

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

Kosovo. Again, the reality of it is that these statements by Mr. DELAY went much further than Senator KENNEDY's and than those of most of my colleagues during last week's debate on the Iraq supplemental. Of course as a Member of the House of Representatives, Mr. DELAY has a right, even a duty, to question the administration when he does not agree with its policies, just like Members of the other body have the right to speak out and Senator KENNEDY did several weeks ago.

The problem that I see, and I point this out to my Republican colleagues, it stems from the fact that whenever someone speaks out criticizing the Bush administration or its policies, there is a concerted effort on the part of the Republican side to attack those critics as unpatriotic. This is what we keep getting over and over again, that those on the Democratic side of the aisle that suggest that the administration's policy in Iraq is wrong or that it should not continue or that it should not be funded are somehow unpatriotic. I just want to remind my colleagues on the other side, and I just would like to use a quote that was made by Thomas Jefferson in 1815, because I think it says it all and the reason that I am here tonight and some of my Democratic colleagues are here tonight. Thomas Jefferson said in 1815, and I quote, that "differences of opinion lead to inquiry and inquiry to truth and that I am sure is the ultimate and sincere object of us both. We both value too much the freedom of opinion sanctioned by our Constitution not to cherish its exercise, even where in opposition to ourselves."

That quote, I think, from Thomas Jefferson says it all, because I think what he says is that we should feel free to criticize the administration when we do not agree with its foreign policy, when we do not agree with a war, when we do not agree with paying for the war, when we do not agree with the conduct of the war. And for anyone, particularly the majority leader on the Republican side, to question whether it is a Member of the other body or a Member of this body's patriotism or say that they do not support the troops or that they are unpatriotic or that they do not care about this country because they oppose the war in Iraq or any aspect of it, I think, is an outrage; and it is important for us to say this over and over again tonight as well as in the future.

I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank my friend from New Jersey for his persistent work in bringing the truth and bringing important issues to the floor of the House of Representatives night after night. We all have heard people in the administration, highly placed people in the administration, from the Attorney General to Mr. DELAY and leaders in the House of Representatives, Republican leaders, talk about patriotism in sometimes directly, certainly by

implication, sometimes directly, question the patriotism of Americans, whether they are Americans in Congress or American people generally, question the patriotism of people who disagree with them on a whole host of issues.

I remember during the trade debate, during the Trade Promotion Authority whether we should extend NAFTA to Latin America that many of us were accused of not being patriotic because we did not want to pass these trade agreements, which incidentally tend to hemorrhage lots of jobs overseas in this country that never come back, manufacturing jobs, all kinds of jobs.

But when I think about patriotism, I want to tell a story. I met 2 weeks ago in Akron at St. Paul's Episcopal Church with 25 families who had loved ones in Iraq, sons, daughters, husbands, wives, cousins, nephews, nieces, whatever. These 20 families talked about the treatment that their loved ones were getting by the United States military, by the administration, by our government. There were not enough Kevlar vests, not enough body armor for our troops, one-fourth of our troops do not have adequate body armor, even though the President of the United States knew that we were going to war well over a year ago. They are now saying, well, we will probably have enough body armor for our troops by December of this year. They talked to us about not having safe drinking water, hundreds and hundreds, thousands probably, of our troops have come down with dysentery. They talked about some shortage of antibiotics, that they actually had to go to the corner drug store and send antibiotics to their son, one in the case of a son, another in the case of a wife he had to send antibiotics to her. Many servicemen and servicewomen when coming home on leave, if they got leave, had to pay their flights home.

When you talk about patriotism, and then you look at the other side of that issue, while we simply, this administration is spending a billion dollars a week, a third of it going to private contractors, much of that money going to Halliburton and Bechtel and friends of the President and contributors to the President, when they accuse people who disagree with them, the administration, of a lack of patriotism, then I look and see we are not taking care of our troops but we are taking care of the contributors to the President? Hundreds of millions of dollars have gone to Halliburton. Much of that has been unbid contracts. Yet Halliburton still pays Vice President CHENEY \$13,000 a month. Halliburton contributes thousands of dollars, its executives and its company, thousands of dollars to President Bush.

