

a price to pay, because after the Soviet Union collapsed, we walked away, and we did not support those elements in the Mujahedin who were somewhat in favor of the freedom and western values.

With those people who oppose this effort of pro democracy foreign policy, a pro freedom foreign policy rather than isolation foreign policy, they would have had us stay out of that war in Afghanistan. They would never have had us confronting Soviet aggression in different parts of the world.

Would the world be a better place today? No. But our problem, again, was not in supporting the Mujahedin, not supporting those people who oppose Soviet tyranny, but our failure was not supporting those people who believed in democracy and following through with them to see that the pro freedom elements were supported.

That is what this resolution is all about, making sure that we support those people in that region, in the Gulf region, and in Iraq itself who are our natural allies. Let us hold Saddam Hussein accountable rather than putting ourselves in a place where we let the situation go to such a degree that we end up having to kill hundreds of thousands of people in the regions, Iraqis who are not even our enemies.

So let us support those people in Iraq who are our friends and in the region who are our friends, and let us push for democracy.

Even in Kuwait today, we can be proud that there has been some democratic reform as compared to what the system was before when we were there. So I stand in support of this resolution.

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California makes a very good point, that sometimes we get involved in these battles and we never fight to complete victory. He argues the case for pursuing it and always winning and take out the dictator that we are opposing.

□ 1845

There is some merit to that argument, but there is also a very good reason why that does not happen and will not happen. It is because when we fight a war for non-national security reasons, when it is limited to protecting oil or some other interest, then there is a limitation, there is no wanting to expand it.

When we fight a war for national security reasons, we declare the war, the people join, they are willing to support it financially, they volunteer to go into the military, and they fight to win. But we have not done that since World War II, precisely because we have this namby-pamby foreign policy of being everything to everybody and we do not even defend our national security adequately enough.

The gentleman from California makes a good point also. He is concerned that somebody like Saddam

Hussein may attack us with weapons of mass destruction. He is precisely right. I am concerned about that too. But I would say that our exposure is about 100 times greater because of our policy. Why is it that the terrorists want to go after Americans? Because we are always dropping bombs on people and telling people what to do; because we are the policemen. We pretend to be the arbitrator of every argument in the world, even those that have existed for 1,000 years. It is a failed, flawed policy.

So I would say I have exactly the same concerns, but I think the policy that we follow has generated this problem, and it will continue.

Mr. Speaker, let me just close by talking a little bit about this authorization. It says, there are to be authorized appropriations, such sums as may be necessary to reimburse the applicable appropriation funds. This is what the money is to go for: Defense articles, defense services, military education, and training. Sounds like getting ready for the Bay of Pigs. That is exactly what we did. And then we backed off, we were not doing it for the right reason, and of course we have solidified for 40 years the dictatorship in Cuba.

So do my colleagues think our policy over the last 10 years has actually helped to weaken Saddam Hussein? Every time he comes out of it stronger. And then those who say, "Well, we should march in," we should all question. Those of us here in the Congress who are so anxious to take out this dictator, they should be willing to march themselves, or send their children and send their grandchildren. Is it worth that? No, no, we would not want to do that, we have to keep our troops safe, safe from harm, but we will just pay somebody to do it. We will pay somebody to do it and we will make wild promises. Promise the Kurds something. They will take care of Saddam Hussein. And sure enough, the promises never come through.

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

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman does not think it is proper for us to offer those people who are struggling for freedoms in Iraq against their dictatorship a helping hand?

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I think it would be absolutely proper to do that, as long as it came out of the gentleman's wallet and we did not extract it from somebody in this country, a taxpayer at the point of a gun and say, look, bin Laden is a great guy. I want more of your money.

That is what we did in the 1980s. That is what the Congress did. They went to the taxpayers, they put a gun to their head, and said, you pay up, because we think bin Laden is a freedom fighter.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Well, if the gentleman will further yield, it was just not handled correctly.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, again reclaiming my time, the policy is flawed. The policy is flawed.

I think the conclusions we have today are logical. I do not think they lack logic. I think that if one decides that we are fighting for our national security reasons, we never stop short of victory. So this would go along with the gentleman's argument that we stopped too soon in Iraq. But we were not there for national security reasons. They were not about to invade us, and they are not about to invade us. The only way we should fear an invasion by these hoodlums is if we incite them to terrorism.

We should consider this a very serious piece of legislation. This is a vote for virtual war and giving more power to the President. It has an open-ended appropriation, and if we spend one nickel on it, we are going to take it out of Social Security, the way the budget works around here.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HAMILTON).

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I have 2 minutes remaining under my time as yielded by the chairman.

Let me just make this observation, if I may. I think the gentleman from Texas questioned my statement a moment ago in which I said that the bill states the sense of Congress, it does not change U.S. policy. I believe my statement is correct for a couple of reasons. The language in the bill is only sense of Congress language. It does not say what the policy is; it says what the policy should be.

