

the State Department and by our government.

□ 1600

It is a card. It is an I.D. card. Foreign governments now have every right to give their nationals any kind of identification that they want to. But what is odd and what has happened in the last several months is that the government of Mexico has charged its consular officials here in the United States with the responsibility of going out and actually lobbying State and local governments to get them to accept this matricula consular card from their nationals who are living here illegally, because, of course, that card has only one purpose. If you are in the United States of America, if you are a national from a foreign country who is here and if you are here legally, you have some documentation to that effect. We have given you a green card. We have given you a passport. Whatever it is, you have documentation from the United States that you are here legally.

If you are here illegally, you need some sort of identification, and that is what this card provides. Recognizing that, and recognizing that they cannot get amnesty through the Congress, they have begun to go to State and local governments all over the United States, lobbying them to get them to accept this card.

They have done it to the banking industry, and the banks have been all too happy to go along with it, looking at their bottom line, looking at profits, even over the security of the Nation, because there is nothing secure about these cards. There is no way to guarantee that the person holding the card is who in fact that card says he is. In fact, we have already arrested people in this country carrying three or four of these identification cards. Their picture is on them, but different names on each card. They are easily fraudulently developed.

So the idea that they have some sort of advantage because they have a secure card is ridiculous. Beyond that, it is again attempting to do exactly the same thing we did not do in the Congress, and that is to give everybody amnesty. Because if you can use this matricula consular card to obtain bank accounts, to get your kids in school, to get housing from the housing authority in their area, get your driver's license, get your library card, everything that a citizen of this country can use their own identification for, if you can do that using this matricula consular card given to you by a foreign government, then of course there is no reason to actually push for amnesty. You will have achieved it. Everyone living in the United States of America illegally, up to 20 million people, will have this card given to them by their government.

By the way, it is now just Mexico and Honduras and I think there are five other countries in South and Central America providing this card now. What is to say that other countries would

not demand exactly the same thing from the United States? Why would the government of Syria not say that they are going to give people living here in the United States illegally this card? How would we tell them that they cannot do that or we will not accept it?

Not only that, we have found the administration, just a little bit ago, we found the regs that have been promulgated by the Department of Treasury now allow the banks to accept these cards. So our own administration, our own government is in league with the governments of these foreign countries who have given these cards to their nationals living illegally in the United States. Our own government is helping these people violate our own laws. That is the truth of the matter. That is an abomination, and that is something we should not allow to go forward.

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

(Mr. LIPINSKI 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 Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

REJECT UNFAIR REPUBLICAN TAX CUTS

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

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, now that we have declared victory over Iraq, the country's attention will turn once again to important domestic priorities. Unfortunately, we find our economy in a great slump.

The President and my Republican colleagues come before you with a program that I believe is woefully inadequate, because all they have done is trot out their all-purpose solution to domestic problems: More tax cuts. I would say to my Republican colleagues that was then, this is now.

In the year 2000, we had a surplus, a \$5.6 billion surplus. At that time, then-Governor George Bush said he wanted to give the surplus back to the taxpayers and invigorate the economy. I would suggest that the economy has not been invigorated. Two years later millions have lost their jobs and we are looking at deficits of \$2 trillion going forth over the next 10 years.

So the question Americans should ask is, why do they want to cut taxes now if the rationale for the tax cut in 2001 was that we had a surplus? We do not have a surplus today. We have huge deficits today. We also have a war

against terrorism and a homeland security program to fund.

Reducing government resources at a time of war against Iraq and a war against terrorism just does not make sense. It is kind of like George Bush said when he was running for President, "It is fuzzy math."

In the year 2001, President Bush passed through his tax cut, \$1.3 trillion, saying it would stimulate the economy. Again, 2 years later, economic growth stands at a mere 1 percent, compared to the 4 percent growth from 1996 to 2000 during the Clinton administration.

Additionally, despite President Bush's promise in his 2001 tax cut that he would invigorate the economy, 2.7 million Americans have lost their jobs. The stock market has lost about 40 percent of its value, roughly \$7 trillion.

The tax cut program did not work. Their all-purpose solution just does not cut it. But that did not deter my conservative colleagues. This week on the House floor we will hear more of the same. We have the Bush tax cut, and now we have the tax cut of the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS).

Originally the Bush plan would provide a tax cut of \$27,000 for households earning more than \$1 million a year. The top 5 percent would receive 64 percent of all the tax cut breaks. That seems pretty bad. But along comes the Thomas tax bill that we are going to consider this week. It is even more unfair. According to the Brookings Institute analysis, the average tax cut offered under the Thomas proposal for households earning more than \$1 million would be, get this, \$43,000 for people earning more than \$1 million a year. The top 5 percent of American households would get 75 percent of the tax cut.

So when they tell you the tax cut is for everybody, do not buy it. It is clearly a tax cut for the rich. When you give the Republicans these numbers, they say okay, we are giving a tax cut to the rich, but the rich create jobs and the jobs will trickle down. Remember, that was then, this is now. The tax cuts in 2001, \$1.3 trillion, did not invigorate the economy, did not create jobs. People in fact lost jobs. Tax cuts for the wealthy do not stimulate the economy.

Let me talk a little bit about why it is even more unfair. They make the tax cuts for the wealthy permanent. Remember that 75 percent goes to the wealthy. Those are permanent. When it comes to the child care tax credit that could benefit working Americans, what happens? Well, the child care tax credit drops from \$1,000 in 2005 to \$700 in 2006, and after 2006 the child care tax credit is phased out, so working Americans get nothing.