And while our troops are not being supplied with Kevlar jackets, our troops are not being supplied with body armor, our troops are not getting safe drinking water, our troops are not getting the antibiotics they should get,

this administration has the gall to charge injured soldiers \$8 a day for their food at Bethesda Medical Hospital, in other hospitals around the country. At the same time we are shoveling money to contributors of the President. And they call us unpatriotic? And they call people who disagree with them unpatriotic? There is just no room for that in this debate. The fact is we ought to do this right. We ought to be working together in this effort in Iraq. We ought to come up with an exit strategy. We ought to come up with a plan. We ought to bring the United Nations in. We should not be shoveling money to private contractors who are friends of the President, who are contributors to the President, who continue to pay DICK CHENEY, the Vice President of the United States, \$13,000 a month. We ought to do this right.

The charges of lack of patriotism ought to stop. We ought to get down to business. We ought to do this right. We ought to make this work. There is just simply no reason for those charges to continue, whether they are from TOM DELAY, whether they are from the top people in the administration, whether they are from anybody else.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALLONE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I am going to be very brief, but I was just moved by the comments of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, and I appreciate the fact that he has met with families, military families. So have a number of us. I would like to just add that these comments certainly are protected by the first amendment. Some of them are protected by the rules of this House.

□ 2100

But I think they need to cease and desist because they are on the brink of or on the verge of cutting a very divisive line in this body and the other body, and that is that the appropriate discourse and debate is no longer allowed.

As we moved toward the Declaration of Independence and the Revolutionary War, I know, by reading history books, that there was a vigorous divide in America as to whether or not we should stay with the British, get along to go along, live and let live, or whether or not we should follow the pathway of independence and seeking equal opportunity and become a sovereign Nation. I can imagine it was probably a deeply dividing debate, and I would hope to think that the reason why this sovereign Nation has withstood the test of time is because that debate went forward and each side managed to get through that debate without undermining the other's patriotism to a certain extent or love for this new fledgling 13-colony group of States. And one maybe wanted to stay with the British Kingdom, if you will, or the United Kingdom, and others wanted an independent land. I cannot imagine why we

have now a majority leader that, one, cannot remember his words of just a few years ago, and now wants to divide this body by suggesting who is patriotic and who is not.

And I would just like to share with my colleagues some words that are constantly found throughout the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as President Clinton tried to direct this country in a way that would provide defense to the defenseless, whether it was Somalia, and that, of course, was not the best military operation but there was a desire there to help those who could not help themselves, whether it was Bosnia or whether it was Kosovo.

So this statement on March 11, 1999, said "Bombing a sovereign nation for ill-defined reasons with vague objectives undermines the American stature in the world. The international respect and trust for America has diminished every time we casually let the bombs fly. We must stop giving the appearance that our foreign policy is formulated by the Unibomber." One could take from that that he has just called a President of the United States the Unibomber. That happened to be Kosovo, where millions of Muslims were being ethnically cleansed. People were actually dying. The world could see it, and we were asked to come in by the NATO allies.

There is no such basis in the preemptive attack against Iraq. We were told there were weapons of mass destruction. We still cannot find them. And so what is the reason for not having the right discourse and debate on issues that are confusing and where the administration has been, if you will, less than forthright on its reasons for going to war? Saddam Hussein still exists. Osama bin Laden still exists. Then I think debate is appropriate.

Let me close on this point. I, likewise, have had the opportunity to engage military families in a townhall meeting that I held in Houston. No one can experience their pain. Even though their loved ones are alive, they feel the pain of those whose families are now experiencing the continuing devastating pain of having lost a loved one in Iraq. But one has to know what it is like to know their loved ones do not have body armor, bulletproof vests, that their loved ones who are in the National Guard or Reserve cannot get their paycheck on time, or they have loved ones who are there who have not seen their newly born child and ask a simple question of Secretary Rumsfeld which is when can we go home? There is nothing wrong with that.

