

mitigates against the concern some of the other language, you may have about some of the other language in here as it relates to military force because once the Beutler amendment is adopted, this will not be urging the United States to take unilateral military action as I understand the intent of your resolution. This resolution will be urging the United States and the United Nations to work together and the United States to take whatever action it takes in consort with other nations and with the United Nations so I think the reference to military action will be mitigated considerably by passage of the Beutler amendment. So with that rather rambling discourse on a number of topics brought up today, I would just conclude by saying I, for one, plan to vote for the Beutler amendment.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Withem. Senator Bernard-Stevens.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members of the body. I, too, rise in support of Senator Beutler's amendment. However, I still will have some concerns with the resolution as presented to us today. I have no difficulty supporting the humanitarian concepts within the resolution. I have no difficulty recognizing the intense atrocities that have taken place. I have no problem in supporting that the United Nations, along with the United States and other countries need to get as involved as possible on a diplomatic front. I do have some difficulties, however, with a couple of points that have been made. Number one, I do want to comment to something Senator Withem said on the Middle East. Yes, the United States was quick to enter and I would agree with Senator Withem that part of our, if not a large portion of our involvement, was certainly economic but when we entered, the only time that we entered at some point was through an international force with an international group where all parties for the most part, even Syria, agreed to enter in, otherwise we would not have done so. This resolution, at least prior to the Beutler amendment did not call for that. The other thing I would like to at least put in the records, when we talk about, even if we're talking about enforcement of no-fly zones, if we're talking about arming a...one side or another with defensive weapons, I'm always intrigued at that word "defensive". What's the difference between a defensive weapon and an offensive weapon? I've yet for anyone to describe to me what that difference is. I understand that I can use the weapon to defend myself, but I suspect I can use the same weapon to do an offensive nature as