

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, a front-page story today in the Washington Post says, "Iraqi political leaders lashed out today at a plan by the top U.S. civilian administrator here to appoint an interim advisory council." The headline says, "Iraqis Assail U.S. Plans."

The front page of the Washington Times has a story today saying, "Unemployed Iraqi soldiers swarmed U.S. occupation headquarters yesterday demanding back pay and emergency payments of \$50 each and avowing vengeance if they didn't get their way."

We are in a real mess in Iraq. Since when did it become the obligation of U.S. taxpayers to pay the salaries of the Iraqi military? When in history has a victorious army had to start paying the salaries of the defeated army? We have already given the retired people on pensions in Iraq emergency payments, handing out two crisp \$20 bills to each, and probably more by now. Since when did it become the obligation of U.S. taxpayers to pay the pensions of Iraqi retirees? Those who support foreign aid found out many years ago that it was very unpopular so they just started putting our foreign aid and overseas spending into every Federal department and agency. The supporters of foreign aid very misleadingly say foreign aid is only about 1 percent of the Federal budget. What they do not say is that we are spending several hundreds of billions of dollars through every Federal department and agency.

I am very pro-military and pro-national defense. However, in many ways today we are turning the Defense Department into the biggest foreign aid agency there is. We were told a few weeks ago that the military is going to build or rebuild 6,000 schools in Iraq and set up a free basic health care plan for all Iraqi citizens. I heard one Member jokingly say that he was going to suggest changing the name of a small town in Wisconsin to the name Iraq so that town could qualify for the huge money that is about to be spent. We are told that the U.S. will spend \$200 to \$300 billion rebuilding Iraq over the next 10 years. This means \$20 to \$30 billion each year in a country where the gross domestic product last year was less than \$60 billion.

Our military did a great job in Iraq, as we all knew they would. But we spent over \$100 billion to defeat a country whose total military budget was only \$1.4 billion, about two-tenths of 1 percent of ours. Saddam Hussein was a very evil man, but Iraq was never any real threat to us, as this 3-week war proved. Now we are in a real mess.

Fortune Magazine, in its November 25 issue a few months before the war started, had an article entitled "Iraq, We Win, What Then?" That article said, "A military victory could turn into a strategic defeat. A prolonged, expensive American-led occupation could turn U.S. troops into sitting ducks for Islamic terrorists. All of that could have immediate and negative

consequences for the global economy." That is exactly what is happening today.

I heard one American general say on the news recently that the American military was not designed to be a police force. Yet that is exactly what we are doing in Iraq today. James Webb, a hero in Vietnam and President Reagan's Secretary of the Navy, wrote before the war: "The issue before us is not whether the U.S. should end the regime of Saddam Hussein but whether we as a Nation are prepared to occupy a territory in the Middle East for the next 30 to 50 years." He was one of many, many conservatives against this war.

Charley Reese, the very popular conservative columnist, wrote a column March 24 entitled "Congratulations" for becoming "the proud mamas and papas of 22 million Iraqis" since we will be providing them with so much. He then wrote:

"I have long been against taxing Americans to solve problems in foreign countries. It seems to me to be a simple proposition. Until an American politician can honestly say that all Americans are healthy and prosperous, that all children attend a clean, well-equipped school, that our entire infrastructure is up to speed, that all of our public health and environmental problems have been solved, then American tax dollars ought to be spent in the United States. I've read the Constitution I don't know how many times, but I never found anywhere in it that Congress can tax Americans and give the money to foreigners, but Congress does it, anyway."

Are true conservatives now for massive foreign aid? I do not think so. Are true conservatives for huge deficit spending? I do not think so. Are true conservatives for world government and the U.S. becoming the world's policeman? I do not think so. Yet we will spend all these many billions in Iraq because a few big multinational companies will make sure we do and because some government officials feel more important if they are placed in charge of other countries.

Charley Reese also wrote in that same column:

"We, of course, will get stuck with the bill and it will cost hundreds of billions of dollars. Some of the politicians' corporate cronies are already being promised lucrative contracts. There's always a profit to be made from war. You and I won't make it; the soldiers, sailors and airmen won't make it. No, as consumers we pay the price in treasure and blood and grief; the big corporations reap the profit."

In yesterday's Washington Post, a story said that some of the same Iraqis who are smiling at U.S. soldiers are harshly criticizing U.S. rule when the soldiers are not around. The Iraqi people hated Hussein, but the only ones who want us around are the ones we are paying.

