



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 107th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 148

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, OCTOBER 1, 2002

No. 126

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 1, 2002.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MIKE PENCE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agreed to the following resolution:

S. RES. 331

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of the Honorable Patsy T. Mink, late a Representative from the State of Hawaii.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That when the Senate adjourns or recesses today, it stand adjourned or recessed as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 23, 2002, 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 gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) for 5 minutes.

IN SUPPORT OF MOSQUITO ABATEMENT FOR SAFETY AND HEALTH ACT (MASH)

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, my brother Fay Boozman, the director of Arkansas's Department of Health, recently testified before a congressional committee that it is very possible more Arkansans will be infected with the West Nile virus this year. Arkansas has seen six human cases of the virus so far, including one death. This time last year, Louisiana had only seen one human case. This year Louisiana has documented more than 260 cases.

States like Arkansas cannot afford to dip into their emergency funds to combat the spread of West Nile every year. This bill will help States and localities fight this virus by authorizing matching grants by up to \$100,000 for the mosquito abatement programs.

I commend the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN), chairman, and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JOHN) for their leadership in this area and for producing and introducing this bill in the House. I encourage my colleagues to pass this bill and provide much-needed relief to our State and local governments who are on the frontlines of this fight.

QUESTIONING THE PRESIDENT'S POLICY CONCERNING IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 23, 2002, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, on September 11, the world watched with horror the terrorist attack on the United States. Congress

acted by granting President Bush authority to mount a strong response. Congress appropriated money to rebuild New York and the Pentagon and roused popular support for the President as we took each step against terror. Congress and the President jointly exercised their constitutional responsibilities.

Our efforts required and received the support from the community of responsible nations. The strong backing of our allies was a reassuring sign that our international partners stood beside us as we faced this new danger.

The President now wants to reposition our efforts from fighting a war on terrorism to fighting a war against Saddam Hussein, to reposition our longstanding national policy of containment and deterrence to a policy of unilateral preemption. Over the last few weeks Members of Congress have questioned the President on this change of focus. Sadly, some in his party have said that to question the President is unpatriotic. I disagree. To question the President sends an unequivocal message to those who would attack America that our democratic system is alive and well.

Like many of my colleagues, I held a series of town hall meetings in August across my district. Virtually without dissent I heard New Mexicans express their strong concerns about a possible war with Iraq. From Gallup to Santa Fe to Clovis, it was clear that the overwhelming majority were opposed to a unilateral invasion by the United States. Some told me they believed the President should involve the Congress in a decision to go to war. Others were concerned about getting support from our allies around the world. Others were concerned about the rush. Not surprisingly, I have continued to hear from my constituents, and their questions need to be answered.

I am pleased that President Bush has taken the initial steps to seek the approval of both the Congress and the

□ 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.

H6785

United Nations before engaging in preemptive strikes on Iraq. I firmly believe that Congress has a vital role to play and a constitutional responsibility to act on matters of national security. However, I also believe there are several questions that must be answered before we rush into war.

Was Iraq involved in the September 11 attack on the United States? I have seen no evidence that it was. A tough and strong war against terrorism in response to September 11 does not reasonably extend to launching a war against Iraq. Indeed, attacking Iraq may be a distraction from the war against terrorism, not a continuation. Al Qaeda and Saddam Hussein are natural enemies, not allies. The al Qaeda terrorist movement is based on the belief that secular regimes in the Arab world are antithetical to the fundamental teachings of Islam.

Does Iraq pose an immediate and independent threat to the United States and our allies? The President has identified the key threat from Iraq as its development of weapons of mass destruction and the potential for Iraq to transfer these weapons to the terrorist groups it sponsors. I agree with this concern. However, what weapons of mass destruction does Iraq now have at its disposal? Does Iraq now have the capability to deliver and use these weapons against the United States? The answer is we do not know. Without reinserting the U.N. weapons inspectors, we may never know.

Why do we not allow the inspections process to take place? Why do we not allow the United Nations to work its will? The first resolution the President sent to Congress would allow him to use all means he determines to be appropriate, including force. Giving the President a blank check to act alone will increase the danger of unilateral military action by others in the future. It will undermine our broader foreign policy goals. It will divert much-needed resources from our pressing domestic needs.

The President has submitted a second draft resolution. Although it is an improvement, I still have serious reservations. While I am confident that the leadership of both parties can work together to draft a more balanced resolution, we need more diplomacy, we need more information, and we need more international allies. I have no doubt that our military can defeat Saddam Hussein in a war. My doubts lie in what happens after we remove Saddam from power. Without the backing of the international community and, most importantly, the Arab world, the aftermath will be uncertain and precarious.

