Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may

consume.

I want to go over a couple of things here that some of it was talked

about yesterday and I said we need a plan. We also need a change of

direction.

Now, why do I say we need a change of direction? A number of people

brought up Beirut. I remember being on the floor, and the Speaker of

the House asked me to go to Beirut after the President had deployed

1,400 troops to Beirut. Go over to Beirut, see what is going on. I did.

A friend of mine who had been in Vietnam with me was there, the

commanding officer, and the rules we engaged in were very loose. Only

had 1,400 people, did not even have people on the high ground to

protect themselves. They were shooting down at the Marines down in the

valley.

I came back and I told the President, I told Weinberger, I told Tip

O'Neill, you have got to get them out of there. They did not, 241

Marines were killed.

The President saw it was a mistake; he changed direction. One thing

about President Reagan, he understood when to change. He understood

when you change direction. He had one of the biggest tax cuts in the

history of Congress, and then he had one of the biggest tax increases.

People forget he had a tax increase because he wanted to change

direction.

He changed directions in Central America. I supported him. They

burned me in effigy back at home because I supported Reagan all through

the Central American thing, but we came to compromise in the end, and

he saw we had to change direction and he did.

What I am saying today, Somalia, I told President Bush I, do not go

into Somalia because if you go into Somalia you will not be able to get

out. He said to me, I will have them out by inauguration day. He had

lost the election by that time. He went in after the election was over,

and he said, I will have them out by inauguration day. Well, he did not

get them all out by inauguration day, and we changed direction there.

We changed direction in the wrong direction. We went after Adide, who

was a tribal leader. We sent in special forces. They bungled the thing.

They fired the Secretary of Defense. They had accountability, and

President Clinton changed direction. We redeployed.

So these are not times to criticize Presidents. This is something

that needed to be done.

Now, we are in the same position here. Iraqi civilian deaths, 2003,

250; Iraqi civilian deaths in 2006, 1,500 a month. Went from we are

there, we are not someplace else, we are there, and that is how many

deaths. Iraqi kidnappings per day, 2003, two; today, there is 35 a day,

35 a day. U.S. troop fatalities, there were 37 in May of 2003; in May

of 2006, 68. We are there. We are there as occupiers in Iraq. Iraqi

Army police fatalities were 10 in 2003; 149 in May of this year.

Now, this is not progress. We are on the ground with 138,000 troops.

The number of estimated insurgents, and I do not know how they find out

who they are, but he said there is 3,000, Mr. Speaker, in May of 2003.

There is now 20,000 insurgents. Now why did that come about? Because

they look at us as occupiers.

Only the Iraqis can solve this problem. The United States cannot

solve the problem as a foreign occupier, and our troops are caught in

between a civil war.

Daily attacks by insurgents, 2003, there were five per day; today,

there is 90. Monthly incidents of sectarian violence, you want to know

what sectarian violence is? Sectarian violence is civil war. May 2003,

5; May of 2006, 250. We are there. We are there in the country, and it

has increased from 5 to 250.

So do not tell me stay the course is the answer. We need a change in

direction. We need to assess this situation and change. All of us want

the same solution. We want a stable Middle East. It is important not

only to the United States; it is important to the international

community.

Bush I worked with the international community, and he got a

coalition together, and it was successful, and he knew the limitations

of what he could do. He did not go into Iraq, even though there were

some zealots who wanted to go into Iraq. He knew, and he said in his

book, If I go into Iraq, I will have to occupy it, I will have to

reconstruct it, and I will lose the coalition. So he did not go into

Iraq, and he was absolutely right. I supported him at the time, even

though a lot of people had said they did not support what he was doing.

Somebody yesterday said, oh, you cannot measure the amount of water

they have per day, that does not mean anything, the amount of

electricity. Let me tell you something. I was without electricity for 8

hours last winter. It is not pleasant. I was cold. Now, it does not get

that cold in Iraq, but I was without it for 8 hours and the house got

cold. I thought to myself, in Iraq, they only have sometimes 8 to 10

hours of electricity a day. Water, they have 1 hour of water.

There is less oil production than before. Deputy Secretary Wolfowitz

said we are going to pay for this with the oil production. Well, it has

fallen far short of that. I think the OMB chairman, I think he at the

time predicted this war would cost maybe $50 billion, and Wolfowitz

said it would cost nothing because they would pay for it. Well, right

now we have spent $450 billion. The longer we stay, the more we pay, in

lives, in hurt to the families, the more we pay in financial resources.

