

fix this nightmare. The failure to address the alternative minimum tax makes a mockery of alleged concern for middle America, for families, and for tax fairness.

WE DID THE RIGHT THING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 20, 2004, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) is recognized during morning hour debates for such time as he may consume.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, there is one point to make in the debate about the war on Iraq and it is this: we did the right thing.

After September 11, President Bush declared war on the terrorists and all the regimes who support them. Saddam Hussein's dictatorship was the very definition of a terrorist regime. He started two wars, invaded two neighbors, and tried to assassinate an American President. He was obsessed with obtaining nuclear weapons and was bent on using them to blackmail the civilized world. He was a merciless tyrant with no respect for human life who butchered his own people and threatened the stability of a fragile region in the Middle East. He worked with terrorists and financed their operations. He was going to kill more Americans and help others to do so. In short, Mr. Speaker, Saddam Hussein was Iraq's weapons of mass destruction; and he had to be removed.

Yet, now in this political season, partisan opportunists suggest that the war was somehow illegitimate because we have not found massive World War II-style warehouses full of missiles. But 9-11 taught us that our enemies need not have conventional weapons to threaten us. If Saddam Hussein had just a briefcase full of one chemical or so much as a vile of another given his past, his hatred of the United States and his ties to international terrorism, he posed a grave and gathering threat to our national security, period.

Critics who now undermine the legitimacy of Operation Iraqi Freedom with their slanderous attacks against the President and the international intelligence community undermined our security at the same time. Revisionists these days seem to believe it was someone other than Saddam Hussein who deceived the international community during the buildup of this war. But by doing so, Mr. Speaker, they embolden our enemies. Every world leader, especially those of us with the honor to serve in this body, should stand up and speak with one voice on the war on terror and how it will be fought and how we should win it in Iraq and elsewhere. Undermining our mission in Iraq to score political points dishonors the victory we won there and the legacy of the men and women who gave their lives in its winning.

We did the right thing, Mr. Speaker; and we would do it again.

PRESIDENTIAL SUPPORT FOR OUTSOURCING JOBS IS OUTRAGEOUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 20, 2004, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today I picked up a newspaper, picked up a Los Angeles Times, and the headline of the Los Angeles Times, I believe the second largest daily paper in the Nation, said, "Bush Supports Shift of Jobs Overseas." The subheadline was, "The loss of work to other countries, while painful in the short term, will enrich our economy eventually," the President's report to Congress says.

Now, I thought maybe that was just an overzealous headline writer, so I looked at some other newspapers.

The Seattle Times headline was, "Bush Report: Sending Jobs Overseas Helps the United States."

Then I looked at the Pittsburgh Post Gazette: "Bush Economic Report Praises Outsourcing Jobs," sending those jobs overseas. The Orlando Sentinel in the President's brother's home State: "Bush Says Sending Jobs Abroad Can Be Beneficial."

Now, this is a President of the United States who in 3 years has seen a job loss of 3 million people. In my home State of Ohio, we have lost 300,000 jobs. One out of six manufacturing jobs in Ohio has disappeared to Mexico, to China, somewhere overseas generally.

We have seen continued job loss in every State in this country. In fact, we have seen manufacturing job loss every single month of the Bush administration. And after I read these headlines and I read the articles which correspond precisely to the headlines, it makes me think maybe that is the Bush plan overall, that we are sending these jobs overseas. Maybe that is what he planned. And that does not make any sense, that the President of the United States would want to send jobs overseas; but this President supported the North American Free Trade Agreement running for Governor of Texas. Then he supported as Governor of Texas the Permanent Normal Trade Relations, the trade agreement with China. He supported Fast Track Trade Promotion Authority. He now supports the Central American Free Trade Agreement which will hemorrhage more jobs to Latin America. And his office is right now negotiating the Free Trade Act of the Americas, which will quadruple the size of the North American Free Trade Agreement, causing more hemorrhaging of jobs.

