Mr. Speaker, being from Detroit, I am often able to

watch CBC, and last night I was privileged to watch Albert Finney's

performance as Winston Churchill in a movie called ``The Gathering

Storm.'' And perhaps it was his finest hour, the former prime

minister's. When Hitler was rearming, he stood in front of the House of

Commons and warned his own conservative party's government, led by

Stanley Baldwin, that Hitler was indeed more than prepared for war;

that he was arming to instigate a new one.

Churchill was thought insane at the time, because no one, coming off

the horror of the millions killed in World War I, could believe that a

European leader would seek to rekindle that tinderbox, certainly not a

corporal of the German army who had been blinded by mustard gas in

combat. Yet Churchill was proven right.

And when we apply these lessons to our own time, one of the first

things we can realize is that sometimes the forest is so menacing, we

choose to stare at the tree which shields us, until it is too late.

Our Nation is in a war on terror. In this war on terror, Iraq is a

theatre. It is not a war unto itself, any more than FDR's much-

maligned, at the time, strike into north Africa was a diversion from

the war against Hitler.

What we have seen in our time is the preemption doctrine applied, and

what I have not heard anyone say is that the pillar upon which this

administration entered into the Iraqi theatre in the war on terror did

not achieve its result. Saddam Hussein desired weapons of mass

destruction. Saddam Hussein had contacts without apparent

collaboration, but contacts nonetheless, with terrorist groups and was,

in fact, shielding terrorists like Abu Nidal in Baghdad.

Since the United States engaged in hostilities against Iraq, we can

be sure of two things, the Saddam Hussein regime will never have

weapons of mass destruction that can be used against the United States

or its troops in the field, and the Saddam Hussein regime will never

again have any contacts with any terrorist groups.

In some polls that are cited, we hear about people believing the link

between al Qaeda and September 11; but one of the polls that I saw that

was interesting was that about 70 percent of the American people

realized that Saddam Hussein was a terrorist, and in the war on terror

the states which sponsor terrorism are as much our enemies by enabling

the terrorists, as the terrorists are our enemies themselves, for

terrorist cells cannot exist without state sponsorship, without state

succor.

Now, put yourself in President Bush's position at the time post-

September 11. You have seen reports from the past administration up

through his present administration detailing contacts, ``shadowy with

terrorists,'' including bin Laden. You know that Saddam Hussein wants

to engage a weapons of mass destruction program for their acquisition,

and you say to yourself, what am I going to do?

The President of the United States in applying the preemption

doctrine made sure, again, that two things would not happen: the Saddam

Hussein regime would not have weapons of mass destruction, ever, and

that they would no longer be able to even be considered for succor as a

terrorist haven.

Now, there were some important points brought up in the earlier

debate, and I would be more than happy to come back tomorrow or at any

time to assist to talk about some of those points with our colleagues

on the other side of the aisle; but I find it fascinating some of the

points.

Now, we are splitting hairs when we say that the contact between Iraq

and al Qaeda in hindsight may not have appeared to have formed a

collaboration. Yet, we cannot say whether they would or not. Now, to

try to destroy that link or denigrate that link, we will hear that

these contacts were meetings, but Iraq never responded.

Now, all of us here in the U.S. House have to get elected. Now, as

politicians, put yourselves in an interesting position. Consider this:

you are sitting around getting ready to run for re-election. An

opponent you have defeated in the past is having coffee on a regular

basis with the opponent running against you now. Do you say to

yourself, well, I am sure they are just having pleasantries and this

has absolutely nothing to do with me, and that while they be having

contact, there is apparently no collaboration that they are out to get

me? I highly doubt many of the people in this room would ascribe to the

latter theory. If Saddam Hussein could, he would do anything to hurt

the United States.

Now, why would bin Laden and his associates that are in captivity

deny any link with al Qaeda? Al Qaeda's premise, on a perverted facade

of Islam, is to work with the secular Ba'athist regime under Saddam

Hussein, but undermine its very credibility as it goes after Saudi

Arabia and other regimes in that region.