And I do not want to point the finger at the military because they are following orders, and the policymakers are the ones who set priorities. So when we do not have priorities that deal with 11 suicides, that represent 34 out of 100,000 when we analyze the number, 11 suicides since May 1; and we pass an \$87 billion supplemental and we do not provide for paychecks on time to Reservists and the National Guard;

we do not have a date certain on exit strategy; we do not deal with suicides and mental health resources in Iraq and on the bases when they return home? Then I would question the person who questions our patriotism for asking these questions on behalf of the troops. And that is what the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) has done, and I think it is unpardonable. I will certainly uphold his right to the First Amendment, but when we debate on this floor, we should not cast those kinds of ugly statements about one's patriotism because we allow free debate, when he in 1999 suggested that our President was the Unibomber. And I can assure my colleagues that we are still being thanked for what we did in Kosovo. And I thank those troops there. I thank them in Bosnia, and I thank them in Iraq. Because the troops are not the issue. It is the policies that have sent them there, and each of us have the responsibility and the obligation under this Constitution to engage in debate and discourse, certainly on behalf of our constituents.

They say that lawyers get two and three closings; so let me make this the last one, in fact, and I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) for his leadership, but I can assure him that the kind of unpatriotic actions that we are being subjected to in Texas where we are losing 50 years of congressional experience, individuals who happen to be prominently placed on the Committee on Appropriations and have been champions of veterans' rights are being drawn out because of political reasons in this politically-gerrymandered massacre of a redistricting process, I can assure the gentleman that we could probably use a lot of names to call people, but that is not appropriate. The issue is a legal issue, a political issue, a court issue or judiciary issue. And taking up and casting about and calling people names as it relates to their patriotism, which anyone could do, is not what we choose to do, and I do not believe we should choose to do it in this body.

I thank the gentleman for allowing me to participate this evening, and maybe we can bring some civility to this place and debate fairly without name calling because people passionately have a difference of opinion, and maybe someone would say "I told you so" after all of this is over.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments from the gentleman from Texas. And, again, I know other speakers are going to follow me, but I just want to point out, again, I find it incredible that the majority leader, who just a few years ago in the case of Kosovo, severely questioned and essentially called the President of the United States names because of the actions that he was taking in Kosovo, now gets up on the floor and essentially has the audacity to criticize Democrats for questioning this President's policies in another war.

I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding. It is a pleasure. I am pleased that he would raise this issue. The questioning of Members of Congress because they dispute with the President is not unpatriotic. And those who take that route, I think, are simply not understanding what this country is all about.

This country was formed by dissenters, people who said, We will not be taxed without representation. Now, they were speaking to the King, for heaven's sake, who could cut their head off. All we have to deal with is the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY). And I think Thomas Jefferson's words in 1815 need to be repeated: "Difference of opinion leads to inquiry and inquiry to truth, and that, I am sure, is the ultimate and sincere object of us both. We both value too much the freedom of opinion, sanctioned by our Constitution, not to cherish its exercise even where in opposition in ourselves."

For us to be unwilling to have debates out here and categorize people who are talking here as being unpatriotic is absolutely nonsense. What is really fun, though, is to go through the RECORD and see what the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) says. I really had a great time doing this. We have already heard this quote, which I think he was talking about the President in bombing Baghdad when he said "Bombing a sovereign nation for ill-defined reasons with vague objectives undermines the American stature in the world. The international respect and trust for America is diminished every time we casually let the bombs fly. We must stop giving the appearance that our foreign policy is being formulated by the Unibomber."

If I did not know that came from March 11, 1999, and had to do with Kosovo, I would think that one of my colleagues had made that statement about our present President. When it was said on that day, nobody got up and said "You are unpatriotic, Mr. DELAY. You are unpatriotic." We let him say it. He is wrong. History has proven him wrong, but he has a right to say it in this country.

My favorite quote of all the quotes is one that I wish that I had said. I wish that I was as smart as my distinguished colleague from Texas. He said "I cannot support a failed foreign policy." I wish I had said that about 3 days ago. He said it on April 28, 1999. "History teaches us that it is often easier to make war than peace." I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) for laying that out for me. I agree with him. I agree with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY). It is very seldom that I can think of a way to agree with him. "This administration is just learning that lesson right now." You had better believe it. Read a newspaper. Pick it up every day. Kids are dying over there. Go out to Walter Reed and you can see kids without limbs, you can see all kinds of horrible

things that have happened to our troops. It is easy to make war, hard to make the peace, and they are learning over in Iraq day by day that when you treat people that way, hey, they are going to maybe fight back. I do not know why people think that only Americans would fight back. Why would the other side not fight back? It should not be any surprise. But they did not plan for that. They thought these people were going to come out with flowers and put them in the ends of their rifles. What nonsense could have been going on in the Pentagon I have no idea, but it certainly was a failed foreign policy.

