

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 Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

POST OFFICE COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP ACT

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I came to Congress to help the Federal Government be a better partner with local communities, to make them liveable, to make our families safe, healthy and economically secure. The simplest way to achieve that objective does not require new laws, regulations, fees or massive outlays of Federal dollars driving us even deeper into debt.

The simplest way is simply for the Federal Government to merely obey the rules that it sets for others. One of the best illustrations of this principle has been realized in massive grass roots support across America for the postal service to obey the rules in locating its facilities.

We have had support from the National Association of Home Builders, the Sierra Club, the Trust for Historic Preservation, realtors, landscape architects, the American Planning Association. Good government organizations across the country have joined with local officials, mayors and Governors, to understand that the over 37,000 postal facilities are not just remote outposts of Federal activities. They can, often are and always should be the centers of community activity.

As a local official, I had my own experiences where the postal service was sadly indifferent to the impacts of its operations on local communities. When putting in a new facility they refused, for example, to pave the sidewalks, to integrate the facility into the local fabric and make them accessible to citizens. I had experiences where the postal service would not work with us to promote orderly traffic flow.

In Florida there was a post office where they were going to put in a parking lot by paving a flood plain. If a private developer had tried to do that, people would have demanded that they be put in jail.

These experiences from around the country were the inspiration for the Post Office Community Partnership Act on which we have been working the last several Congresses. The bill outlines minimum community involvement that the United States Postal Service must pursue to significantly change any post office. More important, the bill requires the postal service to fully comply with local zoning, planning and other land use laws, to play by the same rules as everyone else.

In the past, we have had a majority of the House cosponsor this legislation. Once it even passed the Senate, but so far it has been the victim of politics of postal reform. In recent sessions, all of

the major efforts of more comprehensive legislation have included some variation of this bill as an enticement for passage.

The pressure from our legislation has, in fact, encouraged the postal service to make significant progress, and I have been encouraged by meetings I have had with members of the Board of Governors, the Postal Rate Commissioners, and recent Postmaster Generals. They have made progress. Outstanding examples exist from coast to coast.

In Fairview, Oregon, in my district, working with the developers in the community, the post office was the first civic building in a new development, enacted as an anchor for what has developed into a retail street. By centrally locating the post office as the developers proposed, the residents can easily walk or drive to the post office from anywhere in this village.

In Castine, Maine, the postal service first proposed moving the oldest operating post office in the country, an historic landmark, from its downtown location out to the suburbs. After a public outcry, the postal service and the town worked together to find a way to expand the existing location and keep the post office in its historic downtown location.

It is time, however, to make this relationship something that every community can count on. It should not be the exception. It should not require luck or extraordinary political action. There should be no variation in the commitment of the post office to be part of each and every community.

The recent report from the President's Commission on Postal Service is going to prompt more discussion and analysis of operations. If the recommendations are implemented from the Commission to streamline the postal service, it will result in closure of rural and innercity of post offices. Additionally, opportunities for public response and hearings will be cut, and the role will shrink to giving written complaints to the regulatory board after the decisions are made.

Now is the time to act. I urge my colleagues to sponsor the Post Office Community Partnership Act to guarantee that the postal service is a better partner and to set the tone for the Federal Government to lead by example in the livability of our communities, so that our families are safer, healthier and more economically secure.

WE WILL NOT RUN

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 such time as he may consume.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, 2 days ago in Iraq, the United States lost 16 soldiers in a missile attack on an Army CH-47 Chinook helicopter. Twenty more American servicemen and women were wounded. All on board were headed to Baghdad, on the way to the air-

port and a well-deserved break from combat service.

Today, we all mourn their loss and offer our heartfelt prayers for the victims and, most especially, their families. But, Mr. Speaker, we will not run. The United States will stay in Iraq, along with our coalition partners, until the work there is done.

