

of the million U.S. workers have lost their jobs.

I urge my colleagues to vote down these two agreements.

AVOIDING ENTANGLING ALLIANCES AND INTERNAL AFFAIRS OF OTHER NATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. HARRIS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAUL. Madam Speaker, the truth about whether or not Saddam Hussein was trying to buy uranium from Niger has dominated the news for the past several weeks. Many of those challenging the administration on this issue are motivated more by politics than by policy. Some doing the challenging were strongly in favor of going to war against Iraq when it appeared politically popular to do so, but are now chagrined that the war is not going as smoothly as was hoped.

I am sure once the alleged attempt to buy uranium is thoroughly debunked, the other excuses for going to war will be examined with a great deal of scrutiny as well. It is obvious that the evidence used to justify going to war is now less than convincing.

The charge that Saddam Hussein had aluminum tubes used in manufacturing nuclear weapons was in error.

A fleet of unmanned aerial vehicles capable of dispensing chemical and biological weapons did not exist.

The 63,000 liters of anthrax and botulism have not been found, nor have any of the mobile germ labs. There are no signs of the 1 million pounds of sarin, mustard and VX gasses.

No evidence has been revealed to indicate Iraq was a threat to anyone's security, let alone ours.

The charge that Saddam Hussein was connected to the al Qaeda was wrong. Saddam Hussein's flaunting of the UN resolutions regarding weapons of mass destruction remains unproven.

How could so many errors have occurred? Some say it was ineptness while others claim outright deception and lies. There are some who say it was selective use of intelligence to promote a particular policy already decided upon. This debate, I am sure, will rage on for a long time, and since motivations are subjective and hard to prove, resolving the controversy will be difficult. However, this should not diminish the importance of sorting out the truth from the fiction, the errors from the malice.

One question, though, I hope gets asked is why should we use intelligence cited by a foreign government as a justification for going to war? One would think that with the billions we spend, we could fully rely on our own intelligence-gathering agencies.

Another point of interest, lacking a coherent foreign policy, we have support for war coming from different groups depending on circumstances unrelated to national defense. For in-

stance, those who strenuously objected to Kosovo promoted war in Iraq. And those who objected to Iraq are now anxious to send troops to Liberia. For some, U.N. permission is important and necessary. For others, the U.N. is helpful as long as it endorses the war they want.

Only a few correctly look to the Constitution and to the Congress to sort out the pros and cons of each conflict and decide whether or not a declaration of war is warranted.

The sad fact is that we have lost our way. A threat to national security is no longer a litmus test for sending troops hither and yon, and the American people no longer require Congress to declare the wars we fight. Hopefully, some day that will be changed.

The raging debate over whether or not Saddam Hussein tried to buy uranium, as important as it is, distracts from the much more important strategic issue of what is the proper foreign policy in a republic.

Hopefully, we will soon seriously consider the policy of noninterventionism in the affairs of others. Avoiding entangling alliances and staying out of the internal affairs of other nations is a policy most conducive to peace and prosperity and one the Founders endorsed. Policing the world and nation building are not part of a constitutional republic.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GRIJALVA addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.)

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the special order time of the gentleman from Arizona.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

IN SUPPORT OF INDEPENDENT COMMISSION TO INVESTIGATE DISTORTION OF EVIDENCE OF IRAQ'S WMD PROGRAMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I first thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) for his intellectual honesty and consistency and his clear vision on so many foreign policy issues.

A hundred sixty-five years ago, Madam Speaker, the United States Congress, amazingly enough, the House of Representatives, passed a rule prohibiting its Members from debating the great issue of slavery, the greatest

blemish on American history. In those days, John Quincy Adams, former President, then elected to the House of Representatives, came down to the well of the House week after week reading letters from his constituents, reading what he called petitions from groups in his State of Massachusetts, many of them written by women in women's clubs, women who actually could not in those days, as we all know, vote in American elections. He read these letters protesting this rule prohibiting the discussion of slavery and protesting the institution of slavery itself.

Today, we find ourselves in a Congress where this Congress has refused to discuss and investigate what exactly the President did and said about weapons of mass destruction. As the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) said earlier in the evening, an organization called MoveOn.org, an organization of 1½ million Americans, tens of thousands in my State of Ohio, asked its members to sign an on-line petition saying that we believe Congress should support an independent commission to investigate the Bush administration's distortion of evidence of Iraq's weapons of mass destruction program.

Tens of thousands of those members, in addition to signing the petitions, wrote letters to Members of Congress. And similar to John Quincy Adams's coming to the House floor to expose the Congress' inability and unwillingness to discuss issues of national import, many of us have come to the House floor every night to share the concerns, not just our concerns, Members of Congress, but to share the concerns of people in my district in my State. And I would like to share a handful of those letters.

Dennis Gadel of Akron, Ohio wrote: "What makes this tragedy especially difficult for freedom-loving people to come to terms with is that, unlike September 11, this tragedy was self-inflicted. In order to have a strong democracy, we must hold leaders accountable for their deception."

Ms. Barbara Hanselman from Wadsworth wrote: "I consider it my patriotic duty to give my informed support to those who represent our people. When I cannot trust my government to speak the truth," Ms. Hanselman wrote, "our very basic freedoms are eroded. To lead a country to war, when many U.S. citizens and millions of people around the world were against this act of aggression without clear evidence, by calculated misrepresentation of the facts, is so beneath what my country stands for."

Jim Miraldi of Lorain, Ohio, my hometown, writes: "Our leaders must respect democracy. If our leaders lie or mislead their own people to support military action to make an immense change in foreign policy, then this greatly undermines our country" ". . . Saddam Hussein was" . . . "evil," certainly. "Maybe we should have gone