

affairs of other nations. These people are not seen as men and women of action and world statesmen when they urge that we do more and more in other countries.

I wish more of our leaders would heed the advice of President Kennedy who said in 1962: "We must face that fact that the United States is neither omnipotent nor omniscient—that we are only six percent [now four percent] of the world's population—that we cannot impose our will upon the other 94 percent of mankind—that we cannot right every wrong or reverse each adversity—and that therefore there cannot be an American solution to every world problem."

There is nothing conservative about the U.S. policy in Iraq.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURGESS). The Chair reminds Members that remarks in debate may not include quotations of Senators except as specified in clause 1(b)(2)(B) of rule XVII.

ILL-CONCEIVED WAR IN IRAQ

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, last week in a marathon time frame of probably about 48 hours this House made one of the most important decisions that we will ever have to make and that is the expenditure of \$87 billion based on the premise of a continuing war in Iraq.

When I debated the question on the floor of the House, I reminded my colleagues that this was a war that was not declared under the Constitution, and it was a war that had moved from one so-called premise to the next. When the President presented it to us, he suggested that we were about to be under imminent attack, and we were about to be attacked by the existence of weapons of mass destruction.

As time went on, we heard the words "liberating Iraq," then we heard the "war against terrorism," but we have never been able to determine the factuality or the truth of the issue of whether or not this Nation was about to be imminently attacked that would warrant a preemptive strike against another nation.

But even so, our young men and women went on the frontlines of Iraq and offered themselves as the ultimate sacrifice for our freedom. Therefore, none of us in our support for those troops, will waver away from standing shoulder to shoulder with their families and with their needs. I know that my colleagues will be discussing accusations by Members on the other side of the aisle with respect to a so-called litmus test. They have questioned Members' patriotism because they have had a vehement opposition to an ill-conceived war.

My perspective of that is we live in a democracy and opposition is what the

Federalist Papers were all about. I will continue my vehement opposition to this war, but my enthusiastic and unwavering support of the troops. I would raise the question to the majority leader as to why any such comment should even be appropriate in this democracy and in this body.

Mr. Speaker, I bring to the attention of those who call themselves patriotic by sending troops into war the number of young men and women who have committed suicide in Iraq since May 11. We have had 11. That represents a number of 34. If we had an annualized rate, it would mean 34 per 100,000 service people. What we have found is since the start of the war and after the war, after major combat operations have ended, since then, troops have had to cope with increasing paramilitary attacks with less opportunity to defend themselves.

When I met with troops from Iraq, they indicated that they are constantly going over landmines or IEDs, I believe they are called, going over the same pathways and having their tankers blow up. They do not have the same jobs. They are using carpenters and painters and others to be part of the MPs and knock down doors. It is an unusual Army suicide rate, and when I brought this to the attention of my colleagues in the debate, no one seemed to be concerned. The usual Army rate of suicide is 10 to 13 per 100,000. What we have in Iraq is like 34 out of a 100,000. I would think that Members would be concerned.

In Iraq and Afghanistan, we have hand-to-hand combat going on. We have, basically, wars going on on two fronts, and we have our troops in hand-to-hand combat and they need additional resources.

When I met with some of the leadership from the Arab region, they suggested they would welcome the opportunity for an Arab-U.S. summit to truly see how we could bring peace to the region in Iraq, and I would like to see the administration take them up on that offer to sit down and talk with our Arab leaders about how we can bring peace to Iraq, not with an aftermath, makeshift program that none of us understand, with a number of sniper shootings going on, and IEDs killing our young people.

Mr. Speaker, I would finally say this idea of privatization should be studied because the random privatization of Arabic countries should not be willy-nilly, and gifts to those that would think that this would be a gift, but we need to expand the opportunity to small and minority and women-owned businesses.

As I close, we are going to see a CR come to the floor of the House, and I do not know if we are going to see a tax cut for those with children or whether or not we are ever going to see a guaranteed prescription drug benefit, but we will have a continuing resolution that Republicans want to promote.

HONORING POPE JOHN PAUL II

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

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, earlier today the House voted on H. Res. 400 acknowledging Pope John Paul II's 25th year as the pontiff.