Until innocent Iraqis are no longer threatened by tuggish holdovers from the old regime; until state-sponsored murderers from neighboring counties no longer enter Iraq to terrorize its people; until the citizens of Iraq have a democratic government to set their own course among the free nations of the Earth; and until the nexus of the weapons of mass destruction, international terrorism, and outlaw regimes can no longer threaten the United States from Iraq.

These things, these long overdue and wonderful things, are going to happen. Let there be no mistaking in this or any capital around the globe, justice is coming to the Middle East with hope and freedom riding close behind.

We all have always known that delivering these basic human rights to a region unfamiliar with them will be hard, but that is our mission, and one worth the sacrifice.

Just as it has been since we began debating the removal of Saddam Hussein from Iraq, this war remains a test of America's moral leadership in the world.

Are we serious about destroying international terrorism? Are we serious about holding outlaw regimes accountable for their sponsorship of it? Are we resolved to see our mission through to the end, despite the disproportionate costs and risks we must assume? And finally, is human freedom worth fighting for?

The answers to all of these, of course, is yes. And so we will not run. No matter how perilous our journey, we will stand and fight and humanity will win. Iraq will be free. Terrorism will fall. Evil will be turned back. And the Chinook 16, Mr. Speaker, will not have died in vain.

AMERICA WILL NOT RETREAT

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

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I voted in favor of the resolution to remove the poisonous, snake-infested Iraqi regime because I believe it was the appropriate response.

Do I approve of the manner in which the postcombat peacekeeping effort is developing? No.

It appears to me that we should be beneficiary of more precise intelligence gathering from our Iraqi allies on the ground. We must insist upon better, more timely intelligence. These ruthless murderers who kill and wound our servicemen and women, who bomb and destroy hotels and other facilities must

be identified and apprehended before they subsequently kill and destroy. Granted, the borders are porous and terrorists enter at will, but I believe that better surveillance can be effected, and we must insist upon it.

Some Members of Congress, Mr. Speaker, have accused President Bush of practicing political opportunism by dispatching troops into Iraq. They should be ashamed. Common sense clearly concludes the safe political course would have been to have done nothing. President Bush acted presidential. The approval ratings of President Bush and Prime Minister Blair would be far more favorable had they turned blind eyes to Iraq. Great risk was assumed in going forward, but they responded as able leaders.

Approximately 18 months ago, an Iraqi citizen said to me, the U.S. must take out Saddam. We are afraid of him because we know what punishment and torture he is capable of inflicting. The U.S. must remove him. The world is not safe as long as he remains in power, he concluded.

I then asked him, If we remove this evil regime, will the Iraqi people embrace us or reject us?

The gentleman was silent. I repeated my question, and he reluctantly replied, I do not know. I said, Neither do I and that concerns me.

It continues to concern me. It concerns me, as well, that we have become the Rodney Dangerfield in the world of diplomacy to some; no respect for what we have done. Oh, yes, Mr. Speaker, the great majority wanted Saddam gone, but they did not want to become involved. Let someone else do the heavy lifting. Let others expose themselves to danger.

We were given warnings. The first attack on the World Trade Center in the nineties; our two embassies subsequently attacked; the attack upon the USS *Cole*, and we did virtually nothing in response. No surprise that the terrorists concluded these Americans have no backbone. They have no will to respond. We can attack them with impunity. Then 9/11. Some insist we should have delayed our efforts to remove Saddam.

Delay for what? The U.N. was indecisive. The U.N. observed Saddam's violation of one agreement after another without reprimand, and all the while Saddam operated as he pleased. Surely, Saddam must have viewed the U.N. as his own personal dancing bear.

Some insist that our responding to the 9/11 attack was a mistake, implying that had we done nothing in response, that terrorists would simply have gone away. That gang does not simply go away.

Finally, weapons of mass destruction. There is ample evidence voiced by Democrats and Republicans alike that Iraq and Saddam did possess, in fact, weapons of mass destruction. They have not been detected, but do we then conclude that these weapons do not exist? Neither have Saddam nor Osama

bin Laden been detected, so applying this logic, I suppose they do not exist.