Now, the ones in captivity like al-Anni that were referenced before,

I would just caution everyone, do not take a terrorist at their word

unless they say they are going to kill you, because whether in

captivity or not, there is no incentive to prove any member of the

United States' present administration was correct, and there is

certainly no impetus for these people to undermine the very position,

belie the very myth of al Qaeda as an Islamic group trying to liberate

its people and lead them to a greater life in Islam. So I would caution

against that.

I also would like to just reiterate something that I think is very

troubling to me, that we hear many people saying that our ability to

preemptively deal with the situation in Iraq has somehow hurt us

internationally. I suppose there will always be those people who

believe that when the United States has to defend itself that we will

be hurting ourselves. This is mistaken.

In fact, many of these same people never credit the good will of the

acts of the United States in the immunization of Iraqi children or the

education of Iraqi children or the free speech and association that is

occurring in Iraq today. I would argue that over the long term, these

benefits to the United States are going to outweigh any short-term

anger that the terrorist organizations may feel, because we are

striking a blow at them in the heart of the terrorist network.

I also have not heard about how the regime change and reconstruction

nexus that has been applied in Iraq has also led to the regime

conversion and potential rehabilitation of the Libyan regime, which

also not only in that regard shows what strength and resolve have done

in Iraq.

I think that one of the things that has been missed when Qadhafi

admitted he has a weapons program, he invited weapons inspectors in,

who were then led to the labs or testing facilities of the Libyan

Government. Some of the inspectors pointed out that they would never

have found these unless they were shown. Dr. Kay, who I have much

respect for, when I met with him in Baghdad did not say that we had

weapons of mass destruction, to his credit. But he did say that Saddam

Hussein and his regime were actively engaging in re-energizing to try

to acquire them, especially chemical and biological, which could have

been generated in 2 weeks to 2 months.

If we had trouble finding extant technologies for weapons production

in Libya, even with the Libyans' assistance, it should come as no

surprise that in Iraq we are having extreme difficulty finding not only

the weapons of mass destruction, if they exist themselves, but the labs

or the scientists

who were trying to accumulate them, because, as Dr. Kay pointed out,

the trouble we have in Iraq is that many of the scientists whom we

would go to try to find this information are being killed or are

frightened.

I eagerly await to see what the fruits of security once it is firmly

established in Iraq will yield to us in terms of intelligence regarding

the weapons program and its state; and if there were any weapons, where

did they go once the scientists and others in the community that

participated in these programs feel that they are free of the threat of

assassination or other reprisals to themselves or their family for

sharing this information with the United States of America.

In conclusion, I would like to add just one personal point. I will

not condemn the Clinton administration for what it did not do prior to

September 11, but I would hope that others would be slow to condemn the

Bush administration for what it has done since September 11 in

defending the interests of the United States. In many ways, I do

understand what occurred under the Clinton administration. While I was

not one who was swayed at the time, when we defeated European

Communism, we saw books from left and right proclaiming to the United

States that the end of history was here, that we had peace dividends,

that our future was bright, that we could go on to the task of

perfecting the American experiment in democracy by addressing internal

problems, such as education, race relations, poverty, hunger,

injustice; and on September 11 that was taken from us.

What was foisted upon us was an unsought struggle against extremists

perverting the tenets of Islam. Our generation and all the generations

have to face the fact that once again we are called to our historic

duty to defend freedom and civilization from every would-be tyrant bent

upon world domination. On September 11, we went from sorrow to anger.

But it is fair for us to also feel frustration that a country as great

as ours, that has offered the world so much, could be so lowly stricken

and have to deal with this type of aggressor yet again. It is unfair,

but it is here.

As I said at the beginning, it is a menacing forest; but the trees

will not shield us from the truth any longer, and we must accept the

fate that we now share and succeed and continue with our resolve in the

overarching war on terror to do one thing: it is to kill the terrorists

before they kill us, to kill the terrorists before they kill our

children; and it is to win the war on terror in our lifetimes.