

of drugs and all the things we know go on along that southern border. It is, in fact, a war zone. If anybody does not believe that, they should go to Cochese County and spend some time there, spend some time with the rangers, spend some time with Mr. Eggle.

Mr. Eggle stated recently, "I gave an eye for one war, now I have given my son in another. What is our President going to do about the war on our borders?" This is an excellent question, Mr. Eggle. It is one that should be asked not just of the President of the United States, but of all the Members of this body, because we have essentially abandoned Mr. Eggle. We have abandoned the people who live along the border to the ravages of what I believe can be called nothing less than an invasion. Their homes are being destroyed. Their families are being destroyed. Their lives are being destroyed.

Chris Eggle's life was taken. Bob Eggle lives to tell us the tale and to help and to ask us to remember. That is the least we can do for Mr. Eggle, a true homeland hero.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) is recognized for 5 minutes. (Mr. LANGEVIN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

WAR IN IRAQ

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

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, millions of Americans have grave concern about this administration's policy in Iraq, and I am one of them. Several of us have come to the floor today to express those concerns. But before I do so, I would like to relate a story from this past Monday when I went to the deployment of the United States Navy's frigate, the U.S.S. *Rodney Davis*, where I saw off a group of what looked like awfully young sailors to the potential war zone.

Mr. Speaker, I went there to tell those proud sailors something that there is unanimity about in America. I went to tell them that no matter what people in America think of the policy in Iraq, every single American is proud of our men and women in the military service. I wanted to tell them that because the very freedoms that many Americans have been exercising in various places across this country in the last few weeks are the freedoms that our service personnel protect, and the freedom of speech to dissent against our government's policies would not exist without the courage and dedication of our men and women in uniform.

So I told them that all Americans of every stripe, short, tall, east, west, Democrat, Republican, that during

their mission, our prayers would be with them and our support would be with them in every way shape and form.

But I thought it important to come back and think about the policy in Iraq real hard, Mr. Speaker, because these were young men. Mostly men. There were some women. A mother came up and she was bawling, and she said, about her son, the sailor, "He's just a boy. He's just a boy." He had only been out of bootcamp for just 2 weeks. Upon reflection, I thought to myself that it is old men like us who send young men to combat, and so we should think real hard about it.

With that in mind, I want to pose some questions that millions of Americans to the President before he launches this war in Iraq.

Number one. Why should America abandon its long-term bipartisan belief that we should work with the international community in a multilateral effort at security in favor of an internationally nonsanctioned preemptive attack on another nation? Why are we compelled to break with this long tradition, that has been embraced by Americans, that civilized countries need to work together to stop aggression for mutual security rather than to open the door to war so that every country that is aggrieved can start another war against another one?

Why should we give Pakistan the sanction to attack India without international sanction? Why should we give the sanction for any country to attack another country absent imminent threat without international sanction? And why should our President tell the United Nations that they can just stick it in their ear and that America is going to start a war anyway?

That is a question that the President has not adequately answered to date and that needs an answer before a war starts.

Frankly, it is a little troublesome that our President has said that he respects the United Nations; that he wants the United Nations to be effective; that he wants the United Nations to work together, but tells the United Nations it does not matter a fig what the United Nations thinks, because America is going to start a war anyway. This has not helped to build multilateral international support for the greatest country in the world, which is the United States of America. And we need that question answered before a war starts.

Second question. How many billions of dollars of taxpayer money are being used to buy votes for this war? We have heard of tens of billions of dollars for Turkey. Now we hear the administration trying to buy votes around the world for this war. We need to know how many billions of dollars of taxpayer money are going to buy these votes.

And the reason I say that is that unfortunately, and I think it is most unfortunate, if this war starts, it will not

be a coalition of the willing. The international community will look at it more as a coalition of the bribed. And that is not something our country needs to be proud of. We need to be proud, and we are proud, of our men and women in uniform, but this is not a message to be sending internationally.

Third question: After months and months and months of inquiry by Americans across the country, where is the compelling evidence that Iraq was behind the September 11 attack on this country? We have asked. We have searched. We have given the benefit of the doubt to the administration in every way we could, and that evidence has been wholly lacking.

Fourth: Why abandon inspections right in the middle of this effort? Why abandon something that is making progress? Why abandon the process that is destroying these missiles? And, lastly, why create a chaotic situation in Iraq that can be a breeding ground for the al-Qaeda to regroup, like is happening right now in northern Iraq under our northern fly zone.

No, we should keep this tyrant, this thug in his tight little box and we should work with the international community to keep him there. Mr. Speaker, I hope that no war starts until those answers are in to the American people.

PRESIDENT BUSH'S JOBS AND GROWTH PLAN

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of President Bush's plan to grow the economy, create jobs, and provide meaningful tax relief to hardworking Americans.

In these troubling times, some critics across the aisle believe that the answer to our Nation's problems is to take a greater slice of family income pie. President Bush and I, instead, want to grow the size of that pie by growing the economy. When economic growth occurs, businesses generate greater profits, more people go to work, they earn better wages, and they have greater opportunities. To encourage individuals and families to risk their time and to risk their savings on that new software idea, that transmission repair company, that hamburger stand, that new enterprise, Mr. Speaker, they need tax relief. They need permanent tax relief. And the President's plan does just that.

We have historical evidence that tax relief works. It is not just faith, it is evidence. Each time our Nation has significantly reduced income tax rates, economic growth has followed. When President Reagan lowered rates in the 1980s, it fostered economic growth averaging 3.2 percent a year, and Federal revenues actually increased, I repeat, increased by 20 percent. When

President Kennedy lowered tax rates in the 1960s, we had several years of real economic growth of 5 percent. And the same is true of tax relief during the 1920s, where economic growth averaged 4.3 percent.

