

## SUPPORT IMPACT AID

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

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for the Impact Aid program. Earlier today, along with 30 bipartisan cosponsors, we introduced my Government Reservation Accelerated Development for Education, or GRADE-A, bill from the 107th Congress.

This bill was intended to fulfill an obligation of the Federal Government made in 1950 when Congress passed, and President Truman signed into law, the Impact Aid program.

□ 1800

Impact aid was created by Congress recognizing the obligation of the Federal Government to assist school districts and communities that experience a loss in their local property tax due to the presence of the Federal Government. Between 1950 and 1969, the impact aid program was fully funded by the Congress. But since that time, the funding level has not kept pace with the amount required to cover the Federal Government's obligation.

As we prepare for war and deploy troops overseas, I can think of no better time to support our military personnel and their families. This support should begin with ensuring our soldiers that their children are receiving a quality education. There are 15 million school children in this Nation who are eligible for impact aid. Enrolled in one of 1,331 eligible school districts, these schoolchildren depend on their schools to provide them with an education, and their parents depend on the schools to act as a community of support when they are deployed in our Nation's defense.

In my congressional district, 36 percent of all students attending North Chicago's School District 187 are impact aid military children. School District 187 spends an average of \$6,500 per pupil on education. And herein lies the problem. The North Chicago School District receives only \$3,250 per pupil from the Federal Government for their military impact aid children. With over 1,400 impact aid students, District 187 finds itself over \$4.5 million short in funding levels. This shortfall creates a huge financial strain on the school district overall, decreasing the quality of education for every child in that school district.

Mr. Speaker, the quickest way to take a soldier or sailor's mind off their mission is to have them worrying about their children's education back home. Kids from military families come from some of the hardest working, most patriotic families, but the schools they attend sometimes face bankruptcy because they lack the tax revenues from the military housing where the kids come from. We need to fund our Nation's schools. Impact aid honors our commitment to military

families and families of Native American Indians. It guarantees those families who serve to protect our freedom that they are in turn protected by the Federal Government.

Our Constitution commands that the first job of the Federal Government is to "provide for the common defense." As we improve the pay and benefits of our men and women in uniform, we must also support their kids and the local schools they attend. This may take many years to accomplish, but the time is now, especially now, to support schools that educate the children whose parents wear our Nation's uniform. Let us recognize our duty to America's children and to our military and support the GRADE-A bill.

## BLUE DOG COALITION ON THE FEDERAL DEBT

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, this week the Blue Dog Coalition expressed our deep concern over the announcement that the Federal Government had reached the debt limit just 9 months after increasing it by \$450 billion.

The Federal Government hitting the debt limit so soon after raising it by so much merely validates our concern of the fiscal policies we are now following. Due to the debt limit being reached, the Department of the Treasury announced it will dip into Federal retirement programs to circumvent the debt limit, an action for which House Republicans severely criticized Secretary of Treasury Bob Rubin for taking in 1996. Less than 6 years ago, 225 of my Republican friends voted to soundly reprimand and prohibit then-Secretary Rubin from taking precisely the actions announced this week by Secretary Snow. The silence of the Republicans in Congress about the announcement made by the Bush administration stands in stark contrast to the reaction from many of my same Republican colleagues to Secretary Rubin's action.

A 1995 resolution, authored by a then anti-deficit Republican majority, insisted that a balanced budget would ensure lower interest rates, a faster rate of economic growth, increased national wealth, increased rates of savings and investment, faster growth in the capital stock, higher productivity, and improved trade balances. I agreed with my Republican colleagues 6 years. I wish they agreed with me today.

Now, we can disagree about what has put us in the deficit hole today, but we should be able to agree that digging the hole deeper is ill-advised. Yet the President's budget proposes policies that would increase the deficit by more than \$2 trillion over the next 8 years. According to the White House Office of Management and Budget, the tax cut signed by the President and new proposals in his budget are responsible for 45 percent of the \$7.9 trillion deteriora-

tion in our budget outlook. Now, that is 45 percent. Fifty-five percent is the recession and the war and other things that are occurring today. Not the upcoming war.

