negotiations may still work.

However, as Mr. ASPIN said, as Saddam Hussein, himself, has made clear, negotiations must take place under the threat of war. Until we give the President authority to wage war, President Bush cannot negotiate with Saddam Hussein. Because Hussein has the power to choose war or peace; President Bush does not have corresponding power. Hussein is not a stupid man. He knows that the President of the United States cannot order our troops to take the offensive without the authorization of this body. He has been scornful of efforts to negotiate prior to the granting of that authority. How even more contemptuous he will be, if that authority is expressly denied.

And so I will be voting to give President Bush the authority to wage war; it's the only way I can see to give negotiations a chance.

Many here have asked, what about our allies? Why aren't they doing more. I join in those questions. And when this crises is over, we will need to reexamine our relationship with some of them.

At the same time, while we wish there were more, there are over 200,000 allied troops stationed with us in the desert. How many will there be 3 months from now if this House proclaims to the world that the President of the United States does not have the power to threaten war. Would that action not insure that when war comes, the United States fights alone?

If President Bush is listening to this debate today, I hope he understands what this House is doing. We are not asking him, or inviting him, or encouraging him to launch an attack against Iraq on January 16. I hope that he will not.

I am voting to give him the authority to threaten an attack, and to threaten it with the authority to back it up at a moment that best suits American purposes.

If fighting does comes, I hope it will be after all efforts for peace have been exhausted, after an overwhelming buildup, after uncertainty and confusion have weakened Iraqi forces, at a time that Saddam Hussein expects it least; at a time when fighting would be sudden and brief. And if Saddam Hussein hears a report of this debate, he needs to understand that the United States is ready, if we must, to go to war.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GEREN].

Mr. GEREN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Solarz-Michel resolution.

One of our distinguished colleagues has asked members who have spoken in support of Solarz if they understand that this resolution is tantamount to a declaration of war. To that colleague, I say, I do—and I believe that such a declaration is the best chance for a just and peaceful resolution to this crisis.

And I say further, that passage of the Hamilton-Gephardt resolution poses the greatest threat of war.

There are those who say: "Vote for Hamilton-Gephardt and give diplomacy a chance to work." To those I ask, "diplomacy to what end?"

In your wildest imagination, what could a diplomat offer Saddam Hussein that would lead him to give up his prize of war? Can you offer him a pardon for the murders and rapes he has committed? Or perhaps let him keep some of his loot? And in return, secure from him a promise that he will pursue war no more?

My colleagues, Saddam Hussein is a a warrior—our world has seen his type before.

He has shown his hand clearly. He has invaded two of his neighbors and is in the process of digesting one of them as we meet in this comfortable Chamber tonight. A showdown is inevitable. Only a credible threat of force will back him down.

He is a warrior. Deadly today, and who one day soon will have the power to threaten the world with nuclear tyranny.

The ambitions of Saddam Hussein cannot be accommodated in a civilized world. He must be stood down by those who love peace and liberty.

To postpone that confrontation, as some urge so eloquently, will only embolden Saddam Hussein and will only increase the chances that the inevitable confrontation will lead to war.

I urge my colleagues to stand with the United Nations, with the President, and stand united against Saddam Hussein. A warrior will not hear the sincere, but to his ear, pitiful entreaties of those who plead for peace.

Our last best hope for a just peace is to send Saddam Hussein the message stated so concisely by Mr. SOLARZ, that Saddam faces the choice of leaving and living or staying and dying.

If we shrink from delivering that message, we most surely will have war.

Mr. SMITH of FLORIDA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSON].

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, there is much I would like to say, and I shall make several points in my remarks, but I do want to take these few minutes which the gentleman has so kindly yielded to me to say a few things at this point.

I also want to say at the outset that I have the greatest respect, and personal affection, for the President—as well as for those closest to him in the White House who have been the shapers of our policy in the gulf since this crisis arose. I know that is not relevant to the policy matters at hand, but I wanted to say it anyway. These are decent and thoughtful men, and they are clearly trying to do the very best job they can.

I think all of us feel that way, but as one of the couple of dozen or so Members who have had the opportunity to meet with the President in the White House on a number of occasions during the past 3 months, I did want to say that we all appreciate that opportunity to have had his ear, and to have had that chance to exchange views with him. He has reached out more than past Presidents have to stay in touch with the Congress, and to share his concerns and his feelings and his intentions with us, and I think every one of us appreciates his openness and his willingness to do so, very much.

Having said that, I must also say that although virtually every one of us strongly supported the President's initial response to Saddam Hussein's outrageous and brutal aggression in Kuwait, some of us have strongly disagreed with his handling of this matter since he changed our policy last fall.

Back on August 8, President Bush said:

> The mission of our troops is wholly defensive. Hopefully, they will not be needed long. They will not initiate hostilities, but they will defend themselves, the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and other friends in the Persian Gulf.

All of us supported that original policy of the President. And, most of us thought that policy was working.

I believe that Mr. Bush succeeded, months ago, in protecting our vital interests in the gulf. We have successfully defended Saudi Arabia and the rest of the gulf States, we deterred any further aggression by Iraq, we ensured an adequate supply of oil at reasonable prices to the entire world, and we brought about the release of all foreigners who wished to leave Kuwait and Iraq.

Our initial modest deployment of troops, and our continuing strict enforcement of U.N. economic sanctions against Iraq, were proper and proportionate responses to Iraq's aggression. They were adequate to protect our interests in the gulf, and were likely to have a completely successful result if applied with patience and with perseverance.

We accomplished these objectives with the concerted help of virtually every other nation in the world and, during the first few weeks, at least, it looked as though only a fraction of the troops deployed in the region to achieve our objectives there would be U.S. personnel.

Some time in mid-October and early November the administration changed its original policy. The President announced that we would double, and then redouble, the number of U.S. personnel in the region to about 430,000, in order to ensure, as the President himself put it, "an adequate offensive military option" to carry out our goals there.

That critical shift in policy brought about a number of changes that were detrimental, rather than helpful, to the eventual satisfactory outcome of our involvement there.

It meant that a high proportion of all troops would be American—and it remains likely that, in the event of hostilities, probably 75 percent or 80 percent or more of casualties will be American.

It meant that the world would increasingly see this as an argument between the United States and Iraq, and not as one between the entire world and Iraq, which is, of course, what in fact it is, and should be seen as.

By unilaterally raising the level of rhetoric and U.S. response, we sent absolutely the wrong signal to the rest of the world: that we would be happy to do the job for them, that we would take care of the problem for them.

And by our rushing around to get the United Nations to set a January 15 deadline, and by personalizing the confrontation between Mr. Bush and Saddam Hussein, and by making it more and more evident to the world that we were becoming impatient, the United States transformed the nature of the confrontation, and made it more difficult to end it. We were no longer giving sanctions a chance. And we were ensuring that the sheer number of troops we had sent, and the deadline we had set, would themselves dictate our policy—rather than the other way around, as it should be.

Thus, there was, I believe, a better way of handling this—at a lower level of bombast and bellicosity, with a proportionately lower level of American involvement, and in a way that would have led us to a solution that did not involve offensive military action. That better way was President Bush's original policy.

The question for us now, is: are we bound to support, should we support, our President when he has moved us unwisely to the brink of war—when pursuit of his original policy, which had already achieved almost all of our important goals, would have continued to serve our interests well, at a much lower cost in dollars, and a very much lower risk of loss of lives?

As one of the small group of members who sat in meetings with the President over the last 3 months, as a member who has no doubts about the strength and the sincerity of the President's convictions about the correctness of the policy he is pursuing, this gentleman finds himself wanting very much to be supportive of Mr. Bush.

But I feel much more strongly that we should not—we must not—let our desire to support our President in a time of crisis overrule our judgment about the wisdom of authorizing the President to go to war.

Is war really necessary?

The answer is clearly, no.

We have already stopped Iraqi aggression; we are punishing Iraq; and have already estabished the lesson that aggression does not pay.

And we have done all this—and have every prospect of achieving our final goal of evicting Iraq from Kuwait, without resort to war.

Sanctions are working, and will succeed in weakening Saddam considerably if we are patient. We have succeeded in cutting off Iraq's oil exports, almost its entire source of income; that has reduced Iraq's GNP by 50 percent, and will reduce it by 70 percent in the near future. Sanctions will weaken Iraq's military capability as shortages of spare parts and needed materiel develop.

As someone who has had regular briefings on the Persian Gulf crisis from the intelligence community, I must tell you that I am perplexed about the adminstration's eagerness to abandon a good policy that was working. I am absolutely convinced that continued application of international economic sanctions will force Iraq out of Kuwait. We must give this policy a chance to work.

The case for war in the gulf is very weak indeed, and is driven mainly by our own mistaken policy of forcing the issue unnecessarily, by our huge and uncalled-for military buildup, and our setting of a deadline that make successful diplomacy very, very difficult.

Since we have achieved most of our original objectives, and since our remaining major goal is achievable with patience, and by continuing to enforce the sanctions, we have not right, in my opinion, to put American lives at risk.

We are now voting on whether to send American men and women to war.

My own personal criterion for making such a decision is this: is this a cause, for which I believe my own sons and daughter should be sent to war? And my answer to that question is clearly no—for the reasons I have just given.

And if I would not want my own children to be sent to this war, then I shall not vote to send other parents' children to this war—because I believe that our Nation's vital interests have already been protected and will ultimately be far better protected if we do not go to war.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote for the Gephardt-Hamilton resolution, and against the Michel-Solarz resolution. With patient, steady application of sanctions, and with continued diplomacy, we will succeed in achieving the remainder of our objectives—and we will avoid the completely unnecessary loss of American lives.

□ 2040

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SANTORUM].

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Michel-Solarz resolution and in opposition to the Gephardt-Hamilton resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to address this distinguished body as a newly elected Member from the 18th District of Pennsylvania, and to enter my statement as part of the public record.

We are facing perhaps this Nation's most difficult decision since the Gulf of Tonkin resolution of 1964. The Iraqi invasion of Kuwait was a grave injustice. Peace and international security have been threatened. Justice and freedom are being threatened. And now American lives are at stake as well.

Congress does have a role in offering leadership on this matter. I believe we have the right and responsibility to decide whether or not the President of the United States should have the authority to use force in this particular instance.

The President, however, believes that the United States Constitution gives him the authority to use force if necessary to get Iraq out of Kuwait. I believe that the President will authorize the use of force, pursuant to U.N. Resolution 678, with or without congressional approval if he feels it is necessary. Unfortunately, Saddam Hussein does not believe that President Bush will take offensive military action without Congress behind him. Therefore, to make Hussein realize that the threat of military action is real—and Mr. Hussein, make no mistake that it is real—I will stand behind the President and support the Solarz-Michel resolution.

As an editorial in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette stated on Tuesday, "Prudence and the possibility of further diplomacy argue against an immediate attack on Iraqi positions. But favorable action by Congress would put Saddam on notice that the U.S. Government was behind the position of the United Nations—and this could influence him to obey the United Nations." In this scenario the threat of military action may be the best avenue to peace.

However, I believe it is important to send a message to the President as well. I do not support the sacrifice of thousands of Americans in this conflict. My constituents and the American people do not want to see their sons and daughters die in Kuwait. There are many ways in which powerful, decisive action can be taken militarily against Saddam Hussein without risking great numbers of American lives. President Bush, I will be writing you a letter to urge that you implement other avenues than the sending of thousands of American troops into battle. In casting this vote, I am not endorsing offensive action which would engage thousands of American soldiers. With the support of Congress and the American people, you have the most promising diplomatic tool yet to remove Saddam Hussein from Kuwait peacefully. Please use it.

I am not convinced that we are at the appropriate juncture to justify an all-out assault which may take thousands of American lives. We must, Mr. President, not resort to an all-out assault if military action is needed. And if military action is to be taken, we must not be engaged in it alone. The action must be taken together by all the nations participating in the multinational force present in the gulf.

This decision has not been made lightly. I have taken into account the hundreds of letters and calls directed to my office.

Fred Goehringer of Dormont, who has two sons in the gulf, asked me to support the President. Fred, I will support the President and your sons as you do. I will pray for your sons and for all the men and women deployed in the gulf.

Jim Bowden of Mount Lebanon, who has a brother in the gulf, called me to advocate peace. Jim, I appreciate your perspective as a Vietnam veteran, and I do not want another Vietnam. I believe that a vote in support of the President is our best chance to avoid another Vietnam and achieve peace.

Before I close I would like to address one more person. Mr. Hussein, I know that you are listening to these proceedings carefully. I want you to know that your occupation of Kuwait, your murder of innocent civilians, and your oppression of thousands more civilians is intolerable. The world is in agreement: You must withdraw your forces. We stand together on this and will do whatever is necessary to see freedom restored to a sovereign people. Do not think we will do otherwise.

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CAMP].

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 62, to give our President full authority to resolve the Mideast crisis. It is only by giving the President our full support and this authority that we pursue our best course and our fervent hope for resolving this crisis peacefully.

This is a difficult time for all Americans, especially for the men and women and their families who have literally placed their lives on the line out of a sense of duty and respect to this country.

On Sunday, I was in Owosso, MI, wishing Godspeed to 188 men and women headed for Saudi Arabia. They understand the importance of their mission, the importance of this time for our world. I think of them and their families at this moment and I thank them for their trust in our Nation, and their personal sacrifice, and their belief in our cause.

I make this decision in the hopes that the threat of war will avoid war.

We must send a strong and unified message to Saddam Hussein to get out of Kuwait. We must send a signal to the world community that we stand together, united against Saddam Hussein's acts of war, brutality and aggression. We hope and pray that war will not be necessary, that Saddam Hussein will at last listen to the message of a united international community. Our message is clear: We cannot and will not tolerate his acts of barbarism. We cannot and will not allow him to be rewarded for his acts of aggression. Saddam Hussein must leave Kuwait.

We should stand with our President today in the hopes that our men and women will soon be standing with us at home, secure in the knowledge that we did the right thing as a nation and they bravely served the cause of peace and justice.

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California. [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, President Bush has formally asked Congress to endorse a resolution authorizing him to use "all necessary means" to force Iraq to withdraw from Kuwait. It has been my belief throughout this crisis that this was a step the President had to take if he were to use offensive force against Iraq. After a great deal of thought, and after listening to an exhaustive debate, my intention is to support the Solarz-Michel resolution.

This is not a step I take easily or without reservation. There is no graver matter than war and no man approaches the subject simply or easily. I have seen three great wars that America has fought in my lifetime and do not want see another one. My colleagues know that I am not some young "hawk".

I vote for the Solarz-Michel resolution because I believe its passage is the best way to avoid war. With the Congress firmly behind him, President Bush can negotiate with Saddam Hussein from a position of strength. Saddam Hussein will not be allowed to hide behind any more false hopes that America does not have the resolve to do what is right. I firmly believe, ironic though it may be, that it is the threat of war that offers the best chance for peace. Should this resolution fail, we have effectively tied the hands of the President and told Saddam Hussein he has won. Should this resolution fail, we would only face further stalemate and intransigence on the part of Hussein. It is clear from Secretary of State Baker's meeting with Iraqi Foreign Minister Aziz in Geneva that Saddam Hussein will not back down. It is my deep and unabiding hope that the passage of this resolution will prove to Saddam Hussein that the President is not bluffing and then Hussein will withdraw peacefully. But should it not, I am prepared to face the consequences.

A congressional resolution authorizing the use of force against Iraq after January 15 is a step the United Nations has already taken. The President has made every effort to compel Iraq to leave Kuwait by peaceful means. I am satisfied he has exhausted diplomacy. I am not satisfied economic sanctions against Iraq will compel its withdrawl from Kuwait. Congress has insisted that the President come before it prior to the use of force. Now he has done so. This is a policy the nations of the world have resoundly endorsed. It is time for the U.S. Congress to stand up and be counted. The President deserves our support and will receive mine."

□ 2050

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to one of the chief sponsors of the resolution, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ].

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, if this debate has made any one thing abundantly clear, it is that virtually all of us, Democrats and Republicans, liberals and conservatives, agree on the proposition that it is a vital American interest to secure the withdrawal of Iraq from Kuwait. Where we disagree is over how best to achieve that objective. Should it be done through the protracted application of sanctions, or should it be done through the adoption of a resolution which would authorize the President to use force in order to achieve that objective—which would create the possibility of securing the withdrawal of Saddam Hussein without the use of force, but giving the President the right to use force if that should prove necessary.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that if I thought for a moment that there was any reasonable possibility whatsoever of securing the withdrawal of Iraq from Kuwait through the protracted application of sanctions, I would strongly favor that course of action. But neither Judge Webster, the Director of the CIA, nor any of our other coalition partners believe that the sanctions will be sufficient to induce Saddam Hussein to withdraw from Iraq. Nor do I.

Why do I think the sanctions will not succeed? If we consider the character of Saddam Hussein, and if we take into account the political dynamics of Iraq, it should become clear that the protracted application of sanctions is a formula for failure rather than a strategy for success.

Why is that? The sanctions, to be sure, are having an economic impact. Nobody can deny that. All of Iraq's oil exports have been cut off. Its industry is in a state of paralysis. Its gross national product has been cut almost in half.

Yet those who support the protracted application of sanctions as the best way of resolving this crisis have never demonstrated the connection between the undoubted economic impact of the sanctions and a political decision on the part of the Iraqi leadership to quit Kuwait.

There are, if you think about it, only two ways in which that can happen. Either Saddam himself has to make the decision to go, or Saddam has to be overthrown by a military junta which would then make the decision to go. The fact of the matter is that Saddam himself does not give a whit for the welfare of his own people. The fact that their per capita income will be reduced by 40 percent does not bother him. The fact that they will have less to eat does not bother him. He will hunker down and he will wait.

Anyway, his people will be able to feed themselves. It is a fertile country. Smuggling is going on across the Iranian, Jordanian, Syrian, and Turkish borders. He will wait. And while he waits there is a real chance this coalition against him will crumble, and the sanctions will erode.

He has totally tyrannized and terrorized his own military. There are five secret services. They are riddled with informers. His military officers know that he acts with utter ruthlessness against anyone whom he even suspects of wanting to overthrow him. If they did not get rid of him during an 8-year war with Iran in which they suffered 1 million casualties, they are not going to get rid of him now simply because the Iraqi people have a lower standard of living.

Believing that sanctions will work elevates wishful thinking to the level of hardheaded analysis.

Mr. PEASE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLARZ. I only have 1 minute and then there is no time left.

Mr. PEASE. I suspect that the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN] would give you plenty of time if you wanted additional time.

Mr. SOLARZ. Let me finish and if I have any time left I will be happy to yield.

Mr. PEASE. The gentleman is making a brilliant point. I want to know how it applies to the possibility that the President's plan or course will work as well. What are the odds, in the gentleman's view, that Saddam will withdraw from Iraq as a result of our passage of this resolution?

Mr. SOLARZ. I think it is the last best chance for a peaceful resolution to this conflict.

But I want to conclude with one point in the limited amount of time that I have at this stage in the debate. To the extent that there is any possibility of getting Saddam out, it clearly requires a credible threat of force.

Some say that if the Hamilton resolution is adopted the credible threat of force will remain while we wait for the sanctions to work. But the truth of the matter is that if the Hamilton resolution is adopted there is nobody in the world, and certainly not in Iraq, who is going to believe that we will subsequently have the will to use force. They will break out the champagne bottles in Baghdad. Every one of our coalition partners, none of whom believe the sanctions alone can do the job, will conclude that if we are not willing to use force now we will not be willing to use it later. The option will disappear, and ultimately, therefore, we will be playing right into the hands of Saddam rather than delivering Saddam into the hands of the coalition.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME].

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Solarz-Michel resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my open and absolute opposition to war in the Persian Gulf. My fear against going to war in the gulf is not due to the fact that America and our allies cannot win in battle, but because our objectives and policies in this region have been inconsistent.

I am not comfortable with the stated objectives of why we are so ready to use force to dislodge Saddam Hussein from Kuwait. In August—when it appeared that Iraq was poised to attack Saudi Arabia's oil fields and hold foreign hostages at strategic locations—I concurred with the President's action to create an international force to defend the Saudi's oil fields and impose economic sanctions against Iraq.

Later, President Bush upped the ante with his steadfast promotion of the military option before we could determine whether sanctions and other international initiatives has a chance to take root. Additionally, President Bush began to talk about the need to stop Hussein's "naked aggression" and that he must leave

Kuwait. For me, this is one of the most profound and bewildering turn of events of the entire crisis.

Why are we going to authorize the use of force and the death of thousands of American soldiers to dislodge Hussein from Kuwait and reinstall the Kuwaiti emir. Kuwait by no means represented Jeffersonian democracy. Many of the administration's past objectives and policy positions defended democracy and freedom. Where were these governing principles in Kuwait prior to August?

The Iraqis informed Ambassador April Glaspie that they intended to invade Kuwait in July and Ambassador Glaspie response was that we don't get involved in such Arab affairs and that we do not have a defense treaty with Kuwait. Mr. Speaker, in part, we are responsible for creating the leviathan that challenges us now. Were we as concerned about Iraq's buildup when they were keeping Iran at bay? Of course not. Were we as concerned when Hussein and other Middle Eastern countries escalated their acquisition of arms? Of course not.

The international stance against Saddam Hussein is not truly as united as the President would like us to believe. The major league hitters in this conflict is plainly the United States versus Iraq. Unfortunately, the first and the last soldiers to die probably will be wearing American uniforms.

Now we are considering whether to give the President the authority to use force to dislodge Saddam Hussein from Kuwait. I do not favor this action and believe that we need to fully explore and exhaust our diplomatic options prior to playing the military hand.

I have heard many of our colleagues on the floor and in the media discuss the fact that we need to send a message to Saddam Hussein that his naked aggression will not be tolerated. Mr. Speaker, I want my message to be first sent to the parents and loved ones of those soldiers participating in Operation Desert Shield. My message would be that my conscience cannot rest knowing that your family members are being placed into a conflict that has yet to be clearly defined to anyone.

Mr. Speaker, let us not rush head first into chaos and uncertainty. Let us instead seek ways to leverage Iraq from Kuwait and further tighten the screws via international sanctions and continued isolation against Baghdad.

America has many pressing domestic economic problems. The cost of this war and its concomitant effects will only worsen our economic situation here with no visible relief in sight.

So, I urge those who want to go to war with Iraq to remember that although the Middle East is strategic for its oil, I do not wish to see the Saudi desert become the symbol of unclarified policy and the massive loss of brave American lives.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA].

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I am honored and always grateful for the opportunity to address my colleagues and the people of our great Nation. I have no doubt that no one in this chamber is without sons and daughters, relatives, friends and even constituents who are among the 400,000 Americans in military uniforms in Saudi Arabia—all anxiously awaiting what course of action our President and the Congress will take against Saddam Hussein and the people of Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I have listened with keen interest to the speeches and remarks made by our colleagues about the horrors of war. We have built a monument as a testimony to history and to our Nation—some 50,000 American lives that were sacrificed in Vietnam and some untold hundreds of thousands more who were among the missing, wounded, and maimed and even today, many still wonder if the American people appreciated the services they rendered while in military uniforms in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I have not visited our soldiers and sailors in Saudi Arabia, but I have been to Vietnam like some of our colleagues in this chamber. Throughout the entire year from April 1967 to May 1968, I never doubted for any moment the possibility that I might return either in a body bag or as a cripple for life. I've shed many tears for my buddies and relatives who lost their lives in that terrible conflict, but I'm not going to trouble my colleagues with my personal experiences in that troubled part of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I want to share with my colleagues a few observations of perhaps the most important decision this institution is about to make in a matter of hours. Although I do not have the privilege to cast a vote on the floor of this great institution, I speak on behalf of thousands of Samoan men and women who proudly wear the military uniforms of our great Nation, and many of them now in the Persian Gulf. And coming from a small island community, I will state that several hundred members of my own extended family who are in uniform, are also in the Persian Gulf. I realize my remarks are of no consequence to the outcome of this debate, but we all are responsible to the people of our great Nation.

My first observation is that there is a definite lack of communication and cultural misunderstandings between America and the Arab nations. Additional, there have been problems and confrontations in existence for several hundred years now even amongst Arab nations themselves, which only complicates America's own understanding and real appreciation of the complexity of the situation in the Middle East.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that the public announcement recently made a few days ago by Iraq's Foreign Minister Aziz—of his government's definite intention to attack Israel if the United States and the coalition of nations take offensive military action against Iraq—now opens an entirely new equation of the present crisis in the Middle East. Mr. Speaker, I absolutely support Israel's right to exist as a sovereign state. There is no question in my mind that Israel will respond militarily to defend herself, and she has the right to do so—with or without military assistance from the United States. But, I shudder to think of the consequences, and where our Nation will be then—the reaction from the Arab nations—the status of the world's dependence on oil from the Middle East—the economic standing of all the nations of the world—and ultimately our overall failure to stabilize this region of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I invite my colleagues and the President to take seriously the suggestions offered by Mr. James R. Schlesinger in his testimony which I submit for the RECORD. And I would like to share with my colleagues some pertinent observations of this man's insight on what is happening:

It should also be noted that Mr. Primakov's observations were confined to the original objective of forcing an Iraqi withdrawal from Kuwait and the restoration of the legitimate regime. Of late, to those original objectives some additional goals have been hinted or stated: the elimination of Iraq's capacity to intimidate her neighbors, the removal of Iraq's military capability, the removal of Saddam Hussein from power, and the ending of Iraq's quest for a nuclear capability.

The general effect is to paint Iraq as a rogue or outlaw state, and that its menace to its neighbors and to the international order must be eliminated. To the extent that these additional objectives are embraced, either in appearance or reality, the prospect for a voluntary Iraqi withdrawal from Kuwait is sharply diminished. To achieve these objectives there is really no alternative but to resort to war. Saddam Hussein's inclination to dig in will be stiffened, and in all likelihood the willingness of Iraqi forces to resist will be strengthened.

* * * * *

Saddam's appeal to the hearts and minds in the Arab countries seems to have peaked in September. There has been little restlessness elsewhere in the coalition, no doubt in large degree due to the fact that the world can do without Iraqi and Kuwaiti crude.

Moreover, the status quo includes authorization for the naval blockade, which can therefore be continued indefinitely. It would take a positive act of the United Nations to remove that authorization.

However, that coalition is likely to prove less durable if combat actually takes place. Particularly would this be the case if the objectives turn to the new and sterner demands of war policy reflecting the decision that Iraq has become an outlaw state that must be dealt with now.

Needless to say, the international coalition has yet to embrace that line of reasoning.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I close with two observations regarding the inherent difficulties in the emerging situation.

First, if the United States conveys the impression that it has moved from the original international objectives to the sterner objectives that Saddam Hussein must go, that Iraq's military establishment and the threat to the region must be dismantled or eliminated, et cetera, then whatever incentives Saddam Hussein may presently have to acquiesce to the international community's

present demands and to leave Kuwait will shrink toward zero.

This may please those who have decided that the war option is the preferable one. But it makes it increasingly hard to hold together the international coalition, which we initially put together to bless our actions in the Gulf.

That brings us to the second observation. The more we rely on the image of Iraq as an outlaw state to justify taking military action, the more we will make holding together the international coalition inherently difficult, if not impossible.

International approval of our actions is something on which the administration has set great store. It has provided the desired legitimacy. To abandon it would mean the undermining of any claim to establishing a new international order.

* * * * *

The principal goal of the administration at this time in deciding on these deployments may simply be to increase the pressure on Saddam Hussein to withdraw from Kuwait. Yet, the situation is more complicated. As Mr. Yevgeny Primakov, Mr. Gorbachev's special envoy, has indicated after conversations with Saddam Hussein, even if Saddam is prepared to withdraw from Kuwait, he would require clear evidence that the sanctions would be terminated and that military force would not subsequently be employed against Iraq. In the absence of such commitments, his incentive to withdraw is weak.

The new deployment might also point to an intention to resort to the military option. The deployment will be complete beginning late in January or early February, and for technical reasons that deployment will be difficult to sustain. That no doubt adds to the pressure, the immediate pressure on Saddam Hussein, but it also increases the pressure to choose the war option.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question that no one on this planet has any doubt about America's capability to wipe out Saddam Hussein and Iraq from the face of the Earth. But sometimes a Nation as powerful as ours—even a superpower at that—restraint and common sense becomes a better part of valor, and to prove courage without having to flaunt it is to show wisdom and prudence.

Mr. Speaker, so that my colleagues can really appreciate what war is like, I suggest legislation to require Members of this Chamber to be personnally notified by the Department of Defense on every soldier and sailor from your respective home district, who is killed or wounded in armed conflict that America is involved in—with a strong admonition for the membership of this body to personally visit the families to comfort them for such a tremendous sacrifice.

Mr. Speaker, the issue before us is not who is right, but to do what is right.

Mr. Speaker, I must respectfully disagree with our President on the question of whether he has exhausted all available optons for a peaceful settlement of the crisis in the Middle East. But I appreciate the fact that our President has not given up hope, to continue to seek other available means that are still at his disposal, without having to commit this great Nation to war.

Mr. Speaker, may I conclude by sharing with my colleagues a statement written some 2,500 years ago by a famous Chinese general, Sun Tzu, who wrote a book on the concept of the art of war—and I quote, "to fight and conquer in all your battles is not supreme excellence; supreme excellence consists in breaking the enemy's resistance without fighting." Mr. Speaker, give the sanctions a chance.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following articles by Senator SAM NUNN, Col. Harry Summers, and Mr. James R. Schlesinger as a part of the RECORD.

[From Hearings Before the Committee on Armed Services, U.S. Senate, 1990]

CRISIS IN THE PERSIAN GULF REGION: U.S. POLICY OPTIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

STATEMENT OF DR. JAMES R. SCHLESINGER, FORMER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, SECRETARY OF ENERGY, AND DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

Dr. SCHLESINGER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am pleased to be back with you once again, and I deeply appreciate the invitation to discuss with this committee the challenge posed to American policy and potentially to America's Armed Forces by the developments in the Gulf.

When last I addressed this committee at the beginning of the year, I examined the implications for American policy, attitudes, deployments, and budgetary allocations implied by the collapse of the Warsaw Pact and the decline of the Soviet threat. In a sense, today represents the continuation of that earlier testimony, for what we are to examine beyond the details of the Gulf crisis itself is how this Nation should grapple with the altered conditions in this post-Cold War environment.

Mr. Chairman, if you will permit I shall deal initially with the shape of the post-Cold War world in which the sharp ideological divisions, and the coalitions and alliances polarized to reflect those differences, have now become muted. Some, stimulated by the response to the crisis in the Gulf, have expressed the hope that we are now engaged in fashioning a new international order in which violators of international norms will be regularly constrained or disciplined through the instrument of collective security. Put very briefly, Mr. Chairman, I believe that such aspirations for a Wilsonian utopia are doomed to disappointment.

What is emerging is likely to resemble the somewhat disordered conditions before 1938, an era of old-fashioned power politics marked by national and ethnic rivalries and hatreds, religious tensions, as well as smash and grab and the pursuit of loot. Such elements clearly mark the catalyzing event, Iraq's seizure of Kuwait, and has marked the behavior of a number of players on the international scene since August 2.

To suggest that the international order will miraculously be transformed and that the players on the world scene will be motivated by a dedication to justice and international law strikes me as rather naive.

Mr. Chairman, you and Senator Warner have posed the question, "What are America's interests in the Gulf?" I shall mention three and leave it to the committee to decide whether they are in ascending or descending order of importance.

First is oil. There is no way of evading this simple reality. Oil provides the energy source that drives the economies of the industrial and underdeveloped worlds. Were the principal exports of the region palm dates or pearls or even industrial products, our response to Iraq's transgression would have been far slower and far less massive than has been the case.

Nonetheless, this should not be misunderstood. Our concern is not primarily economic—the price of gasoline at the pump. Were we primarily concerned about the price of oil, we would not have sought to impose an embargo that drove it above $40 a barrel. Instead, our concern is strategic. We cannot allow so large a portion of the world's energy resources to fall under the domination of a single hostile party. Any such party, even Saddam Hussein, would ordinarily be concerned with the stability of the oil market, the better to achieve the long-run exploitation of his economic assets. However, concern properly focuses on the extraordinary periods during which he might use his domination of these oil resources to exploit the outside world's vulnerabilities for strategic mischief.

Second, the United States has had an intimate relationship with the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. That reflects a number of shared strategic objectives as well as Saudi efforts to stabilize the oil market—most dramatically in the period after the fall of the Shah. It is embodied in the Carter Doctrine, which pledges military resistance to external assaults on the Kingdom, as well as the Reagan corollary, which subsequently pledged resistance to internal subversion.

Failure of the United States to honor such commitments would raise questions about the seriousness of the United States, not only in the Middle East, but elsewhere. It is notable that down through August 2 Kuwait itself rebuffed attempts of the United States to provide similar protection, though President Bush's remarks since that date have tended to establish a U.S. commitment to the security of Kuwait.

Third, since the close of World War II, and particularly since the establishment of the State of Israel, the United States has had a generalized commitment to the stability of the Middle East and to the security of Israel. On numerous occasions this generalized commitment has led to U.S. diplomatic or military involvement in the region not always marked by complete success.

Let me turn now to the alternative strategies available to the United States and its allies. The first, of course, is to allow the weight of the economic sanctions imposed in August gradually to wear down the capacity and the will of Iraq to sustain its present position. The embargo, backed up by a naval blockade, is the most successful ever achieved aside from time of war.

Early on it was officially estimated that it would require a year for the sanctions to work. It now appears to be working more rapidly than anticipated. In 3 months time, civilian production in Iraq is estimated to have declined by some 40 percent. Oil exports are essentially nil, and export earnings have dropped correspondingly. The hoard of hard currency necessary to sustain smuggling is dwindling away. The economic pressure can only grow worse.

While Iraq's military posture does not appear to have been seriously affected as yet, as the months go by that, too, will be seriously weakened. Lack of spare parts will force Iraq to begin to cannibalize its military equipment. Military industry, as yet

significantly unaffected, will follow the downward path of civilian industry. In short, the burden on both Iraq's economy and her military strength will steadily increase.

We know that such burdens must ultimately affect political judgment and political will. In time, the original objectives of the United Nations will be attained. Already Saddam Hussein shows a willingness, if not an eagerness, to compromise. One no longer hears that Kuwait is for all eternity the 19th province of Iraq. But for some, ultimately may not be soon enough; and for others, the original objectives may not be sufficient.

To the extent that those original objectives are augmented by demands that Saddam Hussein stand trial as a war criminal, that Iraq provide compensation for the damage it has done, that Iraq's military capacity must be dismantled or destroyed, or that Saddam Hussein must be removed from power, Saddam's determination to hangon will be strengthened.

Some may prefer such a response, in that it precludes a settlement and makes recourse to military force more likely. Nonetheless, if one avoids this list of additional demands and is satisfied with the original objectives, the probability that the economic sanctions will result in a satisfactory outcome is very high.

One should note that since the original estimate was that the sanctions route would require a year, it seems rather illogical to express impatience with them because they will not have produced the hoped-for results in 6 months time.

In this connection, one should also note the frequently-expressed view that Saddam Hussein must not be "rewarded" for his aggression but instead must be punished. As an expression of emotion, it is understandable, but it must not be allowed to obscure our sense of reality. Saddam Hussein is being punished and punished severely. He has forfeited $20 billion of foreign exchange earnings a year; indeed, $30 billion at the current oil price. Iraq's credit is totally destroyed, and the remnants of its hard currency reserves are dwindling.

When Saddam looks across the border at Saudi Arabia or the UAE, they are prospering because of his actions from which he, himself, has derived no benefit. He is likely to be consumed by envy. His own economy is rapidly becoming a basket case.

Moreover, the position of preponderance that he had earlier achieved in OPEC is now gone. He is diplomatically isolated, his military position will slowly be degraded, his pawns in Lebanon have been wiped out by his chief Baathist rival, Assad, who has immensely strengthened his own position. He has been forced to accept an embarrassing peace with Iran, and that nation's position relative to Iraq is slowly being improved. Sympathetic nations such as Jordan and Yemen have been harshly treated, and neither they nor he have had any recourse.

On the benefit side stands only the looting of Kuwait.

In brief, Saddam Hussein staked Iraq's position on a roll of the dice and lost. Only if he has a deeply masochistic streak can he regard himself as rewarded. To allow our own political rhetoric to obscure the severe punishment that has already been meted out or to suggest that our current policy is in some way unsuccessful and that Saddam's position is now or is potentially enviable strikes me as misconceived.

To be sure, imposition of the sanctions has not been painless. Given the limited spare production capacity for oil and the psychological reaction to the prospect of war, oil prices have shot up at their peak. They have more than doubled. The higher oil price, along with the political and economic uncertainties, have imposed a heavy burden on most national economies. Many, including our own, had already started or were tipping into recession. For most economies, the Gulf crisis has either reinforced or initiated a further contraction.

I do not want to understate the cost. In the case of the American economy it will amount to $100–$200 billion in lost economic growth, but that price has already been paid. The oil market, reflecting a sizable shrinkage of expected demand as a consequence of higher oil prices and the impact of recession, has now been brought precariously into balance. The world is able to do without Iraqi and Kuwaiti crude. Thus, to sustain the embargo, no further price need be paid. In effect, we can leave Iraq in isolation until it comes to its senses.

That brings us to the second alternative—the military option. There is little question that the United States and its allies can inflict a crippling military defeat on Iraq. It can eject Iraq from Kuwait. It can destroy Iraq's military forces and military industries. It can destroy, if it wishes, Iraq's cities. The question is, at what cost, and whether it is wise to incur that cost.

Whenever a nation accepts the hazards of war, the precise outcome is not predetermined. Depending upon the military strategy chosen and the tenacity of Iraq's forces, there could be a considerable variation in the outcome. In the event of an all-out assault on entrenched Iraqi positions, the casualties may be expected to run into several tens of thousands. However, if we avoid that all-out assault, make use of our decisive advantages in the air and exploit the opponent's vulnerabilities by our own mobility, the casualties could be held to a fraction of that prior estimate.

In between 4 and 8 weeks it should all be over, save for starving out or mopping up the remaining Iraqi forces in Kuwait. The question then becomes whether one goes on to occupy Iraq to destroy the balance of Iraqi forces and the like. That would be far more difficult and time-consuming, but circumstances could make it unavoidable.

I think it prudent to say no more about strategy and tactics in this session, Mr. Chairman. Suffice it to say the immediate price will not be small. American forces would be obliged to carry a disproportionate burden in any struggle.

This will affect the attitudes of our public and the attitudes in the Middle East regarding the United States. I believe that the direct cost of combat, including that of a probable scorched-earth policy in Kuwait, will be the lesser part of the total cost.

The Middle East would never be the same. It is a fragile, inflammable and unpredictable region. The sight of the United States inflicting a devastating defeat on an Arab country from the soil of an Arab neighbor may result in an enmity directed at the United States for an extended period, not only by Iraq and its present supporters, but ultimately among the publics of some of the nations now allied to us.

To be sure, there are no certainties, yet that risk must be borne in mind. Moreover, the United States will be obliged to involve itself deeply in the reconstruction of the region in the aftermath of a shattering war. In brief, the noncombat costs of a recourse to war, while not calculable in advance, are likely to be substantial.

On November 8, President Bush announced his decision to acquire "an offensive military option" and nearly to double U.S. forces deployed in the Persian Gulf. That announcement altered the strategic, diplomatic and psychological landscape. The deployment of four additional armored divisions implied that the United States might itself choose to cross that "line in the sand" and forcibly to eject Iraq's troops from Kuwait.

As the President indicated, the earlier deployment in August had been intended to deter further Iraqi aggression. One must recognize that to this point Saddam Hussein has remained unmoved either by appeals or by international declarations. It is only the prospect that force might be used against him that has brought forth any sign of willingness to compromise.

The principal goal of the administration at this time in deciding on these deployments may simply be to increase the pressure on Saddam Hussein to withdraw from Kuwait. Yet, the situation is more complicated. As Mr. Yevgeny Primakov, Mr. Gorbachev's special envoy, has indicated after conversations with Saddam Hussein, even if Saddam is prepared to withdraw from Kuwait, he would require clear evidence that the sanctions would be terminated and that military force would not subsequently be employed against Iraq. In the absence of such commitments, his incentive to withdraw is weak.

The new deployment might also point to an intention to resort to the military option. The deployment will be complete beginning late in January or early February, and for technical reasons that deployment will be difficult to sustain. That no doubt adds to the pressure, the immediate pressure on Saddam Hussein, but it also increases the pressure to choose the war option.

Since our forces will already have been deployed, it also diminishes the immediate cost of going to war. It should also be pointed out that the extended period required to complete the additional deployments also makes the first strategic alternative of relying on the sanctions less costly. By the time the deployment is completed, military action is initiated and the fighting ceases, at least 8 months of what was originally estimated to be the 11 months required for the sanctions to work will have elapsed. Even more of the time and cost involved in making the sanctions work will have thus already been incurred. At that juncture, however, only a modest part of the cost of exercising the military option will have been incurred.

It should also be noted that Mr. Primakov's observations were confined to the original objective of forcing an Iraqi withdrawal from Kuwait and the restoration of the legitimate regime. Of late, to those original objectives some additional goals have been hinted or stated: the elimination of Iraq's capacity to intimidate her neighbors, the removal of Iraq's military capability, the removal of Saddam Hussein from power, and the ending of Iraq's quest for a nuclear capability.

The general effect is to paint Iraq as a rogue or outlaw state, and that its menace to its neighbors and to the international order must be eliminated. To the extent that these additional objectives are embraced, either in appearance or reality, the prospect for a voluntary Iraqi withdrawal from Kuwait is sharply diminished. To achieve these objectives there is really no alternative but to resort to war. Saddam Hussein's inclination to dig in will be stiffened, and in all likelihood

the willingness of Iraqi forces to resist will be strengthened.

Consideration of the military option will be influenced by attitudes within the international coalition that the United States has organized. By and large, that coalition has revealed strong ambivalence regarding the military option and a preference for a diplomatic solution, with those least directly involved most dubious about the military option.

While the members of that coalition may be prepared to accept military force to drive Iraq out of Kuwait, to this point they have shown little inclination to embrace the sterner objectives of policy that may have been stated but never officially presented or embraced.

There is, of course, a third strategic alternative: the possibility of a diplomatic solution. Though it remains an eventual possibility, I shall spend little time on it in this hearing for two reasons. First, the United States is probably precluded from any negotiations with Iraq by the position that it initially announced: we will not have any direct communication with Iraq until it has left Kuwait.

For the United States itself to enter into negotiations would represent too much of a diplomatic retreat. To be sure, others have been willing to serve the role of diplomatic intermediaries. Since August, the possibility of an Arab solution has been raised on several occasions. The Soviets, the French, and others have conducted explorations. But as the probability of recourse to war rises, the probability of a diplomatic settlement of necessity shrinks.

That brings me to my second reason for limiting discussion of the diplomatic alternative. If there is to be a diplomatic solution, it will be several months before the outlines gel. It can only gel, gentlemen, as the United States completes its current military deployments.

The United States, given its position, will be obliged to appear merely to acquiesce in such an outcome out of deference to pressures from other elements of the international community. There is something more, however, to be said about the diplomatic situation. In your letter of inquiry, Mr. Chairman, you and Senator Warner inquired about the durability of allied support for the multinational coalition in regard to the original demands on Iraq and the use of sanctions. That support has been firmer than we might have anticipated.

Saddam's appeal to the hearts and minds in the Arab countries seems to have peaked in September. There has been little restlessness elsewhere in the coalition, no doubt in large degree due to the fact that the world can do without Iraqi and Kuwaiti crude.

Moreover, the status quo includes authorization for the naval blockade, which can therefore be continued indefinitely. It would take a positive act of the United Nations to remove that authorization.

However, that coalition is likely to prove less durable if combat actually takes place. Particularly would this be the case if the objectives turn to the new and sterner demands of war policy reflecting the decision that Iraq has become an outlaw state that must be dealt with now.

Needless to say, the international coalition has yet to embrace that line of reasoning.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I close with two observations regarding the inherent difficulties in the emerging situation.

First, if the United States conveys the impression that it has moved from the original international objectives to the sterner objectives that Saddam Hussein must go, that Iraq's military establishment and the threat to the region must be dismantled or eliminated, et cetera, then whatever incentives Saddam Hussein may presently have to acquiesce in the international community's present demands and to leave Kuwait will shrink toward zero.

This may please those who have decided that the war option is the preferable one. But it makes it increasingly hard to hold together the international coalition, which we initially put together to bless our actions in the Gulf.

That brings us to the second observation. The more we rely on the image of Iraq as an outlaw state to justify taking military action, the more we will make holding together the international coalition inherently difficult, if not impossible.

International approval of our actions is something on which the administration has set great store. It has provided the desired legitimacy. To abandon it would mean the undermining of any claim to establishing a new international order.

Mr. Chairman, if you will allow me one final word that goes beyond the crisis in the Gulf. That crisis has preoccupied our attention for more than 3 months and is likely to do so for many months more. It has diverted our attention from subjects that may be of equal or even greater importance.

Six months ago all of us were deeply moved by the developments in Eastern Europe and in the Soviet Union and with the prospect that these nations might move toward democracy and economic reform. Members of this committee will recall our high hopes at that time.

Yet, in the intervening period, with the diverting of our attention to the Gulf, those prospects have been dealt a grievous blow. First was the Soviet decision to force the former satellites to pay hard currency for their oil. Second, that was followed by the Gulf crisis that has sharply raised the international price of oil. The prospects and hopes for Eastern Europe, while our attention has been diverted, have been seriously damaged.

Yet to return to my original theme, in the shaping of the post-Cold War world, it is not clear that the evolution of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union may not be more important than developments in the Gulf.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 10, 1991]

WAR SHOULD BE A LAST RESORT

(By Senator Sam Nunn)

Our nation has engaged in many "gray area" conflicts where Congress has permitted and even supported military action by the commander in chief without providing specific authorization or formally declaring war. Ordering more than 400,000 American troops into battle to liberate Kuwait is not a gray area. It is essential, to comply with the Constitution and to commit the nation, that Congress give its consent before the president initiates a large-scale military offensive against Iraq.

At the heart of the debate that begins today on the floor of the House and the Senate will be a deeply felt difference of opinion—not over the ends of U.S. policy in the crisis but over the means of attaining them. I continue to favor President Bush's original strategy—economic sanctions, a continued military threat and patience.

1. Iraq is unique in its vulnerability to economic embargo. The international blockade has succeeded in cutting off almost 100 percent of Iraq's exports (mostly oil), stopped over 90 percent of all imports and reduced its GNP by an estimated 50 percent. Over time, experts estimate the Iraqi GNP would be down by about 70 percent, the country will be an economic basket case, and Saddam Hussein may be in jeopardy with his own people.

2. The economic sanctions are international and supported by virtually the entire world. A war—no matter how successful—will be 90 percent American and will be viewed as an American crusade by much of the Arab and Islamic world. When the war starts and the dying begins, the American people will have every right to ask, "Where are our allies?"

3. CIA Director William Webster has testified that sanctions will increasingly weaken Iraq's military power through shortages of spare parts and munitions and equipment breakdowns. In addition, the embargo is a very effective mechanism to impede Iraq's quest for nuclear weapons and sophisticated delivery systems—which should be one of our continuing goals after any resolution of this crisis.

In early November, President Bush abandoned his strategy of liberating Kuwait by maintaining an economic stranglehold on Iraq. Rather than preparing for the long haul by planning a rotation policy for American forces deployed in the region, he directed a buildup of American forces to a level that could not be sustained and that reduced our ability to respond rapidly to unforeseen military contingencies in other regions.

A sanctions policy is not perfect but has to be weighed against the alternatives. To those who say that economic sanctions do not guarantee Iraq will withdraw from Kuwait and conclude we must go to war after Jan. 15 absent a diplomatic settlement, I reply: What guarantees do we have that a war will be brief and that American casualties will be light? If we fight, we can and must win. But no one knows whether a war will last five days, five weeks or five months. Our policy and our military planning cannot be based on an expectation that the war will be over quickly and easily. In large measure, the scope and scale of the hostilities, once begun, will be determined by Iraq's willingness to absorb massive punishment and fight on. An Iraqi military collapse is possible but cannot be counted on.

I would also ask, what guarantees do we have as to the aftermath of the war? Here, too, caution is in order. Has anyone in the administration begun thinking about what happens after we win? The president's declared goals include establishing stability in the Persian Gulf and protecting U.S. citizens abroad. Considering the wave of Islamic reaction, anti-Americanism and terrorism that is likely to be unleashed by a highly destructive war with many Arab casualities, it is difficult to conceive of the Middle East as a more stable region where Americans will be safe.

Doubts have been raised about the coalition's staying power. However, the United States possesses sufficient military power to enforce an oil embargo unilaterally if necessary. Moreover, as Adm. William J. Crowe Jr. testified: "I cannot understand why some consider our international alliance strong enough to conduct intense hostilities but too fragile to hold together while we attempt a peaceful solution."

If Congress authorizes the president to wage war or he initiates it on his own, what kind of war should be waged? I am afraid too many recall our most recent conflicts in bumper-sticker terms:

"Vietnam: long, drawn out—bad;"

"Grenada/Panama: quick, decisive—good."

The problem is that a war with Iraq will be far different than any of these conflicts. In preparing for and planning for possible war with Iraq, we must get beyond such simplistic analogies. Above all, we must play to U.S. strengths and exploit Iraq's weaknesses. Our strengths include our air power, our maritime forces, our ground force mobility and our ability to use our intelligence and technological capabilities for selective destruction of Iraqi targets.

If war comes, Iraq's fondest hope is that the United States will commit substantial ground forces to frontal assaults, thus giving Iraq a chance to inflict heavy casualties. Saddam's military leaders are not fools. They realize that they will lose any war with the United States, but entertain the hope that high U.S. casualties would weaken our resolve.

Are there military lessons to be learned from Vietnam? Of course. We should hit military targets with awesome power at the beginning of any conflict, as well as knocking out power and communications, electrical, nuclear and chemical facilities. At the same time, we should not "overlearn" the Vietnam lesson. We in America like instant results. We want fast food and fast military victories. However, our nation places a higher value on human life, especially on the lives of our men and women in uniform. Depending upon developments after the first wave of air attacks, a short war may be possible and may save lives. But we must avoid "instant victory" demands and expectations that could cause a premature and high casualty assault on heavily fortified Kuwait by American ground forces.

If war becomes necessary, we should not tell our military commanders to get it over with quickly no matter what. The order should be—"Accomplish the mission with whatever force is required, but do so in a way that minimizes American casualties, even if it takes more time." Making continued Iraqi occupation of Kuwait untenable with air and naval bombardment plays to our strength. Rooting the Iraqis out with ground forces going against heavy fortification plays into Iraq's strength.

Finally—a message to Saddam Hussein. In the next few days, you will hear an impassioned debate emanating from the U.S. Capitol. These will be the voices of democracy. Don't misread this debate. If war occurs, the constitutional and policy debates will be suspended, and Congress will provide the American troops whatever they need to prevail. There will be no cutoff of funds for our troops while they engage your forces on the field of battle.

President Bush, Congress and the American people are united that you must leave Kuwait. We differ on whether these goals can best be accomplished by administering pain slowly with the economic blockade or by dishing it out in large doses with military power. Either way—you lose.

[From Defense and Diplomacy]

THE RELUCTANT SAMURAI

(By Col. Harry G. Summers, Jr.)

Like Mary Shelley's Dr. Victor Frankenstein who tried to build a new man from a dissecting room corpse and created a homicidal monster instead, some in the United States have been trying since the end of World War II to build a new and better Japan.

Since the early 1980s their efforts have concentrated on getting Japan to devote more of its resources to national defense, relieve the U.S. of the burden providing for Japanese security, and increase its capability for power projection outside Japanese territorial waters.

Those efforts gained urgency after Saddam Hussein invaded Kuwait. Within a month, President George Bush was reported to be pushing Japanese Prime Minister Toshiki Kaifu to send Japanese troops to the Gulf. Under intense pressure from Western allies, Japan already had agreed to contribute $4 billion in support of forces facing Iraq and to countries hurt economically by the UN embargo on trade with Iraq.

Now, prodded by Bush, Kaifu proposed to a special session of the Japanese Diet sending some 1,000 support troops to the Gulf. They would carry no guns. They would do no fighting. Yet the very idea of them sent a shiver around the globe. The Diet itself erupted in outrage. In The New York Times, columnist A.M. Rosenthal warned that if the Diet agreed, "Generations to come . . . will curse the day."

Whether Japan will emerge from this debate as a new, growing military power on the world stage will take years to determine. What those involved in patching such a force together may then discover is that, like Dr. Frankenstein, they, too, have inadvertently created a monster.

Indeed, the monster has already arrived in the pages of Silent Fleet, a comic book with a quarter-million circulation among Japanese young people. In its pages the hero, Captain Umieda, skipper of a renegade Japanese nuclear submarine, launches "a war for independence from American domination." In one episode, while being chased through the Straits of Molucca by warships from the U.S. Seventh Fleet, Umieda and his crew skillfully outmaneuver and cripple six U.S. hunter-killer ships.

The caper is pure fantasy, The Wall Street Journal noted on June 13, 1990, "but it is rooted in sentiments spreading rapidly through the popular culture of both countries." A more serious indicator of such sentiments, as Boston University's Dean H. Joachim Maitre reports in Defense Media Review, is A Japan That Can Say No, a book authored last year by Sony chairman Akio Morita and Shintaro Ishihara, an influential member of the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs of the Japanese Diet.

While Captain Umieda's comic book assault on the U.S. Seventh Fleet was fictional, Morita and Ishihara's America-bashing is deadly serious. Due to be published in an English edition by Simon & Schuster in February 1991, its xenophobic appeal has already made it a bestseller in Japan.

"If Ishihara sounds resentful," writes Dean Maitre, "well, he apparently is. . . . Imperial Japan was defeated 45 years ago. On its ruins—and under American prodding—a new Japan was built democratic, too westernized according to Oriental orthodoxy, not westernized enough in the view of radical reformers. The new Japan, nevertheless, has been and remains pro-West, dependent on the West for its economic well-being, but burdened with a hidden resentment waiting to be exploited."

Hidden, perhaps, but not too well. In the June 17, 1990, Los Angeles Times Ishihara commented on the testimony of a U.S. Marine Corps commander who told the Congress that U.S. Troops are in Japan to ensure "that [Japanese] cannot enhance our military capabilities and once again become a major power."

Ishihara went on to complain that "We are expected to foot the bill so America will, supposedly, save us from ourselves."

Ishihara hit on the crucial question. Does Japan need saving from itself? The U.S. and its allies certainly thought so at the end of World War II. Fresh in their minds was Japan's drive for domination, especially the specter of the Imperial Japanese Empire's "New Order in East Asia" and its successor, the "Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere." While the Japanese Foreign Office preached partnership and liberation from white colonialism, the military had other ideas. "The credo of Japan's dominance in Asia and the superiority of the Japanese over other Asiatics were sacrosanct," noted one French historian. "In the minds of the military elite, all of Tokyo's notions of equality had to fall before it."

It was this military elite who were the guiding intelligence behind this drive for empire. Their code of bushido (the "way of the warrior") led to the assassination of civilian party leaders—Prime Minister Hara Takashi in 1921, Hamaguchi Yuko in 1931 and Inukai Tsuyoki in 1932—in order to break the political alliance between the political parties and business leaders. Inukai's assassination was the watershed event that marked the end of the movement toward democracy that had begun with the Meiji Restoration in 1868 and the gradual assumption of power by the military.

Earlier the military had set out to define its own foreign policy. On September 18, 1931, the Japanese Kwangtung Army, without prior approval of the civil government in Tokyo, siezed Mukden and proceeded to conquer all of Manchuria, ostensibly to provide Japan with "living space" on the Asiatic continent.

When the League of Nations protested this blatant aggression, Japan's response was to withdraw from the League. American remonstrances were also ignored. Having unilaterally disarmed after World War I, the United States locked power to do anything except issue strong diplomatic notes—"diplomacy by incantation," diplomat John Paton Davies called these pathetic efforts—which fueled rather than deterred further aggression.

On July 7, 1937, the Japanese began their attempted conquest of China proper at the Marco Polo bridge near Peking (Beijing). Again, this military action was a unilateral decision on the part of the Army which the civil government in Tokyo was not strong enough to prevent. Peking soon fell and North China and Inner Mongolia were overrun. Shanghai fell in December 1937 and Canton and Hankow in 1938. Japan controlled China's eastern seaboard and the Chinese government was forced to withdraw into the interior.

In September 1940, Japan moved troops into French Indochina and forced Thailand to provide passage through its territory for subsequent movement of troops into Burma and Malaya. At home the military also consolidated its power. On October 16, 1941, General Tojo Hideki, the most fanatic of those dedicated to Japan's military objective in Asia, became Prime Minister as well as Minister of War and a virtual dictatorship was imposed.

An imperial conference on November 4, 1941, approved a policy of war with the United States and on December 7, 1941, Pearl Harbor was attacked, temporarily immobilizing the U.S. Navy and Air force. In rapid succession Hong Kong, Wake Island, the Philippines, Malaya, Singapore, Burma and the

Dutch East Indies fell to the Japanese. By mid-1942, the monster of Japanese militarism had become full-grown. Japan reigned supreme in East Asia and the Shintoist doctrine of hakko-ichiu—Japan's holy mission to rule the world—seemed well on the way toward realization.

Exorcising this militarism from the Japanese body politic was one of the primary Allied war aims. "My directive read 'Japan is not to have an Army, Navy, Air Force, Secret Police organization or civil aviation,'" said General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, the Supreme Commander Allied Powers (SCAP). And after Japan's unconditional surrender on September 2, 1945, these orders were initially enforced with a vengeance.

Not only was Japan's military disbanded, but efforts were made to demilitarize the political structure as well. An allied tribunal chaired by Australia's Sir William Webb tried some 1,128 Japanese for war crimes and seven, including former prime minister Tojo Hideki, were executed. In Manila a military tribunal also tried Japanese General Tomoyuki Yamashita (the "Tiger of Malaya") and Lieutenant General Masaharu Homma (who led the 1941–42 conquest of the Philippines) for violations of the laws of war and sentenced both to death.

The remainder of the war criminals, including some 210,000 minor wartime functionaries, were purged. SCAP Order 550 ordered the Japanese government to "remove and exclude from public office all persons who in one capacity or another" had been "influential in promoting militarism." But the instrument designed to drive a stake through militarism's heart and destroy it forever, was the postwar Japanese Construction which went into effect on May 3, 1947. Article 9 of Chapter 11 provides: "Aspiring sincerely to an international peace based on justice and order, the Japanese people forever renounce war as a sovereign right of the nation and the threat or use of force as means of settling international disputes. In order to accomplish the aim of the preceding paragraph, land, sea and air forces, as well as other war potential, will never be maintained. The right of belligerency of the States will not be recognized."

But, like Dr. Frankenstein's monster, the Japanese military survived these attempts at extermination. Ironically, the hand of salvation was exactly the same hand that earlier had clutched it so firmly by the throat.

"You guys wrote our constitution, which is not a bad document," former government analyst Masau Kunihiro said in the September 9, 1990 *Seattle Times*, "and then you tried to erase it."

The outbreak of war in nearby Korea in June 1950 had changed America's mind about the wisdom of a pacifistic Japan. As General MacArthur said, "Article 9 was aimed entirely at eliminating Japanese aggression. I stated this at the time of the adoption of the constitution, and later recommended that in case of necessity, a defense force be established consisting of ten divisions with corresponding sea and air elements."

In July 1950, as American occupation forces were withdrawn to fight the Korean war, the Japanese government, with American encouragement, established a National Police Reserve of 75,000 men equipped with light infantry weapons. At the same time the United States took the lead in formally ending the state of war with Japan. On September 8, 1951, at San Francisco, California, a Peace Treaty was signed by Japan and 48 allied nations (but not the Soviet Union) which, among other things, provided for Japan's right of self-defense. That same day a Security Treaty was signed by the U.S. and Japan which brought Japan within the U.S. defense perimeter. (A revised U.S.-Japan Mutual Security Treaty was signed on January 19, 1960.)

After Japan's sovereignty was restored on April 28, 1952, the National Police Reserve was redesignated the National Safety Force and was expanded to 100,000 men. Significantly, that same year the restrictions on return to public life of those purged under the demilitarization laws were also quietly dropped. Japan became, in effect, "the Far East Arsenal of the Free World." At the beginning of 1951, "almost three-quarters of Japanese production was directly engaged in what was known as defense production" and "plants that had been earmarked for reparations were returned to their owners. These included 314 aircraft factories, 25 weapons and air-research centers, 119 steel mills, 19 machine-tool manufacturing plants, 18 shipyards, 6 synthetic rubber factories, and 131 military arsenals."

After the Korean war ended in 1953, rearmament continued apace. Separate land, sea and air forces "for purely defense purposes" were established in 1954. But to quell fears that this spelled the resurgence of militarism, nonmilitary euphemisms were used. Under a *jietai* of "Self-Defense Agency," the "Ground Self-Defense Force (GSDF)," the "Maritime Self-Defense Force (MSDF)," and the "Air Self-Defense Force (ASDF)" were created. Today, active and reserve, they are some 300,000 strong.

The Ground Self-Defense Force consists of some 156,000 active soldiers with another 46,000 in reserve. Organized into an armored division and 12 infantry divisions, their armament includes some 1,200 main battle tanks, nearly as many as the Republic of Korea, almost 900 artillery tubes and launchers, 40 attack helicopters and almost 400 transport helicopters. The Air Self-Defense Force, with some 46,000 airmen and another 800 in reserve, has 361 combat aircraft, including six squadrons of one of the world's most sophisticated fighters, the F-15J Eagle, produced in Japan under U.S. contract.

With almost as many warships as the United States now operates in the Pacific, the Maritime Self-Defense force's reach extends some 1,000 nautical miles beyond Japan's coastline. The MSDF has some 44,000 sailors on active duty, with another 1,100 in reserve who man some 16 submarines and 63 other surface combatants, including 42 destroyers and 15 frigates. Also included in the MSDF are patrol boats, minesweepers, amphibious and support craft and 80 combat aircraft.

"Despite steady progress," wrote the Seattle Times' Walter Hatch in his analysis of the arming of Japan, "the defense buildup didn't really get rolling until the 1980s. That's when the Reagan Administration and members of the Congress began to grumble that Japan was getting a free ride, that its economy was expanding like a mutant fruit under the warm, protective shield of America's 'nuclear umbrella.'

"Prodded by the U.S., Japan has increased its military budget by about 6 percent a year over the past decade. . . . Last year, Japan says, it spent nearly $31 billion on defense—just behind France, West Germany and the United Kingdom. And if Japan had counted its expenditures the way those NATO countries do, it would have reported defense spending of more than $39 billion—behind only the United States and the Soviet Union.

"Some of its Asian neighbors—and ironically, even some U.S. officials—now say Japan has gone too far," Hatch concluded. His words were echoed elsewhere. "Leaders such as Thailand's Prime Minister Chatichai Choonhaven and Lee Kuan Yu of Singapore feel that America has created a Frankenstein's monster in Japan," wrote the Washington Post's Jim Hoagland.

In February 1990, Admiral Huntington Hardisty, Commander-in-Chief of the U.S. Pacific Command, testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee that "It is not in the best interests of the United States, of the Japanese people or of the stability of Asia for Japan to develop power-projection capabilities. Such developments would foster arms races and instability throughout the region."

But the Persian Gulf crisis in August 1990, like the Korean war before it, threatens to turn this wise council on its head. Trading on the fact that Japan imports 70 percent of its oil from the Persian Gulf, many in the U.S. and the international community as well demanded that Japan contribute more to the resolution of the crisis there. The result was to open a rift between the Japanese government and its military.

"After four decades of silence," the New York Times' David E. Sanger reported last September, "Japan's military has openly split with some of the country's political leaders in a bitter debate over whether and how Japan should contribute forces to the Persian Gulf." As one high-ranking member of the MSDF put it, "if we are not prepared to do this job of cooperating with our allies, what is our purpose?" Calls have gone up to revise Japan's Self-Defense Law to permit military personnel to be sent to the Gulf, in uniform, as part of the multinational force.

But says Sanger, that is exactly what the Japanese government wants to avoid "for fear that any revision . . . would give Southeast Asia exactly what it is often looking for: Evidence that Japan seeks a new regional role beyond its borders. 'Southeast Asian countries, which suffered during World War II, have shown a serious interest in this issue,' warned Taro Nakayama, Japan's Foreign Minister."

And Southeast Asia was not alone. "In Beijing," noted the Christian Science Monitor on September 26, 1990, "Jiang Zemin, the general secretary of China's Communist Party, indirectly expressed concern . . . to visiting former Japanese Prime Minister Noboru Takeshita over possible use of SDF forces abroad."