Other questions must be answered before we vote. How much will the war cost? How many American soldiers will be seriously wounded or lose their lives? How many innocent Iraqi civilians will perish?

I am disheartened that we appear to be following this course. If we take politics out of this decision, our voice will

be stronger. I believe that we should not vote on this before this election. We should take politics out of it, and I think if we do that, our message to the world will be clearer. The decision is ours.

THE NATIONAL ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 23, 2002, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) is recognized during morning hour debates for 15 minutes.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge the House Republican leadership to address people's serious economic concerns. Today we awoke to reports on the radio which said that the front pages of major newspapers were dominated by the failed performance of our stock market.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation needs an economic plan that will address some of the challenges we face today, like restoring economic growth and opportunity. While the economy is crashing around us, the House Republican leadership continues to answer by passing more tax breaks for the wealthiest Americans and legislation that blames their failure to act on the other body. At a time of mounting economic pain, Republicans have ignored the people's priorities, from investor rights to Social Security, prescription drugs to education, to economic growth.

The Census Bureau reported this week that in the last year, the number of people without health insurance rose by 1.4 million due to a faltering economy and the rise in unemployment. Republicans will pass this week another non-sense of the House resolution calling for tax cuts 9 years from now, in 2011. CNN reported this week that U.S. stocks, and I quote, looked to wrap up what might be the worst September since the Great Depression and had their worst third quarter since 1987.

In a few days Americans will start receiving 401(k) statements showing another drop, a sharp drop, in their retirement savings. Senate Democrats will attempt to extend unemployment benefits today to 1.1 million people whose benefits have been exhausted, which is the right and responsible thing to do.

Today is the first day of the new fiscal year, yet as a result of their failed economic program, the Republicans have been unable to carry out their most fundamental responsibility by passing necessary budget bills. So they will have to bring to the floor this week a second continuing resolution in as many weeks to keep the government simply operating. Their failed economic plan now threatens to cut back resources for the Securities and Exchange Commission, cut back on medical expenses for the Veterans Affairs Department, cut back education, and cut back on front-line resources for homeland defense.

Last week I discussed on this floor this bankrupt economic agenda em-

braced by the House Republican leadership. Today let me discuss some basic facts about our Nation's economic future. In order to make progress for all Americans, we need to understand the results that the Democratic budget produced in 1993 versus the Republican economic plan that was passed in 2001. In 1993, the House of Representatives had an impassioned debate about America's economic future. Republicans predicted then that the Democratic economic plan to cut deficits and grow the economy would drive our economy into a ditch.

If you look at this chart, Mr. ARMEY on August 5, 1993, said that "this Democratic plan is not a recipe for new jobs. It is a recipe for disaster." On another chart, Mr. DELAY said that "this plan has got to be the biggest rip-off in modern history." Finally, on another chart, Mr. HASTERT predicted that "the Democratic plan would add more than \$2 trillion to the national debt."

The House Republican leadership could not have been more wrong about that Democratic economic agenda to secure the future for all Americans. In the 2 years after Democrats enacted this plan, the unemployment rate dropped by almost 2 percent. Real incomes after inflation for average families increased by more than 10 percent. We created more than 8 million jobs. The poverty rate came down. The stock market shot up. The Federal budget deficit was reduced by \$126 billion in just 2 years' time and became a surplus within 5 years. Our economic plan defeated the 1991 recession, and the lives of almost every American citizen were improved due in large part to this responsible economic agenda promoting opportunity in people's lives.

□ 1045

Deficits came down; interest rates came down. The American people created a high-tech revolution that raised living standards and inspired hope in communities nationwide.

Under the Democratic plan, the facts speak for themselves. People created opportunity for themselves, their families, and they created opportunity for their fellow Americans. For almost 8 years we had record economic prosperity due to responsible economic policies that Democrats enacted.

Then, in the spring of 2001, the Republican economic plan passed the Republican House, the then-Republican Senate; and the Republican President signed it into law. But I would like to point to some other statements that were made at the time.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), on this chart, on March 28, 2001, said that the President's budget will spur job creation. Again on the chart, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATTS) boasted that their budget not only provides tax relief, but secures jobs and grows the economy. But he said, we also fund our Nation's priorities and pay down the debt. Finally, the majority leader, the gentleman