"The President began this mission with very vague objectives and lots of unanswered questions." He must have been talking about Mr. Bush. Who else could he mean?

"A month later these questions are still unanswered." No, I say to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY, 6 months later these questions are still unanswered. Things that were said here on the floor were inaccurate. We all know it, but the President says nothing.

"There are no clarified rules of engagement. There is no timetable." One of the amendments out here the other day was let us have a timetable, but the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) said no, we cannot put a timetable on our President, let him kind of fumble around until he figures it out or put the training wheels on his bike or whatever. I do not know. But no timetable was allowed. The amendment was not allowed here to say we had to have a timetable before we gave \$87 billion away.

"There is no legitimate definition of victory." Boy, that certainly fits this situation. How are we going to declare victory and get out of there?

"There is no contingency plan for mission creep." He means Syria and he means Iran, and I do not know where else he means. "There is no clear funding program." Oh, yes, there is. Borrow. Borrow from the Social Security and Medicare funds; put us deeper in debt. That is what the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) wants. That is what he came out here and did. He took \$87 billion out of thin air and gave it to the President and said, Hey, go over there and do whatever you have to.

"There is no agenda to bolster our overextended military." That is exactly what we are hearing. The Reservists are being kept away from their jobs. Everybody is in trouble. The troops are worn out. The equipment is worn out. Things that were supposed to go 80 hours have gone 500 hours, and so things are breaking down. Gee, he was prescient about what Mr. Bush was going to do.

"There is no explanation defining what vital national interests are at stake." Well, we are still looking, boy. It must be they are connected to al Qaeda. No, that is not true. It must be because of weapons of mass destruc-

tion. No, it is not that. What is it? What was our national interest? Oil, or something else? I do not know.

I can hardly wait for our President to come here next year and stand in the well and tell us what our national interests have been saved from, because it is not clear what happened before.

"There was no strategic plan for war when the President started this thing, and there is still no plan today."

I watched with amazement and amusement in a certain sad sort of way when we had this hurricane out here, Isabel, and they had all these generators lined up and all these water purification units lined up. They saw that coming out a week before, and they said, hey, we are going to need electricity, we are going to need water. They planned for 3 years for going into Iraq, at least for a year, fully planning, all the time. From October right after 9/11, they started planning, and they did not think they would need an electrical generator. They did not think they would need purification of water. Did they think they were just going to kind of march in and it would all come back up out of the dust after they had bombed it? They bombed them for how many days, until there was nothing hardly standing, and they could not figure out that if they bomb something, they are going to have to build it back up. They should have had all that planning done. They prepositioned every weapon imaginable to man and woman on the border with Kuwait. It was right there ready to go, but they had nothing behind it in the way of planning for how they were going to deal with the aftermath.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) wants to come out here and say we are unpatriotic for raising these questions. This is what he said to President Clinton. It was not unpatriotic, I guess, when the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) does it, but if the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) or I do it or the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) or anybody else comes out here and does it, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SANDLIN), I mean suddenly we are unpatriotic. No way.

I say to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) answer these questions. Answer your own questions. You put those questions to a President. Why do you not put them to your fellow Texan and ask him?

□ 2115

What is the answer? What do I say to these guys? Because they are tearing us apart. We intend to keep it up until we see a way out. There is no plan, there is no timetable, and our troops are dying day by day.

The worst thing about it, you pick up the New York Times today, the young man who was killed yesterday, he is not on page 1, he is not on page 2, or 3, or 4, or 5, or 6, or 7; he is on page 8. Like, you know, just a kid, right? Those are our young men and women.

We asked them to go over there. They ought to be on the front page, every day. They ought to be in the President's mind every day.

I really thank the gentleman for giving us an opportunity to come and raise these questions and make it very clear to the American people.

I wear this little button. I started wearing it. I am not one who goes around, but I got that because I served during the Vietnam War. Now, in the war, I spent 2 years in Long Beach, California, dealing with casualties coming back. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) did not serve. I do not know where he was. I know he loves his country; I would not even question that. But the question ought to be, how do we get out of this, not is somebody patriotic or not.

I thank the gentleman for the opportunity to speak.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's comments.

I would like to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from New Jersey for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, one time the House majority leader said, "American foreign policy is now one huge big mystery." I think I would have to agree with that.

