

what the gentleman put out there for me to read, and I learned to read in about the first grade, and I am reading what was here. If that is not what was supposed to be out there, I certainly would like to see people explain why this was put in on December 12, passed out of committee on the December 12, and is here, and we cannot get the right version printed to be in the House.

My colleagues do not care about the process, and the United States Congress is losing its power by this kind of action. When my colleagues walk away and allow people to put stuff out here without anybody reading it, they do not know. We may soon have a package of stimulus out here that repeals some parts of the campaign finance law. We are all watching carefully to see if we can catch it; but when we do it at 100 miles an hour, I have to vote against it.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support, strong support of this resolution.

Ten years ago, the United States of America and our allies blew it. We had the opportunity to eliminate a major threat to world peace and world stability and a major dictator and tyrant to the people of Iraq, and we did not do the job. We did not finish the job.

Now is the time for us to finish that job. By not finishing the job before, we permitted, for example, the Kuwaitis to suffer with hundreds of their people still being held prisoners of war, MIAs, prisoners of war, the equivalent of 50,000 Americans would be held today without us knowing what Saddam Hussein has done to the Kuwaitis and still does to them. Saddam Hussein still has a vicious dictatorship; and Saddam Hussein is at war with the United States, most importantly.

I am very happy that the gentleman from Texas does not want us to be at war with Iraq. But the fact is, Saddam Hussein is at war with us, no matter where we would like to be. And if we permit Saddam Hussein to have nuclear and chemical and biological weapons, weapons of mass destruction, he will kill millions of Americans. Make no mistake about it. He has a blood feud with us.

We are not talking about a war with Iraq; we are talking about a war with Saddam Hussein. We should liberate Iraq in the same way that we have liberated Afghanistan, now that we have the chance and the opportunity to do so.

How did we liberate Afghanistan? We simply supported the people; we helped the people liberate themselves from the Taliban tyranny. The people in Iraq hate Saddam Hussein much more than the people of Afghanistan hated the Taliban. By helping them liberate themselves, we are protecting our own population from a holocaust, we are

protecting the world for peace, and we are doing what is right.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. Rohrabacher).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman was to find out that China was much more involved in the Taliban and the terrorist attacks on 9-11 than anything Saddam Hussein has done, would the gentleman be willing to do to China what the gentleman is willing to do to Iraq?

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, let me put it this way. The answer is yes, but I would not right away. Like the President says, we must do things sequentially, and we must be absolutely committed to the job. If we do things sequentially, the next order of business is taking care of the threat in Iraq. And if China is, yes, helping terrorists murder thousands of Americans, yes, we should help the Chinese people overthrow their dictatorship as well.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, would the gentleman do the same thing to Pakistan and Syria and Saudi Arabia and Egypt?

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I agree with the President of the United States that this is a sequential battle against terrorism. If those countries are engaged in supporting terrorists who kill thousands of Americans or continue a belligerency that threatens millions of our lives, yes, one at a time, we have to take care of them. If we do not, millions of our people will pay the price. Who could have ever guessed that by not taking care of Afghanistan, thousands of our people would be dead?

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), my old friend, for his generosity. I can assure him I will not abuse it. I am also happy to join the former chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), in this discussion.

I want to just throw this out because I may not be correct; but is this measure, H.J. Resolution 75, a way of us expanding the war to Iraq? I assume the answer is yes.

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

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

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, this measure is the exact opposite of what the gentleman has just suggested. It

demands of Saddam Hussein what he agreed to 10 years ago: full and complete access to places where weapons of mass destruction are produced. It gives him one chance, one final chance to do what he agreed to do when he surrendered 10 years ago.

□ 1245

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for his comment.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), who is more an expert on foreign affairs matters than I, said "Now is the time to finish the job." I guess that is not very ambiguous, is it? And then he went on to explain something that could be troublesome: we are not at war with Iraq, but we are at war with Saddam Hussein.

Well, that introduces a new concept. I am only on the Committee on the Judiciary. Our impressions have always been that nations declare war on another, we do not declare war on terrorists or a head of a country, or anything else.

I see the gentleman from California in the aisle there.

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

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman's quote was a little bit mistaken. I said that we are not at war with Iraq, but Saddam Hussein is at war with us.

Mr. CONYERS. Okay. That is much better, because that means, then, that we do not have to declare war on China's leaders, either. They are at war with us, not the people? Did I get that right? I continue to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. That was only based on if the assessment of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) was correct and they are supporting terrorists and planning to kill thousands of Americans. Then, yes, they are at war with us.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, could we not tailor this document a little more narrowly than bringing China into this? The gentleman did not do it. All right.

Let me go to the next part. I asked my good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), about the hearings. I was told that there were no hearings, no witnesses; but there was a markup last Wednesday.

Is that right? I have to get something right down here in the well before I return my time. Okay. That much is right.

Mr. Speaker, is there some reason that we did not have witnesses? Silence. All right. Then the only other thing that I could add, Mr. Speaker, is that there has been a change. There was original language that considered that Iraq's refusal to admit U.N. weapons inspectors pursuant to Security Resolution 687 should be considered an act of aggression against the United