Even before the Persian Gulf crisis, the issue of the role of the Japanese military was beginning to surface. As Japanese journalist Kan Ito reported in the Spring 1990 issue of Foreign Policy, 'the American policy of keeping Japan militarily weak while pressuring Japan to pay more and more has built up suppressed anger and resentment among many Japanese politicans and bureaucrats . . . it will eventually invite an unhealthy nationalistic backlash."

As noted earlier, some saw evidence of that backlash already at hand, with Japanese Diet member Shintaro Ishihara as a case in point. But Ishihara himself would disagree. The hysterical reaction on Capitol Hill and by the media to the book by Sony chairman Akio Morita and myself, 'The Japan That Can Say No,' was a very disillusioning experience," he writes in the pages of the October 7, 1990 Washington Post.

"We have come to a juncture today when everything about the Japan-U.S. relationship should be reconsidered and redefined," Ishihara said. "The superpowers staked their destinies on the mad rush to develop nuclear

arms . . . today we can see that economic strength, not military might, will shape the new high-tech civilization now in its formative period. This historical reality calls for a reexamination, both qualitative and quantitative, of the U.S.-Japan security system.

"Japan has often been criticized by Americans for taking a 'free ride' on U.S. military power," he continued, "but it was the United States, after all, that refused Japan the chance to shoulder its due share of the burden by developing a defense system suitable to its needs." Noting that "the era of ideological confrontation is over," Ishihara called for Japan to do its part for world peace by such means as helping poorer countries toward modernization.

While Kuwait would seem to belie his notion that "economic strength, not military might" will shape the world of the future, Ishihara is right that we are on the verge of a new strategic world environment. But going it alone is not the answer.

"It is in America's national interest to create a Pacific defense cooperation system to which Japan will make a substantial contribution," writes Kan Ito. "Since closer, more integrated military cooperation will restrain Japan-phobia in the United States and myopic nationalism and New Asian expansionism in Japan, it will be clearly in Japan's interest as well. . . . As long as Japan's growing military capability is closely and inexorably anchored to a binational Pacific defense system, the Soviets and other Asians would be assured that the United States and Japan would never again engage in a destabilizing geopolitical rivalry in the area."

Ito may have hit on the answer. Dr. Frankenstein's great crime, said his monster before it lumbered off into oblivion, was that he had created a man, a man without love or friend or soul. He deserved his punishment. And the United States will deserve its punishment as well if it forsakes its friendship with the Japanese Self-Defense Force it took such pains to create.

□ 2100

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, as we prepare for the most significant and potentially most consequential vote of our careers in public service tomorrow morning, let me say that I am proud of this institution, proud of the obvious concern for the consequences that we all have for our authorization which may come tomorrow morning for war. We all pray that war will not be necessary.

We fervently hope that Saddam Hussein will withdraw his bloody claws from his innocent neighbor nation.

However, we have no choice. America's most important message to the world has always been that each nation and each individual has the right to be free from tyranny. Kuwait has been savagely raped. Even today its citizens are being slaughtered by a bloodthirsty neighbor. We have no choice.

We have no choice because our credibility is on the line. If we back down now after holding together the historic world coalition to stop Saddam, neither our allies nor our enemies around the world will ever believe us again.

We have no choice because if we allow naked aggression to succeed, where will it end? Not only can we expect Saddam to continue to run rampant through his part of the world, but other despots worldwide will feel free to gobble up their weak neighbors. The Dark Ages could return to the world with a vengeance. The pattern is being cut right now for the new world order that is succeeding the cold war.

We have no choice because clearly America's vital interests are at stake. Kuwait and the other neighbors of Iraq threatened by Saddam contain the very lifeblood of a civilized world: Oil. If Saddam should be allowed to control that vital lifeblood, the nations of the world and all its people would be subject to this ruthless dictator's demands. That threat is real and so sinister in its implications of our loss of freedom that it is almost incomprehensible.

Though we dread the prospect of war, we have never bowed to despots like Saddam, and I pray we never do. He has thrown down the most arrogant of threats to civilization. He is challenging the whole world. He is the bully who threatens us with baths of blood unless we submit to his whims.

We have no choice, my friends, but to call his bluff. Give him one last chance and then do what has to be done.

I believe there is just one last chance for peace, and that is the U.S. Congress. What we do here tomorrow could very well determine whether our brave young men and women are called up to offer that last full measure of devotion to their country.

Why? Because up until now, President Bush's threats upon Saddam have been interpreted by him as empty, because the Congress is not yet on board, and Saddam believes he can continue the rape of Kuwait unless it appears we are united in our determination to free Kuwait.

Now the time has come to show that unity. If the Congress will back up President Bush's resolve to call Saddam's bluff, I believe he will back down. If he does not, we will have done all that we can do to solve this problem peacefully. The last best chance to avoid this war is to show that we are united and prepared to go to war.

I urge my colleagues that you vote for the Michel-Solarz bipartisan show of unity and resolve.

This is an emotional decision for all of us.

I spent last Tuesday visiting the soldiers of a Kentucky National Guard artillery battalion mostly from my district as they received their final training at Fort Campbell, KY, before shipping out for the battle zone in a few days. These are hometown people. I know them, their parents, their brothers, their sisters. These are hometown merchants, doctors, church brethren, friends, relatives. In fact, I belonged to this very unit of the Guard during my younger years. We visited with each one of the 400-odd members of that group. I am frank to say to you that the vote I cast tomorrow to allow them to be sent into battle is the hardest thing I have been asked to do, but I will do so with dread and extreme reluctance, but without hesitation, because I am convinced that I am offering these young friends of mine the very best chance for avoiding combat.

I am glad that Michel-Solarz is not a formal declaration of war which would, by its somber finality, dictate immediate attack. Instead, it gives us a credible threat of massive force to coerce the bloodthirsty dictator to release his claws from the innocent neighbor. It allows the President further peaceful initiatives until he determines there is no other way but force.

Please, by your vote, show Saddam we are together. Tell him we will use the mighty army surrounding him unless he withdraws. Make your stand for peace. Vote for Michel-Solarz.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEHMAN].

Mr. LEHMAN of California. Mr. Speaker, this is the most difficult decision I may ever be called upon to make. I have given it my best. There are merits on both sides in this argument. I agree with those who say the President has moved too quickly to this precipice. He had one policy before the November election and a different one immediately after it. None of us is President and it is not our responsibility to act as if we are. It is our constitutional responsibility to decide whether or not to give the President the authority he has requested to attain a result we all endorse.

The President has narrowed our options to the point where the most important question today, the one the world will focus on is: Does America have a unified position capable of liberating Kuwait and deterring aggression in the Persian Gulf?

Those who oppose giving the President the authority he requests rest their case first on the belief that sanctions will get Saddam Hussein to leave Kuwait and second that the war option will always be available. However, that belief is predicated on the assumption that the domestic, regional, and global situation will remain unchanged following Congress' failure to endorse the U.N. resolution.

That is nonsense. If we do not back the President's request, the following things will happen. First, Saddam Hussein will have the pressure of war taken off his shoulders and will be able to concentrate on a political strategy to beat the sanctions. He can rest his soldiers and pass out medals. Second, the international resolve to stop Saddam Hussein, already weak, as critics correctly suggest, will weaken further.

Iraqis have suffered deprivation before during a protracted war. Does anyone doubt they will be willing to suffer a little now, without the threat of war, to keep Kuwait.

Third, is the issue of American resolve. Let's not kid ourselves, if we are not willing to threaten war now, we will be less willing to do so a year from now. How long can we keep 400,000 men and women in the deserts of Saudi Arabia? Sending our own soldiers a mixed signal is the worst part of Gephardt-Hamilton. And then we would have to face the consequences of removing them without results. Who knows what future mischief this failure of will could generate.

This is not to suggest that there is not great danger on the other side. Yes, I have misgivings. Those who support the President's request implicitly accept Mr. Aspin's analysis that a war will be of short duration and that the casualties will be minimal. Most disturbing of all no one who supports the President's request has any real vision of what America's role will be following the victory.

I am puzzled by the division on the part of those who oppose the President's request. Some say the war option is still available and they will vote for it at some future time if sanctions fail. Others say nothing here is worth fighting for.

The bottom line for me is this: I do not see any possibility of containing Saddam Hussein inside Iraq if we show him and the international community a divided approach. If you don't think it's important enough to take the risks necessary to contain him that's fine, voting for Gephardt-Hamilton is risk free in that regard. But if we do want to contain him, and I do, then we have to take the risks that are required to produce that result.

Just as we should not minimize the risks, we should not ignore the real possibility that Mr. Hussein will reassess his position before the certain destruction of his country.

I have never bought the old cliches that the only way to avoid war is to be willing to wage it or that a big bloody stick is the best weapon in diplomacy or that all power grows out of the barrel of a gun. We have to look at each situation incrementally and select the option best suited to the task of realizing our goals and upholding our values.

In this instance, with the collapse of communism and the emergence of a new superpower relationship, we have an opportunity to participate in the creation of a new world order where the strong do not suppress the weak, and the big do not inhale the small. I cannot let our first act on this new stage be one in which we shrink from our responsibilities because others have not met theirs.

We are deciding much more than whether or not there might be war—we are deciding what the rules will be in the new emerging global order.

□ 2110

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE].

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Solarz-Michel resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I had hoped to serve my political career without ever having to confront the awesome and immediate question of war and peace such as we face here today.

I had also hoped that humanity had reached the level of development that we could find alternative, more rational solutions to such international conflicts.

Strictly enforced international economic sanctions can be that alternative.

When we talk of a new world order in the post-cold-war era, we can find no better example than the universal revulsion and rejection of the brutal Iraqi aggression against its defenseless neighbor, Kuwait.

The quick and decisive action by the United Nations has ensured that Saddam Hussein has gained nothing from his occupation of Kuwait.

On the contrary, each day the international economic sanctions are allowed to work weakens Iraq—economically, diplomatically, and militarily.

Time is on our side in this conflict.

And if we continue to enforce the sanctions, the whole world will continue to be on our side.

But if we choose war at this time, America alone will bear the burden and the pay the costs of that military action.

Let us more strictly enforce the international sanctions.

Let us use the multi-nation military force in the region to impose an airtight naval, air, and land blockade of Iraq.

Let us use our highly capable electronic *intelligence* capabilities and rapid communication facilities to monitor compliance with the sanctions.

Let us punish countries and companies who violate the sanctions by denying them access to our American market.

Mr. Speaker, the Members of this body face no greater question than whether or not to commit American troops to the horrors of combat.

But if we take that momentous decision—let it be with a full understanding of the consequences.

Let us not assume it will be used only as a negotiating tactic.

With our votes, we are authorizing the President to lead this Nation into war.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COYNE].

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, there is no issue considered by the House of greater importance than that of war or peace.

As the elected Representatives of the people of the United States, we have the responsibility to debate the grounds on which our Nation should consider military action against another nation. We must also consider whether the chances of achieving our goals through the use of sanctions are so slim that war is the only option left. Ultimately, we must ask: Why the rush to war?

The U.S. Constitution places this weighty obligation on our shoulders.

First, we should consider the singular event that has brought us to this point. On August 2, 1990, the military forces of Iraq invaded the neighboring country of Kuwait.

Since that date, Iraqi troops have waged a brutal campaign of occupation and repression against the Kuwaiti civilian population. The recent Amnesty International report on Iraqi human rights violations offers ample illustration of Iraq's inhumane policy of terror against the citizens of Kuwait.

For several months, the Government of Iraq implemented a despicable policy of hostage taking against foreign nationals. Hundreds of United States citizens were seized by Iraqi security forces, as were the citizens of nations around the world. Saddam Hussein's failure to realize his goals may have led him to release these hostages, but he still bears the guilt for having seized human shields in the first place. We owe him no gratitude.

Iraqi President Saddam Hussein deserves and has received the condemnation of the international community. It is unnecessary to make comparison of Hussein to other dictators, either past or present, to declare unequivocally his personal responsibility for the crimes against international peace and justice committed by his Government.

The United States has been clear in its condemnation of Iraqi aggression. President Bush has spoken forcefully of our Nation's resolve to see that Iraqi occupation of Kuwait does not go unchallenged.

Let me say now that I am in complete agreement with the President and the goals set forth by recent U.N. resolutions: The complete and unconditional withdrawal of Iraqi forces from Kuwait. The U.S. Congress is committed to achieving this objective.

Saddam Hussein should take no comfort from the debate taking place in this chamber. This is not a debate over the goals of United States policy toward Iraq, but it is a debate over the means by which we shall obtain those goals. Whether by sanctions or by war, Iraq will leave Kuwait.

On this point, our Nation has not stood alone. We have been joined by the nations of the world in common effort to end the occupation of Kuwait.

Since August, President Bush has brought together an international coalition united in its determination that Iraq must leave Kuwait. We should commend the President for his leadership in this first crisis of the post-cold-war era.

The Bush administration has marshalled an unprecedented display of global opposition to the continued Iraqi occupation of Kuwait. Acting in concert with the United Nations, the administration has been able to implement a policy of sanctions against Iraq. American troops have been sent to Saudi Arabia, where they have been joined by military units from other countries.

For the first time in several decades, the United Nations has been able to act decisively in response to a clear case of aggression. We

should be encouraged by the fact that the United Nations is working to advance the goals which its charter set forth.

When United States military forces were first sent to the Persian Gulf region, it was widely noted that their primary military mission was to deter further aggression by Iraq in the region, to defend Saudi Arabia from attack if deterrence failed, and to enforce the U.N. economic sanctions.

President Bush stated on August 8:

The mission of our troops is wholly defensive. Hopefully, they will not be needed long. They will not initiate hostilities, but they will defend themselves, the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and other friends in the Persian Gulf.

As Senator SAM NUNN noted at the beginning of recent hearings on U.S. Persian Gulf policy by the Armed Services Committee of the other body, our military forces are accomplishing their original mission.

Thanks largely to President Bush's leadership, the international community has succeeded in deterring further Iraqi aggression. Hostages have been released. Economic sanctions have been maintained with a surprising degree of unanimity. Most importantly, the world has remained committed to the ultimate goal of complete and unconditional Iraqi withdrawal from Kuwait.

On 12 separate occasions, the U.N. Security Council has passed the resolutions calling for Iraqi withdrawal, and has instituted and reaffirmed repeatedly a policy of strict sanctions against Iraq. The forceful response of the United Nations to Iraqi aggression is testimony to the positive role this agency can play in the post-cold-war world.

In its most recent action, the U.N. Security Council passed Resolution 678, which authorizes member states to "use all necessary means to uphold and implement * * *" previous U.N. resolutions and "* * * to restore international peace and security in the area * * *"

With this resolution, the world's attention has been focused on January 15, as a date of vital importance. The Bush administration has repeatedly notified Iraq that offensive military action against Iraq will become an active option after that date.

So, we are now on the brink of war. For that reason, the Congress of the United States has begun finally to debate specific resolutions dealing with U.S. policy in the Persian Gulf.

Let me state again that I believe there is no question more important for this House to debate than that of war and peace. With nearly 400,000 American men and women stationed in the gulf, we cannot ignore our great responsibility to address this issue.

Currently, there are over 1 million troops facing each other across the border of Kuwait and Saudi Arabia. Along with about 360,000 American troops currently deployed in the region, there are an additional 245,000 Arab and allied troops in place. The Pentagon has estimated that there are more than 540,000 Iraqi troops in Kuwait and southern Iraq.

The risk is great of human suffering and loss of life should war break out in the gulf. This suffering will be inflicted inevitably upon civilian populations as well as armed combatants. It is impossible to predict the number of casualties that may be suffered by American units. For these reasons, if for no others, we must again ask the question: Why the rush to war?

First, January 15 is a sefl-imposed deadline. Even the most recent Security Council statement does not require a move to war on any specific date. The U.N. Security Council resolution calling for Iraqi withdrawal from Kuwait provide for an openended continuation of economic sanctions against the Republic of Iraq. Resolution 678 simply authorizes the use of "all necessary means" if Iraq has not withdrawn from Kuwait "on or before 15 January 1991."

Economic sanctions continue to punish Iraq for its invasion of Kuwait, and constitute one means of enforcing the U.N. resolutions. We must, however, consider whether these sanctions will eventually lead to Iraqi withdrawal from Kuwait.

Central Intelligence Director William Webster has testified on December 4, 1990, that:

More than 100 countries are supporting the U.N. Resolutions that impose economic sanctions on Iraq. Coupled with the U.S. Government's increased ability to detect and follow up on attempts to circumvent the blockade, the sanctions have all but shut off Iraq's exports and reduced imports to less than 10 percent of their preinvasion level. All sectors of the Iraqi economy are feeling the pinch of sanctions, and many industries have largely shut down. Most importantly, the blockade has eliminated any hope Baghdad had of cashing in on higher prices or its seizure of Kuwaiti oilfields.

Despite mounting disruptions and hardships resulting from sanctions, Saddam apparently believes that he can outlast international resolve to maintain sanctions * * * Our judgement has been, and continues to be, that there is no assurance or guarantee that economic sanctions will compel Saddam to change his policies or lead to internal unrest that would threaten his regime.

Let us acknowledge that there are no guarantees that sanctions will work. Still, should we move to war, it is certain that large numberts of men and women will be wounded and killed. With so many lives on the line, the House must consider at what point we should abandon all hope of achieving the liberation of Kuwait through nonmilitary means.

No nation can afford to stand alone against the world forever. Senator SAM NUNN has noted Iraq's high level of vulnerability to an economic embargo.

The reason is because 98% of all their earnings come from oil. Fifty percent of their gross national product including everything they produce comes from oil. We have cut off 50 to 60 percent of their gross national product * * * A 10 to 15 percent reduction in gross national product is somewhere between a recession and a depression. When you get up to 20 and 25 percent of GNP reduction you are taking about a depression. Iraq is already twice that and heading toward 75%.

Sanctions have often been chosen as the most desirable means of implementing U.S. foreign policy. Most recently, this Congress gave approval to a range of sanctions against the Republic of South Africa. The United States has maintained a trade embargo against the nation of Cuba for over two decades. Yet, no previous attempt at sanctions compares to the international sanctions currently in place against Iraq.

As Brian Urquhart, U.N. Political Under Secretary for the past 18 years, recently noted: "There have never been sanctions of this complexity or this comprehensive. And Iraq is uniquely vulnerable to sanctions. It has a single economic base and a poor industrial infrastructure."

With persistence, it is reasonable for us to hope that Iraq will eventually find the price of occupying Kuwait to be too high. Continued imposition of these sanctions will also show other potential aggressors around the world that the international community can stand resolutely against such aggression.

The resolution offered by Mr. HAMILTON offers a prudent course of providing time for sanctions to have their ultimate effect. I am prepared to support all reasonable means of enforcing these sanctions. An eventual turn to military offensive action is not ruled out, but this resolution states explicitly that further congressional approval is required before offensive action is initiated.

The time has not yet come for us to provide the President with authority to use "all necessary means" to force Iraqi withdrawal from Kuwait. Such authority would constitute an abdication of congressional responsibility to declare war.

A move to war will inevitably lead to the defeat of Iraq, but at what cost and with what results? Can we reliably say that a United States attack on Iraq will not unleash a terrorist campaign against Americans around the world. Once United States forces have inflicted devastation on the nation of Iraq, how can we hope to restore stability to the region and calm the inflamed passions of the Arab world.

The resolution requested by the President is fatally flawed by its failure to require further congressional approval for offensive military action by U.S. forces. It is unacceptable to simply accept a declaration by the President that "all appropriate diplomatic and other peaceful means to obtain compliance by Iraq with the United Nations Security Council resolutions * * * have not been successful in obtaining such compliance."

In effect, such a resolution stands the U.S. Constitution on its head, and transfers Congress' power and responsibility to declare war to the Executive. Congress must not cede such power to any President.

Mr. Speaker, there are no guarantees that sanctions will work, but we owe American troops in the field a willingness to exhibit what President Dwight Eisenhower called "the courage of patience."

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO].

Mr. DeFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, this is the second day of many eloquent speeches on the floor, lessons from history, Hitler, Munich, appeasement. We should learn from history. We should not repeat our errors.

It is true that we have encouraged Saddam Hussein through appeasement from April, 1984, when the Reagan administration extended full diplomatic recognition to Iraq, despite its overt

support for terrorism, through the attack on the *USS Stark* and the killing of the United States sailors, through the use of poison gas against Iran, against its own people, the Kurds, the administration stood silent and compliant. Even after Hussein massed forces on the border, the administration opposed economic sanctions, sanctions that we adopted briefly in this House because we knew they were diverting our food aid to military purposes.

The administration reversed that vote.

Finally, on July 26, our Ambassador told Saddam Hussein, "We have no opinion on the Arab-Arab conflict."

Only after the invasion did the Bush administration drop appeasement and adopt a firm stand against aggression, and in those 5 short months since we abandoned appeasement and joined in international condemnation and isolation of Iraq, we have had tremendous victories. We stopped the invasion of Saudi Arabia. We have gotten the hostages back. We have continued the flow of oil. We have stopped the flow of high technology and heavy industrial goods to Iraq.

Only one objective remains unmet, to get Iraq to withdraw from Kuwait.

We have adopted a strategy to firmly oppose aggression, economic and political blockade and sanctions unprecedented in the history of the world and it needs a little bit longer to work to get them out of Kuwait.

I quote Mr. Webster, the head of the Central Intelligence Agency:

> The sanctions have all but shut off Iraq's exports and reduced imports to less than 10 percent of their preinvasion level. All sectors of the Iraqi economy are feeling the pinch of sanctions, and many industries have largely shut down. Most importantly, the blockade has eliminated any hope Baghdad had of cashing in on higher oil prices or its seizure of Kuwaiti oilfields.

Is this a prize that he will keep through time, something from which he cannot benefit at all costs? I believe not.

At long last we have put together a long-term winning strategy in the gulf, a strategy that promises a true new world order, hope for peace, hope for stability.

If the administration wants war, then let the President ask for a declaration of war, lest we repeat another mistake of history.

I quote from Senator Wayne Morse on the occasion of the Gulf of Tonkin resolution:

> I believe history will record that we have made a great mistake by subverting and circumventing the Constitution of the United States by means of this resolution. We are in effect giving the President war-making powers in the absence of a declaration of war. I believe that to be a historic mistake.

If we pass the Solarz-Michel resolution, if we pass a declaration of war "cloaked as a dove of peace" then we are repeating the mistakes of history.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OBEY). The Chair would explain to our guests in the gallery that we are happy to have you, but it is against the rules of the House for any visitor to express any manifestation of either approval or disapproval, and we will ask you to respect the rules of the House.

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. PETRI].

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. McCOLLUM], for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to use the few minutes I have to tell you what I would say if I could address my remarks directly to Saddam Hussein.

"President Hussein," I would say, "you, sir, have succeeded, at great cost to your people and the people of your region and particularly of Kuwait, in concentrating the attention of the world on your area and its problems.

"Now, you confront a momentous decision. Will you end this affair violently by precipitating a war that eliminates you as a factor in your region, or will you seize this moment to bring about a world conference to create a new order in your part of the world, by withdrawing from Kuwait.

"Iraqi withdrawal from Kuwait, far from being the end of this affair will lead to a conference of nations to create a new order in the Middle East. That conference must at least address security concerns raised by your own actions, but its goals no doubt will be broader.

"Your choice of peace can lead to a new order in your region.

"President Hussein, the international conference which would follow your withdrawal could secure borders in the Middle East, create a space for the Palestinians, and permit the peoples of the region to advance into a new age of cultural achievement and prosperity.

"And you, sir, rather than being remembered as a marginal and a destructive figure, could be remembered as a man who did terrible things, to be sure, but who led his people to a new and prosperous world.

"I hope and pray, for all our sakes, that you have this vision and the courage to convert the opportunity you have created, at terrible cost, to the good of your people."

Mr. Speaker, That is what I say to Saddam Hussein. If we must force him to withdraw, we will. It is now up to President Hussein to choose. I hope he chooses to give peace a chance, and I urge that we vote for the Solarz-Michel resolution.

Mr. McCOLLUM, Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. ZELIFF].

Mr. ZELIFF. Mr. Speaker, it has been only 8 days since I took the oath of office as a freshman Member of Congress. I can't imagine a vote more important than the one that we will cast on Saturday. It will be a vote that we must all live with for the rest of our lives. In this new world order which has been established by the resolve of the Western nations and also the emerging democracies of Eastern Europe, we must strive to maintain peace in the world. It is hoped that this peace can be achieved through diplomatic means, but regretfully there remain in the world those who refuse to acknowledge the right of other nations to maintain their international sovereignty. Our concerns are no longer with communism, but with Third World dictators who find it necessary to encroach upon peaceful nations for their own aggrandizement. The United States should not absolve its responsibility as the most able member of the international coalition and of the United Nations to prevent such naked aggression as Iraq's invasion and destruction of Kuwait.

Under the leadership role that we have assumed, it is necessary for the Congress to unite behind our President as he is the constitutional Head-of-State and Commander in Chief. The Congress has wholly supported the President's attempts to resolve this crisis diplomatically, but we must continue to unite behind the President in order to impress upon Saddam Hussein that the United States is determined in its efforts to achieve world peace.

Iraq's invasion of Kuwait was a prelude to their more heinous acts of plundering a sovereign nation, taking all westerners hostage and persecuting all Kuwaitis who attempted to aid these innocent civilians in their escape. The United States must realize that these actions and Hussein's past record, which includes using chemical weapons against his own people, the continued threat of attack against Israel and the unprovoked attack against the U.S.S. *Stark* in 1987, indicate that he has no interest in establishing peace in the Middle East. These conditions limit the President in his options for forcing Iraq to abandon its military occupation of Kuwait.

Therefore, the Congress must authorize the President to enforce U.N. Security Council Resolution 678. The United States must stand strong and firm in its resolve to oppose the contemptible actions taken by the Iraqis in their brutal occupation of an innocent state. The United Nations stands behind us, the international coalition stands behind us and we cannot shy away from the mantle of leadership that we shoulder. As the beacon of the free world we must be the nation that maintains the stability and peace of this new world order. A little more than a year ago we watched as the walls of tyranny crumbled in Eastern Europe and we were infused with the true hope that we might achieve a lasting peace. I urge you to vote in support of the Michel-Solarz amendment. Peace through strength has worked in the past and provides our best hope for peace in the future.

□ 2120

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL. I thank the gentleman from California for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, this is probably the most important and difficult vote that any member of Congress will make for years to come. I have been agonizing over this issue for months and particularly during the past few days. I don't make this decision lightly.

Mr. Speaker, peace is always better than war. I hope and pray that during the next few days and even weeks, we can have a diplomatic breakthrough to this crisis. We should leave no stone unturned in the quest for a peaceful and diplomatic solution to the problems in the gulf. I would hope that the January 15 deadline will be a flexible one and that our country will pursue a dialog to keep the door to a peaceful solution open.

I believe in letting sanctions work but I do not realistically believe that sanctions alone will drive Saddam Hussein out of Kuwait. Nor do I believe that driving Saddam out of Kuwait is the end-all and be-all. The world community must address the fact that Saddam Hussein continues to possess chemical and biological weapons and has a potential nuclear capability. He used poisonous gas to murder his own citizens and he certainly would not hesitate to use it against others in the region. We cannot turn our head away from this threat which he poses to our allies in the region—Egypt, Israel, Saudi Arabia and others. If we don't stand up to him now, won't we ultimately have to stand up to a stronger Saddam Hussein down the road? If the Congress does not give the President the ability to show Saddam (Hussein) that we are resolved in stopping his aggression and threats to the region, doesn't this give him pause to think that he can get away with this aggression? As today's Washington Post editorial stated:

> It is a matter of supplying the president with the vote of confidence, the showing of support, to strengthen his hand at the moment when (conceivably this powerful sort of strengthening of his hand) this can influence the calculations of Saddam Hussein and win him over to the withdrawal that is favored by almost everyone in America.

The Post continues:

> It is no longer seriously disputed that Saddam Hussein is a menace to regional peace and global order and had best be reined in sooner so that he does not become an even greater menace later.* * * Can there be any question as to how Saddam Hussein would read a congressional vote that denied President Bush the authority he seeks to use in conformity with international mandate and national policy alike? Does anyone think he would not take heart from such a vote?

Mr. Speaker, Saddam Hussein has repeatedly rebuffed attempts at a diplomatic solution. I am disheartened upon hearing his comments today that he will not leave Kuwait unless there is some linkage to the Palestinian question. This Congress, this Congressman, the administration and our President have repeatedly stated that there cannot and should not be any linkage between Saddam Hussein's brutal invasion of Kuwait and the Palestinian question. They are two separate issues and must be addressed individually and totally apart from one another. Saddam Hussein did not invade Kuwait to help the Palestinians. He invaded Kuwait because he is a brutal and dangerous aggressor. His attempt to link his aggression to the Palestinian cause is a callous maneuver that must not be rewarded.

Mr. Speaker, again I repeat that peace is always preferable to war, but a peace by appeasing an aggressor will lead to even greater consequences later on. Who can ever forget the 1938 meeting of appeasement between Neville Chamberlain and Hitler when Chamberlain waved the white paper and said he had achieved peace in our time. We cannot make this mistake again.

Mr. Speaker, I was a loud and vocal opponent of the Vietnam war. I don't believe we can be the policemen of the world, but this is no Vietnam. Saddam Hussein possesses biological, chemical, and nuclear capability and is a threat to us, unlike Vietnam. This does represent a direct threat to our vital interests, a threat to our economy, a threat to stability, and a threat to our friends in the region. If Saddam feels that we do not have the resolve to see this through, if we come up with a policy of pretending that sanctions alone will work, we will find that 4, 8, 10, 12 months from now, we will be back here debating the same issue. The difference will then be that Saddam will be bolder, stronger, more intransigent than ever. He will then constitute an even greater threat, with even greater implications for us and the world. Moreover, we can't wait a long time. Our troops cannot stay in the desert for lengthy periods without rotation, a lessening of morale and the potentiality of the allied coalition breaking up.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I believe that while diplomacy should continue to go on, this is a time to strengthen the President's hand, not weaken it. By giving the President the authority he requests, it sends a strong message to Saddam Hussein, and can materially improve our chances of achieving peace. I support the Solarz-Michel resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. PEASE].

Mr. PEASE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Gephardt-Hamilton resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I have served in the U.S. Congress 14 years this month. This is the first time I have had to take a stand and vote whether to send my fellow Americans into combat. It is a daunting and humbling responsibility.

When all is said and done leading up to the so-called diplomatic deadline on January 15, the decision to be made in mid-Janaury, 1991 is whether now is the time to order thousands of our Nation's courageous men and women to likely death in order to drive Iraqi troops out of Kuwait.

I am mindful that scores of young Americans have already died while on duty in Operation Desert Shield, helping to successfully defend Saudi Arabia against further Iraqi aggression and hastening the safe release of thousands of innocent Western civilians who were held hostage by the Government of Iraq. Two of the principal goals set out by President Bush to justify dispatching U.S. forces to Saudi Arabia last August have already been achieved.

Why then should the Congress now give a green light and authorize U.S. troops to go on the offensive against Iraq?

President Bush and Secretary of State Baker have shifted ground and cited several different reasons for why military force may be the only course of action for dealing with Saddam Hussein and his military machine. Only two reasons carry much weight with me.

First, it is claimed that the Iraqi regime wants to secure a stranglehold on the oil in the Middle East. The United States imports 50 percent of the oil we now consume, substantial quantities from Middle East supplies. Therefore, it is deemed a vital U.S. economic interest that we sustain continued Western access to Middle East oil.

This is a shaky justification to go to war at this juncture.

There is no shortage of oil in the world market at present and none is expected for the foreseeable future. Yes, Iraqi and Kuwait oil exports have been cut off, but Saudi Arabia and other oil-exporting nations have increased production to make up for any shortfall.

Futhermore, Japan and Western Europe are far more dependent upon oil from the Persian Gulf than the United States. Why aren't those nations pressing for a military solution to the crisis sooner rather than later? More to the point, why aren't those nations more willing to put their young people's lives on the line and shoulder much more fairly the military and economic burdens associated with rolling back the Iraqi threat to stable supplies of Persian Gulf oil?

The obvious answer is that President Bush and Secretary Baker have rushed in and volunteered our troops for that mission. There are now approximately 37,000 British and French troops in the region compared with 430,000 American troops. Not one Japanese or German soldier is at risk at this moment if war breaks out.

Second, we are told by President Bush that Iraq must not be allowed to profit from its naked aggression against Kuwait. Otherwise, a dangerous precedent will have been set in the post-cold-war era that will tempt other tyrants to use armed aggression as an instrument of national policy. Glib analogies to Munich events and the Nazi threat of 50 years ago aside, I agree with the premise.

More importantly, the international community recognizes the danger and has taken multilateral action to avoid such a precedent. Iraq is the target of sweeping, unprecedented mul-

tilateral economic sanctions. It loses $70 million a day in oil revenue alone because of the worldwide trade embargo. The occupied Kuwaiti ports are worthless.

There simply is no danger that Iraq will go unpunished for its wanton assault on Kuwait. For that reason, there is no compelling reason to resort to military force now without giving the sanctions ample time to work and without exhausting all diplomatic leads to convince Iraq to withdraw from Kuwait.

As this crisis has unfolded, President Bush has skillfully mobilized solid international support in the Saudi desert and at the United Nations to contain and to roll back Saddam Hussein's military aggression. A very positive precedent will have been set for a better world order in the future if the multilateral economic sanctions against Iraq are given sufficient time to take full effect and if they prove instrumental in compelling Iraq to leave Kuwait. That's a precedent worth setting. Certainly, in a world with many festering regional conflicts, this Congress ought not set a precedent of supporting the rapid deployment of U.S. troops as the principal means for the international community to police the world's trouble spots. Such a precedent could not be sustained.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. NEAL].

Mr. NEAL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Hamilton-Gephardt resolution. Mr. Speaker, we are not going to know whether or not the sanctions work if we do not give them a chance. If we try the sanctions, then we always have the option of war.

Mr. Speaker, in a widely discussed and praised document, former Reagan administration Secretary of Defense Casper Weinberger suggested several tests he said should be passed before going to war.

"First," he said, "The United States should not commit forces to combat overseas unless the particular engagement or occasion is deemed vital to our national interest or that of our allies."

Secretary Weinberger's fourth test, among other things, requires that "We must continously keep, as a beacon light before us, the basic question: Is this conflict in our national interest?"

His sixth test says, "Finally, the commitment of U.S. forces to combat should be a last resort."

Secretary Weinberger offered several other important thoughts and tests, including the entire document at the end of this statement, and concluded by saying that his tests "are intended to sound a note of caution—caution that we must observe prior to commiting our troops."

Mr. Speaker, Secretary Weinberger's tests are very pertinent to our debate today. The questions before us are these:

Is it vital—essential—to our national interest to get Iraq out of Kuwait now, within a few days or weeks, rather than later?

Is it worth the costs in human life and suffering, in economic consequences, in likely disruption of oil supplies, in higher oil prices during a time of recession, in the destabilization of the entire Middle East region, and the long-term consequences of war and chaos which are undisputable.

Mr. Speaker, I agree that Saddam Hussein has to be stoped—that it was, and is, vital to our national interest that he be stopped. Saddam has been responsible for the deaths of hundreds of thousands of people, has invaded two countries, has used chemical weapons against his own people. We could not let him control that 65 percent of the world's known oil reserves which are there in the Middle East.

It was and continues to be our vital national interest to stop and contain Saddam Hussein. And unlike the situation in the 1930's with Hitler, who was appeased, Saddam has been stopped.

Under the excellent leadership of President Bush and Secretaries Baker and Cheney, our policy has succeeded. Saddam has been kept out of Saudi Arabia, and although he is still in Kuwait, he is not benefiting from it. Our hostages have been released. Our policy of economic sanctions and embargo backed up by force has been effective.

Now the question is: Is it vital to our national interest to get him out of Kuwait, now, rather than later. I'm not disagreeing with the propositions, that Saddam must leave Kuwait and must not benefit from his brutal aggression. Saddam must leave Kuwait. We all agree on that. The question is one of timing.

I don't think it is vital to our national interest to get Iraq out of Kuwait within a few days or weeks. And yet I think anyone supporting the administration-Solarz approach must believe that it is vital. Either that or they must think that it is a good idea to go to war for reasons less than vital to us.

Mr. Speaker, if it is vital to our national interest to keep countries from invading each other, then why did we not go to war with China over Burma or the Soviet Union over Czechoslovakia?

Of course, no one is arguing for these kinds of actions because, although we deplore these takeovers, it is not in our vital interest to go to war with China or the Soviet Union.

The fact is that it is not necessary, not vital to get Iraq out of Kuwait quickly. We have to get Iraq out of Kuwait, but we should do it in the most intelligent, humane, economical way possible, and in the way that is most consistent with our own long-term interests.

Will the economic sanctions, backed up by force, be successful? And will the coalition enforcing them stay together?

Honestly, I'm not sure, although the evidence available to us suggests they will be. The sanctions are working beautifully so far. Saddam has been stopped from going into Saudi Arabia. He is not benefiting from his occupation of Kuwait. Iraq's economy and warmaking capability are deteriorating daily.

Our country, along with our NATO allies, has had the staying power to contain the Soviet Union for 45 years and virtually alone, North Korea for 40 years. We have proved that we have staying power and can work for long-term goals.

Mr. Speaker, I think the real question is: Will the coalition dedicated to stopping Saddam stay together if war begins? Do we really think Arabs will stick with us and kill other Arabs, especially if Saddam carries through on his promise to attack Israel? What evidence would allow us to assume that?

Our colleague, Senator FRITZ HOLLINGS, has speculated on what the Arab response might to be a sudden, massive violent attack by the United States on Iraq. Senator HOLLINGS said:

> Such a wholesale slaughter of brother Arabs by infidels could quickly break up the hollow coalition of Western and Arab States arrayed against Saddam. Arab public opinion would be united in revulsion and outrage. Every Arab terrorist, every fundamentalist mullah, every anti-American zealot, would take heart. Instead of a new world order, we will create a new world disorder. This is what Admiral Crowe had in mind when he warned that by winning, the United States could lose.

There is no solid evidence, Mr. speaker, that economic sanctions will work, but neither is there evidence that continued cooperative military action will succeed. Since we don't know for sure about either course, we pursue the most humane, most economical, least disruptive course of action first? Shouldn't war be the last, rather than an early option?

Oh, sure, we can save Kuwait by destroying it. But Saddam was perfectly willing to sacrifice hundreds of thousands of people over the last several years during war against Iran. Don't you think that 40,000 or so Iraqi troops in Kuwait will fight? Won't American troops have to fight door-to-door to rout 400,000-plus Iraqi troops? And with the deaths and maiming of tens of thousands of civilians, do you think our coalition will hold together?

In addition to the war's cost in lives, there would be the cost in dollars. It now is costing an estimated $2.5 billion a month, $30 billion year, to maintain our troops in the Persian Gulf region. But the costs of war would be many times as great. At a time when we're running $300 billion annual budget deficits, is it really in our vital national interest to spend and borrow another hundred billion dollars or so, especially if we can achieve our objective in the gulf region another way?

And interestingly, Mr. Speaker, not one speaker I've heard during this entire debate has argued that getting Iraq out of Kuwait immediately is vital.

Going to war at this time would not be in our national interest, certainly not vital, and would be contrary to our values. War should be our last option, not the first.

As Winston Churchill once said "jaw, jaw, jaw, (talk, talk, talk) is always better than war, war, war" and as General H. Norman Schwarzkopf, Commander of U.S. Forces in the Persian Gulf, said in late November, "If the alternative to dying is sitting out in the sun for another summer, that's not a bad alternative."

Mr. Speaker, we should exercise what has been called the "nobility of patience" instead of rushing to war.

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE CASPAR WEINBERGER

(1) First, the United States should not commit forces to combat overseas unless the particular engagement or occasion is deemed vital to our national interest or that of our allies. That emphatically does not mean that we should declare beforehand, as we did with Korea in 1950, that a particular area is outside our strategic perimeter.

(2) Second, if we decide it is necessary to put combat troops into a given situation, we should do so wholeheartedly, and with the clear intention of winning. If we are unwilling to commit the forces or resources necessary to achieve our objectives, we should not commit them at all. Of course if the particular situation requires only limited force to win our objectives, then we should not hesitate to commit forces sized accordingly. When Hitler broke treaties and remilitarized the Rhineland, small combat forces then could perhaps have prevented the holocaust of World War II.

(3) Third, if we do decide to commit forces to combat overseas, we should have clearly defined political and military objectives. And we should know precisely how our forces can accomplish those clearly defined objectives. And we should have and send the forces needed to do just that. As Clausewitz wrote, "No one starts a war—or rather, no one in his senses ought to do so—without first being clear in his mind what he intends to achieve by that war, and how he intends to conduct it."

War may be different today than in Clausewitz's time, but the need for well-defined objectives and a consistent strategy is still essential. If we determine that a combat mission has become necessary for our vital national interests, then we must send forces capable to do the job—and not assign a combat mission to a force configured for peacekeeping.

(4) Fourth, the relationship between our objectives and the forces we have committed—their size, composition and disposition—must be continually reassessed and adjusted if necessary. Conditions and objectives invariably change during the course of a conflict. When they do change, then so must our combat requirements. We must continuously keep as a beacon light before us the basic questions: "Is this conflict in our national interest?" "Does our national interest require us to fight, to use force of arms?" If the answers are "yes", then we must win. If the answers are "no", then we should not be in combat.

(5) Fifth, before the U.S. commits combat forces abroad, there must be some reasonable assurance we will have the support of the American people and their elected representatives in Congress. This support cannot be achieved unless we are candid in making clear the threats we face; the support cannot be sustained without continuing and close consultation. We cannot fight a battle with the Congress at home while asking our troops to win a war overseas or, as in the case of Vietnam, in effect asking our troops not to win, but just to be there.

(6) Finally, the commitment of U.S. forces to combat should be a last resort. I believe that these tests can be helpful in deciding whether or not we should commit our troops to combat in the months and years ahead. The point we must all keep uppermost in our minds is that if we ever decide to commit forces to combat, we must support those forces to the fullest extent of our national will for as long as it takes to win. So we must have in mind objectives that are clearly defined and understood and supported by the widest possible number of our citizens. And those objectives must be vital to our survival as a free nation and to the fulfillment of our responsibilities as a world power. We must also be farsighted enough to sense when immediate and strong reactions to apparently small events can prevent lionlike responses that may be required later. We must never forget those isolationists in Europe who shrugged that "Danzig is not worth a war", and "Why should we fight to keep the Rhineland demilitarized?"

These tests I have just mentioned have been phrased negatively for a purpose—they are intended to sound a note of caution—caution that we must observe.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER].

Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, there is no doubt there is overwhelming support in this Nation and in this Congress for the goals that the President has laid out. There is no doubt in my mind that when history is written, it will show that those goals in fact were achieved.

What this debate is all about is how do we achieve them? That is what the choices are really.

As an engineer, let me examine the problem that we face as a nation and what we are facing in terms of votes.

Certainly under the present course, which is sanctions plus implied force, we have been very successful. So far we have been able to defend Saudi Arabia, we freed the hostages, we stabilized the oil supply.

However, we have not yet been able to free Kuwait and we have not been able to prevent Iraq from developing a nuclear capability.

Those are the concerns that the President has laid out for us.

So let us look at the options we face when we vote tomorrow.

Certainly under the Solarz proposal, which calls for authorizing force, there are two possibilities. Let us assume that in fact we pass that resolution and Hussein blinks. Great.

Kuwait is freed; we are delighted.

But the nuclear problem goes unsolved. That is a problem.

There is no loss of life, wonderful. If Hussein does not blink, then the President will most likely go to war.

The result will be we will win, there is no question about that. We can outproduce them, we can beat them. Kuwait will be freed.

The nuclear problem will be solved, but the loss of life is potentially very large.

Now let us look at the Hamilton side of things, which continues the sanctions with implied force.

□ 2130

Under that program Hussein could well be deposed. If that happens, Kuwait is freed, and the nuclear problem is solved, no loss of life. If in fact sanctions do not work, or the alliance falls apart, we still have the opportunity to use military force and go this path.

Clearly to achieve the goals that the President said we must achieve, which are to get Iraq out of Kuwait and to eliminate any potential nuclear capability for Iraq, Hussein must go. There are only two ways for him to go. War or being overthrown.

Now the problem that I have with the Solarz approach is that it virtually guarantees war, and let me tell my colleagues why. Certainly the Solarz approach, as everyone has said, will potentially get Iraq out of Kuwait. There is no argument. That may work. But it does not solve the nuclear problem. The only way to really solve that is to get Hussein out of Iraq, and we cannot do that under Solarz. So, under Solarz, essentially the nuclear concern gets unanswered, and war is inevitable to stop them from dropping nuclear weapons.

Now, on the other hand, sanctions. No one in this Chamber can guarantee that sanctions will fail or will succeed. There are no guarantees in life. I say, "You pay your money, you take your chance. No one can guarantee it."

But sanctions can disrupt their economy and can disrupt their military capability. Sanctions could cause the overthrow with no loss of life. With patience we can have it all. We can get Iraq out of Kuwait, we can prevent nuclear capability.

Time is on our side. What is the hurry?

Remember World War II? We did not capture every island in the Pacific. We bypassed them, we isolated them, and we went back later and cleaned them up.

We can isolate, and that is what we do with the sanctions. If sanctions fail, we still have the military option.

So, please support Hamilton. Do not use those body bags. Let us have the courage to be patient. We waited out Russia for 45 years. Surely we can wait out this two-bit dictator for a couple of years, if necessary.

Have the courage.

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, history has duly recorded British Prime Minister Chamberlain reportedly achieving "peace in our time" by appeasing Hitler. We are all too familiar with the horrors of World War II which followed this naive statement.

In defense of Chamberlain, the world had never seen a madman equipped with the modern weapons of war. We have no such excuse. History has clearly shown us the dangers of giving in to this type of aggression.

That is what makes this such a difficult question. Do we go in now and eliminate the threat or do we pull back and risk the possibility of Iraqi actions which could threaten the lives of millions?

Yesterday I returned form visiting our troops in Saudi Arabia. Since returning I have been calling the loved ones of service men and women I met to pass along messages. To share in this experience is truly humbling and terrifying.

Despite the feelings of pride I felt it is frightening to know that these very same individuals will be under fire in the event of hostilities. None of us want to place these young men and women in jeopardy.

That is the paradox we face today. By threatening war do we avoid war? And by supposedly striving for peace do we actually bring our Nation closer to war?

In addition, what is the effect of our statements? I will tell you one effect. The inappropriate comment by one of the leaders of this House that left the impression that Congress cut funding to our troops was more damaging to our troop morale than any enemy propaganda.

This one callous statement weighed as heavily on the minds of the soldiers I met than the prospect of battle. It disgusted me to witness this unfortunate result of playing petty politics with the lives of our soldiers.

This is the concern of the soldiers and families I have spoken with. They are rightly worried that Congress will pull the rug from under them.

In my view the Gephardt resolution is not only misguided but unrealistic.

Here is a realistic scenario in the event of hostilities. Within minutes Hussein will be firing missiles from Iraq into our lines. In order to save thousands of American lives these missile bases will have to be destroyed.

Is this offensive action? Are we to tell our field commander to wait until this Congress can convene, draft a resolution, debate it, and give its authorization?

By then it will be too late for thousands of our soldiers whom we are supposedly trying to save.

As I spoke with our soldiers in Saudi Arabia one sentiment became clear. Let us do our job or send us home.

When I expressed surprise at the high level of morale among our troops the answer was always the same. They said they could now see the light at the end of the tunnel and knew they were not going to be left sitting in the desert month after month while politicians and diplomats play their games and our vital equipment fries in the desert.

Finally, let me remind my colleagues that supporting the President does not mean a declaration of war for January 15.

The votes on this issue transcend politics. This is an issue of conscience. None of us want war, especially those of us who have experienced it. Sometimes, however, a military threat is the only avenue toward peace.

We must learn from history. There is no appeasing a madman. History has condemned Chamberlain for appeasing Hitler. That is not the legacy I want to leave behind. Support the Michael-Solarz resolution. Support the President. Support our troops.

To paraphrase Secretary of State Baker "We must not confuse appeasement with diplomacy."

Mr. Speaker, you and I must vote tomorrow. Please dig down deep in your heart and conscience. Do what you believe is in the best interest of our service men and women. This vote is most likely the most difficult one we will ever cast. The Michel-Solarz resolution in my judgment is the only vote.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURPHY].

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Solarz-Michel resolution which would authorize the President to enter into a war.

Mr. Speaker, the repeated and continuous debate and reasons given for our immediate military action in the Middle East seems to cloud the real issues of our involvement.

The Presidential, Solarz-Michel resolution is a declaration of war. Every Member who votes for it signifies his or her support for that war.

As a patriotic American, who has served in the military and for 45 years been an active member of various veterans organizations, it is my firm belief that we should only declare war when our country's security is at risk.

No one has addressed that issue. Let's examine the facts. Iraq is governed by a dictator who has been ruthless in his rule. Kuwait is a kingdom governed by a single person who bestows the benefits to members of his royal family.

Our country has had economic relations with both countries but have not been politically close to either. Americans may not own land or minerals in Kuwait or any country in the Middle East. Neither nation resembles in any way our democracy.

Our Ambassadors appointed by President Bush told both nations last July that the United States has no interest vital or otherwise in the dispute between these two kingdoms. Now President Bush and many Members of Congress want to conduct a costly war to settle their differences. Yes, we acted correctly in joining the U.N. resolution of condemnation and economic sanctions against Iraq—we acted wisely in committing sufficient forces to stem further aggression. As other nations supplied troops we should have gradually withdrawn some of our troops to make this a truly U.N. action, instead President Bush has continued the largest single military buildup in our history at a great financial loss to our Nation.

Are we to involve ourselves in every injustice or attack every nation controlled by a despot or possessing weapons we deem offensive? Of course not or we would already be at war with three-fourths of the nations in this world. Why then do we deem this to be so important that we will condemn thousands of young Americans to death and burden those who survive with an unbearable debt.

Yes, this war will cost American lives and a financial cost far exceeding our ability or willingness to pay. But that is not mentioned in this debate.

Whether the U.N. coalition survives with or without a war is immaterial.

We will never know if the sanctions or negotiations will work.

When our President set a deadline for sanctions and negotiations he created the crisis and dilemma we are in today.

To delay military action is not withdrawing our commitment to Saudi Arabia, another kingdom, or to the United Nations who have at times been unkind to our country. It instead advises the President that we value the lives of our young people more than the kings, emirs, and dictators of the world value theirs.

Before President Bush secured permission from those other nations to set a deadline he should have consulted with the American people and their elected Congress. The fact that he did not is his responsibility and mistake now, he and many of you argue it is too late we cannot take a step back from that line in the sand. Mr. President and my colleagues, it's not your life or your fortune to be laid on the line.

To those of you who espouse war as the only course to take, join my proposal to allow the President, Vice President, Cabinet and every Member of Congress to volunteer for combat military duty regardless of your age. Those who are so willing to have war then could not be denied the opportunity of fighting for their beliefs.

The President's resolution should also contain a tax provision to be levied now on the people we are here to serve. If that war is worth it to you then provide for its payment now not give the bill to your children and grandchildren.

Why did not the sponsors or leaders of this body insist that the President provide us with the true cost and include it in this resolution? For I know that most of you who will vote for it today will not be willing to pay for it next year, when the bill comes due.

If we have a war we will win and when its over be prepared to then tax your constituents with the tremendous costs of rebuilding what we destroyed. That has been our humanitarian trait following every conflict we win.

We provide the tax dollars to rebuild the vanquished infrastructure, schools, housing, factories, transportation, and all else.

As we have done and are doing even today in Grenada and Panama.

When we rebuild those nations they will still be kingdoms not democracies.

And we will continue to buy their oil even at a greater price than we pay now.

The facts on the bottom line will be a loss of many young Americans, billions of American tax dollars and we will have purchased nothing but fewer friends in a region that has been plagued for 5,000 years of religion and ethnic warfare.

What makes us think that we can change a region that has thwarted the military might of Persia-Rome, Greece, Genghis Khan, the Ottoman Empire, and many others.

No armed might can create Utopia. Let the United Nation participate equally in the sanctions and share the load. There will be no Japanese, Korean, Taiwanese, Chinese, Indian, Pakistani, European, Russian or any other total commitment to this conflict. They will not suffer the loss, but will reap the benefits.

Let us dismiss the arguments that we cannot back down or that the United Nation has authorized us to go to war.

There are far greater reasons not to fight this war at this time.

In closing however, I will say that if the House and Senate give the President the authority he now requests then I and all Americans must then unite and provide the resources and strength to bring the conflict to a rapid and successful conclusion.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JONTZ].

Mr. JONTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Hamilton-Gephardt resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL].

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Hamilton-Gephardt amendment.

Forty years ago I was on the Yalu River in North Korea. I was a sergeant in the 2d Infantry Division. We had driven the enemy from southern Korea all the way past the 38th parallel. Then it reached a point that the Congress and the President was going to decide whether or not the 8th Army and the 2d Infantry Division should move across the Yalu River. The political decision in Washington was whether or not the 8th Army should move across the Yalu River in order to invade Manchuria and go after the Communists who were there.

Mr. Speaker, I wondered those nights in Korea whether or not the Congress was paying as much attention then as apparently they are not paying today as we find all of the political courage in the world to submit somebody else's children into combat. When I think of the close to 40,000 Americans that died in Korea, the tens of thousands captured by the Communists and those that were left maimed and wounded for life, and we go back today to try to pick up the pieces for the courageous Congress that supported their battle against communism, and we find them in homeless shelters and in the streets forgotten, and even difficult to find a memorial for them; if my colleagues see what happened after Korea, they go the Grenada, they go to Panama, they go to Vietnam, and we still find a courageous Congress supporting the fighting men, and yet no matter how much our life depends on it, we cannot think of the reason why we were so courageous in sending them there.

□ 2140

There are only three reasons why we would think about allowing President Bush to send our dedicated men and women to Saudi Arabia and from Saudi Arabia to Kuwait and from Kuwait into Iraq, and that is oil, oil, and more oil.

It seems to me that one thing we should have on our record for all our veterans is that we cared enough about them to give peace a chance. January 15 is not only an ultimatum for Saddam Hussein, it also happens to be the birthday of the late Dr. Martin Luther King, someone who said that he was the prince of peace, someone who thought the world should be remembered for what it did for peaceful resolutions of problems rather than dedicating itself to war.

I hope that when we make our decision tomorrow, Members will think in terms of the other people's children and loved ones. It is no profile in courage for us to say we are going to fight to the last drop of blood as long as it is someone else's blood. It takes courage for us to say that we will support the President when he is right and we will not support him when he is wrong, and asking us to send people into combat without giving the sanctions an opportunity to work is not only unfair and unequitable, but it is not the right and moral thing to do. So tomorrow is the date that I think should be for all veterans, when we can say that we may not have had an opportunity to vote on the lives of those people who were lost before, but our Constitution has given us the opportunity to evaluate the situation today. And for God's sake, I can say to each and every one of the Members, "If you want to be courageous, leave the Congress and get out there and enlist, but don't be courageous at the expense of those people in the Reserves who have been called up around the country. Don't be courageous at the expense of the soldiers and marines who are there to defend our country." If they are going to fight for us, let us make certain it is not over the oil fields that are there in Saudi Arabia.

There is one thing that is abundantly clear: When you want to find out who the enemy is, you make certain that those people they are soldiering with are going to stick with you. And I can tell the Members there is no one in these Halls of Congress that trusts our allies that allegedly are supposed to fight with American men and women over there in the Middle East. I say, "You didn't trust them last month or last year, and you don't trust them now."

Mr. Speaker, I say that if we are going to have our boys and girls fighting, the least we can do is to know who they are fighting with. If we think the coalition is going to fall apart because the sanctions will not work, then, my God, if it falls apart in peacetime, then they will cut and run in war time.

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER].

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, like every Member of this House and like President Bush, I desperately hope that we will be able to avoid war in the Persian Gulf. It is for that reason that I rise in strong support of the bipartisan package which is being offered here. And I would like to stress the fact that it is bipartisan.

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, this is not a Democrat-versus-Republican issue. We as a House are standing together in a bipartisan way to address this very important issue, and that once again underscores the fact that we can have a bipartisan foreign policy again.

There are many people, Mr. Speaker, who have argued that diplomacy has not worked, and that we should be going further than we have.

Mr. Speaker, nothing could be further from the truth. After all, the Soviet Union, the Jordanians, the Arab League, Secretary Baker, Jesse Jackson, Mohammed Ali, and in fact maybe even Bart Simpson have tried the diplomatic route to deal with this situation. Obviously it has not worked.

There are some, Mr. Speaker, who like to claim that sanctions are working. Well, we have heard the news about the devastation in the Soviet Union, and I think it is important for us to recognize that in Charles Krauthammer's column in the Washington Post this week he said:

> It is vitally hard to take sanctions seriously when both the Associated Press and the Post report from Baghdad that 1,000 Soviet nationals in Iraq have decided to stay rather than return home to conditions in the Soviet Union. A thousand people with firsthand experience with the Baghdad A&P choose life in a war zone under total international sanctions over life in Moscow.

Those are some sanctions. It is very clear that we must send a solid, united voice from President Bush and the U.S. Congress to this reprehensible man, Saddam Hussein. It is very clear that it should be done in a bipartisan way.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but think of Abraham Lincoln's quote 126 years ago when he said: "The struggle of today is not altogether for today. It is for a vast future also."

Mr. ANDREWS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Solarz-Michel resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I truly believe that we here in this body this afternoon are involved in perhaps what is the most important episode, certainly one of the latest, in the current drama of the Mideast crisis, and I have no doubt in my mind that Saddam Hussein is watching. He is aware of the U.N. resolution. It has been around for some time. He is aware of the almost unanimous condemnation of the entire free world for what he has done.

He has seen the forces that are arrayed against him. He has heard from our President, and now he is waiting for that one last final signal. He will see our actions as a result of the

American people reflected in the decisions of our Congress.

Our responsibility in mirroring the resolve and intent of the people we represent is shown on especially and profoundly important issues like those of war and peace. Those that come in what is the quietest and calmest hours of our deliberations, we believe to be the truth.

Mr. Speaker, I say to my friends that the truth is that in Saddam Hussein we are dealing with what is unquestionably a dangerous, a powerful, a ruthless, and a merciless, ambitious dictator who poses perhaps the greatest threat to world peace that exists on the planet's face today.

We know this man, we know his intent, and the world knows it. Why should we think for 1 minute that after dragging his people through 8 years of the horrors of a war with Iran, he would think of yielding to sanctions? He has built his might and his power on the poverty and the depravity of his people and the dead bodies of anyone who opposed even the slightest question to his ruthless ambitions. This man will not quit until he is stopped.

There is no escaping this commitment of ours. If our true suit, as it has always been, is a quest for peace and for what is right, we will have to deal with him, this evil and ambitious man, now or later, and I think we all know it.

There is but one way to reduce the commitment we will inevitably have to make, and that is to do it now and not later. The passage of the Solarz-Michel resolution is the last best hope for us. It is the last clear signal of our intent, and my prayer is that it will work.

□ 2150

This last clear signal is that America's might and America's resolve stands united for what is right and united against what is clearly wrong. The passage of the Solarz resolution is the last clear signal that we can send, and we should send it now.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR].

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Hamilton-Gephardt resolution.

This resolution addresses two fundamental issues, both of serious magnitude.

The first fundamental issue relates to the makeup of our society—why we are, what we are as Americans. We Americans take great pride in our citizenship—we believe we live in the greatest democracy ever known to mankind and we are right. We love not only our own people, but the people of the world and we wish for the global community the same values and freedom which we hold dear. Many generations of Americans who came before us take credit for our democracy—our freedom. But there is one generation that gave us the foundation of every value we cherish—they were the crafters of our Constitution. Alexander Hamilton, Roger Sherman of Connecticut, George Mason of Virginia, John Jay. The essays, the Federalist papers, explained the new Federal Government and the document by which we are guided. These essays are instructive. Our forefathers explained the debate concerning what body could be "trusted," as Madison put it, to declare war.

Thus, in particular regarding the question of who posseses the power to declare war, the Federalist paper No. 69, written by Hamilton, remains the single most authoritative source which established Congress' sole right to declare war.

In Federalist No. 69, Hamilton writes:

> The President is to be the "Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the militia of the several States, when called into the actual service of the United States" * * * in this respect, his authority would be nominally the same with that of the King of Great Britain, but in substance much inferior to it. It would amount to nothing more than the supreme command and direction of the military and naval forces * * * While that of the British King extends to the declaring of war and to the raising and regulating of fleets and armies—all which, by the constitution under consideration, would appertain to the legislature.

If there was one tenet of government, one principle on which our Founding Fathers were almost all agreed, it was that Congress alone should possess the awesome power to commit this country to war. Thomas Jefferson himself strongly believed that reserving the power to declare war to the Congress would act as an "effectual check on the dog of war." James Madison—the "Father of the Constitution"—wrote that "in no part of the Constitution is more wisdom to be found, than in the clause which confides the question of war or peace to the legislature, and not the executive department."

In the Solarz-Michel resolution, Congress abdicates its constitutional authority and defies the very principle that our Founding Fathers believed was most sacred and substantive. It is not a sign of weakness or subordination to the world or Saddam Hussein that Congress reasserts its constitutional authority—this principle separates our country as a democracy from Iraq, China, and indeed the Soviet Union. For that very reason alone we should support Hamilton-Gephardt and not Solarz-Michel.

But there is another more immediate issue at hand—should war with Iraq, which I believe will ultimately be a world war, be our first option or our last option.

Let there be no mistake—all Americans are in total agreement that Saddam's naked aggression of Kuwait was evil and unjustified. Saddam and his troops must leave Kuwait and Kuwait's sovereignty as a nation restored.

Therefore the second point we are debating is the means to that end. What are the means then in the Hamilton resolution versus the means in the Solarz resolution?

The Hamilton Resolution calls for continuing application of international sanctions; the Solarz resolution gives the President alone blind power to use force.

The international sanctions are working. According to recent reports from the CIA, the economic sanctions have cut off 97 percent of Iraq's exports and 90 percent of its imports.

How long do we wait for these sanctions to work?

According to the CIA, at the current rate of depletion, Iraq will nearly exhaust its available foreign exchange reserves by next spring. Of its imports:

Industry has been hardest hit so far: Many firms are finding it difficult to cope with the departure of foreign workers and the cutoff of industrial imports such as spare parts for machinery and transportation. These totaled nearly 50 percent of Iraq's total imports prior to the invasion.

Iraq's financial resources have been badly damaged by the imposition and success of sanctions. The embargo has deprived Baghdad of roughly $1.5 billion of foreign exchange earnings monthly. The CIA says that a lack of foreign exchange will, in time, be Iraq's greatest economic hardship. Iraq will soon be bankrupt!

In addition. United States economic sanctions against Iraq: the United States has:

First frozen Iraqi assets;

Second, boycotted Iraqi exports;

Third, embargoes all trade with Iraq;

Fourth, interrupted Iraqi transportation and communication links; and

Fifth, restricted loans and credits from international financial institutions.

So why this Presidential march to war, and what is that price not only to the global community—but most importantly to the citizens of our own country, the American people. I believe the President is marching to war to hide the failure of his domestic policy. As we speak, we have 50 percent dependence on foreign oil, from 20 percent a decade ago. Since 1987, the President has not articulated a national energy policy in direct violation of the Energy Organization Act of 1977 which requires the President to develop and transmit a national energy policy to Congress. With all the untapped, invaluable resources in the country: centuries of unmined coal, shale oil, solar energy, synthetic fuel, unexcavated oil, why are we investing in other countries with our taxpayer's dollars and not our own country for the sake of the future of our people? We must ask a basic question: Is it in our people's in-

terest—the American people's interest—to go to war at this time. I believe the answer is "No"! The cost of our participation—more than $2 billion a month—has led us into a recession which has seen a loss of almost a million jobs in the last 5 months.

Americans are being asked to pick up the tab for essentially the rest of the world. Neither Japan, England, Germany, France, the Soviet Union, et cetera collectively are giving what the American people have given at a time when our people lack the means to education, to health care, and to full employment.

And what of the sacrifice of American lives. I visited many of the American troops which are now almost one-half million strong. These young people are among our best and brightest Americans. They are loyal and patriotic. And whose children and loved ones will be killed if there is a war?

H. Ross Perout, conservative, super patriot, graduate of the Naval Academy, business genius, stated that he addressed 15,000 CEO's since August—few had children serving in the Gulf and most favored war. In Congress, two have sons serving. So the troops who are serving in the Gulf are sons and daughters of the workers of this country. Once again, it will be the middle- and moderate-income people who will pay with their loved one's lives.

