

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

population is younger than 20, uneducated and often hungry. A major international commitment to feeding hungry children while educating them would serve the world much more durably in the years ahead.

In embracing the future, America must hold to its deepest ideals in this sea of political discontent and ally with rising aspirations of the dispossessed and forgotten. America should not, as happened in Iran, be caught on the wrong side of an unsustainable dictatorship or propping up weak regimes. Only broad and committed international coalitions can triumph in this struggle. Of three facts we are certain: we need our friends; America cannot win this battle alone; and only with justice will peace come.

THE DEBT LIMIT

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

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Speaker, there is a phrase that famously set atop President Truman's desk stating, "The buck stops here." Mr. Speaker, looking at the administration's fiscal year 2004 budget, nothing could be further from the truth.

President Truman's phrase implies that real leaders have to make tough choices. Real leaders do not assure the American people that our country can afford a war of indeterminate length and massive new tax cuts simultaneously. In fact, the budget is nothing more than smoke and mirrors. Did you know that in spite of an imminent war, not one single dime, not one penny, not anything is budgeted for the looming war? That means the entire budget is nothing but a farce.

Though our country's anticipated effort to disarm Saddam Hussein and his weapons of mass destruction is necessary, and certainly we support our military 100 percent in their efforts, any future action in Iraq which is likely to come will by necessity increase our Federal spending and expand our deficit and the national debt for years and years and years to come. In addition to war with Iraq, which appears nowhere in the budget, the White House is pushing full steam ahead with its \$388 billion plan to exempt dividend income from individual taxation. That may be good long-term planning and certainly no one supports taxing anything twice; that is poor policy. But the question is, can we afford it right now today at this time in the face of record deficits? The only realistic outcome of the revenue losses and increased government spending included in the President's budget is massive increases in the national debt. In the interest of bipartisanship, to quote another popular former Republican President, Mr. Reagan, "There you go again."

Just 8 months ago, the House passed an increase in the statutory debt limit

by a single vote. Now, here we go again, having to raise the debt limit for the second time in 12 months. Last June, Congress had to raise the debt limit by \$450 billion, to \$6.4 trillion. Amazingly, this increase in the debt limit was \$300 billion less than Treasury requested. Our debt is currently over \$6 trillion and we are spending over \$1 billion a day in interest. In fact, 180 of every \$1,000 that east Texans send in to the government goes to interest payments alone. That is outrageous. It is unacceptable.

Treasury and the majority party in the House will not even specify, will not tell us what their desired increase in the debt limit is. It is feasible it will be over \$7 trillion. At what point? When will the majority realize its fiscal irresponsibility in burying this Nation under a mountain of debt? John Adams said, "Facts are stubborn things."

What are the facts? Just 2 years ago, we had a projected budget surplus of \$5.6 trillion. Those predictions of surpluses are long gone, and they have been replaced with projections of deficits and higher debt levels for as far as the eye can see. In fact, our financial condition changed to the worst, \$8 trillion in 24 months. Equally amazing is the fact that as a direct result of the President's fiscal year 2004 budget, total spending in interest alone to finance the debt will increase from \$332 billion in 2002 to nearly \$500 billion in 2008. Further, the higher debt levels embedded in the President's budget will result in \$1.1 trillion more in spending on interest payments on the debt than the government projected just last year. That is simply a waste of money.

It seems all fiscal discipline has blown out the window with this budget and any hope for our children and grandchildren to live in fiscally prosperous times. Instead, we are saddling future generations with accumulating debt payments. Just how much will a family have in net cash savings if this administration's tax cut and budget is passed? If the President's current tax cuts and spending plans are enacted, the average American family of four will pay approximately \$6,500 a year in higher interest payments, far outstripping any negligible tax savings. In addition to the higher long-term interest rates Americans will face as a result of government borrowing in the capital markets, national priorities like health care, Social Security, and homeland security needs will be underfunded as the Federal Government pays more and more and more money to finance our national debt. An exponentially rising debt has consequences and is financed by sacrificing our seniors and our children, sacrificing Social Security, sacrificing Medicare, and sacrificing education.

Congress needs to hold increases in the debt limit to no more than \$100 billion at a time until Congress and the White House have worked together to

balance the unified budget by the end of the decade and to include PAYGO rules and discretionary spending caps.

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

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

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

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

PUBLICATION OF THE RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE 108TH CONGRESS

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pursuant to Rule XI, clause 2(a) of the Rules of the House, a copy of the Rules of the Committee on Agriculture, which were adopted at the organizational meeting of the Committee on February 12, 2003, and modified on this date, February 26, 2003.

Appendix A of the Committee Rules will include excerpts from the Rules of the House relevant to the operation of the Committee. Appendix B will include relevant excerpts from the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. In the interests of minimizing printing costs, Appendices A and B are omitted from this submission.

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE—108TH CONGRESS

RULE I.—GENERAL PROVISIONS

(a) *Applicability of House Rules.*—(1) The Rules of the House shall govern the procedure of the Committee and its subcommittees, and the rules of the Committee on Agriculture so far as applicable shall be interpreted in accordance with the Rules of the House, except that a motion to recess from day to day, and a motion to dispense with the first reading (in full) of a bill or resolution, if printed copies are available, are non-debatable privileged motions in the Committee and its subcommittees. (See Appendix A for the applicable Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives.)

(2) As provided in clause 1(a)(2) of House Rule XI, each subcommittee is part of the Committee and is subject to the authority and direction of the Committee and its rules so far as applicable. (See also Committee rules III, IV, V, VI, VII and X, *infra*.)

(b) *Authority to Conduct Investigations.*—The Committee and its subcommittees, after consultation with the Chairman of the Committee, may conduct such investigations and studies as they may consider necessary or appropriate in the exercise of their responsibilities under Rule X of the Rules of the House and in accordance with clause 2(m) of House Rule XI.

(c) *Authority to Print.*—The Committee is authorized by the Rules of the House to have printed and bound testimony and other data presented at hearings held by the Committee