The suggestion that we will be able to grow our way out of the deficit was contradicted in testimony by Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan earlier this month. Even under the most optimistic, dynamic estimates of the President's tax cut, large deficits will continue as far the eye can see. And the projections of the economic benefits of tax cuts ignore the economic harm caused by government borrowing to finance deficits, higher interest rates, and lower investments in American businesses.

Now, contrary to some suggestions, my concern about the budget deficit has always applied to spending, increased spending, as well as unfunded tax cuts. Even before many of my House Republican colleagues, I volunteered to help hold the line on spending at the level last year requested by the President. I hope the President, Mr. President, that you will send to Congress a list of pork-barrel items that you believe should be eliminated from the funding bill endorsed by the House leadership and recently signed into law. If you do, I will support those spending cuts. But the reality is that under the President's budget the deficit hole will be dug deeper.

Now, the rhetoric from my Republican friends about controlling spending just does not hold up to factual examination. In the 8 years since Republicans took control of the Congress, discretionary spending has increased by an average of 6.5 percent per year, compared to the previous 8 years of 1.6 percent. Those are the facts, not the rhetoric we hear on this floor every time someone stands up and questions the economic direction that we are going.

Now, some days, some of us ignore the most wasteful spending in the Federal budget, the \$332 billion collected from taxpayers simply to cover our national interest payments. This debt tax consumed a whopping 18 percent of all Federal tax dollars last year. Under the budget, the economic game plan that I hear we are going to have on the floor in 2 or 3 weeks, the debt tax will increase 50 percent in the next 5 years. A 50 percent increase in taxes, the debt tax, is what is being advocated.

Now, I do not understand the logic of that. I agreed with the President, and I do agree with the President, and I believe him to be sincere when he says this Congress should not pass on to our children and future generations our debt. That is what we are doing under the proposal that is before us today.

To my friends on this side of the aisle, there are many on this side of the aisle that are ready to reach out and accept the hand and are beginning to work and to recognize that we need a change in direction. Yes, we need to restrain spending. And, yes, we need to

restrain our desire to give tax cuts to the current generation, just as we anticipate sending our youngest and finest over to fight a war. It is not fair to them. It is not fair to our children and grandchildren.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER  
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair reminds Members to address their remarks to the Chair and not to the President.

SUPPORT TRUTH IN DOMAIN  
NAMES ACT

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, tonight I rise more as a father than as a Member of Congress. I am, proudly, the father of three small children, all under the age of 11. And today when I introduced the Truth in Domain Names Act, I did it very much with Michael and Charlotte and Audrey in mind.

This legislation, which we first conceived of in the 107th Congress, would punish those who use misleading domain names to attract children to sexually explicit Internet sites. There would be fines of up to a quarter of a million dollars, and even imprisonment of up to 2 years.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Courts, the Internet, and Intellectual Property of the Committee on the Judiciary, I know well, Mr. Speaker, that the Internet can be a force for good, but it can also be a force for evil. At its best, the Web is used to disseminate information and provide educational materials to children. Teachers and parents often encourage children to turn to the Internet for research, school projects, and homework, just as I did with my 8-year-old daughter this last Tuesday night, sitting with her on my knee, doing her homework and searching the Web.

The reality is that there is also the worst of the Internet, equally accessible to our children. The Internet can actually be used to deceive children into viewing inappropriate material. According to a survey conducted in the year 2000 by the Crimes Against Children Research Center, they found that 71 percent of teenagers had accidentally come across inappropriate sexual material on the Internet. An FBI spokesman told the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism and Homeland Security of the Committee on the Judiciary in 1999 that pedophiles often lure children into viewing pornography to "encourage their victims to engage in sex."

