

more money; they were on the verge of developing the weapons that this murderous dictator was interested in developing. Hussein apparently believed that con, and kept giving them money for their research and for their development, and some of that money was skimmed off the top through base corruption by these scientists and all the rest.

What is amazing is the suggestion from Dr. Kay that our intelligence agencies fell for the con, too. We were conned by the con. We picked up the communications of the Iraqi scientists to Hussein, and we believed those communications, and so that is why we felt that the weapons of mass destruction were well developed and in existence when, in fact, they were not.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, having been a probation officer at one time in my checkered career, I can tell my colleagues a little bit about con men and how they operate. I will tell you how a con succeeds. A con succeeds not because of the special insight of the one perpetrating the con. The person who does that, the con man, is not depending on the desire of the other person to have the conclusion that they want to have come out. It is preordained they want the con. You cannot succeed with a con unless the other person is playing into it with you. They think they are getting something for nothing, or they think that something they want very much to be real is actually going to happen. You are going to win; you are going to succeed; you are going to be able to work the angle; you are going to be able to get something that somebody else does not have.

All you have to do is look at the record of the desire of the advisers to Mr. Bush and their determination to reenter the Middle East along the same lines as I read from the Churchill imperial era, and to come back into with their version in the 21st century, they want those weapons to be there. They wanted to take any scrap of information that came in and turn it into proof positive that what they wanted to do and the policies they wanted to follow of going in there and having a war with Iraq was something that was substantiated by the information that they were getting. It did not matter that it may have gone the other way. It did not matter it was ambiguous, tenuous, or that it was fragments.

What mattered was, is something was being said about it, and they were bound and determined to turn that into information which could be construed as being supportive of having to go to war. No matter what happened, they were going to go to war.

I find it very, very instructive that the Secretary of the Treasury's book that has just come out has been denounced along with him. He apparently has turned into an apostate, too, in the process simply by saying that these impressions and his honest impression

as related in his book was that from the moment he entered service to the Bush administration, that they were determined to go to war; that no matter what happened they were going to go to war.

So as we take a look at this and see what happened in the past, that, it seems to me, is prelude to the future. And so I suggest for our upcoming Iraq Watches that we take up the question, then, of what is going to happen on June 30; who are we going to be dealing with; what are the circumstances under which authority is to be turned over in Iraq by the United States; is this going to be yet another election ploy? Because the Bush administration is trying to use support for troops being synonymous with support for the war for election year purposes now, and I am very anxious to find out whether this transfer of authority is also going to be used for election purposes or are we going to actually be able to do something that will advance democracy in Iraq. I think we need to concentrate on that.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I think it is interesting the gentleman talked about the former Secretary of the Treasury, and I think we all respect his candor and honesty, and I think for many of us it certainly is not surprising. I think probably, and I do not know whether our audience is aware of this, but one starts to see a subtle change in the position of some members of the administration.

For example, Secretary Powell was reported yesterday in the Washington Post, he said he does not know now whether he would have recommended an invasion of Iraq if he had been told it had no stockpiles of banned weapons, even as he offered a broad defense of the Bush administration's decision to go to war.

What we are going to start to see now is a shift in the language. We are going to go from clearly there were weapons of mass destruction, this is where they are, these are the quantities, and that is going to go to the weapons of mass destruction program-related activities. Now we are going to see attempts by senior administration officials to rewrite history. But I think what is most important from this point on is for those that are in denial, because they have I think almost a psychological hold in terms of their belief, we should ask them to accept reality. Let us move on, let us work together in a bipartisan, bicameral basis and to go forward, understand where we failed in terms of this policy, and see that at least the Iraqi people have an opportunity for a democratic future, and as quickly as possible reduce the exposure of American military personnel and the absolutely heavy burden that the American taxpayers are bearing, with no help from anybody else in the world.

□ 2300

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. And none likely to come.

Mr. DELAHUNT. And none to come. Remember that conference in Madrid? That was all about loans. Our allies are loaning, expecting the money back; but American taxpayers, we give it away. We give it away in this body. That is what we do. We just shove it out the door. Well, that is indeed unfortunate.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for joining in Iraq Watch this week. We will be back next week. We are going to look at the commission and what happens June 30th, and we look forward to talking next week.

#### STATE OF THE ECONOMY

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, as the prior speakers were dealing with the foreign wars in which the United States is engaged, here at home the Bush administration has built an economy teetering on a house of cards, or should I say an exploding house of debt.

There is more economic anxiety in our country than at any time that I can remember since the Reagan recession of 1982. President Bush is trying to act as if nothing is wrong, but people know better. They know something is wrong, something deeply wrong with America's economy here at home. They know that jobs are going overseas by the thousands, and they do not know how much worse things are going to get before they get better, or if they are ever going to get better.

