

One of the things that the State of Florida talked about as it relates to moving away from affirmative action was moving away from equal opportunity, not only for race or gender, but also moving away from what we believe makes us Americans.

I think it is important for us to note that some of these programs are more harmful than helpful. In Florida, they have the Talented 20 program. If this was to become the law of the land and philosophy of the land, if the Supreme Court does not uphold the Michigan decision, it is important, it is important that we make sure that we have as many inclusionary opportunities as possible, especially for those that are attending school for the first time.

In Florida, under the Talented 20 program, if you have school A, and school A is a school where the GPA of top 20 percent stops at a 3.5, and school B, where the top 20 shuts off at 3.3; say you have 2 students, they play soccer together, two girls, and you have one student in school A that will have a 3.4 GPA, and the one in school B has a 3.4 GPA, this school A student does not go to school and this one does, based on the capability of other students in their school.

The top 20 cuts off at different locations, different areas in every school; so a child should not be penalized on the fact that they go to a school that has more magnet programs or Rhodes scholars, future Rhodes scholars, whatever the case may be. They should not be penalized. When we move away from the practice of affirmative action, using race among many factors, we get into a very gray area that is going to end up hurting more Americans than helping them.

As we start looking at the fact that, I must say, my President and yours was able to get into school under a legacy, I think it is important that we remember that everyone did not have the opportunity to have a parent or someone that was able to get a dormitory named after them to be able to get into school. That means every American.

I share with people constantly that it is very, very important that we remember that education is the number one key to help individuals provide for their families. I tell individuals when I go to speak at Rotary Clubs or at the Kiwanis Club, if they have a wife or daughter, which qualifies every man in this country, then they should be for affirmative action.

The Michigan case is supported by General Schwarzkopf and many others that are noted throughout the military, because diversity makes our country great and strong. I think it is important that Members, not only of this Congress but definitely of the Supreme Court and just everyday Americans, need to understand that if we have to get a football or a basketball, or we have to take our kids to an arts program where they can learn how to sing or what have you, dance well, to get into our institutions of higher education, I think that is the wrong thing.

Universities and institutions of higher learning would like to be able to have the opportunity to say that this child, based on the fact that they have great ability, will be a great asset, not only to our university but also to our society. I think it is important. I think it should not be just based on sports, and it should not be based on the fact that someone can sing or run. I think it is important that we remember that children and young people that want to move on into higher education should be able to do so based on their academic ability, and not on the academic ability of others.

□ 1945

So I think we really need to really look close to these fast, quick programs, affirmative action, things that are untested, unproven, and look at what the University of Michigan has put forth.

I commend the brief that has been put forth by Members of Congress supporting affirmative action, of supporting the Michigan case in the Supreme Court. I think we, as Americans, it brings us together. It does not divide us. When we start looking at voices and hearing voices that are willing to use race and use divisive kinds of languages like preference, things of that nature, divides us as Americans. I think it is important we redefine preference.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members of the House to really look close as we look at this national debate over inclusion, this national debate of education on behalf of fair play, making sure that every young person in our country has an opportunity to quality education and the best universities that we have that serve us. We do not want to go back to the day like my mother, who served in this House, in this Congress, who had to go to the University of Michigan not by choice but just on the fact that she could not get into an institution in Florida to be able to receive a master's degree. I do not think that we will get to that point because I know that Americans will stand up, and I am glad. And I commend the University of Michigan and the corporations and our men and women that are sponsoring them.

ECONOMIC MYTH OF WAR

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk tonight about an economic myth. There is a myth that has been around a long time and that is that war benefits an economy.

The argument goes that when a country is at war it will create jobs and create economic growth. This is a myth. During the time of World War II and following, they claim that the Depression ended, finally ended with the start

of the second world war. And this is not true either because a lot of men were drafted and put into the military. Unemployment rates obviously went down, but there was no improvement in the economy.

Economic growth and really the ending of the Depression did not end until after World War II. So it is wrong to think there is an economic benefit coming from any kind of a war.

