

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress is now debating the most serious and sobering of issues, whether we go to war, war against Iraq. We do this as we stand on the threshold of a new century.

I believe this debate is as much about voting to declare war as it is about what kind of country we are and what we want our country to be in the future. This resolution of war is an extraordinary and unwise departure from our history of a principled American tradition, that we stand foursquare against unprovoked attacks and for a foreign policy of deterrence.

The Bush doctrine reverses this policy and sets forth that the United States of America has the unrestricted right to attack other nations. This resolution trades deterrence for preemption. This resolution trade multilateralism for unilateralism.

This go-it-alone policy has become the imprimatur of this administration. We have witnessed their abrogation of nearly every international treaty they inherited from previous Republican and Democratic administrations.

This administration has allowed the underfunding of the Nunn-Lugar law, leaving the tools of terrorists unprotected and up for grabs across the former Soviet Union.

This administration has withdrawn from the ABM Treaty, withdrawn from the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, withdrawn from START II, rejected the Biological Weapons Convention, and rejected the International Criminal Court.

This administration makes war the first and only option, rather than a last resort. It has, in one brief summer and fall, upended decades of our time-tested, tenacious foreign policy of deterrence, which has served our Nation and the world so well.

□ 2330

The President has not answered the haunting questions of thousands of my constituents and the American people. Why now? How many troops will we need to wage this war? What will it cost? How long will we be there? What is the plan to manage the chaos in the aftermath of regime change; and, finally, how will it affect the war on terrorism?

Respected military leaders and statesmen have testified to Congress about their deep concerns with preemption and unilateralism. These experts have seriously undercut the President's case of what Saddam Hussein has and the President's remedy to deal with it. And classified briefings have raised more questions than answers.

Today's newspapers were filled with the information that our own intelligence agencies have concluded that Saddam Hussein is unlikely to initiate a chemical or biological attack against the United States. Not one of us carries a brief for Saddam Hussein. We know

what he has done and we know how he rules. We know about his accumulation of chemical and biological weapons and the other weapons that threaten his neighbors and us.

Our answer today, send a thousand troops of weapons inspectors to Iraq. This time they must have unrestricted access to everything and with deadlines to achieve disarmament. The world community will watch and as we disarm him. He will loosen the noose he holds.

We can be tough and principled as we have been in the past. We can bring other nations with us and when we do, Saddam will know he cannot dodge or be deceitful any longer. That is why I support the Spratt resolution which calls for action only if the U.N. determines action is required and the President seeks approval from the Congress.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, when the framers wrote our Constitution, their vision spoke to the innermost yearnings of every human being, then, over the centuries, and now. They created what I have called the best idea that is ever been born: democracy. Their call is the same today in this new century that we lead through the enduring strength of our democratic principles backed by the might we possess. Today our Constitution and my conscience beckon me to oppose the President's resolution for war. I shall vote against the resolution and I urge my colleagues to do so as well.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON), a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

(Mr. LARSON of Connecticut asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in an effort to unite this body behind the Spratt resolution. I oppose House Joint Resolution 114 because this resolution sets a dangerous new precedent in foreign policy, a policy of preemptive first strikes and go-it-alone unilateralism. This is a radical departure from long-standing United States policy of deterrence, diplomacy, containment and collective security. We are drifting away from the successful coalition-building of former President George Bush in Desert Storm and our current President's administration's coalition that is currently prosecuting the war on terror in Afghanistan.

We are united behind the President in his continued prosecution of this war on terror, a mission we need to relentlessly pursue and not be deterred from. We are united behind the President in our efforts before the United Nations, and strongly support a tough, new, robust, unfettered weapons inspection process that is currently being negotiated by Colin Powell. We are in unanimous agreement about the brutal dictatorship of Saddam Hussein, the

atrocities he has perpetuated against other nations and his own people, and the need to remove him. We stand united behind our men and women of our armed services no matter the outcome of the vote.

