

CONGRATULATING TONY HOPSON ON BEING HONORED AS THIS YEAR'S FIRST CITIZEN OF PORTLAND

(Mr. BLUMENAUER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, this evening in Portland, Oregon, Tony Hopson is going to be recognized as our First Citizen, special recognition for a special gentleman who has developed an innovative program for young people that for 20 years has not only helped Portland's youth and stabilized our neighborhoods; it has provided significant impact in terms of being a critical foundation for the revitalization of critical areas of northeast Portland. Not only has his program touched the lives of thousands of young people; it has been a signal about how communities can come together and solve problems, bringing out the best in everyone. The success goes beyond our children and our neighborhoods. All who have had the privilege of working with him and his team have been influenced for the better.

I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, that our community is recognizing Mr. Hopson as our First Citizen, important recognition for an outstanding leader and an innovative program.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

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

THE WISDOM OF TAX CUTS

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, the current tax debate is more about politics than serious economics. Both sides use demagoguery but propose only modest tax cuts. The benefits that could come from the current tax cut proposal, unfortunately, are quite small and not immediate.

Some say tax cuts raise revenues by addressing economic activity, thus providing Congress with even more money to spend. Others say lowering taxes simply lowers revenues and increases deficits. Some say we must target tax cuts to the poor and the middle class so they will spend more money. Others say tax cuts should be targeted to the rich so they can invest and create jobs. We must accept that it is hard to give tax cuts to people who do not pay

taxes. But we could, if we wanted, cut payroll taxes for lower-income workers.

The truth is, government officials cannot know what consumers and investors will do if they get a tax cut. Plugging tax cut data into a computer and expecting an accurate projection of the economic outcome is about as reliable as asking Congress to project government surpluses. Two important points are purposely ignored: first, the money people earn is their own, and they have a moral right to keep as much of it as possible. It is not Congress' money to spend. Government spending is the problem. Taking a big chunk of the people's earnings out of the economy, whether through taxes or borrowing, is always harmful. Taxation is more honest and direct and the harm is less hidden. Borrowing, especially since the Federal Reserve creates credit out of thin air to loan to big spenders in Congress, is more deceitful. It hides the effects and delays the consequences. But over the long term, this method of financing is much more dangerous.

The process by which the Fed monetizes debt and accommodates Congress contributes to, if not causes, most of our problems. This process of government financing generates the business cycle and thus increases unemployment. It destroys the value of the dollar and thus causes price inflation. It encourages deficits by reducing restraints on congressional spending. It encourages an increase in the current account deficit, the dollar being the reserve currency of the world, and causes huge foreign indebtedness. It reflects a philosophy of instant gratification that says, live for the pleasures of today and have future generations pay the bills.

Two final points to remember: whether or not people can keep what they earn is first a moral issue, and second an economic issue. Tax cuts should never be referred to as a "cost to government." Tax cuts should be much bigger and come much sooner for everyone.

Remember, the real issue is total spending by government. Yet this issue is ignored or politicized by both sides of the aisle here in Congress. The political discussion about whether to cut taxes has avoided the real issue and instead has degenerated into charges of class and party warfare, with both sides lusting for power. Of course, the great issue for the ages, namely, what is the proper role for government in a constitutional republic, is totally ignored. Yet another question remains: Are the American people determined they still wish to have a constitutional Republic?

□ 1930

DISSENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida). Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HINCHEY. Madam Speaker, to publicly disagree with the President in wartime is seen by some as being somehow un-American. However, such dissent in this country has a long and distinguished heritage. Thomas Jefferson and James Madison protested John Adams' undeclared war against France. Madison in turn presided over a war so unpopular that it caused the New England States to consider secession. Abraham Lincoln and John Quincy Adams also criticized President James Polk's war on Mexico; and Theodore Roosevelt harshly criticized President Woodrow Wilson's handling of World War I.

Efforts to stifle criticism of the President and his administration during war also have a long history in this country. The Sedition Act of 1798 led to the arrest of many who criticized the Adams administration. A new Sedition Act was passed and enforced during World War I. It was not until 1964 that the Supreme Court effectively eliminated the crime of sedition in the United States and reaffirmed the constitutional right of free expression.

But my own recent experience and the experience of others who opposed military action against Iraq demonstrates that there are still many who believe freedom of speech should be curtailed when American troops go into battle. Respected elected officials have been lambasted for criticizing President Bush's foreign policy failures. Musical groups have been boycotted for making their anti-war feelings known. A screening of Bull Durham at the Baseball Hall of Fame was cancelled because two of its stars are outspoken peace advocates.

When Lincoln was challenged to defend his dissent in 1848, he explained that the Founding Fathers' decision to give war-making powers to Congress was primarily influenced by a long history of oppressive kings involving their peoples in wars under the pretense that it was for the public good. "But your view," Lincoln argued to his correspondent, "destroys the whole matter and places our President where kings have always stood."

Lincoln saw a great peril in the contention that the President should be the sole judge of the necessity to invade another country. He wrote, "Allow the President to invade a neighboring nation whenever he shall deem it necessary . . . and you allow him to make war at his pleasure."

Theodore Roosevelt had strong views on the need to speak out in wartime. Regarding the Sedition Act of 1918, Roosevelt wrote, "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 it is morally treasonable to the American public." In that one eloquent sentence, Roosevelt neatly summed up the point