



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 108<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 149

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JANUARY 28, 2003

No. 15

## House of Representatives

The House met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. TERRY).

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
January 28, 2003.

I hereby appoint the Honorable LEE TERRY to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

### MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) for 5 minutes.

### BUDGET AND HOMELAND SECURITY

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, President Bush has campaigned across the 50 States, has campaigned by issuing promises to strengthen our Nation. He has pledged to improve our schools, to create jobs, to protect our homeland, but soon after these promises were made, we see how empty they are.

President Bush fought against providing funds for his own education bill. It is still unfunded and leaves our children behind.

President Bush fought to prevent Congress from extending unemploy-

ment benefits for laid-off workers. We worked hard to at least to get a reference, and now President Bush is fighting to prevent the Federal Government from spending the funds necessary to protect our homeland.

When we say "homeland security," we are not talking about fancy technology or a building. We are talking about training and equipment for first responders, the men and women of our local police force and fire departments, the ones who will be putting their lives on the line in case of a terrorist attack.

Warren Rudman, the former Republican Senator, who helped lead the United States Commission on National Security in the 21st Century, said about the Bush budget, "The bottom line is that it appears to us we are going to be underfunded in several key areas." His comments were echoed by a current Republican Senator and decorated Vietnam veteran who said Bush's budget is "not even sufficient to provide for the first responder program in the States. It is not sufficient to provide for broader security."

We have known for some time that this President puts children second to tax cuts for the rich. We have known he puts jobs second to tax cuts, but to see our national security sacrificed in favor of a tax cut skewed to millionaires really takes the cake.

Now the President has an opportunity tonight to prove that he values national security more than tax cuts. I urge him to embrace that opportunity.

### TAX CUTS FOR THE WEALTHY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFazio) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFazio. Mr. Speaker, the state of our Union is not sound. Millions of Americans and their families are not

secure in their home, not because of some new wave of crime or because of some immediate and compelling threat from Iraq or other hostile foreign nations, but because so many have lost their jobs, or many fear the loss of their job or lay-off in the near future.

One point seven million jobs have been lost since January 2001. The number of people unemployed for more than 6 months has tripled in the last 2 years. One point three million more people have fallen into poverty in the last 2 years, the first increase in a decade.

Bankruptcies are up 23 percent in the last year. Forty-four million Americans have no health insurance. The government surplus has evaporated. We have a huge and growing deficit as far as the eye can see. Social Security lockbox has been broken open and pilaged, and the trust funds are being spent on day-to-day operations of the government. The Pension Benefit Guarantee Fund, which insures the pensions of Americans in case their company or plan should fail, is broke. It has spent its entire reserves in the last 2 years.

State budgets are the worst since the Great Depression. We are in a domestic economic crisis. That is pretty clear, but the question becomes what is the President going to propose? It appears that he is going to propose more of the same.

When the President was a candidate, we had a large surplus and a booming economy. He proposed tax cuts for the wealthy. When the President was newly elected, we had a faltering economy, and he said we still had a surplus, and he proposed tax cuts for the wealthy, and he got many of those proposals through. Now he is in his third year as President. We are in a recession. We have huge and growing deficits, and the President has proposed, surprise, tax cuts for the wealthy.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H173

His plan is to exempt dividends supposedly because of double taxation, except most of the corporations who pay dividends do not pay Federal income taxes. They have taken advantage of loopholes through Bermuda and other places to not pay taxes. They are not double-taxed. That is not the issue, double taxation or fairness. It is to give a huge gift to the wealthy.

The average tax cut for an Oregonian, for my State, with an income of \$32,000, people who could use a little help, it will be \$40. Do not spend it all in one place. But the average millionaire tax cut, \$45,000, those who have already done so well under his previous tax cuts, and it will compound the State's financial problems. It will cost the States \$4 billion, this little dividend gift to wealthy investors, and it will cost my State \$100 million, a State already in crisis.

There is no credible economist in the United States of America who pretends that this would in any way stimulate the economy, especially since the money will not be refunded to these wealthy folks until next year even if they choose to spend it in a way that might create jobs.

Then the other leg of his way to boost our economy is a war. I believe many are puzzling over what is this about. Is there this a tremendous threat? Well, he has not yet revealed either to me, the United States Congress in any of our classified briefings here on the floor of the House, or in unclassified briefings or in other materials the proof that there is a credible and immediate threat from Saddam Hussein.

We do know that in North Korea they have nuclear weapons. They are building more nuclear weapons. They have tested long-range missiles. We do know in Iran that they have a very advanced nuclear program. Apparently Saddam Hussein does not have one at all, and his missiles that he has, so-called, can reach only a couple of hundred miles.