So when the President's head of Council of Economic Advisors, Gregory Mankiw, when he prepared this report, he said in this report, "Outsourcing is just a way of doing international trade. More things are tradeable than were tradeable in the past. And that is a good thing." He then goes on to claim that, as the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN), who is with me here,

points out, that this Bush plan will create 2.6 million jobs in 2004.

It is another promise of job creation, but we have seen manufacturing job loss every single month of the Bush administration. And now apparently they are saying this outsourcing, this job loss overseas is a good thing.

Now, the most interesting, maybe if not the most important because it is not as big as the job loss in manufacturing, but he talks about one particular group of people who happen to be radiologists. And I know of radiologists in the United States, they are the people that read the x-rays and the MRIs and all of that, who have said that when they take x-rays, when they do MRIs, sometimes those x-rays are literally e-mailed to India, read by radiologists in India, and then sent back. So radiologists are concerned about their work, frankly.

In his report he said, "Maybe we will outsource a few radiologists. What does that mean? Maybe the next generation of doctors will train fewer radiologists and will train more general practitioners or surgeons. Maybe we have learned that we do not have a comparative advantage in radiologists."

Maybe Mr. Mankiw has read too many economics text books when he says we do not have a comparative advantage in radiologists.

But the point, Mr. Speaker, is that this administration has totally lost touch with reality, if they can look in the eye a worker in Akron, Ohio, in the steel industry or in Lorraine or Cleveland or anywhere in this country, look them in the eye and they can say, outsourcing is a good thing. Your job going overseas is a good thing because then maybe you can get a job at Wal-Mart that pays \$7 an hour with health care benefits. Or maybe you can get a job somewhere else part-time, or maybe you can figure out what is going to happen to your health insurance and what is going to happen to your pension.

The fact is that this administration's answer to everything is more tax cuts for the richest people and more trade agreements that hemorrhage jobs overseas. We have seen enough job loss in this country without the President piling on, without the President, as the L.A. Times says, supporting the shift of jobs overseas; without the President, as the Seattle Times said, sending jobs overseas helps the United States; without the President, as the Pittsburgh Post Gazette says, his economic report praises outsourcing jobs; or as the Orlando Sentinel says, sending jobs abroad can be beneficial.

It does not make sense for our country. It does not make sense for workers. It does not make sense for our people.

□ 1245

DEFICIT ACCOUNTABILITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOOZMAN). Pursuant to the order of the

House of January 20, 2004, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I would say to my colleague from Ohio that President Clinton of his party supported a lot of this free trade. In fact, President Clinton was very active in getting passed in previous Congresses many of these free trade agreements that the gentleman from Ohio is complaining about. So I think it is just a question of whether one is for free trade or not. I am for fair trade not free trade.

But, Mr. Speaker, I am here to talk about a deficit that is continuing quite dramatically, and now all of us are faced with a tough task of balancing the budget the next 5 years, and the President is committed to that.

One of the reasons this budget is in a deficit mode is because of the recession that President Bush inherited; also what happened on 9/11. It changed this country's perspective completely and, of course, with it our efforts to secure our homeland borders and security within our buildings. So, obviously, we have had to expend extra money to do that; and the President rightly did so and Congress agreed to reduce taxes so we could help the economy.

Obviously, there is no quick fix for the deficit. However, we must act decisively today in the budget process so that we do not put undue burden on future generations.

I believe that Members of Congress realize how accountability works. We want to support reduced spending around here, and that is why I am introducing a bill this day to underscore accountability that will connect all of us here in Congress with the rest of the country.

Year in and year out, we all have to explain to our constituents why we automatically receive a pay raise regardless of the deficit that occurs here in Congress. So why not have a bill simply to say that no automatic pay adjustments will be made for Members of Congress in the year following a fiscal year in which there is a Federal budget deficit? Something very simple. My bill, the Deficit Accountability Act of 2004, basically says that, again, no automatic pay adjustments are made for us here in Congress unless we balance the budget.

If this Congress can work together, I think we can control spending. We must lead by example, and I believe this simple measure could do just that. The bill would provide a real-world incentive for Members of Congress to curtail wasteful and abusive spending.

So it is a good-faith measure, Mr. Speaker. It is in a small way just symbolic, but I think our constituents would appreciate that, and that is why I am offering this bill today.

