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

Mr. Speaker, this is an important moment in our history. We are in

the middle of a war the like of which has not been seen in recorded

history. Everybody is a combatant, and the enemy works by night and

works through cowardice. We do not see them. It is not like when Hitler

marched through Europe with the blitzkrieg, where you could see the

enemy. The enemy extends from New York City to Madrid to Indonesia. And

if ever there was a time for this country, the United States of

America, to be unified, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Murtha)

said earlier, it is now.

Now, there are two aspects to this issue that we have here today. One

is the procedure by which we got here, and that is controversial and

has evoked some harsh words. And the other aspect, the one that I

choose to dwell on, is the substance of the resolution.

The resolution, it seems to me, is simple, straightforward and one

that everybody can support. It does four things. It congratulates the

Iraqi people on withstanding the torture, the brutality, and the

oppression that Saddam Hussein has visited on that country for so long.

It affirms that the United States and the world has been made safer

with the removal of Saddam Hussein and his regime. And I understand

there are some who doubt that and wish to contest that. I would suggest

to them that they look at Libya and they consider that Libya has given

up its pretenses to have weapons of mass destruction, its capacity to

develop nuclear weapons, and is rejoining the community of nations

without a shot being fired. And anyone who doubts that that is not a

direct result of our intervention in Iraq, seems to me, is not a very

good logician nor a student of history.

The other two things the resolution does is commend the Iraqi people

on the adoption of an interim constitution. This, Mr. Speaker, is a

miracle. You have Sunnis, you have Shiites, you have Kurds who have

been at each other's throats for a long, long time. You have them

coming together in a period of 9 weeks reaching a constitutional

document. Not perfect, but a giant leap forward from where they were.

This is an immense contribution towards democratizing the volatile

Middle East, and they deserve recognition.

And, of course, this resolution commends the United States Armed

Forces and the Coalition for their valor and their courage in the war

in the Middle East.

Now, those things, it seems to me, everybody can support. And

regardless of our disagreements on process, regardless of our concerns

about how we got here, I would ask, in the spirit of, dare I say,

patriotism, sticking up for our country, never mind our ruffled

feelings, justified or not, let us stand as one with our military

people who are fighting this war, this strange, weird, deadly war,

where all of us should be Americans, not Republicans and not Democrats.

Mr. Speaker, the vote in Spain was a great victory for al Qaeda, but

it was simply a battle, it was not the war. The war will be a long,

long war; and the voices of appeasement are being heard in Europe, but

there are other voices, some from the past, voices like Churchill,

voices like de Gaulle and voices like Roosevelt that caution

resistance, resistance to tyranny. I would ask that Members read the

resolution. It is very simple, very straightforward; read it and then

put your bruised feelings aside and support it.

If we want to go into bruised feelings, both sides have ample cause,

we certainly do, being called, and I say this in sorrow not anger,

crooks and liars and having it suggested that the war was started by

the President. Those kinds of ideas are not conducive to getting

together and embracing each other in the unity that must prevail if we

are to win. We do not dare lose this war. What can we do to help win

it? I ask Members that, and I ask my friends on the other side of the

aisle to give it heartfelt thought and support this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I would just like to comment on the use of the word ``imminent.'' I

wonder when the aircraft smashed into the World Trade Center, what was

imminent. That morning? The day before? See, when we are dealing with

suicide bombers, ``imminence'' is a rather difficult term to apply to

circumstances. Sometimes by the time one finds out it is imminent, they

are dead.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman said what is not in our

resolution. I will tell the Members what is not in. The 11 votes he

voted to cut funds for intelligence, his vote against the supplemental.

And so to talk out of one side of his mouth for a vigorous military and

that they should be supplied, and then to deny them the wherewithal to

do it, it seems to me is standing on two stools. It is a great way to

get a political hernia.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds. I think there is a

little semantic difficulty on the words ``safe'' and ``safer.'' I would

not say that Iraq is safe. I would not say crossing Pennsylvania Avenue

in rush hour is safe. The question is, Is it safer with Mr. Saddam

Hussein in a cell? Or is it less safe with him in one of his palaces

plotting to amputate limbs from some of his people or to bury Kurds

alive like he has done?

The world is a safer place with him in a cell because Mohmmar Qaddafi

watched that and went to school on that. He decided to put his cards

down and give up his nuclear pretensions.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I enjoyed listening to the last speaker tell us of his war exploits.

I never tire of hearing them, and I find them quite fascinating. But I

am bewildered. I do not quite understand why someone who wants to

praise the military does not understand that getting rid of Saddam

Hussein and trying to secure Iraq is a conquest by our military, an

achievement, and that is why they are first in the four things this

resolution does. And why he would want to detract from that

accomplishment, that military achievement, is something that I am

bewildered by.

Mr. Speaker, the last time I yielded, I did not get my time

back.

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

I was fascinated by the remarks of the last gentleman. We have been

checking records of people who have strong views on this subject, and I

find the gentleman has voted 11 times to cut the intelligence budget.

That is pretty consistent, and I give him an A for consistency. He also

voted against the supplemental to provide the wherewithal for the

troops to be fully equipped. And so, as I say, the gentleman talks a

very robust military, but he does not quite follow up with supporting

funding for our intelligence.