It took us 15 years to get over the Vietnam War. We had 18 percent

interest rates. We had 13 percent unemployment. Through the Reagan

administration the Federal Reserve had to increase rates to 21 percent.

I remember because at the time I was trying to buy a house. I remember

trying to buy it at first, and I said 7 percent, I am not going to pay

7 percent. It went up to 21 percent. So we suffered because it was guns

and butter. Here it is the tax cuts and troops in the field paying for

the war.

So stay and pay is not a solution. I say redeploy and be ready. Get

our troops out of harm's way and put them on the periphery and let the

Iraqis settle this themselves. Only the Iraqis can settle this, Mr.

Speaker.

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

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Vietnam is the same thing. I believed in my mission in Vietnam. All

of us believed in it, but in 1967 when I came back from Vietnam, they

had an election. President Lyndon Johnson said everything's all right.

Matter of fact, I have a bullet that they gave me, that the first

Marines gave to us when we left there that said everything's all right.

We all believed in our mission. That did not mean we were going to win

the war. That is the problem.

At times we have to change direction. When we look at the Vietnam

War, there was an election right after I came back in 1967, and

President Lyndon Johnson said, now it is all over, they will be able to

do this themselves. 37,000 Americans killed after that, and you know

the results. It was not because of the public. It was because the enemy

kept forcing us into the type of war they were fighting. It was the

kind of war we cannot fight. We could have gone all out and obviously

destroyed Hanoi, but we had to worry about the Russians and the

Chinese.

This is a real problem. It is guerrilla-type war, and when we fight,

we have to use overwhelming force. When we use overwhelming force, you

make enemies, and when you make enemies, you lose the hearts and minds.

I am saying the same thing you are. We want to win some kind of, I do

not say victory. We want to win stability in the Middle East. That is

the key because it is important to the free world. That is what is so

important.

So we all are saying the same thing. One of the top generals said to

me, that part cannot be won militarily all the time they will say.

General Pace said it cannot be won militarily. So how do we do it?

Diplomatically, politically and when the Iraqis say we are going to

give amnesty to people that kill Americans, I mean, they fired the guy,

okay, but that is a signal to them. We have 47 percent of the Iraqis

say that they want to kill Americans. They think that is patriotic for

them to kill Americans. That is disturbing to me.

The reason I started speaking out, one of the reasons, I remember I

was in the hospital. One young woman said to me, with her husband lying

there on the bed, wounded after a second trip, she said, you know, he

did not enlist, this woman said, to fight for the Iraqis. He enlisted

to fight for America.

It has got to be in the national security interest of America.

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

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

make a couple of the comments, and then I will reserve my time.

The gentleman just before I spoke talked about how long it took

America to get its independence. Actually, it is more than just 6 or 7

years, it went on through the Civil War, but they were all Americans.

It was not an occupying force that was trying to force democracy on the

United States. Can you imagine what we would have done if we had an

occupying force here trying to force democracy on the United States? It

would not have worked. But of course they were not democracies in most

cases anyway.

So I just want to point out that in Iraq we have become the

occupiers, and 47 percent of the people in Iraq, and this is a poll

only 3 months old, says it is okay to kill Americans. One of the

officials in the Iraqi government offered amnesty.

Since I spoke out on November 17, things have gotten worse. We have

130,000 troops in Iraq. Every day it gets worse. From May to May, it

gets worse and worse. It is not a matter of stay the course. It is a

matter of change direction.

I said a little earlier, Ronald Reagan understood when it was time to

change direction. He did one of the biggest tax cuts in history. He

turned around a little bit later and adjusted that. This didn't call it

a tax increase, it was an adjustment.

In Beirut he decided we have to make a change, it won't work. In

Somalia, President Clinton did the same thing. And over that mistake,

and it was a substantial mistake, the Secretary of Defense resigned

because he had lost the confidence of the military in the way he

handled the situation in Somalia. We changed direction there. We went

in the wrong direction. We went after a tribal leader named Aideed.

In Iraq, unfortunately, the way we operate as a military, and there

is no one who understands better than the gentleman with the 173rd in

California, understands what the military does when it goes into a

place. You have to use overwhelming force. I promote that. I am in

favor of that. I do everything I can to make sure that the military has

what they need to prevail and protect American lives.

But when you do that, you inadvertently kill people and you make

enemies. Abu Ghraib was another example of the enemies that we made,

and the public relations battle has been lost worldwide. People have

discredited the United States and have little confidence in our

ability.