More importantly, perhaps, is that we in this body cannot set policy without the approval of the executive branch. The President is the chief foreign policymaker, of course, and it is my understanding that the policy of the United States Government is and will remain, after passage of this resolution, a policy of containment.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

In closing this debate I want to respond to a few of the points that have been made by other speakers. First, the bill does not make an open-ended financial commitment. It does not authorize an unlimited expenditure of funds; it authorizes such sums as may be necessary, subject to a cap of \$97 million.

On the contrary, the purpose of the bill is to save money. We had to pass a \$1.4 billion supplemental appropriation earlier this year to pay for U.S. military deployments to confront Saddam Hussein. We are going to have to spend that kind of money over and over again, unless we try something new, because today Saddam is far from complying with his international commitments than he was 9 months ago.

Second, this bill does not force the President to do anything that he might deem unwise. Rather, it gives him additional options for defending our national interests in the Persian Gulf region. Accordingly, I urge support for this measure and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 4655.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4655, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, the Chair will now put the question on the following motions to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today in the order in which that motion was entertained.

Votes will be taken in the following order: H.R. 4614 de novo; H.R. 1154, by the yeas and nays; and H.R. 4655, by the yeas and nays.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first such vote in this series.

CONVEYANCE OF FEDERAL LAND IN NEW CASTLE, NEW HAMPSHIRE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question de novo of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 4614, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN), that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4614, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 230, nays 168, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 480]

YEAS—230

Aderholt	Baker	Barton
Archer	Ballenger	Bass
Armey	Barr	Bateman
Bachus	Barrett (NE)	Bereuter
Baesler	Bartlett	Bilbray

Bilirakis	Graham	Paul	Johnson, E. B.	McNulty	Schumer
Bliley	Gutknecht	Paxon	Kanjorski	Meehan	Scott
Blunt	Hall (TX)	Pease	Kennedy (MA)	Meek (FL)	Serrano
Boehner	Hastert	Peterson (MN)	Kennedy (RI)	Meeks (NY)	Sherman
Bonilla	Hastings (WA)	Peterson (PA)	Kilpatrick	Menendez	Skaggs
Bono	Hayworth	Petri	Kind (WI)	Miller (CA)	Skelton
Brady (TX)	Hefley	Pickering	Klecza	Mink	Slaughter
Bryant	Herger	Pickett	Klink	Mollohan	Smith, Adam
Bunning	Hill	Pitts	Kucinich	Moran (VA)	Stabenow
Burr	Hilleary	Pombo	LaFalce	Murtha	Stark
Burton	Hobson	Porter	Lampson	Oberstar	Strickland
Buyer	Hoekstra	Portman	Lantos	Obey	Tanner
Callahan	Horn	Quinn	Lee	Olver	Tauscher
Camp	Hostettler	Radanovich	Levin	Ortiz	Thompson
Campbell	Houghton	Ramstad	Lewis (GA)	Pallone	Thurman
Canady	Hulshof	Redmond	Lipinski	Pascrell	Tierney
Cannon	Hunter	Regula	Lofgren	Pastor	Torres
Cardin	Hutchinson	Riley	Lowey	Payne	Towns
Castle	Hyde	Rogan	Luther	Pomeroy	Turner
Chabot	Inglis	Rohrabacher	Maloney (CT)	Price (NC)	Velazquez
Chambliss	Istook	Roukema	Maloney (NY)	Rahall	Vento
Chenoweth	Jefferson	Royce	Markey	Rangel	Visclosky
Christensen	Jenkins	Ryun	Martinez	Reyes	Waters
Clement	Johnson (CT)	Sabo	Mascara	Rivers	Watt (NC)
Coble	Johnson, Sam	Salmon	Matsui	Rodriguez	Waxman
Coburn	Jones	Saxton	McCarthy (MO)	Roemer	Wexler
Collins	Kaptur	Schaffer, Bob	McCarthy (NY)	Rothman	Weygand
Combest	Kasich	Sensenbrenner	McDermott	Rush	Wise
Cook	Kelly	Sessions	McHale	Sanchez	Woolsey
Cooksey	Kim	Shadegg	McIntyre	Sanders	Wynn
Cox	King (NY)	Shaw	McKinney	Sandlin	
Crane	Kingston	Shays		Sawyer	
Crapo	Klug	Shimkus			
Cubin	Knollenberg	Sisisky			
Cunningham	Kolbe	Skeen	Becerra	McGovern	Royal-Allard
Davis (VA)	LaHood	Smith (MI)	Bishop	Millender-	Sanford
Deal	Largent	Smith (NJ)	Boehlert	McDonald	Scarborough
Delahunt	Latham	Smith (OR)	Calvert	Moakley	Schaefer, Dan
DeLay	LaTourrette	Smith (TX)	Dixon	Neal	Shuster
Diaz-Balart	Lazio	Smith, Linda	Frost	Norwood	Spratt
Dickey	Leach	Snowbarger	Granger	Owens	Stokes
Doolittle	Lewis (CA)	Snyder	Greenwood	Pelosi	Stupak
Dreier	Lewis (KY)	Solomon	Hansen	Poshard	Tauzin
Duncan	Linder	Souder	Harman	Pryce (OH)	Yates
Dunn	Livingston	Spence	Hinojosa	Riggs	Young (FL)
Ehlers	LoBiondo	Stearns	Kennelly	Rogers	
Ehrlich	Lucas	Stenholm	McDade	Ros-Lehtinen	
Emerson	Manton	Stump			
English	Manzullo	Sununu			
Ensign	McCollum	Talent			
Everett	McCrery	Taylor (MS)			
Ewing	McHugh	Taylor (NC)			
Fawell	McInnis	Thomas			
Foley	McIntosh	Thornberry			
Forbes	McKeon	Thune			
Fossella	Metcalf	Tiahrt			
Fowler	Mica	Trafficant			
Fox	Miller (FL)	Upton			
Franks (NJ)	Minge	Walsh			
Frelinghuysen	Moran (KS)	Wamp			
Gallegly	Morella	Watkins			
Ganske	Myrick	Watts (OK)			
Gekas	Nadler	Weldon (FL)			
Gephardt	Nethercutt	Weldon (PA)			
Gibbons	Neumann	Weller			
Gilchrest	Ney	White			
Gillmor	Northup	Whitfield			
Gilman	Nussle	Wicker			
Goode	Oxley	Wilson			
Goodlatte	Packard	Wolf			
Goodling	Pappas	Young (AK)			
Goss	Parker				