Why is this America against Iraq and not the world against Iraq—the manpower—the loss of lives—our young men and women will be essentially American. Can we afford to drain our country of its most valuable resource: Its youth? Can we afford the estimated thousands of American lives lost when are goals are confused? And can we afford to destroy ourselves internally, as surely will be the case, with the loss of American lives? I believe the division in this country will be as insidious as the war itself. I believe our country is at a crossroads of enormous consequences. Our destiny as a nation is what we are debating today. It is time we said in this Congress America first. I am not elected by Europe, Saudi Arabia, or Japan, I am elected by the American people and the American people must come first.

Finally, what are the consequences of war for America and the world. Today, with deafening silence on the part of the administration we see the Soviet troops marching into Lithuania and the Baltic countries, the unrest in the Asian provinces of the Soviet Union, the civil unrest in China, the extreme tensions in the Middle East, the disparity of wealth and the poverty of the people in Africa and Central America. If war breaks out, there will be no surgical strike for Saddam Hussein, there will be a world war of untold dimension. All of our dreams for world peace will have been shattered because of the failure to negotiate and let the sanctions work. My colleagues, the American people's future, the world's destiny, is in our hands. Let us weigh our vote carefully, let us uphold the Constitution and, let us give the international sanctions more time to take hold. Supporting the Gephardt-Hamilton resolution is truly the only civilized vote we have! Let us vote for it, and cast a vote for the American people.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, "how horrible, fantastic, incredible, it is that we should be digging trenches and trying on gas masks here because of a quarrel in a far-away country between people of who we know nothing." As familiar as you may think these words sound today, they are, in fact, those spoken by Neville Chamberlain after Hitler's annexation of the Sudetenland in 1938 and shortly before the appeasement at Munich. Chamberlain went on to say, "he [Hitler] told me privately and last night he repeated publically that after the Sudeten German question is settled, that is the end of Germany's territorial claims in Europe."

Mr. Speaker, we are here today at another very momentous time in history debating the same age old question: whether or not a civilized world will allow another tyrant to blatantly invade and plunder a sovereign nation, and rape and torture its people. Such aggression clearly violates all civilized ideals and international order. And if it is allowed against one nation, then no other nation can be secure from similar attacks.

So I strongly support the bipartisan resolution authorizing the use of our Armed Forces against Iraq. Our best, and perhaps last, hope for a just solution to this crisis and for avoiding armed conflict is to convince Saddam Hussein that this Congress and the American people are all united in our determination that he withdraw unconditionally from Kuwait. By equivocating for whatever reason, or by showing him that we are weak in our resolve, we will only encourage him to continue on his present course of intrasigence.

Mr. Speaker, we all agree on our ultimate goal: the complete and unconditional withdrawal of Iraqi forces from Kuwait. We have tried United Nations imposed sanctions and we have tried diplomacy. Giving sanctions more time to work will not cause Saddam Hussein to change his position. It will only strengthen his standing among various elements in the Arab world and give him more time to solidify his defenses and further develop his military capabilities. And only a few days ago, we witnessed another diplomatic failure when Iraqi Foreign Minister Aziz refused to even discuss a withdrawal from Kuwait. Unfortunately, it now appears that the only option left is the use of military force. No one relishes the idea of sending anyone in harm's way, but the alternative is appeasement of aggression. And history has shown us that appeasement only encourages more aggression.

Mr. Speaker, we have regrettably arrived at another time in history when we must vote to fight or cower before another tyrant. That crucial decision is now ours to make, but it is not the final one. The final decision will be Saddam Hussein's, and we must not send him the wrong message at this critical time.

I, therefore, urge all my colleagues to support the bipartisan resolution.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, we would all like to live in an ideal world, in a world free of war and oppression, in a world where we all could be whatever it was that we wanted to be. Unfortunately today's world remains far from the ideal and as much as some of the idealists in our society wish otherwise, world events do not always go according to plan.

I hesitate to draw upon the often voiced comparisons, upon the imperial designs of Adolph Hitler and his Axis powers, to make the point that the people of the planet earth are often faced with situations that defy easy solution. Unfortunately power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely. In Saddam Hussein we have a figure who features himself as the modern day Mohammed, as the chosen leader of the Arab people, as the one to rid the Middle East of the Israelis. He attempts to dismiss his most recent action, the takeover of neighboring Kuwait, as simply the settlement of a long standing border dispute. Iraq has no designs on Saudi Arabia he maintains. Iraq lays no claim to territories beyond its presently constituted borders he says. Yet this is the same man that invaded neighboring Iran when he thought it was opportune; this is the same man that promises to level Tel Aviv if the multilateral forces in the gulf attempt to retake Kuwait; this is the same man that used poison gas on his country's Kurdish minorities when they were threatening to secede.

George Bush and the leaders of the Western world have taken the only stand they can take against this tyrant. Admitedly no one likes the thought of playing "chicken" with the world's future, no one wants to see a replay of the "Gun Fight at O.K. Corral," particularly when the guns involved can wreak untold havoc on the populations involved, but I'm compelled to ask, what is the alternative?

We clearly cannot let him keep his ill-gotten gains. We clearly can't look the other way as if nothing has happened. Give sanctions more of a chance we are told. Hit him where it hurts, in the pocketbook. The problem with the sanctions is that it puts time on the side of Saddam Hussein. It gives the Iraqis a chance to harden their defenses and to better prepare for war while testing our country's willpower and logistic and manpower capabilities to the limit. Just as President Truman in 1945 felt compelled to use the weapons at his disposal to hasten the end of World War II and in the process save countless lives, President Bush is faced with a somewhat similar call as the confrontation in the Middle East comes to a boil.

A lot of the criticism surrounding our country's troop presence in the Persian Gulf is centered on our dominant role in this pending conflict. One hears the repeated questions of, why should we be the world's policeman; why should we feel an obligation to lay American lives on the line to resolve a dispute which is

not of our own making? Why don't we let the Arab League resolve what appears to be an Arab problem?

First off, the problem isn't simply an Arab problem. It is a problem that could threaten the peace and prosperity of the world community for many years to come. The United Nations has recognized this fact by its strong condemnation of the Iraqi takeover. As the world's primary proponent for a stable and orderly global community, the United States is looked to for leadership in such situations. It is a role that goes with the turf, so to speak. By being the dominant force in the free world, we automatically assume the mantle as the world's watchdog. To deny our primacy in world politics is to decline a leadership role in forging a world order that will be committed to lasting peace.

I do not believe any American wants this country to turn inward, to isolate itself from world affairs. We can't and we shouldn't. At the same time, what disturbs me most about the confrontation in the Persian Gulf is that many of the other major nations of the world that should have a similar interest in seeing Iraq denied its conquests, are letting Uncle Sam do their bidding for them. By putting Uncle Sam out on the point both militarily and financially, they are abdicating their responsibilities to a stable world order.

Getting back to the days of the Third Reich, then too countless countries defaulted on their obligations to defend the principles of peace and freedom. The United States was not one of them then, nor should it be one of them now. By supporting bipartisan resolution and giving the President the authority to use all the means at his disposal we will send one final signal to Hussein that complying with the will of the international community and withdrawing from Kuwait is his only recourse.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. FRANKS].

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, as a new Member of this body, I may never cast a vote more difficult or more critical during my tenure as a Congressman. I rise in support of the Michel-Solarz resolution.

Mr. Speaker, no one would want to engage in a conflict that would result in the loss of American lives. There are many people in my district who are deeply troubled and gravely concerned about this crisis, as they are across this Nation.

Closer to home, personally, my nephew was enrolled in an ROTC program at Seton Hall. My brother is a colonel in the Army Reserves. I have a cousin who is a lieutenant colonel in the Army, and another cousin who is a recent graduate of the Air Force Academy. All could potentially serve with our forces in the gulf, and all would be proud to do so.

There is still a slim chance, however, that economic sanctions and diplomacy could bring about a peaceful solution to this crisis by January 15. But, if we are unable to convince Iraq to leave Kuwait with those methods, we must be willing to use all means necessary as set forth in U.N. Resolution 678.

If we show a lack of resolve, this Congress will be sending the wrong message to the world, which could encourage others to copy what Hussein has done, attack and conquer a peaceful and friendly country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to vote for the bipartisan Michel-Solarz resolution, and show that Congress strongly supports the efforts to remove the Iraqi military forces from Kuwait.

Mr. ANDREWS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. PAYNE].

□ 2200

Mr. PAYNE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Solarz-Michel resolution.

Only 5 days remain until the President and our allies must decide whether and how U.N. Resolution 678 is to be implemented.

Each of us is greatly concerned with the potential reality that our American soldiers will be in harm's way in any action in the Persian Gulf. Each of us has spoken to the families at home who have husbands, wives, children, who have been sent to Saudi Arabia to defend our national interest. We share their concern and their anquish.

This is the first major test of the post-cold-war world. How we respond tomorrow, next week and next month will have implications far into the future.

Like my colleagues and my constituents, I hope that a peaceful, diplomatic solution can be achieved. I am increasingly concerned, however, that such a diplomatic solution can not be found.

I would like to think that the continued use of economic sanctions and diplomatic pressure alone would convince Saddam Hussein that he must withdraw from Kuwait.

But I do not believe that continued economic sanctions will bring about the goal of an Iraqi withdrawal from Kuwait.

To delay implementation of U.N. Resolution 678 is to give Saddam Hussein a victory of sorts. It elevates him to a status in the middle-East that he so desperately wants, and that we and our allies—Europeans and Arabs among them—are trying to avoid.

Finally, if we wait, I believe that the broad and diverse international coalition assembled against Iraq will eventually unravel.

This vote is not about oil. It is not about the price of gasoline, nor the price of home heating fuel.

Ultimately, the questions that we will consider tomorrow are neither political nor economic.

The questions before us are moral. What kind of world do we want our families to live in? What is the proper role of the United States in a world that is increasingly interdependent?

Is it a world to be governed by decency and civility at home and abroad?

Or is it to be a world in which despots and dictators use the tools of force, instead of the force of reason?

We await the results of the U.N. Secretary General's trip to Baghdad, this week-end. Meanwhile, I urge my colleagues to support our troops and our President and the Solarz-Michel resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I Yield 5½ minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH].

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, No more profound decision can be made by any Congress, President, or nation than to send its young men and women to war. That has always been true, but it is especially so today when the weapons of war are so destructive, when in the span of just a few moments many thousands of people can be killed, the innocent along with the guilty.

And, of course, there is no question that if war breaks out in the Persian Gulf, tens of thousands will be killed, Iraqis and Americans primarily, most of them simply victims of those who make these momentous decisions.

This debate is about whether such a war, with all of its attendant bloodshed and suffering, is really necessary at this time.

This is not a debate about the goals of American policy. The goals are widely supported. They are to force Iraq to withdraw from Kuwait, and to demonstrate to Saddam Hussein and others like him that the international community will no longer tolerate this kind of naked aggression.

In furtherance of those goals, this Nation and most of the world joined together to impose economic and political sanctions on Iraq, and dispatched our military to enforce those sanctions and deter further aggression. President Bush deserves credit for having devised the sanctions strategy, and most of us have given him our strong support.

But now the President and others have concluded that the strategy won't work, and that war is the only way to achieve our common goals. This debate is about that fundamental change in strategy, and specifically about whether this Congress agrees that sanctions will not work and that war is now necessary as a last resort.

I firmly believe that it is much too early to say that sanctions won't work. It is much too early to impatiently throw up our hands and bring on the slaughter of war. I therefore support the Hamilton-Gephardt resolution and oppose the resolution offered by Mr. SOLARZ and Mr. MICHEL.

Like some others who have already spoken, I also serve on the Intelligence Committee. I have been briefed regularly by our intelligence professionals, and I can assure you their judgment is that the sanctions have already hurt the Iraqi economy and over time will

have an increasingly significant impact.

Judge William Webster, the Director of the CIA, delivered an unclassified statement on the impact of sanctions in December. At that time he stated that sanctions had "dealt a serious blow to the Iraqi economy" (p. 1). He made a number of other statements which are instructive on this critical issue, and I would like to share a few of them with you.

The sanctions have all but shut off Iraq's exports and reduced imports to less than 10 percent of their preinvasion level. All sectors of the Iraqi economy are feeling the pinch of sanctions, and many industries have largely shut down. Most importantly, the blockade has eliminated any hope Baghdad had of cashing in on higher oil prices or its seizure of Kuwaiti oil fields. (p. 1)

More than 90 percent of imports and 97 percent of exports have been shut off. Although there is smuggling across Iraq's borders, it is extremely small relative to Iraq's pre-crisis trade. (p. 3)

The cut-off of Iraq's oil exports and the success of sanctions also have choked off Baghdad's financial resources. . . In fact, we believe that a lack of foreign exchange will, in time, be Iraq's greatest economic difficulty. The embargo has deprived Baghdad of roughly $1.5 billion of foreign exchange monthly. (p. 4)

Please remember that Director Webster made those statements over a month ago, and everything we have heard from the intelligence community since then has reinforced his judgments.

In projecting the impact of sanctions on the Iraqi economy in the months ahead, Mr. Webster said the following:

We expect Baghdad's foreign exchange reserves to become extremely tight, leaving it little cash left with which to entice potential sanctions-busters. At current rates of depletion, we estimate Iraq will have nearly depleted its available foreign exchange reserves by next Spring [1991]. Able to obtain even fewer key imports Iraq's economic problems will begin to multiply as Baghdad is forced to gradually shut down growing numbers of facilities in order to keep critical activities functioning as long as possible. Economic conditions will be noticeably worse, and Baghdad will find allocating scarce resources a significantly more difficult task. (p. 7)

It is difficult for me to understand how anyone can conclude, in the face of this testimony from our own intelligence agencies, that sanctions are not working and will not work in the future. To be sure, Judge Webster also said that "there is no assurance or guarantee that economic hardships will compel Saddam to change his policies. . ." (p. 2) This point has been made by a number of the proponents of the Solarz-Michel resolution.

They have also cited a letter released just yesterday by Judge Webster in which he states that there is "no evidence" that sanctions will force Saddam out of Kuwait. Well, of course there's no evidence or guarantee. No one can expect to know what Saddam might decide to do some months from now.

What we do know, however, is that the economic sanctions are already biting and will have increasingly severe consequences for Iraq as time goes on. For this reason it is much too early to conclude that economic sanctions, together with the continuing threat of military force, will not work.

Some have argued that Iraq didn't quit when it suffered economic hardships during its war with Iran, and therefore it won't back off in the face of these sanctions. It is true that Iraq suffered in its last war, but this is a very weak analogy.

In its war with Iran, Iraq had support from virtually all of its Arab neighbors, from the Soviet Union, and from most of the West. Even the United States provided food aid. Today, Iraq is virtually sealed off from the rest of the world. Its GNP has already been cut by about 50 percent, and experts tell us that over time it will be down by 70 percent. The fact that it persevered in its war with Iran is no proof of how it will respond to the severity of the current sanctions.

It's possible, of course, that some of our allies will lose interest in sanctions. There is no sign of that, but it could happen. In that case, there would be some political loss, but it is important to recognize that Iraq is dependent on access to the Gulf for most of its imports and exports. The U.S. Navy controls that access, and therefore we could maintain an effective embargo without much help from others. Nonetheless, we who favor continuing sanctions rather than war must concede that there are some risks in being patient. The American people might also tire of the sanctions policy.

However, the risks associated with the sanctions strategy have to be weighed against the costs of going to war. Not only are casualties likely to be high, but if we are preceived to have initiated hostilities prematurely, our country will be deeply divided over this war. The costs of such divisiveness at home are incalculable. Moreover, our people have yet to be told how much this war will cost and how it will be paid for.

Beyond these domestic concerns, we have to expect that war will fracture the current international consensus. Many of our European allies will distance themselves, and we can expect active hostility from a large segment of the Arab population. What will the ultimate effect on U.S. interests be in the Middle East? What will the real aftermath of war have in store for us in this volatile region? I haven't heard the proponents of war answer these vital questions.

Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that some of our colleagues are inclined to authorize war because of actions beyond our control: the intransigence of Saddam Hussein, the imposition of the arbitrary January 15 deadline, President Bush's insistence that it is the last chance for peace and his denigration of sanctions, the massive deployment of American troops.

These unfortunate actions do create a climate more conducive to war than to patience. They make it easier to argue that sticking with sanctions will be seen as a lack of will. But that doesn't make the argument right. It doesn't mean that war is the most responsible choice for our country at this time.

So long as there is any reasonable prospect that sanctions can achieve our common goals—and I believe there is such a prospect—it would be unconscionable to send our young people to war, with all of the human, financial, and political costs that will be associated with war.

I therefore urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the Hamilton-Gephardt resolution, and to reject the Solarz-Michel resolution.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS].

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, as we traveled this week throughout the Middle East we found that people in Egypt, Israel, and Saudi Arabia are looking to the United States for leadership.

From Cairo to Jerusalem—the current expression is that "the street is with us." Recent polls indicate that sentiment is true on the streets of this country too. We are all proud to be Americans.

All accounts of Saddam Hussein suggest his inexperience. He doesn't understand democracy—he doesn't understand open debate and free speech. And he does not understand that we can differ among ourselves as we examine the means to achieve our goals and then pull together as one Nation with giant resolve to get a job done.

Saddam Hussein has misread the world's reaction to his actions and he now misreads our debate.

This is no time for misinformation and half-truths—there are some in this debate—who flatly say the draft is coming—and higher taxes too—if we pass Solarz-Michel. Well I say that is poppycock—at a meeting this morning with Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Colin Powell, I asked about the draft. I got a direct answer: Absolutely not. There are no plans to reinstate the draft. As for higher taxes—right now our troops are working with an arsenal that has already been paid for. The Pentagon is not asking for higher taxes in support of this resolution.

Some have said that the sanctions are working and can work to achieve our objective of getting Saddam out of Kuwait. I know of no facts to warrant such a judgment. On the contrary, there is known to be plenty of leakage in the sanctions sieve—and even if

leakage were stopped, best evidence is that it could take 2 to 3 years to have a decisive impact on Saddam's military capabilities.

Earlier this week in Egypt several of us met with President Hosni Mubarek—a courageous leader who is taking a lot of heat for his support of the world coalition. I asked him why, and he said to me with the utmost conviction "It's a matter of principle."

Mr. Speaker this is a matter of principle. And it's the most important one we can stand for. The difference between right and wrong.

If this Congress requires delay, our position deteriorates. If we delay, Saddam will hibernate and come out stronger in the spring. If we delay we risk the potential, if not the likelihood, for more casualties. Mr. Speaker, delay could mean defeat.

Do we care? Does it matter if we abdicate our world leadership role? I think it does—and I think Americans, deep in their hearts, think so too.

Mr. Speaker, the failure of the bipartisan resolution we have before us would tie this Nation's hands and remove the military option. Passage of Solarz-Michel preserves both the sanctions option and the military option. Why shouldn't we use all the tools at our disposal? I urge my colleagues to support our President and support our troops—it's been said many times here today and I believe it's true—we still have one last, best hope remaining for peace. I urge that we take it by voting for Solarz-Michel.

□ 2210

Mr. ANDREWS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Solarz-Michel resolution.

There is no disagreement whether Saddam Hussein is a deadly threat to peace in the Middle East and challenges the stability of a new world order. Iraq is an aggressor, and its conquest and pillage of Kuwait cannot stand.

There is no disagreement that the United States has vital interests in the Persian Gulf, and that we have deep commitments to our allies who are threatened by Hussein's aggression.

There should be no disagreement about our responsibilities. The world community is joined together to force Iraq from Kuwait. We are the leader of the free world. If not us, then who will stand up to Hussein?

Let there be no doubt, the eyes of the world watch this Congress to see what step we will take. What we are to decide in this debate is whether to strengthen the President's hand or to undermine his policies.

No one wants our Nation to go to war. I believe the best hope to avoid that calamity, the best hope for peace in the Middle East, the best hope for the security of our allies and our own economic and military interests in the region is for the Congress to stand firm with the President and virtually the entire international community. To avoid this decision now, to rely too much on sanctions will only undermine our policies and embolden our enemy. The costs for America will only increase.

During the Cuban missile crisis, President John F. Kennedy said:

> My fellow citizens, let no one doubt that this is a difficult and dangerous effort on which we have set out. No one can foresee precisely what course it will take, but the greatest danger of all would be to do nothing. The 1930's taught us a clear lesson: aggressive conduct, if allowed to go unchecked and unchallenged, ultimately leads to war.

John Kennedy was a cold warrior, and that was a different time. But tonight the issue is the same. The best course of action for this Congress to take, the best hope for peace is to show our resolve and support this resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. OLIN].

Mr. OLIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Hamilton-Gephardt resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the debate we are having today is critically important. It's critical for two reasons. First, it will permit the House to debate and to vote on whether or not we intend to carry out our constitutional duty and obligation to determine whether or not this Nation is to go to war. And second, it will provide an opportunity for the President to hear open discussion of his strategies, culminating in a series of votes which should give him a good reading on the degree of support he has for what he is doing.

I'm sure most of us agree that in the matter of going to war both the President and the Congress must agree or we don't go. I intend to support the Durbin-Bennett resolution to reconfirm our duty and obligation to declare or not declare war.

Now, on the issue of strategy and policy. Following the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait, I fully supported the President's prompt action to put forces in place and arrange for wide multinational support to stop further aggression. This effort was eminently successful and is a great credit to the President's skill and determination. The blockade and sanctions established have been unusually effective and, as we all know, they have resulted in further aggression being deterred, the release of all the hostages, the restoration of adequate oil supplies and severe economic pressure on Iraq. Iraq may be able to feed itself but it certainly cannot keep its technical military and industrial equipment going for long without imported replacement parts and the help of skilled technicians who are no longer there.

The sanctions have been a success and as time passes they will be a further success. I was surprised on November 8 when the President announced his decision to double our military force.

He then announced that sanctions were not working. He laid down an ultimatum to Iraq and arranged for a U.N. resolution setting a drop dead date.

In December, the President said he would try to arrange talks, but to my knowledge there have actually been no real diplomatic efforts to develop a solution to our problem, other than all-out war. The meeting this week between Secretary Baker and Tariq Aziz was merely a statement of positions. This could have been the beginning of a negotiation had it occurred months ago, but it didn't. I can only guess that the President concluded that negotiation would work totally to our disadvantage, so he decided to have none at all.

So here we are. The President has asked us to approve going to war, to give him full decision authority. Secretary Baker has said that our goal is to drive Saddam out of Kuwait. When that is done, he said, we will have won. When asked what he thought the situation would be in the Persian Gulf after we had won the war, he said, well there are some other problems we will have to deal with but we'll get into those after the war is over.

Ladies and gentlemen, I can tell you I am worried and I do not like what I see. I know that Iraq is going to try to attack Israel if we attack Iraq. Israel will fight back. I know that the Arab countries want to push Israel into the sea. I know that there must someday be a solution to the Palestinian problem, the West Bank and Gaza for there to be peace in the region.

I think we have two objectives in this situation. One is to be sure Saddam Hussein gets out of Kuwait and does not continue to be a threat to others in the area. The second, and of equal importance, is to find a way to bring peace and stability to the region. A war can certainly get Saddam out of Kuwait and destroy his military strength. But where will a war leave us on the larger problem of peace and stability and on our desire to help Israel be a successful nation that can live at peace with its Arab neighbors.

I do not, in my heart, believe that there is any chance of being better off on the broader issue by attacking at this time. On regional stability, I don't think we are even close to agreement with anyone on a reasonable solution. Some will say we don't care. Let's destroy Iraq and at least we will have one less enemy. Regardless of what else happens we will be better off.

Well, I am not so sure. I do not think we should go to war until we have a better fix on how we are going to end the war. We need to have some basis for how we are going to approach the larger problems. We need to be sure we understand and agree on what our real objectives are.

I have the feeling we're being driven to war. It is almost like a self-fulfilling prophesy. It's becoming a matter of patriotism and flag-waving. It would be great to support the President, have a quick war, get the troops back home again, be proud of what we did and be at peace with the world. But my inner mind and my conscience tell me it is not going to be that way. Our true goals are not clear, our plans are not complete, we will not control our destiny once the war starts, we have not assessed all the risks, the cost will be great in lives and money and we have no assurance we will not have chaos as a result.

I was at the breakfast meeting with the President this morning. Many of these issues were brought up and I found no comfort in the President's answers. It is not at all clear how we can come out of a war without having greater problems than we have now.

I will be supporting the Hamilton-Gephardt resolution to stay the course, tighten the sanctions, get some meaningful talks going and lay plans for after the war. Then, if we are ready, if there truly is no other alternative and we know where we are going, let us approve a Presidential request to declare war and have a war that we are more sure we will be proud of.

I urge the members to vote for Hamilton-Gephardt. It is a harder way but it is surer.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Gephardt amendment.

Mr. Speaker, the issue of war and peace is dominant on the mind of every American today. I have just completed a series of 10 town meetings in communities large and small throughout my State of South Dakota. Each meeting was attended by overflow, standing-room only crowds with their interest focused exclusively on events in the Persian Gulf region and America's proper role in the international order of this new post-cold war era.

Several points were made abundantly clear at these meetings: That our views on America's foreign policy differ greatly, but we are united in support of those courageous men and women in uniform who serve our Nation at great risk to themselves and their families; that while our views differ, we are united in our commitment to America and one position is not somehow more loyal or patriotic than another; that while our views differ, we are united in our condemnation of Iraq's invasion of Kuwait and appalled at the brutality that has and is taking place there.

But the decision to commence an offensive war is perhaps the most fundamental of all decisions made by any nation—clearly, for the preservation of American liberty and our most cherished rights, South Dakotans will lay down their very lives and lives of their children. Our contributions to past war efforts have been immense, and we view those sacrifices with patriotic pride.

But as I travel my State of South Dakota, visiting the town meetings, the church basement hot-dish suppers, the high school graduations, if I am to embrace the widow of a National Guardsman, or hold the hand of a reservist's orphan, I need to be able to look that person in the eye and tell them that their loved one's death was absolutely necessary to preserve America's liberty, and that there were no other alternatives.

My constituents have been telling me overwhelmingly, and I deeply believe, that the issues at stake in the Middle East today simply do not rise to such magnitude to justify what will be an almost exclusive sacrifice for American families—at least not until all other options have been exhausted.

Immediately following the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait, our Government put a stop to further Iraqi aggression into Saudi Arabia—that has been accomplished, the border aggression of Iraq has been stopped in its tracks. Is it worth the blood of thousands of our finest young people—is it worth the billions from our treasury—billions which could so much better be put to use for the benefit of our own people, is it worth what will with virtual certainty be the generations-long American military presence in the Middle Eastern deserts, all this to remove Iraq from Kuwait this month rather than this year?

Iraq is unique in its vulnerability to multinational sanctions—the embargo has cut off nearly 100 percent of its exports, including oil, and 90 percent of its imports. Iraq's GNP has already been reduced by an estimated 50 percent, and economists predict it will decline by 70 percent as Iraq's economy and military machine is beggared.

The current sanctions are truly international in nature—immediate war, however, will Americanize the conflict in an unmistakable manner. The Wall Street Journal recently quoted a top Arab diplomat as chuckling that he certainly wouldn't send his teenaged son to fight over Kuwait, but why should he, when their American slaves will do all the dying for them—and tragically, he assessed the current situation all too well.

CIA Director William Webster has noted that Iraq's military capability erodes each month that goes by, due to the shortage of spare parts, munitions, and equipment breakdowns brought about by the international trade embargo, an embargo which serves to thwart Iraq's high tech and nuclear weapon development as well.

There is, of course, a possibility that military action now may be quick and decisive; but there is also the much greater possibility that a region-wide war, including the unknown consequence of an Israeli presence, will occur. Our strategy cannot be premised on the notion that immediate use of the military option will result in a quick, and for us, a largely bloodless, solution. Even after an American military "victory," the aftermath is likely to result in the need for a huge American military presence for generations. Given the reaction of Islamic governments to large numbers of deaths at the hands of Christian and Jewish forces, the certain terrorism, and the fanaticism that is likely to be unleashed, it is difficult to imagine a region which will be made safer and more stable as a consequence of this war. This is truly a moment in time which requires of us the courage of patience.

The world which watches us today should understand that policy making in a democracy is not a neat, simple process. Debate is sometimes loud and rancorous, and may give the impression of divisiveness. But in a democracy, public debate is essential—it is a manifestation of our Nation's strength, and not of weakness.

Saddam Hussein, you should not misread this debate. Our people, our President, and our elected officials, Republican and Democrat, are absolutely united that you must leave Kuwait—we differ here today only on whether to accomplish this end by crushing your economy and military capability over time through world-wide sanctions, or to do so through an immediate military effort. Your failure to leave Kuwait will destroy your nation either way.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VISCLOSKY].

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to endorse the Hamilton-Gephardt resolution as we debate our future, a unique opportunity in history in matters of life and death.

The future is about our country, the world community and the 21st century and how the world community will resolve conflict. It is also about the future of young people, young people throughout the world, particularly those in the desert, those whom I will nominate next Tuesday morning to attend the U.S. military academies, and those who are yet to be born.

It is a debate about a unique opportunity in history. There has been a change in the world order. There is increased democratization throughout the world.

Setting aside the immediate crisis at hand, the world today is safer than it was 2 years ago, but obviously much less stable and much less predictable. However, in the immediate future at hand, the world community has come together. They have come together to indicate that they will not tolerate aggression, that they will contain and ostracize those who do not conduct themselves in a human fashion.

But ultimately we must resolve the question of whether or not we all have the strength of patience to persevere in concerted diplomatic and economic efforts until all options are exhausted before military action is taken.

On Wednesday evening of this week, I held a town forum in Gary, IN, and one of the 73 speakers was Father Charles Kniblik. He spoke briefly but eloquently. Father Kniblik indicated Wednesday evening that Congress had a tremendous opportunity to educate the youth of our country and the world, to educate them that we will not tolerate aggression, that we will not tolerate violence, but we will deal with those transgressions through the strength of our convictions to the last degree, and only then exercise the military option. The siege of Richmond lasted for a year. Sanctions against South Africa have not worked overnight. We have been patient in containing communism since 1945. The free world has stood fast in Korea since 1953.

Clearly, we are not talking about waiting decades to have the removal of Saddam Hussein from Kuwait. However, just as clearly, we should not have ever anticipated the sanctions would work in simply 5 months.

Clearly, the answer is sanctions must be given a longer period of time to work.

Finally, we are dealing with questions of life and death. I have a son, John, 3 years old, and a son, Tim, 10

months old. It is obviously an academic question as to whether or not their lives are at stake tonight, but I do ask myself: Is it worth their lives? Is it worth the lives of anyone else's children to protect the vital interests of the United States as dictated in terms of whether or not Hussein has to be out of Kuwait by midnight, next Tuesday? I think the answer in terms of our children's lives and our vital interests is next Tuesday night is not the time.

Let us stand firm. Let us stand resolute. Let us see this crisis through to the end, but let us give every chance of peace to prevail.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN].

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, we come before the House today focused on matters of utmost gravity: the unprovoked invasion, occupation, and plunder of Kuwait by Saddam Hussein, and the appropriate American response.

President Bush has asked Congress to indicate support for the 12 U.N. Security Council resolutions that have passed to date, including resolution 678 (1990), authorizing the use of force in the Persian Gulf, should all else fail.

It is time now to put partisanship aside and endorse the U.N. resolutions on a broad bipartisan basis.

The U.N. resolutions, after all, have been supported by practically every other nation in the world—a very disparate group which came together to oppose the bestial abuse that Saddam Hussein has inflicted on Kuwait.

What is at stake? World order in the post-cold-war world is at stake. Preventing the settlement of disputes by use of naked aggression and plunder is at stake.

It is not the price of oil about which we are concerned; if that were the case, we would have waged war on OPEC a long time ago. Rather, it is the control over the world's economy that would come if Saddam Hussein should emerge as the dominant leader of the Arab world, with influence over half of the world's proven oil reserves.

It is domination of the Arab world and the Middle East by a leader who has launched two wars in less than a decade, who has shown no compunction about using chemical and biological weapons, and whose arsenal may soon include nuclear weapons—that is at stake.

Only if the United Nations effort is successful is there any hope for a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

Why not wait longer before endorsing the U.N. resolution on force, waiting for economic sanctions to take a toll on Iraq? We should not wait precisely so that U.S. commanders and our Commander in Chief can move in a way and at a time that maximizes the chance of success and minimizes the risk to U.S. servicemen and servicewomen.

Calling for further action by Congress or setting additional future deadlines only allows Saddam Hussein to stand down his forces to conserve valuable resources—to limit his military exercises, to reduce the readiness levels of his armed forces, and to minimize the damage that sanctions would impose on his ability to fight. The Director of Central Intelligence, in a letter to Chairman Aspin, has just concluded that "even if sanctions continue to be enforced for an additional 6 to 12 months, economic hardship alone is unlikely to compel Saddam to retreat from Kuwait or cause regime-threatening popular discontent in Iraq."

Further delays also would deny U.N. and U.S. forces the ability to select the optimal time for any action—an important consideration in light of the fact that, 6 months from now, daytime temperatures in the desert will likely exceed 140 degrees, rendering the use of force virtually impossible. Delay is the fatal opiate of the faint-hearted.

Moreover, a protracted stalemate may not only increase the costs of potential conflict, but entails an indefinite period of difficult economic sacrifice imposed on our National Guardsmen and Reservists who have been called to active duty. These individuals and their families have been forced, in some cases for 6 months now, to make due on military salaries. For reserve military people who have already settled into civilian life, replete with house payments and other obligations, this is an entirely untenable economic situation. Beyond this, the size of the current United States presence in the Persian Gulf precludes an effective rotation of forces without reinstituting the draft—a step that I would oppose.

As Republican Leader BOB MICHEL has noted so well, "Patience at any price is not a policy, it is a cop-out." In words attributed to Robert F. Kennedy, "If not us, whom? If not now, when?"

Why not simply negotiate more? President Bush has taken every step possible to achieve a peaceful solution to the Persian Gulf crisis and has vowed to continue to do so. I believe him.

President Bush knows the horrors of war. I served in the Marine Corps during the Korean war and know its trauma. I have a son flying F/A-18 fighter bombers in the Marine Corps today, and I am quite aware that duty may call him to fight.

The United States has supported negotiation of the disputes between Iraq and Kuwait once Iraq's occupying forces are withdrawn. To negotiate as a condition of withdrawal, however, would be to reward aggression.

This is not a declaration of war. The resolution before us today provides the Commander in Chief with the authority to use such measures as he may see fit, including the use of force. I believe it is important to recognize, if it comes to the point of pursuing military force, that our Nation will be seeking not the unconditional surrender of the Iraqi Government, but rather a reversal of Saddam Hussein's pillaging of Kuwait.

This is an important distinction, in my view. Our mission is not the destruction or occupation of Iraq, but rather, participation in an international effort to achieve the salvation of Kuwait. Such fighting as may occur in or over Iraq will be carried out with the goal of rescuing Kuwait from a brutal occupation and limiting Saddam Hussein's ability to strike at us and our allies. We have no quarrel with the Iraqi people.

Nor does endorsing the U.N. resolutions mean we will engage in conflict on January 15. It means that we have an additional option as of that date. And, if Saddam Hussein is persuaded of our unity in this regard, it is the last best hope for peace.

We cannot have 535 Commanders in Chief or Secretaries of State or Defense. Congress cannot micromanage military operations. We have only one President at a time.

That President has vowed to take, and has taken, every step possible to achieve a peaceful solution. Nobody—not me, not any of my colleagues, and most of all, not the President—wants a military conflict. But all are agreed that Saddam Hussein must withdraw from Kuwait. This Congress should give the President the ability to use all necessary means to accomplish this objective.

□ 2220

Mr. ANDREWS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. CLEMENT].

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the Solarz-Michel resolution. This is one of the most, or probably the most difficult decision I have ever had to make in my life, of all the jobs and positions I have held, of all the decisions that I have made. I do not know of any that are more soul searching than to make this decision that we are ultimately going to make very soon.

I want to now direct my remarks to Saddam Hussein. I know Saddam Hussein watches CNN.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OBEY). The chair should point out under the rules the gentleman must direct his remarks to the Chair.

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, I will address my remarks to the Chair. However, I also know that Saddam Hussein listens to CNN. I want him to hear everything that I have to say because today with many of my colleagues, I had the opportunity to meet with

President Bush, and it came accross to me and many of my other colleagues very clearly that President Bush has every intention toward moving toward military action after January 15. He made that very direct today.

However, Saddam, it is not too late, whether you work with the Secretary General of the United Nations, the Soviet Union, France, or any other intermediary country, it is critically important that you send some type of message to the world that you want peace.

I sent a member of my staff to Iraq 6 months prior to the invasion of Kuwait. His trip was paid for by the Arab American Affairs Council and not the American taxpayers. My staff member had the opportunity to travel all over Iraq. When he went to the ruins there at Babylon, there are some engravings of Nebuchadnezzar, who we all read about in the Bible, that ruler of the then known world at that particular time. In the engravings, it says "This is the beginning of my kingdom." But right next to that stone of Nebuchadnezzar is also a stone of Saddam.

I had the opportunity to meet and visit with the emir and members of the royal family recently. The emir told me, referring to Saddam Hussein, that "You are not a 21st century man, that you don't think as we think, and you cannot be trusted." Well, Saddam, this is a different world. The cold war is over. The new world order is taking shape.

Your people have suffered enough. Your people deserve a future. You have the power to change the world by announcing your intentions to withdraw from Kuwait. Saddam, you can work with the United Nations to accomplish that objective. It is not too late, but the clock is ticking.

Let Memberrs rise above hatred and mistrust, and let Members also support the Solarz-Michel resolution.

We have all been critical of the United Nations in the past, but they have made a bold move now. Let Members stand by the United Nations, and let everyone have peace.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would take this occasion to remind all Members that under the rules, they must direct their remarks to the Chair and not others in the second person.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKLE].

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate my colleagues on the thoughtfulness and eloquence of this debate. Their comments have brought into sharp focus the critical issues facing Congress, our country, and the entire world.

I am particularly sympathetic to our freshman colleagues who must cast as one of their first votes in Congress a vote that will help determine whether to send American troops into battle. I know how difficult their position is; as a freshman Congressman I was called upon to vote on the Gulf of Tonkin resolution in 1964. That resolution was adopted in support of President Lyndon Johnson's decision to respond to an attack on American troops, and I believe if we were attacked in a similar manner today, Congress would again respond with similar support. However, this situation is different.

The Congress of the United States strongly supported President Bush when he sent American forces into the Persian Gulf to oppose Iraqi aggression and prevent an attack on Saudi Arabia. We supported the President when he deployed U.S. troops and applauded his ability to assemble a broad coalition of nations, including many Arab nations, in opposition to the aggression of Saddam Hussein. The debate in which Congress is now engaged does not indicate opposition to what President George Bush has done. This debate is not whether we support the President. The question is when we start offensive action.

However, events have reached a critical turning point which requires Congress to consider whether to authorize American armed forces to be used in an offensive military action to implement the U.N. resolution and force Iraq to withdraw from Kuwait. Congress is asked to ratify a shift from diplomatic efforts to resolve this crisis to military efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I continue to believe that we should support the President's use of military force to continue to enforce economic sanctions and to support and defend American personnel stationed in the Persian Gulf. However, I also believe that a little more time is needed to pursue the last hopes for a peaceful diplomatic resolution to this crisis. At this point, I favor the use of military force as embodied in the Gephardt-Hamilton resolution, primarily to gain a little time.

At the same time, I do not think we can rely indefinitely on economic sanctions alone for 6 months or a year in hopes of resolving this situation. Continuing the sanctions that long as the sole means of bringing this crisis to a conclusion in the timeframe is not realistic, and you and I know that the President will not accept that approach.

I am glad that the Gephardt-Hamilton resolution gives the President the authority to come back to Congress with a finding that all alternatives have been exhausted and seek final approval to use offfensive force. This resolution does not tie the President's hands, but gives him the flexibility I believe he and other world leaders need to continue to seek peaceful solutions. If all possibilities are exhausted and no peaceful answer is found, I think Congress will and should at that time support the President's request for offensive military capability.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I hope that January 15 will not be interpreted as a deadline for U.S. military action, but that 2 or 3 additional weeks—or some reasonable time—should be used to explore all remaining options that might lead to a negotiated solution. I admit that there may be little hope that a negotiated settlement can be reached, but I call upon all parties to this crisis to take this extra time to intensify their search.

I call upon the Secretary General of the United Nations to continue to explore any new possibility of peacefully enforcing its resolution.

I call upon the international community of nations to renew their efforts to help find a solution. If no solution is found, we risk a global conflict in which every major nation in the world will be involved. Those nations should help to find a solution, and should be aggresive in that search.

I call upon our Arab allies in particular to join in a new clear and forceful plea to Saddam Hussein to explore a peaceful settlement.

And I call upon the President of the United States to remain flexible and dedicate a little more time to the search for peace, and listen to any fair and reasonable option that will achieve our objectives.

Surely there is some way in this great world that we can find a way that this bloodshed can be prevented. But if we authorize offensive military action now, I fear we may extinguish that faint hope. A little more time is needed, Mr. Speaker, a little precious time.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. PICKLE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman how much more time? When he says a little bit more time is needed, how much more time does he believe will be necessary?

Mr. PICKLE. I suggested perhaps 2 or 3 weeks, a time that would be agreeable to the President. I do not believe you could go on for 6 months or a year with sanctions. The Gephardt-Hamilton resolution under the rule allows the President to come back at any time.

I would hope we would take another 2 or 3 weeks to see if we cannot find some solution and then if there is no solution in that short time, then I think the President should come back and ask us, and I think the Congress would support him.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. The gentleman would support the Solarz amendment in 3 weeks' time?

Mr. PICKLE. Yes; that would be my intention. That approach, or something like it.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3½ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, 3 days ago, I had the opportunity to visit the Middle East and speak to the troops and political leaders. Let me say, that troop moral is high, political leaders are united, and the military force is in place.

Never, in recent history has there been an international coalition like the one forged to oppose Saddam Hussein. It is not hard to understand why. Since August 2, Saddam's troops have literally raped and plundered the peaceful country of Kuwait.

Yesterday, I received Amnesty International's report of the human rights violations in Kuwait since August 2, 1990. No Member of this body should vote tomorrow until they have had the opportunity to review this document. It is shocking. The report details widespread abuses of human rights that have been perpetrated by Iraqi forces following the invasion of Kuwait.

I, respectfully, request that pages 37–40 be included with my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. These pages describe the cruel methods of torture practiced by Saddam's troops.

The members of the U.N. Security Council recognized that permitting the use of force is the best hope of peacefully resolving this crisis. Now it is our turn.

We have the opportunity to support the U.N.'s resolution which permits the use of force, or we can turn our backs on world opinion.

I agree that it would be best to give sanctions more of a chance to work if there was any reasonable possibility that they would bring an Iraqi withdrawal from Kuwait. No one looks forward to war or the loss of life an armed conflict would inevitably bring. But, realistically the prospects for the success of sanctions are slim.

Yesterday, Congressman LES ASPIN, the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, received a letter from CIA Director William Webster regarding sanctions. Judge Webster has some reliable things to say about the difficulty of relying upon economic sanctions. He says:

> Even if sanctions continue to be enforced for an additional 6 to 12 months, economic hardship alone is unlikely to compel Saddam to retreat from Kuwait.

Also, when you consider that this is a man who dropped chemical weapons on his own people, and fought a bloody war with Iran for 8 years it is obvious he is unconcerned about the discomfort economic sanctions may bring.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to submit Judge Webster's letter for the RECORD and to be included with my remarks.

I would like to close by saying the Michel-Solarz resolution is our best option for long-term peace and stability in the Persian Gulf. This measure has the support of world opinion. The United Nations has acted, now it is our turn. Do we turn our backs? For the sake of a lasting world peace I hope not.

Mr. Speaker, the articles referred to are as follows:

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY,
Washington, DC, 10 January 1991.

Hon. LES ASPIN,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your letter of January 9, 1991, in which you ask for an updated assessment of the impact of sanctions on Iraq and on the policies of Saddam Hussein subsequent to my testimony before your committee in December. In that testimony, as you accurately noted, I observed that the sanctions were effective technically and that they were being felt economically and eventually would be felt militarily in some areas. I also testified that there was no evidence that sanctions would mandate a change in Saddam Hussein's behavior and that there was no evidence when or even if they would force him out of Kuwait.

You now ask me to: (1) address the impact of the sanctions on the economy and populace of Iraq and on the operational effectiveness of its military if left in place for another six to 12 months; (2) address the question of how Iraq's defensive abilities might be affected by the sanctions on the one hand and by having additional time to prepare on the other if sanctions are allowed to work for another six to 12 months; and (3) address the likelihood that sanctions, again if left in place for another six to 12 months, could induce Iraq to withdraw from Kuwait.

UN sanctions have shut off nearly all Iraq's trade and financial activity and weakened its economy, but disruptions in most sectors are not serious yet. The impact of sanctions has varied by sector. The most serious impact so far has been on the financial sector, where hard currency shortages have led Baghdad to take a variety of unusual steps to conserve or raise even small amounts of foreign exchange. For the populace, the most serious impact has been inflation.

The ability of the Iraqi ground forces to defend Kuwait and southern Iraq is unlikely to be substantially eroded over the next six to twelve months even if effective sanctions can be maintained. This is especially true if Iraq does not believe a coalition attack is likely during this period. Iraq's infantry and artillery forces—the key elements of Iraq's initial defense—probably would not suffer significantly as a result of sanctions. Iraq can easily maintain the relatively simple Soviet-style weaponry of its infantry and artillery units and can produce virtually all of the ammunition for these forces domestically. Moreover, these forces will have additional opportunity to extend and reinforce their fortifications along the Saudi border, thereby increasing their defensive strength. Iraq's armored and mechanized forces will be degraded somewhat from continued sanctions. The number of inoperable Iraqi armored and other vehicles will grow gradually and the readiness of their crews will decline as Baghdad is forced to curb its training activities. Iraq has large stocks of spare parts and other supplies, however, which will ameliorate the effect of these problems. On balance, the marginal decline of combat power in Baghdad's armored units probably would be offset by the simultaneous improvement of its defensive fortifications. While the military, especially the army, has been protected from the impact of sanctions by stockpiling and minimal usage, during a military action the impact would be more profound as equipment and needed parts are expended.

Iraq's Air Force and air defenses are likely to be hit far more severely than its Army, if effective sanctions are maintained for another six to twelve months. This degradation will diminish Iraq's ability to defend its strategic assets from air attack and reduce its ability to conduct similar attacks on its neighbors. It would have only a marginal impact on Saddam's ability to hold Kuwait and southern Iraq. The Iraqi Air Force is not likely to play a major role in any battle for Kuwait.

In December, during my appearance before the House Armed Services Committee, I noted that while we can look ahead several months and predict the gradual deterioration of the Iraqi economy, it is more difficult to assess how or when these conditions will cause Saddam to modify his behavior. Our judgment remains that, even if sanctions continue to be enforced for an additional six to 12 months, economic hardship alone is unlikely to compel Saddam to retreat from Kuwait or cause regime-threatening popular discontent in Iraq. The economic impact of sanctions is likely to be increasingly serious, with conspicuous hardships and dislocations. Nevertheless, Saddam currently appears willing to accept even a subsistence economy in a continued attempt to outlast the international resolve to maintain the sanctions, especially if the threat of war recedes significantly. He probably continues to believe that Iraq can endure sanctions longer than the international coalition will hold and hopes that avoiding war will buy him time to negotiate a settlement more favorable to him.

We have seen little hard evidence to suggest that Saddam is politically threatened by the current hardships endured by the populace. Moreover, Saddam has taken few actions that would indicate he is concerned about the stability of his regime. Assessing the populace's flash point is difficult, but we believe it is high because Iraqis have borne considerable hardship in the past. During its eight-year war with Iran, for example, Iraq endured a combination of economic difficulties, very high casualties, and repeated missile and air attacks on major cities without any serious public disturbances.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM H. WEBSTER,
Director of Central Intelligence.

METHODS OF TORTURE AND ILL-TREATMENT

The following are details of allegations of torture and ill-treatment which have been made to Amnesty International since 2 August, some of which are supported by medical evidence and photographic material [see Appendices C and D]. These reports are entirely consistent with methods of torture and ill-treatment known to have been used in Iraq over many years, and some of which are also supported by medical evidence [see in particular Amnesty International's report entitled "Torture in Iraq 1982–1984", published in April 1985, and the organization's annual reports].

It should be noted that not all of the methods listed below are said to have been widely used since 2 August. Those methods which

have been alleged only in a few cases brought to Amnesty International's attention are marked with an asterisk (*).

1. Beatings on all parts of the body, involving punching, slapping, delivering Karate-style blows and kicking with heavy army boots. Implements used for beating include canes, metal rods, whips, steel cables, hosepipes, rubber truncheons and rifle butts.

2. Falaga: prolonged beating on the soles of the feet. Sometimes the detainee is then forced to walk or run.

3. Suspending the detainee by the feet, or by the arms which are tied behind the back.

4. Beating the detainee while suspended from a rotating fan in the ceiling.

5. Breaking of the arms, legs or ribs; dislocating elbow and shoulder joints.

6. Lifting the detainee high up in the air and then dropping him, sometimes resulting in the fracturing of bones.

7. Applying pressure to the fingers with a clamp-like instrument.

8. Slashing the face, arms or legs with knives.

9. Extracting finger and toenails.

*10. Boring a hole in the leg, apparently with a type of drilling tool.

11. Cutting off of the tongue and ear.

12. Goughing out of the eyes.

*13. Castration.

*14. Hammering nails in the hands.

15. Piercing the skin with pins or staplers.

16. Shooting the detainee in the arm or leg at point blank range, followed by deprivation of the necessary medical treatment.

17. Rape of women (including virgins) and young men.

18. Inserting bottle necks, sometimes when broken, into the rectum.

*19. Tying a string around the penis and pulling it tightly.

*20. Pumping air using a pipe through the anus, particularly of young boys.

21. Applying electricity to sensitive parts of the body, including the ears, lips, tongue, fingers, toes and genitals. Sometimes the detainee is doused with water prior to the administration of electricity. The electrical instrument used include electric batons as well as wires fitted with clips (like those used to recharge car batteries but smaller in size).

22. Burning various parts of the body, including the genitals, with domestic appliances such as electric irons, with heated metal rods, or with a naked flame.

23. Extinguishing cigarettes on the eyeballs or on various parts of the body, including the genitals, nipples, chest and hands.

24. Pouring hot and cold water alternatively over the detainee.

25. Placing the detainee in a cold, air-conditioned room for several hours, and then immediately into a heated room.

*26. Pouring an acid-like substance onto the skin.

27. Pouring caustic substances onto the eyes, causing blindness.

28. Plucking facial hair, particularly the beard, with pincers or pliers.

29. Placing heavy weights on the detainee's body.

30. Spitting into the detainee's mouth.

31. Exposing the detainee to the sun for several hours at a stretch without water.

32. Subjecting the detainee to mock execution. This includes holding the head below water to the point of near suffocation; going through the motions of execution by firing squad; and holding a gun to the head or in the mouth and pulling the trigger.

33. Forcing the detainee to watch others being tortured, or to hear their screams.

34. Raping or torturing the detainee's relatives in his or her presence; threatening the detainee with such acts.

35. Threatening the detainee with torture methods such as the electric chair [al-Kursi al-Rajjaj], or with death by immersion in an acid bath.

36. Deprivation of medical treatment.

37. Deprivation of sleep, food, water, fresh air and toilet or washing facilities.

38. Degrading the detainee by using obscene language or insults.

Mr. ANDREWS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, as I begin my third term as a Member of this house, I can think of no issue more important, or more solemn, upon which we have been called to cast a vote. Many issues are described as matters of principle, and indeed, many are, but none are of this magnitude. Often we are told that an issue or vote is a "matter of life and death" for some group, but that is a hollow claim when viewed against a vote on the issues now before us.

It seems to me that we face two types of decisions. One involves the assertion of the constitutional role of the Congress on the question of using military force. The second question has to do with the wisdom of choosing one strategy over another and with the question of timing.

I firmly believe this Congress has a right under the Constitution and a duty to the American people to vigorously debate the issue of using military force in response to the invasion of Kuwait. I believe each of us must search our hearts and our minds and then cast a vote which reflects our considered judgment, our moral conscience and our Nation's best interest.

Three basic, fundamental requirements must be met before any American military force is used in any situation:

First, there must be a clearly defined goal. Neither friend nor foe should ever have reason to question what it is that motivates our use of military force or what we seek to accomplish. If the objective can not be clearly and precisely defined, then something is wrong with the policy and we in government have no right to put the lives of our military forces at risk.

Second, there must be strong public support for the policy. If the American people are divided or confused as to the proper course of action, if they can not agree on where our true national interests lie, then it will prove impossible to sustain any meaningful commitment to the use of force.

Third, there must be a commitment to prevail. If we use force, we must do so with the determination to win. If we have clear goals, and enjoy public support, we must not lack the resolve and determination to see matters through to the resolution we desire. If we use force under these circumstances, we must have the commitment to use sufficient force to accomplish our legitimate goals.

Our experience in Vietnam and more recently in Lebanon has shown that if we cannot meet all three of these requirements, our policy is likely to fail, at an irreplaceable cost of blood and treasure.

People ask me why are we there? Is it oil? Is it preserving peace in the gulf? Is it to set the ground rules for a new, post-cold war order? My reply is, "It's all of the above."

It was President Jimmy Carter, in 1980, who declared our Nation's resolve that aggression in that part of the world "will be regarded as an assault on the vital interest of the United States. And such an assault will be repelled by any means necessary, including military force."

There can be no more clear-cut act of aggression than Iraq's invasion of Kuwait. Those who remember, and those who have studied history, see the clear parallels with Germany's aggressive policies in the 1930's. At that time there was a great public chorus calling for "preserving the peace," for seeking negotiated solutions, and ultimately for turning a blind eye as each victim was devoured by a beast whose appetite for conquest only grew. When we finally took a stand, the battle was much tougher, the cost much higher.

In the present crisis more is at stake than simply control of oil supplies, even though this itself is of vital concern to all nations which are not completely self sufficient in energy. When Iraq invaded a peaceful neighbor and then declared the unilateral merger of the two nations, an action condemned by all nations of the world, it presented a fundamental challenge to the world community. We can talk about the end of the cold war and how to spend our peace dividend, but the question now is what we, together with our allies and the members of the United Nations will do to resist this act of naked aggression. In our reaction to this first crisis of the post-cold-war era we will be setting the ground rules. All those dictators with ambitions against their neighbors will be watching and drawing their own conclusions from our conduct. If they see there is no real penalty for aggression the world will have become a much more dangerous place for all of us.

Make no mistake, in today's world, where ballistic missiles can be bought as readily as trucks and tractors, even countries as poor and technically backward as Iraq can threaten mass destruction far beyond its own borders. Iraq has demonstrated a commitment to developing atomic weapons, weapons it might now have if not for Israel's preemptive strike on their atomic reactor in 1981. All the world has an interest in resisting any increase in the power of such predatory dictatorships.

We are fortunate to enjoy the support of nearly all the nations of the world for our present policy. Not only our NATO allies, and Japan, but even those countries which frequently oppose us in the United Nations are now not only supporting us verbally, but many are sending ships, aircraft and ground troops. Others are making military bases available in support of these operations. Such international cooperation is unique in postwar history.

Mr. Speaker, I will support the Michel-Solarz resolution. From all of the information available to me it seems clear that our best hope of restoring the independence and territorial integrity of Kuwait lies in convincing Saddam Hussein that failure to comply with the United Nations' demands for total and unconditional withdrawal will involve Iraq in a military conflict it cannot hope to win.

I sincerely hoped that sanctions would work. However, I also sincerely believe that a policy which avowedly relies on sanctions alone is doomed to failure. The threat of force may actually increase the prospects for a diplomatic solution.

I do not consider this to be a vote which will automatically result in armed conflict. But I do acknowledge that this vote approves and endorses the use of force, if such becomes necessary, in the judgment of the President, acting as commander in chief, to accomplish our stated goals.

I believe it is the role of Congress to make the policy judgment as to whether or not force should be authorized. Once that authorization has been given, I believe it is the responsibility of the President to make the strategic and tactical judgments as to how and when such force should be employed. Both the Congress and the President bear a tremendous responsibility, but we must all remember that our responsibilities are separate and distinct.

When we vote tomorrow, let us speak clearly to the issue before this House. Let us not equivocate or temporize. And again, let us not confuse the avoidance of conflict with advancing the cause of peace.

Mr. SMITH of FLorida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KOLTER].

Mr. KOLTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Hamilton-Gephardt resolution and in opposition to the Solarz-Michel Resolution.

Many people of my district are strongly opposed to military action in the Middle East. They know, full well, the grave consequences of war. These are people of experience and knowledge. They have heard the rhetoric of war before. They have heard the promises of quick, decisive action that have not come true. They remember young, brave, patriotic soldiers who did not return home, or who did return home less than whole. They know that diplomacy and economic sanctions are much better than death and destruction and dislocation.

We have been advised by the administration and other leaders that this war will end in 3 or 4 days, perhaps in 1 week. However, my colleagues, it will never be over in the minds and hearts of people who lose loved ones or whose loved ones come back from war less than whole.

It seems absolutely ludicrous to me that we have not learned the lesson of 20 years ago in a conflict that saw the losses of over 50,000 American lives and thousands of young people wounded. Have we not learned that military action does not solve the underlying problems in these areas and that it is the lest effective alternative in both economic and human costs?

We have been asked by President Bush, Members of Congress, and various groups who think war is the answer, to stand behind and be proud of our troops in the Middle East. There is no question that we are all proud of our service men and women and we do stand behind them. But I wonder, Mr. Speaker, will President Bush, the Pentagon, the Veterans' Administration, and Members of Congress stand behind these same men and women if and when they come back to us as veterans of war? Will these same people guarantee that our veterans' hospitals will be able to take care of our veterans' needs.

History shows that the Reagan-Bush administration made repeated requests to eliminate benefits of our present veterans and many Members of Congress voted to approve these cuts.

Mr. Speaker, if we really want to stand behind our service people, let us insist that President Bush use his ability to establish an executive order to reinstate full benefits that were taken away from our present veterans and thus insure that future veterans—those in the Middle East—will be taken care of when they return to us.

I urge adoption of the Hamilton-Gephardt resolution.

□ 2240

Mr. MCCANDLESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER].

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that my first speech on the floor of Congress could be on an easier and less contentious subject—like balancing the Federal budget. Instead, I rise to discuss the most difficult and important issue Congress has faced in a generation, and to explain to my constituents and to you, my new colleagues, why I have decided to vote for the Solarz-Michel resolution authorizing the President to use military force against Iraq.

The decisions we make tomorrow will determine this Nation's ability to create a more peaceful and stable world in the 1990's and the next century.

We face one of those gut-wrenching occasions when our best chance for peace lies in our being able to threaten war with credibility. If we fail tomorrow to give the President the backing he needs to give meaning to the U.N.'s January 15 deadline, there is no reason why Saddam Hussein should believe we would ever use force, and there is no reason why any future aggressor should ever take us seriously.

Those who oppose the Solarz-Michel resolution say our credibility is not at stake because we have the military strength to demolish Iraq whenever we want. But they miss the point. If we cannot summon the will to authorize the use of that strength, all our divisions and all our weaponry are useless against an aggressor.

I agree with many of the points raised by the opponents of the Solarz-Michel resolution. But they are not pertinent to the central issue at stake today. Granted, we tilted too much toward Iraq before it invaded Kuwait. Granted, our allies should be contributing more troops and more money to the cause. Granted, Kuwait and the Arab members of our coalition are autocratic regimes that ought to democratize.

But all of this does not change the principal fact: The President and the community of nations have solemnly set January 15 as a deadline for Iraq's withdrawal, and the United Nations has authorized military action after that date. For Congress to deny the President the authority to enforce this deadline gives Saddam Hussein every reason to believe that he will never authorize war. It is as though we were telling him "if you don't get out by the time we count to 3, then we'll count to 10, or 20, or 30, or until we get tired of counting."

I am voting for the Durbin-Bennett resolution because it is our constitutional obligation to decide the course of our Nation at this critical moment in history.

I believe we should exercise our constitutional power now to authorize President Bush to use force as a last resort after all other means have been exhausted and after he notifies the leaders of Congress. And, frankly, I trust him with that authority.

Saddam Hussein has shown absolutely no willingness to cooperate with the international community. We can't continue in this manner indefinitely. As the father of two draft-age sons, I fervently share the hope for peace. But it is clear to me that at this point in history our best, and perhaps last, prospect of peace is to tell Saddam Hussein that the world will not go on playing his game forever, that we refuse to be drawn into a stalemate in the desert.

If we fail to stand behind this Nation's threat of military action, we will lose the value of such threats as a legitimate tool of diplomacy. Every tinpot dictator will be more willing to invade neighboring nations without fear of repraisal despite the rhetoric of all the nations of the world.

Our failure to act now will only postpone an inevitable conflict with Hussein and prove far more costly in the long run. This is a sobering moment. I am confident, though, that by acting wisely today, we will brighten the prospects for peace.

I call on my colleagues to join me in supporting the Solarz-Michel resolution in the interest of global stability and a more peaceful world now and for decades to come.

Mr. ANDREWS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlemen from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I support President Bush's handling of the Persian Gulf Crisis, including his request to use force to drive the Iraqi military from Kuwait. I will vote yes on the Solarz-Michel resolution.

This is the hardest decision that anyone can ever make. War is hell. Over the last five months since the August 2nd invasion, I have talked to hundered of Tennesseans as I have agonized and prayed about this crisis.

I respect to opinions of the many thoughtful, patriotic Americans who disageee with me. Ultimately, it boils down to a question of judgment. Does Saddam Hussein understand anything but force? Is time against him or us? Will our use of force be as effective as our generals claim? Will it add or detract from stability in the Middle East?

No one really knows the answers to these questions, so we should all be very humble in our statements. History will judge us harshly.

The lives of thousands of Tennessee volunteers are at risk. But I have been struck by the fact that almost every one of these brave men and women and their families say they support the President. They do not want to play any waiting games with Saddam Hussein.

Every President since Franklin Roosevelt, whether Democrat or Republican, has declared that we have vital national interests in the Middle East, particularly in their vast oil reserves. I hope that all Americans learn form this crisis what OPEC failed to teach us: we must wean ourselves from Middle Eastern oil. I also hope that we can bridge the cultural, religious and political differences that today separate us from so much of the Muslim world.

Since every diplomatic initiative has failed in the last 5 months, including a precedent-setting 12 United Nations resolutions and the recent Geneva talks, Congress faces a terrible choice at this late date in the crisis: First, continue economic sanctions; or second, authorize the President to use force to free Kuwait.

I choose the latter option, not because I like it—no one wants war—but because I don't believe that sanctions are likely to be effective against Saddam Hussein. Why? His country, unlike most Arab nations, is relatively fertile. Should there be shortages, Saddam will starve his people to feed his army. More and more goods will get through Iran and Jordan. And sanctions are a two-edged sword that hurt not only innocent Iraqi civilians, but also our allies like Turkey and Egypt.

Tragically, the threat of military action may be the only language that Saddam Hussein understands. He did not use sanctions against the Kurds, he used poison gas. He will view a vote for sanctions as a victory. We all hope that, once force is authorized, he will finally see that the United States is not a paper tiger. He will see that our debates don't make us weak; they make us strong.

I hope and pray that Saddam Hussein will relinquish Kuwait before hostilities begin. Everyone loses when war breaks out. But he—and every other would-be dictator—need to know that he will not get away with brutalizing his neighbors and his own people with weapons of mass destruction.

Saddam is just a large-scale terrorist. We must not give in to terrorists whether they take an individual hostage, or a nation like Kuwait hostage.

There are many things that I would have done differently in this crisis than President Bush. I suspect there are things he would have done differently. But now I am ready to help him do the best that he possibly can.

Mr Speaker, after tomorrow's vote we should all stand behind the President in this time of crisis, and at least give him as much leeway as the other nations of the world have been willing to give him. He's our President, we should trust him as much as they do.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAFALCE].

Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Operation Desert Shield and in opposition to Operation Desert Sword.

Mr. Speaker, I want to address my remarks not to my colleagues, for each Member has likely decided how he or she will vote; not to America, for my colleagues have already offered every argument imaginable. Rather, I will address myself tonight to Saddam Hussein:

You have made Iraq an outlaw nation. Every American, and especially every Member of Congress, condemns your aggession. Every Member of Congress insists that Iraq be ostracized from the Community of Nations, militarily, diplomatically, and economically, until you remove your troops from Kuwait. And we are prepared to presevere until Hell freezes over, if necessary, until that happens.