I enjoyed listening to my colleague from Washington as he gave the quote, and I have a copy of that quote, and I began reading it. Without going through that long quote again, it does have a lot of relevance to the situation our country finds itself in today and to our debate tonight, where the leader says, "I cannot support a failed foreign policy. The President began the mission with vague objectives and lots of unanswered questions. There is no timetable, no legitimate definition of victory, no contingency plan for mission creep, no clear funding program."

Those are the very issues that we debate today, and those are legitimate questions raised by the majority leader. Those are legitimate issues. That is a legitimate debate.

Those comments were about, of course, the war in Kosovo. And while I may not agree with all of those points, I certainly do not see it as unpatriotic to raise those issues, just as it is not unpatriotic to raise those same issues today.

Just last week, Mr. Speaker, as we engaged in one of the most important debates of this Congress on the \$87 billion supplemental appropriations bill to fund the military reconstruction efforts in Iraq, not Kosovo, the majority leader denigrated the Members of the House who had the audacity to question the administration's Iraq policy or to ask for an accounting or to ask for a justification for the spending of taxpayer money.

Those, just like in the Kosovo effort, were legitimate questions, it raised legitimate issues, it was a part of legitimate debate. It was a different war; it was a different political situation, different politics. Legitimate debate, different politics. And yet, once again,

our majority leader equated a failure to blindly go along with the administration policy to be unpatriotic, while in actuality many on this side of the aisle wanted to make sure that the funds went directly to our servicemen and servicewomen and to their protection, and not just to the beneficiaries of no-bid contracts.

Recently, the majority leader said this "isn't about patriotism. It is about judgment."

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, judgment requires a presentation of the facts, and judgment is important. But, speaking of judgment, in a press release the majority leader complained about what he called the "vociferous Democratic critics," from KERRY to Dean, and DASCHLE to PELOSI, claiming they used "hateful rhetoric." Now, what sort of judgment is that, when we are talking about legitimate debate, legitimate issues, about funding, about how we make sure our servicemen and servicewomen are protected in the field, and to call that hateful rhetoric?

We may not agree in this House on all the points of the war effort. We do not even agree completely within the confines of each party, Mr. Speaker. That is clear. But it is our duty to examine these issues closely and to account for the American taxpayer dollar. It is our duty to exercise the judgment that the majority leader was speaking about.

But I am sad to say he seems to be suffering from a crippling short memory. In questioning the administration's policy in Iraq, the manner in which it is handling operations in Iraq and the examining of the accounting, I would be interested to know how the majority leader would now characterize his own comments on the eve of the war in Kosovo.

Many of them have been set forth tonight, but in case some of us have forgotten the rhetoric that was "spewed," to use that term at that time, he said in April that "this is the President's war." These are the comments made while we are in war, comments made about our Commander in Chief: "This is the President's war."

Next he said, "There is no national interest of the United States in Kosovo. It is flawed policy. It was flawed to go in. I think this President is one of the least effective Presidents in my lifetime. He has hollowed our forces while running around the world with these adventures."

That is what he said in 1999 about Kosovo, in the middle of a military action.

He said, "American foreign policy is now one huge big mystery." That is what he said. He said, "Bombing a sovereign nation for ill-defined reasons with vague objectives undermines the American stature in the world." That is what was said by the majority leader in the middle of a conflict.

He said, "Mr. Chairman, I rise today to voice my complete opposition to sending American troops to Kosovo.

There is simply no vision to this mission."

Later he said, "It is clear that any deployment in Kosovo will simply drag on and go enormously over budget," some of the same comments being made today.

Later he said, "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."

In April he said, "It is very simple: the President is not supported by the House and the military is supported by the House."

The quotes go on and on. I do not want to bore this House with quote after quote after quote after quote, but the point is made. Those were legitimate issues, legitimate questions, legitimate things to debate in the House of Representatives. And while I do not agree with many of those points, I agree that it is legitimate to talk about these things in the greatest deliberative body that the world has ever known. And no one at the time questioned the patriotism of the leader or anyone setting forth those positions.

He had no problem in questioning the legitimate action of American policy when it suited his political fancy, but now there are problems for those that question the actions we are taking today. When anyone speaks out criticizing the lack of accounting, the lack of justification for spending money, the lack of a plan, those folks are attacked as unpatriotic.