Where we differ is not whether, but how, we address this threat. As former Secretary of State Jim Baker points out it is not whether to use military force to achieve this, but how we go about it. While we address the near-term danger presented by Saddam Hussein, we must be equally mindful of the dangerous long-term consequences of first-strike, go-it-alone policy. To that extent, there is a notable divide in past and current Bush administrations and within this Congress and amongst people across this Nation.

This divide stems from those advocating the abandonment of long-standing policy in favor of going it alone. This is not about the use of force. I voted for the use of force in Kosovo and in Afghanistan. It is about the preemptive and unilateral use of force. The United States is the undisputed preeminent military, social and economic leader in the world; but there are many issues we simply cannot solve alone. Issues like the environment, disease and global economic stability are but a few examples and only further underscore the problematic concerns of our ongoing debate about going alone.

There is no question that we have the military might or that we will prevail against Iraq or any nation. But what lingers is whether we have the restraint as the world's lone superpower to lead by the rule of law and use our terrible swift swords only as a last resort.

The goal of the administration is to isolate Saddam Hussein and bring about his demise. In the process we must make sure that it is not the United States that is isolated and alone. For even with all our military might and resources, we cannot solve all the global problems by ourselves. The internationalist wing of the Republican Party best expressed the perils of preemption, in going it alone in Brent Scowcroft, the former National Security Advisor to both President Ford and former President Bush, who has argued that attacking Iraq will take away from the effort against the war on terror and do long-term damage to the stability needed in the Middle East.

Retired generals like Norman Schwarzkopf and Secretary of State Eagleburger, hardly appeasers, come down on the side of caution and coalition building. General Zinni, retired Commander in Chief of U.S. Central Command, talks about the need to be intensely involved in the peace process between Israel and Palestine. In staying focused on Osama bin Laden and al Qaeda, he wonders aloud about those in the administration who have never served in the military who seem so anxious to place our troops in harm's way; and those in the administration

who characterize heroes like General Wesley Clark, former Commander in Chief of the U.S. European Command, who urged the two-step approach of the Spratt resolution and calls them dreamers.

This is a time that the President, Congress, and the people need to be united. It is why we have introduced the Spratt resolution. This resolution strengthens the President's hand and demonstrates national resolve. It preserves the constitutional authority that resides with Congress and does not abrogate our role to the executive branch.

The people in my district feel strongly about this and have spoken out in town hall meetings. They are deeply opposed to a go-it-alone policy; and while understanding the potential threat posed by Saddam, they want us to pursue the course the President outlined before the United Nations.

Make no mistake, there is broad support for the President and implicit understanding of the awesome responsibility he bears as Commander in Chief. There is also an equal expectation that elected representatives will ask the tough questions and will measure the consequences and collateral damage of our actions. Our system is one of checks and balances; and clearly from my perspective, the use of force preemptively and unilaterally needs to be held in check, debated, discussed and not rubber stamped in a climate of fear and crisis.

The people's House must question the unintended consequences of this new policy. What are those consequences? What will be the collateral damage associated with preemptive unilateral attacks?

I say it can be said no better than our Ambassador to Saudi Arabia, Robert Jordan, when I asked him if we were facing a gathering storm in the Middle East. He replied, no, Congressman, you are from New England. Surely you have read the book or seen the movie. This is not a gathering storm. This has all the makings of the perfect storm.

Our relationship with our allies in the Middle East in the prosecution of the war on terrorist is fragile. There is great unrest in the region from economic instability to religious fanatics spewing hate towards the United States. A preemptive unilateral attack on Saddam Hussein could accomplish what Osama bin Laden failed to do, and that is unite the Islamic world in a jihad against the United States. Going it alone may well bring down a tin pan dictator, but will the consequences of that be the recruitment of tens of thousands of new terrorists bound for our shores?