More and more people are wondering whether our jobs are ever going to come back. In my district, almost every week brings the news of another plant closing. This week it is Georgia Pacific, maker of Dixie Cups, leaving Sandusky, Ohio, and 206 long-time workers terminated. Hundreds and hundreds of family-owned tool and die and machine tool businesses in Ohio and the Midwest have fallen victims of unregulated competition from China.

The manufacturing sector in the Nation's heartland is in the intensive care unit, and President Bush is offering Band-aids. He was in Ohio last week, he came to us empty-handed, but then he went around the country and raised millions more for his campaign coffers. In his State of the Union address delivered here, he did not even propose extending unemployment benefits for those workers who have lost their jobs.

There is great economic anxiety in our land because workers do not know how much longer they can hold on to their health benefits. There is great economic anxiety in our land because people see Congress and the President giving \$87 billion to Iraq and the President's corporate cronies, but leaving 43 million Americans without health care coverage.

There is great economic anxiety because the average American family

lives by a rule that Washington breaks every day. It is called the rule of balancing your checkbook. If a family bounces a check, their bank hits them with a fee for insufficient funds. But apparently that does not apply to President George Bush and his Republican Party. They have proposed the biggest budget deficits in history and call it economic progress.

President Bush has proposed a back-breaking \$521 billion budget deficit for this year. And when we add in the Social Security funds that they are borrowing, it is actually \$709 billion. Next year, his deficit is proposed at \$364 billion, but it is actually \$607 billion if he does not raid the Social Security fund. And if he is as wrong this time as he has been in his fiscal projections in the first 3 years, the budget deficit for fiscal year 2005 will hit over \$734 billion.

That is the highest deficit in history, and that does not even count the additional funds that they are going to add for the war in Afghanistan. We seem to have a President who talks a lot about national security, but has forgotten about economic security.

I can remember, coming from our family, what happened back in the 1920s and 1930s when Washington spent with abandon. We know that Wall Street likes debt, but they like it too much, and they deal in paper wealth, not real wealth. And when our predecessors during the 1920s and 1930s forgot the difference between real wealth and paper, and spent with abandon, they literally brought down America's families and financial system right around them. The dollar lost its value, and we face that precipice again.

The Great Depression of the 1930s was the largest economic disaster our Nation ever experienced. Our family, like everyone else in the Nation, felt the impact of wild behavior on Wall Street and reckless government in Washington. Our family lost all their meager savings, and I am sure that the irresponsible people who have raided our people's 401(k) plans have done the same thing in this modern day. Just ask the former employees of Enron. And I do not mean George Bush's close personal friend, Kenneth Lay. I mean the people who lost everything when the Lay scam was exposed.

A look at the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, the largest hole in history. It is supposed to ensure our

workers' pension benefits in private companies. It is over \$11 billion in deficit. The President says it is not a crisis. It surely is a crisis when the largest instrumentality that we have to back up our workers' retiree benefits does not have the insurance to do it. He best pay attention.

Mr. Speaker, the economic anxiety that is gripping America tonight is real. We are losing jobs to unfair trade agreements. The President wants to expand NAFTA. Workers are running out of unemployment benefits. The President says there is no crisis and, therefore, no need for extended unemployment benefits. Retirees are losing their pensions, and the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation is losing money hand over fist. The President says there is no crisis, but indeed the system is at risk.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, let me say to the American people the way to change our Nation for the better is for people to register to vote from coast to coast. If we can change the captain of our floundering Ship of State, we can put firm new leadership at the helm and begin moving again toward a better tomorrow for all.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BORDALLO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of official business in the district.

Mr. LANGEVIN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and February 4 on account of attending a memorial service.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and February 4 on account of personal reasons.

Ms. ESHOO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. ORTIZ (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and February 4 on account of attending a funeral.

Mr. RAHALL (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for the week of February 2 and the week of February 9 on account of surgery.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legis-

lative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. SOLIS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HINCHEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CONYERS for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. SOLIS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WATERS, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GILCREST) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, February 4 and 5.

Mr. PEARCE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GILCREST, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURGESS, for 5 minutes, February 4 and 10.

Mr. FLAKE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GINGREY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, February 4.

Mr. FEENEY, for 5 minutes, February 4.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.

#### SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1879. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend provisions relating to mammography quality standards; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 4, 2004, at 10 a.m.

#### EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for speaker-authorized official travel during the third and fourth quarters of 2003, pursuant to Public Law 95-384 are as follows:

##### REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MR. JOEL MONTALVO, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN NOV. 25 AND NOV. 28, 2003

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Joel Montalvo .....	11/25	11/28	Jordan .....	674.00	952.00	.....	.....	.....	.....	674.00	952.00