

CONGRATULATING TONY HOPSON ON BEING HONORED AS THIS YEAR'S FIRST CITIZEN OF PORTLAND

(Mr. BLUMENAUER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, this evening in Portland, Oregon, Tony Hopson is going to be recognized as our First Citizen, special recognition for a special gentleman who has developed an innovative program for young people that for 20 years has not only helped Portland's youth and stabilized our neighborhoods; it has provided significant impact in terms of being a critical foundation for the revitalization of critical areas of northeast Portland. Not only has his program touched the lives of thousands of young people; it has been a signal about how communities can come together and solve problems, bringing out the best in everyone. The success goes beyond our children and our neighborhoods. All who have had the privilege of working with him and his team have been influenced for the better.

I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, that our community is recognizing Mr. Hopson as our First Citizen, important recognition for an outstanding leader and an innovative program.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

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

#### THE WISDOM OF TAX CUTS

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, the current tax debate is more about politics than serious economics. Both sides use demagoguery but propose only modest tax cuts. The benefits that could come from the current tax cut proposal, unfortunately, are quite small and not immediate.

Some say tax cuts raise revenues by addressing economic activity, thus providing Congress with even more money to spend. Others say lowering taxes simply lowers revenues and increases deficits. Some say we must target tax cuts to the poor and the middle class so they will spend more money. Others say tax cuts should be targeted to the rich so they can invest and create jobs. We must accept that it is hard to give tax cuts to people who do not pay

taxes. But we could, if we wanted, cut payroll taxes for lower-income workers.

The truth is, government officials cannot know what consumers and investors will do if they get a tax cut. Plugging tax cut data into a computer and expecting an accurate projection of the economic outcome is about as reliable as asking Congress to project government surpluses. Two important points are purposely ignored: first, the money people earn is their own, and they have a moral right to keep as much of it as possible. It is not Congress' money to spend. Government spending is the problem. Taking a big chunk of the people's earnings out of the economy, whether through taxes or borrowing, is always harmful. Taxation is more honest and direct and the harm is less hidden. Borrowing, especially since the Federal Reserve creates credit out of thin air to loan to big spenders in Congress, is more deceitful. It hides the effects and delays the consequences. But over the long term, this method of financing is much more dangerous.

The process by which the Fed monetizes debt and accommodates Congress contributes to, if not causes, most of our problems. This process of government financing generates the business cycle and thus increases unemployment. It destroys the value of the dollar and thus causes price inflation. It encourages deficits by reducing restraints on congressional spending. It encourages an increase in the current account deficit, the dollar being the reserve currency of the world, and causes huge foreign indebtedness. It reflects a philosophy of instant gratification that says, live for the pleasures of today and have future generations pay the bills.

Two final points to remember: whether or not people can keep what they earn is first a moral issue, and second an economic issue. Tax cuts should never be referred to as a "cost to government." Tax cuts should be much bigger and come much sooner for everyone.

Remember, the real issue is total spending by government. Yet this issue is ignored or politicized by both sides of the aisle here in Congress. The political discussion about whether to cut taxes has avoided the real issue and instead has degenerated into charges of class and party warfare, with both sides lusting for power. Of course, the great issue for the ages, namely, what is the proper role for government in a constitutional republic, is totally ignored. Yet another question remains: Are the American people determined they still wish to have a constitutional Republic?

□ 1930

#### DISSENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida). Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HINCHEY. Madam Speaker, to publicly disagree with the President in wartime is seen by some as being somehow un-American. However, such dissent in this country has a long and distinguished heritage. Thomas Jefferson and James Madison protested John Adams' undeclared war against France. Madison in turn presided over a war so unpopular that it caused the New England States to consider secession. Abraham Lincoln and John Quincy Adams also criticized President James Polk's war on Mexico; and Theodore Roosevelt harshly criticized President Woodrow Wilson's handling of World War I.

Efforts to stifle criticism of the President and his administration during war also have a long history in this country. The Sedition Act of 1798 led to the arrest of many who criticized the Adams administration. A new Sedition Act was passed and enforced during World War I. It was not until 1964 that the Supreme Court effectively eliminated the crime of sedition in the United States and reaffirmed the constitutional right of free expression.

But my own recent experience and the experience of others who opposed military action against Iraq demonstrates that there are still many who believe freedom of speech should be curtailed when American troops go into battle. Respected elected officials have been lambasted for criticizing President Bush's foreign policy failures. Musical groups have been boycotted for making their anti-war feelings known. A screening of Bull Durham at the Baseball Hall of Fame was cancelled because two of its stars are outspoken peace advocates.

When Lincoln was challenged to defend his dissent in 1848, he explained that the Founding Fathers' decision to give war-making powers to Congress was primarily influenced by a long history of oppressive kings involving their peoples in wars under the pretense that it was for the public good. "But your view," Lincoln argued to his correspondent, "destroys the whole matter and places our President where kings have always stood."

Lincoln saw a great peril in the contention that the President should be the sole judge of the necessity to invade another country. He wrote, "Allow the President to invade a neighboring nation whenever he shall deem it necessary . . . and you allow him to make war at his pleasure."

Theodore Roosevelt had strong views on the need to speak out in wartime. Regarding the Sedition Act of 1918, Roosevelt wrote, "To announce that there must be no criticism of the President, or that we are to stand by the President, right or wrong, is not only unpatriotic and servile, but it is morally treasonable to the American public." In that one eloquent sentence, Roosevelt neatly summed up the point

that needs to be made. When we disagree with the President and his administration during a war, we have not merely a right but a responsibility to publicly air those disagreements. Accepting that responsibility is imperative for the survival of the Republic as we know it. Without it the checks and balances of our separated system of government would be lost. The suppression of dissent in wartime would provide an unscrupulous or overzealous President with additional motivation to wage war. Senator Robert LaFollette said it best on a speech on the Senate floor in 1917. "It is no answer . . . to say that when the war is over, the citizen may once more resume his rights and feel some security in his liberty and passion. . . . If every preparation for war can be made the excuse for destroying free speech and a free press . . . then we may well despair of ever again finding ourselves for a long period in a state of peace."