So how is it that this is the most credible and immediate threat that we should spend hundreds of millions of dollars, potentially thousands of American lives, tens of thousands of lives of innocents in a war against Saddam Hussein while weapons inspectors are in there, when we have gotten what we proposed, which is let us go in there and find if he has weapons of mass destruction. Give the process time to work. There is no reason to rush to war with potentially catastrophic results and one that is certainly not going to help us with these pressing domestic problems at home.

In fact, it is going to rob from that, since the President is now talking about a long-term occupation and rebuilding of Iraq similar to Japan after World War II despite the fact that, of course, basically their culture is not as integrated as that of Japan. In fact, the people who live in Iraq do not get along very well. There is a number of divisive factions. They have no tradi-

tion in democracy, and a long-term occupation and democracy-building in that area is going to be very problematic.

So the President should focus on real steps to help real Americans with their real problems at home and real threats to our domestic integrity or our international security. Where is Osama bin Laden? Remember, dead or alive? Guess what. He is still alive. He is still planning attacks on the United States of America. The President needs to refocus his priorities.

#### REJECTING THE APOSTLES OF INACTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, in recent days we have heard a loud and relentless chorus of critics who are attempting to hamstring President Bush and restrict his ability to defend this country. These foreign and domestic apologists for inaction would subordinate U.S. national security decisions to an international litmus test.

They are subverting the real issue beneath the false allure of avoidance and a smokescreen of diplomatic double-dealings and evasions. Under their specious logic, the burden of proof shifts from Saddam Hussein's evil regime to the free and democratic nations insisting that he disarm.

It is a known fact that Saddam developed, deployed and destroyed thousands of lives with weapons of mass terror. It is not a question of whether or not he has terror weapons.

American soldiers found and destroyed chemical weapons depots 12 years ago. Saddam later confirmed our fears with the thousands of corpses that littered the Iraqi countryside.

Here is the real question: Where and when will he choose to use the countless terror weapons he still has? Will it be here in the United States? Will Saddam's agents launch the attack, or will Saddam quietly transfer his chemical or biological weapons to al Qaeda or any other terrorist organization? Will they be leveraged to blackmail freedom-loving nations into inaction in the face of future aggression?

The answer is that we cannot know what this dictator will do, and for that reason the only acceptable outcome to the United States is that either Saddam Hussein voluntarily destroys all the materials related to his nuclear, chemical and biological weapons development programs or a coalition of free nations will do the job, and this brings up a widespread misperception.

The purpose of the U.N. inspectors in Iraq, a purpose that is either misunderstood or it is being manipulated by the left, is simply to verify that Saddam is declaring and destroying his known but hidden weapons of mass destruction programs and weapons caches.

It is not the inspectors' mission to fruitlessly scour the Iraqi countryside in a feckless search for Saddam's terror weapons. In a country larger than the State of California, that would be an empty objective doomed to fail. Outside observers cannot hope to uncover the truth within an uncooperative and hostile regime. It is an impossible task to discover weapons of mass destruction within a ruthlessly wicked and oppressive dictatorship that refuses to cooperate. Iraq is not destroying its weapons.

Let us just be clear about it. Saddam is an evil tyrant. He illegitimately holds power by controlling the thoughts and the behavior of the Iraqi people with a climate of state-administered terror. His secret police coerce the Iraqi people into a terror-driven code of silence.

Time and time again over the 20th century the West learned that the scale of crimes committed by totalitarian regimes was far worse than we even knew. It was not until those brutal regimes fell and their victims documented the full extent of the monstrous abuse that we learned the truth. We saw it in Hitler's Germany. We saw it in the Soviet Union. We saw it in Cambodia, and eventually we will see it in Cuba, and once Saddam fails and falls, the Iraqi people will shock and disgust the world by revealing the full ghastly scope of Saddam's oppression.

This much is obvious today. We will never get to the truth about Saddam's weapons so long as his regime holds power. We need to recognize that it will be extremely difficult for Saddam's past and future victims to tell inspectors what they know.

□ 1045

When they, their friends and their families are subject to brutal and wicked reprisals, including rape, torture and murder at the hands of Saddam's secret police, U.N. inspectors cannot approach the truth in Iraq. And it is not their job to discover Saddam's weapons. No, the onus is squarely on Saddam Hussein to prove to the world that he has disarmed.

Unfortunately, many observers continue claiming that the United States has to round out the indictment of Saddam Hussein's regime with additional evidence. No such evidence is needed. No more facts need emerge before America can rightfully take action against this regime. We have all the evidence that we need. The pages of history. There has never been a threat confronting the United States that was overcome or improved through inaction or the counsels of contrived evasions and equivocations. The American people expect us to face our threats squarely and directly.

Many observers would have us pin the security of the United States to a fading fallacy, the discredited notion that a U.N. inspections team, operating within a hostile regime, can adequately secure our security. They cannot.