

Mr. Speaker, if we are willing to consider a different foreign policy, we should ask ourselves a few questions:

What if the policies of foreign intervention, entangling alliances, policing the world, nation-building, and spreading our values through force are deeply flawed?

What if it is true that Saddam Hussein never had weapons of mass destruction?

What if it is true that Saddam Hussein and Osama bin Laden were never allies?

What if it is true that the overthrow of Saddam Hussein did nothing to enhance our national security?

What if our current policy in the Middle East leads to the overthrow of our client oil states in that region?

What if the American people really knew that more than 20,000 American troops have suffered serious casualties or died in the Iraq war, and 9 percent of our forces already have been made incapable of returning to battle?

What if it turns out there are many more guerilla fighters in Iraq than our government admits?

What if there really have been 100,000 civilian Iraqi casualties, as some claim; and what is an acceptable price for doing good?

What if Secretary Rumsfeld is replaced for the wrong reasons, and things become worse under a defense secretary who demands more troops and an expansion of the war?

What if we discover that when they do vote, the overwhelming majority of Iraqis support Islamic law over Western secular law and want our troops removed?

What if those who correctly warned of the disaster awaiting us in Iraq are never asked for their opinion of what should be done now?

What if the only solution for Iraq is to divide the country into three separate regions, recognizing the principle of self-determination while rejecting the artificial boundaries created in 1918 by non-Iraqis?

What if it turns out radical Muslims do not hate us for our freedoms, but rather for our policies in the Middle East that directly affected Arabs and Muslims?

What if the invasion and occupation of Iraq actually distracted from pursuing and capturing Osama bin Laden?

What if we discover that democracy cannot be spread with force of arms?

What if democracy is deeply flawed and, instead, we should be talking about liberty, property rights, free markets, the rule of law, localized government, weak centralized government, and self-determination promoted through persuasion, not force?

What if Osama bin Laden and al Qaeda actually welcomed our invasion and occupation of an Arab-Muslim Iraq as proof of their accusations against us, and it served as a magnificent recruiting tool for them?

What if our policy greatly increased and prolonged our vulnerability to ter-

rorists and guerilla attacks both at home and abroad?

What if the Pentagon, as reported by its Defense Science Board, actually recognized the dangers of our policy before the invasion, and their warnings were ignored or denied?

What if the argument that by fighting over there we will not have to fight here is wrong, and the opposite is true?

What if we can never be safer by giving up some of our freedoms?

What if the principle of preemptive war is adopted by Russia, China, Israel, India, Pakistan, and others, and justified by current U.S. policy?

What if preemptive war and preemptive guilt stem from the same flawed policy of authoritarianism, though we fail to recognize it?

What if Pakistan is not a trustworthy ally and turns on us when conditions deteriorate?

What if plans are being laid to provoke Syria and/or Iran into actions that would be used to justify a military response and preemptive war against them?

What if our policy of democratization of the Middle East fails and ends up fueling a Russian-Chinese alliance that we regret; an alliance not achieved even at the height of the Cold War?

What if the policy forbidding profiling at our borders and airports is deeply flawed?

What if presuming the guilt of a suspected terrorist without a trial leads to the total undermining of constitutional protections for American citizens when arrested?

What if we discover the Army is too small to continue policies of preemptive and nation-building?

What if a military draft is the only way to mobilize enough troops?

What if the stop-loss program is actually an egregious violation of trust and a breach of contract between the government and soldiers; what if this is actually a back-door draft, leading to unbridled cynicism and rebellion against a voluntary army and generating support for a draft of both men and women? Will lying to troops lead to rebellion and anger toward the political leaderships running this war?

What if the Pentagon's legal task force opinion that the President is not bound by international or Federal law regarding torture stands unchallenged and sets a precedent which ultimately harms Americans while totally disregarding the moral, practical, and legal arguments against such a policy?

What if the intelligence reform legislation which gives us a bigger, more expensive bureaucracy does not bolster our security, distracts us from the real problem of revamping our interventionist foreign policy?

□ 1430

What if we suddenly discover we are the aggressors and we are losing an unwinnable guerilla war? What if we discover too late that we cannot afford this war, and that our policies have led

to a dollar collapse, rampant inflation, high interest rates, and a severe economic downturn?

Mr. Speaker, why do I believe these are such important questions? Because the number one function of the Federal Government is to provide for national security. And national security has been severely undermined.

On 9/11 we had a grand total of 14 aircraft to protect the entire U.S. mainland, all of which proved useless that day. We have an annual DOD budget of over \$400 billion, most of which is spent overseas in over 100 different countries.

Tragically, on 9/11 our Air Force was better positioned to protect Seoul, Tokyo, Berlin and London than it was to protect Washington, D.C. and New York City. Moreover, our ill advised presence in the Middle East and our decade-long bombing of Iraq served only to incite the suicidal attacks of 9/11.