However, in our democratic society, there are always differences of opinion on how to achieve common goals. There is now a difference of opinion over whether we should use military force, at this time, to force you out of Kuwait. There are many who believe we must. They believe your are a virtual madman, and that therefore only destroying you and annihilating Iraq's military capacity will accomplish that. I suspect that they will be in the majority. For your sake, but primarily your people's sake, I hope you will get out before January 15, as the U.N. resolution demands.

There are a sizeable number, however, who are not yet convinced you are a madman. They believe your realize that a military encounter will result in your destruction, and that therefore you, if given some diplomatic over, will pull out of Kuwait. I hope so, for it not, I am completely convinced that the world will exercise the military option authorized by U.N. Security Council Resolution 678.

And when our President commits our troops to battle, Americans and Congress will rally around that military effort, and will demand that it be short and decisive. And there will be no disagreement on that, either in America or in its Congress. I would then fear for your people, who are also our brothers and sisters.

You engaged Irag in almost a decade long war with Iran. You caused the deaths of tens of thousands of Iraqis, and then gave back all gains you had achieved. You gained nothing and lost all.

Your have now invaded and ravaged Kuwait, and you must, and you will, give back every square inch of that country. You will do this either peacefully, or you will be forced to do it militarily. If you choose the latter path, again, you will be responsible for the deaths of thousands of Iraqis. Again, you will have gained nothing and lost all.

A great number of us will vote to continue Operation Desert Shield, to continue to sanctions, but to postpone the implementation of Operation Desert Sword, the offensive use of our awesome military might. I am one of those. For I believe that not only must war be an option of last resort, so too must declarations of war be options of last resort. But not misjudge our votes. We do this to give you another chance to exercise right reason, another chance to prove that you are not a madman, another chance to avoid a catastrophe of Iraq. But do not confuse this with disagreement over our objectives, our goals, our common purposes and common resolve. There can be only one result that will not lead to your destruction—you must get out of Kuwait.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. EARLY].

Mr. EARLY. Mr. Speaker, we are gathered in this great chamber to debate the gravest issue which can ever come before the House—whether this Nation shall go to war. I rise to counsel patience.

Let me state my appreciation, as a Member of the House for some 16 years, that we are debating this crucial issue. It is our duty to debate vigorously and openly a question of such grave consequences.

We are not "Democrats" or "Republicans" when we consider this issue. Rather, we are Americans, each seeking to do his or her best in fulfilling the awesome responsibility which the Constitution places on the Congress when the suggestion of war is raised.

I urge this body to do something which, in many ways, is the most difficult act * * * the act of being patient. This is difficult because most of us believe that our military forces can, indeed, quickly dispatch Saddam Hussein and the evil which he represents. Recognizing the clear superiority of our military power makes it all the more difficult, and in many ways frustrating, to exercise restraint. Still, patients and restraint are, at this moment, the best policies.

Consider the situation which we confronted, as a nation and as a civilized world, five short months ago. Iraq had overrun Kuwait. There was no real doubt that Saddam Hussein fully intended to consolidate his position and move on to Saudi Arabia. In a manner very similar to that of a common street mugger, Hussein had taken literally thousands of de-facto hostages from among the citizenry of almost every civilized nation in the world.

Led by the President, the world united against Hussein. An imperfect but also effective international embargo was instituted. A large multinational military force, again led by the United States, was quickly assembled. Hussein understood. He stopped in his tracks. There has been no further aggression. Hussein also understood that he had done something which diplomats had failed at for 40 years. He had created an issue and a crisis which brought together the United States and the Soviet Union against a common enemy, himself.

Hussein is evil. Hussein is corrupt. He is not, however, stupid. All the hostages were releasted without a shot being fired. There is a message in that. The message is that Hussein realizes that he has backed himself into a corner. Like the common mugger who finds himself face to face with a strong and armed police officer, Hussein is looking for a safe place to run. But the bully Saddam Hussein has no place to run. He cannot run from public opinion. He cannot run from the entire world. He can only face the consequences of his actions.

I repeat that this is the time for patience. We should recognize certain realities. The most fundamental reality is that there will be no real "winner" in any war in the Middle East.

How do you measure the "winner" of a war? By the fewest casualties? Indeed, is there a winner? Just losers—some lose less than others, and are declared the winners. But they are not the winners—only the survivors.

We should also bear in mind that the evidence indicates that the embargo is effective. Iraq is a nation which is not, in any way, self-sufficient. One day at a time, Iraq is strangling under the burden of worldwide repudiation and economic sanctions. As each day passes, Iraq and Hussein are becoming weaker, not stronger.

Iraq does, however, possess evil chemical warfare capability. Fortunately, we have never fought a war in which we have been confronted by the technology of the 1990's in the areas of chemical and biological warfare. While I have no doubt that the United States would prevail in a war against Iraq, and quite quickly, I suggest to you that we would also learn a terrible lesson about the evil which these technologies can inflict. We do not want young American men and women to be the laboratory on which this technology gets its first real test.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I counsel patience. Patience will spill no blood. Neither Americans nor Iraqi citizens, who simply have the misfortune to suffer under Saddam Hussein's dictatorship, will die. In the upcoming weeks Hussein will become weaker, not stronger. World opinion should be allowed to prevail. Justice will prevail.

□ 2230

Mr. MCCANDLESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER].

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, as a parent, I know of the uncertainty facing those whose sons and daughters are part of Operation Desert Shield. I pray that their loved ones will soon be returning home safely. The question before the House, how do we best achieve this goal?

Saddam Hussein is listening to what we are saying. He knows the U.N. Security Council has voted overwhelmingly to support all necessary means to achieve this goal. Can we afford to send Saddam a cloudy message? Can we afford to grant him the luxury of believing that the U.S. Congress will not join in the international insistance that he leave Kuwait by January 15? I do not believe we can.

Saddam Hussein has clearly shown us that he will forecefully if necessary, take whatever the nations of the world will allow him to take. In addition, he may very soon have nuclear weaponry. His threat is not going away, and we Americans, so often the victims of international terrorism, may well be his next targets.

Historians tell us that if the free world had stood up to Hitler in 1936 when he first violated the treaty of Versailles, we could have averted the far wider catastrophe of World War II. Would a more prompt containment of Hitler not have cost any lives? I doubt it. But the total loss of life would almost certainly have been significantly smaller than the 50 million who ultimately were killed in that war. The Michel-Solarz Resolution does not say we are going to war. The resolution simply authorizes the President to enforce resolutions already adopted by the overwhelming majority of the members of the United Nations. It says to Saddam Hussein that force is one option available if he does not choose to remove himself from Kuwait by January 15. For our greatest hope of peace I strongly urge your support of the Michel-Solarz Resolution.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, there can be no question that the actions we take here may very well be the most profound and important that any of us will ever be called upon to take.

In our first vote, we will be called upon to determine if the President has the exclusive power to take this Nation into war, or does the Congress also have a constitutional responsibility which it must discharge.

One this constitutional issue is clarified, we will be called upon to make a choice. One option is for the Congress to delegate its constitutional authority to the President and allow him to commit United States forces to an active military war against Iraq after January 15. Make no mistake about it, the President's resolution is tantamount to a declaration of war. The resolution gives the President the power to decide when and how to start the actual war.

The alternative to this is equally clear. Under the Hamilton resolution, Congress would retain its constitutional responsibility, instruct the President to withhold committing United States troops immediately to combat, and allow the current international economic embargo, blockade, and sanctions additional time to further weaken Iraq's military.

Voting for the Hamilton resolution does not mean that we may not vote to authorize the President to go to war at a later date. Instead, it means that we believe war does not need to begin immediately after January 15. It means that we believe our position will be strengthened by allowing the embargo, blockade, and economic sanctions to weaken Iraq's military.

Voting for this alternative also provides the President with the time he needs to clarify several crucial questions on the minds of the American people and to build a stronger consensus for war if it truly becomes unavoidable.

Mr. Speaker, let me make one thing absolutely clear: regardless of the choice the Congress makes in the coming hours, and regardless of what actions the President may take, the loyal American men and women who have answered the call of duty and are serving in the Persian Gulf have my unconditional support.

I believe I speak for the entire Congress when I say that regardless of the decision we make, we will provide whatever is necessary, in terms of material, encouragement, and protection to our soldiers. They deserve nothing less.

Speaking for myself, I cannot in good conscience place the lives of our sons and daughters in jeopardy at this time. American bloodshed should be the last resort, not the first.

The January 15 deadline is an artificial "line in the sand." The initial actions by President Bush, have resulted in an economic strangle

hold on Iraq, have not been given adequate time to work.

CIA Director William Webster, and seven out of the eight last Secretaries of Defense, have testified that the sanctions will increasingly weaken Iraq's military. It makes sense, therefore, to allow the sanctions to have their maximum effect, especially when the lives of American soldiers are at stake?

There are crucial questions about exactly what our objectives are. Is our goal to force Saddam Hussein to withdraw from Kuwait? If so, does this mean that an American offensive would stop at the Kuwaiti border?

Or, is our goal to completely remove Saddam Hussein from power? Do we intend to wipe out any future nuclear threat that may be posed by Iraq? If these are our objectives, then it is possible that American troops will never step foot in Kuwait.

Will we occupy Iraq following the war? If so, how long will we keep our troops there, and what will it cost? Will we also spend billions of dollars to rebuild Iraq after the war, as we did in Japan and Germany after World War II and as we are doing today in Panama?

Do we want to protect the availability of cheap oil? If this is the reason for our involvement, I would seriously question that priority. There are sufficient alternatives to Middle East oil. No American should die to keep the cost down. Further, it has been predicted that oil prices will soar if war occurs.

Is our objective to establish a long-lasting stability in the region? If so, what does this stability look like, and are we proceeding in the appropriate manner? Is it really possible to attain?

As we all know, the Persian Gulf has a long history of instability and shifting alliances. This will not change. Consequently, not only is our present alliance tenuous, but it is also unlikely that any coalition that is forged as a result of this war will last long afterward. We must proceed judiciously to ensure that the United States is not seen as a bully to rally against the future.

We also need to look at what we are protecting in the gulf. We are not protecting democracy. Neither Kuwait or Saudi Arabia is a democracy. Is there sufficient moral imperative for us to risk the lives of more than 400,000 loyal Americans?

Who has defined the ethical urgency to which we are responding? The international community, faced with the prospect of a new world order, should now take the time to define moral imperatives and what we are willing to die for.

By establishing an international code of criminal conduct the United Nations will give the American people, as well as the other citizens of the world, the reason and the moral imperative they need to take a truly international force to war.

This raises the question of what role of our allies have and will play in the current conflict. To date, the American taxpayers and the American military have borne the brunt of Operation Desert Shield. If fighting begins tomorrow, next week, or next month, it will be almost exclusively American lives which are at stake.

The United States can no longer afford to be, and should not be, the policemen of the world. Yet this is a role we are taking on. Clearly, our allies have assumed an insufficient share of the burden thus far, both in human and financial terms. This is all the more galling because it is their economic interests, far more than our own, which are at stake.

If the United States is to spend billions of dollars which we do not have on this war, we will undermine our already shaky global economic standing. At the same time, we will be strengthening the economic standing of our allies who are not even contributing their fair share.

Experts estimate that if we go to war, the cost will run between $500 million and $1 billion per day during the time of most intense fighting.

How will this money be raised? In the 1950's, Americans' income taxes were raised significantly, and an excise profits tax was enacted to pay for the Korean war. From mid-1969 to January 1971, a 10-percent surcharge was imposed on personal income tax to fund the costs of Vietnam.

To date, the President has not addressed what programs he will cut, or what taxes he will raise, to support the huge costs of this war.

I have introduced legislation, H.R. 475, requiring the President to submit to Congress, within 48 hours of initiating offensive military action, a report detailing the cost, both in terms of money and lives, of any military operation, and how he will find the money and manpower.

The President of the United States, as well as the Members of congressional leadership, are to be commended for bringing this debate to the floor of the House and the Senate. This is where it belongs, and the President's request for congressional authorization averts a constitutional crisis.

By holding this debate we are taking the time to decide what powers the President will have after January 15 to make war. Our ability to debate, decide, and air the views of the American people is one of the factors that distinguishes us from Saddam Hussein.

The Congress may well grant the President the power to go to war after January 15. If this happens, or if at any time our military forces are engaged in battle, our service men and women can be assured of my unconditional support. They deserve nothing less.

For my part, I do not believe that the national interest is best served by rushing to war after January 15.

Nevertheless, if we do go to war, we shall be united. We shall support our President. We shall spare nothing to back our troops. We shall prevail.

Mr. DWYER of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, as Members of the House of Representatives, we frequently have to make difficult decisions. We are called upon to cast votes which we find complex and troubling; we are torn by the crosscurrents of public opinion, our own world view, the pressures of interest groups. All must be considered in reaching a conclusion on the tough issues.

Yet, never in my 10 years as a Member of the House have I had to look at a more significant, more profound issue. We are talking this week not about whether to increase the tax on motor fuels; not about whether to surcharge incomes of more than $1 million a year or grant family and medical leave. We are discussing issues of war and peace.

The situation in the Middle East calls into question a variety of issues. The first and foremost among these is a determination of the vital interests of the United States and whether those vital interests are in imminent danger.

When the Iraqis invaded Kuwait and the potential existed for them to continue to move on into Saudi Arabia, the vital interests of the United States were clearly at risk. Largely through our own fault, we are substantially dependent on Saudi Arabian oil. The President moved quickly and effectively—with my strong support and the support of the American people—to preclude any further aggression. The work the President did to assemble international support for our efforts to stop Iraq was brilliant and achieved its purpose.

Once the aggression was stopped, we embarked on a course of economic strangulation. The United States and its international partners isolated Iraq, largely preventing its ability to import goods it needs and export its oil. Again, strong and effective leadership.

In November, however, without substantive explanation, the issue changed. The President unilaterally committed an additional 200,000 troops and dramatically changed the American position from a defensive posture to an offensive one. It was at that point, Mr. Speaker, that I had to leave the reservation.

There is substantial evidence that the sanctions are working. They are causing inflation thoughout Iraq, creating shortages, fostering discontent. Economic sanctions are not a "weapon of mass destruction" designed to have instantaneous effects. Rather they are an insidious weapon, designed to cut off the lifeblood of a regime bent on terror, at home and abroad.

War is a quick and relatively easy option; peace takes patience and hard work. It appears that our Government may have lost its patience and may be taking the quick way out.

There is no doubt that Iraq must leave Kuwait—that is beyond question. There is, however, a difference of opinion over how to reach that result in a way which serves America's best interests.

The President speaks eloquently about a new world order and we all pray that it will come to pass. But, part of that new world order must be the understanding that the United States of America is one nation—albeit the greatest and most powerful Nation on the face of the Earth. Our allies in this struggle must stand with us—not just with words, but with their soldiers and sailors and with their national treasure. Nothing less is acceptable.

From the time we were schoolchildren, we were taught that only Congress has the power to declare war and clearly that is where the power belongs. But my conscience will not allow me to take this step at this time. We need to stay the course—to show the patience of a truly great Nation. The sanctions must be allowed to do their job; the world community must join us as full partners in this endeavor.

All of the elements are in place to avoid war. With work and patience—with wisdom and with leadership—we can achieve our goals and keep the peace. This is the course

and effect of the Hamilton resolution which I will support. I will vote against the administration's resolution.

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker I rise in support of the Hamitlon-Gephardt resolution. As a freshman Member of the 102d Congress I am immediately faced with a vote that may send our country to war. It may be the most difficult vote I will cast throughout my tenure in Congress.

I have carefully listened to the arguments supporting and opposing the resolutions before this body. I agree that the only tolerable solution to Saddam Hussein's barbaric invasion of Kuwait is his complete withdrawal from that region.

I support President Bush's contention that nothing short of Iraq's removal from Kuwait should be accepted. My decision on these resolutions is predicated on what action by the United States will achieve the President's objective with the fewest American lives being sacrificed.

We should not allow our decisions to use offensive military action to be forced by an arbitrary date which was drawn in the sand in a vacuum devoid of considerations of the potential effectiveness of continued sanctions or diplomatic opportunities. Military force should be used when it is our last available alternative for removing Saddam Hussein.

I do not believe we have reached that point yet. I believe that sanctions put so carefully in place by President Bush and our allied coalition should be given more time to reach their full intended effect.

Let Saddam feel the full pinch of the worldwide embargo. Then if need be we'll consider military force. Let the United States establish a "new world order" that is achieved by measured patience, economic, and diplomatic sanctions, and lastly military threat.

During my first caucus meeting I was moved by the heartfelt comments of Congressman DE LA GARZA who stated that he hesitated to speak out in opposition to U.S. military action because he had a son who was stationed with troops in the gulf and that his personal feelings may make his arguments to this body less valid. My decision today is guided precisely by the sentiments of Representative DE LA GARZA and my constituents with loved ones at risk. If the United States were to engage its troops in desert battle in the near future, and I was approached by a constituent who had lost a son or daughter, could I look that persons in the eye and say my vote backing military action was the best alternative available?

That's the question I ask myself. My answer is "No."

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, last August 2, Saddam Hussein's Iraqi troops unleashed a devastating and unprovoked invasion on a sister Persian Gulf nation, the Emirate of Kuwait. In the more than 5 months since that violation of national borders, Iraqi troops have systematically destroyed Kuwait as an entity.

No one that I know condones Saddam Hussein's naked and illegal aggression. Everyone I have spoken with believes without question that Hussein should, and must, withdraw his forces from Kuwait and permit Kuwait the opportunity to rebuild.

Almost everyone with whom I have spoken in recent months fully supported the President's initial response to Iraq's invasion of Kuwait—the imposition of economic sanctions through an air and sea blockade as a means of making life more difficult for all Iraqis and the deployment of a defensive force—some 100,000 American troops—in Saudi Arabia as a means of preventing any further aggressive military action by Saddam Hussein in the Persian Gulf region.

There is now, and has been for some time, considerable difference of opinion as to whether we should build up American forces, to about 450,000 in order to establish the base for an offensive military response in order to force Hussein to withdraw from Kuwait.

I, too, have serious doubts about the direction we as a nation are considering.

Today, Mr. Speaker and colleagues, is a time for careful deliberation and consideration.

We have before us a resolution calling on the Congress to endorse the United Nations Security Council Resolution 678, which has established January 15, 1991, next Tuesday, as the date by which Saddam Hussein must withdraw from Kuwait or face the threat of armed conflict.

Mr. Speaker, there are questions which we, the elected representatives of the American people, must give thought to as we consider this resolution.

Have we really and truly enforced the economic sanctions and have we allowed sufficient time for those sanctions to work?

If we endorse the United Nations resolution and permit the President the authority to initiate an armed response in the Persian Gulf, are we then abdicating the Congress' constitutional responsibility for declaring war against another nation?

First and foremost, we should all recognize that it is American troops—men and women, husbands and wives, mothers and fathers—and all of their families, and ours, who will bleed and suffer, no matter how short or long an armed intervention will be.

It has been estimated that in a short-term conflict in which our Navy and Air Force will lead the way, as many as 1,000 Americans could fall in the first week. And, just keep this figure in mind, even as things are right now with no fighting, nearly 100 American troops have died as part of Operation Desert Shield.

In a longer military exercise, I have heard that the numbers of dead and wounded could top the 100,000 mark.

Are we prepared as a nation to see Americans coming home this way?

Most Americans, including most of us here today, know that under even the best circumstances, American soldiers, sailors, pilots, and other Air Force personnel would bear the brunt of the load under a United Nations umbrella.

But, Mr. Speaker, I must ask a serious question. When the United Nations Resolution 678 was adopted by the Security Council, where was the concurrent Security Council resolution calling on other members of the United Nations to support the action by sending either troops, war materials, or funds?

Why is there no Security Council resolution setting forth the responsibilities of other member nations?

There are some nations, 29 including the United States, that are in one way or another supporting the effort to drive Hussein out of Kuwait and to restore peace and order to the Persian Gulf.

But Mr. Speaker, there are 159 nations in the United Nations, and some of those nations that are not contributing to Operation Desert Shield are conspicuous by their absences.

It comes as no surprise that France, England, Canada, and a host of other European nations have sent token forces or other minimal assistance. And I must admit that I am presently surprised that such small nations as Bahrain and Bangladesh, along with several other African and Middle Eastern nations, have made token contributions to the effort.

Where, however, are Japan, Germany, and the Soviet Union? Why aren't these nations with significant means putting something into the pot?

Thus far, there has been evidence that the economic sanctions are not working as was originally thought, but that may be primarily because some nations in this world have refused to agree to the concept of isolating Iraq from the community of law-abiding nations.

It will take more time for the economic sanctions to have the desired effect and it may require that sanctions also be applied to those nations that are refusing to support them now, but that kind of action may well be far less destructive for America than committing its troops to a military action in the Persian Gulf.

Mr. Speaker, I must oppose the idea of giving the President the authority to commit American troops without a formal declaration of war by the Congress.

I am concerned about the abdication of constitutional authority of the Congress by even extending to the President permission to engage American forces in a military operation.

Twice in the 20th century, the Congress has declared war. In both cases, the declaration came after an event that touched America and Americans directly.

Almost 50 years ago, in the wake of the Japanese bombing of Pearl Harbor and other American bases in the Pacific and at the request of then President Franklin Roosevelt, Congress issued a declaration of war.

In 1917, then President Woodrow Wilson said:

> We entered this war (World War I) because violation of rights had occurred which touched us * * * and made the life of our own people impossible unless they were corrected.

In both World War I and World War II, we had a better sense of purpose. We knew who the enemy was and why we were fighting.

It was not that the loss of life was more acceptable then, only that the loss of American lives were tied to the goal of freedom and liberty. That has not been the case with other American military actions in this century.

I likewise, am not sure that we have a clear sense of purpose for an armed conflict in the Persian Gulf. I am not sure that we have been personally touched enough to justify sending American troops into a battle or a war.

Mr. Speaker, colleagues, while we can equate Saddam Hussein's takeover of Kuwait with the takeovers of Austria, Czechoslovakia, and Poland by Adolph Hitler in the 1930's and 1940, we are not following the pattern of acquiescence of England and France at that

time. We are fortunate to have history to guide us.

But neither is it necessary for us to engage in an immediate shooting war, putting American lives in jeopardy, without giving the economic sanctions and other peace initiatives a chance to work.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, some who engage in this debate characterize it as something that is very simple. It is, they say, a choice between doing something or doing nothing; a choice of strength or weakness; a choice between good or evil.

But in fact it is not simple at all. It is for some a choice of life or death. The question we face is whether words of persuasion will be replaced by weapons of war as a solution to the Middle East crisis.

We are told today we must stand with the President to send the message to Saddam Hussein. But it is not that simple either. For the message we are asked to send to Mr. Hussein is also a message that we authorize American troops to go to war in the Persian Gulf. Some, myself included, feel very strongly that it is far too early to authorize American troops to go to war in the Persian Gulf. We have not nearly exhausted the opportunities that exist for economic sanctions and diplomatic pressure to achieve our goals without resorting to war. The test of one who carries a big club is not how indiscriminately he uses it, but it is how he is able to accomplish his goals without having to resort to its use.

Let me be clear. I support the President's goals in the Persian Gulf.

There is no disagreement about our country's goals in the current crisis in the Persian Gulf. Iraq must be removed from Kuwait. The naked aggression Iraq exhibited in its invasion of Kuwait cannot be allowed to stand. That is the position of President Bush, and its my position, and I think that of most Members of Congress.

So the question is not one of goals, but of methods. The United States and its allies have moved quickly and decisively to impose economic sanctions on Iraq. Iraq, because of the economic blockade is unable now to sell its oil and raise the foreign currency that is necessary for its continued economic well-being. The result is that Iraq's gross national product will collapse.

Iraq is going to pay a very heavy price as a result of the continued patient application of these economic sanctions by the United States and its allies.

The United Nations at the urging of the United States has adopted a resolution setting a January 15 deadline for Iraq's withdrawal from Kuwait. The U.N. resolution authorizes the use of "force" if Iraq has not complied with its resolution by January 15.

As we count down now the final days to the 15th, the President is asking Congress to give him the authorization needed to use force in the Persian Gulf to remove Iraq from Kuwait.

This debate is troubling to me for a number of reasons.

First, I think that our objectives in foreign policy are best achieved when America speaks with one voice. We will in this debate be demonstrating that we are not of one mind or of one voice on this subject. But while I think that is troubling, it is not at all surprising. America is not of one mind on this issue. Our country is deeply split on whether we should order our soldiers to war in the deserts of the Persian Gulf. As untidy as a debate of this type might be, it is, I think, necessary in a democracy before committing our soldiers to die on the battlefield to determine whether it is in our national interest; whether there is a national will; whether there is a moral imperative to commit our troops to war.

A rancher from southwestern North Dakota came up to me after an evening meeting in late December and gave me a piece of paper on which was written this:

Ten thousand men marched off to fight,
When forty statesmen called it right.
But had the statesmen fought instead,
Their impatience would have cost but forty dead.

I wonder if old men deciding whether young men should fight would be quite so quick, quite so bold, quite so full of bravado, if they were leading the charge. I can't help but think that we are being far too impatient. Have we stopped Iraq's aggression? Yes. Since our deployment of troops, Saddam Hussein is stopped dead in his tracks. Have we exhausted the potential for economic sanctions to impose the kind of price on Iraq that will persuade Saddam Hussein to leave Kuwait? The answer's no. Have we exhausted all avenues of diplomatic pressure to achieve our goal in the Persian Gulf? I don't believe we have.

I think it is in this country's best interest to use of force only when it's clear that our goals cannot be attained through the continued patient application of tight economic sanctions and diplomatic pressure. In short, I think it is a mistake for this country to rush to commit its soldiers to combat before we have exhausted all other remedies.

There are a couple of other elements about the current mood here in Washington that bother me as well. Why are we so quick to Americanize this conflict? To call the force in the Persian Gulf a multinational force is a fig leaf. If there is war it will be a U.S. war. Our allies have not contributed their treasury and their troops in proportionate numbers to represent their responsibilities to keep the peace.

Shouldn't we constitute a true multinational force and require a true commitment of financial resources and troops from around the world before we take military action. Even if we end up not taking military action shouldn't the prominent peace-keeping force that will have to exist in that region be a true multinational force rather than Uncle Sam once again paying the price, bearing the burden, and incurring the risks? The answer is yes. It is time the President and Congress insisted on that kind of commitment from its allies.

The financial cost of Operation Desert Shield in the Persian Gulf without war is estimated this year to be $30 to $35 billion. With war, it will skyrocket far above that.

An enemy as dangerous to this country's well-being as Saddam Hussein is a budget deficit estimated to be $400 billion in this fiscal year.

Where is the grim determination, the steely resolve, the get tough attitude from President Bush or from this Congress to respond to the crippling deficits that are slowly but surely strangling this country's economy. As America perches precariously on the cliffs of recession and serious economic trouble, is it wise for President Bush and Congress to focus virtually all of our attention on a tinhorn dictator in Iraq rather than the serious threats to the American way of life here at home?

My colleagues, America is borrowing money from its allies and spending it to risk the lives of our young men defending our allies interests in a desert 10,000 miles from home—even as our unemployment lines lengthen, our economy turns sour.

As we debate the crisis in the Persian Gulf, let's understand it's also time to start dealing with the threat here at home.

Mr. OWENS of New York. Mr. Speaker, stop the madness. Stop the war. Deny the President the authority to wage war in the Middle East.

Let us make no mistake about what it is we are debating here. Attempts have been made to obfuscate and obscure what is really before us to provide some political cover for those among us who want to dodge the issue. But clever rhetoric cannot conceal it. We are debating war. The President has asked the Congress to give him a specific mandate to attack Iraq. That is what is at issue here: whether we will wage an offensive war against Iraq.

The administration has accomplished a great deal by its swift and skillful assembly of an international coalition aligned against Saddam Hussein's rape and annexation of Kuwait. Further Iraqi aggression has been contained; Saddam's forces have been stopped in their tracks. Sweeping, worldwide economic sanctions have been erected; the Iraqi economy is sputtering in their wake. If the President's true objective really is to liberate Kuwait and punish Iraq, he is well on his way to achieving that goal if he just holds the line and stays the course.

But Presidential temperance and restraint are about to be discarded. Suddenly impatient, President Bush is poised now to pitch American men and women into a calamitous bloodbath against Iraq.

We are urged by the President to join him in his rush to war because the United Nations has reputedly endorsed such an attack. We are told not to second-guess their decision. But the United Nations was wrong. And it is our duty to correct their mistake.

The costs in human terms of a war with Iraq are terrible to contemplate—terrible, in fact, that the Pentagon has refused to make any estimate at all of the potential American casualties in such a conflict. But other experts have given us some rough idea of the kind of carnage we can expect. Newsweek estimates that 5,000 Americans will die and 15,000 will be wounded in the first 10 days of war—as many as in an average year in Vietnam. The Center for Defense Information estimates 10,000 American dead and 35,000 wounded over 90 days. The Washington Post reports that the Pentagon has just made a rush order for 16,000 additional body bags. And Jack Anderson, citing Pentagon sources, has estimated that 30,000 Americans will be killed in the first 20 days of war. This, Speaker, is nearly as many dead as we lost during the entire Korean war.

Disproportionate numbers of those who will be slaughtered in the desert will be African-Americans. Nearly one-third of our soldiers in Operation Desert Shield are African-American, many of them with families in my 12th Congressional District in Brooklyn. Numerous others are Hispanic, Native American, and Asian. But this is an issue that is of particular concern to the African-American community. Young African-American men and women are three times more likely to be in the Armed Forces and involved in this impending war in the sand as young whites. Thousands more precious members of a generation already devastated by malignant Republican social policies here at home will be lost to a malignant Republican foreign policy abroad. Ironically—no, sickeningly—these young men and women who have been denied adequate health care, housing, and educational support by their own government will be sent into battle to try to restore a foreign government which provided free health care, education, and ever free telephone service to its oligarchic elites.

Yet with the prospect of so much bloodshed, of so many losses of American lives, the White House has offered up only the most feeble of rationales for its headlong rush to war—when it has bothered to offer them at all. But even if the potential casualties were smaller, a move toward war would still be unacceptable. I have heard not one word from the lips of President Bush that would justify the loss of a single American soldier in the sand of Kuwait.

War is never morally justifiable when peaceful means of resolving a conflict remain viable and available. But after a promising beginning, the White House has suddenly abandoned the pursuit of a peaceful resolution of the crisis. It tells us not that a United States military assault against Iraq is the only way to bring peace and stability to the Persian Gulf. War, in other words, is the only path to peace.

So many times before have we heard that chilling refrain from those who lead nations—and always with such tragic consequences for the men and women who are called to follow them. Old men declare war; young men and women fight and die; then old men sit down to make the deals they could have made before the war.

In this 1967 "A Christian Sermon on Peace," Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. underscored the fraudulence of this peculiar but all too familiar vision of the way toward peace.

It's one of the strangest things that all the great military geniuses of the world have talked about peace. The conquerors of old who came killing in pursuit of peace, Alexander, Julius Caesar, Charlemagne, and Napoleon, were akin in seeking a peaceful world order. If you will read Mein Kampf closely enough, you will discover that Hitler contended that everything he did in Germany was for peace. And the leaders of the world today talk eloquently about peace. Every time we drop our bombs in North Vietnam, President Johnson talks eloquently about peace. What is the problem? They are talking about peace as a distant goal, as an end we seek, but one day we must come to see that peace is not merely a distant goal we seek, but that it is a means by which we arrive at that goal. We must pursue peaceful ends through peaceful means. All of this is saying that, in the final analysis, means and end must cohere because the end is preexistent in the means, and ultimately destructive means cannot bring about constructive ends.

Dr. King was right. We cannot come killing in pursuit of peace in the Persian Gulf; we must pursue peaceful ends through peaceful means. We must hold the line, maintain the sanctions against Saddam, and resist the rush to war.

I do not understand the logic of those who now insist that economic sanctions cannot now do the job of getting Saddam out of Kuwait. Of course they can; economic sanctions work all the time and they are working now. Iraq's ramshackle economy is uniquely vulnerable to this kind of peaceful but potent economic pressure. And the scope and complexity of the sanctions now in place are unprecedented in modern world history. Sanctions will work if we give them time; there is no need for war.

President Bush has often said that what happens in the gulf at this moment in history is so critical because it promises to be the event that will define and shape the code of conduct among nations in what he calls the new world order. Indeed, it will be. Which is precisely why we must stop the war and stick with sanctions. With our votes this week, let us act to make the pursuit of peaceful ends through peaceful means the central guiding principle of the emerging new world order. Do not go killing in pursuit of peace.

I had hoped that the Democratic Party would leap into the vacuum of moral leadership at the highest levels of our Government and loudly declare itself in opposition to war. Americans are urgently seeking that kind of vision and leadership. But the Speaker has declared that this is a nonpartisan issue and has urged Members to vote their conscience on this issue. That they must do. Each Member here bears personal responsibility for what will happen in the next few weeks in the Persian Gulf.

I will be voting my conscience and voting against the war. My conscience tells me that to do otherwise would make me an accessory to murder.

Mr. BUSTAMANTE. Mr. Speaker, Congress can debate no more important question than the issue of war and peace.

The American people should know that while the Members in this Chamber may disagree over what course of action we should take in the Persian Gulf, this is not a partisan issue.

I commend the leadership for making this an issue of conscience, not of party.

Our common goal is for the complete withdrawal of Iraqi forces from Kuwait. Our differences exist on the tactics that get us there.

What is the most effective means of accomplishing our objective? Going to war? Or letting sanctions work?

Retired Adm. William Crowe, Jr., former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff said it well:

The issue, he said, is not whether an embargo will work, but whether we have the patience to let it take effect."

So, from my viewpoint we either bomb Iraq or starve it. The war option results in immediate sacrifices. The economic option takes time, but reduces the risk of American casualties.

There is no question of the effectiveness of the economic embargo.

Last month, CIA Director William Webster said that the economic sanctions against Iraq are effective and are being felt economically and militarily.

I understand that Director Webster has expanded on that statement.

Supporters of the Solarz-Michel resolution site Director Webster's letter of January 10 to support their position to give the President the authority to use military force.

But listen to what Director Webster has to say about relying on economic sanctions for another 12 months. Continuing with the sanctions, he says, will degrade Iraq's "armored and mechanized forces."

He goes on to project that "The number of inoperable Iraqi armored and other vehicles will grow gradually and the readiness of their crews will decline as Baghdad is forced to curb training activities."

Economic sanctions may not achieve the political objective of toppling Saddam Hussein quickly from power.

But they will work to further weaken Iraq militarily. I don't question the use of the war option, but I do question using the war option at this time. The United States waited 40 years to win the cold war.

Why can't we show a little more patience in letting the economic sanctions work their deteriorating effect on the Iraqi war machine before we decide to commit our young men and women to a military offensive?

There is one other point that has influenced my decision to lend my support for the Hamilton-Gephardt resolution.

Despite what the polls say, I do not find a consensus of support in the 23d Congressional District for giving the President blanket authority to conduct war.

In fact, very few of the calls and letters I've received have indicated support for the President's position.

If this Chamber mirrors the mood of the country, then clearly this country is divided over the war question.

And in my view, the last thing we should do is commit this country on a course to war in the absence of a national consensus.

It is for these reasons that I rise in support of the Hamilton-Gephardt resolution.

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as a new Member of Congress, this is my first speech on the floor of this historic House.

Rather than being the uplifting and exciting moment I had dreamed about for so long, this is a sad and difficult moment for me, because 22,000 brave men and women from Fort Hood, in my district, are at this moment in the Persian Gulf.

For weeks I have agonized over the decision on war and peace, the most important vote any Member of Congress could ever face.

I have met with 20-year-old wives at Fort Hood who could be young widows in the near future. I have walked alongside the Vietnam War Memorial and touched the names of men and women who died in that tragic war—a grim reminder that war is not a John Wayne

movie where the good guy rides off happily into the sunset.

If we go to war, many of my constituents may not ever see another sunset. Children will lose their parents and mothers and fathers will lose their most cherished dreams of seeing their own sons and daughters live a full and happy life.

For these reasons, I had hoped and prayed that diplomacy, not war, would solve the Persian Gulf crisis. That is still my hope.

Since I represent more troops in the Persian Gulf than perhaps any other Member of this House, the easiest personal decision for me would be to vote to prohibit military force as of now. By doing that, I would not have to look a young widow or child in the eye and say I was part of a decision that sent her husband or father to an early grave.

However, I have decided that the only hope for peace, as slim as it might be, is for the United States and the world community to send a clear message to Saddam Hussein that we will not tolerate unprovoked aggression against a sovereign nation.

I wished we lived in a world where the threat of force was not necessary to prevent war. If that were the case we would have no Defense Department and no nuclear weapons. Unfortunately, I can only dream of living to see such a day, and that day will never come as long as we have Saddam Husseins in this world.

I had hoped diplomacy might work, but it has not. Genuine efforts by the Arab League, the United Nations, the European Community and the United States have failed.

I had hoped sanctions might work to bring Hussein to his senses, but that has not happened so far.

I had hoped continued sanctions could work, but, in my own judgment, Saddam Hussein's delusions of grandeur will let him rationalize the tremendous suffering of his own people to keep his war machine alive, regardless of sanctions.

I had hoped there would be no downside, no risk in just letting sanctions work for a year or two. But, I now do not believe that to be the case. The potential breakup of our fragile alliance, the temptation to appease Hussein's aggression with concessions, the growing supply of chemical and biological weapons, the increased threat of nuclear weapons, and the possibility of a Hussein with enhanced Arab prestige as a result of his having stood up to the world community—these are all grave and real risks of withholding the threat of military force now.

When I vote for the Solarz-Michel resolution, it will be with the belief that war can still be averted, but not at all costs.

I urge President Bush to exhaust every means of diplomacy, because I still hope for peace.

Just as every Member of this House has done, I have searched my conscience and have tried to do what I think is right, knowing that each of us must live for the rest of our lives with this decision.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, the objective of American policy in the Persian Gulf is clear and unequivocable—Iraq must effect a complete and total withdrawal from Kuwait. This objective is not subject to compromise or negotiation. Simply put, we cannot permit Iraq's naked aggression to stand. I fully support this policy objective and want to commend the President for taking decisive action to stop Iraq at the Kuwaiti border and for organizing an international coalition to work in concert to isolate Saddam Hussein economically.

The debate is not about what our policy should be, but how to best implement it. As I see it, there are three options to accomplish this policy: we can vote to give President Bush the authority to commit U.S. forces to war after January 15; or as some believe we could decide to only use economic sanctions and diplomacy to pressure Iraq to leave Kuwait; or finally, we can pursue what I think is the best option—allow sanctions and diplomacy more time to work while at the same time keeping all our military options open.

The most important reason for pursuing this option is that sanctions may work and military force will not be needed. Equally important is that if the sanctions have their intended effect they will drastically inhibit Saddam Hussein's ability to prosecute war against United States forces thus reducing the number of American lives that may be lost in expelling Iraq from Kuwait. After all when you get right down to it isn't that what we all want—to accomplish the policy objective with the minimum loss of American life?

Until this week, all we have heard is that no oil is getting out of Iraq and no spare parts are getting in. Some estimate that Iraq's GNP has been cut in half and that Saddam Hussein's military infrastructure is deteriorating rapidly. Mr. Speaker, if the sanctions are not working it is the duty of President Bush to make the case to the American public and the Congress. I cannot vote for the immediate use of force until I have been presented with tangible evidence that the economic sanctions are not having their intended effect.

Nor can I vote to authorize the President to go to war until appropriate diplomatic options have been exhausted. This does not mean that Iraq should be allowed to use endless diplomatic maneuvering to merely delay his exit from Kuwait. But, at the very least a high-level official of the administration or our U.N. allies should have a face-to-face meeting with Saddam Hussein or a member of his intercircle before American troops are sent into action.

Commiting U.S. Armed Forces to war is the gravest decision a Member of Congress must make. My vote is not one that is cast against the President because I support his ultimate policy objective. The most important duty all of us share is to support our brave men and women stationed in the desert of Saudia Arabia. That is why I am following my conscience to pursue an option that I firmly believe will ensure as many of them as possible to return home safely to their families and loved ones.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding President Bush's pathetic utterances that the language in the Constitution dealing with war is ambiguous, the Constitution of the United States in unequivocal terms confers on the Congress the exclusive right to declare war.

Notwithstanding our President's irrational statements about Iraq being a threat to world order, there is no sufficient justification to involve the United States military in armed conflict over the invasion of Kuwait. Despite President Bush's illogical rantings and ravings about the need to use force without allowing economic sanctions to play out their course, it would be a tragedy of great proportion to sacrifice the lives of American men and women in this misguided cause.

Mr. Speaker, when will the American people ask our President to define the American interest in the Kuwaiti, Iraqi, Saudi Arabian conflict? Certainly it is not to defend liberty and democracy, for Saudi Arabia and Kuwait are two of the most undemocratic, oppressive nations on the face of the Earth. Hopefully, our President is not contending that the occupation of Kuwait threatens the flow of oil to American industrial machinery; there are no long lines at the gas pumps and there is no threat of the excessive consumption of our own vast oil reserves. Americans remember the long lines at the gas pumps in the 1970's and we should not forget that they occurred as a result of Kuwaiti and Saudi Arabian OPEC policy.

If, Mr. Speaker, the President is correct in his interpretation that the situation in the gulf is a threat to the world order, then where is the rest of the world community? Especially those nations which really depend on oil from Kuwait? We don't see Japan and Germany commiting any troops to fight. We don't see France, Belgium, and England amassing hundreds of thousands of their young men and women on the border of Kuwait. And perhaps the greatest irony of all, is that we don't see Saudi Arabia and Kuwait armed at the border to suppress the Iraqi aggression.

I am unalterably opposed to sanctioning the use of force by the President to evict Iraqi troops from Kuwait, until it is demonstrated beyond a shadow of a doubt that such occupation is a threat to the world order. Our mighty military machine would probably win a war with Iraq, but the cost will be astronomical in terms of Iraqi and American lives lost.

Over the past several months I have worked with some of my colleagues in an effort to forestall the very war mongering that is presently taking place in this body today. We have argued that economic sanctions, accompanied by genuine efforts of diplomacy, should be given ample opportunity to work. But those sanctions have not been given that opportunity and God knows that the stubborn, intransigent, abrasive attitudes of President Bush and Secretary Baker were intended to effectuate the precise war mood that exists on the floor of this House today.

In addition, I cosponsored the resolution of concern about the President's policy and requested the administration not pursue any offensive military action without the full deliberation and declaration of Congress. Further, I joined with other Members of Congress as a coplaintiff in the lawsuit which sought a Federal injunction to prevent offensive military action in the gulf without express congressional authorization.

Mr. Speaker, diplomacy is the art of give and take. Over the years, I have criticized most militaristic foreign policy initiatives. I believe U.S. foreign policy is too often directed toward a military solution and not often enough directed toward a diplomatic resolution.

Today we have the technological power to destroy every nation on this Earth—but we also have the technology to help create real dialog among all the nations of our planet. A wise Missouri's legislator—Harry S. Truman—once said "the responsibility of great states is to serve and not to dominate the world." I believe our Nation would gain much more if we would heed this advice and use our power and influence to serve others by creating viable diplomatic solutions to world problems.

A war with Iraq promises to serve no one. War is a nonsolution. The U.S. military presence in the Middle East has already acerbated the serious regional problems and turmoil which plague the nations of the Middle East and typify so many developing countries.

Mr. Speaker, today we have the opportunity to make an historic change in U.S. foreign policy. We have the power to pursue diplomatic solutions to world problems and we must exercise it. I implore this body to vote against war. I urge my colleagues to approve the Durbin-Bennett resolution confirming that our Constitution has vested in Congress all power to declare war and I encourage passage of the Hamilton-Gephardt resolution authorizing the defense of Saudi Arabia and the enforcement of the U.N. embargo against Iraq.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I have listened very carefully to the debate for 2 days now.

I have not heard any of you say a single thing for which I would vote to send even one American to die. Not one of the many reasons given, such as Hussein being a modern day Hitler, the need for oil, protecting the Saudis, the need to save Kuwait, or the safety of Israel have convinced me that war is justified. The only valid issue is whether to give President Bush authority to order thousands, even tens of thousands to their death.

Our allies have done almost nothing to help with this burden. The embargo is the only humane alternative.

I will not vote for the President's resolution.

Mr. ANDREWS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON].

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply troubled today as I begin my service in the House of Representatives. I cannot imagine having to make a more difficult or more agonizing vote.

I rise in support of the Solarz-Michel resolution. I believe that it is important for Congress to support the President. I have fully and consistently supported the President's deployment of American troops, defense of Saudi Arabia, and imposition of the U.N. sanctions against Iraq. I question, however, the President's decision in November doubling the number of American troops in the gulf and setting the January 15 deadline for Iraqi withdrawal. This shift from a defensive to an offensive posture by American forces in the gulf has embarked this Nation upon a high-risk gambit which I would not have chosen.

Keeping the peace is more complicated than simply delaying the onset of war. I have searched my mind and my soul and have reached a decision which I pray is correct. Ironically, I have concluded that a vote against the President's authority to conduct war will almost certainly result in war. It would embolden Saddam Hussein and would not prevent President Bush from acting without congressional authority.

On the other hand, a vote granting the President authority to conduct war might be the last hope for peace. By exhibiting unity of American resolve, Saddam might realize that futility of his actions and withdraw.

In the final analysis, the success of the President's diplomatic strategy requires the credible threat of force. Once Congress approves the use of force, the President must make the decision whether to use force, and when, what type and how much force is necessary.

Mr. Speaker, we are asked to authorize force and stand prepared to take this Nation into war if necessary in the hope that war will be avoided. I pray that we are right. I pray that girding up for war constitutes the last best chance for peace.

I will give President Bush my trust and my vote and my prayers.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I am here to tell you that I am in favor of giving sanctions more time to work.

When President Bush first sent troops to the Middle East on August 8, 1990, he said the mission of our troops was wholly defensive—that it was not to initiate hostilities. I support the President's decision to defend Saudi Arabia. I support the President's decision to prevent Saddam Hussein from selling the oil that he has stolen from Kuwait.

Beyond our defensive posture, this issue becomes more complicated.

Article I, section 8, of the Constitution clearly gives Congress, the authority to declare war. We met for 20 hours a day, seven days a week at the end of the 101st Congress. At a time when we could have taken action on this issue, we were told by the administration that the sanctions were working.

Three weeks later, when we were no longer in session 2 days after an election—our President convinced the United Nations to set a deadline for withdrawal.

What happened during the weeks that we were out of session to cause this change? Were we attacked? Was a single American killed by hostile fire? Was one shot fired in anger?

During the same 3-week period, our Nation spend $12 billion on interest payments alone on the national debt. Not principal; interest payments. Yet there is no clamor here or in the White House to balance the budget.

During the same 3 weeks, freighter loads of marijuana, truck loads of cocaine flooded across our borders, but there is no clamor to win the war on drugs.

During the same 3 weeks, three additional S&Ls failed and yet no one clamored to bring the abusers of the public trust to justice.

Dozens of American industries closed their doors and joined the ranks of our maritime industry, shipbuilding, steel textile and electronic industries—another segment lost from what was once our industrial might. Yet, there was no clamor to protect the backbone of the American dream—decent jobs that provide opportunity for upward mobility.

During the same 3 weeks, organized crime figures murdered, extorted money and bragged of their successes in manipulating our legal system. Yet Members who traveled thousands of mills to investigate the wrongdoings in the Middle East, won't raise a hand against the criminals at home.

Why are those who are so intent on solving Kuwait's problem, so reluctant to solve the problems of people here in this country? America has never wavered in its purpose. We have been willing to fight for the things in which we believe.

Historically, we have been a peaceful nation, that has acted not in haste. When North Koreans captured the U.S. *Pueblo* in January, 1968 and tortured and interrogated its 82 crew members for 11 months, did we attack North Korea? If not then why now?

The great leaders in this nation have always thought of war as a last resort.

Some people may ask what kind a message are we sending Hussein if the President and the Congress appear divided in the issue of aggression and of liberating Kuwait?

With 400,000 U.S. troops already in Saudi Arabia, America already has sent Hussein a clear enough signal.

Hussein is a little man. Iraq is only one of 13 little nations to possess over 1,000 tanks. Iraq is one of 14 little nations to possess chemical weapons. Iraq has no Navy. Its Air Force is a joke. Hussein is a petty thug.

Tonight, after work, I will walk down the street to have some dinner—no escorts—no bodyguards—no fear of the people I have the privilege to represent. Tonight, Saddam Hussein, traveling in a bomb proof vehicle will sleep in one of his 10 bomb-proof shelters out of fear for his life. He knows that his people will one day avenge the murders that he has committed against his countrymen. He is afraid of his own people.

No one, no one rushes to Hussein's defense. All Members of this body reject Hussein and his methods. All agree that he must go. The question is whether we starve him out, or blast him out.

A universal criticism of government is that we always find the most costly way to accomplish our goals. Must that

criticism apply to the waste of young men and women as well? It is wrong to waste one dime of our citizens' money. It is inexcusable to squander one life.

Those who would have us rush to spend these lives would like to have the citizens believe that any Member who does not vote in favor of this war resolution is faltering in his support for our troops.

Nothing could be further from the truth.

I represent one of the most patriotic areas of our country—and one of the most conservative. South Mississippians believe in our President and, over the years, we have stood behind the flag. Mississippi has one of the highest proportion of residents called up as Reservists in Operation Desert Shield. These men and women will selflessly serve in war, if this is what our President and this body calls them to do.

True conservatives, know the value of conserving all of our resources—not just our money. One of the most precious resources that we can conserve is the lives of our young men and women in uniform. The citizens of this nation built the hospitals in which they were born, the schools in which they were educated and the communities in which they live. As a nation, we have spared no expense in training and arming these warriors. Is it not wise to want to protect our investment?

Our forces were trained to combat very real threats. Despite all of their internal trouble, the Soviets continue to build nuclear submarines and missiles. Just last month, a new Soviet Victor III Class nuclear submarine entered the Mediterranean. The submarine carries nuclear missiles and is virtually impossible to detect. Ladies and gentlemen, that is a real threat.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is not a vote for or against the President, for or against the United Nations. Above all, this is not a vote for or against those people who have volunteered to serve our country. The Solarz resolution is a vote for war and it must be called that.

Last year, Congress passed what it called an ethics package. To the people back home it was a pay raise. No slight of hand should disguise this issue.

If we are willing to go to war, let's say so. If we are willing to pay the costs of war, let's say what programs are going to be cut or what taxes are going to be raised. If we are willing to go to war, let's come up with a program now that outlines a draft should that be necessary. All of the citizens and all of the Members should know exactly what the issues are.

To do anything less is an injustice to the American people.

If this body is not ready to give the President a clear declaration of war, to pay the cost of that war and to draft our young people to serve this great Nation, then we should follow the course of the sanctions and explore every possible avenue to achieve our goals with the least cost in American lives. Regardless of the outcome of this vote, I make this pledge to the people of Mississippi, this Nation, our men and women in uniform and to Saddam Hussein: If one bullet is fired at one American anywhere by an Iraqi soldier, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, I will support the President in using every weapon in our arsenal to eliminate the scourge of Saddam Hussein from the face of the Earth.

□ 2300

Mr. McCANDLESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MCCRERY].

Mr. McCRERY. Mr. Speaker, as badly as we all wish to avoid military conflict in the Mid-East, we must recognize the unfortunate reality that sometimes in the course of human events, wars are necessary. Americans are a peace-loving people—we have not fought wars for conquest or territorial gain, but rather to preserve our freedom and to give others a chance to enjoy freedom. Yes, Americans are a peace-loving people, and yes, Americans abhor war and its ugly consequences, but Americans have never been afraid of a fight and recognize that there are times when we must fight. This Congress, as representatives of the American people, needs to send a clear message to Saddam Hussein that now is one of those times—that we are decided, and we are together. To be fair with the Iraqi people and to give the most impetus to prospects for a peaceful resolution to this crisis, we must adopt the Solarz-Michel resolution to make it abundantly clear to Iraq's leaders that Americans will indeed fight if need be to remove Saddam and his troops from Kuwait.

Why is this a time to fight? The reasons are many and have been stated by other speakers here today.

Briefly: As far as the timing of military engagement:

It is unlikely that sanctions alone will achieve our goal of removing Saddam from Kuwait;

There is serious question as to how long the international coalition now arrayed against Saddam will hold together;

The morale of our soldiers is high now—the prospect of waiting another 6 months, or even longer, will surely threaten that morale;

We don't know how close Saddam is to production of a nuclear weapon, and we surely do not want to wait until he has nuclear weapons to begin a military action against him.

As far as the underlying reasons for our goal of removing Iraqi troops from Kuwait, there are two:

One, purely and simply—economic—oil and energy;

Two, the necessity for the United States to play a leadership role in establishing the post cold war world order.

The United States is the only true superpower, in both military and economic terms, in the world today. We, as Americans, have always dreamed of living in a world which is at peace, one which is not threatened by global war. We have long sought a world in which people will be free to use their minds, their talents, and their skills to improve the quality of life on this planet, a world in which trade will flourish among nations, lifting the standard of living for a greater and greater proportion of the world's population. We have a chance now to pave the way for such a world order—Shame on us if we shrink from the leadership role we must play if it is to come about.

Mr. ANDREWS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bipartisan Solarz-Michel resolution, which reaffirms U.N. Resolution 678, and authorizes the President to use military force as an option to liberate Kuwait if other efforts fail.

It is our duty now to face the reality which has evolved, to choose the course which will, in our best judgment, serve the interests of peace, save American lives, and protect our international interests. I have come to believe deeply and sincerely that economic sanctions alone will not force the unconditional withdrawal of Iraqi forces, and that the threat of massive force against Saddam Hussein is no threat at all without the authorization to use it.

This resolution does not ask or encourage the President to conduct war. It does not preclude patience. It does not preclude the continued use of economic sanctions, nor does it preclude the search for peace through diplomatic channels. In my opinion, it strengthens our diplomatic effort, by underscoring the seriousness of our commitment against the outrage of Saddam Hussein's occupation of Kuwait.

Mr. Speaker, this war has begun—it began on August 2, and it continues in the daily terror of atrocity in Kuwait. The civilized nations of the world community who are aligned against this aggression did not seek this fight. We seek to end it. And we must give ourselves every option to secure that end.

Mr. Speaker, we must send the strongest possible signal to Saddam Hussein that the time has come to accept the opinion of the community of nations, and to withdraw from the sovereign state of Kuwait, unconditionally and peacefully.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON].

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, on the most important vote of my career, I am uncertain whether my vote will be

the right one. I say this even though I have been in the Persian Gulf recently, I serve on the House Intelligence Committee, I have been a Member here 8 years, and I usually make up my mind fairly fast on issues.

I was among those this morning that met with President Bush. He was magnificent and I firmly believe that he wants peace and has gone the extra mile. In contrast, Iraq showed its true colors by choking off any interest in negotiations.

My gut and the facts tell me to go with the President, but my heart and my conscience tell me to give sanctions more time. In the end, I will be voting with my heart and my conscience to give sanctions more time. I do so with the view that the military option may have to be exercised, even at a date certain, perhaps in 60 to 90 days if Iraq continues to rebuff peace efforts.

Here's why I believe we should be patient a little longer knowing full well that this may be a potential mistaken course.

First, the President's resolution puts the Congress out of the loop in future decisions on the gulf involving war. That I believe is inappropriate, both constitutionally and because the only voice the American people have is the Congress. We are talking about 400,000 American lives. We are talking about an American war. A strong America is a democratic America. If we go to war, Congress should not shirk its responsibility by giving a one time blank check.

Second, I believe that Iraq will ultimately become an economic basketcase because the President's economic sanctions are working. The international blockade must be given more time, not indefinitely, but clearly for a few more months. To those who say that economic sanctions do not guarantee Iraq will withdraw from Kuwait after January 15, without a diplomatic solution, I say what guarantee do we have that a war will be brief and that American casualties will be light?

Third—something has to change about allied burdensharing, about whose interests are at stake, about who is really doing the dirty work. Let's face it. Where is Japan? Where is Germany? Who is on the front line? Who is coming back in body bags? It's American boys. The burden needs to be spread more evenly. It should be a real coalition where you are counted by how many troops you send rather than casting easy U.N. votes.

Fourth—I have to listen to what New Mexicans have said to me. A majority are not for going to war. They want to give sanctions more time and so I have to reflect what the people that sent me here want. It is not the major reason, but an extremely important one for me, and I am sure for many of us.

I am not optimistic about the prospects of a diplomatic solution nor of the certainty of sanctions to get Saddam out of Kuwait. And I concede that we might be on the brink of a quick military victory but I don't know that either. So in the end, I have opted to give the slim possibility that a nonmilitary solution might succeed one last chance.

Finally, I know the President would prefer to have my vote rather than these nice words.

Mr. President, you have handled this issue masterfully internationally. What is happening today in the Congress is not division, but democracy in action.

Mr. President, if you go to war at least you have constitutionally given the Congress a role, although not to my entire satisfaction.

Mr. President, I think you have given peace a chance but if you can wait a little longer it might avert the blood we all fear will be spilled.

Mr. President, as you make the enormously difficult decisions in the days ahead, remember that every Member of this body deep down supports our troops and hopes you succeed.

Mr. Speaker, I am including a diary that I kept of my Persian Gulf trip in December 1990.

OPERATION DESERT SHIELD DIARY

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 11, 1990

10:00 am—Leave Andrews Air Force Base via a VC-137 military jet en route to Operation Desert Shield. It is a 13 hour flight with a brief refueling stop in Shannon Island.

In the cargo compartment of the VC-137 I brought a huge ice chest containing seventy 12-ounce containers of salsa roja, courtesy of the Chavez Chile Corporation of Santa Rosa, letters and 81 messages to be delivered to New Mexico troops. Navy Commander Nash, the group's military escort, warned me not to expect every New Mexico troop to come marching to meet with me. "We'll do what we can to find them," he said.

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 12

8:30 am—The military jet touches down at Riyadh Air Base.

9:30 to 11:30 am—General Norman Schwartzkopf, U.S. Commander of Desert Shield, gives us an exhaustive briefing.

Schwartzkopf is not intimidated by the presence of 28 members of Congress. We need your support he keeps repeating. He wants mainly to clear up several misconceptions about Desert Shield. First, U.S. equipment has been effective and has worked in the desert, specifically the Apache helicopter, he assures us. Second, the morale of troops is very good, not negative as the press has been reporting. Schwartzkopf mentions that the troops are receiving 300 tons of mail per day. He is especially laudatory of the 16 tons of weightlifting equipment sent by Arnold Schwartzenegger and the free phone calls that AT&T has arranged for them.

Schwartzkopf impresses me with his facts, a strategic mind and deep concern for his troops. From press reports, I had expected a gung ho type salivating to go to war. I am pleasantly surprised, as are the other members of our delegation. His main message is twofold (1) that Operation Desert Shield is a highly competent military force ready to go to war if necessary and determined to win and (2) that had we not sent American forces to the Gulf Iraq would have made a move on Saudi Arabia and other Persian Gulf states.

11:30 am to 1:00 pm—Briefing by U.S. Embassy staff and Ambassador Chas Freeman.

The Ambassador gives us a broad overview of Saudi Arabia and its problems. He tells us of the growing tensions in the Kingdom because of the possibility of war and the excellent behavior of American forces. When Freeman observed that U.S. troops hadn't downed a beer in four months in observance of strict Saudi Moslem regulations, that set off some fireworks (especially from me) from some of my colleagues over the restrictive Saudi practices on our troops, such as limiting religious practices, discriminatory measures against women troops, and freedom of movement within Saudi Arabia.

Although extremely well versed and capable, Freeman strikes me as being a bit too eager to defend Saudi behavior. On a bipartisan basis, Members inform Freeman, who no doubt will cable the Secretary of State about our meeting, that (1) we should stop acting like the Saudis are doing us a big favor about being here and that they should loosen up on restrictions and (2) that we are not happy about allied contributions to Desert Shield, notably Germany and Japan. The meeting nonetheless ends on a positive note.

1:30 pm—After a brief tour of an RC-135 reconnaissance aircraft we get back on our military jet and head off for Dhaharan and the King Abdul Aziz Air base.

2:30 pm—After a one hour flight, we are met by Prince Turki Faisal, a Saudi Royal family member and F-15 pilot and Col. John McBroom of the 1st Tactical Fighter Wing who give us a tour of the Air base and the Joint American-Saudi units.

The starkness of the Saudi landscape is most evident. Desert and sand and more desert—virtually engulfing the city of Dhaharan. The Saudi and American pilots seem to work well together with little language difficulty. Turki Faisal gets a little defensive when I ask him informally about Saudi restrictions on our troops.

3:00 pm-4:30 pm—Col. McBroom takes us to meet several of our pilots from the 1st Tactical Fighter Wing.

He tells us that fighter pilot morale goes up and down and that Iraqi surface to air missiles can hurt us. I meet up with Fighter pilot Bill Lebrecht of Albuquerque and I promise to call his father. "Let's take action so that we can go home. Morale's okay but we want to get out of here. Just let us do our job," Lebrecht tells me. Lebrecht doesn't look like a day over 21.

Pilot Don Schlipp, who trained at Cannon, says "Just do it constitutionally, get Congress involved. You guys (Congress) figure it out, but let's just get out of here."

The message from other F-15 pilots who had trained in New Mexico was basically the same: "Let's do something, kick some rear ends, and go home."

Several complained about Saudi restrictions. One woman officer told me she didn't like the fact that the Saudis closed their gyms to women. "It's hard to go downtown—there are just too many hassles." On the bus back to our next stop, Col. McBroom testily answered he, not the Saudis, put on many of the restrictions because of possible terrorist threats.

The rest of the afternoon we spent touring a military hospital, a logistics center, and talking to a variety of top brass about the American presence in Saudi Arabia. It is

truly amazing how we have constructed a sprawling city in the middle of the Saudi desert. Our job, said the head of the logistical support group, is "to bring the troops in, take them to the field, and provide them sustenance."

8:30 pm—After calling my office and a few calls to New Mexico, I am sound asleep. Tomorrow, we are told, we start at 7:00 a.m. and end up with a 10:00 p.m. briefing in Israel.

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 13

8:00 a.m. to 9:15 a.m.—Visit 1st Marine Expeditionary Forces. As we board three huge Marine helicopters, I smile at how we look—28 Michael Dukakises with our little caps and flapjackets. As we fly over miles and miles of Saudi sand and desert to see American marines near the Kuwaiti border, you can feel the sand and dirt all over you. Huge sandstorms are everywhere.

Landing at Jubail Naval Air Base, we are met by Lt. General Walter E. Boomer and a group of young Marines, quiet and determined looking, none looking older than 19. They look fit, agile, clean, and in good spirits. They joke and chuckle a bit at one or two overweight Congressmen trying to get into jeeps.

Boomer looks mean and tough but with a devilish twinkle in his eye. We are glad you are here, and we need your support, he says. He starts his briefing in a camouflaged net. "I've got thousands of Marines up here on the front 40 miles from the Kuwaiti border and the morale is basically good. My boys here want to hear news from the states so most of our time here we'll use so that you Congressmen see the troops from your states. I haven't given them a day off in four months, so they'll be glad to see you." The temperature is about 90 degrees and it goes down to about 70 at night.

The first question rings out from one of my colleagues, "What other countries are up here with you on the front?" Boomer rattles off the Saudis, Omanis, Qataris, and Senegalese. He says morale is good. The most important necessities up here says Boomer is food, warmth, clothing, mail, and phone calls home. Boomer adds, perhaps noting his audience, "The guys are getting mixed messages about Desert Shield from back home. They want the American people to back them."

Boomer concludes his briefing. Like Schwartzkopf, he is no nonsense, impressive and sincere. He seems like a guy you definitely want on your side in an alley fight. Again, what comes across is a deep concern for his troops. "Make sure my boys get plenty of mail. Thank God for the AT&T free phone calls. The goal of every Marine is one phone call home between now and the end of the year." Boomer's remarks make me feel good about the letters, messages, and salsa I brought from New Mexico.

As we jump in a jeep to meet troops from our home states deeper in the desert, I notice a picture of a scantily clad women on the dashboard, posing provocatively. "That looks like Pretty Woman Star Julia Roberts," I said to the pleased Marine. "That's my wife, sir. Just looking at her keeps me going," he said.

