as we know that we have a course of action that can command the attention of the body at large, we will make that information available.

But it is possible, as long as Members want to continue working, that on into the evening we may find ourselves holding the opportunity available to continue the work this evening. As it proceeds, if it ever comes to a point where we can give Members sort of a definitive notion that the votes will be at this time or another, we will make every effort to quickly get the information to the Members.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would just say in conclusion to my friend from Texas, we obviously would like to cooperate. As well, I think it is in everyone's interest to finish the business of this session of this Congress. To the extent that we can be included in understanding what we will be doing and when we will be doing it, it will expedite that process. The majority will need unanimous consent from this side of the aisle to bring the extender bill up; and I am not going to speak for everybody on our side of the aisle, but we would be inclined to do that if we are part of the process. If we are not, if it is sprung on us without any notice and with provisions that we are not comfortable with, then we are going to run into difficulty later on.

That is why I am trying to, as the gentleman from Texas aptly described it, pull from him as much information as I can this afternoon.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, throughout this day, last evening, this morning, yesterday, and as we continue to work on this, we will continue to contact the minority leadership as we have been doing, including as many long-distance phone calls as are necessary to California and other places and as many fund-raising events that we may have to interrupt, we will keep our colleagues informed.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I do not think that was necessarily necessary. That is the kind of thing that is going to keep us here longer than any of us would want.

So I would hope that we could refrain from those types of references. I did not get up here this afternoon and make reference to the comments of the gentleman before we left here for Veterans' Day that we would be here that weekend and Members had to change their schedule on both sides of the aisle. I refrained from doing that, and I would hope in the future that the gentleman from Texas would refrain from comments that he just made.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The Chair will recognize Members for Special Order speeches at this time without prejudice to the Speaker's right to return to legislative business later today.

## SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

(Mr. EHLERS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

## POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan will state his point of order.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, do I not have the right to ask unanimous consent for 1 minute prior to proceeding with the 5 minutes speeches?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has already begun recognition from the 5 minute list, and would advise the Member from Michigan at this point to seek unanimous consent to be recognized from the 5-minute Members list and the Chair will be happy to recognize the gentleman. This is purely a matter of recognition, not a point of order.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. But, Mr. Speaker, I only want 1 minute.

## U.S. FOREIGN POLICY OF MILITARY INTERVENTIONISM BRINGS DEATH, DESTRUCTION, AND LOSS OF LIFE

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, demonstrators are once again condemning America in a foreign city. This time, it is in Kabul, Afghanistan. Shouting ''Death to America,'' burning our flag, and setting off bombings, the demonstrators express their hatred toward America.

The United States has just placed sanctions on yet another country to discipline those who do not obey our commands. The nerve of them. Do they not know we are the most powerful Nation in the world and we have to meet our responsibilities? They should do as we say and obey our CIA directives.

This process is not new. It has been going on for 50 years, and it has brought us grief and multiplied our enemies. Can one only imagine what the expression of hatred might be if we were not the most powerful Nation in the world?

Our foreign policy of military interventionism has brought us death and destruction to many foreign lands and loss of life for many Americans. From Korea and Vietnam to Serbia, Iran, Iraq and now Afghanistan, we have ventured far from our shores in search of wars to fight. Instead of more free trade with our potential adversaries, we are quick to slap on sanctions that hurt American exports and help to solidify the power of the tyrants, while seriously penalizing innocent civilians in fomenting anti-America hatred.

1330

The most current anti-American demonstrations in Kabul were understandable and predictable. Our one-time ally, Osama bin Laden, when he served as a freedom fighter against the Soviets in Afghanistan and when we bombed his Serbian enemies while siding with his friends in Kosovo, has not been fooled and knows that his cause cannot be promoted by our fickle policy.

Sanctions are one thing, but seizures of bank assets of any related business to the Taliban government infuriates and incites the radicals to violence. There is no evidence that this policy serves the interests of world peace. It certainly increases the danger to all Americans as we become the number one target of terrorists. Conventional war against the United States is out of the question, but acts of terrorism, whether it is the shooting down of a civilian airliner or bombing a New York City building, are almost impossible to prevent in a reasonably open society.

Likewise, the bombings in Islamabad and possibly the U.N. plane crash in Kosovo are directly related to our meddling in the internal affairs of these nations.

General Musharraf's successful coup against Prime Minister Sharif of Pakistan was in retaliation for America's interference with Sharif's handling of the Pakistan-India border war. The recent bombings in Pakistan are a clear warning to Musharraf that he, too, must not submit to U.S.-CIA directives.

I see this as a particularly dangerous time for a U.S. president to be traveling to this troubled region, since so many blame us for the suffering, whether it is the innocent victims in Kosovo, Serbia, Iraq, or Afghanistan. It is hard for the average citizen of these countries to understand why we must be so involved in their affairs, and resort so readily to bombing and boycotts in countries thousands of miles away from our own.

Our foreign policy is deeply flawed and does not serve our national security interest. In the Middle East, it has