There are a lot of shortcomings from a war. During wartime it is much more common to have inflation, and the money presses are running so we can expect inflation from the military build up and the possible war that we are facing. Also, during wartime there is a bigger challenge to the currency of that nation that is at war, and already we see that the dollar in the past year has been down 20 percent. Although there are many other reasons for a weak dollar, the war is contributing to the weakness in the dollar.

Also, during wartime the country can expect that taxes will go up. I know we are talking about cutting taxes, and I am all for cutting taxes; but in real terms taxes will go up during wartime. And it is inevitable that deficits increase. And right now our deficits are exploding. Our national debt is going up nearly \$500 billion per year at an analyzed rate.

The other shortcoming economically of wartime is that funds, once they are either borrowed, inflated or taxed, once the government spends these, so much of this expenditure is overseas, and it takes away from domestic spending. So this is a strong negative for the domestic economy. Another thing that arises during wartime so often is the sentiment for protectionism and a weak economy, difficulties with currencies in wartime will really build an incentive for protectionists measures, and we are starting to see that, which I think is a danger.

During wartime, trade is much more difficult; and so if a war comes, we can expect that even our trade balances might get much worse. There are a lot of subjective problems during wartime too. The first thing that goes is confidence. Confidence in general. Right now there is less confidence in the stock market and literally hundreds of billions of dollars lost in the stock market in the last year or two, again, due to other reasons; but the possibility of war contributes to this negative sentiment toward the stock market.

It is hard to judge the future. Nobody can know the future because of the unintended consequences of war. We do not know how long the war will last. How much it will spread? So there are a lot of uncertainties about this. There is fear. Fear comes from the potential of war or during wartime and a lot of confusion. And unfortunately, also when wars are not fought for national security reasons, the popularity of the war is questioned, that this may alienate our allies. And I believe we are seeing some of that already.

There is no doubt that during wartime the government expands in size and scope. And this of course is a great danger. And after war, the government rarely shrinks to its original size. It grows. It may shrink a little, but inevitably the size of the government grows and there is a tremendous incentive to increase the size and scope of government during wartime. This is a danger because when government gets bigger, the individual has to get smaller; therefore, it diminishes personal individual liberty.

So these are the costs that we cannot ignore. We have the costs of the war. We have the cost of potential loss of life, but there is a tremendous economic cost that even the best economists could not calculate what this war may cost us.

War should always be fought as the very, very last resort. It should never be done casually, and it should be done only when absolutely necessary. And when it is, I believe it should be fought to be won. It should be a declared war. It should be a war not fought under U.N. resolutions or for U.N. resolutions, but for the sovereignty and the safety and the security of this country. Under those conditions, it is explicit in our Constitution that only those wars that are fought in that manner should be declared by the Congress. And that is something that concerns me a whole lot because we have not declared a war outright since 1945; and if you look carefully, we have not won very many since then and wars tend to linger.

We are lingering in Korea. That is a mess over there. We have been there for 58 years, have spent hundreds of billions of dollars, and we are still messed up because we went in there under U.N. resolutions and we did not fight to victory. The same with Persian Gulf War I. We went in there without a declaration of war. We went in there under the U.N., and we are still there and who knows how long we will be there. So there are a lot of costs, hidden costs and some are overt. But the greatest threat, the greatest cost to war is the threat to individual liberty. So I just caution my colleagues that we should move much more cautiously and hope and pray for peace.

INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the gentleman from the State of Utah, we bring good news. The good news is Colorado has got snow, and we are almost back to average. We are having a great year out there in Colorado.

I saw in one of the Eastern press papers lately that the Rocky Mountains, in our ski areas out there, are suffering because of our lack of snow and we

have had great snow out there. That is the good news that I bring to you.