□ 2340

Thomas Friedman, noted New York Times columnist, spoke at a recent book tour about the long-term consequences of our doctrine, and I was struck by the reaction of a man who simply reached into his wallet and

showed a picture to Friedman of his children.

Nothing else need be said. Support the Spratt amendment.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA), a member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

(Mr. HONDA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding me the time.

I rise this evening as Congress considers one of the most difficult decisions a nation must make. President Bush and leaders from the House negotiated a resolution to authorize the use of force against Iraq. However, this new resolution still allows the President to launch a unilateral, preemptive attack without providing any evidence to Congress that the U.S. is under imminent threat.

The President says that he is willing to go it alone against Iraq as a last resort, but there is no mechanism in this resolution to ensure that it is just that, a last resort.

Let one thing be clear. A vote for this resolution is more than an authorization for use of force. It is a declaration of war, and I will oppose it.

We all agree that it is critical for the United States and the world community to ensure that Saddam Hussein is not developing weapons of mass destruction. I believe we can accomplish this goal by working with the U.N. Security Council to gain consensus on a tough and effective plan to gain unfettered access to inspect Iraq facilities. A powerful multinational force created by the U.N. would carry legitimacy and strong support in the United States and abroad. If the U.N. does not heed our call to action, then other options should be explored.

As of today, it is clear that the administration has yet to exhaust diplomatic options.

Many generals, military strategists and Republican policy-makers have expressed reservations with President Bush's approach to Iraq. Iraq does not exist in a vacuum. The decisions our government makes relative to Iraq will have consequences that will extend to all corners of the world, as well as potentially destabilize the Middle East. Will the concentration of our Armed Forces in Iraq limit our resources for a war against al Qaeda?

Additionally, experts agree that a war against Iraq will be much different than the Gulf War. Intensive, urban combat against an entrenched force is likely. How many thousands of American lives is the administration willing to imperil? What are the long-term plans for the stabilization of Iraq, and how many billions of dollars will this cost American taxpayers?

After September 11, the United States made great strides with the international community in our war

against terror. A unilateral effort by the United States would not only weaken our relationship with our allies but also will increase resentment in the volatile Middle East and further embolden anti-American opinion throughout the world.

We must rid Saddam Hussein of any weapons of mass destruction. However, I urge the administration to continue to work with the U.N. to gain support for a tough resolution with an accompanying national multinational force, if necessary. Diplomatic efforts must continue. This war can still be avoided; and, as such, I cannot vote to put American lives and innocent civilians in harm's way, straight from our war against terror, or create uncertainty that could further hamper our struggling economy.

I will not support this resolution.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH), a member of the Committee on International Relations, in fact, the Chairman of the Subcommittee on East Asia and the Pacific and a man who has great insight into this region.

(Mr. LEACH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, as all Members know, this resolution involves a difficult set of decisions that neither the Congress nor the executive can duck. Anyone who is not conflicted in their judgment is not thinking seriously.

For myself, I have enormous regard for our President and great respect for his sworn policy advisers, but I have come to the conclusion that this resolution misfits the times and the circumstances. There may be a case for a regime change, but not for war against Iraq and its people.

Because time is brief, I would like to emphasize three points:

One, given the events of 9/11, a doctrine of preemption has a modicum of legitimacy. But the greater our power, the more important it is to use it with restraint. Otherwise, it will be seen as hubristic, with a strong prospect of counterproductive ramifications. Engaging in war the wrong way can too easily jeopardize the underlying conflict against terrorism and undercut core American values and leadership around the world.

Two, there are many so-called end game elements that have not been adequately addressed. They range from the dilemma of street combat to problems of postwar governance to worldwide Muslim reaction.

Three, and most profoundly, this resolution is based on a misunderstanding of modern science as it applies to weapons of war. The assumption is that there is a compelling case to preempt a nuclear weapons program, but what is little understood is that Iraq already controls a weapon of mass destruction more dangerous than nuclear bombs,