LaFollette was not un-American nor were Abraham Lincoln or Theodore Roosevelt. They were patriots in the true sense of the word as are Michael Moore and Susan Sarandon and the Dixie Chicks. Patriotism is defined as "love for or devotion to one's country." Our country is not one President or one administration or one military action or even one flag. It is a place where we are free to openly disagree with our President and his decisions. That is what our country stands for. That is the principle to which we are devoted, and that is what we love.

The most recent ostensible reason we went to war to remove Saddam's regime was to bring this principle to Iraq. Would we have any credibility as freedom preachers if there were no public disagreement in our own home? Vocal displays of dissent during war do not hurt the cause of democracy and freedom. On the contrary, they provide a shining example for those parts of the world that are not yet free. Let us continue to show the world what it is like to live in a country where one can protest against its leaders without fear of reprisal. Let us continue to speak out. Let us continue to be true patriots.

#### THE OLD MAN OF THE MOUNTAIN

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

Mr. BASS. Madam Speaker, 4 days ago New Hampshire lost an old friend. It went unnoticed probably between 2 a.m. in the morning on Saturday. The Old Man of the Mountain collapsed and fell a thousand feet off the face of Canon Mountain, and I know New Hampshire mourns the loss of this great icon as if it were a friend. We all got to know the Old Man of the Mountain very well. We take it and took it very seriously. I remember as a child driving up through Franconia Notch and always stopping to see the Old Man

because it was really an extraordinary landmark. As recently as a month and a half ago, I drove down through Franconia Notch with my two children, ages nine and eleven, and we stopped for a moment just to take a look at it and get a quick photograph. Indeed, it was an extraordinary symbol of our State.

I have to say, however, that its loss was not totally unexpected. As long ago as 1880, people began to notice that there was some cracking and slipping beginning on this face, and it has continued to deteriorate over the years, and there have been organizations and groups who formed over the years to try to preserve it, but ultimately the day came when this 10,000-year-old rock formation which consists of over seven different ledges together to create this illusion of a face finally perished.

What does this loss mean for my State of New Hampshire? As I said a minute ago, the Old Man of the Mountain was indeed an icon for New Hampshire; yet it meant something different to each and every one of us. To some it was a tourist attraction, an important part of the local economy. As I said a minute ago, it was a childhood memory for me and my children and countless millions of other people not only from New Hampshire but all over the country. And most importantly, perhaps it is a symbol of what New Hampshire is all about and what New Hampshire has been for the last 200 years.

Indeed, those of us from New Hampshire take this symbol very seriously. The Old Man of the Mountain is on every single road sign of New Hampshire, every single license plate in the State. Highway tokens have the Old Man's face on it. The U.S. commemorative quarter for New Hampshire has the Old Man on it and the postage stamp which was created a couple of decades ago commemorating the Old Man of the Mountain.

I want to quote Daniel Webster, if I could, who served in Congress from New Hampshire over 200 years ago. He once wrote of the Old Man: "In the mountains of New Hampshire, God almighty has hung out a sign to show that he makes men."

We will all miss the Old Man of the Mountain. He is gone. But like any loss, his symbol and his memory will live on and New Hampshire will be a greater and stronger State as a result.

#### THE REPUBLICAN TAX PLAN

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, budgeting is about choices, whether they are a working family or the Federal Government. Working families know far too well that they cannot afford everything. They often must decide between making a mortgage payment or taking a family vacation or

between paying for health insurance or buying a new car. Their decisions reveal their priorities. It is more important to have a safe home for their families and to know that they can take their children to the doctor if they get sick. Parents routinely forego luxuries in order to ensure their children are safe and secure. The future of their children is clearly a top priority.

Just like working families, the Federal Government has limited resources, and just like working families, the decisions we make about how to use our limited resources say a great deal about our priorities. The tax package presented by the Republican leadership once again reveals what we have known for a long, long while: Working families are not their priority. When push comes to shove and difficult decisions are made under the Republican leadership, working families get the short end of the stick each and every time.

The message Republicans are sending with their tax package is clear: If one is wealthy, if one is heavily invested, they deserve a huge amount of permanent tax relief. If one is a working parent with a child, forget it. Not only will their tax cut be much, much less if they get one at all, it will be temporary. The \$1,000 per child tax credit will be lowered in the year 2006 to \$700, proving once again that families are not a priority.

The message from Republican leaders is clear: Working families are not their priority. I say that is a very bad policy. These are the toughest fiscal times that our States have seen in decades, and working families are suffering the consequences. As States are forced to tighten their belts and make cuts, teachers are losing their jobs and children are being taught in overcrowded classrooms. State health insurance programs now cover fewer children and are not providing as many services, and in many States families must now meet stricter eligibility requirements to enroll in State childcare programs, and all of this is done so the Republicans can give our Nation's wealthiest a big tax cut.

But the fact is we have a choice. We can help States meet these shortfalls or we can give tax breaks we cannot afford to the wealthiest people in this country, people who are actually not particularly feeling the pain of these bad times. The Republican message is inescapable. The rich are more important. If one is among the more than 1 million unemployed workers in this country who have exhausted unemployment benefits, this administration is saying you are certainly not a priority. Instead of extending benefits which would help care for families and immediately stimulate the economy for those who are out of work and out of their unemployment benefits, it is more important to put a little extra cash in the pockets of investors in the hopes they eventually will invest this extra money back into the economy.