

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1802

Messrs. JACKSON of Illinois, OBEY, WYNN and RUPPERSBERGER changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

☐ 1800

HOUR OF MEETING ON THURSDAY,
MARCH 4, 2004

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 11:30 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

SAVE THE HUBBLE

(Mr. MCDERMOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago today the *Columbia* Space Shuttle, in what turned out to be its last full mission, serviced the Hubble Space Telescope.

Those astronauts knew and children across America know that Hubble is a national treasure. Hubble offers a dramatic view into the cosmos, and it has yielded profound scientific discoveries. Yet for all of Hubble's national acclaim and the inspiration it has given us, NASA has given Hubble a death sentence. It is up to us to commute that sentence.

That is why I have joined with a bipartisan group calling for NASA to convene the best and the brightest minds to reevaluate their decision and look at every reasonable alternative. In the meantime, keep the Hubble going.

In my view, Hubble is one of the best scientific investments we have ever made. Hubble is certainly the best recruiter we have today to inspire our children to excel in science and reach for the stars.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEARCE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana 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 Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO 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 Michigan (Mr. MCCOTTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

OUR ECONOMIC POLICY

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the President last week delivered the Central American Free Trade Agreement to this Congress as part of his economic plan to grow the economy. What we have seen from the President's economic plan, which consists of two basic solutions, are two things. One is tax cuts for the wealthiest people of our society, the 1 percent wealthiest, the people who need it least, hoping it will trickle down and create jobs. The other part of this program is to push through this Congress more NAFTAs, the Central American Free Trade Agreement, the Free Trade Area of the Americas, trade agreements which have no labor and environmental standards, trade agreements which hemorrhage jobs, which ship jobs overseas.

We have seen that kind of economic policy, except we have seen it not work. We have seen in this administration a loss of almost 3 million jobs. In my State of Ohio, we have lost one out of every six manufacturing jobs. Hundreds of thousand of Ohioans have lost their jobs. We have seen no manufacturing jobs created. In fact, since President Bush took office, we have lost manufacturing jobs not just in Ohio but across the country every single month of the Bush administration.

Now, just recently the President put out his economic report. This Economic Report of the President is put out every year. As my colleagues can see here, the President signed it on page 4, and this economic report makes a lot of promises. As one of his earlier economic reports had made, the President in 2002 promised an increase of 3.4 million jobs. We have actually seen a loss of 1.7 million jobs since then. In this report, he makes another promise of 2.6 million jobs created just this year alone. Already the President's people are backing off that promise.

But you might be interested, and there are some things in this report that the President and his people, his Chief Economic Adviser, have sort of

bragged about. One of the things that the President's Economic Adviser said when he said, "When a good or service is produced more cheaply abroad, it makes more sense to import it than to provide it domestically," and then the Chief Economic Adviser to the President said, That is a good thing. If it is made somewhere else cheaper, then good economics says we ought to ship those jobs overseas and make them more cheaply overseas and make them there and displace the jobs in the United States.

That is not good economic policy. It is not good trade policy. It particularly is not good policy for our people. Yes, we want to do trade. Yes, we want that train to move out of the station advancing trade, but we want to do the trade, we want fair trade, not free trade. This administration, unfortunately, is committed to free trade.

In the meantime, the President's Council on Economic Advisers has said in this report, also on page 103, In the long run, a large part of the burden of taxes is likely to be shifted to workers through a reduction in wages. In other words, the President's policy of tax cuts for the wealthy, hoping that it trickles down and provides something for everybody else, and these trade agreements with no labor and environmental standards, these trade agreements that ship jobs overseas, in the meantime, the President's people say what is going to happen is a large part of the burden of taxes is likely to be shifted to workers through a reduction in wages.

That is why even people that have kept their jobs, as most people have during this Bush recession, even then those people's wages have been stagnant or in some cases have gone down. That is because the President's people say that we are going to see tax cuts for the wealthy, and we are going to see loss of wages for workers and for the middle class.

The President's Chief Economic Adviser goes on to say, Analyses that fail to recognize this shift can be misleading, suggesting that higher income groups bear an unrealistically large share of the long run burden. In other words, when the President's people say, well, we have to give a tax cut to the richest people in our society because they are paying the most taxes, the President's own Economic Adviser said that is not the case.

What is happening in our economy, you may applaud that, is these tax cuts shift the burden. As we cut taxes on the wealthy, it shifts the burden to the middle class in the form of lower wages, and we can also see that, Mr. Speaker, with what Alan Greenspan said last week.

He came to this Congress and said I support continuing the tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans, and then he said, but because of that, we have a budget shortfall and we have to cut Social Security. So the President of the

United States and Alan Greenspan, his man at the Federal Reserve, are saying to the American people, you have either got the tax cuts for the most privileged and if you take those tax cuts, then it means we have to cut Social Security.

That is really what we are going to talk about in the next 8 months, that if we are going to make these tax cuts, if we are going to continue these tax cuts for the wealthy that the President wants, it means fewer dollars for education, less money for prescription drugs and other health care, and ultimately it means cutting Social Security. That is the choice. That is what the election will be about this year.