We should get out of Iraq, Mr. Speaker, the sooner the better and not put

more American lives at risk. We should let Iraqis use their homogenous oil wealth to rebuild their own country.

REPUBLICAN TAX CUT IS UNFAIR

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, after the passage of the largest tax cut in history 2 years ago, the President began to talk about a little glitch in that, and a glitch that no one could have anticipated, not the Republican White House which wrote it, the Republican Senate which passed it, and the Republican House which passed it who deliberately wrote the glitch in, which was, gee, the estate tax would only expire for 1 year and then if you did not die during that 1 year, you would be subject to the full estate tax again. And a number of other taxes were phased back in.

Well, it was not a glitch. They knew about it. They had to do it so they would not bust the bank and that was when they were predicting a surplus. But guess what now? Whoops, here we go again. There is a little glitch in the second largest tax cut in American history passed at the time of the largest deficit in American history 2 weeks ago in the dark of the night, personally written and negotiated by Vice President CHENEY and the Republican leadership of the House and the Senate.

How could they have known that they left out half of the American people? I mean, after all, it was Ari Fleischer who said, "And, of course, for people in the 10 percent bracket, they benefit the most and that's the lowest income workers in America." He went on to say that it certainly does deliver tax relief to the people who pay income taxes. The President surrounds himself with waitresses. But unfortunately it is all a lie because those people are not going to get tax cuts under this bill. In fact, 51 percent of income-tax-paying Oregonians will get no cut under this bill and about 49 percent of income-tax-paying Americans will not get any cut under this bill. 7.6 million people who are in this 10 percent tax bracket that Mr. Fleischer referred to who were supposed to get a lot of benefits are going to get zero, zilch, nada under this bill. But every millionaire is guaranteed \$93,500 or more under this bill.

To even heap more irony on top of the injustice, the \$93,500 for each millionaire will come from FICA taxes, payroll taxes paid by wage-earning Americans. Wage-earning Americans pay about 7 percent of the first dollar they earn and every dollar they earn up to about \$88,000 on FICA tax. In fact, more than half of American workers pay more in FICA taxes to the Federal Government than they do income taxes. No relief for them. And, hey, guess what? We have really suckered you, because we are going to borrow every penny of the FICA taxes you

have paid that you thought was going into a trust fund, in fact, a lockbox, passed seven times while the Republicans have been in charge of this House. Seven times we passed a lockbox for Social Security. Well, we cannot afford a lockbox anymore. It is busted open and robbed. Empty. That money is going to be used to finance the tax cut and replaced with IOUs. So the millionaire who gets a \$93,500 benefit under this bill, they pay a FICA tax at the rate of .7 percent, one-tenth of the rate at which a wage-earning teacher or sales clerk pays that same tax, because they do not pay it on any income over \$88,000 a year.

□ 1845

So \$912,000 of their income is exempt from FICA tax, and the poor person who works for minimum wage or for a decent wage is paying FICA tax of 7 percent on every penny earned.

Finally, they made much hay on the fact that they were going to do so much with the child credit. Of course, it was temporary and going to expire in 2 years, but that is probably a glitch and they would have discovered that later.

But there was another little glitch. Most Americans, in fact, all Americans who earn between \$10,500 and \$26,625 will not get the child care credit. That is an awful lot of people who have an awful lot of need. That includes 11.9 million children.

So, all in all, what we have here is one of the biggest scams in history. Never before has this country in a time of huge deficit borrowing, and that is how this is being paid for, borrowed so much money from so many wage-earning Americans to give to so very few at the top under the premise that somehow those really rich people might invest or spend that money in a way to give those working people jobs so they can pay more FICA taxes that can be transferred to them in next year's tax cuts, which the President has already targeted toward those who earn over \$1 million a year, to help them have more to contribute at election time in what is expected to be a record expensive Presidential election.

The system is incredibly corrupt.

JOBS AND GROWTH, TAX CREDITS AND SMALL BUSINESS

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, last Wednesday President Bush signed the Jobs and Growth Act of 2003, a bill I was proud to cosponsor.

After liberating the people of Iraq from despotism, it was time to liberate the American family from economic uncertainty. The best way to do that is to create jobs and economic growth, and although this bill has been substantially compromised, the bill was designed to do just that. Yet there are

some in this body who still complain. They say the bill is not fair. They say that there is not tax relief for the poor.