Somebody brought up Spain yesterday. They said ask Spain about

terrorism. Well, 56 percent of the people in Spain think the United

States is more of a threat in Iraq than Iran is in the world. So we

have got a lot of things we can talk about as rhetoric. The facts are

the situation is not getting better. We have 130,000 troops on the

ground and only Iraqis can handle this.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to me, we stand here and fight in the

air-conditioned Chambers of the United States Congress where these

fellows are walking around in Iraq, men and women, with 70 pounds every

day facing IEDs, never knowing when they may go off with tremendous

stress. They are being deployed three and four times. It is easy to

stay in an air-conditioned office and say I'm going to stay the course.

But let me tell you something, those troops, I hope they believe in

what they are doing. That's what America is all about. But standing

here and talking about policy and criticizing people just because they

disagree with a policy is absolutely absurd. All of us support the

troops and want them to come home as soon as they can.

What we need is a change in direction so we will be able to work this

out. All of us want stability in the Middle East. That is what this

whole thing is all about. We just disagree on how you do it. We

disagree. Ever since the troops have been there, everything has gotten

worse.

Electricity production is below pre-war levels; water only 1 hour a

day in some parts. In Anbar Province no water. 90 percent unemployment.

Not one project in Anbar Province. So it is not a matter of whether it

is good or not. It is a matter only that the Iraqi's should solve this

thing.

And when I hear somebody standing here sanctimoniously saying we are

going to fight this out, we are not fighting at all. It is the troops

that are doing the fighting, the families that are doing the

sacrificing, a very small proportion of families in this country are

doing the sacrificing. And that is why I get so upset when they stand

here sanctimoniously saying we are fighting this thing. It is the

troops that are doing the fighting, not the Members of Congress that

are doing the fighting.

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

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may use.

I didn't mean to imply that the gentleman from California is

sanctimonious. It is just some of the speakers have been sanctimonious.

But that is not the point. We want the same thing. We want stability in

the Middle East. It is important. We use more oil than any other

country in the world, 20.6 million barrels of oil a day. The closest to

us is China with 6 million barrels of oil a day. The whole free world

wants stability in the Middle East. It is how we get it.

What I am saying is there is more instability in Iraq because of us,

because of our troops. They have become occupiers. This is the thing

that worries me. That is why I think we have to change direction.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I would just point out to the Speaker that Franklin Roosevelt might

have said that, but he waited till they attacked us at Pearl Harbor

before he took any action. He tried to build up the forces, but

certainly didn't take any military action until we were attacked at

Pearl Harbor.

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

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may

consume.

The problem is, 42 percent of the people don't know what the mission

is. When I talk to the young folks in the hospitals, they tell me their

mission is to go out and find IEDs. That is explosive devices. Their

mission is to be a target.

Hey, we all agree with everything that the gentleman from California

said, Mr. Speaker. We agree. We support the troops. We have done

everything we can do. It is the policy we disagree with. It is a change

in direction we want. We are staying and we are paying and we are

paying with troops' lives. We are paying with financial resources.

The first gulf war the United States paid $5 billion. We had 500,000

American troops. We had 160,000 coalition troops. President Bush I did

a marvelous job, one of the finest international coalitions in the

history of the United States. They paid and they produced and they

supported. But he knew how far he could go. He understood the enemy and

he understood what could be done. And he was willing to change

direction. When they thought they had enough troops, General

Schwartzkopf said he needed more troops, he put more troops on the

ground.

So I am convinced all of us agree we want a solution. But the

American troops, unfortunately, have become occupiers. And 80 percent

of the Iraqis want us out of there. And I have a piece of paper here

that the Vice President of Iraq, here, Tuesday night on the way home on

Air Force One, President Bush said there are concerns about commitment

in keeping our troops there. They are worried about it to a person.

They said they will leave before capable.

Then the Associated Press reports, yesterday morning Iraqi's Vice

President has asked President Bush for a timetable for withdrawal of

foreign forces from Iraq. And Iraq's Vice President's office said Vice

President of Iraq made the request during his meeting with Bush on

Tuesday when the U.S. President made a surprise visit. I supported him,

the President said. Eighty percent of the Iraqi people want us out.

They want to solve these problems themselves. The Americans cannot

force democracy on Iraq.

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

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Let me go over what I said before.

All of us applaud the elections. All of us applaud the fact that

Zarqawi was caught and the way he was caught, using Iraqis, giving

information to Iraqis, and the United States operating and going in and

eliminating Zarqawi.

The problem is because of the way we handled this at first, it got

out of hand, and United States forces had to use overwhelming force in

many cases. Fallujah, for instance, they went in and put 300,000 people

outside their homes. Only 100,000 have come back.