"Did you bring me some green chili?" asks Lance Corporal Eric Omelas of Rio Rancho, approaching me from the rear. Omelas is tall, stocky, muscular, bespectacled and smiling, obviously in good spirits. Omelas' artillery battalion had trained at Mojave. Omelas passes on several messages to his family. "Tell my folks Raymond and Jesse and my wife Aggie that I love them and miss them and that I'll be home soon. Thank them for sending me the Albuquerque Journal, the articles about how New Mexico is really backing us." Omelas tells me he wants to write a letter to the Journal thanking the many New Mexicans that have formed support groups. "The January 15th date of the UN resolution was the best thing that happened for morale around here," said Omelas. "It means that we know we won't be around here forever and in fact might be home soon. If we can go in, we can get it over with. The worst is sitting out in the desert and waiting." Omelas misses the Lobos, the Pit, and Luc Longley. He misses deer season. He seems excited about having participated in a live fire exercise recently. We chat for about half an hour and he never stops smiling and talking. We embrace as I depart and he is still smiling. Eric Omelas is 27 years old and on the front line. In a ground war, he would be one of the first to go to battle. He is ready.

11:00 a.m.—Marine helicopter takes us to visit Army units. Forty-five minutes later we land at 24th Infantry Division, mechanized brigade.

12 noon—We are met by Col. John LeMoyne, the division chief of staff for another briefing.

I immediately notice several women troops. We head for a briefing at a small tent that seems lodged in the middle of a Saudi sand dune. LeMoyne starts the briefing stating that women soldiers have performed extremely well and that they never make excuses and they never require extra attention. "In case you Congressmen are wondering," he adds, "women in the military is definitely working." Congresswoman Barbara Vucanovich winks at me. I never knew our reputation as male chauvinists extended to the Saudi desert. LeMoyne adds that the woman about to give us the slide briefing had to leave her young 11 month old baby with her husband at home.

She smiles at LeMoyne and proceeds businesslike with her slides. The Army's main messages are (1) we are combat ready whether we need to move in two or thirteen months (2) our equipment is working well in the desert, close to 94% operational and (3) morale is good. As I leave the briefing tent, Commander Nash tells me that Sgt. Juanita Curry of New Mexico is outside waiting to see me. Nash tells me that Sgt. Curry claims to know me very well and that her deceased father was one of my early supporters in Taos. I am panicked as I can't recall Juanita nor her father. Juanita, all four feet ten inches of her makes it easy when she hugs me and tells me that she is the daughter of Abelino Cordova of Rodarte, who was the Democratic precinct chairman of the Penasco when I first ran for Congress in 1980. Now deceased, Cordova was one of the few Northern New Mexico political patrons who backed me when I ran against then Rep. Manuel Lujan now Secretary of the Interior. Ironically, Cordova used to tell me that to get elected I should attend as many funerals, communions, and weddings as possible. Juanita had since married Raymond Curry, who was stationed 40 miles away in a separate brigade. Juanita thanked me for having helped her and her husband get stationed in Korea. Thank God for my caseworkers, I thought silently, they are the blessed ones who get us all elected. My dad always told me to call you when I got in trouble, said Juanita.

In two hours, Juanita took me around to visit several Army helicopter and equipment units. At one of the M-1 tank units I met Andre Borowell of Albuquerque. He was extremely shy but loosened up right away. As I was leaving with Juanita after snapping some pictures he grabbed me and said, "Tell my family I'm okay and I miss them. Congressman, let's get this war over with." Borowell was one of many black troops that I noticed in the Marine and Army units that I'd seen that day.

Juanita and I lunched together. The chicken was good and all the troops seemed to have few complaints about the food and living conditions.

2:15 pm—Taking off for the King Fahd Air Base to visit A-10 and Apache units from the 354 Tactical Air Fighter Wing, I could see Juanita's small figure waving to us and I thought I saw some tears on her face glistening in the hot Saudi sun. We had spent nearly two hours together, and already I felt a strong bond. What do you want me to tell your family in Taos, I asked her? "Tell them the training here is excellent, and that, I'll be home soon. Tell them I've convinced my non-New Mexico husband that we'll be making New Mexico our permanent home after this is over."

3:00 pm—More briefings and troop visits with the A-10 and Apache units.

I had brief visits with Jeff Scott of Santa Fe, Melvin Patrick, Dave Vargo and Patrick Wattenberg of Albuquerque. Patrick said there was no morale problem and he was ready to go. He wanted to know if I was backing President Bush. Wattenberg said let's get it over before Ramadan, the Moslem holiday which starts in March. "Saddam Hussein won't pull out," he said. Patrick jumped in the conversation, "Congressman, are you going to support us?" Jeff Scott was also for quick military action but added there should be a clearer policy, "Our policy needs to be more directed," he kept repeating. At first he said little, deferring to his senior colleagues Wattenberg, Patrick and Vargo. "Give these pilots a green light to do their job without restrictions and the war will be over in two days, said Vargo. He wanted me to make sure the shooting range at Sandia stayed open. Patrick wanted me to thank AT&T for making those phone calls possible. "And thank Coca-Cola for all those free cokes." In the end, we were all joking and taking pictures. As we were boarding the bus, I saw a bunch of my colleagues from large states still talking to dozens of their constituents. I noticed some troops without Congressmen—they looked disappointed.

The four New Mexicans were ready and in excellent spirits. As they say, they definitely had the eye of the tiger. We posed for a final picture, then I had to go. Our final stop was at Tent City where we heard numerous complaints about Saudi restrictions. "At least they could let us have a beer once in a while," said one. At Tent City, James Brodhed of Albuquerque told me we needed to develop an alternative energy policy. "We need to develop geothermal and solar instead of relying on this worthless oil," he said. As we left Tent City, Brodhed asked me to call his wife Kimberly. "Tell her I love her," he said. Other troops I talked to were down on the Saudis. A Puerto Rican soldier said he might have to die in Saudi Arabia yet they wouldn't let him practice his Catholic religion.

5:00 pm—Depart Saudi Arabia for Israel.

On the plane a sense of exhilaration and fatigue. Unanimously, all agreed that the highlight of the trip was the high caliber, readiness, and morale of our forces.

9:00 pm—Arrival in Tel Aviv—met by U.S. Embassy personnel.

In the one hour bus ride to the King David Hotel in Jerusalem, Embassy officials

briefed us about the current state of siege in Israel. Israel is faced with several problems (1) the Gulf Crisis—Saddam Hussein has threatened to launch missiles against Israel to break up the U.S. led Arab coalition (2) the intifada—while the Palestinian unrest continues, Saddam Hussein has become a hero to the Palestinian masses because he has challenged the U.S. and Israel (3) Jewish emigration—nearly 1,000 refugees are arriving daily from the Soviet Union (4) the economy—Israel has a serious recession and budget deficit. The country's limited economic resources are stretched.

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 14

8:00 am—Israeli government briefing on the situation in the occupied territories and alleged human violations against Palestinians.

A charismatic Israeli General, deputy spokesman for the government, held us spellbound for nearly an hour, gesticulating madly, screaming, but effectively getting his point across. "As we quell the revolts successfully to protect ourselves, we lose the propaganda war. We may win in the battlefield, but we lose in world opinion," he said. The General claims that it costs Israel two million per year to deal with the intifada. "And the intifada has gotten new life from Saddam Hussein. He is now perceived as a messianic leader who will give the Palestinians a homeland," he added.

10:00 am—Meeting with Foreign Minister Levy.

The meeting with Levy is uneventful and the translations from Hebrew to English are extraordinarily long. He overbriefs us with history, anecdotes, and Israeli positions that most of us know. He is not overly candid. I wonder if maybe he doesn't want to say anything to upset a recently concluded summit between President Bush and Prime Minister Shamir.

12:00 noon—Luncheon with Moshe Arens, Minister of Defense.

Arens is candid, direct and his English is flawless. His main point is that Saddam Hussein poses a great threat to Israel, especially if he is allowed to develop nuclear weapons. He had just come from a funeral where an Israeli General, a good friend of the Arens family had just lost a 22 year old daughter stabbed to death by a Palestinian terrorist in a downtown bus. He was obviously shaken and said, "My friend told me, 'Moshe, I joined the Army to protect our children—now I've lost my child.'" The discussion with Arens stretches for two hours. He knows many of us and is obviously most comfortable with American politicians. He has nothing but praise for President Bush and the United States. "But our best friends are in the U.S. Congress," he says, "and we don't forget that." The message is clear: we may be needing each other soon again. The meeting concludes and there is a one hour briefing by Israeli intelligence on the military balance in the Persian Gulf.

4:00 pm—A few of us sneak in a trip to Bethlehem before heading off to a cocktail party arranged by the American Consul General in Jerusalem with a group of Palestinians. "Can you believe it—the Embassy is giving us one hour of R&R?" said one of my colleagues. Many of us hope that the cocktail party will be a light affair—a meet and greet event that won't tax our weary bodies too heavily.

For the next two hours, the American Consul General presides at his event like Phil Donahue. After six Palestinians speak for two minutes or so each, Consul General Wilcox invites debate from the floor. Two of my Jewish colleagues get into loud arguments with the Palestinians. The exchanges show me that the Palestinian situation is getting worse, with both sides further apart than before. We leave the residence drained and depressed, but all agreeing it was a fascinating evening.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 16

6:00 am—Tel Aviv to Andrews Air Force Base.

For practically the entire 14 hour flight, 28 members of the United States Congress slept soundly. The trip made me proud of our troops. I was also determined to punch out anyone who called this journey a junket. Most of us learned a lot and were able to see the situation on the ground. The journey, however, added to the already huge burden on my shoulders as to whether I ultimately vote to allow the President to go to war.

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 18 TO THURSDAY, DECEMBER 20

At town meetings where I reported on my trip in Santa Fe, Los Alamos, Taos, Las Vegas, Rio Rancho and Farmington, a strong majority of those attending sent me a clear message: give the economic sanctions more time, don't give President Bush authority to declare war without the approval of Congress, and we don't want to go to war in the Gulf. Usually my town meetings are packed with those of a certain political predictability. This time the meetings seemed more broadly based with mothers, veterans, etc.

Now it is time for Congress to either put up or shut up.

□ 2310

Mr. McCANDLESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SCHIFF].

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I hope for a peaceful solution to the gulf crisis, but I am going to endorse the U.N. resolution by voting for the Solarz-Michel resolution in this House.

This is the most difficult decision I have had to make since being elected to Congress 2 years ago, not just because I have the obvious heavy responsibility already for the people of my district and the people of this country, but also because both I and my wife, Marsha, are currently active military reservists. In fact, members of my unit, the security police of the New Mexico Air National Guard, are serving in the Persian Gulf tonight.

But I think this is the necessary decision. There are many reasons why the world must insist that Iraq leave Kuwait unconditionally, but that has not been the nature of the debate here today and tonight. Most if not all of my colleagues agree with that. The difference has been in coming to choosing an approach to achieve that goal, and that difference is reflected in the two main resolutions offered here tonight, the Solarz-Michel resolution which I support, and the Hamilton-Gephardt resolution which I do not support.

What is the difference between these resolutions? Some of the supporters of the alternative Hamilton-Gephardt resolution say the difference is that the Solarz-Michel resolution is the equivalent of a declaration of war and they cannot vote for that. But the Hamilton-Gephardt resolution is also the equivalent of a declaration of war. The Hamilton-Gephardt resolution also authorizes force by the United States in the Persian Gulf for several reasons, including to enforce the embargo. Using military force to enforce an embargo is under international law an act of war, so that is not the difference between the two resolutions.

The difference between the two resolutions is that the Hamilton-Gephardt resolution prevents the President as Commander in Chief from using force in one specific way, and that way is to offensively push the Iraqis out of Kuwait.

I do not think that we should guarantee to Saddam Hussein that we will not use force in one particular manner. I do not think that guarantee will result in the Iraqis leaving Kuwait. This is a dictatorship where sanctions can be channeled so the military still receives necessary support. That policy will not even necessarily weaken the Iraqis for a future military confrontation.

It is true that if the embargo continues the Iraqis may have trouble getting things like spare parts, but it is also true that a guarantee of no attack will give the Iraqis the time they may need to reorganize their troops and to improve their defenses.

Further, in the meantime our own coalition might be weakening.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the Solarz-Michel resolution does not demand that we go to war after January 15. I certainly hope that we do not. But I think it is time that the President of the United States had that option.

Mr. ANDREWS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. PARKER].

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Speaker, the anger and hatred emanating from the Middle East is not a new phenomenon. This animosity has disrupted the region for several thousand years. It just happens that the current situation has been instigated by a maniacal despot whose ultimate goal is control of the entire Middle East.

I have listened to all sides of the debate wanting to hear an alternative to military action as a response to the Iraqi occupation of Kuwait—hoping that someone would offer the world community, of which we are an integral part, a way to solve this problem diplomatically. No one has presented an idea that is an acceptable and workable alternative.

I am convinced that economic sanctions are not working and will not work to the extent needed to stop Iraq's aggression. Iraq is a fertile land. The Iraqis can feed themselves. Iraq's borders have not been closed. Goods are moving across. A long-term stalemate can only benefit Iraq. The longer we wait, the more difficult the task is likely to become, and of paramount

import, the more American lives will be lost.

Yes, decisions have been made. Since the crisis began the troop numbers were drastically increased, effectively committing us to a single course of action. Additionally, the U.N. Security Council set the absolute deadline of January 15. A calendar date is a poor choice to serve as the trigger to end the negotiating process. Perhaps, we could do nothing more or less. I do not know.

Nevertheless, the key issue at stake here, is the presence on the ground of 400,000 American troops. Absent that fact, perhaps we would have other choices. But they are there, and we must now give the President, as Commander in Chief, a free hand, to give him maneuverability, to protect our soldiers from unnecessary risk and increased vulnerability. Only in supporting the Solarz-Michel resolution do we have a chance for peace.

The question is not whether we can defeat Saddam Hussein. We can defeat him. The question is not whether we can obliterate the Iraqi military forces. We can obliterate them. Rather the question is—how and when? Saddam Hussein must withdraw. Stability must be returned to the region. Saddam Hussein has left us no alternative but to force him out of Kuwait. Congress must act to authorize use of such force. It is my belief that our President will not impatiently and unilaterally move into Kuwait without exhausting every possible diplomatic approach. It is my belief that our President will factor in all his decisions the stability of the Middle East. The final decision will rest with the President. I trust that God grants him the wisdom to do what is best for our Nation and the world.

□ 2320

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, as a new Member of this body, I have listened intently these last 2 days to the words of my colleagues. I have heard the opinions of those I represent in Rhode Island. All have expressed great concern at the thought of war in the gulf and, I am struck by the irony that these first few votes may be the most difficult ones I may ever face as a Member of Congress.

The United States and the world community acted appropriately and promptly to isolate Iraq in response to Iraqi aggression that cannot be tolerated. Through economic sanctions and diplomatic action we are responding to this grave crisis.

Let us be clear, Mr. Speaker, those sanctions and the continued use of diplomatic pressure are producing results.

Evidence suggests that if left in place, these sanctions will weaken Iraq's military strength and with it its willingness and its ability to wage war. At this time, it is premature to reject the use of sanctions to dislodge Iraq from Kuwait.

The United States is united in opposition to Iraq's invasion of Kuwait. And I recognize that we cannot rule out the use of force at some point. But now is not the time.

To date, little thought has been given to what the Persian Gulf will look like even if we have a military success. Will it be more stable or will we inherit a host of more profound and perplexing problems?

Time will not only give sanctions more effect, but it will help us truly understand the results of a military solution.

Many words have been spoken about a new world order and America's role in this new world order. In the days ahead the lessons of this crisis will be drawn. If the lesson is that international crises are resolved by the use of almost exclusively American military power, then that will be the wrong lesson. A stronger and more durable world will emerge if we can reach a peaceful solution through collective action.

All of us here today have called upon our backgrounds and our personal experience in making this decision. We are thinking of our families, our friends, and of those who serve us in Saudi Arabia and around the world.

I am a graduate of West Point. The company I once commanded in the 82d Airborne is now close to the front line. People with whom I served are in the gulf. I have every confidence in the bravery and skill of our Armed Forces. I know that they are trained to do their job well and that they have the ability and the willingness to serve their country.

But now is a time for wisdom as well as bravery.

I am not ready to enact a declaration of war when there is still a chance for a peaceful and proper resolution of this conflict.

I urge my colleagues to support the continued use of sanctions and diplomacy called for in the Hamilton-Gephardt resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MINETA].

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, the choice between war and peace is the most serious decision any nation can take.

The choice defines our national priorities.

The choice defines our principles as a nation.

Today in this Congress, some believe that war is the next step for the United States to take, and that this step should be taken now.

I do not agree.

Many of us in this Chamber have seen the horrors of war, but our duty today is more than merely to bear witness to our past.

Congress and only Congress has the responsibility to decide the questions of peace and war.

To do that, we must confront two issues which reach into the core of this democracy.

First, is the President required to get the approval of Congress before starting a war?

The answer is "yes."

What the President and his advisers may believe to the contrary does not matter.

What actions the United Nations may authorize do not matter.

The only thing that matters is what our Constitution says. And the Constitution says that only the Congress can declare war.

One week ago, I took my oath of office for the ninth time as a Member of this House.

I promised again to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States.

If the President starts this war with Iraq without the consent of Congress, he undermines the Constitution, he jeopardizes his Presidency, and he will endanger the success of the war that he starts.

If the President wants us to authorize him to conduct a war, let him come and stand before us and ask us to declare a war.

I cannot and will not relinquish the responsibilities of Congress by giving one individual the power to start a war under these circumstances.

The second issue before us is the specifics of a conflict with Iraq.

On this point, let me say first that I believe the President does not want a war. My concern is that he believes he has no choice, and in this he is wrong.

The President has failed to present a convincing case that the United States is now imperiled to the point that sacrificing thousands of American lives is imperative to protect our Nation.

I respect those who fear the evil Saddam Hussein can thrust upon his neighbors. I share this concern.

I have no love for Saddam Hussein or his utter disregard for national sovereignty and human rights.

But the mistake I hope our country will not make is to allow our hate for this man and his barbarism to overshadow what is in our national interest.

Where is it in our national interest to launch a war?

Until the President has come before Congress and provided a rationale that satisfies me that all else has failed, I will not vote to give him the authority as Commander in Chief to conduct a war.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the President has made a serious mistake by forcing this issue through the arbitrary January 15 deadline.

What significance does this date have on its merits? None that I can determine. That is why I will vote for the Gephardt-Hamilton resolution.

Mr. Speaker, turning a desert shield into a desert sword was the President's decision and his responsibility.

The President chose this course on his own on November 8. And now, that unilateral decision threatens to expend thousands of American lives in a costly war.

I will not rubberstamp that mistake by voting for a resolution that provides political insurance coverage at the expense of the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, if this Congress cedes to the President our constitutional authority to declare war, we may never forgive ourselves.

I will not vote away my right as a Member of this Congress to determine when and if the President will be allowed to wield the sword he's forged in Saudi Arabia.

As of today, that sword should at most stay right where it is: At the ready, and nothing more.

Mr. McCANDLESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RIDGE].

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, My colleagues, America has been blessed since its creation over 200 years ago. We have enjoyed an enormous bounty of natural resources and encountered few natural barriers to growth. Lengthy and friendly borders were never occupied by threatening neighbors. Men and women of limitless talent and energy have been empowered by a unique and much admired political and economic system to become a nation of incredible wealth, influence, and opportunity.

As a result of this national evolution and maturity, we have inherited, in part by design and in part by default, an unparalleled position of political, economic, and, more importantly, moral leadership within the community of nations. And in spite of our basic antimilitaristic, proisolationist nature, we have sent soldiers to faraway places to fight and, sadly and heroically, to die. We have done so as often to protect and defend the interests of others as we have our own.

On these historic occasions, we have defined for ourselves and the rest of the world the principles, values, and relationships that are at the heart of the American experience.

This crisis and our national response is one of those rare and defining moments.

More time is Hussein's ally, not ours. Time is the enemy of our coalition, the brutally repressed people of Kuwait, and the world that is regrettably, but inescapably, addicted to oil.

Moreover, ruthless despots like Hussein and their armies rarely endure the deprivations and suffering of such actions. Their subjects do, and our quarrel is not with the people of Iraq.

So if America and Americans seek a world where the strong are effectively discouraged from preying on the weak, where aggression is challenged and unrewarded, where collective voices of nation states are raised in loud and nearly unanimous opposition to the kind of conduct that has reduced one sovereign country to another's 19th province, where America's vision, values, and voice are respected and credible, where our national ability to influence positively the conduct of nations and the flow of events for ourselves and others is preserved and strengthened, then we must support our President, the United Nations, and the men and women wearing our uniform in the gulf.

My colleagues, on the occasion of Saddam Hussein's aggression and brutal rape of a defenseless neighbor, we have the responsibility and the opportunity to define again ourselves as individuals, as a nation, and as a world leader.

□ 1130

On this occasion we must remind the world that we abhor war, that annually we expend enormous sums of energy and money to promote freedom and peace, but as a country we are unwilling to sacrifice fundamental principles to achieve a fraudulent peace which would ultimately lead to a wider and more devastating war. I urge my colleagues to support the Michel-Solarz resolution.

Mr. ANDREWS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HALL].

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Michel-Solarz resolution. Most of my colleagues have addressed their remarks to the Speaker and to those in attendance here. I would like to address my remarks, my specific remarks, to the one person in the world who can tonight, tomorrow, Monday, or Tuesday, render this entire debate moot. I address my remarks to Saddam Hussein, for I am told that he monitors all of our speeches, that he has CNN beamed into his headquarters. I hope you listen, and I hope you listen well.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OBEY). The Chair would instruct the gentleman in the well that the gentleman is required to address his remarks to the Chair and not address any remarks in the second person.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I address my remarks to you, Mr. Speaker, and to this group, and to all who would hear. I hope that you would listen and listen well.

I hope we remember that there were those who refused to accept the President's letter. I hope they remember deep down, though, that surely those who refused that letter must have the message. We know those who have their tentacles into the heartland of Kuwait, but I think the knowledge of Saddam Hussein should cry out that these despots, these dictators, these invaders, eventually pay the supreme price.

It is only a matter of time, and one man has the power to harness this time.

Let Members take a little walk through history. Put yourself in a bunker in Berlin. The year is 1945. Your name is Adolf Hitler, a gun is to your head and to Eva Braun. Gasoline, a fire, a dishonorable and unmarked grave. Or put yourself on that bleak scaffold there in a Tokyo prison. Your name is Hideki Tojo. What were his last thoughts? There was a time when he could have said, "Wait a minute." What were his thoughts as the trap door collapsed? He, as Saddam Hussein, was out of time. What were his last thoughts?

I think we could put ourselves in Ruldolf Hess' parachute, a jump that culminated in almost 60 years of incarceration in a lonely Spandau Prison. I wonder if Saddam Hussein can remember and envision Benito Mussolini's last thoughts as he and his mistress were hung like animals when they, too, ran out of time.

Only about a year ago, to bring this into recent history, Nicolae Ceausescu, along with his wife of many years, were executed in Romania, a cigarette and a blindfold. What were their last thoughts? Would they like to turn back the tolls of time?

Adolf Eichmann even escaped that final moment for many years, but just as surely as Saddam Hussein is going to face judgment, he had time to think. He had to walk those 13 steps because he was out of time. So I am hoping that for Saddam Hussein, that he will know what he must do and what he should do to make all this moot.

How will the last picture appear in his annals of history? I think Saddam Hussein only can control that now, before January 15, and cannot only save his life but the lives of many of the youth of his nation. He can save the lives of young boys and girls from my hometown, my State, my Nation, and the world, if he would act before the 15th. Saddam Hussein has that power. What will the last sentence in his obituary read, and when?

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MAVROULES].

Mr. MAVROULES. Mr. Speaker, having addressed the issue yesterday during the debate on the rule, I am in

favor of Gephardt-Hamilton at this time.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, the United States policies in the Persian Gulf have worked. We have successfully deterred an attack against Saudi Arabia. World oil markets are stabilized. The hostages have been freed. The economic sanctions have succeeded in cutting off almost 100 percent of Iraq's exports and 90 percent of its imports. And, most important of all, Saddam Hussein has been contained. He does not pose an immediate offensive threat to American troops or to other countries in the region.

Two former Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Jones and Admiral Crowe, in testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee, both acknowledged the unmatched success of the international economic embargo against Iraq and urged continued reliance on economic sanctions.

CIA Director William Webster offered testimony that the sanctions will have a significant impact on Iraq's ability to maintain its military. Mr. Webster said that the readiness of Iraqi ground and air forces would begin to deteriorate after 9 months. He said that probably only energy-related and some military industries will still be functioning by next spring and that this would almost certainly be the case by next summer. The bottom line is that the economic embargo is having, and will continue to have, the intended effect. And the letter sent by the CIA just yesterday to change the thrust of the December testimony is ambiguous at best.

The response of the international community to Hussein's aggression has been swift and sweeping. President Bush is to be commended for his ability to galvanize international opinion in condemning the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait. Further, the President's ability to garner the unequivocal backing of the United Nations has been a cornerstone of the United States response to the Middle East crisis.

But, let us not kid ourselves about this situation. It is a U.S. operation. United States forces comprise 90 percent of international forces in Saudi Arabia. While our allies provide us with the rhetorical backing and their votes on the U.N. Security Council, they fall short in committing their own troops to enforce the Security Council resolutions. Only two of the other members on the Council have sent troops to the Persian Gulf. And, there are indications that our Arab allies who have troops in Saudi Arabia would not be full partners in an offensive campaign against Iraq. In peace, the international coalition is strong. In war, it is fragile, if it exists at all.

Former Chief of Staff Adm. William Crowe underscored this point when he stated:

> I cannot understand why some consider our international alliance strong enough to conduct intense hostilities but too fragile to hold together while we attempt a peaceful solution.

Senator NUNN made some very pertinent remarks earlier today on the Senate floor about the timing of the sanctions. He asserted correctly that, in August, when we first contemplated imposing sanctions, everyone agreed that the economic embargo would take at least 9 months to 1 year, and perhaps as long as 18 months, before the full effect would be felt in Iraq. Now, we are effectively being told that 5 months is long enough and that we can wait no longer. However, no one has demonstrated why we have decided to sell short on the sanctions.

Though no one can guarantee the success of the economic embargo, the outcome of waging war against Iraq is equally unpredictable. The aftermath of war, putting the pieces together, may leave the region with less stability and the United States with even less influence. Paul Nitze, a former Reagan adviser, confirms this point,

> Even a successful all-out war could throw the Middle East into chaos. With the destruction of much of Iraq's military capability, Syria and Iran could be expected to vie for regional domination. Other nations—including Saudi Arabia, Jordan and Egypt—could be destabilized, enraged by their government's collaboration with Americans who had killed thousands of their Arab brothers.

Gen. H. Norman Schwarzkopf, commander of American forces in the Persian Gulf, also recognizes the difficulty of securing long-term United States interests in the Middle East, and the potential for creating a power vacuum in the region. He stated in a November interview,

> The ultimate objective is to make sure that we have peace, stability and a correct balance of power in the Middle East, so that all nations can continue to prosper without the fear of being attacked or blackmailed by a neighboring state. There are many ways you can accomplish that. Obviously one way would be the total destruction of Iraq, but I am not sure that is in the interest of the long-term balance of power in this region.

As some have suggested, this is not a question of supporting our troops in the field. I have fully supported our troops and I will continue to support them regardless of the outcome of this vote. I just find it disheartening that some seek to politicize this debate, to question our patriotism and suggest that by not supporting the President on this vote that we are undermining American interests and placing the lives of American soldiers in danger. I find it ironic that these same people who question the Hamilton resolution backers' support for our troops are so ready to send many of them to their deaths. I concur with General Schwarzkopf, the commander of United States ground forces in Saudi Arabia. He said, "If the alternative to dying is sitting out in the Sun for another summer, I think that's not a bad alternative."

Mr. Speaker, we all support the President's goals in the Middle East. The question we must answer is not whether we have cause to go to war—international consensus clearly says that we do—but whether going to war is in the best interest of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, let there be no mistake about it. We are being driven to the edge of a potentially devastating military confrontation not because Iraq has viciously and without provocation occupied its sovereign neighbor, which it has and which has rightly generated a tough and vigilant response from our Nation and the world community. We stand on the brink of war because of our own over dependence on Persian Gulf oil.

Preserving access to cheap oil from the Middle East is the only real vital national interests at stake here. And, Mr. Speaker, the tragedy is that the two presidents of the last decade dismantled a whole array of programs that were designed to protect our economy, our jobs, and our vital national interests from just the kind of threatened oil supply interruptions that have forced us to mount this massive force against Saddam Hussein.

In 1980, the Federal commitment to conservation and renewable energy technologies that would help reduce our reliance on imported oil exceeded $1 billion. Over the last decade, however, that support was slashed by more than 90 percent, in real terms. And, funding for these technologies over the entire decade of the eighties totaled just $3.3 billion. That's how much our current deployment in the Middle East will cost us in just 33 days, and that is without a single shot being fired.

Clearly, there is a dramatic inconsistency between the price the President is willing to pay to prevent Saddam Hussein from dominating Middle East Eastern oil, and his willingness to take even modest, affordable steps toward reducing United States dependence on imported oil.

Largely because we abandoned our support for these technologies, imports make up a greater percentage of our demand for oil than at any other time in our Nation's history. Oil imports have risen 60 percent in the past 6 years alone.

Today, the price for that dependence and for the abdication of an energy security policy has finally come due. If oil is our primary purpose for being in Saudi Arabia, then we must resolve the dilemma of whether or not adherence to a cheap oil policy is more valuable than the lives of thousands of American servicemen.

President Bush talks of a new world order, of an opportunity to establish a precedent on which the future of international and diplomatic relations will be based. However, by going to war now, having given the economic embargo only 5 months to work, it seems to me that we are only resorting to the tired old solutions of the past.

The United States is uncontested in its military prowess. We have the ability to reach into the far corners of the Earth and destroy any opponent who steps in our way. Perhaps it is because we are so strong that the military option comes to us so easily. We have come to rely on it readily and as anything but the last resort which it should be.

Perhaps this vote is where we begin to broaden the definition of strength in the new world order. As John F. Kennedy said in his inaugural address 30 years ago, "Let us never negotiate out of fear. But let us never fear to negotiate." Clearly, we need fear no one. But where and when do we overcome the fear to negotiate? We must rise above the passions of the moment, and err on the side of patience and diligence and consistency.

Of course, each of us is making a decision today based on conviction and our best judgment. The President and the Congress act knowing that whatever fate will bring—from a negotiated settlement at the last possible moment to a bloody and protracted war and all possibilities in between—leaves enormous advantage in its aftermath for those who focus not on policy but on political campaigns.

There are some who are already attempting to build a case against the Democratic Party because its leadership in Congress had generally chosen to withhold the grant of an offensive military option for the moment. Even after agreeing to a massive deployment of American troops to Saudi Arabia, placing them in a deterrent posture, and supporting the President's policy with great consistency, it is now said that we are appeasers or that we lack the will to ever commit troops to combat, simply because we wish to try alternatives to the immediate use of force.

Where and when will we decide that toughness comes from relentless dedication to the pursuit of policy goals over time. If this Nation—which in the very recent past was subsidizing Iraq's economy, providing it with intelligence information about Iran and looking the other way as Iraq acquired advanced military technologies—really cares to be a continuing force in the region, it must be willing to endure long and difficult contributions to the peace of the region—including regrettably, for the moment, a continued deployment of our young men and women in this very harsh terrain.

We are told that the President fears that the American people would not have the patience for a long commitment—that staying the course is politically untenable. Are we saying that this preeminent world power's attention span in not long enough? Or, is it the Congress and the President, who cannot provide the inspirational leadership to carry effectively this sort of cause to the American people over an extended period of time. If this is the case, we could easily be defined as we have defined the Soviets—as a military power only, not a world power in every sense. And, can we then justify sending American troops to die in combat simply because our elected officials lack the leadership qualities needed to sustain American public opinion.

I do not rule out the possibility of using force in the future. But, today, I am not convinced that we have given diplomatic and economic pressures time enough to work. The evidence is clear that the economic sanctions are working. But the evidence is not clear that we will benefit from war. As Paul Nitze asserts, "the all-out war option seems highly counterproductive in the long term and certainly not worth the thousands of lives it would cost."

Mr. Speaker, this is without question the most difficult issue I have had to grapple with in my public career. Our decision on these resolutions will have far-reaching implications for our country and for the world. Today, Mr. Speaker, I believe there is an alternative to going to war—an alternative that will save American lives and achieve the United States goals in the Middle East. This alternative is embodied in the Hamilton-Gephardt resolution.

□ 2340

Mr. McCANDLESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BAKER].

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, July 7, 1990 and there are reports of Iraq's accusations that Kuwait is stealing oil from the Rumailia oil field, and Iraq demands reimbursement. On August 1, 1990, the Iraq-Kuwait talks break down, and borders are closed. August 2, 1990, Iraq invades Kuwait, and in an emergency session the U.N. Security Council pases resolution 660 condemning the invasion and demands Iraq's immediate withdrawal.

On August 8, 1990 Iraq formally annexes Kuwait. President bush issues a statement of United States policy and requires the unconditional withdrawal of Iraq forces. On August 9, Iraq closes its borders and announces that foreign nationals will not be allowed to leave.

On August 19, the Arab League holds an emergency meeting and votes to condemn Iraq's aggression and agrees to send troops to Saudi Arabia. August 31, U.N. Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar and Foreign Minister Aziz meet, and de Cuellar characterizes the meeting as a failure, as Iraq refuses to withdraw from Kuwait.

The U.S. Senate adopts on October 3, a resolution supporting deployment of troops to the gulf by a vote of 96 to 3.

On November 29, 1990 the Senate Armed Services Committee begins the first congressional hearings on the gulf crisis, and on this day the U.N. Security Council votes 12 to 2 to adopt Resolution 678, which authorizes the use of force if Iraq fails to withdraw from Kuwait.

On January 1, 1991, NATO sends 42 aircraft to Turkey to protect that nation from possible attack by Iraq. And on January 9, 1991, Secretary Baker meets with Foreign Minister Aziz and Iraq refuses to withdraw from Kuwait.

Time has run—opportunities have been rebuffed, warnings ignored. International pleas have fallen silently on the sand.

Sure, sanctions are taking their toll—the people of Kuwait are feeling the impact, and all innocent people in both countries know what shortages mean. But President Hussein feels no discomfort. His needs are met. He has no reluctance to sacrifice his people to feed his own ambition. He simply waits eagerly for our resolve to fade, or for timer to pass until the wind driven sand storms of summer make military action risky if not impossible. The bully of Bagdad does not believe that America will take a stand.

Now is the time to give the President real authority at this moment—while Secretary de Cuellar speaks for the United Nations and holds out the last real opportunity for peace. It is imperative that Hussein know there will be serious consequences, if he does not choose peace.

If we fail to adopt the Michael/Solarz resolution, it will not just be victory for Hussein, or just a political embarrassment for President Bush. There will no longer be reason for Hussein to alter his invasion policy, and we will have turned our back to tyranny, brutality, and oppression. May God have mercy on us all.

Mr. McCANDLESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS].

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased we are debating and voting on this issue, and I agree with those who say we should have held this debate much earlier.

In this most important vote, all in this Chamber are trying to achieve the same goals.

We all want peace in the troubled Middle East.

We all want Iraq out of Kuwait so that in this post-cold-war period all nations are notified that aggression will not be rewarded. The world will not look the other way as it did with Hitler.

We want to prevent an ambitious dictator from controlling the world's economy through his control of 60 percent of the world's oil sup-

ply. All of us recognize the danger of this cold and ruthless leader who used poison gas on his own people.

And none of us wants to put at risk the lives of men and women in our Armed Forces—or, indeed, any life.

Our decision today is how best to achieve these goals—to bring about peace; save lives; and prevent aggression.

The choices are clear: We can vote to withhold the authority to use force, and allow a longer time for sanctions to take effect. If we do this, I believe, Saddam Hussein will think America will never act. We will be back in this well debating again, in 6 months or a year. The international coalition will have unravelled in the face of our indecision. The blockade will be a sieve. Our troops in the area will be less ready and less fit.

Even as we debate, Hussein is trying to negotiate with Iran to build a pipeline into Iran's distribution system in order to sell Iraq's oil to the world. If this happens, Hussein will gain the currency he needs.

If we choose the course of delay, we will not be facing a weaker Hussein in the future, but a strong Hussein. And therefore I am supporting the bipartisan Michael-Solarz resolution.

I pray that we do not take aggressive action on the morning of January 16. I hope that our determination and the strength of the world community will cause Saddam Hussein to leave Kuwait and that through the United Nations or a regional coalition, peace and stability can be fostered.

Everything the United States had done up to this point has been to prevent war. This vote gives Hussein one last opportunity to comply with the wishes of the world community—the United Nations and indeed his neighboring Arab nations.

Although a vote for the bipartisan resolution is a vote to authorize the use of force, it is a vote that I believe is the last real hope of preventing war.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRUCE].

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, a lot has been said about the difficulty of the choice we will make tomorrow. The President claims we're in a battle against evil in the new world order. Many say we must stop a ruthless dictator from further aggression. We have heard from our allies, from the generals, and we have heard from the experts. I have considered all their views and thought carefully about this issue. But when it comes right down to it, this is a decision the American people must make because if America goes to war, it must have the people's consent and support. And I have heard from the people in my district. Earlier this week, I was in the IGA grocery store in my hometown of Olney, IL, when a neighbor and a good friend stopped me and said "Please don't let the President get us into war." It was a simple way of saying what I think is on the minds of the majority of the American public. That our President has set a deadline that the American people do not agree with. The President has drawn a line in the sand which he claimed would stop Iraqi aggression. Now he wants the United States to step across that line, plunging us into a costly, destructive, and devastating war.

Why do we need to go to war? War should be an absolute last resort, especially when the sanctions are working. Members of the President's own administration have claimed that our current strategy is working, including the Secretary of Defense and the Director of the CIA. Former chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and a host of military analysts of every ideological background all agree that the sanctions are hurting Saddam and hurting him badly. Surely it is unwise to change an effective, working strategy.

For those who say that we cannot afford to wait, I ask them, why could we wait for 45 years with a policy of containment and economic isolation to topple the Soviet Union and we can't wait a year to topple Iraq, a much less formidable foe? There are 10 previous cases in modern history when we've slapped sanctions on dictators, and every time, they have contributed significantly to their downfall. Remember Somoza in Nicaragua? Idi Amin in Uganda? And the current regime in South Africa.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that Mr. GEPHARDT and Mr. HAMILTON have come up with a resolution that will let the President of the United States and the American people know that the Congress has supported his actions up to this point. Iraq's aggression must be stopped, the United Nations embargo must be enforced, and Saudi Arabia must be protected. Sanctions can accomplish these goals, if we just give them time. Support Hamilton-Gephardt, and vote no on giving the President a blank check for war.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SIKORSKI].

Mr. SIKORSKI. Mr. Speaker, the architects of the Constitution I swore to uphold just days ago used an economy of words in article I, section 8:

> The Congress shall have power to declare war.

That efficiency does not make our duty today easy or simple. And that duty is not escaped by an implicit or de facto war declaration as contained in the resolution before us, House Joint Resolution 62.

Search through the fancy words and the noble notes and the meaning and force of this resolution are as sharp and simple as the Constitution. They distill to one word: War. And the power is granted to one man: the President. Congress thus becomes the bursar, our citizens the payors, and our children the currency of exchange.

Before that simple, terrible power is transferred from the elected representatives of the American people to the Commander in Chief, the arguments for should be closely regarded:

First, Saddam Hussein is an evil man.

That is a truth. In one decade, he has taken a million casualties. He has used chemicals and gas on thousands of innocents. He has cavalierly tortured and killed his own people. He has ruthlessly raped a sovereign neighbor. He has spit on universal conventions of war and humanity. And he must be stopped.

Saddam Hussein must be stopped and destroyed. And that too is a truth. The debate is whether we should, now, impatiently do that by throwing our children at his with maximum violence. Or do we strangle him to death by sanctions, embargoes, military positioning, threats, blockades, and diplomatic initiatives? The latter is paid with time. The former is paid with American blood.

Second, war is the only way to stop Saddam Hussein. That too may be true—next week or next month. But it is not true now.

In fact, the international opposition to Hussein is so universal, so powerful that Iraqi exports have been slashed by over 97 percent, Iraq's gross national product [GNP] has been cut by 50 percent, imports have been reduced by 90 percent, and experts believe the Iraq GNP is going down to 30 percent—with parallel economic and political instability.

Iraqi military defectors tell us military supplies have been shortened and morale is decreasing.

Former American secretaries of defense and state have told us "sanctions are working," "the blockade and embargo are biting," and the embargo is "the most effective peacetime blockade ever levied."

Gen. David Jones and Adm. William Crowe, both military men who rose through the ranks to attain the highest positions within their services and to become respected chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff for President Reagan, have urged Congress to give the sanctions full play and not declare war out of impatience.

Third, the international effort against Saddam Hussein will unravel if we do not go to war now. This is not even close to true. In fact, it is false.

If we go to war now, we will go it quite alone. A U.N. effort will become a U.S. effort. A host of allies in this effort, including Egypt and other Arab nations, the Soviet Union and other Eastern bloc countries, even European allies of long-standing, have told us and the world that they will not join with us now militarily.

War now will therefore mean that the blood shed in the gulf desert will be red, white, and blue.

War now will therefore mean that America's children will carry the burden for resolving what is an international problem. That American tax-

payers will carry the burden of paying for what is an international obligation. That other nations and economies will have their debts wiped clean by American blood. That the international effort will be ripped apart by U.S. impatience. And that the remarkable progress on world cooperation will be co-opted by a rush to war.

The United Nations has been given a new lease on life, the President's dream of a new world order is taking shape, friends are standing shoulder to shoulder with foes, Arabs and Christians and Jews are united in one enterprise for the first time in centuries. All of this will be destroyed if we strike without exhausting other options that involve these nations and, failing that, convincing many of them that quick military action is required.

Finally, Americans must ask why the most hawkish of our allies and those with the greatest economic stake in the effort are not carrying anything close to their share. If this is an international effort, why aren't Saudi and Japanese children at proportionate risk? Why aren't their—and a lot of other nations'—pocketbooks at least open in proportion to their financial gain?

Fourth, American oil interests are jeopardized, and that affects all Americans. This is an economic argument that has force—and so do the counter economic arguments.

About 15 percent of American oil comes from the Persian Gulf. If we drive 55 instead of 65 miles per hour on our highways, we can reduce gas consumption by about the same 15 percent. And thereby lessen the pressure to act militarily immediately. Are we now to ask American servicemen and women to kill and be killed and not ask American citizens to slow down to the speed limits or turn down their thermostats?

American car companies have the technology to mass produce safe cars that can greatly increase mileage, but they don't want to use it. Are we now to ask American service men and women to be shot and maimed and gassed and burned, and not ask General Motors to market their fuel-efficient cars?

American oil companies are getting rich on the gulf crisis and stand to get even richer. Are we now to ask Americans to offer up their sons and daughters, their mothers and fathers, their brothers and sisters to war—so that oil companies can hoard war profits?

Certainly, resolution of this crisis in the gulf will require American sacrifice. The kind of sacrifice and its spread have not been addressed by those who propose to act militarily now. American fairness and economic democracy demand that we not ask 5,000 or 10,000 or 20,000 young Americans to sacrifice their lives and limbs now so that we can continue to live high on cheap oil in the near future. Where is the talk of shared sacrifice?

Fifth, Justus est. "It is right and just" to go to war now.

Too many of those who equate mass violence with "kicking ass" and want to "just go in and get it over with" are quick to draw on morality and history.

Proponents talk of World War II, Hitler and Chamberlain, and opponents talk of Vietnam and old men sending young men off to reappear on little white crosses and VA rehab beds.

This is not World War II and it is not Vietnam. It's not "The Longest Day" or "Platoon." It does, however, raise the same questions of principle, values, righteousness, and purpose.

Much as we may want to believe otherwise, this will be no push-button war. No anonymous planes and anonymous targets. No grainy black-and-white newsreels and films hyping the march against Hitler. But full-color action-cam videos of destruction and instant replays. Technology and air superiority will not prevent the off-loading of body bags and paralyzed and maimed and burned American boys and girls. It will not prevent the destruction of civilians—Iraqi children and the thousands of Egyptians, Pakistanis, and others who labor in Iraq.

Likewise, we know that successful war requires an understanding of cause and effect—not simply the moral causes of war but the practical effects as well.

If we do attack Iraq and succeed, what then? Who will rule Iraq? Will Iran and Syria occupy Iraqi land and oil? How long will American resources and personnel be drained for the protection of the Kuwaiti Government and the necessary reforms in Iraq? Will the United States soon find itself engaged in another, possibly bloodier, war as anti-American sentiment in the region grows? Only months ago, the Bush administration counted Saddam among its closest friends in the Middle East. While we cannot undo the arms deals and diplomatic incompetence that encouraged Saddam's boldness, we in Congress are morally bound to prevent future short-sightedness in American Middle East policy before we send one man or woman to die. Few here or at the White House have even fathomed that puzzle.

Our Library of Congress tells us that words of the American hero whose birthday we celebrate on the deadline date of January 15, Martin Luther King, are among the most quoted by us: "Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere." That charge calls upon us to act immediately, effectively, and responsibly wherever we perceive injustice. King relied on the teachings of Mahatma Gandhi: "Non-cooperation with evil is as much a duty as is cooperation with good," but "violent non-cooperation only multiplies evil" and "evil can only be sustained by violence." While only two Members of this body will vote in the knowledge that their children's lives hang on this decision, each one of us should vote as if it were our son or daughter on the frontline.

As an American Congressman, as an American citizen, as an American parent, I challenge those who cry impatiently that the cause of justice will only be served by a rush to war.

For generations, Tolstoy has instructed humanity on war and peace, life and death, leadership and strength of character. Today we should listen to his words: "The strongest of all warriors are these two—Time and Patience."

Let us be strong.

□ 2350

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise because under the rule we have the opportunity, the majority leader and the minority leader, to ask for additional time. We have a large number of speakers left on our side, and for that purpose I would ask unanimous consent that we extend the time beyond the time now allotted by 4 hours, 2 hours on each side.

I might say before the question is put that it may well be that we do not need that amount of time, and, if we do not on both sides, we obviously can yield the time back.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. VISCLOSKY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have no objections, but it is important, however, I think, that, if the time is not used, on both sides the time be yielded back so that we can hold to the schedule that we told everybody we would adhere to in the morning by beginning sharply at 9, beginning with a rigid succession of the three amendments.

Mr. McCANDLESS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McCANDLESS. Mr. Speaker, there was an arrangement prior to this dialog that the amount of time would be limited per speaker in order to keep track of that. How is that going to be handled on the additional time?

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I do not know that we have had an agreement on limiting time. We are trying on this side, and we will continue to try, to cut down on the amount of time that each speaker takes, and I think, as time goes on, that will be adhered to.

Mr. McCANDLESS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], the majority leader.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCANDLESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume

Mr. Speaker, let us begin at a point on which most of us agree.

We agree that armed forces from the country of Iraq should not have invaded—nor continue to occupy—Kuwait. Most of us also agree that we should not allow Saddam Hussein to annex additional portions of the Middle East. Nor should we allow him to control roughly two-thirds of the world's oil supply.

Where we differ is in response to the question of "What are we going to do about it?" This debate—which may very well be the most important debate of the post-cold-war era—is to decide whether we have the resolve to take the actions necessary to deal with the crisis.

There are three resolutions before us. The Bennett resolution asserts the sense of Congress that the President may not engage in offensive military actions against Iraq without congressional approval. With all due respect to the distinguished sponsor of the resolution, he seeks to resolve a constitutional question that has been debated for over 200 years. While well intended, it is highly unlikely that a nonbinding resolution will settle that debate.

Passage of either the Hamilton or Michel resolutions will make the Bennett resolution unnecessary. However, because the vote on Bennett will occur first, I must oppose it. If the Bennett resolution was adopted, and the Michel resolution was subsequently defeated, it would send the message to Saddam Hussein that Congress currently lacks the resolve to deal with Iraq. That begs the question: "If not now, when?"

The Hamilton resolution says that the United States will continue to rely on economic sanctions, and tells Iraq that it need not worry about military action until—and unless—it is approved by Congress at some unspecified time in the future. The Michel resolution authorizes the use of military force—if necessary—to drive Iraq out of Kuwait.

Several of my colleagues have invoked the painful memories of the Vietnam war in support of the Hamilton resolution. While they are correct to remind us of Vietnam, they have failed to learn from history. During the 1960's, some argued that we should not have troops in Southeast Asia. Others argued that we should do what was necessary to win the war. The very same arguments are being made today about the Middle East. The tragedy of Vietnam is that the United States was indecisive and committed troops—and sacrificed the lives of over 58,000 Americans—without the resolve to win.

Make no mistake. The Hamilton resolution sets the stage for another Vietnam. It says, "Keep the troops in the gulf, but do not allow them to resolve the crisis." I cannot and will not support it. I would have far more respect for a resolution that informs Saddam Hussein that he is welcome to the Middle East, and which calls for a complete withdrawal of United States forces from the region. I don't agree with that position, but it is consistent for those who advocate peace at any price.

Let's not repeat the mistakes of the past. Support the Michel resolution and allow us to resolve the crisis. Absent a complete withdrawal, anything less is a vote for another Vietnam.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state his understanding of the situation at this point.

The gentleman from California [Mr. McCANDLESS] would have 2 hours and 47½ minutes remaining. There are 2 minutes remaining for the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI] and there are 3 hours and 14 minutes remaining for the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN].

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS].

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the Gephardt-Hamilton resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I have had no trouble coming to this conclusion. I sympathize with those who have had to agonize, with those who had been traumatized by the fact that they are confronted with this very difficult decision, but I made up my mind a long time ago in my life. I do not believe in war. I do not believe it is a viable way by which we can resolve conflict. I believe in peace. I do not believe in war or death.

Mr. Speaker, I just returned from Saudi Arabia. I talked with the young men and women there. I do not agree with the representations of others who have returned who talk about the high morale and the fact that they are ready to go and that they are ready to be involved in war. I talked with young men and women about their families, and I asked them about their mothers and their fathers, and many of them said to me before I left, "Ms. WATERS, can you and the Members of Congress find a way to get us out of here? Can you find a way to prevent war?"

Mr. Speaker, I simply said to them, "I'm a new Member of Congress with very little influence. But I guarantee that my voice will be heard as I speak to the other Members about my feelings about this war."

I do not know a lot about how the President came to this conclusion, that we must use force. I have tried to analyze the President's decision. I have watched, and I have listened. This is the same President that has said to us on another important matter, "Read my lips," and I did, and I believed him, and then, when he changed his mind and we tried to find out what was motivating him, he simply said, "Watch my hips."

I do not know why the President came to this conclusion, but I do know that we must not support the use of force at this time.

Some Members have come before this body, and they have said that Saddam Hussein is just like Hitler, he is a demon, he is a killer, he is a terrible man, and he may be all of these things.

□ 2400

But we must come to grips with the way we make public policy in this body. We cannot continue to insult the intelligence of the American public. We cannot continue to say to them, "He was all right just a few months ago." We were aligned with him when he fought the war against Iran. He was our friend, and we gave him support, and we had many Members who stood here and said, "Support him," and they now say that he is Hitler and he is such a terrible man.

Mr. Speaker, I know that there are problems in the Persian Gulf. I do not believe that using force is going to solve the complications and the problems that we have in the Middle East. It is about time that we understand that if we take Saddam out today, it will be Assad from Syria tomorrow. If we take him out, the next day it will be Iran. They will team up then with somebody else. Jordan will continue to play its games, and we will not know where they are going.

It is about time we confront the issue that we must be leaders in this world. We must bring people to the peace table. We must talk about how we deal with the future. Again, I know that the President of this country has said that he is not into the "vision" thing. But I am into the "vision" thing. I have a vision of what this world could be and what it should be. I have a vision for peace. I have a vision that we can say to the young people of this country, "We don't believe in war and weapons."

And just as we do not want them to use weaponry in this conflict, we do not want them to use AK-47's in Harlem and in south central Los Angeles, in these inner cities where we see gang warfare. We should be saying to the world, "We want to solve the problems of people. We believe in human potential, and we want to do something about the infrastructure of America. We want to get rid of the deaths of children that we are experiencing here in this country today. We want to do something about the health care needs of this country, and we want to make sure that the rural health care needs are being met in this country."

Madam Speaker, it is about time we share our vision with the world and we

give real leadership. I say to the Members, do not support the President in his effort to use force at this time, but let us talk about the unthinkable. Let us talk about a world conference for peace. Let us say to all of our friends and our allies, "We love you, but we must talk about peace. And let us say that to those people who only think that the way to deal with the problems today is to use force against this one man who we have made bigger than life. He is only a human being. He is only one other human being who is wrong in what he has done, but he is a human being that we must force to the peace table along with all the others who would dare to use aggression to solve the conflicts in whatever way they think they should be solved.

Mr. McCANDLESS. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of peace and our men and women in the Middle East.

We are here today because Saddam Hussein is a world criminal. He has slaughtered his own people, he has slaughtered innocent civilians in Kuwait, and he has ignored and trampled upon the basic human rights of Americans and others in using them as human shields to protect his unprovoked aggression. He has personally committed murder and has overseen the mass murder of his own people. He is surrounded by a limited number of advisors, none of whom would gentle his condition.

To allow Hussein to remain in Kuwait indefinitely while leaky sanctions are continued means an increasingly defiant Saddam with less and less to lose.

Since the middle of this century, the United States has had inviolate policies in the region. Our Nation and I personally are committed to the survival of the State of Israel, even though we may have concerns about some policies of the Israeli Government.

Our Nation has as well had a long and close relationship with, and commitment to Saudi Arabia and other Arab nations. We cannot and will not sit by and see Saudi Arabia and the entire peninsula go the way of Kuwait. Can you imagine the devastating effect of Saddam Hussein controlling 70 percent of the world oil and its effect on the world economy and world peace?

Saddam Hussein has today, a massive chemical and biological warfare inventory and is daily increasing his storehouse of death. He has the capability of delivering these weapons, and he has shown his willingness to use them even on his own people.

Saddam Hussein is rapidly developing nuclear capability as well, and could have it in usable form in short order.

Saddam Hussein has threatened terrorists acts through the world and we've seen the terrible toll terrorism can take, whether it's in Lebanon, or aboard an international jetliner carrying civilians.

Saddam Hussein has captured sophisticated weapons from his invasion of Kuwait, and antiaircraft missiles which he may not be able to use effectively today but will be able to use soon.

I know of no Member of this House who has advocated that we withdraw from Saudi Arabia. The United Nations regards Saddam's threats with such seriousness that it has authorized the use of force anytime after January 15 if diplomatic efforts fail. I believe the best course to guarantee peace is to provide the President with the authority to use force after all reasonable diplomatic efforts have failed.

To prohibit the use of force guarantees a stalemate and requires the United States to continue to have hundreds of thousands of Americans remaining in Saudi Arabia—indefinitely. It means that the families of the thousands of Reserves and Guard members will continue to be separated from their loved ones.

Madam Speaker, I met earlier this week with the families of many of our Guard and Reserve troops from western North Carolina, I met with mothers and fathers, and wives and husbands, and I cannot in good conscience act to guarantee that the active service time for our troops already in Saudi Arabia will be increased for up to 2 years—with no end or peace in sight.

Knowing what we know of Saddam Hussein and his terrorist capacity, why do we think troops left in harm's way indefinitely will not sustain casualties?

Knowing what we know of Hussein's development of offensive weapons we have no assurance that those weapons will not be used as the pressure on him increases.

On one hand, today's debate is whether the Congress will leave our troops in the desert while denying the President the option of force if it is the only option left available. Or on the other hand, allowing the President to certify that all diplomatic options have been exhausted and then determining that force is the only option remaining. The Congress must provide the President with the support to make that decision. I pray that decision will bring peace.

I believe that it is our best chance for peace and the best way to protect our men and women who stand in harm's way. I will vote for the bipartisan Michel-Solarz resolution.

Mr. McCANDLESS. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE].

Mr. KOLBE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Michel-Solarz resolution. I do so with the sober knowledge that 1 week from today American men and women may be in deadly combat with the forces of Saddam Hussein.

However, I cannot vote other than to support the President.

During this debate, it has become clear that members believe that we have three options to resolve this situation: Force, sanctions, or diplomacy. These options are not mutually exclusive, as witnessed by the implementation of sanctions and the flurry of diplomatic activity since August.

But I agree that force should be a last resort, after sanctions and diplomatic efforts have been exhausted. But the decision of when force must be used is not and never can be absolutely defined. Sanctions, to be credible, must have military force as an alternative.

There are some who say the President has not given sanctions the time to work. How long should we give them? One more week? A month? A year? At the end of a year why would we not want to allow just a little more time? If we cannot say today that force is an alternative, when will we be willing to authorize its use?

Sanctions have certainly hurt Saddam Hussein's war machine, but it has not crippled it. CIA Director Webster stated in his letter of January 10, "The ability of the Iraqi ground forces to defend Kuwait and southern Iraq is unlikely to be substantially eroded over the next 6 to 12 months even if effective sanctions can be maintained."

Nor have sanctions led to a decrease in the harsh rhetoric emanating from Baghdad. Saddam has not softened his position, in fact he has hardened his fortifications and strengthened his resolve.

On the diplomatic side, I can describe Saddam in a word: disingenuous.

On July 31, only 2 days before his invasion of Kuwait, Saddam began negotiating with Kuwait. At the same moment, he was amassing 100,000 troops on the Kuwait border. Kuwait was faced with the stark reality of either capitulating, or face disintegration. That's not diplomacy, that is vicious, state-sponsored terrorism.

Throughout the first few months of the crisis, Saddam initiated, not diplomacy, but a sickening lottery involving thousands of Western citizens who overnight became pawns in his grab for power. Every decent human was revolted by the sight of Saddam flaunting young children before CNN's cameras while citizens worldwide agonized if they would ever see their loved ones again. That's not diplomacy.

President Bush extended the diplomatic hand to Saddam, only to have it slapped away. The President suggested more than 10 dates for a meeting between Secretary Baker and Saddam in December. None were accepted, and no reasons were given. That's not diplomacy.

Tariq Aziz would not even accept President Bush's letter delivered in Geneva by Secretary Baker. And then Aziz reiterated the bizarre claim that Saddam's invasion of Kuwait was somehow linked to the Palestinian issue. That's not diplomacy; that is a lie.

I believe an excellent definition of the "new world order" we have been hearing so much about the last few weeks is the existence of autonomous nations, with divergent views and cultures, drawn together by the universal interest of increased social, and economic prosperity.

Saddam Hussein violates this principle. He repulses a world which is de-

termined to pursue peace as its final objective.

Saddam Hussein has not attempted diplomacy. A true diplomat knows the stakes, and understands the consequences of his actions. Surely the almost total unanimity of opposition to Saddam's aggression demonstrated by the world should have made it clear to Saddam that he miscalculated.

But not according to Tariq Aziz. He claims that Saddam has not miscalculated. Saddam fully understands, according to Aziz, the situation he has put himself in.

I share President Bush's discouragement with the diplomatic option because diplomacy has never been an option for Saddam Hussein.

And now Congress must decide.

Are we prepared to accept our superpower responsibility as the only country capable of stopping a brutal madman that posses one of the most powerful military forces in the world?

Only a few hours ago, I returned from the Soviet Union. While there, we met with members of the Supreme Soviet and a variety of other Russians in official and unofficial capacities. What I heard was a clear message: Only the United States is capable of fulfilling its role as a superpower and that we are right to stand firmly against Hussein's aggression. I heard expressions of shame that Iraq had been able to commit its aggression and inflict such pain on Kuwait with Soviet-built weapons. On more than one occasion, I was told that the U.S.S.R. should be standing alongside the United States in this effort, Afghanistan notwithstanding.

Madam Speaker, the clock is ticking. Every minute we wait, Saddam grows stronger. He gets closer to achieving nuclear weapons. He gets more opportunities to bolster terrorism. More time to dismantle Kuwait. More time to dig in and await Ramadan and the harsh Arabian summer which will undoubtedly make military operations only more difficult. And more time to threaten and intimidate the rest of the Middle East.

Are we willing to keep American troops in Saudi Arabia for a year, and revisit this issue then? That appears to be what opponents of the Michel-Solarz resolution are advocating. And if those opponents recoil at the potential casualties of military action now—and all of us do—they will be even more horrified at the casualties we would suffer 1 year from now.

Sadly, force is the only language that Saddam seems to understand. Now, he must know the strength of our resolve to deter unbridled aggression. Only the Michel-Solarz resolution accomplishes this task.

I don't want war. I don't want American men to die. There was another war and another time when the democratic leaders of the world could not face that same alternative. They refused to act when a small step might have averted Hitler. Instead, they reaped the harvest of death and destruction that was World War II.

The French Marshall, Henri Petain, put it is these words:

> Our spirit of enjoyment was stronger than our spirit of sacrifice. We wanted to have more than we were willing to give. We tried to spare effort, and got disaster.

Let this House stand today as one to meet this challenge, that our children will know that the principles America has stood for the last 200 years are principles worth standing for today.

□ 0010

Mr. FEIGHAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MANTON].

Mr. MANTON. Madam Speaker, I rise tonight in support of the resolution offered by the majority leader, Mr. GEPHARDT, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON].

Madam Speaker, at the outset, let me clearly state that I strongly support the following goals of the President's policy in the Persian Gulf region: First, Saudi Arabia must be protected from Iraqi aggression. Second, Iraq must unconditionally withdraw its forces from Kuwait. Finally, Saddam Hussein's brutal aggression must not be allowed to stand. I commend President Bush for his successful efforts to unite the international community in its imposition of economic sanctions against Iraq.

Let me also state the people of the Ninth Congressional District of New York, which I represent, have historically rallied around the President during times of international crisis. My constituents are patriotic and willing to make the sacrifices necessary to preserve freedom and protect liberty at home and abroad. But my constituents also know just how costly war can be. During the Vietnam war, the Pentagon categorized casualties according to the home Zip Code of every injured or killed soldier.

Woodside, NY, Zip Code 11377, a neighborhood in my congressional district, in New York City, where I lived for many years, lost more young men during the Vietnam war than any other Zip Code in the Nation; 28 men from Woodside were killed in Vietnam, 17 from the Army, and 11 from the U.S. Marines, including Lance Cpl. Thomas Noonan, winner of the Congressional Medal of Honor. Most of these fallen heroes were under 21 years of age.

The memories of Vietnam remain painfully clear in Woodside. Before my constituents are willing to sacrifice a new generation they must be convinced war is our only alternative.

Madam Speaker, as of today, I am not convinced, nor are my constituents convinced that all the alternatives to war have been exhausted. I also am deeply concerned that war in the Persian Gulf would be shouldered disproportionately by Americans. Many of our allies, particularly France, Germany, and Japan, have a greater economic stake in removing Saddam from Kuwait. Yet most of these countries have been unwilling to commit combat troops in the event of war. The few nations willing to commit troops have done so at levels dramatically less than the United States should war break out, American casualties would account for more than 90 percent of total allied casualties. That would be unfair to the American people.

Madam Speaker, the international economic sanctions imposed against Iraq are firmly in place and they are working. Iraq is not exporting any of its oil. Iraq's gross national product already has been cut by 50 percent. Sanctions also are weakening Saddam's military by denying his army the spare parts it desperately needs.

Madam Speaker, before we commit our Nation to war, we must give economic sanctions and other peaceful means an opportunity to work. This much we owe the brave young men and women who are willing to give their lives for their country. Until those efforts fail, war must remain the last resort.

I urge my colleagues to support the Gephardt-Hamilton resolution.

Mr. MCCRERY. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of our servicemen and women and for my draft-age son by supporting the Michel-Solarz for peace. No one in this room has my combat experience, and, in most cases, all of them put together. Gephardt-Hamilton means a war of attrition, our attrition.

It pains me, Madam Speaker, that Gephardt-Hamilton revisits a personal nightmare. In Vietnam our hands were tied, and over 55,000 Americans were killed. Double that number were lost of our allies. For us to say our allies today would cut and run is an unnecessary slap to their face.

Let me tell Members a personal experience. I have flown the Mirage fighter in the Middle East. I know the Iraqi skills and their mindset. I flew 300 combat missions in Vietnam and was part of Operation Proud Deep.

President Johnson had stopped the action against the North Vietnamese. None of us wanted to be there. We wanted to get the job done and get home.

From 1968 through 1972, the North Vietnamese were allowed to rebuild. We saw clearly the need for striking North Vietnam, but his forces and our politicians held us back. We launched a second time, but were called back. We launched a third time, but scrubbed the mission due to bad weather. We again asked the politicians for an extension

of time. They said no, take those 3 days or none.