I think it is important, Mr. Speaker, that we look at what was said recently, on March 27 of this year, by the leader when he said, "Now is not the time to question the carrying out of the present war." A week earlier he said, "Rhetoric does nothing more than demoralize the troops."

Well, Mr. Speaker, if rhetoric demoralizes the troops, I wonder what a lack of planning does. I wonder what a lack of equipment does. I wonder what a lack of preparation does. I wonder what a lack of an exit plan does. I wonder what those sorts of things do.

Those are legitimate questions. The point being, it is hypocritical to raise them in one war, and it is then later unpatriotic to talk about it in the other. Either our majority leader was not supporting the troops in 1999, or he is the one that is spewing hypocrisy today.

We are obligated, obliged in this body, to have an honest and full-throated debate about all the issues that are being brought up and about the accounting of the public's money for the support of this war effort.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to remember what Mahatma Gandhi said one time. He said, "Honest disagreement is often a good sign of progress," and Mark Shields said, "Debate and dissent are the very oxygen of democracy."

Mr. Speaker, our country faces many challenges today, both from within and

from without. From within we face challenges of addressing a budget with record deficits, record debt, and reckless budgeting. We face a challenge of making prescription drugs available to our seniors. We have the challenge of educating our children and giving them access to quality health care at affordable prices.

From without we face the threat from nameless, faceless, hateful terrorists who are bent on destroying the freedoms that we believe in this country are unalienable, granted to us by the Creator and protected by our Constitution and our Armed Forces.

All of these issues deserve and demand a full debate and a complete examination. To turn this debate, this effort, this war effort into a political platform, to criticize or to call names or to point at one side or the other and say you are unpatriotic for asking for an accounting, for a justification, for asking that we air out the issues in this war is beneath this House.

Our troops and our country deserve a full and complete debate on these issues. Our country supports knowing what our plan is, what we hope to accomplish, how we are going to get out, and how much it is going to cost. That is a complete support of the troops and our efforts, and our House needs to support the will of the American public in those areas. Calling one side or the other unpatriotic is simply improper.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Texas for what he said and for pointing out to us those many statements made by the majority leader, because, again, I think that it is very simple, the point we are trying to make tonight, which is the majority leader, the Republican majority leader many times during the war in Kosovo questioned President Clinton about the conduct of the war and the paying for the war, and did so in ways that were, to say the least, very unflattering. Now, when Democrats question the conduct of the Iraq war, we are accused of being unpatriotic. So he cannot have it both ways. Obviously, he is trying to have it both ways.

□ 2130

I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) for gathering us together to call for some accountability, some of the remarks of the majority leader of the House, but actually to make an even more important point, I think. When I was elected to this great body in 1998 and came to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1999, I was under no illusion that the elected Members would agree on every issue. I looked forward to the vigorous debate that would take place between Republicans and Democrats and even among Members of my own party and would expect that since free and open debate is not only a tradition of this Congress, it is, perhaps, the most highly-valued principle of our great democracy.

The very first amendment to our Constitution is freedom of speech, our precious right to say exactly what we believe, even when those words challenge those who are in power. Maybe I should say particularly when those words challenge people that are in power.

Voltaire's words, quote, "I disapprove of what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it," is the spirit of the first amendment. And all of our great Presidents have defended that right to speak one's mind in this great country. And one of those eloquent statements was made by a Republican President, Theodore Roosevelt, who said, "To announce that there must be no criticism of the President or that we are to stand by the President right or wrong is not only unpatriotic and servile, but is morally treasonable to the American public." Very strong words.

But now in an environment in which one party dominates the U.S. House, the U.S. Senate, the Presidency, and even the Supreme Court, those who challenge the policy decisions of the Republicans are being accused of being unpatriotic, of aiding and abetting terrorists, disloyalty to the Commander in Chief, of needing to apologize for voicing their views. And leading that effort has been the majority leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY). And I think it is time to call him to account for his hypocritical comments and his effort to stifle important and legitimate debate.

We are now engaged in war, in a war in Iraq. And our young men and women as well as innocent Iraqis are dying every day. There is nothing more serious than this. Many of us have been critical of the decision to engage in a preemptive war of choice, not necessity, of the poor planning, of the lack of proper equipment provided to our troops, of the lack of accountability of the billions of dollars being spent, more than a billion per week, much of which has gone to friends of this administration and not to provide things like clean water and modern body armor to our troops. There are legitimate issues to raise whether one agrees or not.

