

sector retiree health initiatives because retirees no longer have faith in their employers' promises.

Last Congress, this bill garnered national support from retirees across the country. My office received hundreds of testimonials from people affected by these cutbacks, and tonight I want to share three.

From my own district in Massachusetts: Leo Murphy of Ipswich, who is the regional Vice President of the National Association of Retired Sears Employees, which represents 154,000 retirees nationally, has this to say: "H.R. 1322 will ensure that companies don't sell out their retirees whose hard work grew the companies in the first place. We all made plans anticipating our retirement years, and those plans have all been torn apart. Enactment of H.R. 1322 will restore credibility to private sector health care plans and assure that retirees and their families continue to have the health coverage they were promised and worked for all their lives."

From a retiree in Morristown, New Jersey: "What a hardship it has been to see the health coverage I retired with, and fully expected to continue as is, be constantly whittled away. It just isn't fair. Not only is it eating into my pension every year, but my pension has not received a cost of living increase for the past 10 years. Please help us; we are counting on you. And thank you again for caring about us."

And from Wellington, Florida:

"I am writing you concerning retiree benefits. I retired in 1991. Since that time, the company has reneged on promised retiree life insurance. The company has also made the retiree medical plan almost unaffordable by raising premiums far beyond the normal type increase. They have cut averages and cut coverages, they have raised deductibles, and made it pretty obvious that retirees are a liability, and please go away is the preferred method of handling retirees. Legislation is needed to protect retirees from vigilante actions of companies and protect retirees from unscrupulous company executives. Since many companies can no longer act in a trustworthy manner towards retirees, it will take Federal legislation to protect retirees when those retirees are the most vulnerable and least able to provide replacement benefits."

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for their courtesy, because I have received hundreds of testimonials from these people. Congress should act, and I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting H.R. 1322.

□ 1745

WHAT COULD AMERICA DO DIFFERENTLY TO PREPARE FOR ANOTHER SEPTEMBER 11?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONNER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia

(Mr. KINGSTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, imagine if we could rewind the tape, we could rewind it back to September 10, 2001. We are sitting around looking at the world. We know that in 1993, the World Trade Center was bombed. We know that 17 Americans were killed when the USS *Cole* was bombed in Yemen. We know that two embassies in Africa have been bombed. We have withdrawn from Somalia.

If it was September 10, 2001, and we were taking a sober assessment of the world, what would we do differently? Particularly what would we do differently as respects the events of September 11?

Mr. Speaker, obviously we cannot rewind the tape ever, but the reality is we are sitting potentially on another September 10 date right now. We have been in this world for a long time. We are looking at a world where Saddam Hussein had 90 days from April, 1991, to disarm after withdrawing from Kuwait and after the U.N. action that we know of as Desert Storm.

We know that in the 12 years that followed April 19, 1991, he flaunted the weapons inspection process. We know that weapons inspectors such as Scott Ritter quit in disgust. We know that it was criticized. We know that he went 4 years without having U.N. weapons inspectors. We know that indeed 17 U.N. resolutions have gone by.

Our President has been very patient with the U.N. diplomatic process. It is too bad that it failed. It is too bad that maybe the U.N. could have stepped forward a little bit stronger during any of the time in the last 12 years, but that did not happen. Maybe the future of the U.N. should be debated in another Chamber at another date.

The reality is Saddam Hussein has chemical and biological weapons, and has tried to get nuclear weapons. We know that he has murdered hundreds of his fellow men. We know that Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch estimates that there is something like 70,000 to 150,000 people who have disappeared in Iraq, which is more than any other country in the world.

We know that in the year 2000 they implemented tongue amputations as a way of dealing with their enemies. We know that he uses torture. We know that he drills people. We know that he rapes people. He films things like this and shows it to family members. We know that, indeed, he has killed some of his own family members.

The message from the United States of America to the people of Iraq is that the enemy of Iraq is not the United States of America; rather, the enemy of Iraq is their own government; very specifically, Saddam Hussein.

We in America stand against oppression. We in America stand for the liberation of the people of Iraq. We in America stand for our own homeland and national security, and we in America stand for our own troops, who at

this moment are abroad and ready for action.

I hope that in the 11th hour of this long process Saddam Hussein decides to step forward and save his country as he knows it and to help support another regime. I hope we do not have to pull the trigger; but should we need to do that, we will be successful. We will liberate the people of Iraq. We will do the right thing.

Mr. Speaker, let me close with just saying that on this very critical hour in our history, we all say a prayer for our troops, and we all stand behind our troops. God bless America.

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

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

THE BUDGET RESOLUTION

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

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, the last few weeks have been a time of solemn reflection and debate in this country. It has been an impassioned and peaceful process with many voices heard, which have again reinforced the United States as the world's greatest democracy.

We owe our system of democracy and self-concern to America's veterans, who have given so much to ensure its legacy. Today our military is once again on the brink of a great sacrifice in the name of security and freedom for America and the rest of the world. Without reservation, it is time for all Americans to come together to support our men and women in uniform and their families back home. Our country's focus must now be on the success of their mission.

