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

Mr. Speaker, I just want to lay some groundwork for some comments I

will make later. I am concerned in the first place, as I said before,

that no one on this side was consulted about this resolution. I am

embarrassed, I am indignant that they did not consult me.

This looks like an innocuous resolution, but when it says it is safer

today than before Saddam Hussein was captured, I believe we are putting

on paper something that is not true. It is like some of the things that

were said, and I said, before this war started. I said there were

weapons of mass destruction. I said that Saddam Hussein was a danger to

the world. We do not go to war unless there is a core national security

interest, and now we are trying to justify why we went to war by some

of the things that are in this resolution.

There is no question that a number of people were killed. Thousands

of people were killed. There is no question that Saddam Hussein was a

despot. There is no question about a brutal regime. But in this one

list, they say that in 1988, 5,000 people were killed, Kurdish citizens

were killed. Well, we went to war in 1991. President Bush once said,

and he was one of the best foreign policy Presidents we have ever had,

he said, I am not going into Iraq because I do not want to occupy Iraq

because that would be a problem. He said that in his book, and he said,

I do not want to reconstruct Iraq.

We have spent $150 billion in Iraq today. We had testimony before our

committee right before the war started by the Under Secretary of

Defense who said it will not cost us a penny, the oil revenues from

Iraq will pay for this war. Well, $150 billion later we are still

paying for it. When Members say it is safer, it makes me nervous

because we are exaggerating, as we have during this whole thing. And I

blame myself as much as anyone else.

A constituent of mine said to me, he said, never in history have so

many been misled by so few, and he was talking to me. He was saying I

misled him. I believed there were weapons of mass destruction. I

believed there was an imminent danger, but it turns out that I was

wrong.

What we have to look at now is we need bipartisanship now to win long

term. This is a long-term problem. I have voted for every

appropriation, I have supported every President when it comes to

foreign policy, but this resolution, just because it says on paper it

is safer, does not mean it is safer throughout the world.

Today we had an incident where there was a bombing in Baghdad where

the bomb took out as wide as a street, 30 or 40 feet wide and 30 or 40

feet deep. We had the Spanish problem where they killed a couple

hundred people and wounded 2,000. So worldwide, and it says here the

world is safer. The world is not safer today than it was before they

captured Saddam Hussein.

I have a list of countries where they do not think it is safer. Those

countries, Canada, France, Italy, Germany, Spain, all of them believe

there is an increased terrorism threat in the world. The reason I am

saying this is we have to depend on those countries. We have to be

honest and upfront, and when we say it is safer today, we are not being

upfront. It is not safer. It may be down the road. This is not the

time, in my estimation, for us to make statements like that. There will

come a time if we persist, and I am going to be there the whole way,

but I am just concerned that we are making a statement which just

exacerbates the very problem that we have.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr.

Obey).

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

The President of the United States has said there is no connection

between al Qaeda and Saddam Hussein. The director of intelligence has

said there is no connection. Secretary of State Colin Powell has said

there is no connection. You may think there is a connection. We are

revisiting history when we start to talk about all the things the

gentleman is talking about. We went to war because there were weapons

of mass destruction. We went to war because there was connection with

al Qaeda. We did not go to war because of this. Many of these incidents

happened when George Bush I was President and he said, ``I'm not going

to go into Iraq because I don't want to rebuild Iraq.'' The cost to

this Nation, the Under Secretary of Defense said, will be nothing. He

said, ``We'll pay for it with their oil.'' $150 billion later we are

still paying, and we will pay for a long time.

I am in this for the long haul, but when I see a partisan resolution

which was brought up without any input from me or any other Democrat,

and you call us partisan? This does not make any sense. Why did anybody

not come to us and say, change a few words, change some in the preamble

and we will have a resolution we can support.

I appreciate what the gentleman is saying. There is nobody that has

supported Presidents more than I have, but I just get upset when

something comes across this way.

