



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 108th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 150

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MARCH 16, 2004

No. 33

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, March 22, 2004, at 12 noon.

House of Representatives

TUESDAY, MARCH 16, 2004

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CHOCOLA).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 16, 2004.

I hereby appoint the Honorable CHRIS CHOCOLA to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 20, 2004, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) for 5 minutes.

THE REAL WINNER OF THE SPANISH ELECTIONS

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I am here this morning to talk about the recent tragedy in Spain. The real winner

in the Spanish general elections was not the Socialist Party or its new Prime Minister or the Spanish people. The real winners were the terrorists who murdered 201 and wounded over 1,500 Spaniards.

The results in Spain's general elections, in which Prime Minister Jose Maria Aznar's party was defeated while the antiwar Socialist Party came to power after 8 years out of office, can be almost entirely attributed to the devastating terrorist attacks just 3 days before.

Is it a stretch to credit these terrorists with winning the election? Consider this: The day before the train bombings, Aznar's party was predicted to win comfortably. A mere 3 days and a changed nation later, the Socialist Party, whose main election year promise was to pull the Spanish troops out of Iraq, won by 5 percentage points.

It was an incredible change in just 72 hours. All it took was a note from people claiming to be al Qaeda saying they were responsible for the bombing. Prime Minister Aznar was blamed by his countrymen for the bombings, which they linked to his strong support of the war in Iraq. Now the newly elected Spanish Prime Minister is poised to withdraw Spain's 1,300 soldiers in Iraq.

Spain is not the only country under retribution for fighting against terror. Pakistan's President General Musharraf confirmed yesterday that al Qaeda was behind two assassination attempts against him in December.

Mr. Speaker, we have reached a critical moment in the international war

on terror. Al Qaeda has long threatened to attack any country that dares to help us. But now a true and valued ally has been hit, and they have chosen to withdraw from the coalition of the willing.

We extend our sympathies and hand in friendship to the people in Spain, but we must realize that the surest way to encourage terrorism is to let terrorists think that their bombs will make us do their bidding. Retreat will result in more terrorism, not less. Appeasement begets more appeasement, which leads to war. We can either abdicate our responsibilities or face these terrorists with steely resolve.

The Spaniards have their reasons for voting out the Aznar government. They have experienced a shocking ordeal and they responded the only way they knew how in the short time they were given. But the people of America also had to vote against terrorist attacks with a threat of war approaching. In November 2003, the American people stood up to thugs like Osama bin Laden and Saddam Hussein and defied off-year election history by choosing Members of Congress from the President's party who supported our war against terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that al Qaeda is an enemy of us and Western civilization, not just against our allies in the war who are fighting terror. In the international alignment of us versus them, the opponents are not the coalition of the willing or, quote, Old Europe, not warriors or pacifists. The two sides are tyranny and democracy. Al Qaeda's mission is

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H1077

not about particular countries; its hate transcends borders. As cited by David Brooks in the New York Times today, quote, "You love life and we love death," unquote, the purported terrorist said in the videotape found in Madrid.

We are distinguished not by nationality but that we choose freedom and the rule of law and the terrorists choose rule by force. We resolve our disputes at the ballot box, they with bombs.

Furthermore, just because a country does not back the war in Iraq does not mean that it is safe from terror either. Of Spain itself, Osama bin Laden himself said long ago about Spain, modern Spain was al Qaeda's enemy because in 1492 the Spaniards removed all Muslims from their country. But also Osama bin Laden named Canada as one of al Qaeda's enemies, even though our northern neighbor has been especially vocal in opposing intervention in Iraq. Turkey refused to let us invade Iraq from its territory but it, too, suffered terrorist attacks anyway.

Mr. Speaker, these terrorists may use the excuse of Iraq to justify their massacre of innocents, but the fact of the matter is that their groups and these groups like al Qaeda are irrational and remorseless. They are barbarians and their only goal is the death of the West. For we, the freedom-loving people, appeasement, capitulation, and negotiation with terrorists are not options. How the civilized world responds to this challenge will determine the future of our society.

IRRESPONSIBILITY WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 20, 2004, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) is recognized during morning hour debates.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, one week ago today, the majority leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), told the Members of this body and the national television audience watching C-SPAN, and I quote, "It is responsibility week here in the House." "It is responsibility week here in the House."

