

The wisdom of that young Marine was true then, it remains true today. It was not about oil during the Gulf War. The action taken by the President yesterday was also about more strategic and significant concerns.

Mr. Speaker, this is about denying access to one of the world's tyrants to weapons of mass destruction, nuclear, chemical and biological capabilities. The action taken by the President yesterday was fully justified.

Our tactical bombardment must now lead to a strategic objective, the removal of Saddam Hussein from power. For the past 8 years that tyrant has exercised brutal authority in a manner not only adverse to the interests of the United States but detrimental to the peace of the world. I welcome the President's action and urge him to take all necessary steps sufficient to strip Iraq of offensive military capabilities, most especially weapons of mass destruction.

Now I would say to my colleagues:

Regardless of how we may vote on other issues within the next few days, now is the time for nonpartisan national unity in support of our President and our forces overseas.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, as a 5 yr Air Force veteran I rise in strong support of the troops: we all do. Everybody supports the troops. But this resolution is a lot more than supporting the troops. Even by the very nature of our debate today, most of the debate has been about the military action. I see this as nothing more than a rubber stamp on a war that has already been started, and it has not been started in the proper way.

Mr. Speaker, it is clearly stated in the Constitution that only Congress has the authority to declare war. It is precisely because of the way we go to war these days that we are continuing to fight the Persian Gulf War. We did not win the Persian Gulf War because we did not declare war since there was no justification to because there was no national security interests involved.

Saddam Hussein is not threatening our national security. This is a concocted scheme to pursue bombing for oil interests and other reasons, but it has nothing to do with national security.

This resolution is an endorsement for war. We are rubber stamping this action.

We should follow the rule of law. The rule of law says that resolutions, to begin war, should come to the House of Representatives and pass by the Senate. But we have been too careless and too casual for many, many decades, and this is the reason we do not win wars any more.

We are in essentially perpetual war. We have granted too much authority to

our President to wage war. Even under the most unusual of circumstances we permit him to wage war. This is wrong. We, as a House, must assume our responsibilities.

I cannot support this resolution because it is a rubber stamp, it is an endorsement for an illegal war. We should argue the case for peace. We should argue the case for national sovereignty. We should not allow our President to use U.N. resolutions to wage war.

First and foremost, the notion that the United States can dictate the political leadership of a foreign policy is immoral. What right have we to determine these things for any nation other than our own? The answer, clearly, is "none," we have no such right.

There is an idea known as sovereignty, and that idea is integral to nationhood. Among other things, sovereignty dictates that a people be responsible for their own leadership, without the interference of other nations. Is it any wonder that the same American leaders who would invade other sovereign nations spend so much time surrendering the sovereignty of the United States? I think not. Simply, their efforts are designed to undermine the entire notion of sovereignty.

One evident outcome of the anti-sovereignty philosophy is our dependence on institutions such as the United Nations. It is an affront to our nation's sovereignty and our constitution that the President presently launches war on Iraq under the aegis of a UN resolution but without the Constitutionally required authorization by the United States Congress.

As Americans we are rightly offended by the notion that the Chinese Government has influenced our domestic elections. However, we are not free from hypocrisy. For recently this Congress passed legislation appropriating money for the sole and express purpose of changing the government of a sovereign nation.

Next, we ought to consider the morality of the means which must be employed to change the government of Iraq. Yesterday I sat on a panel with Harry Summers, a man of considerable military knowledge. Summers stated that it would take ground troops to overthrow Saddam Hussein. Moreover, he unequivocally stated that military history shows that no war has ever been won simply via air strikes. This statement is not only factually accurate, it is also a stark reminder of what the price of this policy will be. Namely, the price of successfully changing the government of Iraq is the blood of many thousands of innocent human beings. And, lest we fool ourselves, many of these people will be American troops, brave young men and women who patriotically agreed to defend the United States but have now been placed like pawns in a chess game, perhaps to remove the leader of Iraq, or perhaps to stave off the removal of the US President. At any rate, these brave young Americans ought not be sacrificed for either of these improper political purposes.

Finally, even by the amoral measure of "realpolitik" the policy of Saddam's removal is unwarranted. The reason that the US has hesitated to actually complete successful enactment of its stated policy is because the result of such enactment is fraught with uncertainty. Iraq is a country made up of many different factions. And many of its neighbors are

interested in increasing their influence and control over areas which are now within Iraqi territory. Hence, if Saddam ever were to be removed by force of US efforts, we would face a very real risk to regional stability. Stability being the key concern of those who practice "realpolitik" this points to the fact that by the measures established by the "pragmatists" the stated policy of Saddam's removal is wrongful. Let me be clear, while I reject the notion of divorcing politics from moral considerations, I do believe we should understand that our current policy is not only devoid of morals, but is also doomed to failure from any practical viewpoint.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SISISKY).

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

Mr. SISISKY. Mr. Speaker, I support the President's decision to attack Iraq. The cat and mouse game with inspection has gone on far too long. It is clear that Saddam Hussein does not intend to comply with the agreement made at the end of the Gulf War. Our best evidence is that Saddam has continued to focus resources on weapons of mass destruction. The problem is that chemical and biological weapons are relatively unsophisticated. It is relatively easy to produce them and hide the production facilities.

In addition, evidence indicates Saddam continues to produce an array of conventional weapons, but the possibility of chemical, biological and even nuclear weapons and delivery system production is clearly the most troubling issue. Our certainty about what is happening in these areas is clouded by Iraq's mistreatment of inspection teams, and this is what has precipitated this crisis.

I was with the President and the congressional delegation, both Democrats and Republicans, to the Middle East. We came back Tuesday night. There was a paradox here. In the West Bank and in Gaza, instead of seeing American flags being burned we saw American flags being waived, and we saw the Palestine Committee raise their hands and knock out a covenant in their charter that says Israel will be destroyed. The President of the United States really was the King of Peace in the Middle East, and then on the way back the paradox is that unfortunately he had to order an attack on Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, we are the luckiest people in the world by having young men and women ready and willing to serve. I would add that they deserve our undying support.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BURR).

Mr. BURR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution.

The men and women of the United States Armed Forces have once again been called on to defend our country's interests abroad. We can no longer stand idly by while Saddam Hussein flaunts the will of the world and