NAYS—168

Abercrombie	Clyburn	Fattah
Ackerman	Condit	Fazio
Allen	Conyers	Filner
Andrews	Costello	Ford
Baldacci	Coyne	Frank (MA)
Barcia	Cramer	Furse
Barrett (WI)	Cummings	Gejdenson
Bentsen	Danner	Gonzalez
Berman	Davis (FL)	Gordon
Berry	Davis (IL)	Green
Blagojevich	DeFazio	Gutierrez
Blumenauer	DeGette	Hall (OH)
Bonior	DeLauro	Hamilton
Borski	Deutsch	Hastings (FL)
Boswell	Dicks	Hefner
Boucher	Dingell	Hilliard
Boyd	Doggett	Hinchee
Brady (PA)	Dooley	Holden
Brown (CA)	Doyle	Hooley
Brown (FL)	Edwards	Hoyer
Brown (OH)	Engel	Jackson (IL)
Capps	Eshoo	Jackson-Lee
Carson	Etheridge	(TX)
Clay	Evans	John
Clayton	Farr	Johnson (WI)

Johnson, E. B.	McNulty	Schumer
Kanjorski	Meehan	Scott
Kennedy (MA)	Meek (FL)	Serrano
Kennedy (RI)	Meeks (NY)	Sherman
Kilpatrick	Menendez	Skaggs
Kind (WI)	Miller (CA)	Skelton
Klecza	Mink	Slaughter
Klink	Mollohan	Smith, Adam
Kucinich	Moran (VA)	Stabenow
LaFalce	Murtha	Stark
Lampson	Oberstar	Strickland
Lantos	Obey	Tanner
Lee	Olver	Tauscher
Levin	Ortiz	Thompson
Lewis (GA)	Pallone	Thurman
Lipinski	Pascrell	Tierney
Lofgren	Pastor	Torres
Lowey	Payne	Towns
Luther	Pomeroy	Turner
Maloney (CT)	Price (NC)	Velazquez
Maloney (NY)	Rahall	Vento
Markey	Rangel	Visclosky
Martinez	Reyes	Waters
Mascara	Rivers	Watt (NC)
Matsui	Rodriguez	Waxman
McCarthy (MO)	Roemer	Wexler
McCarthy (NY)	Rothman	Weygand
McDermott	Rush	Wise
McHale	Sanchez	Woolsey
McIntyre	Sanders	Wynn
McKinney	Sandlin	
	Sawyer	

NOT VOTING—36

Becerra	McGovern	Royal-Allard
Bishop	Millender-	Sanford
Boehlert	McDonald	Scarborough
Calvert	Moakley	Schaefer, Dan
Dixon	Neal	Shuster
Frost	Norwood	Spratt
Granger	Owens	Stokes
Greenwood	Pelosi	Stupak
Hansen	Poshard	Tauzin
Harman	Pryce (OH)	Yates
Hinojosa	Riggs	Young (FL)
Kennelly	Rogers	
McDade	Ros-Lehtinen	

□ 1915

Ms. BROWN of Florida and Mr. BOWELL and Mr. MCNULTY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. BURTON of Indiana, LAZIO of New York, SNYDER, CHRISTENSEN, CARDIN, and ADERHOLT changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So (two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof) the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, rule I, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device may be taken on each additional motion to suspend the rules in which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

INDIAN FEDERAL RECOGNITION ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES ACT OF 1998

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 1154, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) that the House suspend the