Madam Speaker, with that restriction we attacked. We lost over 20 aircraft in 2 days.

This body is being called upon to make a prompt and wise decision based on facts, not politics. The facts are indisputable. Sanctions alone will not remove Iraq's Army from Kuwait. If I believed it could, I would change my vote. I know in my heart that it won't.

Madam Speaker, it is not that this Congress should shrink from its constitutional responsibilities of declaring war. Far from it, Rather, we should clearly vest our President with the authority he needs in these crucial times so that our world can for now grasp a tenuous hold on peace.

We, with our inaction, would play directly into Saddam Hussein's hands, for today, for hope of peace tomorrow. I do not believe in war, as my colleague previously stated. I want to get us out safely. But an extension of time and sanctions would clearly not get us out.

Can you imagine, Saddam Hussein does not have revetments in Kuwait. He does in Iraq. I have attacked targets that have not been revetted, and been successful. I have been with aircraft that have attacked revetted implacements, and it cost us dearly in pilots' lives.

The sanctions will not get the job done. The President is working with Congress today and working with the world that supports the President. Only in Congress have we some that do not support our President.

Anyone who attempts to do what the Gephardt-Hamilton bill does, I will fight it, because it has cost lives in the past, and it will in the future. The lives of my son, your sons, and your daughters, rest with not supporting Gephardt-Hamilton. Let us bring home our MIA's from Vietnam, let us bring home our troops safely from Saudi Arabia, by supporting Michel-Solarz for peace. For those of us that have fought for life, and those that face death in Saudi Arabia, life has a special flavor that you, the protected, will never know.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN].

Mr. FEIGHAN. Madam Speaker, the debate today is not over U.S. goals in the gulf crisis. Our goals are clear: to force Saddam Hussein to withdraw his forces from Kuwait. And beyond that the elimination of Saddam Hussein's potential to rain death and destruction upon our Middle East allies: Israel, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Jordan, Turkey, and, in fact, on all the nations of the region that Saddam has threatened at one time or another.

There is unanimity in this body about those goals. Saddam Hussein should not think for a minute that this Congress is divided on those fundamentals.

We stand as one in opposition to Saddam Hussein and everything he stands for.

And we stand as one behind President Bush and his promise that Saddam's aggression "will not stand." It will not. We will not permit him to remain in Kuwait. And we will not permit him to continue to threaten his neighbors.

The differences in this body are over what would constitute the best means of reversing the consequences of Saddam Hussein's aggression and of eliminating his capacity to terrorize his neighbors.

The supporters of the Solarz-Michel resolution believe that the most effective way of confronting Saddam Hussein is by giving the President the authority to go to war with Iraq after January 15. And, in fact, it is possible that—at some point—it will become clear that war is the only way to achieve our goals.

But Madam Speaker, we haven't reached that point yet. On the contrary, we see that our current policy—the policy of sanctions—is working. Only a few weeks ago, the administration's own witnesses conceded that Saddam was being badly hurt by our economic blockade.

And he is hurting even more now. Right now, we are blocking 90 percent of Iraq's imports and 97 percent of its exports. We are depriving Saddam of $1½ billion in hard currency each month.

In 6 months, he'll be broke. His air force will be grounded. And his land forces will be stuck in the sand, unable to operate its machinery for lack of spare parts and supplies.

Why then should we rush to war: what makes a January 15 deadline sacred, when we have as good a chance of achieving our objectives through other means. As President Bush himself said back in August, "nobody can stand up forever to total economic deprivation."

Madam Speaker, there is always time to go to war. Our mission as Members of Congress must be to avoid war, avoid the loss of American lives, so long as there is a viable alternative that can achieve the same goals.

The sanctions policy provides that alternative and that is why I am supporting the Hamilton-Gephardt resolution. Hamilton-Gephardt says to the President:

> Continue the sanctions. Keep the diplomatic option open. Use the combined forces of our allies to remind Saddam Hussein that his isolation is complete.

And it says to the President, that if that approach fails, then come before the Congress and ask for a declaration of war. Hamilton-Gephardt would give sanctions a chance to work and, in so doing, it would give peace a chance.

My colleagues, I am haunted by one thought about what will happen if we vote to endorse immediate war today. I am haunted by the calls I will receive—calls that you will receive—from bereaved grief stricken parents asking us to explain just why their son or their daughter died in the sands of the Arabian desert.

Will we be able to tell them that they lost a child because America's security was threatened and because we had exhausted every possible alternative to war? Or will we have to say that we grew impatient and decided that we were tired of waiting for sanctions to work? And so we voted for war, and they made the supreme sacrifice.

Madam Speaker, the decision on whether or not we go to war rests with us. The Constitution is unambiguous on that point. And it is incumbent upon us, the Congress, not to cede that responsibility to anyone, even to the President of the United States.

The Solarz-Michel resolution does just that. It allows the President to unilaterally decide whether or not we go to war. It is, in my opinion, an abdication of our constitutional prerogative to declare war under article 1, section 8. In that regard, it is nothing more—and nothing less—than this generation's Gulf of Tonkin resolution. And history will regard it as such.

If President Bush believes that there is no alternative but to go to war, then he should come before us, the Congress, and ask for a declaration of war. But there should be no blank checks and there must be no undeclared wars.

Madam Speaker, this is truly an historic debate. While each of us will struggle to reach a decision on how to cast his or her vote, I know that we share one goal. That goal is to see the complete Iraqi withdrawal from Kuwait and the total elimination of Iraq's capacity to intimidate its neighbors.

We will achieve that goal. I will cast my vote for Hamilton-Gephardt in the firm belief that we can achieve it without the loss of American life.

□ 0020

Mr. McCANDLESS. Madam Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER].

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Madam Speaker, this debate is not about giving sanctions time to work. It is not about the imperfections of our allies. It is not about unleashing our military's awesome power in the Persian Gulf. What we are deciding is America's role in the post-cold-war world.

Is America to be a force on this planet? Or are we to retreat and let history be determined by others? And make no mistake. There are others, not constrained by our values, traditions or democratic institutions who are eager to rise in prominence as America fades.

Saddam Hussein is just one such man—ruthless, bloodied and without mercy—a tyrant who captured the reins and has maintained control through murder and terror.

This man never was a soldier, although he wears the uniform. He began as a hired street thug, a strong arm boy, from finger-breaker to assassin. His pathway to power is littered with bodies, and tales of torture and ghoulish brutality.

Once in control, he killed again and again. Sometimes a potential rival would crash in a helicopter or car accident; other times, it was a bullet through the head.

And as the supreme authority in Iraq, he attacked his neighbor, Iran, leading his country into a genocidal war that brought misery, death and privation to those he governed. He was trying to steal land from Iran—land that had been established as Iranian in a legitimate mutually and internationally recognized treaty.

But Saddam Hussein believed Iran weak and divided, so he grabbed for the territory. His miscalculation is evidenced by a million graves and the sound of mourning which fills the air in Iran and Iraq.

War, hunger, repression, demolished villages and torn bodies—such is the legacy of individuals as Saddam Hussein. And if the United States retreats into its shell, these are the ones who will determine the future of humankind.

If we back away, their power to control events, to exercise their will, to dictate to the rest of mankind grows as our influence diminishes.

Regional powermongers like Saddam Hussein, no matter how evil, will find their military might far more intoxicating, when it is no longer compared to that of the United States. This peril to mankind has been held at bay—deterred and restricted by our commitment and our muscle.

An American retreat from the world, a weak America, means a world subdued by the likes of Saddam Hussein. It will be, if we let it happen, a more frightening world. And the people of good will, suffering and huddled, will wonder why America, the mightiest force for good and virtue on this planet, the last best hope for mankind, threw its sacred trust into the sand and walked away.

We've heard much in this debate about signals. And yes, I agree that unless we stand with our President now, and back up his January 15 deadline, no one will again take an American President at his word. It will be the last deadline an American President will ever be able to set.

If we undercut our President, Saddam Hussein will be emboldened. Our friends and our adversaries will reach conclusions about the reliability and courage of the United States based on our actions. Contrary to what some would prefer, the world will not be endeared to us, nor appreciate the sincerity of those in this hall, whose hearts plead for peace and understanding among all peoples.

Our message will be Saddam Hussein, and all others like him, and all others like him in the years ahead. It will be a message not of peace, but of weakness, confusion, and retreat.

Undercut our President, limit his options, and you threaten the alliance our President has so painstakingly put together. If we eclipse his mantle of leadership: his claims, his promises, his threats, his assurances will ring hollow and be ignored.

Is this what will bring about a more peaceful world? An emasculated President, an America unable to take a stand without bickering, backbiting and retreat? Let us not kid ourselves. Our friends and enemies will see any cancellation of the January 15 deadline by Congress as flinching, cowering before a flame, a defeat of our will brought on by the fear of loss of sons, daughters, and loved ones.

Yes, it is right to care about the lives that may be lost should conflict begin. I do not question the patriotism of those who would vote to restrict our President in dealing with this threat. They do what they believe is best for our country. I ask, however, that they grant that I, and others who support our President, are as compassionate and as heavy in heart at the potential loss of life as they.

Our compassion is not just for those who may fall in the weeks after January 15, should force prove to be necessary. Our thoughts and commitment must also be focused on those many Americans and others throughout the world, whose lives and freedom are tied to America's willingness to hold firm, to do our duty and to meet our responsibility as the world's leading democracy, the only country with the capacity to lead, to ensure that evil does not prevail.

Our actions will tell the tale. We are writing the chapter that will lead inexorably to the next. And whatever history records, there will be time for an assessment. How we got to this point, this confrontation, will be judged. And yes, there are serious questions, but they need not be argued and resolved now.

Now it is for us to set a course, to demonstrate to the world with our grit and our steel, that America will be a force on this planet, even as cold war strategies and positionings no longer are relevant.

This is not the time for backing down. It is the time for standing tall, for proclaiming our ideals and our steadfast resolve. Let us confirm that America will not turn its back on a friend. Nor will we back away from mankind and leave the field to the likes of Saddam Hussein.

Let us stick with our President, stand behind him, and give him the leverage and authority he needs to deal with this enemy of peace and stability. Let us have the courage to do the right thing for today and tomorrow. After all, we are Americans.

And finally, let us note that the Secretary-General of the United Nations is on his way to Baghdad. He is carrying a plan which offers Saddam Hussein a way out. Even if Congress gives the President the authority he needs, there is no guarantee that Saddam Hussein will take this opportunity. One thing is certain. If we take from the President the option of using force, Saddam Hussein will have no reason to accept the Secretary-General's offer.

Giving President Bush the authority he needs as Commander in Chief maximizes the potential for peace. Words are not enough. If sincerity meant anything to tyrants, enough has been expressed in this debate to keep America at peace for a hundred years. Sadly we are dealing with individuals who understand only power and thus, even in this post-cold-war world, we must maintain a certain level of military might and expertise.

And we must be willing to face the challenges today and in the years ahead with the courage and determination that past generations of our countrymen demonstrated in their time. And now the choice is up to us. The future is in our hands.

□ 0030

Mr. McCANDLESS. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HOLLOWAY].

Mr. HOLLOWAY. Madam Speaker, I ask my fellow Members and colleagues to support the Michel-Solarz resolution. I strongly support it, and I feel our troops in the Middle East would also.

Madam Speaker, the sanctions against Iraq are not working well. The embargo is clearly not as effective as it should be and must be.

For example, some 1,000 Russian nationals chose to remain in Iraq rather than return to the Soviet Union because there was more food readily available in Baghdad than in Moscow. Mr. Speaker, we must demonstrate to Saddam Hussein that the world community is serious, that the United Nations, the United States and free nations everywhere mean what we say.

We have no choice but to support the President. No one wants war—the loss of a single human life is a terrible thing—but the result of not being prepared to go to war may be worse than war itself. Saddam Hussein has a proven record of barbarism and aggression. We must meet force with force. History has proven that mutual weakness is no guarantee of security.

As we watch the Soviet Union continue to break-up, it becomes clear that the United States is the world's only superpower, the only nation which has both the will and the ability to fight for the cause of liberty and justice on the world stage. Giving in to aggression does not end aggression but rather encourages it. Hussein must be stopped now. The future sta-

bility of our world is at stake. Madam Speaker, I hope and pray for peace. At the same time, I hope and pray that this body has the wisdom and the will to act as we must on behalf of free people everywhere.

As defenders of democracy around the world, the responsibility to stop Hussein has been thrust upon us. We reluctantly accept this responsibility and realize that it is a tremendous moral decision. We recognize that although the price of freedom is high, the price of oppression is much higher.

In closing, I strongly encourage my colleagues to support the Michel-Solarz resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ALEXANDER].

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam Speaker, with the Saudi Arabian oil supply secure and our hostages free we are fortunate in that the current stalemate has given us time in which to explore options other than a shooting war.

Yes, we want Iraq out of Kuwait. Saddam Hussein's naked aggression should be punished. And, I believe that he is being punished now—through the sanctions imposed on him.

War should be the last resort. It should be undertaken only after it is clearly apparent that no other choice is open to use.

Madam Speaker, I am not convinced today that war is the only choice. Therefore, I cannot support the administration resolution.

I was at the White House yesterday morning and listened very carefully to President Bush when he talked about a new world order.

The drama playing itself out on the sands of the Middle East represents our first opportunity in the post-cold-war era to examine options other than force in settling international problems—options which can become valuable precedents for this new era.

A new world order means new options, and we should have the courage to explore them, rather than resorting to force—which is the quintessential cold war response.

There are many actions which can be taken by a civilized world to assist in containing Saddam Hussein. Other members have reacted to these actions.

It is not fair for the United States to bear most of the burden for this effort, to have a U.S. force under the U.N. flag.

The nations of the world should speak with one voice in branding Saddam the international outlaw that he is, and to step up political and economic pressure to leave Iraq ostracized and bankrupt.

By taking these actions, the world community can show the Iraqi dictator as the outcast he is.

Worldwide condemnation, coupled with economic sanctions, can be expected to produce real political trouble for Saddam, perhaps even forcing him from power.

But I want to raise a point that has not been raised. Mr. Speaker, that we seem to have no clear statement of policy goals, "after Saddam."

Perhaps most conspicuous by its absence is the option that would free us from the dependence on oil from an unstable region, a region which has displayed a growing hostility to America and the Western World.

The option would be an aggressive effort to mobilize the resources of the Nation to establish an energy security policy which would displace our dependence on Persian Gulf oil.

As a member of the U.S. Alternative Fuels Council, I have heard clear and convincing evidence that America can become more energy self-sufficient—depending more on its own resources and less on those of foreign nations.

Without an energy security policy, America is doomed to continued dependence on Persian Gulf oil and the continued necessity to protect that supply of foreign oil.

It is mindless for this Nation to remain enslaved by our dependence on Middle Eastern oil. Continued enslavement means the very real possibility that our brave young soldiers will be permanently stationed in the region to keep oil flowing to the Western World.

Madam Speaker, how long will we allow our military, economic, and foreign policy to be driven by our addiction to oil?

The path our troops took to Saudi Arabia was littered with the good intentions of past generations.

Yes, we would work on energy policy.

Someday.

We would expand the use of alternative fuels.

Someday.

We would reduce our dependence.

Someday.

Well, someday never came—but "D" day is now upon us.

In my view, it is much more important to our long term future to declare our independence from Persian Gulf oil—rather than to declare war on Iraq.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the Hamilton-Gephardt resolution in an effort to ensure that we explore every possible option before declaring war.

Mr. McCANDLESS. Madam Speaker, we are going to yield 4 minutes, which I understand will be added to the 2 minutes of the Solarz group that is remaining if I have this all figured out correctly. We are yielding it to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

Mr. MORAN. Madam Speaker, I ask for the balance of the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. UNSOELD). The gentleman from Virginia has 2 minutes, and the gentleman from California yields an additional 4 minutes for a total of 6 minutes.

Without objection, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN] may control the time.

There was no objection.

Mr. MORAN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, many's the time I have dreamed that when I first addressed this body that I would be bright eyed and energetic, speaking for the principles that brought me into public life peace, progressive social policy, speaking on the side of my heroes, TOM FOLEY, DICK GEPHARDT, LEE HAMILTON, DAVE OBEY.

Instead I stand before you today exhausted, without sleep since Sunday, at odds with my natural constituencies and political allies, and while my anguished decision may have very little effect on the course of the world's destiny—it will affect the rest of my life—and the decision we make will affect the lives of countless others. I am haunted by the spectre of the Vietnam war and the error of the Tonkin Gulf resolution.

But the issue we face today, is about far more than the feudalism of Kuwait, or the efficacy of sanctions, or the immorality of Saddam Hussein. The issue we face today is about leadership—world leadership. The fact that America is being called upon to be the world's leader. Why? Because we are a people of principle. Leaders don't act only out of selfish interest. Leaders don't look behind them saying "if you don't go I'm not." And "leaders don't flinch."

This world that we are asked to lead is full of bullies and tyrants and petty international thieves like Saddam Hussein. And all of them are looking for opportunities to beat up on those weaker than them.

And for every bully who is allowed to mercilessly prey upon his victim, many more thugs will emerge from hiding to try to get away with the same.

Madam Speaker, a state of war already exists. It began when Iraq invaded Kuwait, raped and pillaged it. We are not starting a new war, we are reacting to a state of war.

We live in a fragile world with the international scales of good and evil now weighted on the side of good, of justice under law.

But that is because America weighs in so heavily on the side of peace under law.

There is a reason Madam Speaker, that the rest of the free world stands with us and it is not out of coercion. They have confidence that the United States will stand strong and straight, speak with one voice, and when necessary show the courage of our convictions. Madam Speaker, we are not a nation of warmongers nor are we a nation of peaceniks. We are a nation of patriots.

And when it is time to be heroic in the pursuit of peace, no petty thug

should ever have reason to believe that we are confused in our purpose, nor divided in our resolve.

Madam Speaker, I owe George Bush nothing, but I owe the democratically elected President of the United States to support his request for what he has said is our last best chance for peace. My support does not come easy nor is it unconditional, and I hope that the President does not abuse nor breach the faith I place in him today.

I ask the President for only one thing, that he accept the responsibility that the American people and the rest of the world have given him, to secure peace, not at all costs—but by every means, to continue negotiations—even if it requires judicious flexibility, to maintain sanctions, even if it requires infinite patience and to treasure the lives of every man and woman whose life is at risk—and yes, Mr. President, to use force if necessary, but only after all attempts for a peaceful, diplomatic solution have been exhausted. Mr. Bush, you are my President and our President and their President, and as we vote to support your request, you now hold our best hope for peace. It is an awesome responsibility. May God bless you with the ability and resolve to achieve it.

□ 0040

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. UNSOELD). The Chair must remind all Members to direct their remarks to the Chair and not to others in the second person.

Mr. MCCANDLESS. Madam Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT].

Mr. BOEHLERT. Madam Speaker, we live in a global village, one in which what we say here is followed intently, not just in this Chamber, or indeed across America, but at far distant points in the world. So the thrust of my message is not so much for my colleagues or those I am privileged to represent—it is directed to Baghdad, to Saddam Hussein, and to those to whom he looks for guidance.

Mr. Hussein, don't let a lack of understanding of a true democracy lead you to the wrong conclusion about what is taking place in this Chamber and this land.

The Congress and the American people are united in our condemnation of your actions. Simply put, you are wrong and your conduct, past and present, cannot be tolerated. It must be reversed.

It should not have been lost upon you that when our President stood in the sands of Arabia before our troops on that special Thanksgiving day, he was flanked by the Speaker of the House and the majority leader of the Senate—Americans first united in common cause.

What this debate is about is not an objective but rather the best means to achieve that objective.

I am one who has recommended sanctions and diplomacy as the best course to follow, feeling in the final analysis that patience and persistence would pay off.

What's the rush, I would argue, let's continue to squeeze and squeeze some more while simultaneously exploring every possible diplomatic option.

Well we have squeezed and squeezed some more and sanctions have produced some results. The problem is that the sanctions have not negatively impacted Hussein or his elite troops—inconvenienced perhaps, but no serious disruption to their military capability.

The people who have been hurt the most are the people for whom Hussein has little regard, the masses within Iraq who dare not complain or they will face elimination. The Butcher of Baghdad nickname is not an affectionate reference. He earned it by slaughtering his way to the top.

I didn't arrive at my conclusion about sanctions in isolation, but rather reached out for all the informed opinions I could get. I traveled to the Middle East, returning just yesterday, to question political leaders and military leaders and intelligence experts in Saudi Arabia, in Egypt, and in Israel as well as those here in Washington.

The collective judgment is that the tightest sanctions, with minimal leakage, something not easily achieved, would not force Hussein's hand, for a long time to come, if ever.

What about diplomacy?

No one should deny the President has demonstrated repeatedly, a willingness to go the extra mile. His calls for reason have fallen upon deaf ears.

So, the sanctions and diplomacy, which I prefer, have not produced. Now what?

We face a critical choice here today. We can endorse U.N. Resolution 678 and give to the President another option, one which we hope and pray will not be employed, or we can reject that resolution and deny those options. And what would be the consequence of either action?

An affirmative vote, one expanding the options available to our Commander in Chief tells Saddam Hussein he is wrong. It tells him we do not lack resolve, we are not willing to look the other way, we are people to whom the word commitment has meaning. Then, just then, coupled with what he will hear from the U.N. Secretary General, Saddam Hussein might get the message and commence to reverse his actions.

But if we are negative, if we say no, I am afraid a far different attitude will prevail in Baghdad. Saddam thinks he is winning. I don't share that view, but it is not so important what I think, it is what he thinks.

In no way should our action give him an opportunity to sense a weakening in resolve, a lessening of commitment.

Support of U.N. Resolution 678 does not deny the sanctions option; defeat of U.N. Resolution 678 eliminates the military option, it substitutes certainty for uncertainty in Baghdad, at least for now, and we don't want that.

Finally, I do not accept the inevitability of war, maybe it is wishful thinking, perhaps it is because I am an eternal optimist, but I will concede one point to our adversary: the American people do not want war. No thinking person anywhere wants war, it is a mindless way to resolve disputes. Yet we realize, as the father of our Nation George Washington said, "to be prepared for war is one of the most effective means of preserving the peace."

I urge support for the Michel-Solarz resolution.

□ 0050

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOEHLERT. I am glad to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's statement very much. It was very heartfelt and very much in the right direction, but I would like to correct one thing the gentleman said.

The sanctions have worked very significantly militarily to reduce the capacity of Saddam Hussein's Air Force to fly sorties or reconnaissance. He is running short of spare parts, and in that regard we know for sure that those sanctions have pinched him very significantly militarily right now, and it is getting worse every day.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Reclaiming my time, Madam Speaker, I will tell my colleague that the sanctions have worked most effectively at the very people we are not at war with or want to be at war with, the rank and file, the innocent citizens and victims of Iraq; but the Republican Guard, the Elite Force, and I wish we could change that name, they have not suffered at all. Saddam Hussein is not experiencing any inconvenience by these sanctions.

Mr. WELDON. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOEHLERT. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WELDON. Madam Speaker, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, having sat through almost 25 hours of hearings on the military implications of our Persian Gulf operation, I would like to add for the record that the greatest threat to the loss of life among our troops and our allied troops has not come from the Iraqi Air Force. It comes from the Iraqi ground forces, which are very heavily embedded into their operation, and that is our greatest concern in terms of loss of life, not the Iraqi Air Force.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for that contribution.

I would point out my assertion that sanctions are not working as intended is not a personal opinion arrived at in isolation. It comes after an extensive briefing from the Central Intelligence Agency, an exceptional briefing from Israeli intelligence, it comes from conversations with the leaders of Egypt, it comes from conversations with our military leaders in the field in Saudi Arabia.

Sanctions, I would like to think could work. I am convinced they are not working as intended. So I want to give the President this additional option, with the hope and prayer and expectation that he will not have to use it, but I want to send the right message to Baghdad.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, tonight in this long and sobering debate before our country, there are really two questions. On the question of whether we should go to war, there is heartfelt disagreement, but I would hope that on the question of how we should wage war, if we must wage war, that we speak with unity and clarity.

I would hope that all of us in the country and all of us in this House send a message to our troops and to the world that we are undivided in our support for the troops in the desert and that we are undivided in our commitment to total victory in war if it must come.

But the question that divides us and gives us cause for deliberation is whether we must wage war.

This is the first time that I have had the occasion to rise on behalf of my constituents in New Jersey to address an issue in this great institution. I have prepared myself to make this decision by listening. I have had the opportunity to listen yesterday morning, Friday morning, to the heartfelt and good faith words of the President of the United States.

I have had the opportunity to listen to the eloquent pleadings of my colleagues, but most significantly, I have had the opportunity to listen to the men and women and children who sent me here to Washington from New Jersey to represent and speak for them.

Now, I have heard in my listening the last few days lots of high rhetoric, high international theory about New World orders and great global visions, but I do not really approach this issue from that framework. I approach it from a more simple and clear framework that is suggested to me from those constituents that I have listened to, and I would invite you to listen to it as well.

When I make this decision that we will all make together tomorrow, I make it with this situation in mind. I imagine a constituent coming to me and saying to me, "Congressman, why did my son die in the Persian Gulf? Why did my daughter die in the Persian Gulf?"

If each of us is not prepared to answer that question, then none of us is prepared to commit our troops to war in the Persian Gulf.

My constituents know that we do not have a good answer to that question. My constituents know that sanctions have not been given the opportunity to build on the success that they have already achieved. My constituents know that the road to diplomacy has not been exhausted and fully traveled. They know that until there is a face-to-face session with the only person in Iraq who has the authority to make a decision, Saddam Hussein, that there has been no real diplomacy with real results.

Madam Speaker, My constituents know the difference between strength and recklessness. They understand that we have not exhausted all peaceful means to earn peace.

My constituents understand that a decision for war would be reckless and precipitous and wrong, and I understand that, too, and that is why I will oppose the Michel resolution tomorrow.

Mr. McCANDLESS. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCHREST].

Mr. GILCHREST. Madam Speaker, I stand before you today as a veteran who remembers vividly my experiences in Vietnam. I stand before you, Madam Speaker, today as a father who only a few years ago took my sons to the Vietnam Veterans Memorial to show them the names of the men who I served with who died in Vietnam.

On that particular day as we were leaving, a few young people ran up to a section of the wall and hurriedly looked at all the names. One of the young people said as they quickly scanned the names, "There he is, there he is. Here is Daddy."

Madam Speaker, as I stand before this body today, I want you to firmly know that I am committed to peace in the Persian Gulf. As a teacher who has seen students that I taught be deployed to the Persian Gulf, I am committed to peace, and now as a Member of Congress having a crucial role to play in the future of 400,000 men and women who represent this country, I am committed to peace.

□ 0100

I have listened to my distinguished colleagues on both sides of the aisle and stand now in support of the President of the United States because I believe he has acted wisely in his methodic steps, his step-by-step efforts in dealing with this enormous problem that faces the United States and the world.

We as a nation have implemented economic sanctions against Iraq, and they must continue to play a crucial role in our initiative. We have used diplomatic efforts wisely and intelligently and, yes, we must continue to pursue all avenues of diplomacy.

I stand before you as a colleague who asks that you support one of the few means left to us now to achieve a peaceful settlement in the gulf, and that is a strong signal of unity from the Congress of the United States.

That strong signal of unity is the Michel-Solarz resolution. We must work together to avoid war, bring peace and stability to the Middle East and bring our young men and women home.

There are three things we must have at this time to achieve a peaceful settlement and a stable Middle East. Those three things are: continued international economic sanctions, diplomatic initiatives, and a credible military option.

The paradox of military force and the will to use it is that, in all likelihood, it will not be needed nor will it be used. I urge your support for the Michel-Solarz resolution.

This Congress, this Government, and this Nation will stand together to show our resolve to the tyrants of the world.

God bless America.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield 5½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE. Madam Speaker, we meet today at a time of grave international crisis and a time of testing for our own country. The brutal invasion and occupation of Kuwait by Saddam Hussein's Iraq poses a threat which we can neither minimize nor ignore. The prospect of this ruthless regime, armed with weapons of mass destruction, exercising political domination in the Middle East and obtaining an economic stranglehold on the Western family of nations is simply intolerable. This aggression cannot go unchecked.

Saddam Hussein must leave Kuwait and that country's legitimate government must be restored. On this proposition the international community is united and we in this Congress speak with a single voice. We will debate vigorously which means might best be employed to achieve this purpose. But whether those means be an economic blockade backed up by the threat of military force, or an immediate military offensive, the purpose remains the same: Iraq's aggression must be reversed.

The implications of our debate have been articulated well by Senator SAM NUNN, in a message intended for Saddam Hussein:

You will hear an impassioned debate emanating from the U.S. Capitol. These will be the voices of democracy. Don't misread this debate. If war occurs, the constitutional and policy debates will be suspended, and Congress will provide the American troops whatever they need to prevail. There will be no cutoff of funds for our troops while they engage your forces on the field of battle.

President Bush, Congress, and the American people are united that you must leave Kuwait. We differ on whether these goals can best be accomplished by administering pain slowly with the economic blockade or by dishing it out in large doses with military power. Either way—you lose.

I believe that the best means to achieve our goals are articulated in the resolution introduced by Representatives HAMILTON and GEPHARDT.

The resolution begins by expressing our firm commitment "to reversing Iraq's brutal and illegal occupation of Kuwait." The resolution then authorizes the continued use of American military force to help enforce the United Nations economic embargo and to defend Saudi Arabia from direct Iraqi attack; states the sense of the Congress that the continued application of international sanctions and diplomatic efforts to pressure Iraq is the wisest course at this time; and explicitly states that the military option shall remain available should other means fail.

Economic sanctions promise to devastate Iraq's economy and drastically weaken Iraq's capacity to wage war. The international blockade has cut off almost 100 percent of Iraq's exports—mainly oil—and has stopped over 90 percent of the country's imports. CIA Director William Webster has testified that Iraq is losing $1.5 billion in foreign exchange monthly, and the Agency already reports severe shortages in Iraq's military spare parts.

Some of those who urge giving the President immediate and unilateral authority to wage war stress the uncertainty surrounding a reliance on sanctions. I am well aware of the uncertainty, and of the fact that a resort to war may yet prove necessary. But some talk as though we are weighing two equivalent policies in the balance—morally equivalent, equivalent in terms of human and economic cost. We are not. There is a tremendous burden of proof on a policy as costly and as dangerous as a full-scale rush to war. The gulf crisis may come to that. But we should make no mistake about the likely costs of that course of action—thousands of casualties, a conflict that could last a very long time, and the risk of a radically destabilized Middle East. As President Eisenhower said: "Every war is going to astonish you." The fact that a tightening of the economic noose will require some patience, will require continuing efforts to keep our coalition intact, and will be fraught with some uncertainty is not a good enough reason to rush to war.

In the meantime, the threat of war against Iraq must be maintained. I would explicitly oppose any resolution which foreclosed the military option until a specific future date, as some have suggested. But we must not take this Nation into war, with all the frightful costs and heartaches that entails, except as a last resort. I cannot in good conscience ask our young men and women to put their lives on the line until and unless all other means have been exhausted.

President Bush's original strategy—economic sanctions, a continued military threat, and the patience to wear Iraq down—still has much to recommend it. The international community—not just our usual allies but the Soviet Union and most Arab nations as well—have displayed unprecedented solidarity in isolating and sanctioning Iraq. I fully supported President Bush's initial deployment of troops to deter the imminent Iraqi invasion of Saudi Arabia. With those forces in place and the economic noose tightening on Iraq, we were well situated for the long haul. But with the massive November deployment and the cancellation of troop rotations, the President has achieved a buildup that cannot be indefinitely sustained and has created a tilt toward early military action.

I understand the dangers of pulling back from that forward posture, the dangers of sending the wrong signals to Saddam Hussein. We are in a difficult situation strategically, one largely of our own making, and there is no risk-free solution. But when I weigh the costs and the risks of premature military action, I conclude that we should persevere with the President's original policy. There is no comfort in that policy for Saddam Hussein. And there is the real possibility that we and our allies can achieve our objectives with coercive measures that fall short of full-scale war. The Hamilton-Gephardt resolution would commit us to giving this policy a chance to succeed.

The resolution would also commit our Nation to an effort to increase the military and financial contributions made by our allies. I share the concern expressed by many today in this Chamber, where a few months ago we witnessed wrenching debates on our country's fiscal crisis, about the costs of our gulf operations and the failure of our allies to share those costs more equitably. I too am outraged by the small numbers of troops fielded by the gulf states who are supposedly most in jeopardy. This effort cannot succeed, and will have legitimacy neither in the Arab world nor here at home, if it is seen as simply an American crusade.

Finally, the resolution would require the President to obtain authorization from the Congress before waging war on Iraqi forces and would provide for expedited consideration of such a request. This provision would hold both the President and this body to our constitutional responsibilities. The President is asking for open-ended authority to wage war, and the Solarz resolution, as I read it, would grant him that authority. Some insist that the Solarz resolution is less than a full declaration of war, while others insist that it nonetheless fulfills our constitutional obligation. You cannot have it both ways. What I do know is this: The President would treat it as all the declaration of war that he needs. That alone is reason enough for withholding support, for we should give no President a credit card for war.

I close, Madam Speaker, again emphasizing the unity of purpose which this debate must not obscure: Saddam Hussein's aggression cannot and will not stand. But the debate over means is nonetheless an important one. It is much too early to give up on the policy of economic sanctions, a blockade backed by the threat of military force. We must stay the course, and for that reason I urge support of the Hamilton-Gephardt resolution.

Mr. McCANDLESS. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON].

Mr. HOUGHTON. Madam Speaker, the hour is late and much has been said. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the bipartisan resolution backing the U.N. Security Council.

I wish, frankly, that this were not the case. But although through this resolution war is not a fact, not a fact on January 15 by any means, it does involve great risk, and risk is something we try to avoid since it centers on something deep within every politician. But I am persuaded that now is the time to stand up and to take that risk, and if we do not, I fear that we look straight into the barrel of higher risks for our children, our children's children, and our grandchildren.

I did not set January 15 as the decision point; the United Nations did.

□ 0110

I have no idea whether January 15 or February 15 or any other date is the right date, but some date is since without it things will drag on and on, and it is us who will be bled dry by the costs and not Iraq. And if that happens, not only do we suffer, but two other things take place.

First, the so-called new world order following the end of the cold war would be pushed aside. There would be no order. There would be no strengthening in the United Nations to evolve as the "good cop," the strong balance wheel of the world.

The second thing to take place would be that Saddam Hussein would see that not even a rap on the knuckles would be forthcoming, and he could bully and intimidate that part of the world which is not unimportant to us.

The sanctions approach, as I understand it, pleads for time, and I am sympathetic with that argument. I would like to see them work. I come from a world where even a moderate economic squeeze can be brutal on the lives of people.

But the question in a year's time will be: Will Saddam Hussein be weaker? And the answer is that he probably will be, yes. Or will he be less popular? And the answer to that question is also probably, yes. But what I fear is that by going the sanctions route alone, we write off the military option, and if we write off the military option, we cancel the one threat, the one message that experts say Saddam Hussein understands.

Abraham Lincoln used to say that if the only tool you have is a hammer, soon everything begins to look like a nail. This is the mind set of this wily leader of Iraq, according to those I talked to in Cairo, the Egyptians, the Israelis, the leaders of over 30 African nations, in other words, his neighbors.

Now, I know that this is not self-confession hour, but I must say I have tried to pray for peace and for wisdom in making any decisions that are coming in front of us. The Lord gives no easy answers, and he did not fail me in this particular case. Yet, having been down here about 4 years, one point is clear: Sometimes leaders have to do what is uncomfortable, and the approach of putting if off and letting others handle it later has its merits, and there are, of course, times when no action is the best action. But I sense that this is not one of those times.

As Richard Murphy, who is the former Ambassador to Syria, told me today on the telephone, it is a mean and brutal scene over there. This is a man who has killed 500,000, not of the enemy but of his own people. So if we want peace, we must put ourselves inside the head not of the Marquis of Queensbury but of a man who watches for any weakness, any sign of hesitation.

Make no mistake about it, through C-SPAN or CNN, the eyes of Saddam Hussein are on us. If we are resolute, he will move, and if we stutter, he will hold. I am told that depending on the Saturday vote, Saddam Hussein is looking for a way to back down and yet not lose face. He will not give us that satisfaction, or he will not give that satisfaction to the United Nations that he holds in such great contempt, but he may give it to the Saudis or even the PLO. But everything is on hold until we get the signal.

As proven by the Iranian war, this man has an obsession about not looking weak. He does not want to appear to have been pushed. He will play the hand out, and I plead with all of us not to fold prematurely.

I have had great difficulty in coming to this decision, and I have had great uncertainty, having talked to hundreds of people from the southern tier of New York and listening to their cries for peace. But I cry for peace also, just as they do and just as any person does with whom I have talked.

But peace is not the issue. The issue in my mind is how to get at it, and I guess I come down on the side of standing tall rather than standing aside. Good people can differ, and I do not claim to have all the answers. I certainly do not claim to be a Middle Eastern psychologist or a student of dictators. I just have a sense, having come back only yesterday from the Middle East, that now is the time to be firm. If not, then all will fail, as it did after Mr. Chamberlain in the 1930's, on the shoulders of others at far, far greater cost.

Mr. Speaker, I support our President and I support the United Nations of this world, perhaps for the first time in history.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ].

Mr. MARTINEZ. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Michel-Solarz resolution and in support of the Gephardt-Hamilton resolution.

Madam Speaker, I cannot in good conscience vote for a resolution which in effect is a declaration of war. I have not been convinced by the administration that we have exhausted all peaceful options to resolve this crisis. We stand today on the precipice of a holocaust that could very well engulf the Middle East, leaving in its wake the debris of shattered governments with international consequences that are unpredictable. Make no mistake about it, if war is to be the chosen path in the gulf, it will be American men and women that make the ultimate sacrifice.

Let us remember that the disproportionate share of dying will not be done by Germans or Japanese or even Saudis but by Americans who make up more than 80 percent of the multinational force. I would be more in support of a conflict if our allies who benefit by 80 percent were 80 percent of the forces on the front line.

I have heard a number of my distinguished colleagues forcefully argue that we should support the President and that there is no assurance or guarantee that international sanctions will convince Saddam Hussein to withdraw his troops from Kuwait. But at the same time, they have not shown any conclusive data that shows that sanctions will not work.

Don't we owe it to the American servicemen and servicewomen in the gulf and to their families back home to give sanctions a chance to work.

Madam Speaker, let us stay the course that the President originally embarked on following Iraq's brutal invasion and occcupation of Kuwait. Instead of losing patience with the situation, the President should continue to work on isolating Iraq, tightening economic sanctions, and reinforcing the current international resolve to squeeze Iraq until they see the folly of their way.

Madam Speaker, I continue to support the President's stated objectives in the gulf, however, I disagree with his timeframe for resolving this crisis by immediate war. There is nothing magical or sacred about January 15. It is simply an arbitrary date, nothing more and nothing less. We should not tie our hands by it nor should we be too eager to shed blood over it. It is my opinion, my firm belief, that the solemn act of war should be taken as a last resort and only after we have conclusively determined that Iraq will not comply with U.N. Security Council resolutions—and that sanctions will not work and that time has not yet come.

For these reasons, I will vote for the Hamilton-Gephardt resolution which declares that continued sanctions and diplomatic efforts represent, at this juncture in time, the wisest course of action to resolve this crisis. If war is to be the final arbiter in this crisis, and that time may come, let us not say that we did not exhaust all peaceful options to persuade Iraq to comply with international law.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield 5½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER].

Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York. Madam Speaker, for the first time since Vietnam, America is poised to fight a major war. Never before in history have we committed so many young men and women so quickly against a nation that did not directly threaten our borders. Soon our troop strength will total more than 400,000 troops in the Persian Gulf. In Vietnam, it took us 5 years to build up such a huge military presence. In the Persian Gulf it has taken less than 6 months.

President Bush has promised that he will not repeat the mistakes of Vietnam and that any offensive military action against Iraq will be quick and decisive. While I have great confidence in our military, I know that life is not a Rambo movie and that any major offensive against a brutal regime like Iraq involves great risks and great costs. We must consider fully the cost of war in terms of the loss of human lives and human suffering.

How many Americans will die if we go to war? It is a question my constituents raise back home in Rochester every day in their letters and their phone calls to my office. The estimates are appalling. Consider these: 5,000 Americans dead and 15,000 wounded in the first 10 days. Newsweek; 10,000 dead and 35,000 wounded in a successful 90-day campaign to take Baghdad—Center for Defense Information; as many as 30,000 dead in 20 days—Jack Anderson quoting from "top secret Pentagon estimates." Whatever the figure, the prospect of casualties by the tens of thousands is something we cannot ignore.

There are other costs as well.

What will be the cost, for example, of caring for a new generation of disabled veterans, who will require a lifetime of medical care as a result of a Persian

Gulf war? Today, our country is hard pressed to humanely care for those American heroes traumatized by past wars. Every week, my office helps veterans searching desperately for adequate health care, only to find that the VA cannot meet their needs.

What, will be the cost of war to our entire economy? Will the peace dividend evaporate forever in the sands of Saudi Arabia and with it our hopes for new domestic investments in deficit reduction, education, and health care?

Will the burden of shouldering the costs of this war, without the promised help of our allies, cause our economy to collapse?

And what will be the cost of war for the United States in the new world order? Will attacking Iraq simply increase a sense of world disorder? Will our new extensions of friendship to Syria and China—countries known for terrorism and suppressing freedom of expression—help lessen tensions? Or will these gestures encourage other regimes to adopt similar tactics within their own countries?

In raising these questions, I want no one to conclude that I condone Iraq's invasion of Kuwait. I abhor the atrocities perpetrated on Kuwait and its people. I know of no Member in Congress who believes that Iraq can be allowed to remain in Kuwait.

The key question we are considering today is whether we have given diplomacy and economic sanctions enough time to work. The potential costs of waging war is so great that we should postpone military action until we are absolutely convinced that diplomacy and economic sanctions will not work.

Even the President's own CIA Director William Webster agrees. The sanctions, he testified, have had a dramatic impact on Iraq's economy.

Two former chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff have seen no reason to rush into war. I was particularly impressed by Adm. William Crowe's statement:

> I cannot understand, he said, why some consider our international alliance strong enough to conduct intense hostilities but too fragile to hold together while we attempt a peaceful solution.

Paul Nitze, former President Reagan's special adviser on arms control, argued that a stable world order was more likely to result through successful sanctions than all-out war. Success through sanctions would lower the risk of violence and distruption in the region; it would likely maintain our access to Middle East oil, and it could halt the proliferation of nuclear weapons. Nitze concludes, sanctions are worth pursuing.

This Chamber is no stranger to Saddam Hussein and the threat he poses in the Middle East. I recall only last July, 6 days prior to the invasion of Kuwait, the House voted to impose tough sanctions against Iraq. We voted to cut off new financial credits and export quarantees to Iraq until President Bush certified that Iraq was in compliance with the international agreements on human rights and weapons of nonproliferation. At that time, however, we were cautioned by the State Department officials who said our tough actions "would not help us to achieve U.S. goals with Iraq."

Ironically, while we were reacting to Iraq's buildup of troops along the border of Kuwait, our Ambassador in Baghdad, April Glaspie, was telling Saddam Hussein in a face-to-face meeting that—and I quote, "We have no opinion on the Arab-Arab conflicts, like your border disagreement with Kuwait." At best we gave Hussein a mixed signal of our position on an invasion of Kuwait. At worst, we led him to believe we would not react at all.

Unfortunately, there is no way of turning back the clock. We missed the opportunity to deliver to Saddam Hussein, prior to his invasion of Kuwait, the same strong, unequivocal message that President Bush attempted to deliver earlier this week.

Today, we must deal with the future—and we must do so with a full realization that diplomacy and economic sanctions still offer opportunities for peace that may be lost forever if we vote to engage in war.

Over the past 4 years, a half a dozen of my colleagues have told me that the one vote they regret is their vote in favor of the Gulf of Tonkin resolution. In reading that debate, I can't help but see the similarities of the debate then and now. I urge my colleagues not to make that same mistake again.

Tonight, I rise in support of the Hamilton-Gephardt resolution. Our duty this weekend is clear. Under the Constitution, it is the Congress—not the United Nations or the President of the United States—that has the awesome responsibility to declare war. It is up to us to decide what is best for the people of this country. On this issue of war and peace, I urge my colleagues to consider the difficult path of diplomacy. Let us exercise patience. And let us work as hard for a diplomatic solution as we have to prepare for a violent one.

□ 0120

Mr. McCANDLESS. Madam Speaker, I yield 9 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN of California. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the President, but I do it with a sense of dread, that one of the most evil people in the world on the modern scene may force the hand of the most amazing coalition of allies in my lifetime, or at least since World War II.

The situation that we have been faced with in this Congress, beginning a new Congress, the 102d Congress, has made me very proud of this House and Members on both sides of the aisle, of all ideologies and persuasions. I have been particularly impressed with the freshmen class and the speakers on both sides of the issue, and the way that they have presented themselves, with dignity and with conviction. They have made compelling arguments on both sides.

I think I have only been put off by speeches that I could count on one hand. I can understand the frustration that led some people to use unseemly analogies, like we are trying to be the bully boy of the world, or have some John Wayne image where we are lusting to fight.

George Bush, our President, who lost both his crewmen, one of them a family friend on his first and final mission of the war, replacing Bush's regular enlisted gunner, that has haunted him all of his life. He spent 30 days on a submarine under the water on lifeguard patrol picking up other shot down pilots, some of whom lost their crewmen, and he is not going to look to shed blood. I think he will go the extra mile, the second mile, the third mile.

Mr. Cheney, our former colleague who I think is the best Secretary of Defense we have had since we reorganized our Pentagon after World War II, assured me that there is no need for our ground forces to share in any combat from day one. Besides, our units and the British units are behind young Arab men, a division that I would not have asked to come into this, the Syrian division. God knows Syria is as much a terrorist supporting state as Iraq. God knows that the butcher of Hama, Mr. Assad, is equal to the butcher of Baghdad for the slaughter of Kuwait City.

But there is a Syrian division on the front line, with two Egyptian divisions, the equivalent of a Saudi division, and there are Kuwaiti young men that are ready to try and liberate their country, young men that are not pleased with the emirs and the sheiks and the feudal system there.

Sunday I will meet with 500 young Kuwaitis who have left colleges all over the United States and who are training by our Army to go back to the Saudi Arabian desert to try and liberate their country. Some of them will have safer jobs than others. Some of them will be translators. That will take a month at least to get them into the lines over there.

The support of the coalition that George Bush has put together, the 100 soldiers from Honduras, Bangladesh with their economic problems and weather problems, Pakistan, Venezuela, people all over the world, for the first time since the end of World War II, a Luftwaffe squadron going to Turkey this week, a French Mirage, the British Seventh, the Desert Rats, the 4th Armored Brigade, people from all over the world.

None of these nations want to fight, but they realize that Saddam Hussein must be stopped.

The desert war will not be a Vietnam. All desert wars, because of the nature of the topography, are short wars. Bloody, brutal, but short. The India-Pakistani war, the Israelis' constant defense of that tiny little county to defend its very existence, our back and forth early 1942 crusades against Rommel in northern Africa. It will be short.

But there is an aspect to it that I dread, and that is the terrorism aspect. This sadistic gang of six, Saddam and the only five cronies that he talks to, one of them is his son-in-law and a paternal cousin, the same person; two of them are half-brothers who are full brothers to themselves; and another paternal cousin; and this unbelievable Joseph Goebbels propaganda minister, Jazeez, who talks about torturing pilots, literally cooking them and eating them, constantly talking about bathing us in blood.

Those five cronies, four of them related to him, are the only people that Saddam Hussein takes any counsel with.

That is why the sanctions cannot work. We are not dealing with a reasonable person here. We are dealing with someone not out of the Middle Ages, but out of the Dark Ages.

I am not worried about running out of time this late at night. I am fortunate enough to have been offered a hosting job on a live radio show starting Monday, 3 hours a day for 5 days during this crucial period, all next week, 300 stations, all 50 States, an audience of 1½ million. I urge my colleagues to call in on this show all next week. You don't have to buy time. We will continue to discuss this, because I believe, and I am not any more expert on this than anybody else, that the real moment of war here is mid-February, not the 15th of January.

Everybody I have talked to in the Air Force, the Marine Corps, the Army, the Navy, some branches of the service are ready to go because of the nature of the way they deploy their forces. But we do need some more armor from Germany, and this will get us, I believe, and the President has not assured me of this personally, but I have gotten semiassurances from his most trusted advisers, that there will be a period of time where we will try to make diplomacy work, during the rest of January and the first part of February, and I am holding out for hope against hope that even de Cuellar, the Secretary-General of the United Nations, may give Saddam Hussein the fig leaf that he needs to start a pullout. But it does not end our problems with this man, who will use biological warfare in a minute in his messianic, Nebuchadnezzar dream that he is the sword of the desert, that he is the leader of one united Arab nation. And this is the problem we have with the sanctions, and the fact that beyond another month, my arbitrary 6-month period, beyond 1 more month, President Bush may be asked to make that dreaded decision that only a handful of our Presidents have had to make, to put our young men and now young women into combat.

My nephew, blood nephew, a Dornan, Don Dornan, Jr., arrived in the gulf this week on a carrier I choose not to name.

BEVERLY BYRON's son is a Strategic Air Command pilot, he never knows where he will be. He may be on Diego Garcia.

I spent a morning with JERRY COSTELLO's handsome young son, Jerry, Jr., in the 82d Airborne. Our colleague, KIKA DE LA GARZA, has a doctor son there.

That is four. But that does not give us any other edge. We have come down on both sides of this. All of us have all our sons and daughters there. We are an American family. These are all our constituents, and we do not want to shed blood.

But there comes a defining moment in history, and this is one of them, where somebody, regardless of what happened yesterday and all of the mistakes of the past, and I can stand here clean as a hound's tooth and say I praised Israel the day after the Osirak raid in June 1981. I yelled at the Reagan administration and the current administration, do not deal with this lesser of two evils. He may be the worst of the evils. Do not deal with this man.

My focus has been on human rights, and it is a great compass to have in this House, and I recommend it to the freshmen.

But that is yesterday. Tomorrow, this man is getting ready to unleash terrorism around this world without parallel.

□ 0130

I will sit at the desk and listen carefully to the rest of the fascinating debate and hope for the best, for peace.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MRAZEK].

Mr. MRAZEK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Gephardt-Hamilton amendment.

All of us pray that war can be averted in the sands of the shattered country that was Kuwait.

I don't know one Member of Congressor even one American citizen who hasn't recognized the necessity of confronting Saddam Hussein and neutralizing his ability to make further conquests of weaker neighbors.

I applauded as President Bush moved boldly, quickly, and wisely to isolate Iraq behind the most comprehensive blockade even mounted by the civilized nations of this world.

I continue to support the policy of tough effective sanctions that have significantly reduced—and will continue to reduce—the effectiveness of Iraq's Army and Air Force to wage war.

I would submit that additional patience on the part of our President will provide an opportunity for the international blockage of Iraq to produce further positive results in weakening Iraq in every important way.

Although there is no guarantee that giving the embargo an additional 6 months to work will result in Saddam Hussein's withdrawal from Kuwait, no one can disagree that his ability to wage war will be further weakened.

This weakness may eventually save the lives of a great number of young Americans if war becomes inevitable.

All of us pray that if war comes, it will be over quickly, with a minimum of casualties. But a continued sanctions policy that is tough and unyielding could avoid any dead American combat soldiers at all.

A tough effective sanctions policy requires that any nation found supplying Iraq with key spare parts or other war fighting materiel be isolated just like Iraq from the world of nations.

How much are we willing to commit to achieve our objectives if we rush into war? How many dead? How many billions of dollars? How many weeks or months?

We do know we have the support of virtually every nation of the world in continuing to strangle Iraq economically and militarily.

How many of these nations will commit their sons and daughters to fighting alongside our own? How many Germans and Japanese and French and Syrian and Saudi Arabians? If we go to war next week, we will learn who pays the highest price.

I enlisted in the service at the height of the Vietnam war, but I later joined many others in opposing the war because our Government could not identify objectives that justified the human cost of the combat.

I know what the price of war can be, and I know it is essential that both the American people and the front-line soldiers understand and support the objectives of the war and that they are willing to accept the costs.

We do not have that situation today.

To give the President a free hand to go to war when so much is still unknown would be a mistake of tragic proportions.

Let's support the President's current course of action—the most comprehensive economic embargo the world has ever known, combined with deft, tough international diplomatic efforts, and an in-place international military force capable of going to war in short order—while giving him the time to answer for Congress and the American people these fundamental questions.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5½ minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER].

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, the hour is late and all of us have spent literally dozens of hours listening to this historical debate, and I sometimes think that everything that could be said has been said. But nevertheless, when we vote tomorrow we must think long and hard about the grant of absolute power to make war that we may or

may not grant to the President of the United States.

If we vote for the Solarz-Michel bill, then we issue in effect what is practically a declaration of war.

If we make this so-called tantamount declaration of war and Saddam does not abandon Kuwait, then we have made a grave miscalculation, my colleagues, and we will have no choice but to embrace war, and to embrace the full war option. There will be no turning back. The economic sanctions road will be closed, as will the diplomatic road.

Paradoxically, we will have to go to war because many of my colleagues believed they were on the road to peace, and how ironic that is. What is war, after all, but the ultimate demonstration of the law of unintended consequences.

Vietnam and the botched hostage rescue attempt in the Iranian desert are stark proof of this.

We do not know what forces a Middle East war will unleash, but we can hazard a guess. We can guess that the war will unleash an unstoppable firestorm of Islamic fundamentalism, engulfing the Middle East, Africa, and the Moslem republics of the Soviet Union in its consuming fires. We can guess the war will not only destabilize Iraq, but also will destabilize Jordan, Egypt, Saudi Arabia, and the gulf coast states, leaving the region in a terrifying and tragic shambles.

We can guess that the war will destroy the oil fields, the refineries, and the pipelines of Saudi Arabia, drastically reducing global oil supplies, and shocking the fragile economies of the merging democracies and threatening global stability.

But after all that guessing, we must know that war will take a tragic toll of human lives, wasted, precious human lives because of the lack of wisdom and lack of patience on our part.

Mr. Speaker, has our country become so immersed in instant gratification that we cannot summon from the wellsprings of our wisdom and maturity the patience and vision to give a demonstrably promising sanctions policy the time to work?

Mr. Speaker, we are not justified in jettisoning the promising sanctions policy until they have been proven ineffective, a policy of sanctions that demonstrably, according to much testimony given to this body and to the committees of this House and Senate, a policy that promises to devastate Saddam Hussein's military capability and rid the Middle East finally and once and for all of Saddam Hussein as a towering threat to the peace and stability of the entire region.

Almost every expert who has testified before the House and the Senate and its committees have predicted that the sanctions policy will be successful, and none of them have even suggested that success would have to be achieved and demonstrated by now. Two former Chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and seven out of eight of the last Secretaries of Defense tell us that economic sanctions should be given more time, and they express their terrible reluctance to go to war until we have exhausted every conceivable option.

How can we fail to be impressed by the testimony of these brilliant men who have served their country so well? What has become of our simple common sense?

The Hamilton-Gephardt resolution indeed does support the President. It supports his finely crafted economic sanctions policy backed by a credible military option. That was the policy last summer, that was the policy President Bush constructed brilliantly, and it promises remarkable success, and it would be absolutely ludicrous of us to abandon it now when it is demonstrably doing the job and promises to bring Saddam Hussein to his knees, and all without firing a shot.

I urge my colleagues to support Hamilton-Gephardt, and to reject the Michel-Solarz resolution.

Mr. McCANDLESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RAHALL].

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, these have been somber yet proud days for this House. The debate has been high caliber, it has been formative, dignified, and made us in my opinion healthier as a Nation and stronger as a body.

There has been a lot of talk, about blinking in the last several months, about who will put their own interests behind the greater interests of world peace and stability. Mr. Speaker, I have blinked, I will admit it, more times in the last 24 to 48 hours perhaps than I have in the past 5 months.

I have supported the President in his commendable powers or organizing and maintaining international focus and opposition to the brutal and naked aggression of Saddam Hussein toward Kuwait, this despite very obvious misleading statements by the United States that we would look the other way if Iraq invaded Kuwait, given by our United States Ambassador in Baghdad personally to Saddam Hussein just days prior to his invasion.

I have blinked because I am an American of Lebanese ancestry, an Arab heritage of which I am proud. My heart has cried because of the backlash I have seen, and more of which I fear should more American lives be lost in the Middle East. My prayers go out to the families of those 98 Americans who have already lost their lives in Operation Desert Shield.

I personally came under vicious attack last November because of my ancestry by those who tried to link my heritage to support for Saddam Hussein. Mr. Speaker, I deplore his actions in Kuwait, just as every Member of this body does.

The President's name calling and Saddam's hyperbole have come to mean nothing to me. Name calling, unfortunately, has only hardened Saddam's resolve. Reasoned, objective and serious diplomacy now being conducted I hope will bear more fruit than media events of recent days.

I have blinked, Mr. Speaker, because I am an American first, and more concerned with America's best interests in the Middle East than any one country in that region. I know how the President keeps stressing that it is the coalition versus Iraq, not the United States versus Iraq, but no one is fooled. The United States has bought and paid for this coalition support. It is, therefore, very tenuous, it is complex, and it is a fickle phenomenon that one has to treat with kid gloves.

We all want to do what is in America's best interest first, not any one country in the region or any one country in the coalition, any one of whom will have agendas that are entirely different from our own best interests.

I have blinked, Mr. Speaker, when I traveled in the Middle East and heard personally from the leaders of those countries, including many that are allied with us now in this crisis. I hear their list of grievances against the United States for what they can only best describe as a one-sided policy on our part. They have seen us in and out so many times that they doubt our resolve should they be aligned with us today. They have seen us run when the going gets tough, and they fully understand the constant attacks upon us from that part of the region.

They have seen us in the past strongly hint we would protect innocent Palestinians, only to see them massacred in cold blood in their camps in Lebanon.

The Saudis have watched the United States arm to the heavens one country in the region while they, the Saudis, have to fight to buy defensive AWACS planes from us.

□ 0140

These systems are now so vital for our best interests and intelligence-gathering in the gulf region.

Mr. Speaker, yes, I admit I have blinked, but I believe it has been for America's best interests.

I will also state that I share the feelings of thousands of my constituents and perhaps millions of Americans. I wanted it both ways. I have wanted to kick butt and, at the same time, I have wanted no loss of American lives and to stay the course and give effective sanctions more time. I have attacked our allies, especially Japan and Germany, for not doing more to share the burden. Their help can only be de-

scribed as frustrating and downright despicable, but I know that this will not allow me an escape from the tough decisions we must make under our Constitution and will make in a few hours on this Saturday morning. Mr. Speaker, we have all at one time or another tried to go with the flow on this issue. We have given our President strong backing in August, September, and October when the polls were so high in his favor. Some have backed off when the troop deployment doubled, realizing, and rightly so, the changed nature of our commitment.

However, we all remain steadfast in our common goal of removing Iraq from Kuwait via every peaceful route possible.

I share the President's concern for human-rights violations, the rape, torture, and pillaging of Kuwait, and, quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I am more concerned about the rape, pillaging, and neglect of our own needs right here at home.

I want peace. The American people want peace. George Bush wants peace.

I want to turn our attention to our problems immediately on our doorstep, our infrastructure needs, our health care, our education policy, and in caring for the needs of our Americans right here at home.

Mr. Speaker, we have pressing problems with which we, until about 5½ to 6 months ago, were to use our much deserved peace dividend to help solve. Oh, how nice it would be to set up a special account to receive contributions from those we now protect in the Middle East and, instead, help protect and rebuild America here at home.

Mr. Speaker, I challenge the President and this Congress that the second we have ended this conflict that we move forward determined to make this Nation independent, to break the chains of energy dependence, to rebuild our economy, to defend this country with a new commitment to economic strength and to stop playing Uncle Sucker to the whole world.

Mr. Speaker, I blink this final time in these early hours of this fateful Saturday less than 48 hours from the deadline. After careful thought, the toughest vote of my 14 years in this body will be to support the President. Let us give the true peace a real chance. I will stand by our President. I will stand by our troops. And I pray for both.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EVANS].

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we are not simply voting on the question of authorizing the use of military force but also on the creation of a new generation of war veterans.

Most military experts say that we will lose thousands of young American lives and that the trauma of a technologically intense and mechanized war will cause severe physical and psychological damage to many of the survivors.

As a member of the Veterans Committee I have seen too many veterans suffer from cutbacks in VA health care. Veterans of World War II, Korea and Vietnam are not getting the help they deserve from the VA.

For example, our Government has continued to ignore the plight of agent orange victims and we have treated only a small fraction of vets who still suffer from the psychological scars of the Vietnam war.

Mr. Speaker, if we cannot help veterans from previous wars, how can we in good conscience say we will serve the thousands of veterans who will carry home the wounds of this impending war? And for what?

Should this Congress support a resolution that amounts to a declaration of war so we can restore the Kuwaiti royal family to power?

Should this country go to war to protect the supply of oil to our so-called allies who have not sent ground or naval forces to the gulf?

Should we send thousands of young Americans into battle when Saudi Arabia is not willing to fully mobilize its own population?

None of these reasons, nor any of those advanced by the Bush administration, should compel us to risk the lives of our servicemen and women.

I believe we should send our finest young Americans into combat only when vital national security interests dictate that we do.

In the meantime, let us continue the sanctions which are weakening Saddam Hussein's ability to wage war. And let us ensure that our allies like Japan, Korea and Germany send some of their own to the desert to aid our containment of Iraq.

War now means we will suffer greatly while our allies sit on the sidelines.

Such a war is not worth it—and it certainly is not in this country's best interests.

Mr. Speaker, it is for these reasons that I urge my colleagues to vote for the Hamilton-Gephardt resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GUARINI].

Mr. GUARINI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to strongly support the Hamilton-Gephardt resolution.

As a free, Democratic people we have struggled and fought hard for a newer world.

Today, we are involved in a historic debate; crucial to the future of our Nation. We have a profound responsibility before us.

In the final analysis, we will be voting our conscience knowing that what we are doing is in our national interest regardless of party.

Unfortunately, the United States may be headed for armed confrontation in the Persian Gulf. Saddam Hussein has invaded and pillaged Kuwait committing countless human rights violations.

The U.N. resolution calling on the international community to "use any means necessary" to bring about Iraq's "immediate and unconditional withdrawal" shows unanimous condemnation of Saddam's actions. This unmitigated aggression must not be allowed and must not be rewarded.

Since the August 2 invasion of Kuwait, the United States, with international backing, has tried moral persuasion, and face-to-face talks in Geneva. All appear to have failed. Iraq has not budged an inch and remains firmly in control of Kuwait.

Aggressive behavior by one nation against another must be resisted or we will lose the opportunity for a new world order. The rule of law must prevail. The international community should continue its efforts to enforce the U.N. resolution. The question is how best to achieve this objective.

In my opinion we have two options: We can continue to strive for a political solution through diplomacy and continue to tighten the sanctions or we can declare war. My vote is to give sanctions more time to work. We must be more patient.

Five months of sanctions have clearly weakened the Iraqi economy. By some reports their GNP has dropped 40 percent. They have been declared an international outlaw—cut off by the rest of the world, and their problems will continue to escalate.

We have already seen positive results from our policy. We have stabilized the region. We have stabilized the world's oil markets. Our hostages are safe at home and we have contained Iraq's territorial ambitions.

Sanctions are indeed exacting a toll. Our policy is having a marked effect. Why change strategy in midstream?

At present, our forces are in a defensive position and I support this fully.

We must exhaust all possibilities for a peaceful solution before we commit ourselves to war.

War must be our last resort.

If there is to be war, it is Congress that has authority under article 1 section 8 of our Constitution to declare war.

The President is wrong when he claims that he has sufficient authority under the Constitution to order U.S. forces into battle. He is our Commander in Chief in charge of conducting military operations. Under our system of checks and balances, only Congress has the power to declare war.

He has not only ignored the powers bestowed upon Congress by the Constitution but he has said that if appropriate action is necessary, he will go ahead without congressional approval. This is a blatant usurpation of power and a distortion of our constitutional process.

I am not ruling our armed conflict should the circumstances warrant it. Saddam needs to know that our patience is not endless and Iraq must unconditionally withdraw from Kuwait.

But, first, let us give peace a chance. Tens of thousands and hundreds of thousands of lives are at stake.

Wars are not tidy and they are fraught with the unexpected. If you have been through war—you have experienced the pain and the horror—you are not so quick to commit others.