I urge every American to join with the Congress and our President to wish our Armed Forces Godspeed and safe return from abroad. However, we must not lose sight of our mission at home, the mission of our police officers, firefighters, and emergency personnel, our first-line responders, in the event of a terrorist attack that might occur.

While our Armed Forces have our full support, the front lines of our homeland and hometown security are our cities, counties, and towns. We must equip our first-line responders the same as we equip our military abroad.

Since the fall of 2001, local governments all over America have had to bear the burden of equipping and training all of our first responders against an unknown threat. My district, which is the Second Congressional District in Maryland, is home to two Army bases, the Port of Baltimore, Baltimore-Washington International Airport, and

the 17th largest city in the country. This lack of funding directly affects every community in our metropolitan area.

Last year the Baltimore region alone spent more than \$14 million to protect itself. Cities, counties, and towns cannot do it by themselves; they need Federal funding to equip our first-line responders. We must train our first-line responders. We must give them the equipment to protect themselves so that they can protect us in the event that there is a terrorist attack.

Put against a tax cut that equals \$117 billion, \$3.5 billion is not asking for too much to protect and to give the resources to our front-line responders. I urge my colleagues across the aisle to reconsider their budget priorities so that they better reflect the priorities of the American people as it relates to our protection and our security. We must provide the tools necessary to our first responders that would protect our citizens.

In today's Washington Post, the Secretary of Homeland Security, Tom Ridge, said that the President plans to propose a supplemental Federal budget to pay for more counterterrorism measures. I applaud that; however, for the sake of our country, our citizens, our hometown, our homeland, I hope these counterterrorism measures include more resources for local governments and first responders.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. LYNCH 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 gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Ms. LEE addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

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

PROPOSED BUDGET FAILS TO PROVIDE FOR HOMELAND SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about the budget we are going to have tomorrow. A budget needs to reflect what our national priorities are. That is what a budget is all about, making choices.

I want to tell the Members, although I made several attempts, as well as many members of our committee, to make changes in the budget, all of those were defeated. I am going to talk just a minute about one of those issues, and that is homeland defense.

This is a time, Mr. Speaker, when more than ever we need to make sure that our counties and cities and States are well-equipped for our national security. This budget fails to adequately provide for our homeland security. The President said we were \$2.2 billion short in homeland security. The Secretary said we were short \$2.2 billion for homeland security. Yet this budget leaves that shortfall.

Let me just talk a minute about what is happening in our State. Our State has high unemployment. We are laying off our police and our firefighters. Our young men and women who are in law enforcement are being called up for the National Guard and being sent to the Middle East, and many are already in the Middle East. Our local communities frequently do not have equipment that talks to one another, communicates with one another.

What we are trying to do in this budget and what the Republican budget lacks is the money to make sure that our local police and our local fire departments and our local emergency workers, not only that we have adequate personnel, but that we have the equipment so they can respond if there is a terrorist attack in the United States and in our communities.

I cannot believe that we are going to do a budget at a time like this that does not respond to our local communities and our local States for those people that are going to be the first line of defense.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL).

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, this Republican budget resolution is a failed economic plan that proposes \$1 trillion in tax cuts in search of an economic purpose. This budget follows President Bush's \$1.3 trillion tax cut 14 months ago to get this economy moving and produce jobs. That was the argument behind the original tax cut.

The net result is 2.5 million Americans today are without work who had work prior to that tax cut, and there are 4 million more Americans without health care who prior to that tax cut had health care, 2 million more Americans who have moved from the middle class to poverty prior to that tax cut, and \$1 trillion worth of corporate assets have been foreclosed on and hit Chapter 11. That has been the net effect of this tax cut.

Now, what are we about to do? We are about to put our foot on the accelerator 14 months later for another \$1 trillion plus tax cut that will have the same effect of lost jobs, lost health care, lost corporations and family dreams, and more and more Americans moving from middle class to poverty.

We need to move the trend the other way. We need an economic plan, not just a tax cut. While we consider this budget, we as a Nation, as one Nation, as one country, are moving closer to war. We also have a plan now for that war and for after that war to rebuild Iraq; in the range of \$100 billion they are talking about rebuilding Iraq. The administration's postwar request would build more housing, more schools, and go further in providing health care for pregnant woman in Iraq than this budget provides Americans. The Wall Street journal wrote on Monday that the postwar reconstruction of Iraq is ambitious in scope and speed.

I want to read some of the juxtapositions that are playing here, so as Members on the other side think about their vote, it just does not get glossed over by one fix or two in what we here in this Chamber call the manager's amendment.

Let me read under health care. Medicaid provides insurance coverage for over one-third of the live births nationally here in this country, yet Medicaid is scheduled for a \$95 billion cut. In Iraq after the war, maternity care will be guaranteed for 100 percent of the population.

The U.S. budget we are about to vote on does not provide a single dollar of health insurance for the uninsured in this country, where we have 42 million Americans who work full time without health care. In Iraq after the war, 13 million people, half the population, will be guaranteed health care coverage.

Under education, the U.S. budget cuts Head Start for 28,000 children, cuts education spending by 8 percent, zeroes out 40 new programs, like technology, like Star Schools. In Iraq, there will be guaranteed books and supplies and 100