I wanted to take a few minutes to reflect on his remarkable life that so many can draw tremendous strength from in a world that often challenges our strength.

Some who see him now see this older man, stooped and bowed by age, trembling with his hands, now leaning on his crosier when he can stand for support, and what a different view that is from the young Karol Wojtyla who had such strength and vibrancy of character. And yet despite his age, it is remarkable how he continues to be such an example for all the world. Even though there are so many challenges around, his strength continues to shine through in a changing world.

I thought it was worth reflecting on what it is about the Holy Father that has given him his strength that adds particular interest to our resolution today in commemorating such an incredible life.

Some have said that to understand this Pope you need to go back to his roots in Poland. He was born on May 18, 1920. From early on in life, suffering was very much a part of him. Poland itself is a nation that has seen itself go from perhaps one of the leaders in medieval days to a country divided up and essentially had so many of its citizens turned into near slaves in this century and the last. Many Polish citizens continue to reflect upon their own history as a source of strength, and indeed it is with the Pope.

His father was a devout and upright man, a decorated World War I officer. His mother, apparently of delicate health, would suffer much on her own, and had a young daughter who died before Karol was born. His own mother died when he was eight, and his father when he was a young man. And his brother died, too. He said at one point, "By the time I was 20, I had already lost all the people I loved, even those who I might have loved, like my older sister, who died 6 years before I was born."

His suffering gave him incredible meaning in his life. As a young man, he and his father stood in line once with other refugees of World War II, and they were sprayed with machine gun fire from aircraft. He was arrested at age 21, narrowly escaping being sent to Auschwitz. He lay in the basement of his house praying with his arms outstretched in the shape of a cross while Nazi officers went through the house. He was hit by a speeding truck during the war, and probably would have died if caring citizens did not take care of him.

It was the problems he had with World War II which gave him strength

during the time when the communists took over Poland as well. Again, the suffering continued. The oppression of the Catholic Church, that he saw so much of during World War II, continued as well. And yet he used his position as a bishop and cardinal to give guidance and strength to the people of his region.

It was no wonder when he was chosen to hold the position of Holy Father some 25 years ago, the other cardinals and people in a world saw him as a source of strength in a world that was badly needed in a world that was weakened by lack of courage and moral fiber.

His struggles have shaped him and given him incredible strength. He has visited some 125 countries around the world, remained active in sports, visited many churches, and as incredible as it may seem, still could draw crowds of hundreds of thousands of youth. A million came to the World Youth Day that he had not too long ago, youth wanting to see him and get a glimpse of this man, the Holy Father whom they see as a great source of strength. He is gentle. Despite his strength, the most incredible thing that stands out is still how he would reach out to those weak, sick, poor, those who were sinners. Some fail and blame their history, some move forward despite their history, and some achieve greatness because of the suffering they have been through. We owe a great deal to this incredible man.

□ 2045

EXAMINING MINORITY LEADER'S VOTING RECORD ON DEFENSE ISSUES

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, before I actually get into what I want to talk about, I would like to mention a couple of things that I heard on the floor tonight. I heard that going into Iraq was not against the Constitution, but I remind my colleagues that this President came to the United States Congress and asked for permission. The previous President, President Bill Clinton, did not when he went into Haiti, Somalia, Bosnia and Iraq five times. We hit an aspirin factory in the Sudan; 214 deployments. I did not hear much from the other side of the aisle during that time frame. This President came to this Congress to do that. We were told that we would be in Bosnia 1 year. We are still there. Take a look at Haiti and Somalia today. I think the popular movie, "Black Hawk Down," shows how the denial of armor caused a bunch of our troops to be killed. I think that when we talk about different things, I think we need to put it in perspective.

I saw that this week President Izetbegovic passed away. President

Izetbegovic in Sarajevo used Sivilanovic, who was his minister who trained under Qaddafi, put Mujah Hadeen, Hamas and al Qaeda into Sarajevo. And I will tell the Speaker that many of those individuals are still there from those terrorist organizations and are under scrutiny.