We must ask ourselves if we went to war, would it be a pyrrhic victory? Are we willing to occupy Iraq indefinitely? Do we have a plan for stability in the Middle East? Do we have a plan to deal wtih terrorism?

Where to? What next, Mr. President?

We must make every effort to lead the way—away from violence.

Otherwise we will be unleashing the most awesome power ever assembled in history.

Let us not make war a quick fix. We need time to find an acceptable solution. Let us give ourselves more time to work with our allies to strengthen the coalition and to get them to join in a fairer burden sharing.

We must not turn this into an American war. Almost two-thirds of the 750,000 troops in the gulf are Americans together with three-quarters of the planes.

Our focus should be on bolstering our failing economy, fighting the war on drugs, making our streets safe, straightening out our banking crisis, and attending to our deep-seeded social problems. We are faced with a $320 billion deficit that is continuing to grow out of control and threatening to lessen every American's standard of living. This is a war we can ill afford.

The estimated cost of our effort in the gulf is $30 billion now. If we go to war this sum will increase astronomically.

It should be noted that Saudi Arabia, whose homeland and oil fields we are defending, is benefiting from a windfall profit of $60 billion. Every American taxpayer is contributing to this windfall. This is not fair and it is not just.

Patience is a virtue. NATO is proof positive of that patience. We acted together with our allies and we won.

Give sanctions a chance to work. Perfect these sanctions relentlessly—keep the pressure on. Strive to replace many of our forces with our Western and Arab forces. Work toward peace. Let us stand up for America.

We should all pray for peace and for the safe return of our service members. They and their families are making extreme sacrifices for the ideals for which this country stands. We are grateful to them and we are proud of them. We can best serve them by adopting a policy which will bring each and everyone of them home safely.

□ 0150

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SAVAGE].

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, I oppose America's military involvement in the Middle East, but of course this is not to condone the position of Saddam Hussein in Iraq.

I, of course, oppose all invasions, not only in Kuwait, but the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan and our own invasion of Panama and Grenada. I oppose all occupations, not only Iraq of Kuwait, but also Israel of the Gaza Strip in the West Bank and Golan Heights in southern Lebanon. I think that Saddam Hussein and Iraq should comply with the U.N. resolutions, but so should Israel.

I think that the United States needs to, in order to play its part as a world leader, be more evenhanded and fair. Before trying to wage war abroad, to try to win some of the wars in which we are engaged in at home: the war against drugs, the war against crime, the war against homelessness, the war against racism. This is here, before we go to teach elsewhere.

I think it is a disgrace that a President who just recently vetoed the rights of African-Americans to have a chance to get a more proportionate share of our employment in business, and ownership in this country, and to turn around now and ask these same African-Americans to risk their lives at a rate above the proportion of their population. The same may be said of whites. Whites' sons and daughters of working class families.

May I just add also in this debate, I think it has been clouded by jingoistic hyperbole that personifies the problem as though Hussein is the problem, so we can talk about doing out Hussein, bombing Hussein. Well, let me tell Members, if we bomb Baghdad, we do not bomb Hussein. We bomb and kill children, and mothers, and senior civilians unarmed. Do not cover that by some phony personification.

The real problem, if not Hussein, existed before him and will exist after him, the question of resource exploitation in our world where developing nations exploit the resources of undeveloped nations so that the undeveloped nations suffer ever-increasing poverty while the developed nations prosper. Africans, Latin Americans, Arabs, many members of Asiatic nations, while the developed nations with the Eurocentric culture, the capitalistic economy prosper, that is unjust. I say to Members that they cannot have peace without justice. Justice is a prerequisite for peace. If America wants peace, it cannot do so with military might, but only by promoting justice in the world so that our prosperity and good health can be shared by all. Justice is the answer to the problems in the Middle East, not military might.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. POSHARD].

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Speaker, it is an established fact: That both the President and the Congress unanimously agree that Saddam Hussein must leave Kuwait unconditionally.

It is an established fact: That both the President and the Congress unanimously agree that our troops must be given 100 percent support now and should Congress declare war and empower our President to conduct that war, they should be given 100 percent support in the future.

However, it is not an established fact: That we should abandon the policy of economic sanctions against Iraq while maintaining a defensive posture in Saudi Arabia until the sanctions accomplish the result of forcing Hussein out of Kuwait.

Let us reiterate: The policy of sanctions, international unity, and a defensive posture was one articulated to the Congress and the world less than 5 months ago by the President himself.

Now we are being asked to abandon this policy, a policy which the President initiated with these words.

This is a policy which will take time—it will require the patience of the American people.

The President of the United States is in the prayers of every Member of this Congress. Despite the brash statements of some, statements in error, that some Members will vote on the basis of their politics, I do not believe there is one Member of this Congress who wants to see our President or our country fail at this critical moment in our history.

But there are many Members of this body, including this Member, who disagree with the change in policy which the President has stated and wish him to stay the course which he originally established.

Why? Because we believe that the original course of action, the course of economic sanctions, defensive military posture to prevent further aggression, and international unity against an aggressor nation represents the best solution for resolving, not just this conflict, but all conflicts such as this one in the future.

Why do we believe that this original course of action has a chance to work? For one reason. Because there is indeed a new world order which the President himself has had a part in bringing about.

A new world order which is more democratic, less prone to tolerate naked aggression by one country on another, and more capable of adopting and implementing the very course of action which the President set less than 5 months ago.

Even 5 years ago we would never have seen a unified international community stand with us against the likes of saddam Hussein. Sanctions would

never have worked then, they have a chance now because we truly do live in a different world.

They have a chance to work now if, in the President's own words, "We can be patient", understand that this new model for a new world order is one for the long haul. And it is not enough for the people of America to understand this—it must be understood by our allies also.

As it has been said many times on this floor, impatience is no excuse for war. When future generations open the history books—will they read that at this moment in our country's history—we had a chance to lead a new world order in a new direction for defeating naked aggression—and we refused to have the patience or the courage to risk that effort?

Or will they read that we resorted to the old method of resolving differences, the method of war first. This is the first time in history that we have had sufficient unity among the nations of the world to chart a different course.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the President and I urge the Congress to stay the course, the one that the President himself set out. Let us teach our children, and teach the world, that leadership also means daring to find peace in a different way than through the mechanism of war. And let us have faith that the people, given an appropriate understanding of the need for resolving this conflict through sanctions, and defensive action, will stay the course with us.

□ 0200

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NEAL].

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, as many of us have pointed out today, these votes we take on our Nation's policy in the Persian Gulf will be remembered as the most important of our careers, whether we have been here 1 term, or 25 terms. For that reason alone, we should not rush our judgment. History tells us that when we rush, or even stumble, into war, we end up regretting our actions later. A number of current and former Members of Congress have told us that their vote for the Gulf of Tonkin resolution was the vote they regretted most. Patience is a virtue in instances when the consequences of quick action are so high. I have been home in my district for a couple of months and this is the message I have heard from the people there: "Don't rush to war—let the sanctions take grip—use force as a last resort."

We are all proud of our Armed Forces in the Middle East. Those brave men and women have the support of all of us, no matter what course of action we favor here today. We all believe that Iraq should end the armed occupation of Kuwait, a sovereign nation and an ally of ours. The aggression of Saddam Hussein cannot be rewarded. This is a vital matter for the postcold war world order. The question is why we have to make a snap decision, on a short timetable, on the use of offensive force.

I am also concerned about the huge burden that this country has taken on as we defend Saudi Arabia and seek to liberate Kuwait. The projected cost of Operation Desert Shield is projected to be about $30 billion for fiscal year 1991. Our allies have pledged a mere $9 billion in assistance. This is not enough. If our allies are going to be the direct beneficiaries of our military actions in the gulf, then they must be prepared to pay an equal share of the costs.

Mr. Speaker, this will be the first time in American history that we have set a date on which we will attack another country. This is unprecedented and unnecessary. I do not believe that enough time has been given for the worldwide embargo against Iraq to have their full effect. I believe there are additional diplomatic channels that can be brought into play that have not yet been explored that could lead to a peaceful solution to this explosive situation. We owe it to the one-half million American service men and women in the Persian Gulf to completely exhaust those options before we resort to force. War is a last resort and should be treated as a last resort. I do not rule out offensive strike at a later date. If the President comes to the Congress and demonstrates that sanctions against Iraq are not working and will not ultimately work, and if the President is certain that all diplomatic options have been explored, then the Congress can do its' duty under the Constitution and declare war.

We were right to go to the defense of Saudi Arabia and our other allies in the Middle East against the aggression of Saddam Hussein. Our policy to this point has isolated this dictator and is hurting his country. I believe we should proceed from this point with caution and patience. I will vote for the Hamilton-Gephardt resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KOSTMAYER].

Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Speaker, this is what the House is debating: "A resolution concerning the authorization for use of military force against Iraq."

Why do we not call it what it is, a declaration of war?

We are debating whether or not America will go to war perhaps in the next 72 hours.

We are deciding whether to send men and women to kill and to be killed.

We are debating the most fundamental question a democratic society can debate.

If ever there was a time to speak plainly, now is the time. This is a declaration of war and it will take the country into a war that we are told will be short and decisive, but which could be long and bloody.

Mr. Speaker, this is something the Congress has done only five times in American history, only twice in this century. Is this such a time?

Does the Congress believe this declaration should join those that launched two world wars in this century?

Is this the new world order?

There seems to me nothing new at all about two armies poised to fight one another to the death on a faraway battlefield. War, Mr. Speaker, is definitely part of the Old World order. This is the wrong war, at the wrong time in the wrong place for the wrong reasons.

Mr. Speaker, others before me have argued for more time for the sanctions and for diplomacy. I will not repeat those arguments again.

But it seems to me that this drive to war is taking on a perilous life of its own. It is as if because there are soldiers there, we must fight or surrender. But war, Mr. Speaker, even necessary wars, should never be rushed into, and tonight America is rushing to war.

The very people who would take us to war now want it to be a secret war.

The New York Times reported this week that the Pentagon will impose restrictions on the press to keep it from reporting fully to the American people the horrors of this war and its bloody realities.

The Pentagon and the White House want to deny the American people the knowledge of the suffering this war will cause to so many, they want to sanitize it.

If we go to war, Mr. Speaker, we ought to see it in its unvarnished horror, we ought to see it every night on the Nation's television screens.

It ought not to be kept from us or hidden from us. We ought not to be shielded from it. We should see and share the suffering of our countrymen who will fight and die in this war.

And so Mr. Speaker, if there is to be a vote on declaring war, let us call it what it is. And if there is going to be a war, let us see and know and feel what its costs will be in blood as well as treasure.

The Pentagon's action is unprecedented, for they remember that when television brought the war in Vietnam into America's living rooms, America turned against it.

Mr. Speaker, since others have dealt with the efficacy of sanctions and the hopes of diplomacy, let me say a word about the country's attitude toward this war.

Earlier this week I spoke to the people I represent at three separate public meetings in Pennsylvania. I found them deeply divided on going to war. The polls indicate the Nation is as well divided. If the war is short and the casualties few, the President will be a hero and the war will be judged a vic-

tory, but if it is long and deadly the country will feel the bitterness of division once again.

This war, which has not even yet begun is opposed by half the country, what will happen when the casualties mount?

Mr. Speaker, the country remains unconvinced and so do I. In the end, when all the arguments are put aside, this decision, the decision to go to war can not be justified when measured against the possible loss of so many American lives. We are not saying to the President, "No", we are saying "not yet".

"To everything there is a season", Mr. Speaker, we have in these few hours remaining the chance to make this a season, not of war, but of peace.

□ 0210

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. NAGLE].

Mr. NAGLE. Mr. Speaker, I confess that I am not one of the Members of Congress who normally takes up the debate on the floor. I prepare carefully, I assemble my notes and then I come to the well, listen to the debate of others, decide that what others have said is probably better than what I was going to say. And so I thank the gentleman for yielding, put my notes back in my pocket, and sit down. Not today.

Today, I want to talk. I have studied this situation like no other. I have read, I have listened, and for 4 straight weeks in November and December, and to the expense of my friends, my staff and my family, I discussed little else. I honestly sought something, anything, some tidbit of information that would say to myself intellectually and morally, "there, that's it, here at last is the reason for war" and I should support the President. When the President ordered troops into Panama, I supported the President. When Iraq invaded Kuwait in August and the President ordered troops into a defensive positure in Saudi Arabia, I supported the President. I don't lightly step back from the President in matters of foreign affairs.

However, I cannot justify this mindless rush to combat that I sense in this administration.

And as I come here today for one of my few speeches, I am now searching for a word, a phrase, some utterance or clever saying that will stop this House from marching with the President to war.

I cannot find the logic of the argument that says on one hand the military capability of Saddam Hussein must be destroyed if he does not get out of Kuwait, but argues on the other hand that if he leaves, he can retain that military capability. There are more important priorities for the United States than the restoration of sovereignty to Kuwait.

I cannot find the logic of the argument that says in a region where 80 percent of the troops are ours, 90 percent of the casulties are ours and we receive but 11 percent of the oil, our European allies should be brushed aside, their counsel of caution and patience and perseverance ignored, and we should rush to war.

What path did we take, what turn did we miss, what twist of wind or logic happened to us that suddenly made this our war, our war to fight, our war to die. Does this new world order we are told of mean that the paths of diplomacy and sanctions are replaced with a new American slogan no longer the "land of the free and the home of the brave" but we are now the world's paladon: "Have Gun, Will Travel."

Should we set aside the administration's justified pride in their unprecedented mobilizing of world opinion and world sanctions against aggression, of the fact that the hostages are freed, that this man is now blocked on all sides, his ill gotten gain of oil cannot be sold? I think not.

This is not the early days of World War II. Back then, we didn't stage troops in Poland, in the Ruhr Valley, in Czechoslovakia. We didn't mobilize world opinion, we didn't isolate Hitler; then, unlike now, we tried to ignore him and pacify him. Firmness then, not force, should have been our early response. Here, we have been firm, here the use of other tools should be pursued such as sanctions and patience and unity.

And finally, I cannot find the logic of the argument that says that we should not worry, history is wrong; this will be the first clean, nat and tidy war, where the deaths are few, the pain minimal and our enemy is not going to shoot back. That by destroying Kuwait, like hue, we will save it.

Like here, it is winter now in Iowa. The mornings start cold and gray, the sun barely rises above the line of dark and barren trees. But because our winters are cold and long, spring is a special time. The first day without a jacket, the first time the warm, new wind of the first warm day touches your face tells you most vividly that you are life, the renewal of that cycle has commenced again.

I want our sons and daughters, when spring comes, to feel that first warm wind. I want children to be comforted by their parents, husbands and wives to hug, the planting to be done, and their lives to be lived in peace—not wasted on sand and sea halfway around the world in a place where no one else wants to fight and die.

This Member cannot give up willingly their right to live and lead those lives without every effort having been made first for peace. War should be our last alternative, peace should be our objective.

The administration's request for a blanket endorsement of war should be rejected, Congress should insist that all peaceful alternatives be pursued.

We should remember the admonition of Adlai Stevenson: "Making peace is harder than making war."

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. KOPETSKI].

Mr. KOPETSKI. Mr. Speaker, there are few issues as important to debate as the delineation of constitutional powers or decisions to authorize military action.

Today, we consider both of these grave issues.

Under our democratic government our debate today is not a nicety; it is a necessity.

It is not a sign of weakness, it is a sign of strength. Our form of government not only requires but thrives on this form of debate.

The first issue at hand is whether the President needs congressional authority to take offensive military action against Iraq.

I say yes. And I will vote for the Durbin-Bennett resolution.

Some would say, however, that this is a gray area; that the Framers of the Constitution left us with conflicting provisions. While article I, section 8 of the Constitution gives Congress the power to declare war, article II, section 2 designates the President as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces.

However, the intent of the Framers, in fact, is comprehensively, clearly, and convincingly spelled out in the Federalist Papers. Alexander Hamilton, writing in paper 69, tells us:

> The President is to be Commander in Chief * * * In this respect his authority would be nominally the same with that of the King of Great Britain, but in substance much inferior to it. It would amount to nothing more than the supreme command and direction of the military and naval forces * * *; while that of the British King extends to the declaring of war and to the raising and regulating of fleets and armies—all which, by the Constitution under consideration, would appertain to the legislature.

The Founding Fathers understood history. They knew of the propensity of monarchs to commit the citizenry to war, wars that took the lives of the working people and drained the economic resources of their communities. In this new great experiment called representative democracy, the Framers devised a check on the warmaking powers. The safeguard was simple: the President would be required to ask the Congress for the authority to wage war.

The second issue we consider today is whether we should authorize the President to take offensive military action against Iraq.

Using his powers as Commander in Chief, the President committed troops to the Persian Gulf on August 8, 1990, in a defensive operation. Since that

time, 400,000 American troops have been stationed in the region on a nonrotation basis and we have spent billions of taxpayers dollars on Operation Desert Shield. Now the President wishes to have the authority to take offensive action.

I do not support—and will vote against—the Solarz-Michel resolution, authorizing the President to take offensive action at this time. I will vote for the Hamilton-Gephard resolution.

This decision does not come easily. I concur in the President's goal to remove Iraqi forces from Kuwait. It is important in this postcold war era that the world community not allow such violent aggression as Saddam Hussein's to go unchecked, and therefore, be rewarded.

I support the deployment of troops to defend the Saudi Arabian peninsula.

I support the imposition of economic sanctions.

I support the full range of diplomatic pressures against the Iraqi Government, including ostracism from the world community.

But the President's consideration of offensive military action is premature—premature by his own words. As recently as November 1, the President said, and I quote:

> I want a peaceful resolution to this crisis * * * I've indicated we're prepared to give sanctions time to work, and I'll repeat that here again today.

So what made the President change his mind?

A decision to change our country's policies from one of a defensive military posture to an offensive action must result from the failure of economic and diplomatic actions, that there is no other alternative.

But the facts speak for continuing sanctions. Sanctions are having an effect. Combined Iraq-Kuwait oil production has dropped 91 percent, denying Saddam Hussein virtually all of Iraq's export revenue. Estimates tell us that sanctions will reduce Iraq's economic output by 40 to 50 percent.

Think about that. How long can a country's economy survive—or how long can a despot stay in power or maintain his war machine—when the gross national product drops by 50 percent?

There are more signs of success as well.

Since our troops are in the gulf, and the sanctions are in effect, Saddam Hussein's military aggression is contained. And herein lies the difference between Saddam Hussein in the Middle East and Hitler in Europe in 1939. No one stopped Hitler. We stopped Saddam. Our multinational military action is working.

The hostages have been freed.

Up until a few days ago, the price of oil had dropped and was relatively stable.

We have built a world boycott of Iraq including Arab and non-Arab nations.

All of these signs point to success if we continue the policy we have been following: The use of economic sanctions and diplomatic pressure to force Saddam Hussein to withdraw from Kuwait.

We've even been told by the White House, State Department and Pentagon that sanctions are having the desired effect. Members of the congressional delegation who returned from the gulf this week report that sanctions will work—but might take longer than we all would like.

So, what has changed since the President told us on November 1 he wanted to resolve the crisis peacefully by giving sanctions time to work?

Apparently, only time and the President's logic. No one can say unequivocably that sanctions won't work; only that they will take time.

We should continue to follow our policy of economic sanctions and diplomatic ostacism until Saddam Hussein leaves Kuwait or until we are absolutely certain no further progress can be made.

But despite the continued progress in the gulf, the President wants to change course in a move toward offensive military action. In order to convince the Congress to give him the authority to do that, he needs to make his case. Not just to us here, but to the citizens of Oregon's Fifth Congressional District and the rest of the Nation.

I don't believe he's done that.

The power conferred upon the Congress concerning offensive military force is not just procedural. It is substantive as well. The Congress is not just a rubber stamp of the President's policies. The power to declare war, to authorize the use of offensive military action, is also the power to say no. And we should say no until the President proves his case.

So, Mr. Speaker, I wish I could support the tactics of our President. But then, I think of Glen Klein. Glen was my best friend in Pendleton, OR. He was an all-America boy, a high school track star, a dedicated student. He was a young man who went to war and died for his country.

One of the first visits I made when I got to Washington was to look up Glen's name on the black granite of the Vietnam Memorial. I touched his name. And I thought about how much I missed him. I could not help but think of the possibility of this very vote.

When I'm told we may have 1,000 or 10,000 dead soldiers, I don't think solely of the men and women who will die. I read my mail and I think of thousands of wives and husbands. Then I double that figure and think of their parents. I multiply that number and think of children, brothers and sisters.

Nothing is less certain in war than predictions, how quickly to victory, how many death. This is why we today should tell the President to be patient, to give economic sanctions a chance, as he asked us in November.

Now is not the time to give the President discretionary authority to commit American men and women to the perils of war, to injury, to death. Bloodshed is not the only recourse. It appears we have contained Saddam Hussein. Let's allow more time for economic sanctions and world diplomatic pressure to drive Saddam Hussein out of Kuwait.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I am submitting for the RECORD the recently published thoughts of the father of one of the service people from my district serving in Saudi Arabia. I am also submitting a poem by the young man himself.

[From the Statesman Journal, Salem, OR, Aug. 18, 1990]

NATIONS CAN'T TEACH CHILDREN

(By Cy Eberhart)

What does a father say when his son calls and says, "This is it, Dad. We report at 1300 hours to check our rifles and gear"?

You've known for a week that the unthinkable could happen, but still . . . maybe something would change.

You choke up. Feelings from three wars ago come flooding back . . . when your own father clasped you by the hand as you boarded the 1:30 a.m. train. There were no words then, and there are none now.

So you try to hold together long enough to make certain that you have his correct mailing address . . . after all, Saudi Arabia is a long way away. You ask if you can send him anything. Yes, there is one thing. That sight scope he bought for his own rifle a few years back. Send that.

Ah, the Marines taught him well. Your weapon is everything. Take care of it, and it will take care of you. Combat is for keeps. Get the advantage over your enemy.

There is a feeble goodbye, and the brief conversation is finished. The tears well up.

With clouded eyes, you imagine the two hours he has left at home. He'll hold his own son, not yet 3 weeks old. You feel his own bewilderment at being wrenched away from the one place he knows he's supposed to be.

He's supposed to be that special source of laughter and play for his son, opening to him the world of joy and excitement. To open to him life's wonders, encouraging his curiosity to dream dreams and see visions. A hand to hold, fulfilling the infant's need for trust and security. To hug and to bounce so that belonging and love are things to take for granted.

He was not taught this. These are simple truths that rise naturally from his heart. Now he's violating that which his every instinct tells him to obey.

This makes obvious the fact that in matters of truth, whenever the mind abandons the heart, trust only the heart. It alone has the wisdom of human survival.

Never is this more in evidence than when situations bring you face to face with life's basics.

I saw this often in my work as a hospital chaplain. In the quiet hallways at night, seeing family after family sitting in vigil. Life is reduced to its essentials: love, caring, compassion, empathy.

But outside, because of an unpopular war, the world was marked by people against peo-

ple. There was constant unrest, violence, riots, political maneuvering and confrontations of all sorts.

The lesson in this has been repeated throughout history.

It's there to see at least as far back as the Old Testament prophets. Basic human and spiritual values are the essentials for human fulfillment. Without this, all else collapses. History has vindicated those who spoke this truth, not those who held power. It is a message expressed some way in every living religion.

But the lesson has not yet been learned. Some say it's even idealistic to try to teach it. But without it, where is there any hope?

Some say the struggle today is about oil and economics. Perhaps. But there is another struggle. It is for the survival of those values essesntial to humanity itself.

The ways of nations have yet to elevate human life and human purpose. They have yet to offer human life a future.

What is a father to say when his son calls, saying he is headed toward war? There are no words, only feelings. But perhaps he understood their meaning:

"Come back, son. Come back soon—you and all who are with you. The world has more need of you in your home than on the battlefield. Your son needs to learn from you the ways of life and love and hope. Nations can't do this. But you can. Come home, son. Come home soon!"

POEM BY ERIC EBERHART, U.S. MARINE CORPS, SAUDI ARABIA, NOVEMBER 1990

O ften I may wonder why
P erhaps it's just my fear
E ven when the war begins
R eality is here
A nd as I wither in the heat
T he desert wind blows on
I t's where I stand, here in the sand
O bserving what goes on
N othing to compare it to.

D rink from my canteen
E at with us, oh noble one
S it and live like a Marine
E arly morning swarms of flies
R estless nights and troubled times
T hen the thought of fear was gone.

S oon the days became so long
H oly land, the desert sand
I s not our fate in another's hand
E ven I, prepare to die
L ord my God watch over me
D estiny, not up to me, what is my identity?

□ 0220

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ECKART].

Mr. ECKART. Mr. Speaker, the absurdity of much of what we have heard tonight is hard to ignore. We are told that we have to declare war in order to avoid it. We are told that we may have to destroy a country in order to save it. The magic of a date plucked from the air is said to be that linchpin around which we will decide whether or not to move this Nation's and other nations' great forces in an indiscriminate attack aganist some who is universally decried as an evil person. But January 15 is not a special day. It does not recognize the birth of any great leader, nor does it commemorate any great event. It does recognize, however, the abdication to the simply philosophy once again that might makes right and commemorates the surrender of reason to impulse. Saddam Hussein being wrong does not make war on January 15 right. But it may make it inevitable.

Mr. Speaker, we were in this well just 2 years ago speaking about the peace dividend. Two years later we have neither peace, nor a dividend. That which we in this Chamber fought so vigorously for just this past October, to reduce the deficit, has already evaporated in the hot desert air, and we will lose much more financially with each day that this desert adventure goes forward. But war cannot be measured just in dollars and cents alone.

Mr. Speaker, this vote is not really the end. It is merely the beginning. It is the beginning of lonely knocks on faraway doors telling families that a love one is lost. It is the beginning of the end of a rule of reason in an administration that I am so fearful wants to see much more come from the pockets of American taxpayers and more to be asked from the lives of American citizens. It is the beginning once again of the failure to believe in the reasonability of those who seek to achieve peace through negotiation.

We do not win when we fight. Mr. Bush does not lose when we vote. Those who lose are those who resort to violence and the threat of violence in order to achieve their ends.

What counts is not simply the cold statistics of bodies or dollars, not whether George Bush or Saddam Hussein is the winner, or which military strategy should be used, but how each American will react when Life magazine records in color the pictures of the dead. It is the human toll that must convince this body that war and that which is attendant to war is not really an answer in and of itself.

The new order should not be commenced by resorting to an old tactic. The final resort, war and violence, is that which must meet a very high moral test, and simply to say that we have waited long enough, that we have no more patience for peace, does not meet the moral standard of using force as a last resort.

Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to look my constituents in the eye and tell them that this Government, our people, has exhausted every opportunity to save their children's lives. When I can do that, then I will support the initiatives before us. Until then I honestly believe that the best course and the only course for hope and opportunity for all people everywhere is to give an opportunity to let peace have its chance.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri [Ms. HORN].

Ms. HORN. Mr. Speaker, this is my first statement before this body as a Member of Congress.

We all recognize that the Persian Gulf situation before us is most grave.

At this moment, hundreds of men and women from the second District of Missouri stand ready to prevent further aggression—and force Saddam Hussein from Kuwait, if necessary.

I want to thank them for taking that risk.

They are in my thoughts as I have listened and weighed the options before Congress.

I join my colleagues in stating that: First, Saddam Hussein's aggression will not stand; second, there will be no appeasement; third, Saddam Hussein will leave Kuwait; and finally, fourth, he will never control the oil supply in that region.

Saddam Hussein must take no comfort from this debate. He must make no mistake that the military might of the United States, including many men and women from Missouri, will force him—if that is necessary—to leave Kuwait.

The President's decision to stand firmly against Saddam Hussein last August is honorable and just. I commend and support it. There is no doubt that our military and diplomatic position is one of strength.

Five months ago, the United States and our international allies put into place sanctions against Iraq. These sanctions are working. The flow of Iraqi oil to the world market has stopped. Iraqi GNP will soon be cut by 70 percent. American hostages have been released.

CIA Director Webster, known and respected by many of my constituents, has testified that the sanctions are continuing to weaken Iraq's military capability as shortages of spare parts and munitions develop—and as equipment breaks down.

Despite the disappointment of Wednesday's meetings in Geneva, diplomatic channels are still open.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to address the issue of what happens if we go to war.

What happens when Saddam Hussein attacks Israel, as he has assured us he will?

Israel will respond.

We all realize that when that happens, Arab participation in the coalition will change.

Many of us are not satisfied that this issue, along with the issues of possible terrorism and the ultimate balance of power in the Middle East, have been fully addressed.

I support the Hamilton-Gephardt measure because it does support the President. It endorses all actions taken to date by our Government. It ensures that if the President should seek to use force against Saddam Hussein in the coming weeks or months that his request for authority will be given immediate consideration in Congress. As many of my colleagues have pointed

out, the only thing this measure does not do is affirm January 15 as an arbitrary deadline.

This debate in Congress just began on Thursday. The urgency we and the rest of the world community feel today will not cease to exist on January 16. The determination and commitment of our Nation will strengthen—as Saddam Hussein grows weaker—under the international coalition for peace.

Patience beyond January 15 does not weaken our position. The threat of force is still available to the President.

Therefore, I will support the Hamilton-Gephardt measure to pursue peace in the Middle East through continued sanctions and diplomacy.

□ 0230

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS].

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, the crisis in the Persian Gulf, and determining the course we should take in dealing with it, requires each of us to decide how to cast the most difficult vote of our lives.

It is not acceptable for Iraq to overrun and annex a relatively small and powerless neighbor. It is not acceptable for Iraq to fuel its further aggression by plundering and exploiting the resources of a conquered nation. It is not acceptable for Iraq to ignore international law and U.N. Security Council resolutions.

Last year, when Iraq invaded Kuwait, I supported President Bush's initial decisions to deploy United States forces to the gulf to block further aggression; to impose economic isolation through an embargo on trade with Iraq; and to take those steps as part of a concerted, international response authorized by the United Nations. These have been among the most important and effective actions the United States has taken in world affairs in recent years. The President deserves great credit for these remarkable achievements.

Iraq should be, must be, and will be contained and punished. And containment and punishment is being accomplished, through the deployment of our forces and the economic embargo.

Our policy has certainly not yet been a complete success. But just as certainly, it has enjoyed substantial success. Iraqi aggression has been blocked; the hostages have been released; energy markets were stabilized; sanctions have begun to hurt.

Still, after 5 months, Iraq has not left Kuwait. That objective has not yet been accomplished. But is that sufficient reason to change our policy now and go to war?

This debate, and the debates that will inevitably follow, will again test the maturity of this Nation's politics. I pray we will rise to the occasion. The country, the troops, the world deserve our very best.

It is important at a time like this to consider our limits: the extent to which we can with any assurance really know what will happen, what the consequences of our actions will be. We are rarely as smart as we think we are. And however smart we may be, it is essential not to confuse our smartness with wisdom.

So, let us be mindful of our limits. This is not the time for pridefulness, or willfulness, or self-righteousness, or false certainty.

We are dealing with the most profound moral decision a legislature or a government can have to make. Shall we go to war, and so knowingly embark on a path that we must assume will mean death to thousands of our troops, of those of our allies, and of those Iraqi people with whom the President rightly observes we have no quarrel?

With many, many lives in the balance, there should be a high degree of moral certainty about the rightness of our actions with answers to at least the following questions.

Are our Nation's objectives so vital and valued that they justify the use of deadly force on a broad scale and the deaths that will surely follow? In this case, I believe the objective of turning back Iraqi aggression, and so deterring future aggression, may well meet this test. As I stated, I also believe much of this objective has already been attained.

But we must answer a second question, too. Have we exhausted all reasonable alternatives to war, such that war and loss of life cannot be avoided, or, if avoided now, are likely to be more costly later? It is here the evidence is sorely lacking.

The answers to these questions are not now so clear that they can inform a decent and civilized judgment to go to war.

Am I certain that my position is absolutely correct? No. No one could be. No one knows what will happen. But when not certain, I prefer to err on the side of actions which stop short of the horrific irreversibility of war.

In announcing his response to the invasion of Kuwait, the President stated that "The mission of our troops is wholly defensive * * *. They will not initiate hostilities." Right after the November election, the President changed his policy and deployed forces sufficient for an offensive mission, and he now indicates in every way that he is determined to use those forces after January 15 if Iraq fails to withdraw from Kuwait.

Having changed his policy, the President now asks Congress to fall in line behind the new policy—without serious qualification, restriction, or modification.

Those of us who decline to endorse the President's request for authority to use force will be accused of undermining him and our Nation's credibility. That is an unavoidable result of a vote against his request, and that pains me greatly. But this exercise in democracy adds much more to our credibility than this vote can subtract.

I was once an officer of marines, and so I am always a marine. And proud of it. When my Peresident issues a call to duty, when he makes an appeal for support, my first instinct, my first reflex is to salute.

However, my constituents have elected me to represent them, and the Constitution requires me to fulfill a national responsibility as a Member of a coequal branch of this Government. The branch charged with the power to declare whether to take this Nation into war. These supervening responsibilities make it impossible for this marine to support this President's request this time.

Perhaps more importantly, the President cannot presume to set out on a course that almost certainly implicated the eventual massive use of military force, do so without first obtaining the informed agreement of the Congress, and later be heard to complain when Congress has to confront its own responsibility. As I've said before, the President may possess the power to take this country into war without congressional assent, but under our Constitution he does not have the right to do so. That right is expressly reserved to the representatives of the people in Congress.

There is good reason why our Founding Fathers organized our Government this way. The decision to go to war is the gravest decision that a Government can make, and it is imperative that such a decision be made with the broadest possible support, and after careful consideration of all the options and all the ramifications.

So, the decision is properly one to be made by this body.

For my part, as a veteran of Vietnam, I have been mindful in recent weeks and months of the horrors of war. And while I might say "Yes" to war against Iraq at some point, I will not at this point. War now is not necessary. The President's original policy—of containment, punishment, and diplomacy—can still work.

The decision to change that policy and initiate the use of force—with many thousands likely to be killed, and tens of thousands wounded and maimed—should be made as a last resort only.

Before we take that step, we must be prepared to say, to the mother who might lose a son, to the husband who might lose a wife, to the neighbor who might lose a friend: We tried everything else that had a realistic chance of working before we chose war.

And we have some time. The immediate objective of containing Iraq's aggression has been accomplished. The longer term objective of forcing Iraq

out of Kuwait can still be accomplished. Let us employ what President Eisenhower called the courage of patience.

The fact is sanctions are working, and working better than any sanctions in modern history. The administration has testified that the embargo is more than 90 percent effective. There is leakage, and some newly imported consumer goods can be obtained in Iraq. But the first purpose of the blockade was always to cut off Iraq's exports of the one product on which its economy depends—oil—and that part of the blockade has been effective. Most experts say the embargo has also been extremely effective against major war materiel.

These sanctions are unprecedented in their success, extraordinary in the international backing they enjoy, and more massive in scope than any adopted in peacetime against any nation. And they are inflicting painful costs on the Iraqi economy—and, increasingly, on the Iraqi military.

A respected group of former U.S. military chiefs, Reagan Cabinet members, and diplomats has testified that continued economic sanctions could achieve our goals in the region. In hearings last month, two former Chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—Gen. David C. Jones and Adm. William J. Crowe—two former Secretaries of Defense—James R. Schlesinger and Robert S. McNamara—former National Security Adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski, former National Security Agency Director William Odom, and the current Director of Central Intelligence William Webster advised that economic sanctions can be expected to have a serious effect on Iraqi military and economic capabilities within 3 to 6 months.

All but Judge Webster—and former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger—counseled for patience and continued reliance on sanctions, and against premature military action. I agree with this patient but strong approach. It offers good prospects for success in Kuwait with perhaps the least collateral damage to our allies in the region and in our standing with Arab populations. Further, if military force proved necessary at some future point, our own forces would face an Iraqi army significantly weakened by the embargo. Without foreign-supplied maintenance, equipment, and spare parts, as much as one-third of Iraq's war-fighting capability could be compromised by midsummer.

Given this, it is extremely unfortunate that the Bush administration has shifted its focus away from sanctions. Immediately after the Iraqi invasion, administration officials worked hard to convince Congress and the United Nations of the value of sanctions. Since then, however, the administration has repeatedly cast doubts on their worth and called into question the reliability of allies in respecting them.

The President did a masterful job of constructing the sanctions policy. I do not understand why he now insists on deprecating it.

If the administration would apply itself as diligently to maintaining and strengthening the sanctions as it has to preparing for military action, there is every reason to believe the sanctions could be made even more effective. One way to do this would be for the United States to return to the United Nations for beefed up sanctions—perhaps with a carrot-and-stick proposal directed at the border nations—such as Jordan and Iran—that still allow some goods to leak through to Iraq. The carrot, to induce them to uphold strict sanctions, would be some additional aid to shield their own economies from the costs of sanctions; the stick, if they did not, might be direct interdiction or a secondary U.N. embargo against them. These are possible alternatives—and there are others—which ought to be examined.

The administration, in focusing most of its efforts on preparing for the use of force, may be unduly optimistic about the prospects for a relatively painless military success. Administration officials appear to believe that U.S. Armed Forces could win a war quickly, while suffering few casualties. Unfortunately, history tells us that both leaders and the public tend to underestimate the costs of war and exaggerate how quickly, easily, and successfully one can be concluded.

If war breaks out, I hope and pray that the optimistic assumptions prove accurate.

But, before authorizing war—particularly through a resolution as open-ended as the one the President has asked for—we should make clear that we are prepared to see the fighting through to the end, even if the end is a long, bloody ways off. As Admiral Crowe testified, "War is not neat, it's not tidy, and once you resort to it, it's uncertain and it's a mess." No one should base a decision to go to war on any prediction that it would be quick or easy.

Just as wars tend not to be quick and tidy in military terms, so too they rarely have simple and obvious effects on international affairs and the course of history. I have seen little evidence that the administration has thought through the possible ramifications of the war it is prepared to initiate. Even assuming we win a war quickly, what are the immediate and longer term consequences for both the national and international politics of the countries of the region? Will we have, in the end, served our other goals in the gulf: improved conditions for our moderate Arab allies; regional stability; and movement toward settling longstanding conflicts there?

Both American and Middle East experts warn that military action against Iraq would very likely cause political instability for our closest Arab allies by strengthening extremist, anti-Western forces, many of them religious. Will we have created a generation or two of virulent hostility toward Americans and American interests among most Arab and Muslim peoples? Will nascent democratic movements in Jordan, Algeria, Yemen, and Tunisia be put at risk? What of terrorism? As Admiral Crowe testified:

> Many Arabs would deeply resent a campaign that would necessarily kill large numbers of their Muslim brothers and force them to choose sides between Arab nations and the West.
>
> Even if we win, we lose ground in the Arab world and generally injure our ability to deal in the future with the labyrinth of the Middle East.

Paul H. Nitze, special adviser on arms control to President Reagan, also fears the consequences of a successful war:

> Saudi Arabia, Jordan, and Egypt could be destabilized, with strong internal forces rising in opposition, enraged by their government's collaboration with Americans who had killed thousands of their Arab brothers. In all this ferment, U.S. influence could be reduced to shoring up friendly regimes, if we had the stomach for it. All these troubles would be exacerbated if Saddam were to succeed in drawing Israel into the war.

Others have pointed out the political damage we would suffer in any attempt to establish a new regime in Baghdad to replace Saddam Hussein, or in keeping a long-term peace-keeping force in place in either Iraq or Kuwait—both possibilities that administration officials have discussed.

I certainly expect that keeping enough forces in the region to contain Iraq while sanctions do their work may also cause difficulties for some of our regional allies. But I am convinced that these problems are likely to be far less harmful than the probable consequences of war and of postwar developments.

Last September, in an address to Congress, President Bush invoked a vision of a world free of terrorism and superpower competition, where countries would work together as partners and resolve conflicts peacefully, seeking a more just and secure world. This was his vision of a new world order, and he called the gulf crisis a test of whether the United States and other nations would succeed in making this vision a reality.

I agree with President Bush. With the end of the cold war, there is a tremendous opportunity to initiate a new world order. And I agree that in the gulf crisis we face our first real test in creating it.

That is precisely why I am concerned about a U.S. policy that would use military force relatively early on and not as a last resort. I would hope that

in a new world order, the United States and the Soviets and the United Nations could agree to resolve conflicts in a way that doesn't turn too quickly to the use of force. Especially where practical alternatives exist, as they do in the gulf today.

I believe President Bush has accomplished tremendous things in uniting the vast majorities of both the Western and Arab worlds in opposing the Iraqi invasion. His work could bear fruit for decades to come. We must be tough with Saddam Hussein. But if we really want the world to break out of its old behavior patterns, we ought to start now, with our own policy, and apply it proudly, passionately, persuasively to this crisis in the gulf.

In the search for any alternative to a premature resort to war, we must also be on guard against embracing a false peace. Saddam Hussein does pose a real and substantial threat to regional stability in the Middle East, to international economic stability and so to extremely important interests of the United States. He is going to have to be dealt with.

My advocacy of patience and determination in behalf of sanctions and economic and political pressure should not be misunderstood. I believe many of us who support the Hamilton-Gephardt resolution would stress that our patience, too, is limited; that we are in earnest in saying the use of force may be justified later. It is, rather, a matter of being smart about our timing, and not letting arbitrarily determined deadlines preempt our best judgment.

What should be made of Wednesday's sorry conduct by Foreign Minister Aziz and of the inflammatory words of Saddam Hussein? Their behavior was again outrageous. But let us not let them manipulate us into making a decision based too much on our emotions and too little on our hard assessment of what's ultimately in our own interests. We cannot let the idiocy of the other side provoke us.

We are now urged to unite. We are told that we owe that to the troops in the field. But what we owe the troops in the field is not some unexamined unity behind an unwise policy. What we owe the troops, what we owe the country, is our very best judgment—about what truly is in our national interest.

I have read and listened and thought about this to the best of my ability. I do not conclude that war this winter is right for America.

□ 0240

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

Mrs. LOWEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the vote I will cast today will be the most important and most difficult that I will face as a Member of Congress. It will affect every facet of our lives in the months and years ahead.

Last weekend, as I struggled with this difficult decision, I met with constituents for over 10 hours in five community meetings in my district. Those present were representative of the people I serve and of our Nation at large. They were old and young. They were black, white, Hispanic, and Asian. They were Protestants, Jews, and Catholics. They were rich and poor; Democrat, Republican, and Independent.

All of them were deeply concerned about the course our Nation will be taking in the days ahead. Some argued strongly that we should go forward with war. The overwhelming majority, with equal passion, pleaded that we give more time for peaceful solutions to work. All, however, were troubled, as I am troubled, with the situation we confront and the choices we face.

At the end of each of those meetings, most people came to me and, having expressed their personal views, said that the most important thing was for me to vote my conscience, to do what I felt was right for our Nation. That is precisely what I intend to do.

Let me first make clear that I have supported the President time and time again as he has pursued a very strong course of action against Saddam Hussein's naked aggression against Kuwait and his blatant disregard for the principles of international law which are fundamental to the future of civilization.

On August 2, when Iraq invaded Kuwait, I strongly supported legislation authorizing the President to impose strong economic sanctions against Iraq. And his policy has been working. Iraq is suffering. Its gross national product has been cut in half. It has no access to spare parts for its military. Food shortages are growing. And this progress is after only 5 months when administration officials told us that they would take 1 year to 18 months to work.

On August 7, when the President sent troops to the region to protect Saudi Arabia against Iraqi aggression, I supported his decision. I reiterated that support on October 1 in voting for House Joint Resolution 658 stating the strong support of the House of Representatives for the President's policy in the gulf. And his policy has worked in preventing further aggression.

As the President pursued tough stands with regard to the thousands of American hostages trapped in Iraq, I supported him. And his policy worked.

As the President has worked to maintain an international consensus, I supported him. And his policy has been working.

As the President has stood firm against linkage between Iraqi withdrawal from Kuwait and other issues in the Middle East, I have supported him vigorously. And his policy has held in spite of Saddam Hussein's blatant attempts to the contrary.

The question before us now is not whether we support the goals of our President. Iraq must leave Kuwait and must no longer pose a threat to our interests or those of our allies. Saddam Hussein must not be allowed to undermine the movement toward peace enveloping much of the world. I am in full agreement with these goals and have repeatedly taken affirmative actions in support of those goals. But there are serious questions which must be answered before we take aggressive military action.

Our soldiers are presently stationed in the heartland of the Moslem world. Never in the history of Islam has such a massive non-Moslem force been so close to the most sacred shrines of Islam. There may be many differences between the Arab nations of the Middle East, but whatever their conflicts, they are, first and foremost, all part of "Dar Al-Islam," the world, the home of Islam. Saddam Hussein has visions of becoming the modern Salach a-Din, the great Arab Moslem conqueror; however, he is not alone in his belief that this is an age of the resurgence of Islam. From that perspective, we have no Arab allies who share our interest in protecting the stability of the Western World. Their priority is and will always be an Islamic world.

It is an understatement to say that the Arab nations do not daily concern themselves over the welfare of the United States. The best we can claim is that we presently share an enemy. But to think that this alliance unites the world in peace and in support of our vital interests, or that these are true allies in the long run, is a delusion. We should not forget that Iraq was one of those allies only months ago. If we understood so little about the realities of the Middle East to not suspect that we, the United States, helped create Iraq's power, I am concerned that we have not effectively thought through the implications of an Iraqi defeat.

On Iraq's border is Syria, now allied with us against Saddam Hussein. This is the same nation which has nurtured terrorists who have been responsible for acts of horror against innocent Americans and others. It is the same nation that presently occupies 70 percent of Lebanon. Its president oversaw the massacre of 30,000 of his citizens and initiated war against Israel. President Assad was also a committed ally of Iran while American citizens were held hostage by its imams. The collapse of Iraq could well create a new and potentially more lethal enemy, one which has proven its willingness to fight against us and which sits on the border of our most valued ally in the region, Israel. There is no reason to assume that Assad has abandoned his hopes for a greater Syria. Assad, no

less than Hussein, sees himself as a potential savior of Dar al-Islam, the world of Islam, over the infidel forces of those whom he believes are out to attack the Moslem Arab world.

Have we assessed how the map of the Middle East will look after our military victory over Saddam Hussein? I have not yet heard what strategies have been developed and what plans prepared to address the transformations which will result even from a swift American victory. In fact, in response to a direct question earlier this month, Secretary of State Baker indicated that our Government would cross that bridge when we come to it.

One can well imagine the difficulty with which Arabs and Moslems would view news reports and graphic coverage of American planes and missiles killing other Arab Moslems in Iraq. Though Saddam may be a bully to us, he is still a brother to Arabs. Will the United States, in spite of our alliances and good faith, become the great Satan for those who do not see our military action in the context of the fine distinctions of intra-Arab politics but only see American soldiers on Moslem territory? Will the deaths of thousands of Iraqis taint not only us, but also Arab leaders who support our country? Will the result be the downfall of moderate Arab leaders, such as Egyptian President Mubarak, with whom we have worked in recent years?

We must ensure that the government and the policies of Saddam Hussein are thwarted. I am committed to the destruction of the military infrastructure of Iraq. It may ultimately be necessary that the United States enter the quicksand of war on the Arabian peninsula. But in doing so we must not ignore the fact that this place is also the heart of a culture and civilization which does not share our world view. We are, for all Arab Moslems, Dar-al-Harb, the world of evil and warfare. Our hostages are still held in Lebanon, and we are called Satan by many. Saddam Hussein has been cheered not only by Iraqis, but also by many citizens of Arab nations throughout the Middle East.

I recognize that war is chaos, that predictions are impossible. I do not expect our President to promise us no casualties and no cost. But I cannot vote to commit young American men and women and a significant portion of our economic capacity and strength to a policy formulated myopically, without taking into account the full context of conflict. The administration has not articulated a cogent policy on our policy upon victory nor how the long-term strategic and economic interest of our country will be protected. Therefore, for the moment, a forceful patience is our best policy: continued pressure, continued blockade, and a strengthening of our military capacity.

This policy is most likely to maintain the international coalition against Iraq. In addition to the risk of losing Arab members of the coalition if United States forces are attacking their Arab brothers in Iraq, others in the coalition have made no secret of their feelings that diplomatic options and the pressures of sanctions have not been exhausted.

However, 452,000 American troops are committed to the Persian Gulf. Two out of every three troops facing down Iraqi forces are American. There is little doubt that the blood which will be shed if we enter a war will be, in large measure, American blood. In Korea, where there was a similar multilateral force, 90 percent of the casualties were American. The same result is highly likely in the gulf.

It is not an easy thing to vote contrary to the wishes of our President at a time such as this; however, I have a responsibility under our Constitution to make the best judgment that I can. It is a difficult judgment to make; indeed, many of the arguments made in behalf of authorizing the use of force are very persuasive. But the fact of the matter is that a very real possibility still exists that, given a reasonable time to work, the international sanctions can achieve our objectives. I do not rule out force, but to choose war now and abandon diplomacy and economic pressure would be premature.

As I prepare to vote, I must ask myself, as the mother of three grown children, could I accept their deaths in battle, with the justification which has been made at this point. As a Member of this Congress, I have a responsibility to consider the lives of the American men and women serving in the gulf as if they were my own children. To use any other standard would be unthinkable. For now, my answer to those questions is no.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4½ minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, it is with a tremendous sense of responsibility and a hopeful vision toward the future that I cast a vote in my first week in Congress that may determine whether or not the United States goes to war. I find myself wondering whether any freshman class in Congress has been faced with such a profound and difficult decision so early in their careers.

If there is an agreement on the issues which we face in making this difficult decision, it is that we are united in our bitter condemnation of Saddam Hussein and in our enthusiastic and complete support behind our courageous men and women in the Persian Gulf. That cannot be contended.

But this vote, this historic vote is about our highest responsibility as citizens and as a Congress. We have made mistakes in the past by not committing the people of this country, by not committing Congress before committing the troops. It should be the people represented by the Congress who ultimately declare war.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support for the Hamilton-Gephardt resolution, and I applaud in particular the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] who exhibits as much knowledge, insight and experience in the Middle East as any Member who has served this most august body.

My reasons for supporting the Hamilton-Gephardt resolution are threefold: democracy, deadlines and dreams. Democracy because just 1 week ago I took the oath to defend that Constitution.

□ 0250

I raised my hand and pledged allegiance to that Constitution, and for 15 months in a campaign against an incumbent, I told my constituents that I would make the tough decision even if I disappointed some constituents, and in voting on this particular issue and resolution, I will not vote to abdicate the decision to declare war to a U.N. resolution. Congress should shoulder this responsibility, not forfeit it.

We should not allow the United Nations, which is not bearing its burden financially nor militarily, to tell the United States and the people what to do.

Second deadlines. January 15 is an arbitrary date, and the administration has not made compelling cases for the U.S. national interest being at stake. They have not explained what would happen in Iraq if we won a military victory in Iraq. They have not carefully articulated if Saddam Hussein, Kuwait, or chemical or biological weapons are our military objectives.

Lastly, dreams. If I come here to this body as being one of the youngest Members to serve this body, I hope, I strive for idealism and principle. I come here with hope in my heart. I come here with prayers in my thoughts and a belief in the magnificence of America.

We have shown that we can lead the world by our proven success as a superpower to enforce peace in Saudi Arabia and in the Middle East. Let us still hold out that hope that we can pursue peace with a bit more patience, purpose, and persistence.

Mr. Speaker, it is with a tremendous sense of responsibility and a hopeful vision of the future that I cast a vote today, in my first week in the Congress, that may well determine whether or not the United States goes to war. I find myself wondering whether any freshman class of Members has been faced with a decision so profound at such an early stage in their congressional careers. It is the essence of the Harry Truman adage, "The buck stops here."

This debate fulfills one of the highest responsibilities of this body. No President must be allowed to commit U.S. troops to a ground war overseas without the approval of the Congress. Clearly, we have both a constitutional and moral responsibility to be heard on the

question of whether or not to use military force in the Persian Gulf.

The U.S. military presence in the Middle East is not just about oil. Saddam Hussein clearly must not be allowed to blackmail the world economy, but neither must he be allowed to solve his country's diplomatic and territorial disputes through brutal military force. More than just the protection of the vast oil reserves of the Arabian Peninsula is at stake—the U.S. presence in the gulf represents an intolerance for Saddam Hussein's brutal tactics.

If there is agreement on any single point among the various participants in this debate, it is that Saddam Hussein is a ruthless leader who will stop at nothing to achieve his selfish personal goals. He has invaded and literally raped a nation that did not provoke attack, and the United States must not allow such aggression against our allies and friends worldwide to go unpunished. Saddam Hussein stands virtually alone in his aggression, and he and his army must leave Kuwait unconditionally.

Our disagreements today center on the means by which we accomplish this goal—whether we authorize the President to act now with military force or give economic sanctions and the diplomatic process more time to resolve this crisis peacefully. It is not a decision that I take lightly, since I personally believe that it is important to send a clear message to tyrants such as Saddam that their egregious acts will not go unpunished. It is therefore my view that we must retain a military option if our international commitment to remove Saddam from Kuwait is to remain credible.

The situation as I see it today calls for careful moderation. We are at an extremely sensitive stage in this crisis. A decision to immediately send U.S. troops into war touches families not just throughout the State of Indiana and its Third Congressional District, but ripples throughout this country and across the shores to our allied nations as well. The United States has expended considerable energy in trying to reach a solution through diplomatic means. The President's policy of economic sanctions has received an unprecedented degree of support from the international community, and it has significantly affected Iraq's military and civilian industrial base. Sanctions have curtailed the Iraqis ability to gain spare parts for the military machine. Sanctions have cut back on the economic performance, the foreign currency, the exports and imports, and the standard of living for Iraq's citizens. The failure to establish a meaningful direct dialog with Iraq in Geneva on Wednesday was a major disappointment, but it is not the end of the road.

There are numerous questions to consider for U.S. policy beyond the most dramatic and obvious one of a U.S. ground war in the gulf region entailing a loss of American lives. These questions are unsettling as we contemplate the future of the security regime in the Middle East. If we militarily remove Saddam Hussein, what type of government will follow him? If we choose to invade, how long will the international coalition that we have rallied against Saddam hold up? Some argue that the condition could crumble through sustained sanctions. How long would it hold together after the missiles are fired? While these are important questions, there are two issues in my view that are of critical importance.

The first is whether or not the President can be authorized to initiate a war solely on his own. The second is whether we utilize a U.N. resolution deadline to initiate military action now or give sanctions and diplomatic initiatives more time to work.

In the first instance, the answer is obvious. The Constitution provides that the Congress declare war, and neither Congress nor the President can dodge that responsibility. I voted this week to reassert that responsibility, and in so doing have fulfilled my solemn oath to the citizens of the Third District of Indiana and the United States to "support and defend," and to "bear true faith and allegiance" to the Constitution of the United States. I will not abdicate this awesome responsibility at this time to one person. Congress should be involved in the ongoing process of debate and deliberation, at least for now.

On the second question, I support the approach embodied in the Hamilton-Gephardt resolution. Testimony before the relevant oversight committees of the Congress has indicated that the economic sanctions imposed against Iraq are taking their toll. In just 6 months, they have significantly affected the Iraqi economy. The international coalition lined up against Iraq is unprecedented in recent history. To spill American blood into the sands of Kuwait when we have not exhausted every possible option is a foolhardy and unnecessarily dangerous course at this time.

Hamilton-Gephardt is a well thought out and reasonable course. It preserves a military option for the removal of Saddam Hussein, and authorizes the continued use of military force to defend Saudi Arabia and protect American military personnel. It does not rule out a declaration of war at some future date, which may or may not be necessary to oust Saddam from Kuwait.

Mr. Speaker, the diplomatic process may not be as fast as we would like, but it could save precious American lives. To go to war now when we have tried only 6 hours of diplomacy would be premature. To go to war from a request from the U.N. resolution rather than the U.S. Constitution would be unfair. To go to war now because an arbitrary deadline has been reached when we have not exhausted every peaceful means at our disposal is unwise. Before young Americans fall in battle, we must go beyond the extra mile for peace.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. LAROCCO].

Mr. LAROCCO. Mr. Speaker, the United States is a great nation, a strong nation. The strength of our country is evidenced by this debate.

Mr. Speaker, 9 days ago I stood in the well of this—the people's House—and took the oath as a new Member of Congress— a sacred oath to defend the Constitution.

Now I speak here for the first time on the issue of war and peace. The votes I cast will perhaps be the most momentous of my House career. What is certain is that I will never forget the gravity of this decision.

My colleagues have spoken eloquently on the merits of the issue. I have listened carefully to them and to my constituents who have conveyed their heartfelt concerns. After careful consideration of the arguments, I must in all good conscience support the Hamilton-Gephardt resolution.

In doing so, I do not reject the President. Indeed, the President and I share similar goals. We both want Saddam Hussein removed from Kuwait. The President's strategy of sanctions has already achieved many key objectives in this critical region. The hostages have been freed. Saudi Arabia's borders have been protected. Iraq's oil exports have been halted. Saddam's aircraft and artillery suffer from lack of spare parts. And, Iraq has been appropriately choked off from the world and showcased in the United Nations for what it is—an aggressor nation.

Why have these goals been achieved. Because the President has carefully fashioned an unprecedented coalition to enforce sanctions and to isolate the illegal and immoral acts of Saddam.

Mr. Speaker, this sanctions strategy has a record of success—not failure. This sanctions strategy has a recent history of peace—not war.

The resolution I support neither ties the President's hands nor closes off future military options. Rather it calls for patience and for firm resolve: Saddam must withdraw from Kuwait. The goal is clear, but the means are in dispute.

I will vote for the Hamilton-Gephardt resolution because it best fulfills our common goal without risking massive casualties and misery on both sides. The resolution seeks to exhaust all diplomatic means before resorting to war.

As the sole superpower in this post-cold-war period, the United States must add to our massive military arsenal the weapons of patience and diplomacy. As a veteran, I know that war is the inevitable result of failed diplomacy.

Mr. Speaker, it has also been suggested that war is the last chance for peace. This is not a new world order. This is new-speak.

The Congress and the American people have been generous to the President in permitting him wide latitude in the Persian Gulf thus far. Now, I believe, he is obligated by the same Constitution which I have sworn to defend, to seek the approval of Congress. It is this constitutional prerogative which we now exercise.

Mr. Speaker, in the end, Saddam Hussein will lose. We are united in that goal. But the wise course is not to rush into battle. Rather, let us be strong in our resolve and press our advantages to bring this chapter of history to a successful conclusion. Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of the Hamilton-Gephardt resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER].

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, as we begin to close debate at this stage of a long and difficult crisis, we now face as a nation, and in a larger sense as a world, an defining choice and the opportunity for a last alternative to war. We need to remind ourselves, our allies, and our adversaries that all America stands united behind a common goal: The removal of Iraqi forces from Kuwait now and the restoration of stability to this pivotal station in the balance of world security. This President and the Congress alike have demonstrated consistent support for this purpose.

The question we now address is how to achieve our aim without plunging the world's most fragile region into a horrible war, one that will have corrosive effects on world peace and the long-range interests of this Nation.

We offer a last alternative to war. We must have the courage of patience. And we must have the resolve needed to reach our goal and to recognize that the solution may not be simple and it may not be direct. This involves escalating a militarily enforced embargo and taking every multinational measure—to insure that our allies honor the policy of economic sanctions as well, and to demonstrate that we stand united with the world in this common purpose.

The Hamilton-Gephardt resolution is that last alternative to war. But it does not preclude it. The Hamilton-Gephardt resolution continues to authorize the President to use force to protect American forces in the region and to defend Saudi Arabia. It also advocates that this Nation explore every available and remaining diplomatic remedy.

The Hamilton-Gephardt resolution is the last alternative to war, but it does not propose to eliminate the use of force in the future to achieve our goal. It reinforces it. It does mean, however, that we have decided to exhaust remaining alternatives to war before we commit American forces to battle.

We cannot say with certainty that economic or any other sanctions will work. Today, well-meaning and knowledgeable people are divided on this question. Nor does anyone know with real certainty how much time must pass before we can tell whether they have worked or failed. They may not work at all. But that does not mean that we should go to war today—or tomorrow.

We owe it to our best hopes for a secure and stable future to assure that a militarily enforced embargo, coupled with the imminent and continued threat of the use of force, has had the full opportunity to force a diplomatic solution. We are ready to fight but not while it is still possible that our goal can be achieved through other means. Not while there is a last alternative to war.

In choosing this policy, we must be prepared to summon extraordinary determination and patience in the days or weeks before us. And we must prepare the Nation to act. In choosing this policy at this time, we do not offer concession. We do not offer appeasement. This is an act of final determination. If war is indeed the only option available to us, if the force of international pressure and reason does not prevail, and our best efforts short of initiating armed conflict have failed, than we must be prepared to use the full force of arms. Until then, we should pursue this last alternative to war.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WHEAT].

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and for the way in which he has handled this debate this evening.

Mr. Speaker, tonight we are not debating the legality of Iraq's aggression against Kuwait. All of us in this body recognize the brutality with which the forces of Saddam Hussein literally swallowed its tiny neighbor. Neither are we at odds with the conviction that Iraq's aggression should not, cannot, and will not stand. Instead, the central focus of our debate today is, quite simply, whether our Nation should rush headlong into war in the Persian Gulf. A war that is, at best, premature, and at its worst, tragically unnecessary.

When Iraq invaded Kuwait over 5 months ago, the President brought together an unprecedented array of nations, all united in condemning Iraq's actions, and all willing and prepared to join together in the effort to isolate Iraq. The President's policy to utilize our military might, defensively, to prevent an attack against Saudi Arabia, has succeeded. And his effort to employ economic sanctions to force Iraq's withdrawal from Kuwait will also prove effective. The President should stay this course.

Instead, we deviate from this path with the decision to shift our forces from a defensive to an offensive posture. I have profound reservations with our apparent willingness to endanger the lives of thousands of young men and women—our neighbors and our friends, our sons and our daughters.

Mr. Speaker, as the son of a career military officer who served in three wars, I do not shirk the responsibility of the decision that Congress must make as to whether men and women should be sent to far-off shores to fight, and perhaps to die. But for me to make this fateful decision on behalf of the families of others requires clear and convincing evidence that no viable option remains. That all diplomatic efforts have been exhausted. And that all means of pressure, short of war, have been thoroughly explored and tried to their fullest. Mr. Speaker, we have not yet reached this critical point, for the sanctions have not been given sufficient time to take effect.

When the President outlined the economic isolation of Iraq as a policy, we all knew that sanctions could not achieve their desired objectives overnight. We knew that this effort would take time, patience, and continued skill on the part of the President to hold together the coalition united against Iraq.

And the President must be given credit. The fact is that, after 5 months, the coalition holds together and sanctions are working, 90 percent of all goods coming into Iraq have been stopped and, perhaps more importantly, not one drop of oil is flowing out of Iraq or occupied Kuwait. Because of sanctions, Saddam Hussein has been denied the profits from his brutal occupation.

Let us also not forget that every day of the embargo is another day without spare parts and other critical materials to supply the Iraqi war machine. As the sanctions continue, Iraq becomes even more debilitated. And as Iraq weakens, we are further strengthened.

It is true that, over time, Saddam Hussein may become more desperate, his rhetoric more shrill, and his actions more unpredictable. But we cannot allow this brutal despot to goad us into playing his game. War and death are the methods he has used to attempt to expand his world. But a world united against him—willing to meet force with force if necessary—but determined to overturn his aggression through peaceful means, can demonstrate in the words of President Bush that a new, civilized world order really is at hand.

At what has been described as a defining moment in world history, I know that there are those who say we cannot afford to wait. But I say that we cannot afford to act hastily out of frustration. I urge my colleagues to remember that the cost of sanctions is measured in dollars, but the cost of war is measured in lives.

□ 0300

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. JEFFERSON].

Mr. JEFFERSON. Mr. Speaker, in 1941, Hale and Lindy Boggs, my predecessors in office from Louisiana's Second Congressional District, came to Washington, DC, under clouds threatening a great world war—a war that eventually came to pass.

Now, 50 years later, it is more than ironic that my first vote in Congress deals with the very real threat of another great international conflict. It is a threat that exposes how little we have learned as a nation, and as an international community about resolv-

ing international disputes without military action.

So the question before us is "Why are we here debating whether to go to war?" "Why are so many in this Chamber and throughout our country convinced so early that war is our only solution?"

Yes, Saddam Hussein is a ruthless, cruel dictator, bent on the sort of world domination that threatens our national security—but why are we debating going to war?

Yes, we cannot tolerate Saddam Hussein controlling, perhaps, 40 percent of the proven oil reserves of the world—but why are we debating going to war?

Yes, we must be concerned about Saddam Hussein as a future threat of even greater proportion—but why are we debating going to war?

Are we convinced to a moral certainty that there are no other ways to deal with these threats?

Why have we gotten lost on the road to peace?