All of us have returned from our respective retreats, the Democrats and Republicans, and all of us, of course, are resolved to have a tougher stance

on spending and try to balance the budget. There has been some talk again about having a line item veto. I would like to see that effort reenergized, re-enacted; and I believe now is the time to support the shift in this fiscal environment towards a balanced budget.

Momentum is building in this House to write a congressional budget resolution that would freeze outright non-defense, nonhomeland security appropriations. Furthermore, many Members have introduced legislation that seeks to make deep cuts in the discretionary spending of the various departments. These departments have lots of accountability problems. There is waste and fraud in some of these Departments. The President's budget proposal makes a strong effort to address these problems.

Mr. Speaker, I just bring to my colleagues' attention a recent GAO report that showed that the collective departments, across the board every department in the budget reported a staggering \$17.3 billion in unreconciled transactions in 2002. That is, to put it bluntly, we have lost \$17 billion. It is unaccounted for. I know all Members will agree that these lost funds are staggering, and something must be done to get to the bottom of this, and obviously in this budget process we should do this.

At this time, we clearly have an opportunity to curtail wasteful spending and at the same time support our President as he seeks to balance the budget in the next 5 years. I believe starting today this body can make a statement of how we want spending in this Congress to proceed and also how to pay ourselves in the event we have a deficit. Mr. Speaker, we must draw a line on spending, and hopefully we can now remember it is the American taxpayers who occupy the most prominent position at the negotiating table here in Washington.

THE RULE OF LAW SHOULD MATTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 20, 2004, the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, just for a second I would like to go over the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio where he says that the Republican administration actually promotes the outsourcing of jobs, reducing jobs here in the United States. It almost makes it sound like the Bush administration does not care about Americans.

Keep in mind, for every 100 jobs we export, we create one or two very rich Americans; and, on balance, that may be thought to be a good thing by the Bush administration.

We also have a huge half trillion dollar trade deficit.

THEFT OF DOCUMENTS FROM JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

But I want to remind my colleagues of a day back in 1972 when we had a positive trade surplus and when the Watergate headquarters of the Democratic Party was burglarized. Howard Hunt and G. Gordon Liddy went to jail for that burglary because Republicans here in Washington believed that the rule of law was more important than Republican success.

Today, a similar crime has been committed. At the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, a computer server that was jointly used by Democrats and Republicans was burglarized, and thousands of the Democrats' documents were stolen, far more than Howard Hunt and G. Gordon Liddy ever thought to steal.

A shared computer server is not an unusual thing on Capitol Hill. My Democratic colleagues need to be reminded that every e-mail we send, every e-mail we receive goes through a shared computer server, under the control ultimately of the Speaker of this House and his staff. But we Democrats here in the House do not believe that the Speaker and his staff are criminals. We believe they are honorable men and women, and so we send e-mail today just as we do every other day.

What is happening in the other body, Mr. Speaker? A small cabal has decided to burglarize documents. That is the same as what happened back in 1972, but what is more interesting is that the predominant power in the Republican party, the predominant power here in Washington, wants to protect this act of robbery.

Sure, one staffer has been fired. Now that staffer is free to obtain lucrative employment and cash gifts without having to report it. Another staffer has left, and that staffer boasts about being in control of stolen documents, stolen property. Instead of going to jail for being in possession of stolen property, he trumpets how he is going to use this property for the support of the Republican position.

The rule of law should matter. We are told, though, that the rule of law is being upheld because a couple of staffers lost their jobs. Since when is it the criminal law in this country that if one steals something the only sanction is they have to go get employment elsewhere?

We are told that this crime is not a crime because it was a shared computer server. That is a little dangerous for Democrats in the House, where every e-mail is going through a shared server under Republican control.

It is also a complete repudiation of American criminal law. If two partners share a safe deposit box or a safe, that does not mean that one can use the combination to steal all the cash and valuables that the other has put in it. It is very clear. Sharing a box does not mean one gets to steal the other person's or other entity's property. Except that is what it seems to mean in the Republican lexicon.