Even in my own experience this Tuesday night, Mr. Speaker, I found that even though we were entering words in a search engine to help my second grade daughter do her homework, nevertheless the sites we were

accessing, I had to cover her little eyes and see first what popped up because of the type of prurient materials that would come with the most innocuous word search.

So I ask my colleagues to join me today in this very simple proposal to provide criminal penalties to those who would name Web sites in a way to deceive children into being exposed to prurient material. The Truth in Domain Names Act is all about protecting the innocent from those who would prey upon them.

The Good Book tells us it would be better to have a millstone tied around their neck and have them thrown into the sea that would mislead and lead astray these little ones. Not a lot of millstones around this city, Mr. Speaker, but we can tie the seriousness of the law to those who would prey upon our children with prurient intent by this session of Congress adopting the Truth in Domain Names Act.

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

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

EXPRESSION OF GRATITUDE  
TOWARDS FRANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, tonight I wish to express my profound gratitude toward President Jacques Chirac and toward the French Parliament for their enduring alliance with our country and with NATO. I would also like to offer my respect to French Foreign Minister Dominique de Villipin. The civilized world cannot know yet the best method for stemming the growing terrorism that is engendered by the revolutionary fervor found in the Middle East and Central Asia, but I am certain of one thing: We will not succeed without our historic and valuable allies in Europe. They are priceless. War must be the last resort, only after tough and thorough inspections performed by U.N. agents have been exhausted.

I would like to speak of relations between the Governments of France and the United States and between the citizens of our countries. Our friendship is important and historic and dates from the days when General Marquis de Lafayette helped us win our own revolution for independence. Our very capital city, the city of Washington, was designed by a Frenchman, Pierre L'Enfant, and was modeled after Paris. The words of the French Revolution, "liberty, equality, fraternity," remain true today, and in our Congress they are truly carved for all time.

Just this week, I opened a medal for our Uncle Stanley Rogowski, who had

fought in Normandy. Three Bronze stars. Bloodied for 3 years across the northern plains of France. As I visited the cemeteries there, I thought about the close alliance between the American people and the people of France and the struggle for freedom over tyranny in the 20th century.

U.S. President and U.S. Ambassador to France Thomas Jefferson wrote, "I do not believe war the most certain means of enforcing principles. Those peaceable coercions which are in the power of every nation, if undertaken in concert and in time of peace, are more likely to produce the desired effect." He wrote that in 1801. He loved France. He traveled there, he learned much, and he helped weave that into the fabric of American life in our earliest years.

□ 1815

As Archbishop Desmond Tutu of South Africa urged from a continent torn by terrorism in Sudan, in the Ivory Coast, in Egypt, in Nigeria, "Peace. Peace. Peace. Shouldn't America listen to the rest of the world?," he said. "Give the inspectors time."

Note what is happening throughout the world. The largest antiwar turnouts in U.S. history. In London, 750,000 citizens marched against the war, that city's largest demonstration ever. In Rome, 1 million people. In Spain, millions marched in Madrid and Barcelona. In Berlin, half a million. People marching in nations whose homelands have been ripped apart by past wars and who are victims of terrorism as well. Surely they know the price of suffering.

Imagine the message these demonstrations are sending across the caves of terrorism. America is being isolated in world opinion. This is neither wise nor politically sustainable for our Nation to go it alone. The war on terrorism can only be won with a broad and committed international coalition starting with America's most historic allies.

In this new struggle of righteousness, moral force is more important than bombs. The war on terrorism is actually a political insurgency halfway around the world, first against the corrupt regimes in the world of Islam, much like a civil war. Lacking any experience with democracy, desperate and politically motivated masses grasp Islam as a metaphor for political change and reform. The United States should not become the beleaguered referee caught between warring factions who also happen to sit atop the world's largest oil wells on which we have become dependent. Rather, America must unhook ourselves from that oil addiction; and as important, America must work with a broad international coalition to support the forces of popular reform and rising hopes for a better and more just way of life.

In some of the most undemocratic places in the world, in places like Pakistan and Afghanistan, two-thirds of the