In my judgment, the events that have brought us to the edge of war today, represent a study in opportunities missed and miscalculations.

Unfortunately, we are brought to this point because of the administration's distorted idea of diplomacy.

Instead of negotiation, the administration has pursued a policy of threats and innuendo.

Instead of negotiation, the President has moved hundreds of thousands of our sons and daughters, and brothers and sisters into positions of grave danger in the Persian Gulf.

Instead of negotiation, the administration has orchestrated, through the United Nations, an artificial and arbitrary deadline of January 15 for Iraq's withdrawal from Kuwait.

Instead of negotiation, the President has pursued a policy of brinkmanship.

Diplomacy has not failed—it has not been given a real chance to succeed. If we go to war, it will be because our brinkmanship, rather than our diplomacy, failed us.

Through the Solarz resolution, the President seeks one more card to continue his failed policy—our support for the policy that he has heretofore carried out without our consent.

I have supported most of the President's policies in the Persian Gulf to this point, and it is tempting to deal him the next card. It is tempting to stand unified with the President, to give him a vote of confidence for his policies at a time of international crisis.

It is tempting to shore up his failed policies with our support. But we must not further his high stakes game.

We cannot treat what the President now asks us for as a means toward peace, a means of merely strengthening his hand with Saddam Hussein to achieve peace. What he asks for is calculated only to make war. He already has in place what is needed for a peaceful expulsion of Saddam Hussein from Kuwait—a multi-national force united to support economic sanctions.

I do not view the Solarz resolution as a declaration of war. I view it as a congressional capitulation over to the President or our constitutional prerogative to declare war. Under Solarz, the President gets to take us to war whenever he pleases. The Constitution does not contemplate that we support the President, that we back the President in war-making at the expense of our oaths of office to represent the people on this very question.

To observe the constitutional authority of Congress to make war, is not a matter of indifference, nor a mere legal technicality. Rather, it is essential to our democratic form of government.

President Abraham Lincoln described it thus:

> The provision of the Constitution giving the war-making power to Congress, was dictated, as I understand it, by the following reasons: Kings had always been involving and impoverishing their people in wars, pretending generally, if not always, that the good of the people was the object. This, our convention understood, to be the most oppressive of all kingly oppressions, and they resolved to frame the constitution that no man should hold the power of bringing this oppression upon us.

The contrary view, Lincoln said:

> * * * destroys the whole matter and places our President where kings have always stood.

Therefore, I cannot support the Solarz resolution.

The price of war will be terrible. According to the House budget office, it will cost in the range of $60 billion to wage war. Who among us is willing to vote for the taxes to pay for it?

And the cost of occupying, policing, and rebuilding the conquered territory in the Middle East for years to come would be staggering. And what financial responsibilities are our allies shouldering? While we expect to spend an estimated $30 billion on Operation Desert Shield for this fiscal year (Oct. 1, 1990 through Sept. 30, 1991), our allies have so far made cash contributions as follows: $760 million, from Saudi Arabia; $2.5 billion, from Kuwait; $428 million—from Mideast oil-dependent Japan; $272 million—from Mideast oil-dependent Germany; $250 million—from United Arab Emirates; and $50 million, from South Korea.

American taxpayers are paying for Operation Desert Shield, and they will pay for any war that breaks out as well, if our recent history with these allies is any indication.

But, what of the ultimate stakes in the war—the lives and futures of our young service men and women. How can we begin to calculate their loss to their families and to our Nation? Perhaps two-thirds of the fighting men and women in Saudi Arabia in a gulf war will be American. Do our interests there, compare to those of our allies, justify our risking the lives of our military personnel in such great disproportion? I think not.

By all estimates, we stand to lose thousands upon thousands of soldiers, a loss which is patently intolerable under the circumstances.

The Hamilton-Gephardt resolution, at least, gives us and the international community a chance for peaceful expulsion of Saddam Hussein from Kuwait, and a chance for future stability in the region without a sustained military presence. From testimonies given before the committees of Congress by the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency and other witnesses, sanctions will work if given time. Reports that have been many times repeated on this floor suggest that the GNP of Iraq has already been cut by 50 percent due to internationally enforced economic embargoes.

Hamilton-Gephardt permits military action by the President to:

1. Enforce the unendorsed international embargoes.
2. To defend American soldiers in the Persian Gulf; and
3. To protect Saudi Arabia from invasion by Iraq.

It endorses the President's present policy by calling for continued enforcement of economic sanctions, and it calls for a true effort at a negotiated settlement. It reserves to the Congress, as the Constitution requires, the authority to make a declaration of war in the future, if deemed necessary. It strikes the right balance at this time.

Talk of a new world order along the lines that have been suggested by sponsors of other resolutions in this Chamber and by our President is misplaced. The new world order that I wish to see our Nation embrace is not merely a world order free of Saddam Hussein, or of dictators, or of aggression.

It is not one where we restore monarchs to their thrones, upon the blood of our soldiers—thrones that are unapproachable by almost all of their own people and by all of ours—thrones set above democratic principles and human rights. Rather, the world order that I envision for our Nation and that the Hamilton-Gephardt resolution gives a chance, is represented by the emerging democracies of Eastern Europe, by the release of Nelson Mandela and other political prisoners around the world, and by peaceful resolution of world disputes.

The new world order that we should be seeking is one where democratic tenets are embraced and autocratic regimes felled without the firing of a shot. This is the new world order that our Nation must stand for. The road of economic sanctions—the highway that the Hamilton-Gephardt gives us—permits us this chance. The path toward war down which the Solarz resolution leads us destroys it.

Winston Churchill, on the occasion of an allied victory, hoped for this world order when he said "The victory is not the end. It is not even the beginning of the end; but, it is perhaps, the end of the beginning."

What we witnessed, in recent months as peace broke out in Eastern Europe and in other parts of the world, was widely viewed as the beginning of a truly new world order of which we had only seen the end. Let our Nation not be the one, to use Churchill's words, to turn what has truly been an extraordinary end of the beginning of world peace around our globe into the beginning of a world without peace.

I am supporting Hamilton-Gephardt, and I urge each Member of this body to do likewise.

[From the Times-Picayune, Jan. 9, 1991]

LET ARAB NEIGHBORS DECIDE FATE OF SADDAM

(By David C. Trest)

NEW ORLEANS.—As a member of the House Armed Services Committee when I seved in Congress (1973-1980), I was considered a "hawk." I still am; I believe the best hope for peace lies in maintaining superior military power.

This power enables us to pursue alternatives to war because our enemy knows he will be defeated if the alternative is not accepted. Such is the situation in the Persian Gulf, where there may be an alternative to war that will achieve our purpose."

Saddam Hussein says his claims on Kuwait are founded on certain historical and legal rights. Among his claims is the contention that Iraq has rights to various oil fields that straddle the border between Iraq and Kuwait and further that Kuwait has unlawfully drained oil from reservoirs which belong to Iraq.

Louisiana and the United States have also had a continuing dispute over drainage of oil and gas reservoirs on or near the dividing line between Louisiana waters and the federal offshore zone in the Gulf of Mexico.

Without acknowledging the legitimacy of Iraq's claims the United States, in concert with its allies, should propose an international tribunal to evaluate and adjudicate the claims of Iraq against Kuwait and any counterclaims of Kuwait against Iraq, including claims for reparations. All parties, including the United Nations, will be bound by the result.

Once the organization of the tribunal has been agreed upon, Iraq will commence withdrawing from Kuwait and repositioning from Kuwait and repositioning its troops and equipment in an non-threatening configuration. When that is accomplished, the United States and its allies will withdraw.

The tribunal would be established by the Arab League nations or by a group of Arab nations agreed upon by the parties.

Would Saddam accept such a proposal? Consider what enormous pressure would be placed on him to accept. He will have his claims adjudicated and his fate will be in the hands of his Arab neighbors. He has repeatedly said that this is an Arab issue and should be settled by Arabs.

Saddam recognizes he is in a no-win situation. He needs to save face in any peaceful solution. Why not let him save a little face if it saves thousands of American lives?

Does this amount to appeasement of a powerful tyrant? No, the tryant will have been forced to withdraw and accept the rule of law.

It is possible that some of Saddam's claims will be approved by the international tribunal. Should be get increased oil resources, that will have minuscule effect on the world oil situation.

For our part, if we have learned one lession from this, it must be that we need to increase our level of self-sufficiency. Californians will simply have to go along with drilling offshore, as we have in Louisiana.

Some will say this would not solve the long-range problem which will be posed by Saddam developing a nuclear weapons capability. He may develop this capability, but that is also true of numerous other nations, for we know that technology cannot be forever contained.

Are we to threaten military action every time some nation achieves nuclear capability? No, we are simply going to have to find a way for the major powers to be so formidably arrayed against such activity that it will not be seen as an option by other nations. The developments in Eastern Europe and in the Soviet Union hold promise that such a world alliance can be achieved.

Should such a proposal be the foundation of a peaceful solution, a grateful nation will applaud President Bush for his resoluteness and courage in achieving our purpose without having one American killed in conflict.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. TORRES].

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, to be sure, we are engaged in a great debate. It is a debate on an issue of such magnitude that the Constitution specifically empowers the Congress to debate this question. The debate here will transcend into the future and well into the 21st century.

As a youngster, I saw a distinguished American President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, ask the Members of this Chamber for permission to engage in a war against tyranny in Europe and in the Pacific.

After that war, I served in the Armed Services and at the outbreak of the Korean conflict, President Truman extended my term of service by an additional year. During Vietnam, I stood by as a witness to the national anguish, the peoples' frustration, and the unintended consequences which we continue to pay for today.

I came to Congress in an earlier day, fully prepared that I would probably have to cast a vote in a war between two great superpowers. That never happened and the cold war is behind us.

With the dawning of a new age in the post-cold war, with the promise of a better world, I find it incredulous we are now engaged in a momentous vote that could usher in a war that would pale Vietnam. Have we not learned from the lessons of history? Must we once again give to the President a "blank check" to carry out a war under doubtful circumstances? Is this another Tonkin Gulf Resolution? I believe it is! And I can well remember the consequences and price that this Nation has had to pay for that ill-conceived resolution.

With all due respect for the talents of President Bush—he has employed his considerable skills to ally the world against Iraq—he has not articulated to my satisfaction why an invasion of Kuwait and Iraq is in our best interest. Why should the United States risk thousands of American lives and spend billions of dollars to protect Saudi Arabia and Kuwait in order to provide Japan and Europe with cheap oil?

I doubt the hostilities will be over in a few days. I doubt that American casualties can be minimized while Iraqi casualties are maximized. I doubt we can limit destruction to Kuwait.

Assuming we win, what then? What then? Who will govern Iraq? Do we militarily install a puppet government? How long will that last? I know for a certainty the Muslim world will not support our puppet regime. How long will we have to maintain a sizable force in the region to secure that win? How long will our Arab friends permit our troops to remain?

Mr. Speaker, I wish to make clear that in a debate such as this one which stirs such emotions and passions among Members of this body, that there are those who feel that if one raises questions, or expresses criticism of the policies of our country, one's very patriotism is subject to question. Article I, section 8 of our Constitution does not permit the President to make war at his discretion. I stand here in this well as a patriot, fulfilling my constitutional responsibility to challenge the President's judgment.

Make no mistake, having lived through the Korean conflict as a serviceman, and having been witness to the Vietnam war, I know the high cost of war—both when we win and when we lose. In the case of Korea, our victory cost thousands of lives and billions of dollars to station United States troops there in perpetuity. In the case of Vietnam, our loss cost us thousands of lives and billions of dollars—much of it squandered—in a military buildup unparalleled in history. Either way, win or lose, war is costly.

I took careful note of my distinguished colleague LEON PANETTA, the chairman of the Budget Committee, who declared today that this Nation, under the wraps of a recession already in place, with taxpayers bearing the cost of billions of dollars in failed savings and loans, with the expectation of serious problems in our banking system, with unemployment beginning to escalate, we can little afford to engage in a war with a national deficit of $330 billion for 1991.

Our Nation's deficit at the time of the Korean war was $3 billion, and when we entered the war in Vietnam, we had a $6-$8 billion deficit. My friends, who pays the bill? Yes, the

American people, in vast capital outlays and with the blood of our youth.

Mr. Speaker, on this, my first substantive vote in the 102d Congress, I cannot vote for war—not yet. War should be our last resort—after all diplomatic and economic efforts have failed. War should be our defensive strategy, not our offensive posture.

For that reason, I shall oppose the President's resolution and vote for the Gephardt-Hamilton resolution.

□ 0310

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5½ minutes to the Delegate from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON].

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I had intended that my first words from the well of the House would concern the District of Columbia. As it turns out, they will. The prospect of war in the Persian Gulf has brought anguish to the residents of your host city, if I am to judge by the near unanimous reaction my constituents have communicated to me. The reasons for that anguish are in some measure special to the District and critical to their view of war and peace.

I support the Durbin-Bennett concurrent resolution and the Hamilton-Gephardt concurrent resolution. I support them on their merits and I support them for their special meaning for my district. The Durbin-Bennett mandate that the President seek explicit approval from the Congress before engaging in an offensive war is nothing more than a reiteration of the war power as stated in the Constitution. I regard Durbin-Bennett as implicit in the oath of office which I took last Thursday in this very Chamber.

If you agree that Congress is properly affronted if the President proceeds to war without its approval—and some have called this an impeachable offense—then you may be able to identify with the self-same anguish of the people of the District. If the decision is to proceed to war, it will inevitably be without their approval becuase their representatives cannot cast a vote for or against war. Congress in its wisdom has accorded the Delegate from the District of Columbia all of the privileges of this body, including the vote in committee. But the vote on the House floor, the vote that in this instance will decide the most important question that can confront any legislative body—that vote is denied the District. If there was ever an opportunity to understand the meaning of the denial of full democratic rights and statehood for the District, that understanding should come now.

Of the 50 States and the District of Columbia, we rank fourth per capita in the number of troops called to active duty in the Persian Gulf. In this 70 percent black city, this figure has double meaning. African Americans are 30 percent of the Armed Forces but only 11 percent of the population. Both as District residents and as black Americans, our people have volunteered to serve their country and if necessary, to die for their country, in greatly disproportionate numbers. Is it too much to ask that, they have a say in the matter? The next time that you are asked to cast a vote concerning the District—whether to disallow a law passed by our city council or to add a rider to our appropriation nullifying our laws, Think of the District's men and women serving in the Persian Gulf.

Mr. Speaker, in the name of District of Columbia residents in the Persian Gulf and in the armed services and in the name of the residents of this city, I voice my support for the Hamilton-Gephardt resolution, I support diplomacy and I also support international sanctions. These economic sanctions are the moral equivalent of force and they are doing the work of war without violence and the loss of American lives. Iraq presents the quintessential case for sanctions because it is a one-product economy that cannot sustain itself in a situation where no oil is getting out to create the necessary foreign exchange. To jump ahead to war now is to cut off our nose to spite our face. It is we with our air strikes who shall have destroyed the oil supplies of Iraq, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Jordan and elsewhere in the gulf, thereby raising oil prices and curtailing the world's supplies, precisely the result we are there to avoid. We would create Arab civilian and American military casualties in a war of madness.

The President appears to regard sanctions as an adjunct to war, not an independent weapon. At the moment there is potent evidence that sanctions can do the job in a civilized and effective way without the barbarity of a self-destructive war that will wipe out significant portions of the world's oil supply. This time the price would be prohibitive because we would not only pay at the gas pump, American lives needlessly would be part of the foreign exchange.

The present coalition—note that we do not dare call them all allies—will scatter if war begins, devastates part of the Arab world from the air, and demands, as every war does, that ground troops take the ground, take prisoners of war, and occupy the territory. We learned this lesson expensively in Vietnam where, with all our air power, we could not claim victory on the ground and were finally routed.

Ultimately we could be left to fight another American—or Americanized—war almost alone. If this happens, District residents will be there disproportionately and patriotically. They deserve a vote in that collective decision. Through me they have had some say today. Through me, they ask also to be treated as if they count and to be counted as other Americans are when we pledge our lives for war and peace.

□ 0320

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana [Ms. LONG].

Ms. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Hamilton/Gephardt resolution.

As my distinguished colleague, Mr. JACOBS from Indiana, said earlier in this debate, we should never go to war just because we have the opportunity to go to war. And we should never go to war to prove that our military is bigger and stronger than the military of an adversary. We should go to war only when our national security or American lives are at risk. We should go to war only because we must go to war.

We should also ensure that we have the military capability and the military readiness to protect and defend our freedom, our security, our people. I commend the President for his quick and effective response to Saddam Hussein's invasion of Kuwait. Because of his leadership, we were able to halt further aggression by Iraq. And we are militarily ready for a war, should that become our only option.

I support our President in standing up to Saddam Hussein. I support the United Nations resolution that gives us the authority, as a nation, to use whatever means necessary to force Iraq out of Kuwait. And if we reach a point where I believe that we have exhausted all attempts for a peaceful resolution, I will support using all military action necessary to force Saddam from Kuwait. But, I believe it is bad policy for us as a Congress to vote to go to war at this time.

I recognize that voting to go to war now sends a strong message to Saddam Hussein, and may indeed scare him enough to withdraw his troops. If the Congress votes to authorize war, I hope and pray that that happens. But, the risk is just too great. We sacrifice American lives without giving sanctions enough time to work.

Furthermore, current administration policy combined with the Hamilton/Gephardt resolution make a strong statement to Saddam Hussein. We have 400,000 troops and billions of dollars of state-of-the-art equipment in the Persian Gulf. The Hamilton/Gephardt resolution authorizes continued use of American military force to enforce the United Nations economic embargo against Iraq; to defend Saudi Arabia from direct Iraqi attack; and to protect American forces in the region. It also pledges full and continued support for maintaining our military options; and finally, for efforts to increase the military and financial contributions made by allied nations.

Some have argued that if we do not declare war now, that our fragile alliance will break down. If it is so weak

that it would disintegrate during peacetime, surely it could never endure the strains of war. Additionally, I believe such an argument underestimates the importance felt by other Arab nations and the rest of the free world in getting Iraq out of Kuwait. Finally, I think those who say the alliance will break down underestimate the ability of our Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the President to hold the alliance together.

It has also been argued that Iraq will only grow stronger over time. Yet, our head of the Central Intelligence Agency has said that with sanctions, Saddam Hussein's position has become weaker. I have to believe that his inability to obtain supplies and parts will only strengthen our position and weaken that of Iraq. If at some time in the future, this trend has reversed, and we have the need, the Hamilton/Gephardt resolution allows us to expeditiously make a decision to go to war.

Contrary to what opponents of this resolution are saying, it is not a policy that sends a message of weakness. It sends a message of strength and of reason. I extend my appreciation to Mr. HAMILTON, for crafting this resolution. The chairman of the Europe and Middle East Subcommittee and the dean of my State's delegation, Mr. HAMILTON brings to this House a true sense of statesmanship.

Today we will vote to authorize going to war, or to maintain our military strength, but give sanctions longer to work. For all of us in this body, we will vote our best judgment and our conscience. Men and women of good judgment and the best of intentions will disagree. And only time will tell us which decision is best for our country. I echo what others have said and pledge my support to stand behind whatever course of action we choose because I believe we must put the interest of our country above the individual judgments and decisions. But, at this point in this process, I believe the Hamilton/Gephardt resolution is the better course of action. I urge adoption of the Hamilton/Gephardt proposal.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SERRANO].

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, for the last few days I have had a difficult time trying to figure out what this presentation on my part would be like today, not in terms of what my vote would be. That I have known for the longest time.

But certainly whether it was proper for me or not to bring into this debate and into this discussion issues having to do with my district and the suffering of my district.

After much soul-searching and somewhat despair at times, I have come to the conclusion that it is indeed appropriate to discuss some other issues as we discuss this very important issue.

My district being the poorest district in the Nation and having problems that we try to get rid of in other nations, I just wonder what our role would be if war breaks out. I do not think that we need to go to war right now. I do not want to see young men and women die.

I am sure that our allies, so-called allies, will not help.

TOM DOWNEY on this floor said yesterday that the help they will give us will be equivalent to the way people in the South Bronx used to hold somebody's jacket when you got into a fist fight. That is what they will do for us.

After the war, what? After the boys and women come back home hurt, wounded, and some will not make it at all, then what about the occupation that will take place? Please do not kid ourselves, that will be for many years to come, and that will cost a lot of time, a lot of effort and a lot of money.

In the meantime, we will have a lot of ruined lives, a lot of people coming back home. You know, today and yesterday and tomorrow morning we will hear a lot of people talk about how much we feel for the troops and what great heroes they are and how much we respect them. But a lot of the same people, with all due respect to them, when they come back needing support and medical help and homes and jobs, will say that the economy does not allow it and they are fiscal conservatives and they do not want to spend the money on the same people that they are sending into war right now.

So my district has to be told something that I do not want to have to tell them in the next few days, that our agenda will have to be put on the back burner; that the issue and homelessness in my district will have to be put aside for a while, that the fact that I have more babies born with AIDS will have to be put aside for years to come because we have to pay for a war that we should not be in; that the fact that I have more babies born addicted to crack in my district than anywhere else in the Nation will have to be forgotten for a while so that we can continue to spend $30 billion or more every 5 months to take care of this war.

And for what? To restore the legitimate Government of Kuwait? Legitimate? A prince and his 50 cousins in a little kingdom, not sharing with anyone else, that is what we are going to restore in return for not taking care of the poor in my district?

And Syria, our new-found ally; if 6 months ago I had said on the floor of this House that Syria was an ally of mine, I would have been asked to remove myself from this floor. Now we have not even removed them from the list of terrorist nations, and we are still calling them our ally.

□ 0330

And Saudi Arabia; now is that not wonderful? A country that we send troops to defend which will not let our boys and our girls wear medals, religious medals, because it offends their religion. Well, it offended me that 450,000 men and women have to be over there ready to die for a country that will not let me or someone else wear my religious cross because it is improper.

What is the hurry? Let sanctions work. We have time. We have waited out Europe for 46 years. My God, we can wait another year. And in the meantime we will not lose anybody. Why do we have to go around trying to force someone into believing that we can win this war in a week or win it in a month?

Mr. Speaker, people talk as if it were not important, that we will only lose 5,000 men and women in the first month, that maybe we will only lose 10,000. Well, yes, that is a number we throw up, but I say, "If you're Mrs. Smith, or Mrs. Rivera, or Mrs. Rosenberg, and it's your son that died, then it really doesn't matter that only 5,000 others died."

There are times when we must make war. There are times that I would be willing to declare war. But I am not willing to do it now because we are not willing to declare war on homelessness, and we are not willing to declare war on AIDS, and we are not willing to declare war on poverty in this country.

I am sorry. I really hope that we do not go to war. But I suspect that we will. And after we win this war, if my colleagues want to call it a victory, then maybe I will travel to Kuwait, and I will ask the emir and his cousins to fund the poverty programs in my district. After all, it is the least they can do after we restore them to their throne.

Mr. MCCANDLESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS].

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, January 15 is a deadline for Saddam Hussein and Iraq. It is not a deadline for the United States of America.

I intend to support the Solarz-Michel resolution. The President should be given the authority to use the full power of our Armed Forces to get Iraq out of Kuwait. This is an option that should be made available to our President. The fact is, diplomacy works only if there is a strong economic and military force to back it up.

I want this issue to be resolved peacefully, diplomatically. But regretfully, Saddam Hussein doubts our resolve. He doesn't believe we will use our military force. And a military force that no one—particularly our adversary—believes we will use, is not a deterrent. No matter how powerful that military force, if no one believes

we will use it, it has no diplomatic value.

Whether to give our President the extraordinary power to use force to get Iraq out of Kuwait is not, for most of us, an easy issue to decide, as this very fine debate of the past 3 days has shown.

Each of us is doing what we believe is right for our Nation and the world. And we will live with our decision and our votes the rest of our lives.

I believe what happens in the Middle East is of utmost importance to the United States and the world. Sixty-five percent of all the known world's oil reserves are in the Persian Gulf. Iraq has 10 percent of the world's reserves, Kuwait—now annexed by Iraq—has another 10 percent. And Saudi Arabia has 25 percent of all the world's reserves.

In contrast, the U.S.S.R., the world's largest oil-producer, has only 5½ percent. The United States has even less—just 2½ percent of the world's reserves.

Think of it. Our Nation has just one fourth of the reserves of Kuwait. Kuwait is not a tiny irrelevant desert nation along the Persian Gulf. It is a nation with four times the oil reserves of the United States.

From my viewpoint this conflict is in large measure about oil, the life blood of the world, and whether one man, Saddam Hussein, will control nearly 50 percent of all the known world's oil reserves. This would give him the power to dictate price and, more frightening, gain the extraordinary monetary benefit that comes to a nation that controls the reserves.

Saddam Hussein cannot be allowed to finance his terrible war machine, which has no parrellel in the region, with such wealth.

I want the president to give sanctions more time to work. But I want Saddam Hussein to spend his every waking moment fearing that what Irqa did to Kuwait could happen to Iraq.

The President should be given the option to use force. And Saddam Hussein must live with the recognition and fear that the United States could use that force at any moment. Only then, in my judgment, are we likely to achieve our primary objective—the complete withdrawal of Iraq from Kuwait.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, first let me thank you for the patience and work that you have done this evening in presiding over this debate, and I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. MCCANDLESS] and the others who have presided on the Republican side of the aisle.

Let me also at the outset compliment the freshman class, both Republicans and Democrats. I am truly impressed by the level of their commitment to their positions, the level of the debate which they have engaged in and the force of their conscience which came through the presentations made by each and every one of them.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is wonderful, and I am very proud to be a Member of this body which just renewed itself in the election cycle with so many good Members who bode well for the future of this institution.

Mr. Speaker, with this right hand I voted in 1983 for a resolution allowing the President of the United States to send a peace-keeping force into Lebanon. I thought I had a fairly good, suitable, relevant, legitimate amount of knowledge of the situation which would allow me to make a rational, and reasonable and logical decision. I voted with the President. I believed it was the right thing to do. The President assured us that these people, although they were in harm's way, would be in every way protected. These were young American service men. As far as I know, there was no single woman among them.

One day in October of 1983 I woke up to find out that approximately 250 of them were dead in a heap in a building where they were bivouacked outside Beirut. Two hundred and fifty, gone. To this day I feel responsible. To this day and for all time I shall remember that vote and rue the casting of that vote.

Mr. Speaker, with this right hand just last week I and every Member of this body took an oath to uphold the Constitution of the United States. I swore loyalty and made a commitment to the very basic requirement of the role of a Congress Member, to uphold the Constitution.

□ 0340

I also privately swore after the October disaster in Lebanon, and swore again to myself on this floor, that I would never again make such a vote without having every single piece of relevant information that I deserved and every other Member deserved in order to make a reasoned, rational, and proper vote on an issue of sending young men and women to war and to die, because people die in wars. It is not an abstract, nor are they disconnected occurrences.

I do not support the Solarz-Michel resolution, first for the reason that I firmly believe that no Member of this body has been given by the executive branch which is asking for this resolution—and it is to go to war—all of the relevant information that is absolutely necessary for them to make a reasoned, logical, sound, and conscionable vote.

Maybe I am naive, Mr. Speaker, but I always believed that article I, section 8 of the Constitution, which says that the Congress shall have the power to declare war, add some legislative intent, some of the intent of the framers, somewhere in the ethereal space of the last 200 years that was definable. Oh, it is not definable in the Constitution. There are no A's, B's, or C's to tell us what a declaration of war really is. It does not say anything. It does not say how it is supposed to read. It does not say it is supposed to have a seal, it does not say it is supposed to have a ribbon. It does not say anything, but it reserves to the Congress that power.

So we improvise. The reality is that on the five occasions when war has been declared, they have been in different forms.

But this time we are not being asked to declare war. We are being asked to endorse to the President a resolution of the United Nations which calls for the use of force to remove Iraq from Kuwait.

Now, as I said, I thought—maybe I am naive—that if we were asked to declare war, somehow that President asking for the declaration might perhaps come to Congress and ask for a secret session, look all 535 Members in the eye and say, "This is what I am asking. This is what we have done on each of the issues that are important for you to make a decision. This is what we expect the body count might be. That is our best guesstimate."

He might say, "That is what our best guesstimate is perhaps of the duration. This is what our best guesstimate is of the cost of this war, economically speaking. This is what we believe may be left to do."

Or ideally, the President would say, "There is nothing left to do, no diplomatic overtures which will work. We have tried everything, and we are stymied." And like you, the President would say, "Mr. Speaker, I don't want to go to war either except as the absolute last option that we would have."

So the President would present the case. We would have what we consider to be all of the relevant information, and we would vote.

But, Mr. Speaker, I guess I an naive. The President has not done that, and we do not have this information. And I would bet that no one in this Chamber or in the other body has enough information to make that conscionable decision, a cogent decision based on fact. And we are being asked yet, in light of that, to send young men and women of this country, my neighbors' daughters and sons and husbands and wives—and the same is true in every district, in every one of our elected congressional districts—off to war and off possibly to their death.

So that is the first reason I shall not vote for this, because I do not believe we have any of the necessary evidence or any of the necessary facts given to us by the President. I do not mean that in a negative sense. I do not think he is trying specifically to withhold information. It just has not been imparted.

It might shock the American people to know that we do not know much more than they do when it comes to having all the information we ought to

have. But we do not, and I challenge Members to come up here and tell me they have gotten the estimates I have talked about a minute ago from the State Department, from the Defense Department, or from the President.

I am not talking about firm figures. I am not talking about guarantees. But we are being asked under our constitutional authority to grant that authority to the President, and we do not know any of this.

Would it not make a difference if we knew that the President and his Defense Department estimated 100,000 casualties as opposed to 1,000? It might make a difference to some, and they are entitled to know that.

So the first reason I will not vote for it is because we do not know enough of the anticipation and all the diplomacy and all the facts and circumstances surrounding the President's decision to ask us to vote for it.

The second reason I will not vote for it is because I do not believe it meets the constitutional test. It is, as other speakers have said, a Gulf of Tonkin resolution. It is not a direct request for a declaration of war. It is an open-ended blank check for the President to take from us the power and decide then at what point in the future he will use it and under what circumstances and at what time, thereby depriving us of what I consider to be the real intent of the Framers of the Constitution that we would declare war. But that means it would be a specific time, for a specific purpose, with specific players, and under specific circumstances then and there existing at that moment.

Now, it is easy to do that when you have a catastrophic enormity of a calamity like Pearl Harbor. Boy, is it much easier to make a decision based on that kind of provocation rather than the one we have now. I do not envy the President his job.

So the second reason I will not vote for it is that I do not believe that constitutionally we should be voting on that type of a declaration in lieu of a direct request for a declaration of war.

The third thing is the reality of the situation in the field.

□ 0350

We have heard pros and cons all night here about the efficacy of sanctions. But everyone including General Powell and General Schwarzkopf have told Members of Congress that the sanctions are working. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WHEAT] indicated that he is getting weaker, not stronger, and he is getting weaker. His Air Force flies less reconnaissance sorties than they flew before because they are running low on spare parts, and parts in general are becoming more difficult for him to obtain.

His military machine is slowly but steadily being reduced. Yet in the face of that, all of a sudden we have a decision by the President to come and ask us to declare war at this moment when we are watching our enemy, against whom this war would be waged, slowly strangling and getting less capable of putting up a fight than he was weeks and weeks and weeks ago. So the timing certainly is bad.

But beyond that, the sanctions are having an effect on his whole country, and they are providing us with the capability of continuing the sanctions with a compounding effect to bring him to his knees.

Now those who argue that sanctions alone are not enough, as Mr. Webster has in his letter, I believe are correct. But Mr. HAMILTON stood in this well and talked about the three strands of the sanctions, and the force of the military might that is arrayed against him, and the threat that it will be used, and the diplomacy. That is what has worked.

But let us be very careful to realize that he has yet to blink, even though 450,000 people, Americans are there, and even though we have applied the sanctions, and even though the President has said up until last week when he sent us the letter asked for this resolution that he did not need this, he could do this on his own. Saddam, perhaps, did not believe him because he is not out of Kuwait. What makes Members think now that if we vote this resolution that miraculously, all of a sudden Saddam is going to say, "Oh, that's what I was waiting for. The Congress says he should wage war, and so now it's over, I'm leaving."

That is an awfully thin premise on which to posture a declaration of war, and it seems somehow strange and illogical to me to have the constant argument made that in order to avoid war we shall declare war. That has never seemed to happen in the past, not ever.

He knows what our capability is. He chooses not to get out for his own reasons.

The next reason I shall not vote for it is because it is premature. I am not one frankly who likes the Gephardt resolution all that much in the sense that it is open-ended. It does give the President the right to come back any time he wants, and so he could come back next week, and in that sense the control is in the President's hands. By the same token, I would like the Congress to be on record that frankly we should not go any further than about 30 days. And the reason I say that is because much of the testimony presented by the military to the committees in the Congress and in this House was that the optimum date for any kind of offensive thrust against Iraq and against Saddam Hussein would be February 15. The President, to quote him, has said, "In the quest for peace I will go the extra mile." I commend him for what he has done already, and I might add at this juncture, Mr. Speaker, I supported the President then. I supported the President in the interim, in the buildup of troops, and I support him now. We all want Saddam Hussein out of Kuwait. Most of us would like to see Saddam Hussein removed as well. We know he is an international criminal, and international terrorist, a brigand, a murderer and all of the epithets, all of them fit. We know it all and we agree.

But if you truly want to be a peacemaker, then you would walk a second extra mile. You would regard the advice and the testimony of your own military people and go until February 15. Do not let the artificial date set by us, because we maneuvered the January 15 resolution, Resolution 678 in the United Nations, it was ours. It did not spring from the Somalians or the Rhodesians or anyone else. It sprang from us. We should be willing to go that extra mile, thereby for the President foreclosing any further criticism because he would have done everything he could have in order to be able to bring about a peaceful resolution which we would all like to see.

So I think it is premature at this moment to be asking for this, even though it is in the wrong forum, and I would hope that when he came back he would ask for a declaration of war.

Finally, we have to be very careful in any event because we must find a peaceful solution, if it is at all possible because of the enormity of what war will be. I do not know how many people understand the array of weapons that we have against Iraq. But I also do not know how many people understand what Iraq is capable of. I do think his military prowess is not all that great. He is a classic overestimator of his own capabilities. He went to war with Iran for something less than 8 years with an army which had no air force and hardly any real weaponry, so they are not exactly the premium military force in the world in Iraq.

But let me assure you, Mr. Speaker, and I am sad to say this, the battle which will wage in Iraq and in Kuwait will not be the only battlefield on which Americans will be fighting and will be dying. This man is capable of any gross behavior, any immoral act is within his purview. He gassed his own people, and he did not gas them by bombs, you know. He flew planes over, like crop dusters and released that stuff in the air. He has killed people left and right by his own hand and at his direction. He has done unspeakable acts in Kuwait.

But watch what happens when we attack him. If you think you have seen terrorist acts, you ain't seen nothing yet. He is capable of killing innocents around the world, and let me assure you they will be Americans as the prime and foremost targets. This Capitol is not without his range. And we had better be very, very certain that

before we enter into any course of conduct which will raise that specter of direct terrorist acts against Americans, both domestically here and abroad anywhere, targets of opportunity for which I am sure agents have already been assigned and are operating, waiting for the signal, we had better be sure that we have explored every single avenue and every possible road for a peaceful solution.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, what will postwar Iraq look like? When we attack Iraq it will be with enormity. There will be an enormous amount of damage and loss of life to them, first and foremost, because again the technological weaponry arrayed against him I do not think anyone understands. It is bigger than what was assembled for D-day, better by leaps and bounds, and geometric proportion, and that will invite for the future an enormous power vacuum in Iraq.

□ 0400

And that power vacuum will attract in the Syrians, the Iranians, and the Shiite fundamentalist Moslems, because those are the organized groups in that region who will take advantage of the death of the government of Saddam Hussein, and that is not going to be any better for us than what is there now, as sad as that is to say.

The possibility exists of a peacekeeping force having to be maintained there by the United States. If that is so, the chances are we may lose as many people in the peacekeeping due to terrorism as we might lose in the war, and I do not know how long Americans will sustain that either.

So the President ought to be thinking of all of these things, and perhaps he is, before he makes this decision to ask us for war. We ought to be thinking of them before we make the decision to grant him that authority.

The future of that region is important to us, but we have to ask ourselves the single most important question. Is this offensive war that is being asked for by the President necessary at this moment for the vital strategic interest and protection of the United States? And the answer is no. We are not at risk. They are not on our borders. They have not attacked us. Until we can find a direct link, we had better be careful about these Gulf of Tonkin resolutions and the kind of domino-theory application which prevailed in Vietnam, because that is what we are doing here, without calling it the same thing, saying that it is in our interest, our national interest, to free Kuwait of Iraq and somehow get rid of Saddam Hussein, and it is. But is it that interest which is controlling sufficient to commit Americans to die? Because they will. They will.

We have to think long and hard about that, and I think we are a few steps away from that threshold. I think we are short of where we need to be in order to have to make that decision, and there are many more pieces of the puzzle that have to be fit in and put together.

I would urge you to consider the irony of this new world order as the President calls it, having as its first act making war. I thought that was the old world order, and the new world order would be to resolve issues peacefully.

We built hundreds of billions of dollars of weapons in the old world order and faced each other down. I thought the new world order was for the purpose of resolving things peacefully. That is how it started. We began to resolve our differences with the Soviet Union peacefully.

I think it would be a terrible tragic start for this new order if it began with a war, and I urge all of you to consider very carefully and not vote to go to war at this time. We all support the President in his goals. We all support the President in wanting to find a way to bring peace to the region, but none of us wants to commit the young men and women of America for the purpose of war if there is any single other way available to us.

We have not reached the time when we can make that statement. I do not believe either has the President, and so I would urge a no vote on the Solarz-Michel resolution, and hopefully we would then be able to have the President say to us, "I am going the extra mile. Maybe we can achieve peace." If it is worth going to war for, it is worth going to find peace for.

Mr. McCANDLESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO LIBYA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 102-28)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OBEY) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and without objection, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

1. I hereby report to the Congress on developments since my last report of July 13, 1990, concerning the national emergency with respect to Libya that was declared in Executive Order No. 12543 of January 7, 1986. This report is submitted pursuant to section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c) ("IEEPA"); and section 505(C) of the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1985, 22 U.S.C. 2349aa-9(c).

2. Since my last report on July 13, 1990, there have been no amendments to the Libyan Sanctions Regulations, 31 C.F.R. Part 550 (the "Regulations"), administered by the Office of Foreign Assets Control ("FAC") of the Department of the Treasury. Additionally, since July 13, 1990, there have been no amendments or changes to orders of the Department of Commerce or the Department of Transportation implementing aspects of Executive Order No. 12543 relating to exports from the United States and air transportation, respectively.

3. During the current 6-month period, FAC approved only one license application authorizing the renewal of a patent. Twenty licensing decisions were made prohibiting transactions in connection with Libya.

4. Various enforcement actions mentioned in previous reports continue to be pursued. In October 1990, based upon violations of IEEPA, the U.S. Customs Service seized $3 million in funds at a New York bank and $800,000 at a bank in Florida. The U.S. attorneys for the respective jurisdictions utilized 18 U.S.C. 1956, the Money Laundering Control Act, to effect the seizures. This marks the first time that this statute has been used to effect seizures based upon an IEEPA violation. This continuing investigation centers around an alleged conspiracy to invest Libyan funds in various U.S. businesses and technology.

In November 1990, FAC blocked a letter of credit in the amount of $332,124, drawn on the account of a U.S. manufacturer to pay a South Korean firm for the shipment of industrial equipment to Libya. The funds have been placed into a blocked account, and the investigation into the actions of the U.S. firm continues.

5. The expenses incurred by the Federal Government in the 5-month period from July 13, 1990, through December 14, 1990, that are directly attributable to the exercise of powers and authorities conferred by the declaration of the Libyan national emergency are estimated at $407,603. Personnel costs were largely centered in the Department of the Treasury (particularly in the Office of Foreign Assets Control, the Customs Service, the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Enforcement, the Office of the Assistant Secretary for International Affairs, and the Office of the General Counsel), the Department of State, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Justice, the Federal Reserve Board, and the National Security Council.

6. The policies and actions of the Government of Libya continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. I shall continue to exercise the powers at my dis-

posal to apply economic sanctions against Libya as long as these measures are appropriate, and will continue to report periodically to the Congress on significant developments as required by law.

GEORGE BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 11, 1991.*

TRIBUTE TO COMMAND SGT. MAJ. JAMES E. MASKE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, a good friend of mine is retiring later this year after 42 years of service in the U.S. Marine Corps, Marine Corps Reserve and the Mississippi Army National Guard. His name is Command Sgt. Maj. James E. (Gene) Maske of Newton, MS.

In 1982, Gene became the State command sergeant major for Mississippi. His steady leadership in that position over the past 8 years has earned Gene the respect of National Guard personnel throughout our State and across the country.

Enlisted men and women from Biloxi to Corinth have come to count on Gene's knowledge and experience to help solve problems large and small. He has been a tremendous asset to the Mississippi National Guard.

I know Gene's many friends join with me in wishing him the very best in retirement. We all salute this great American for a job well done.

I also want to share with my colleagues Gene's resume, which outlines his 42 years of outstanding service to his State and his country.

BIOGRAPHY OF COMMAND SGT. MAJ. JAMES E. MASKE

CSM Maske served on active duty with the U.S. Marine Corps from 13 May 1949 until 12 May 1950 when he transferred to the Marine Corps Reserve. On 20 October 1950, he was activated for the Korean Conflict and remained on active duty until 2 April 1952.

During the conflict, he served in the Korean Theater of Operations, aboard the USS Midway, the USS Saipan and the USS Cabot as a member of Marine Fighter Squadron 225 where he was assigned as a crew chief.

After his discharge in 1952, CSM Maske again joined the U.S. Marine Corps Reserve where he remained for four years.

Upon his release from the U.S. Marine Corps Reserve on 26 July 1956, CSM Maske enlisted in the Mississippi Army National Guard and was assigned as the Operations Sergeant for the 415th Field Artillery Battalion (Heavy Mortar) in Newton. He was reassigned to the First Sergeant position in 1957, filling that position for seven (7) years. On 3 June 1964, he was named Command Sergeant Major of the 4th Battalion, 114th Field Artillery at Newton and was one of the first in the Mississippi Army National Guard to achieve that rank. He remained in that position until 3 August 1982 when he was appointed as the State Command Sergeant Major of the Mississippi Army National Guard.

CSM Maske is a past President of the Mississippi National Guard NCO Association; Past President of the Camp Shelby NCO Club Board of Governors; Co-Chairman of the Adjutant General's Advisory Committee, Mississippi National Guard NCO Association. Chairman, NGB CSM Advisory Council; Chairman, State E-9 Promotion Board; Chairman, NCO/Soldier of the Year Board; Member of the State Safety Council; Member of State/Federal Awards Board.

CSM Maske is Past Member and Secretary of the Newton Chamber of Commerce; Past Member and Secretary of the Newton Volunteer Fire Department; Past Chairman of the Board, Newton United Methodist Church, where he also served as a Sunday School Teacher and Youth Counselor. He is also Master Mason and member of Newton Lodge #57.

AWARDS AND DECORATIONS

Meritorious Service Medal.
Army Commendation Medal.
Army Achievement Medal.
Army Good Conduct Medal.
Marine Corps Good Conduct Medal.
Navy Presidential Unit Citation.
Army RC Overseas Training Ribbon.
Army Service Ribbon.
National Defense Service Medal.
Korean Service Medal w/2 Battle Stars.
United Nations Service Medal.
Humanitarian Service Medal.
Armed Forces Reserve Medal.
Army Reserve Component Achievement Medal.
NCOPD Ribbon w/numeral.
Mississippi Magnolla Medal.
Mississippi Commendation Medal.
Mississippi Emergency Service Medal w/5th Award.
Mississippi Longevity Medal.
Mississippi Service School Medal.
Mississippi War Medal.
Mississippi Medal of Efficiency.

USE OF FORCE BY THE UNITED STATES IN THE PERSIAN GULF

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I asked for a special order today to present my views on the three resolutions regarding the use of force by the United States in the Persian Gulf. Although I do not have the privilege to cast a vote on the floor of Congress, I speak on behalf of the thousands of Samoan men and women presently serving in the armed services of our great Nation, many of them who now serve in the Persian Gulf.

Mr. Speaker, I support two of the three resolutions presently before us. The Bennett-Durbin resolution reaffirms the authority of Congress to make war as provided in the U.S. Constitution and the laws of the United States. The Hamilton-Gephardt resolution reaffirms the international economic sanctions and embargo against Iraq, which have been in effect for the last 6 months.

However, Mr. Speaker, I have some serious reservations concerning the Solarz-Michel resolution. This resolution authorizes the President to use military force pursuant to U.N. Security Council Resolution 678. This resolution is tantamount to a declaration of war by Congress. The Solarz-Michel resolution, in my opinion, gives too much discretion to the President. This nearly blank check authority would result in the Congress shirking it's constitutional duties while the President wages war. In that we have not given the economic sanctions sufficient time to become effective, and given that we have not exhausted all peaceful means of resolving this crisis, passage of the Solarz-Michel resolution at this point may be premature.

Mr. Speaker, I am also very concerned with the gross disparity of American servicemen employed in Operation Desert Shield relative to the other countries. The European countries and Japan have not fulfilled their commitment to protect their interests in the Persian Gulf. This is very disturbing given that 40 percent of Europe's imported oil and 60 percent of Japan's imported oil comes from the Middle East. The United States only imports 8 percent of its foreign oil from the Middle East. Also, present estimates put the cost of the U.S. military operation at $2 billion, and this will increase to $30 billion per month if war begins. Although our allies have pledged $25 billion, only $4 billion has been received. Who will willingly bear the financial costs for Operation Desert Shield? It is clear to me that the United States will incur a disproportionate share. I urge the President to continue negotiations with these countries so that the financial and military burden of Operation Desert Shield is shared proportionately among our allies.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the administration should continue to support the international economic sanctions and embargo against Iraq. The economic sanctions are supported by virtually the entire world. By all estimates, the sanctions and embargoes are having a major effect on the Iraqi economy.

Recent reports indicate that the international blockade has succeeded in cutting off almost 100 percent of Iraq's export—mostly oil—stopped over 90 percent of all imports and reduced its GNP by an estimated 50 percent. Experts estimate that over time the Iraqi GNP would decrease by about 70 percent. In addition, Iraq has forfeited $20 billion of exchange earnings a year and Iraq's credit has been destroyed. Iraq is also experiencing a shortage of spare parts for its munitions and military equipment. The embargo has also been effective to stop Iraq's attempt to obtain nuclear weapons and delivery systems. Because of these facts, there is a downward spiral in Iraq's overall military strength.

When the international embargo was initiated, experts estimated that it would take a year before the affects of the sanctions were felt by Iraq. If this is the case, then according to Dr. James R. Schlesinger, former Secretary of Defense, "* * * it seems rather illogical to express impatience with them because they will not have produced the hoped for results in 6 months time."

Mr. Speaker, Saddam is now in diplomatic isolation. He has been forced to an embarrassing peace with Iran and he has lost his position of influence with OPEC. Iraq is becoming an economic basket case and Saddam Hussein may be in jeopardy with his own people. Meanwhile, many of Saddam's neighbors are prospering from his actions while he derives no benefit. Saddam is clearly being punished by the international sanctions and embargo.

I realize the American diplomatic effort has fallen on Saddam's deaf ears. The lack of communication and cultural misunderstandings

between the United States and Iraq continues to forstall United States diplomatic efforts. As we near the January 15 deadline, I believe that we should continue to aggressively pursue the diplomatic effort. I believe Saddam is becoming increasingly aware that the United States is serious and that war is not in his best interest.

Mr. Speaker, the alternative to the international economic sanctions and embargo is war. Some military experts suggest that a limited air strike upon Iraqi strategic positions and cities would convince Saddam to withdraw from Kuwait. Other analysts suggest that war with Iraq would be quick and perhaps last a few days or a few months. I would like to ask those same experts what guarantees do we have that war will be brief and that American casualties will be light. In fact, no one really knows exactly how long a war with Iraq would last. I submit Mr. Speaker that war is not two dimensional and the cost of victory cannot be calculated on paper like some elementary mathematical equation. It is clear to me that the immediate price for war will not be small and that the American forces will carry a disproportionate burden in any event.

I also ask what guarantees do we have as to the aftermath of a war with Iraq? What will we do if we win? Will we establish an alliance similar to NATO to enhance stability in this region of the world? Islamic reaction will certainly be anti-American and terrorist acts are likely to occur. Given the problems and confrontations among the Arab nations for the last century, it is difficult to foresee stability in this region of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I believe Saddam must leave Kuwait. However, I differ with the President on the means used to achieve this objective. Should the economic blockade be given more time or should swift military action be taken? I believe we should try to achieve this objective through peaceful means. Peaceful means mandates that we give the sanctions a chance. In the words of Adm. William J. Crowe, Jr., USN, retired, former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff:

> If in fact the sanctions will work * * * the trade-off of avoiding war with its attendant sacrifices and uncertainties would, in my view, be more than worth it.

The Persian Gulf crisis has been further clouded by the recent public announcement by Iraq's Foreign Minister Aziz of his government's intention to attack Israel if the United States and the coalition of nations take offensive militray action against Iraq. I absolutely support Israel's right to exist as a sovereign state and it's right to defend itself. However, this declaration by Iraq adds to the instability of the crisis. I shudder to think of the consequences and reaction among Arab nations and the overall economic stability of this area of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the President continue to support the international economic sanctions and diplomatic efforts. Military force should be used only as a last resort.

Mr. Speaker I cannot in good conscience support the Solarz-Michel resolution at this time, and I urge my colleagues to reject this measure.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MCCANDLESS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DREIER, for 60 minutes, today and January 12.

Mr. DORNAN of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HUNTER, for 60 minutes, today and January 12.

Mr. DORNAN of California, for 60 minutes, on January 12.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Florida) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SCHEUER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MAZZOLI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MFUME, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. DURBIN, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. WILLIAMS, for 5 minutes, on January 12.

Ms. PELOSI, for 5 minutes, on January 12.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MCCANDLESS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BEREUTER, in two instances.

Mr. BLILEY.

Mr. MACHTLEY.

Mr. LEWIS of California.

Mr. GINGRICH.

Mr. SLAUGHTER of Virginia, in two instances.

Mr. EMERSON.

Mr. GEKAS.

Mr. DANNEMEYER, in two instances.

Mr. RHODES.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, in two instances.

Mr. SOLOMON.

Mr. FIELDS.

Mr. COBLE.

Mr. DUNCAN.

Mr. ROGERS.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Florida) and to include extraneous remarks:)

Mr. RICHARDSON.

Mrs. KENNELLY.

Mr. FAZIO.

Mr. SOLARZ.

Mr. HALL of Ohio.

Mr. BONIOR, in two instances.

Mr. ACKERMAN.

Mr. PENNY.

Mr. STARK.

Mr. KENNEDY.

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas.

Mr. DYMALLY.

Mr. TALLON.

Mr. LAFALCE.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida.

Mr. LIPINSKI.

Mr. VISCLOSKY.

Mr. HUBBARD, in two instances.

Mr. CHAPMAN.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 8 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Saturday, January 12, 1991, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

273. A letter from the Comptroller of the Department of Defense, transmitting notification that the Department plans to transfer $806.4 million to the operation and maintenance appropriations for the modernization and expansion of automated data processing systems, pursuant to section 8108 of the DOD Appropriations Act, 1991; to the Committee on Appropriations.

274. A letter from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's sixth annual interim report on the Neighborhood Development Demonstration Program, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 5318 nt.; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

275. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 8-257, "Naylor Court, N.W., Designation Act of 1990", and report, pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

276. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. act 8-258, "D.C. Government Comprehensive Merit Personnel Act of 1978 Employee Benefits Free Clinic Amendment Temporary Act of 1990," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

277. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. act 8-253, "D.C. Government Comprehensive Merit Personnel Act of 1978 Employee Benefits Amendment Act of 1990," and report, pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

278. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. act 8-254, "D.C. Jewish Community Center Real Property Tax Exemption Act of 1990," and report, pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

279. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. act 8-255, "Department of Corrections Grant Award Authorization Temporary Act of 1990," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

280. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. act 8-256, "D.C. Religious Accommodation Amendment Act of 1990," and report, pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-

233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

281. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. act 8-259, "D.C. Government Comprehensive Merit Personnel Act of 1978 Employee Benefits Free Clinic Amendment Act of 1990," and report, pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

282. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. act 8-239, "D.C. Prevention of Domestic Violence Amendment Act of 1990," and report, pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

283. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report on the Department's efforts to bring about coordination of goals, objectives, and activities of agencies and organizations which have responsibilities for programs related to child abuse and neglect during 1987 and 1988, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 5106f; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

284. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the fourth annual report of the Department's Council on Alzheimer's Disease delineating revisions to previous research plans and progress made in research sponsored by the Federal Government, pursuant to Public Law 99-660, section 912(b)(2) (100 Stat. 3805; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

285. A letter from the Chairman, Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1990, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

286. A letter from the Executive Director, Interagency Council on the Homeless, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1990, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

287. A letter from the Martin Luther King, Jr., Federal Holiday Commission, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1990, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

288. A letter from the National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1990, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

289. A letter from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to waive requirements of section 210(b)(2) of title 38, United States Code, for a planned administrative reorganization involving the organizational realignment of management responsibility for Department of Veterans Affairs data processing centers, and the corresponding realignment of associated central office components and functions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

290. A letter from the Secretary of State transmitting on behalf of the president, a report on progress on resolution of expropriation claims for El Salvador, pursuant to title II of Public Law 101-513; jointly to the Committees on Appropriations and Foreign Affairs.

291. A letter from the Agency for International Development, transmitting a report on the quantity of agricultural commodities programmed under title II in fiscal year 1990; jointly to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Agriculture.

292. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting the first annual report on the programs, projects, and joint ventures supported under the act, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 12001 et seq.; jointly to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology and Energy and Commerce.

293. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the annual report of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act covering the major activities and accomplishments on the Indian Health Service during fiscal year 1989, pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 1671; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Interior and Insular Affairs, and Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

[Omitted from the Record of January 10, 1991]

By Mr. OWENS of Utah:

H. Con. Res. 25. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that notwithstanding previous debate disagreement and votes taken authorizing the use of military force in the Persian Gulf, all Members of Congress now desire to express their unified support for the President of the United States and for American and allied forces; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

[Introduced January 11, 1991]

By Mr. BEREUTER (for himself, Mr. BARRETT, and Mr. HOAGLAND):

H.R. 479. A bill to amend the National Trails System Act to designate the California National Historic Trail and Pony Express National Historic Trail as components of the National Trails Systems; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BILBRAY:

H.R. 480. A bill to amend section 28 of the Mineral Leasing Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DARDEN (for himself and Mr. SYNAR):

H.R. 481. A bill to establish grazing fees for domestic livestock on the public rangelands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FLAKE:

H.R. 482. A bill to declare that the continued operation of the Freedom National Bank of New York is essential to provide adequate depository services in its community, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. GORDON:

H.R. 483. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 and the Communications Act of 1934 to require an image of a candidate for Federal office to be included in any television advertisement for such candidate, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on House Administration and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HEFLEY (for himself, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, and Mr. ALLARD):

H.R. 484. A bill to improve the water quality of water flowing from the Leadville Mine drainage tunnel, CO, and of the Upper Arkansas River Basin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LAFALCE:

H.R. 485. A bill to extend the expiration of the Defense Production Act of 1950 to September 30, 1991; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. LENT:

H.R. 486. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to make grants to local agencies for converting closed school buildings to efficient, alternate uses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 487. A bill amending the Rail Passenger Service Act to establish collective bargaining arbitration procedures for issues relating to the employment of railroad police by the National Railroad Passenger Corporation; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 488. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the prorating of veterans compensation and pension for the month in which the death of a veteran occurs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 489. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a monthly insurance benefit thereunder shall be paid for the month in which the recipient dies and that such benefit shall be payable for such month only to the extent proportionate to the number of days in such month preceding the date of the recipient's death; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 490. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude from the gross income of any participant in any State or local government plan so much of any distribution from such plan as represents his allocable share of tax-exempt interest of such plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 491. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to require the establishment of procedures to assure that benefit payments will not be made thereunder to deceased individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 492. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a basic $10,000 exemption from income tax, in the case of an individual or a married couple, for amounts received as annuities, pensions, or other retirement benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 493. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow individuals a deduction for commuting expenses incurred on public mass transit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 494. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that tax-exempt interest shall not be taken into account in determining the amount of Social Security benefits to be taxed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 495. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to improve the treatment of women through the establishment and payment of working spouse's benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 496. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow certain low- and middle-income individuals a refundable tax credit for a certain portion of the property taxes paid by them on their principal residences or of the rent they pay for their principal residences; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 497. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 498. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the medical expenses of handicapped individuals and individuals who have attained age 65 shall be

deductible without regard to the requirement that only medical expenses in excess of certain percentages of adjusted gross income are deductible; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OWENS of New York:

H.R. 499. A bill to require that federally insured depository institutions establish random drug testing programs; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO (for himself, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. CONTE, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FROST, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HUCKABY, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. LAFALCE, Ms. LONG, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. LENT, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. TORRES, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. WILSON):

H.R. 500. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the quincentenary of the discovery of America by Christopher Columbus and to establish the Christopher Columbus Fellowship Foundation; jointly, to the Committees on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, Education and Labor, and Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. OWENS of New York:

H.R. 501. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to provide grants to urban and rural communities for training economically disadvantaged youth in education and employment skills and to expand the supply of housing for homeless and economically disadvantaged individuals and families; jointly to the Committees on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, and Education and Labor.

H.R. 502. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to improve the procedure for appointing members to the National Labor Relations Board; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 503. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to provide for fair and expeditious representation elections; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PICKETT:

H.R. 504. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to prohibit the paying of witness fees to persons convicted of crime and serving a prison sentence pursuant to that conviction; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES (for himself, Mr. UDALL, Mr. STUMP, Mr. KOLBE, and Mr. KYL):

H.R. 505. A bill to designate the Salt-Gila Aqueduct of the Central Arizona Project as the "Fannin-McFarland Aqueduct"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mr. SHAYS):

H.R. 506. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide immunity from damages to cable franchising authorities for cable regulatory actions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SLAUGHTER of Virginia (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. JAMES, and Mr. HUGHES):

H.R. 507. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow newspapers a credit against income tax for using recycled newsprint; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLLOWAY:

H.R. 508. A bill to designate the lock and dam 1 on the Red River Waterway in Louisiana as the "Lindy Claiborne Boggs"; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. KOLTER:

H.R. 509. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require food and drug manufacturers to maintain a toll-free telephone line for inquiries respecting foods containing vitamins or minerals, herbal foods, foods for special delivery uses, and over-the-counter drugs and to require the labels and advertising of such products to contain a reference to such line; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KOLTER:

H.R. 510. A bill to require generators of hazardous waste to treat or dispose of their waste at the site on which the waste was generated; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KOLTER:

H.R. 511. A bill to amend the Motor Vehicle Information and Cost Savings Act to require that passenger motor vehicle repair businesses supply customers with information respecting the origin of parts installed and the cost of available parts and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KOLTER:

H.R. 512. A bill to provide for a bonus to veterans of World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KOLTER:

H.R. 513. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to terminate the exclusion from gross income of Americans working abroad, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KOLTER:

H.R. 514. A bill to establish a temporary program of supplemental unemployment benefits for unemployed coal miners who have exhausted their rights to regular unemployment benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KOLTER:

H.R. 515. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit individuals to include cash contributions with their income tax returns to be used for grants to reduce the cost of organ transplants, and for other purposes; jointly; to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MATSUI (for himself, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. STARK, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. PEASE, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. DONNELLY, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. FAZIO, and Mr. JONTZ):

H.R. 516. A bill to amend the Federal Unemployment Tax Act with respect to employment performed by certain employees of educational institutions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURPHY:

H.R. 517. A bill to waive age restrictions preventing the enlistment or appointment in the Armed Forces of the President, Vice President, Members of Congress, and heads of executive agencies; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 518. A bill to provide additional life insurance under the Servicemen's Group Life Insurance Program for members of the Armed Forces assigned to duty in the Persian Gulf region in connection with Operation Desert Shield; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of California:

H.R. 519. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit tax-free withdrawals from individual retirement plans, section 401(k) plans, and section 403(b) contracts for the acquisition of the first principal residence of the taxpayer or a member of the taxpayer's family; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. APPLEGATE (for himself, Mr. MCEWEN, and Mr. MONTGOMERY):

H.J. Res. 70. Joint resolution designating April 9, 1991, and April 9, 1992, as "National Former Prisoner of War Recognition Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FIELDS:

H.J. Res. 71. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution requiring that federal judges be reconfirmed by the Senate every 10 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HASTERT (for himself, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. COX of California, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. UDALL, Mr. ESPY, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. STUMP, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. GORDON, Mr. WOLF, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. HYDE, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. SLATTERY, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. LENT, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. FROST, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. ROE, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. OLIN, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. PAXON, Ms. LONG, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. PARKER, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. HUGHES, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. BERMAN):

H.J. Res. 72. Joint resolution to designate December 7, 1991, as "National Pearl Harbor Remembrance Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LAGOMARSINO:

H.J. Res. 73. Joint resolution designating the month of November 1991 as "Dyslexia Awareness Month"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.J. Res. 74. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to permit Congress to grant power to the Supreme Court to remove judges in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KOLTER:

H.J. Res. 75. Joint resolution to designate September 1, 1991, as "National Day of Recognition of the Polish Armed Forces of World War II"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KOLTER:

H.J. Res. 76. Joint resolution designating October 8 through 14, 1991, as "National School Lunch Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LENT:

H. Con. Res. 30. Concurrent resolution directing the Commissioner of Social Security and the Secretary of Health and Human Services to immediately conduct a study and

report to Congress on steps which can be taken to correct the benefit disparity known as the notch problem, in order to ensure equitable and fair treatment for those who have based their retirement plans on benefit levels which have existed for the past decade; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PENNY:

H. Con. Res. 31. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding the need to provide adequate health care for America's children; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HOLLOWAY:

H. Res. 30. Resolution to amend the rules of the House of Representatives to prohibit the House from receiving and considering special interest commemorative legislation; to the Committee on Rules.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 3: Mr. REGULA, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mrs. KENNELLY, and Mr. BARRETT.

H.R. 8: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 53: Mr. POSHARD, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. ANNUNZIO.

H.R. 83: Mr. KANJORSKI.

H.R. 86: Mr. HUNTER, Mr. HORTON, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. CHAPMAN.

H.R. 90: Mr. WOLPE, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. SMITH of Florida, and Mr. OWENS of New York.

H.R. 102: Mr. YATRON, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. STOKES, Mr. WOLF, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. BACCHUS, and Mr. MACHTLEY.

H.R. 103: Mr. LENT, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. ERDREICH.

H.R. 104: Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 105: Mr. RITTER, Mr. YATRON, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. GOSS, Mr. TALLON, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. RAY, Mr. YATES, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. JAMES, Mr. PAXON, and Mr. POSHARD.

H.R. 123: Mr. HANSEN, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. COUGHLIN, and Mr. STUMP.

H.R. 193: Mr. GUARINI.

H.R. 234: Mr. KYL.

H.R. 262: Ms. PELOSI, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. JONTZ, and Mr. STOKES.

H.R. 263: Mr. JONTZ, Mr. STOKES, and Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado.

H.R. 325: Mr. SHAYS, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. GILMAN, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. STARK, Mr. MCMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. ROE, Mr. BATEMAN, Mrs. UNSOELD, and Mr. SMITH of Florida.

H.R. 328: Mr. NOWAK, Mr. OLIN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MRAZEK, and Mr. BILBRAY.

H.R. 381: Mr. SERRANO and Mr. MAVROULES.

H.R. 385: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. FAZIO, and Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois.

H.R. 414: Mr. GILCHREST and Mr. BATEMAN.

H.J. Res. 18: Mr. KANJORSKI.

H. Con. Res. 1: Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. REED, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. RUSSO, and Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey.

H. Res. 19: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. MFUME, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. SMITH of Florida, and Mr. JACOBS.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

11. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the city council, city of Boston, relative to the current crisis in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

12. Also, petition of chair of the Committee of Foreign Affairs of the National Assembly of Austria, relative to ending military aid to the Government of El Salvador; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

13. Also, petition of the legislature of Rockland County, NY, relative to the footbridge between Jersey City, NJ and Ellis Island, NY; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

14. Also, petition of Office of the County Legislature, Suffolk, NY, relative to cost of living adjustments (COLA) to all veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.