The same thing with small business. My Republican colleagues say, well, we will make the dividend tax cut for the very wealthy permanent, but the small business tax cuts and tax breaks to provide more deductions for small businesses and help them expand and create jobs, they phase out after 5 years.

After 5 years, small businesses get nothing.

Now, there is another element to this issue, and that is called State aid. What is happening here is the Federal Government is just passing along tax increases to the States. They say "we are cutting your taxes." But what happens when the States do not have enough money, as is the case now? They cut Medicaid, they cut child care subsidies, they cut education. So that means what, either you lose programs at the State level, or you get a tax increase at the State level, while the Republicans tell you we are giving a tax cut to the very wealthy at the Federal level.

We Democrats believe that if we want to stimulate this economy we do a couple of things. We give money directly to the American working class. Second, we give money to the States so they can hire people, build roads, improve our infrastructure. That is how you create jobs.

There is a consensus among economists that this tax plan will not work. I think this dog will not hunt. I think we need to reject the Republican proposal this week.

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

(Ms. KAPTUR 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 Washington (Mr. INSLEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

SUPPORT THE JOBS AND GROWTH TAX ACT OF 2003

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H.R. 2, the President's Jobs and Growth Tax Act of 2003. There is no need for further debate on this bill: America needs economic stimulus, and it needs it now. Congress cannot stand on the sidelines while too many of our fellow citizens cannot find work or are on the verge of being laid off. That is why I support the Jobs and Growth Tax Act of 2003.

This important legislation will help expand business investment by eliminating the double tax on corporate income. This plan encourages investments that help small businesses grow. I believe more tax relief means more jobs.

Small businesses are becoming more and more important to the Nation's overall business activity. They create the majority of new jobs and account

for half the economy's private output. For this reason, this package gives small businesses the ability to immediately expense up to \$75,000 instead of the current write-off of \$25,000 for capital purchases. This encourages small businesses to buy technology, machinery and other equipment that they need to expand and meet the needs of their consumers.

The Flower Mound Chamber in my district expressed their support of the provision since they have over 725 companies that will be able to benefit. These small businesses in my district will receive a tax cut of at least \$2,000 each, money that can be used to hire additional workers, boost current workers' pay or reinvest in their company. Any amount of money that a small business can save today will result in business growth and development in the years to come.

The Jobs and Growth Tax Act will create at least 1 million jobs by the end of 2004, according to the Heritage Foundation.

With the increase in the child tax credit and elimination of the marriage penalty, with those savings an additional 300,000 jobs will be created.

Over the recent district work period, I conducted 10 town hall meetings in my district. At almost every event constituents asked about the economy and asked about tax cuts for stimulus. Many out-of-work or underemployed people begged for relief soon. We cannot let these Americans down.

Also, May marks the month hundreds of students will graduate from local colleges and universities and from the two universities in my district. These young people, having completed their education, will enter the job market eager to contribute. We owe it to future generations to stimulate our economy now to ensure that jobs are available in the future.

ISSUES AFFECTING AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I am certainly proud to be here this afternoon, and wanted to talk some about the issues that we are facing here in Washington.

I am proud to say that while the national news has really focused, and rightfully so, on the war in Iraq, the House has not only supported our military efforts, but we have been working on a very good, pro-growth, pro-jobs domestic agenda. We have a good jobs package that will be voted on this week, we have passed a good energy bill, we have passed a good education bill, and we will be working on a Medicare reform bill very soon. So I am optimistic about the things that the House has been doing.

We hear a lot of partisan politics and a lot of bashing. I guess one of the

things that is frustrating to me is that while we hear people, as one of the previous speakers was talking about tax breaks for the wealthy, and that just seems to be the Democrat buzz phrase for hatred and division in society, what I have been curious about is tear down somebody else's policy or plan, if you want to, but offer your own.

It is always curious, we do not hear too many alternatives from the other party. I say, look, hey, this floor is the great hall of debate. Whether you are liberal or conservative, urban or rural, bring your ideas to the floor. Offer your ideas in the form of amendments. Offer your ideas in the form of legislation, and let us see what we can do. Bring the best of the Democrats, the best of the Republicans, together to do what is best for America.

It is always disappointing when you hear people just attack legislation when it is clear they have not even read the bill. Yet on the other hand, Mr. Speaker, you cannot take the politics out of politics, so what the heck, let us just move on with it.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk a little bit about the war in Iraq. I have to continuously brag about the 3rd Infantry Division in Hinesville, Georgia, Fort Stewart. I am wearing their patch on my lapel, which was given to me by the wives organizations down there. I am very proud of what they did. We followed them up the Euphrates River as they marched on to Baghdad.

□ 1615

Also, Mr. Speaker, I am glad to say that I have had more constituents in the last month sleep in Saddam Hussein's palace than I have who have eaten in French restaurants. That is probably going to continue to be the case as the months and weeks pass by.

But in terms of the mission in Iraq, liberating Iraq, one of the things that we have had in Congress is many former Iraqi citizens who have come to seek refuge in the United States of America, many women. And these are women whose fathers or brothers were abducted, sisters and cousins, and for very small offenses, such as starting peace movements or protesting this or that. And they lived under the oppression of Saddam Hussein's regime. And it was a common practice that if he had a critic he would take their wife or their daughter and videotape sexual abuses of them and show it back to the male members of the family and say, get in line, get behind our program, or we will continue it. What a harsh way to deal with enemies.

We are, of course, finding mass graves. Amnesty International, which is not exactly a pro-American organization, estimated that there are anywhere between 70,000 and 150,000 Iraqis who have disappeared, unaccounted for, the highest number of any nation in the world. And now we are seeing these mass graves and trying to identify the loved ones of the Iraqi people.

But all of these folks have told us over and over again, we need an outside