Well, Mr. Speaker, the majority leader was only half right. Last week indeed was responsibility week, but the real responsibility was being exercised not here in this House but on the other side of Capitol Hill.

While we named post office buildings, honored professional sports teams, and passed legislative solutions in search of national problems, the other Chamber adopted a bipartisan pay-as-you-go measure that repudiates the central fiction of the Republican Party's fuzzy math: that we can somehow reign in record budget deficits created by the Bush administration and the Republican-controlled Congress while ignoring the consequences of tax cuts.

Do not take it from me, my Republican friends.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair must remind all Members not to characterize the actions of the Senate.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, as responsible?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Either way.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, do not take it from me, my Republican friends, listen to a respected Member of your own party, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG.) In February Chairman YOUNG said, and I quote, "No one should expect a significant deficit reduction as a result of austere nondefense discretionary spending limits. The numbers simply do not add up." So said the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, one of the most respected Members of this body.

And why do not the numbers add up? Because nondefense discretionary spending represents only 17 percent of the entire Federal budget. The fact of the matter is we could wipe out all domestic discretionary spending, the funding for this House, the funding for the Senate, FBI, CIA, NIH, NASA, all of that. If you wipe it all out, we would still be running a deficit of more than \$100 billion.

Yet this week the Republican majority continues its markup of a budget resolution for fiscal year 2005 that utterly ignores mathematical and fiscal reality. By applying pay-go rules to spending only, the Republican budget resolution pretends that making existing tax cuts permanent or enacting new ones are a freebie with no budgetary impact. But, of course, that is false. And if one said it, it might even be a lie.

The truth is this Republican budget resolution cuts taxes while spending the entire \$1 trillion Social Security surplus between fiscal year 2005 and 2009. All of it. Every nickel of Social Security surplus, spent. And it would continue to do so in subsequent years.

The truth is the Republican budget resolution would make our deficits \$247 billion worse over the next 5 years under current law. And over 10 years it would increase the deficit, already projected by the Congressional Budget Office at \$2 trillion, by another \$1.6 trillion.

There are a lot of young people who are going to pay the price for our profligacy and irresponsibility. Indeed, this budget resolution proposal, as has the economic policies of this administration, been immoral to the extent that they adversely affect generations to come. And the truth is this budget resolution would freeze funding for domestic appropriations outside of Homeland Security to make room, not for defense, not for homeland security, but for new tax cuts.

For years House Republicans preened as, quote, deficit hawks. Some even suggested that tax cuts are not in fact

sacrosanct. For example, in 1997 the majority leader himself, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) who I quoted earlier, said of Jack Kemp, you all remember Jack Kemp, he served in this body, a member of the Committee on Appropriations, candidate for Vice President of the United States, he quoted and he said the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) said this: "Jack Kemp worships at the altar of tax cuts. Jack has always said that deficits do not matter."

Now, this is the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) the majority leader, the Republican leader of this House. He concluded by saying, quote, "We think that deficits do matter."

What a tragedy for our country and for our young people that the policies do not follow that conviction. My Republican friends, this week and next you are going to show the American people whether you are really serious about reducing the deficit you created or whether you are simply taking it and lack the courage to make the tough choices.

Now, when I say the deficit of your creation, let me remind all of our colleagues the first 4 years took us on a straight line out of deficit financing and the last 4 years, for the first time in 8 decades, in the lifetime of anybody older than 80, was in surplus for 4 years straight. So this administration inherited a budget surplus which they said, not what we Democrats said, which they said was \$5.6 trillion surplus over 10 years that they had to work with. It is now \$4 trillion of debt. That is what I refer to as immoral.

As Republican Senator JOHN MCCAIN said last week in supporting pay-go rules that apply to existing as well as future tax cuts, and I will quote again, Senator JOHN MCCAIN.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If the gentleman will suspend. The Chair must remind Members not to quote Senators.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry. While I cannot characterize the debate that occurs on the other side or characterize the position of the Senate itself, is the Parliamentarian or is the Speaker saying that the quoting of a Member who happens to be a Member of the United States Senate is contrary to the rules of this House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct. The gentleman may be identified as a sponsor of a measure but his remarks may not be quoted.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, let me say to my friends that a prominent American has said recently that our failure to start making some of the tough decisions will land squarely on the backs of our children and grandchildren.

□ 1245

Their financial future will be strapped with the digging out of holes that have been created by our actions