Now, in Anbar Province they have no electricity at all. They have 2

million people there. They have zero projects in Anbar Province. That

is the province where we had the most trouble. And then as I go through

the liturgy of things that have happened with 130,000 troops there,

this is the point: in May of 2003, we had 3,000 insurgents. In May of

2006, we have 20,000 insurgents. Now, we are there. The United States

forces are occupying Iraq. The estimated number of foreign fighters in

2003 was 100. This comes from our intelligence people. And today there

is an estimated 1,500. I think it is a little less than that, but it is

estimated at 1,500.

Now, think. We have got 130,000 troops. They supposedly have 265,000,

police and army trained. They have more confidence in their army than

they have in the United States forces; yet there are only 1,000 foreign

fighters. We have sectarian violence which is, in my estimation, a

civil war and we are caught in between. Our troops have become the

targets in a civil war.

All of us want this thing to be resolved. This is absolutely

essential to stability in the free world because of the energy that

comes from the Middle East. But how we do it is what we disagree with.

As long as American troops are there, we actually are attracting

terrorism.

Do you know who wants us in Iraq? al Qaeda wants us in Iraq. Iran

wants us in Iraq. North Korea wants us in Iraq. Russia wants us in

Iraq, and China wants us in Iraq. Why? Because we are depleting our

financial resources and our human resources. Because we are destroying

the future viability of the Army. We have $50 billion in backlog right

now for the Army, equipment that needs to be repaired. We have had to

lower the standards for the Army, taking category 4s, which we did not

take for a long time. We have had Air Force people and Navy people we

transferred over to the Army because they do not have enough people.

And we can talk about reenlistment, but they had no reenlistment

bonuses that I know of during the old days. They now have up to

$150,000 that they pay people in reenlistment bonuses. So we are having

real problems. I agree the troops are doing everything they can. Their

mission is actually accomplished.

But let me go on. Monthly attacks on oil and gas assets: there were

five in 2003, and it has gotten worse in 2006. Oil production is less

than the prewar level. Oil production. Somebody complained not long ago

that electricity doesn't make any difference. Let me tell you

something. If you have ever gone without electricity in your house, you

know that it makes a difference.

I am just saying that we have 130,000 troops there, and it is not

going well. That is what I am saying. I am saying we have a problem,

and our troops are not able to solve the problem. We have become the

enemy. It has got to be won on the ground.

We are giving a microphone to be people like Zarqawi. We talk about

Zarqawi. We talk about all these foreign leaders and what they say. Why

should we pay attention to what they say? Why should we pay attention

when Zarqawi says they are going to drive us out of there? That is just

rhetoric. That is only rhetoric.

The only way it is going to be won is a change of direction. I gave

some examples before. When President Reagan went into Beirut, he went

in with 1,400 people, and he decided he needed to change direction.

When he had the biggest tax cut in history at that time, he decided he

had to make some adjustments later on. He changed direction.

When President Bush went into Somalia, President Clinton changed

direction in Somalia because we made a mistake and we went after Adid.

There are times in our history when we have to be big enough as a

country to change direction.

All of us want the same thing: stability in the Middle East. All of

us want to find a way to stabilize the Middle East. If we stay, we are

going to pay; and we are going to pay long term. After the Vietnam War,

it cost us through the Reagan administration to pay for it. Now, I

voted against every tax cut because I felt very strongly that we

couldn't fight a war and cut taxes. Now, there is an argument about

that and you can argue about the benefit of the tax cut. But you cannot

fight a war and have tax cuts. And we will have spent $450 billion by

the end of this fiscal year.

My proposal, if anybody has read, is to redeploy and be ready.

Redeploy to the periphery. Now, we went after Zarqawi. What happened

when we went after Zarqawi? The Iraqis reported to the Iraqis, and then

the Iraqis reported to the United States forces and they worked

together. This did not come from inside Iraq. This came from outside

Iraq. This was the periphery. The F-16s came from outside of the

country to go after him. And this was not something that just happened

overnight. This was a long-term thing that they had been working on for

a long time.

So in my estimation, the only way we can change things in Iraq is to

change direction. It has to be changed on the ground. What we say here

today, as President Abraham Lincoln said in the Gettysburg Address, is

going to mean very little. It will get lost in the rhetoric. What means

something is what happens on the ground. All of us support the troops.

If you vote for the appropriation bill, the defense appropriation bill,

you vote to support the troops. If you voted for the Armed Services

bill, you voted to support the troops.

I believe this resolution, if you vote for it, you are voting to

support a failed policy wrapped in illusion. And I would recommend to

the Members they vote against this resolution.