I want to bring another piece of good news to my colleagues that happened to the State of Colorado. In Colorado we have an area called the Four Corners. It is the only area of the country where four States touch in one spot, down near Cortez or Durango, Colorado, to give you a vicinity earmark so you know where I am talking about. The United States Navy, I had the privilege of being invited by the United States Navy to go to the Pascagoula, Mississippi shipyard. I have never been to a shipyard. In Colorado we do not have a lot of Naval presence. But the Navy decided to name one of their new ships after the national park down in the Four Corners. And the name of that national park is Mesa Verde, mesa verde meaning "green table."

It is a beautiful area. It is the only national park in the Nation that protects man-made objects, not objects just of nature. So to have a ship named in honor of that park, and I got to go down to the keel ceremony, Northrup Grumman is the builder of it, and I got to meet a lot of their employees down there. Great people. I had a great trip and I considered it to be a great privilege to be involved in the keel ceremony. So we in Colorado are proud about that, and of course we are proud of our members that serve in our military forces.

There a number of subjects that I want to visit about this evening, all dealing, of course, with the international situation that we face today.

First of all, let me talk about the success we had over the weekend. I notice we have had a lot of criticism of late of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, a lot of criticism of the Central Intelligence Agency, a lot of criticism of the President of the United States, President Bush, and what I would call the A-Squad Team down there, criticism of the A-Squad Team that nothing is happening with terrorism, that for some reason terrorism has been forgotten.

I can tell you we had a great victory over the weekend, in fact, a huge victory over the weekend. I think I can quote my colleague, the gentleman from the State of Florida (Mr. GOSS), who said this was like freeing Paris in World War II. That is how significant it was. And that is that we were able to arrest, right below bin Laden, our second-highest target, Mohammed.

Now this Mohammed guy is a bad guy. And to get our hands on him, and we were even more fortunate, we also thought we had arrested one of his bodyguards. In fact, it turned out that this so-called bodyguard was not a bodyguard in fact, but was in fact a financier for the al Qaeda network. So we really hit a bull's-eye over the weekend.

Now I find it very interesting that some commentators come out and say, oh, my gosh, we have arrested one of their top guys. This means more terrorist attacks. I do not know what we

take out of a comment like. That because we go and arrest one of the lead terrorists in the world, one of the key people involved in September 11, one of the most horrific murderers in the world, that because we arrested him that that could perhaps mean we will have an uptake in terror activity, and their remarks are as if maybe we should not have arrested him, that we have might have offended some of his colleagues that intend to do harm to the United States or to the allies of the United States.

And then tonight, of course, comes up the subject of how do you question a suspect like that? And I hear some people out there saying, oh, my gosh, it is torture to deprive him of sleep. Keep in mind what this individual knows, and keep in mind on the one hand what the individual knows and on the other hand the public good. What this individual knows, I suspect is he knows of different attack schemes, different timing of attack schemes, different methods that they are going to attack the United States or its allies. And over here on the public good we have riding this issue, one, hundreds, thousands, tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands, maybe millions of lives are dependent on whether or not we can get this information and take a preemptive strike, stop this terror strike before it occurs. And today I hear commentation on the fact that, my gosh, you better not deprive this suspect of his sleep. That is torture.

And I say to myself, What do you mean? This guy, this suspect who we know is one of the lead architects, if not the lead architect, of the September 11, you are going to say we are torturing him because we deprive him of sleep to get answers out of him, to get information out of him in hopes of preventing another September 11 or even a larger attack? Of course it brings up the debate of torture. At what point in time should torture be allowed or should it be allowed? And I think you have got to weigh that out. Think about it, and I know a lot of people, right when you use the word torture, it is a word that if you ask 100 people, do they have a positive or negative feeling about the word torture. Out of 100 people you will get 100 people who will say they have a negative feeling about the word. So right off the bat you are on the defensive side.

So I am asking some of my colleagues tonight to not draw a rapid conclusion, but put in your own mind to what extent should we be allowed to use different methods, and what type of methods should we be allowed to use on a suspect we know probably has information that if we do not get that information in a timely fashion could very easily result in the deaths of hundreds of thousands, perhaps even more, a more significant amount, even one, of innocent human beings out there that could be the victims of this kind of terrorist strike.