Before 9/11 our CIA ineptly pursued bin Laden, whom the Taliban was protecting. At the same time, the Taliban was receiving significant support from Pakistan, our trusted ally that received millions of dollars from the United States. We allied ourselves both with bin Laden and Hussein in the 1980s, only to regret it in the 1990s. And it is safe to say we have used billions of U.S. dollars in the last 50 years pursuing this contradictory, irrational, foolish, costly and very dangerous foreign policy.

Policing the world, spreading democracy by force, nation-building and frequent bombing of countries that pose no threat to us, while leaving the homeland and our borders unprotected, result from a foreign policy that is contradictory and not in our self-interest.

I can hardly expect anyone in Washington to pay much attention to my concerns. But if I am completely wrong in my criticism, nothing is lost except my time and energy expended in efforts to get others to reconsider our foreign policy.

But the bigger question is, what if I am right, or even partially right, and we urgently need to change course in our foreign policy for the sake of our national and economic security, yet no one pays attention?

For that, a price will be paid. Is it not worth talking about?

RESIGNATION AS A MEMBER OF HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

The Speaker pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the House Committee on International Relations.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 26, 2005.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Office of the Speaker, U.S. Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Please consider this letter as my resignation, as of this date, as a member of the House Committee on International Relations. I have appreciated the opportunity to serve as a member of this

committee and have enjoyed my eight years of service.

With every good wish, I am
Sincerely yours,

JOHN M. MCHUGH,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TIBERI). Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The Speaker pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Effective today, January 26, 2005, I am resigning from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

RICK G. RENZI,
*U.S. Congressman,
1st District of Arizona.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 11 of rule X, clause 11 of rule I, and the order of the House of January 4, 2005, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence:

Mr. LAHOOD, Illinois
Mr. CUNNINGHAM, California
Mr. EVERETT, Alabama
Mr. GALLEGLY, California
Mrs. WILSON, New Mexico
Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS, Virginia,
Mr. THORNBERRY, Texas
Mr. MCHUGH, New York
Mr. TIAHRT, Kansas
Mr. ROGERS, Michigan
Mr. RENZI, Arizona
Mr. HASTINGS, Florida
Mr. REYES, Texas
Mr. BOSWELL, Iowa
Mr. CRAMER, Alabama
Ms. ESHOO, California
Mr. HOLT, New Jersey
Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Maryland
Mr. TIERNEY, Massachusetts

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for January 25 and today.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. WOOLSEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. BIGGERT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. BIGGERT, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. FLAKE, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. GOHMERT, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. MALONEY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. BARROW, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Accordingly, pursuant to the previous order of the House of today, the House stands adjourned until 2 p.m. on Friday, January 28, 2005, unless it sooner has received a message from the Senate transmitting its adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 21, in which case the House shall stand adjourned pursuant to that concurrent resolution.

Thereupon (at 2 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.), pursuant to the previous order of the House of today, the House adjourned until 2 p.m. on Friday, January 28, 2005, unless it sooner has received a message from the Senate transmitting its adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 21, in which case the House shall stand adjourned pursuant to that concurrent resolution.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

321. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Oranges, Grapefruit, Tangerines, and Tangelos Grown in Florida; Change in the Minimum Maturity Requirements for Fresh Grapefruit [Docket No. FV05-905-1 IFR] received January 7, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

322. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hazelnuts Grown in Oregon and Washington; Establishment of Final Free and Restricted Percentages for the 2004-2005 Marketing Year [Docket No. FV05-982-1 IFR] received January 7, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

323. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Poultry Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Voluntary Shell Egg Grading Regulations — Facilities and Equipment [Docket No. PY-03-005] (RIN: 0581-AC33) received January 7, 2005,

pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

324. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Livestock and Seed Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Lamb Promotion and Research Program: Procedures for the Conduct of a Referendum [No. LS-04-06] received January 10, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

325. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Dairy Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Milk in the Appalachian, Florida, and Southeast Marketing Areas; Order Amending the Orders [Docket No. AO-388-A16, AO-356-A38, and AO-366-A45; DA-04-07] received January 10, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

326. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Onions Grown in South Texas; Decreased Assessment Rate [Docket No. FV05-959-1 IFR] received January 10, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

327. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Emerald Ash Borer; Quarantines Areas [Docket No. 02-125-2] received January 7, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

328. A letter from the Regulatory Officer, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — National Forest System Land and Resource Management Planning; Removal of 2000 Planning Rule (RIN: 0596-AB86) received January 12, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

329. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting a report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); to the Committee on Appropriations.

330. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting notification that the DoD anticipates it will be prepared to commence chemical agent destruction operations at the Pine Bluff Chemical Agent Disposal Facility in Pine Bluff, Arkansas, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1512(4); to the Committee on Armed Services.

331. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

332. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to the Cooperative Threat Reduction Act of 1993 and the FREEDOM Support Act, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 5852; to the Committee on International Relations.

333. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 15-638, "Captive Insurance Company Act of 2004," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

334. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 15-612, "Approval of Starpower Communications, LLC's Open Video System Franchise Act of 2004," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

335. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a