

To conclude, this is a very serious piece of legislation the committee has produced. I will not oppose the bill, because I, like most of us, feel the opposition should be supported, and Iraq and the world would be better off without Saddam Hussein.

But we should have a clear idea of what we are doing. We are making a down payment on support for the opposition. We should have no illusions about the bill.

Uniting the opposition will take a long time. The bill could create false expectations. There is a wide gap between means and objectives in this bill. There is plenty of doubt whether the bill is workable. The bill does risk the weakening of sanctions against Iraq.

Let us be very clear about what the bill does and does not do. The bill states the sense of Congress. It does not change U.S. policy. The bill does not compel the provision of military assistance to Iraqi opposition groups. The bill leaves the administration flexibility in carrying out U.S. policy toward Iraqi opposition groups. I understand that the administration does not oppose the bill.

So despite some of my concerns, I support the bill. As the legislative process moves along, I hope improvements can be made in the bill.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). The gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) has 10 minutes remaining. The gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) has 6½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HAMILTON) has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana makes some very good points indicating that he is not convinced that this is workable. So back to the practicality of the bill. Even though one might argue there is a lot of good intentions here, even a Member that is supporting the bill is very uncertain whether it is workable.

In some ways, even if it is workable, it is going to be working against us and working against the United States and working against the taxpayers of this country.

But I would also like to challenge the statement that this does not change policy, because on section 3, it says it should be the policy of the United States to seek to remove the regime headed by Saddam Hussein from power in Iraq and promote the emergence of a democratic government to replace that regime.

That sounds pretty clear to me. As a matter of fact, I think it sounds so clear that it contradicts U.S. law. How do you remove somebody without killing them? Is it just because we do not use our own CIA to bump them off that we are not morally and legally responsible? We will be.

So we are talking about killing Saddam Hussein, a ruthless dictator. But

how many ruthless dictators do we have? We have plenty. So how many more should we go after?

So the real question is, why at this particular time, why would we give our President more authority to wage war? He has way too much authority already if the President can drop bombs when he pleases. This of course has occurred not only in this administration but in the administrations of the 1980s as well where bombs were dropped to make some points. But generally speaking, the points are not well made. They usually come back to haunt us.

This is more or less what has happened. This is part of a policy that we have been following for quite a few decades. Yet, the problems continue to emerge.

We can hardly be sympathetic to the Kurds who are being punished by the Iraqis at the same time we are paying the Turks to do the same thing to the Kurds. So there is something awful inconsistent about this.

There is nothing wrong with a policy of trying to maintain friendship with people, trying to trade with people and influence them that way rather than saying, if you do not do exactly as we tell you, we are going to bomb you.

This is a policy we have been following for way too long. It costs a lot of money. It costs a lot of respect for law because, technically, it is not legal. Waging war should only occur when the Congress and the people decide this. But to casually give more and more authority to the President to do this and encourage him to bump off dictators is a dangerous precedent to set.

I think there is no doubt in my mind what is best for the United States. We should not pass this resolution. If there need to be more efforts made, do it some other way. But, obviously, this is not a good way to do it. It is sacrificing the principle of law. It is sacrificing the Constitution. It is sacrificing the practicalities of even the people who are supporting it are not quite sure it is going to work.

So I would say give serious consideration to not supporting this bill. We need a "no" vote on this.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) a member of our committee.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4655, and I would like to applaud the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), chairman of the committee, and the gentleman from California (Mr. COX) for what I consider to be a well thought out, both philosophically and practically, plan that will get our country out of a situation in which we are now in jeopardy unless we do something.

The only thing coming back to haunt us now is that, when the Gulf War was going on, we did not dispatch Saddam Hussein from this planet. We did not

finish the job. We should not have gotten involved in that war unless we intended to finish it. Unfortunately, we did not do so, and now we will live with that decision not to finish that job.

There is a symmetry to the affairs of State. There can be no peace without freedom, and there can be no prosperity without peace. Our failure in the Gulf War was in not supporting those who oppose Saddam Hussein's tyranny and not to finish the job on Saddam Hussein himself back when we had the power to determine the course of events in the Persian Gulf.

Our willingness not to finish the job, our unwillingness, I should say, to finish the job and to stand for our ideals, which are to support those elements in their area who believed in freedom or at least some degree of freedom and were not aggressing upon their neighbors, were opposed to aggression, that is the decision that haunts us today.

Saddam Hussein now has a blood feud with us, and he will murder if we give him the opportunity to do so with weapons of mass destruction. He will murder millions of Americans. So like it or not, America's safety is now tied to events in Iraq and in the Persian Gulf. We cannot turn our backs on that region, or we will risk the death of millions of Americans, not to speak of just those people in the Persian Gulf itself.

But it is not too late to get ourselves out of this dilemma by supporting the people in the region and in Iraq itself who oppose Saddam Hussein's aggression and his dictatorship.

This resolution is exactly the right formula, and we should have used it long ago. If we would have used it while we were there in the Gulf during the Gulf War, we would not have the problems and the threat to our well-being that we face today.

Support democracy. Oppose tyranny. Oppose aggression and repression. That is what America's policy should be based on. We should strengthen the victims so they can defend themselves. These things are totally consistent with America's philosophy, and it is a pragmatic approach as well.

Furthermore, this resolution calls to hold Saddam Hussein himself accountable. The man is a murderer. The man has murdered large numbers of his own people. The man has invaded his neighbors. It is the dictatorship in Iraq, not the people of Iraq, who are the enemies of the United States and threaten our well-being.

That is what this resolution is all about. It is not a declaration of war. It is a declaration that we are on the side of the Iraqi people and the other people of that region who believe in freedom to some degree, whatever degree that is, more than what they have today, and oppose aggression.

Let us stand up and stand by our ideals, because we did not do that before, and we left the practical planners to say do not eliminate Saddam Hussein, and now we face this threat.

Our support for the Mujahedin collapsed the Soviet Union. Yes, there was