But rather than deal with the substance, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) has, to put it bluntly, slimed the questioners. On March 20 of this year, Mr. DELAY said, quote, "This destructive rhetoric does nothing more than demoralize our troops and second-guess our Commander in Chief," unquote. But in May of 1999 while our troops were there fighting against genocide and ethnic cleansing in Kosovo, that same gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) said, quote, "It is a flawed policy, and it was flawed to go in. I think this President is one of the least effective Presidents of my lifetime. He has hollowed out our forces while running around the world with these adventures."

It was perfectly fine then for him to make this critical and, I would argue,

somewhat intemperate comment about his Commander in Chief in 1999 while our troops were engaged in conflict. But not now. Oh, no.

Last week during the debate on handing another \$87 billion to this administration that cannot seem to provide enough fresh water or sunscreen to our troops, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) said, "Let me just say that the old debating tactics of 'I support the troops but' is just not going to cut it this time. If you support the war, and you support the troops, you must, you must vote for this bill."

Well, that is a very, very different story, again, from what he said in 1999. Our leader, the Republican majority leader, came to the floor of this house, stood probably over there, and said to this body, quote, "This is a very difficult speech for me to make because I normally, and I still do, support our military and the fine work that they are doing, but, I cannot support a failed foreign policy."

Now last week, he is saying "no buts," and in 1999 he was all about "but he could not support a failed foreign policy."

Mr. DELAY can say what he wants because that is his right, not only as the majority leader or an elected Representative, but because that is the right of every American. But I have the right and we have the right, and I think an obligation, to demand that he act in the spirit of the oath that he took to uphold the Constitution, to take responsibility for the hypocritical and, I would say, unpatriotic remarks he has made for the purpose of demeaning and defeating his critics and critics of the failed policies of the Republican administration and Republican Congressional leaders.

I urge him, once again, to heed the wise words of the President from his own party, Teddy Roosevelt and let me repeat that quote, he said, Teddy Roosevelt, "To announce that there must be no criticism of the President or that we are to stand by the President right or wrong, is not only unpatriotic and servile, but is morally treasonable to the American public."

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) for her comments, and I may ask that we leave up that quote, if we could, from Teddy Roosevelt, because I think it says it all about what this special order is tonight and why so many of my colleagues have gotten up here and spoken out about the statements that have been made by the majority leader.

And if I could conclude tonight, I would like to conclude with a couple of quotes comparing what the majority leader said this year, in regard to the war in Iraq, and what he said a few years ago, with regard to the war on Kosovo, because I think that one of the greatest concerns I have is this notion that he has tried to spread that somehow if you do not support the war in Iraq or if you criticize this different as-

pects of the war or if you do not vote for the funding for the war in various ways, that you do not support the troops. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Everybody in this House of Representatives on the Democratic side, and I know on the Republican side as well, support the troops and want to do whatever we can to support the troops. And much of the controversy and much of the debate last week on the supplemental was about how best to support the troops. But at no point was anybody suggesting that we not support them, just how best to support them.

And the thing that is amazing about it is if you look up one of the quotes that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) made this year with regard to the Iraq war, and this is the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) on March 20 of this year, a quote from the Washington Times where he said, "I think it is hypocritical to say on the one hand that you support the troops, while on the other hand you say the reason they are risking their lives was wrong. I think it undermines the effort and the unity this country ought to be showing right now." Yet just a few years earlier, talking about the Kosovo war, as quoted in the USA Today regarding floor votes on Kosovo, the majority leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), then said, "It is very simple: The President is not supported by the House and the military is supported by the House." What he essentially was saying that you do not have to support the President in the war in order to support the troops.

And that is the bottom line. Everyone here on the Democratic side and the Republican side wants to do whatever is necessary to support the troops and to make sure that they are not unnecessarily in harm's way. But the bottom line is that you can support the troops and not support the President's foreign policy, either collectively in Iraq, or separately on different votes.

And I think it is very, very important for us as Democrats to continue to make that point. And we will continue to make it unless the majority leader stops his criticism and his comments relative to the patriotism of the Democrats.

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

(Mr. BEAUPREZ 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 Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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