Mr. Speaker, the war in Iraq, since its beginning, has

gone against every traditional conservative position I've ever known,

especially fiscal conservatism. There is nothing conservative about the

war in Iraq. So it should have been no surprise when William F.

Buckley, often called the ``Godfather of Conservatism,'' wrote in 2004

that if he had known in 2002 what he knew then by 2004, he would have

been against the war. But listen to what he wrote in June of 2005, 2

years ago.

William F. Buckley. ``A respect for the power of the United States is

engendered by our success in engagements in which we take part. A point

is reached when tenacity conveys not steadfastness of purpose, but

misapplication of pride. It can't reasonably be disputed that if in the

year ahead the situation in Iraq continues about as it has done in the

past year, we will have suffered more than another 500 soldiers killed.

Where there had been skepticism about our venture, there will be

contempt.''

That was William F. Buckley in 2005. And his main point was, quote,

``A point is reached when tenacity conveys not steadfastness of

purpose, but misapplication of pride.'' Unfortunately, we are losing

our young soldiers at a much faster rate than the 500 a year that Mr.

Buckley said would move the American people from skepticism to

contempt; 103 U.S. soldiers killed in April alone, at least 71 more

killed through May 21, including 15 this past weekend, and someone told

me 8 more today.

Saddam Hussein was an evil man, but he had a total military budget

only a little over two-tenths of 1 percent of ours, most of which he spent

protecting himself and his family and building castles. He was no

threat to us whatsoever.

Mr. Speaker, we all respect, admire and appreciate those who serve in

our Nation's Armed Forces. As I said a few days ago on this floor,

serving in our military is certainly the most honorable ways anyone can

serve our country. I believe national defense is one of the very few

legitimate functions of our national government, and certainly one of

the most important. However, we need to recognize that our military has

become the most gigantic bureaucracy in the history of the world, and

like any huge bureaucracy, it does many good things, of course, always

at huge expense to the taxpayer. And like any huge bureaucracy, our

military does many things that are wasteful or inefficient. And like

any huge bureaucracy, it tries to gloss over or cover up its mistakes.

And like any huge bureaucracy, it always wants to expand its mission

and get more and more money.

Counting our regular appropriations bills, plus the supplemental

appropriations, we will spend more than $750 billion on our military in

the next fiscal year. This is more than all the other nations of the

world combined spend on their defense.

The GAO tells us that we presently have $50 trillion in unfunded

future pension liabilities, on top of our national debt of almost $9

trillion. If we are going to have any hope of paying our military

pensions and Social Security and other promises to our own people, we

cannot keep giving so much to the Pentagon. No matter how much we

respect our military, and no matter how much we want to show our

patriotism, we need to realize there is waste in all huge

bureaucracies, even in the Defense Department.

There is a reason why we have always believed in civilian leadership

of our Defense Department. The admirals and generals will always say

things are going great because it is almost like saying they're doing a

bad job if they say things are not doing well. And the military people

know they can keep getting big increases in funding if they are

involved all over the world. However, it is both unconstitutional and

unaffordable, and, I might add, unconservative, for us to be the

policemen of the world and carry on civilian government functions in

and for other countries.

National defense is necessary and vital. International defense by the

U.S. is unnecessary and harmful in many ways. Now we are engaged in a

war in Iraq that is very unpopular with a big majority of the American

people. More importantly, every poll of Iraqis themselves shows that 78

to 80 percent of them want us to leave, except in the Kurdish areas.

They want our money, but they do not want us occupying Iraq. Surely we

are not adopting a foreign policy that forces us on other people, one

that says we are going to run Iraq even if the people there want us to

leave.

The majority of the Iraqi Parliament has now signed a petition asking

us to leave. It is sure not traditional conservatism to carry on a war

in a country that did not attack us, did not even threaten to attack

us, and was not even capable of attacking us. And it is sure not

traditional conservatism to believe in world government, even if run by

the U.S.

Mr. Speaker, President Bush, when he ran for office in 2000,

campaigned strongly against nation building. Unfortunately, that is

exactly what we have been doing in Iraq. The President, in 2000, said

what we needed was a more humble foreign policy. That is what we needed

then, and it is what we need now.