We are at war. And war has a way, Mr. Speaker, of frustrating timetables, good intentions notwithstanding; I cite Bosnia.

I know we in the Congress are appreciative to the countries around the world that are assisting us in this effort and to our servicemen and women as well. If we prevail, the world will be better for it, but we must be strong. As we know from the outset, it will not be a quick fix. Many have compared Saddam and Osama bin Laden and their fellow terrorists with Adolf Hitler, but there is a salient distinction, Mr. Speaker. Hitler and his gang wanted to conquer the world. Saddam and Osama bin Laden and their thugs are not averse to destroying the world. Therein lies a distinction, Mr. Speaker, that makes our task far more formidable.

As the majority leader just said earlier, to retreat at this juncture would be ill-advised.

GOOD ECONOMIC NEWS

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, last week brought the American taxpayers some good news. Whether it was in the USA Today newspaper, Associated Press stories, the New York Times or the Washington Post, they all said pretty much the same thing. The U.S. economy grew at a rapid pace of 7.2 percent during the third quarter of this year.

□ 1245

Mr. Speaker, this is an accomplishment that has not been seen in 19 years, or since 1984, when Ronald Reagan was President of the United States. Most economic analysts were expecting just a 6 percent gain. In addition, the growth rate accelerated from a 3.3 percent rate in the second quarter. This must come as quite a surprise to those who have been hoping for bad economic news.

I would like to greet the economic detractors with even more positive news: the value of U.S. stock markets has increased with shareholder wealth up \$2.9 trillion, an increase of 22 percent since October 2002; and the 10,000 mark in the Dow Jones is well within reach. Disposable income is up 5.8 percent at an annual rate in 2003.

This is very interesting. U.S. homeownership in the United States was 68.4 percent in the third quarter. Now this is the highest level it has ever been.

Productivity growth remains strong, which has bolstered business profits. Orders of manufacturing goods have been increasing since earlier this year, and shipments of durable goods have increased since this summer after, of course, a period of decline and stagnation.

Consumer confidence has increased and consumer spending has increased on food and clothes by 7.9 percent, and this is the best increase since 1976.

Business spending on equipment and business software has increased 15.4 percent, the largest increase since 2001.

Mr. Speaker, these economic facts are evidence that what President Bush proposed and Congress passed was right in passing the Jobs Growth and Tax Relief package, that is, the tax cuts. It has given the economy the shot it needed from the recession that started at the end of the Clinton administration; and with higher economic activity, American workers obtain better wages and living standards.

While this significant growth is encouraging, we must strive to ensure that our economy continues on this positive track. Of course, we cannot logically expect that the economy will continue to grow at this rate as it did in the third quarter, but most private forecasters predict the economy will be above the historical average.

Of course, one thing a good economy must do is create jobs; 57,000 new jobs were created in September, the first gain in nonfarm payroll employment since January. This is positive news, and we are seeing signs that the labor market is improving. Initial claims for unemployment insurance have declined by more than 10 percent, and the 4-week moving average has stayed below 400,000 claims for 4 straight weeks.

As the economy has recovered, the U.S. has become more productive. With higher productivity, fewer people are needed to do the same job. Because of this, there has not been a corresponding job increase in the national economic growth.

Of course, I think there is more we need to do to continue these progrowth policies. I would offer one caveat this afternoon. Part of a progrowth economic policy is to reduce spending. Federal Government spending increased by 1.4 percent in the third quarter alone. Over the past 5 years, the government has increased spending by \$586 billion. Spending is now just over 20 percent of the gross domestic product. If we continue to follow an alarming increase in Federal spending, the government will be faced with more and more difficult choices, none of which will help our economic recovery and economic growth.

We have a healthy economy to look forward to today. Let us keep it that way. Let us control government spending.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RENZI). Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 49 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m. today.