States to back up U.N. inspections, to back up U.N. enforcement actions, would be ours to make and that, moreover, those troops would remain under U.S. command? Is there any ground for treating this as some kind of abdication of sovereignty?

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, my friend from North Carolina is absolutely right. This amendment strengthens the position, the leadership role of the United States. It builds on the lesson of 10 years ago that was a success then and should be a success today.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Chairman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Spratt substitute. I have great respect for the gentleman from South Carolina, but believe that this resolution is very misguided. It divides, or bifurcates, American foreign policy instead of speaking with one voice.

Nothing in the resolution put forth by the committee, led by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), prevents the very course of action outlined by the gentleman from South Carolina, but I fear that if this resolution offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) were adopted, it would have the opposite effect of that intended by the gentleman; and that is because it sends the message that the President, in his efforts to get strong United Nations action and support from our allies, does not have the support of our own Congress.

Between the votes on the two resolutions contemplated by the gentleman and while the President seeks international support, we will in effect be a cacophony of voices rather than speaking with one voice.

Many Members of Congress have differing opinions on what the U.N. resolution should be. It is time to speak to the U.N. with one voice. Politics must end at the water's edge.

In dealing with other Nations and especially with the United Nations, the President must have a strong hand. He must be able to say what he is authorized to do, if necessary, to push the U.N. to do the right thing itself. On the other hand, the Spratt substitute sends the message to Saddam Hussein that we are talk without action. He has relied upon that state of affairs for the past 12 years.

This resolution is little different than the 16 U.N. resolutions, all without consequences. This resolution demands the truth, but removes the consequences. This resolution prevents the President of the United States from taking action to protect our national security interests. It ties his hands, even to do the limited things we are already doing.

The Congress needs to speak with one voice. The Congress needs to speak now, not later, and the Congress needs to place into the hands of the President the necessary tools to implement a unified and effective foreign policy.

I urge my colleagues to reject this substitute.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. MCCARTHY).

(Mrs. MCCARTHY of Missouri asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this measure. The Spratt-Moran substitute charts the right and responsible course.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Spratt-Moran Substitute to H.J. Res. 114. I join the sponsors in commending the President for calling upon the United Nations to enforce existing Security Council resolutions eliminating weapons of mass destruction in Iraq, as well as his seeking approval of a new resolution establishing tougher arms inspections. Should force be necessary, this substitute encourages the President to make every effort to obtain U.N. Security Council approval. It is essential that we execute a multilateral approach to Iraq by uniting with our allies as we did this past year in Afghanistan, and which we also did in prosecuting Desert Storm with a minimal loss of American lives. Indeed, mobilizing a broad coalition of nations to join us in Desert Storm helped avoid destabilizing the Middle East, something which we may be powerless to prevent if we act unilaterally now. It is important to acknowledge that, as with our responsibility to nurture and support the effort to democratize and help stabilize Afghanistan, it is also in our national interest to make a long term commitment to assist in the transition to a new and stable democratic government in Iraq. This is the way to build a collective security throughout the region and enhance the prospects for a lasting peace.

I concur with the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops that "the use of massive military force to remove the current government of Iraq could have incalculable consequences for a civilian population that has suffered so much from war, repression, and a debilitating embargo." In addition to concern for the people of Iraq who have been subjugated by Saddam Hussein and his evil regime, we must fully understand that an attack on Iraq, particularly without support from the world community, may have unintended, negative consequences to our global war on terrorism. We must not lose sight of the fact that it is the worldwide terrorist network which poses the most immediate danger to the people of the United States. We have the support of the world in combating terrorism. If we go it alone in Iraq, we risk destroying that support and impeding our ability to win the war against terrorism.

That is reason enough for making a strong and diligent effort to obtain support of the U.N. Security Council for an aggressive and immediate program of widespread on-site inspections for weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. The Spratt-Moran Substitute allows the President to use our troops to assist the U.N. inspections. Such inspections must be executed unrelentingly and must lead to the immediate disarmament of Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, historian Robert Dallek recently noted that during the Presidency of Harry Truman our defense policy was one of containment and deterrence quite unlike the policy proposed by the current administration. President Truman felt that the best way to preserve the peace following World War II was to contain our adversaries. Truman said, "There is nothing more foolish than to think that war can be stopped by war. You don't 'prevent' anything by war except peace." Mr. Dallek assessed the current administration's policy as "prevention" by removing a head of state who has the power to do harm to us. Such a unilateral act must be justified with facts that convince the American people to go it alone. The Spratt-Moran Substitute calls upon the President to justify that such force is the only option left available, and mandates that the President seek a second vote of the Congress to authorize use of our military might if the President determines a regime change in Iraq is the goal. I commend my fellow Missourian, Mr. SKELTON for his efforts to assure that we adhere to our Constitution by requiring this second vote.

Mr. Speaker, we are united in our desire to achieve peace and stability in this region. One of the strengths of our country is our right to express our views freely and not have our patriotism questioned if we disagree with a particular administration or policy. I realize my view may not be the prevailing opinion of this body or this administration, but I truly believe it represents the view of a majority of my constituents given the information that is available to us.

I recognize the tremendous sacrifices of the armed forces in this endeavor and I fully support them. The question before us is when and how they should be engaged. I support the multilateral approach stipulated in the substitute and the call for a vigorous, all encompassing inspection program by the U.N., and urge my colleagues to adopt the substitute. As anthropologist Margaret Meade wisely noted: "We must devise a system in which peace is more rewarding than war." The Spratt-Moran Substitute charts the right and responsible course.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH).

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

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Spratt amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Spratt Substitute for the Use of Force Against Iraq Resolution.

The Spratt substitute authorizes the use of U.S. armed forces to support any new U.N. Security Council resolution that mandates the elimination, by force if necessary, of all Iraqi weapons of mass destruction, long-range ballistic missiles, and the means of producing such weapons and missiles. The substitute also calls on the president to seek authorization from Congress in the absence of a U.N. Security Council resolution sufficient to eliminate by force, if necessary, all Iraqi weapons of mass destruction.

If we go to war with Iraq, we must do so with the approval of the U.N. Security Council, and the general cooperation and support of the United Nations. We risk damaging the