That is what this Congress is going to be about in the next 6 months. That is what we are going to hear JOHN KERRY and George Bush debate. If we do the tax cuts and cut the taxes of the wealthiest Americans, it means less money for Social Security beneficiaries. It means less money for environmental enforcement. It means less money for the middle class. It means a stagnation of wages, and it takes this country in the wrong direction.

It is bad economic policy. It is bad for our country. It is bad for our communities. It is bad for our schools. It is bad for the middle class.

THE SITUATION IN AFGHANISTAN AND IRAQ

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

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, as we have listened to debates over the last several days, actually last several weeks, there has been a lot of rhetoric about how poorly things are going in Afghanistan and Iraq, the administration has no plan, et cetera, and along with many other Members of Congress, I visited both countries within about the last 5 or 6 weeks, and it did not seem to me that the information I was getting and seeing squared with what we have been hearing.

In Afghanistan, for instance, the Taliban is out. They were a tremendously oppressive regime. Terrorist training camps, and of course, Afghanistan was the hotbed of terrorist activity, have been shut down. Most of the funding has been dried up. Al Qaeda is on the defense, and of course, the democratic loyal jurga formed a constitution which I think was a tremendous step toward democracy. Women have been given a significant role. Elections have been scheduled this summer, and they have a great leader in Karzai, and I think there is a great chance he will be elected President.

All of this has been accomplished with 13,000 coalition troops controlling this country, very little loss of life. It has been a tremendous military victory and a great victory for those who are opponents of terrorism.

□ 1815

Iraq, of course, is a little behind the time line of Afghanistan, because it came several months later; but the infrastructure has been restored.

The water is running, the electricity is on, and 17,000 reconstruction projects have been completed; 17,000 projects have been completed. The schools are open. They have been given significant aid; 33,000 teachers have received training in just the last few weeks. The hospitals and clinics are open. There is much better health care. There has been a 6,000 percent increase in health care service expenditures in the last few months. The economy is expanding. Shops and businesses are springing up. Consumer demand is good. Wages are between 25 and 30 times higher than they were under Saddam Hussein. So the economy is showing real signs of life. One million more cars in this country than a year ago. Newspaper and television stations are springing up as well.

Insurgent attacks on our troops have decreased dramatically. About all the attacks we are hearing about lately are on Iraqi citizens, mainly because they are the only soft targets that they have left. Weapons and ammunition supplies have been destroyed, and an Iraqi army of 133,000 is being trained and should be in place by next fall. An Iraqi police force is assembled. And all but a handful of Saddam's lieutenants have been captured. I think 45 out of 50 have been captured and, of course, Saddam Hussein himself.

A provisional constitution has been drafted and ratified, just today, I believe, by the Kurds, the Shiites, and the Sunis. This is a tremendous step toward democracy and a tremendous accomplishment. So we are on track to see a viable democracy in a country that has been a major destabilizing influence in the Middle East for the last number of years. We have had no attacks in the U.S. since 9-11.

So again, Mr. Speaker, I would just reiterate the fact that what I and many of my colleagues have witnessed in Afghanistan and Iraq does not seem to square with some of the conversation we have been hearing on the political scene in recent months and recent weeks. So we think that we have been doing a good job over there.

The soldiers, the troops that I met, have a tremendous sense of mission, a great sense of accomplishment; and I think it is important that they get the message that we are solidly behind them and solidly behind this effort that is going on.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEARCE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California 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 Florida (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE PRESIDENT'S CREDIBILITY DEFICIT

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

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, President Bush has announced that his campaign strategy will be to make credibility an issue. Just last night, the Vice President said that if the Democrats had been in charge for the last 2 or 3 years we would have endangered the job creation of the economy.

Really? What a fascinating take, that Democrats would have endangered the job creation and the economy. Under this administration, \$3 trillion has been added to the Nation's debt, and nearly 3 million American jobs have disappeared. And they want to make credibility an election year issue?

In the "Meet the Press" interview, the President could have talked about his foreign policy accomplishments and his record, but what does he have to offer but an endless occupation. He could have chosen to talk about the economy and the jobs he created, but then he would have to point to the jobless economy and the wage recession Americans face. And this is a President and an administration that wants to make credibility an issue in this campaign?

The administration announced 5 months ago, on Labor Day, that they were appointing a manufacturing czar. That position remains empty. There is not even a nominee. And they want to make credibility an issue? Interesting.

Since that date, 250,000 Americans have lost their manufacturing jobs. And they want to make credibility an issue? After 5 months, there is not a single person to fill that job.

Now, the President does not take advice from me, but as far as I can see David Kay is available. He did the weapons of mass destruction research. Maybe we can help him find where the 2.7 million American jobs have gone. And they had the gall to announce it under a banner of American jobs and American values. And they want to make credibility an issue?

Every year the President submits a budget, and he has submitted time and again the elimination of the Manufacturing Extension Program, which helps small businesses, small manufacturers in this country. And he wants to make credibility an issue?

Not only is the President not interested in the issue of jobs and job creation in the United States, his own economic report that he submitted the other day to Congress say that