Mr. Speaker, they are wrong. First, for all practical purposes, poor people do not pay income taxes. In fact, in this bill, we take 3.7 million Americans off the tax rolls. That is right, almost 4 million people who paid income taxes last year will pay no income taxes this year. None. How much more tax relief can you receive than having your tax bill canceled, torn up, thrown away? These Americans join millions of other low-income Americans who have already been taken off the tax rolls in recent history.

By lowering marginal rates, Mr. Speaker, other lower-income Americans benefit as well. Many who were in the 15 percent bracket last year are now in the 10 percent bracket. The net result is, the bottom 50 percent of wage earners in America now pay 3.9 percent of the income taxes. In contrast, the top 10 percent of wage earners in America pay over 50 percent of the income taxes.

What the critics of this bill fail to appreciate is that tax relief is for taxpayers. If you do not pay taxes, you should not expect tax relief.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that some in this body are confusing tax relief with welfare. Welfare is about direct government assistance to those who are at or near the poverty line. Fortunately, under a Republican Congress we have continued to move millions of Americans from welfare to work, and we have increased Federal child care funding by 166 percent. We have increased funding for housing by 75 percent. Just this past year we committed \$17 billion to the TANF program.

Tax relief is different from welfare. Tax relief is about allowing taxpayers to keep more of what they have earned, earned through their hard work, keeping more of their own wages for their families.

Mr. Speaker, let us not forget, it is not the government's money, it is the American family's money. If critics of the Jobs and Growth Act truly care about low-income people, they should help move them off of welfare, off of welfare checks, onto paychecks. In other words, they should join us in creating jobs.

But, Mr. Speaker, jobs are not to be found hanging in the trees, nor do they fall from the sky, and they sure are not brought to us by the Federal Government. Jobs are created by hard-working, risk-taking, visionary men and women who, with access to capital, roll up their sleeves, and they work hard to create that next generation of software, a new automobile repair shop, an innovative sign painting company, or any other enterprise.

Small business is the job engine of America. It creates two out of three jobs in our country. But, Mr. Speaker, the number one impediment to launching a new job-creating enterprise is access to capital. That is why we cut cap-

ital gains and dividend taxes in this bill. You cannot have capitalism without capital, and by lowering these tax rates, we will spur capital formation, the lifeblood of small business.

Additionally, we have lowered marginal tax rates. This is important, because 80 percent of the tax relief from reducing the top marginal rate goes to small business owners and entrepreneurs.

Mr. Speaker, I have had a number of jobs in my life. I used to clean out chicken houses. I used to bus tables. I have loaded windows on a loading dock. I have been an officer in two companies and started my own small business. In all of those jobs, not one low-income person has ever hired me. It was a taxpayer, a taxpayer who had vision, who had access to capital and went out and took a risk. If we want jobs, these are the people who need tax relief.

If we really care about low-income families in America, and if we truly want to be fair, let us quit trying to turn the Tax Code into a welfare system. Let us give tax relief to taxpayers, to small businessmen, to entrepreneurs, and go out and create jobs, jobs, jobs and more jobs.

TRIBUTE TO JOSEPH ROSEN

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a longtime friend, mentor, fellow activist and one of the most committed and dedicated educators that I have ever known, Mr. Joe Rosen.

Joe died a few days ago at the ripe age of 91, after having devoted much of his adult life to teaching, being a principal, a district superintendent and overall advocate for improving teaching techniques and for finding additional ways to more effectively educate racial minorities and disadvantaged children.

One of Joe's unique characteristics is that he never gave up on the neighborhood where he grew up and sharpened his skills. Mr. Rosen was born and grew up on the west side of Chicago in a community that was predominantly Jewish. He graduated from Marshall High School and put himself through college, working as a taxi driver, at the post office, and as a laundry worker.

His undergraduate studies were at the Chicago Teachers College and he earned a master's degree at DePaul University. Mr. Rosen studied to become a biology teacher, but could not find an opening during the Great Depression. Therefore, he took a job teaching physical education and did that for several years. He loved to tell the story of how he beat out the legendary Chicago Sun Times columnist Irv Kupcinet for a handball instructor's position because he was willing to work for less money.

Joe eventually got a job teaching biology at Wells High School, and in 1947