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

We did not go to war in World War II because of Dachau. We went to

war because they attacked us, because our national security was in

danger. And we went to war in Iraq because there

were weapons of mass destruction, I thought. There were al Qaeda

connections, I thought. We did not go to war because these people were

killed.

George Bush one, the first George Bush, knew there were mass graves.

And he did not go into Iraq and he said, I do not want to rebuild Iraq;

I do not want to occupy Iraq. And one Under Secretary of Defense said

to our subcommittee it will not cost us a cent. It has cost us $150

billion to fight in Iraq and to rebuild Iraq.

So we are trying to revisit history. I mean, we cannot change it. We

went to war because we thought we were threatened. These things were

terrible things. We are glad to get rid of Saddam Hussein. That is not

the point. We cannot revisit and change history. So I feel very

strongly.

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

I went to Austin with the gentleman from California (Mr. Lewis), the

gentleman from Florida (Mr. Young) after the President was elected but

before he was inaugurated, and I sat at his table, and I said to him,

Mr. President, you do not have to worry about missile defense, you have

got to worry about terrorism and you have got to worry about nuclear

proliferation.

Then I came back, we went to committee, and under the leadership of

the gentleman from California (Mr. Lewis) we moved $1.4 billion out of

missile defense and put it into counterterrorism on September 11, 2001.

We could not finish our markup that day because of what happened. One

of the planes went down in my district. That was the start of the war

against terrorism because those passengers in that plane took a stand.

They got up and fought that plane to the ground. The plane was probably

coming towards the Capitol of the United States.

The reason that I am so upset about this resolution, not only because

they did not consult any of us, but because the terrorists worked with

a calendar and we work with a clock. This is going to be a long war. We

have been discredited worldwide with our intelligence.

I told the story before. When Dean Acheson, former Secretary of State

at the time, went to meet with President de Gaulle to show him the

evidence of the Cuban missiles in Cuba, and he offered to show him

photographs, he said, I do not need to see the photographs, I will take

the word of the President of the United States.

We have been discredited because our intelligence was faulty. I

believed there was weapons of mass destruction. I believed that there

was an al Qaeda connection. None of this has turned out to be true.

A constituent of mine said in pointing to me, he said, Never in

history have so many been misled by so few. I said, You mean me? He

said, I mean you, Mr. Murtha. He said to me, Before I voted on the

resolution and before we went to war, he told me, I have confidence in

your vote; I have confidence we should go to war and put our soldiers

in harm's way because I know you have the inside and you know the

truth.

Well, let me tell my colleagues, the preamble to this paper is what

makes me so upset. We are trying to justify what we did. Look, no

question about Saddam Hussein being a bad guy, but that is not why we

went to war. If we

took the preamble and we put that as a resolution, there would not have

been a resolution. When they ask me if you would have voted for this

resolution if you know what you know, I said there would not have been

a resolution because the resolution would not have come up because

there was no threat to our national course, national security.

This is going to be a long war, and I am going to be right there. I

am going to be voting for something that means something. I am going to

be voting for the money, for the troops, for all the things they need.

The gentleman from California (Mr. Lewis) and I stand shoulder to

shoulder. Only 16 people voted against our defense bill. I do not think

that many voted against the authorization bill of the gentleman from

California (Mr. Hunter) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. Skelton).

So we are for the defense of this country, but we should not mislead

the people. I have said over and over again, do not be overly

optimistic. This is going to be a long haul. And if we are overly

optimistic and we tell the American public and the international

community and they lose faiths in us, we cannot win this war on

terrorism. We have to have the support of the American public, which

has dropped dramatically. And if you tell them the cost, it drops below

50 percent. Internationally they do not support us because they do not

believe many of the things that we say now, and we have to have them if

we are going to win this war on terrorism.

So I would ask the Members to be careful with the charges that they

are making in this resolution. And I would hope the Members understand

that all of us support the troops. All of us want to do everything we

can; and when it comes to the money, we will be there. So I would ask

all the Members to vote for the recommital motion and let us make a

slight change in this resolution so that we can pass it overwhelmingly.