The main reason I came today is I heard that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle were going to do a hit piece on Mr. DELAY. Well, I think it is unfortunate that if they cannot win with ideas, they hit our leadership and they try to do anything that they can to discredit the Republican Party. Mr. Speaker, in counter to that, I am going to go through a few things about their leadership. I challenged the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) a while back and said that she had in 1993 and 1994 a 15 percent national security voting record. In 1995 she had a 20 percent national security voting record. In 1996, 21 percent. In 1997, 30. In 1998 through 2002, 36 percent. The gentlewoman got on the floor and said the gentleman can say anything he wanted but that it was inaccurate, that I vote for every defense bill. Tonight I researched, Mr. Speaker; and I researched that information and it is just not true.

The gentlewoman voted against the defense appropriations bill in 1998. She voted against it in 1997, in 1996, in 1992, in 1991, and in 1989 against defense appropriations. I have got lists here where she voted against defense authorization bills. I would also state that that rating is not just for the bill itself but for the overall defense and how the gentlewoman from California, the minority leader, voted.

She voted to reduce military spending by \$41.9 billion. That was an amendment. She voted to reduce funding for ballistic missile defense; Mr. Dellums at that time, \$1.5 billion. To downsize U.S. forces. Prohibit U.S. command of U.S. forces, she voted for that. Reduce defense and technology spending. Support sharp cuts in defense spending which included pay and allowances for our troops. Of the 20 votes that year, the gentlewoman voted against defense 17 times.

The next year. Provide national defense funding, pay raises, combat readiness. The gentlewoman from California voted against that. So again the statement that the gentlewoman from California made was inaccurate and the votes are recorded here.

She voted to reduce funding for the F-22 fighter, the B-2 bomber; and we saw how efficient the B-2 was in Bosnia and in Kosovo and in Baghdad as well. The gentlewoman voted of the 20 times, 16 times against national security positions.

EXAMINING RECENT COMMENTS BY MAJORITY LEADER ON ADMINISTRATION'S POLICY IN IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-

uary 7, 2003, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, last week during debate on the \$87 billion supplemental appropriations bill to fund military and reconstruction efforts in Iraq, Majority Leader TOM DELAY said Members who had the audacity to challenge the Bush administration's foreign policy and not support the appropriations bill were not supporting our troops over in Iraq. This statement, Mr. Speaker, comes on the heels of statements that Mr. DELAY made last month after Senator EDWARD KENNEDY seriously questioned the Bush administration's reasoning for the war in Iraq and its handling of Iraq during the postwar period. The majority leader called KENNEDY's criticism "hate speech." During a speech at the Heritage Foundation on September 24, Mr. DELAY said, and I quote, "Ted Kennedy unleashed the most mean-spirited and irresponsible hate speech yet."

One day earlier, the Associated Press quoted Mr. DELAY as saying, and I quote, that "Kennedy's brand of hate speech has become a mainstream in the Democratic Party."

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind the gentleman that he must refrain from improper references to Senators.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, the majority leader must have a short memory. If these statements are hate speech and mean-spirited, I would hate to see how Mr. DELAY would characterize his own comments about President Clinton on the eve of a successful bombing campaign that ejected Serbian troops from Kosovo and led to the uprising that ended the murderous regime of another dictator, Slobodan Milosevic.

Here are some examples of DELAY's criticism of President Clinton during that Kosovo conflict that I would like to point to this evening. This was a statement that TOM DELAY said, a floor statement opposing the resolution commending America's successful campaign in Kosovo on July 1, 1999.

He said, and I quote, "For us to call this a victory and to commend the President of the United States as the Commander in Chief showing great leadership in Operation Allied Forces is a farce."

On the same resolution, floor statement, Mr. DELAY said, and I quote, "So what they are doing here is they are voting to continue an unplanned war by an administration that is incompetent of carrying it out. I hope my colleagues will vote against the resolution."

I would like to point out to my colleagues that on one occasion, Mr. DELAY is basically questioning the President's ability as Commander in Chief, in the case of President Clinton; and in this other case, he is suggesting that the Clinton administration is incompetent of carrying out the war in