History has shown us that tax relief can spur economic growth and can allow hardworking American families to keep more of what they earn and increase government revenues.

Now, Mr. Speaker, some say that tax relief is too expensive. But in fact, under a worst-case scenario, if the President's plan generates no economic growth at all, the package would account for only 5 percent of the \$2.2 trillion budget proposed for next year. Yet as many of my colleagues from across the aisle decry deficits and tax relief on the one hand, they are the first to demand more Federal spending on the other. Instead of focusing on the 5 percent of the budget that constitutes tax relief, perhaps we should all focus on the 95 percent which constitutes Federal spending, much of which is pure waste and duplication.

Today, we have nearly twice as much inflation-adjusted Federal spending per family than when I was born. Do we really need that much Federal Government? And over this same period, inflation-adjusted Federal spending has grown seven times faster than our family budgets. Is it any wonder that our family tax burdens are near an all-time high? A middle income American family can now pay up to 40 percent of their income in Federal, State, and local taxes. That is not tax fairness.

The President's economic program is tax fairness because it provides tax relief to taxpayers, especially middle income Americans.

□ 1500

Mr. Speaker, 46 million married couples would keep over \$1,700 of what they earned, enough to pay two mortgage payments. Now that is a housing program. Thirty-four million families with children would keep an additional \$1,500, enough to purchase a new personal computer for their children. That is an education program. Six million single women with children would keep \$541, which could purchase a month of day-care. That is a child care program.

Middle-income families would also receive additional relief from accelerated reduction of the marriage penalty, a faster increase in the child care tax credit, and immediate implementation of the new, lower 10 percent tax bracket.

To boost investor confidence and encourage investment, the President's plan also eliminates the unfair double taxation on dividends. The elimination of this unfair double taxation on dividends is expected to produce a one-time increase in equity values of up to 5 percent, at a time when we desperately need to increase stock values and consumer confidence.

Mr. Speaker, about half of all dividend income goes to our seniors who

often rely on those checks for a steady source of retirement income.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot tax, spend, or sue our way into prosperity. We can only grow our way into prosperity. I strongly encourage Members to support the President's jobs and growth plan.

BOMBS AND BULLETS WILL NOT WIN WAR ON TERROR

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I am here to share the opposition of my constituents to a war in Iraq. The folks I work for understand that the war on terror cannot be won with bombs and bullets, that we can fight with bombs and bullets, but that will not end terror, nor will this approach ensure the safety of Americans. Only a strategy of multilateralism, humanitarian aid and development can win the war on terror. Only a strategy that preempts new terror attacks without creating new terrorists can win the war on terror. Bombs, bullets, and war are not the solution to terrorism. My constituents understand this.

The gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) has been coordinating with an organization called Poets Against the War. This organization has been collecting poems written by Americans around the country. Their poems reflect their concerns about current U.S. policy toward the war against terror and Iraq.

Today it is my honor to share a poem that was written by one of my constituents, Elizabeth Barret, an 83-year-old woman from Mill Valley, California. She wrote a poem called "Peace."

"I will listen to my heart. I know that I need to open my heart to God. The prospect of war makes me cry out for peace. Where are all the mothers and children? Where are all the men whose hearts have been hurt? Do they not know that they were at one time children too?"

"The world needs peace. We have become very small. We need to love each other more than ever. Who will help the world? The women and children will save the world."

Mrs. Barret eloquently makes the key point that we should measure every single decision this House makes by its affect on our Nation's children. She understands that an invasion of Iraq will inspire a new generation of terrorists to threaten our children.

Instead of following this path of destruction, we can work to contain Iraq and concentrate on destroying al Qaeda. That is what is best for our children. One of those children, 15-year-old Carina from San Rafael, California, wrote this poem. It is called "Lady Paz."

"I imagine there are jungles inside her if not under her fertile skins, what

hope? I know it is our vampire wishes that leech life from this stolen soil our scrawled, thoughtless messages that degrade such indelible bark.

"I can see her relief so clearly, the dark impressions of her liquid eye casting cacophonous shadows across our curve of hazy planet.

"Give us your real hand, the one where sap pulses warm and whose clasp is meaty and sharp through sun's dream-tricks whose brown fingers don't leave us abandoned and guessing.

"Will you take us, our legs streaked in ash, our misconceptions bending and bending, the fissures in earth's crust growing deeper, the molten rock bubbling up like blood? Oh, peace, you must be a tainted lady. A tainted lady to tame us screaming so."

Mr. Speaker, Carina understands that violence is not the way to peace. She understands that we can start a war in Iraq and destroy Baghdad from the air. And she understands that after sending our soldiers and their soldiers to the grave, we can win a war in Iraq, but that will not win the war on terrorism.

The only way to win the one war that matters, the war on terrorism, is to bolster crumbling societies, support economic development and end support for undemocratic regimes. Let us do the right thing for ourselves and for our children. These children, 25 percent of our population, are 100 percent of the future of this Nation.

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.)

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

TROOPS IN IRAQ WILL ONCE AGAIN BE EXPOSED TO DEADLY CHEMICALS

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I am here to talk on behalf of three doctors and myself. I was a physician during the Vietnam War. I was in Long Beach. I saw the troops coming back from the Vietnam War, and I saw what the war did to them. I also have been in government since then and have seen how our government for many years denied that