

going to continue the tax cuts for people who are lucky enough to clip coupons off of stocks, dividends. The trade-off is almost exact.

So students will pay more for their loans, kids who are trying to get ahead, start a life, start a family, do better, become productive citizens, have a good living and pay taxes so that the richest among us will not have to pay taxes on their investments. But under their bizarre theory of trickle-down economics, somehow those students and everybody else is going to benefit by the fact that the richest among us, those who live off dividends on stocks, will pay a lower rate of taxes. What a bizarre view of the world from that side of the aisle. What a mean-spirited cut.

□ 1945

I wonder how many people from that side of the aisle went and talked to students about this during the break. They probably went to the country club and chortled with the rich people over champagne after Thanksgiving dinner, but they did not go out and talk to the students who they are sticking it to nor the seniors who they are sticking it to in this bill or the hungry primary and secondary school kids whose school lunch programs they are cutting. Those are the people who have to sacrifice so the richest among us can have their tax cuts continue.

Last year, according to the Internal Revenue Service, 99 percent of the people in America saw their incomes decline in real dollars. One percent saw an increase, those over \$300,000; and they did not even do really that well. It is only 4 percent for between \$300,000 and 1.3 million, but the people over 1.3 million, the people that these students are going to pay for their tax cuts, they saw a 10 percent increase in their income.

There is something wrong here when we have young people working hard, trying to get ahead, and we are saying you are going to pay for the rich folks' free ride.

OP-ED: IRAQ

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, certainly the last 2 weeks we have seen a great deal written and spoken about the conflict in the country of Iraq. The middle of this month we will see the third popular election held in the country of Iraq this year.

Stay the course or pull out now, these seem to be the two recurrent themes debated in this House and on the editorial pages across the country.

Our military action was really never popular with the press here at home, and it has been portrayed in the most negative possible fashion for the past 2½ years. The result, predictably, is de-

clining popular support for military activity in Iraq in this country and the very real possibility that the United States will lose its political will to complete the mission in Iraq. This would be truly tragic as we are so tantalizingly close to success in this effort.

I was not a Member of Congress when the vote was taken to provide the President the necessary authority for military action in Iraq. I do believe it was the right decision, and I believe I would have voted affirmatively had I been here. I do not recall ever believing that it would be easy, but I do recall believing that it was justified and necessary.

When the House and the Senate considered and approved the resolution authorizing the President to use military force to bring Saddam Hussein in compliance with the United Nations resolutions, several strong reasons were made for the foundation of this decision: weapons of mass destruction, to be sure; a gathering threat; violation of the no-fly zone; targeting our aircraft; endangering our pilots; violations of U.N. sanctions; violations of the terms of surrender from the first Gulf War in 1991; failure to account for Kuwaitis taken prisoner in the first Gulf War; failure to make restitution to the country of Kuwait; mass murder; mass graves; and the only world leader to have ever used weapons of mass destruction in an offensive fashion.

These were the details of the resolution supported by a bipartisan majority of Members of Congress. The policy of the United States as laid out by law in 1998, passed by the Congress, signed by the President was to effect regime change in the country of Iraq. In 2002, by approving this resolution, the Congress and President Bush were finally enforcing this long-standing U.S. foreign policy goal in an environment radically changed by September 11, 2001, and the gathering threat that Iraq and other rogue nations represent to the safety and the security of the American people.

The failure to find warehouses stockpiling weapons of mass destruction has now somehow morphed into allegations that the President misled the American public.

Opponents of this war argue that President Bush and other leaders misled the American people through dishonorable misrepresentations of the Iraqi intelligence; but those allegations are, in fact, themselves lies, refuted and discredited; and this type of representation has only emboldened our enemies to target the United States personnel overseas. Debating how the war has been executed is a debate that we should be having in this country, but attempting to change the facts in the lead-up to the war is disingenuous and has more pernicious ramifications than temporary political advantage.

I have been to Iraq four times in the past 2 years. It is my impression that

one day the big story will be that the press missed the big story in Iraq. What you see in the country of Iraq and what is reported by the press in this country are two completely different worlds.

Every time I have been there, I have been struck by how much progress has been made by American troops. Each time I have traveled to Iraq, I have been moved by the dedication of our military and their commitment to the completion of this mission.

My first visit to the Baghdad airport in August of 2003 left me thinking that the place looked like the city dump. During visits in January and August of this year, the airport was a clean environment, with obvious evidence of commercial aviation having resumed.

This is a picture of the Baghdad power plant in August of 2003. This is a rusted, burned up generator that Saddam Hussein had charged his engineers with keeping running under pain of death.

Contrast that to August of this year, 2005. This is a generator in the city of Kirkuk called the "mother of all generators." This generator was taken across the desert at great risk to our Marines and has been installed in the city of Kirkuk. It is now providing about 12 percent of Iraq's generating power, truly an amazing success story by our Marines. I do not recall having read about it in the press back home here.

Another picture, flying over the town of Kirkuk, and I was taking pictures randomly out the window of our Black Hawk helicopter and did not notice until later, there are two small figures here. One is waving at the helicopter; and if you look very closely and I have done this, she is waving with all five fingers but, very importantly, next to her is a small male child, probably her brother. Think of this, Mr. Speaker, in the city of Kirkuk, prior to our taking out Saddam Hussein, this sister could not mention the fact she had a brother. In fact, her family probably has a crawl space in the wall of this house where the boy could be hidden when Saddam's conscriptionists came through town.

It truly is an amazing transformation in that country. We are very close to having the third and final election for this year. We are close to having sufficient Iraqi forces trained and equipped to participate in their own security operations. Our soldiers are very close to having completed their mission. Congress should not desert them now.

CONGRESSIONAL ACTIONS ON IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, the good news, I suppose, is that nearly 3

years into the Iraq war, the Bush administration has seen fit to share with the American people their war plan.

The bad news is that there is no “there” there. The “national strategy for victory” shared with the American people last week is barely worth the paper it is printed on.

It is essentially the same old warmed-over rhetoric that we have become accustomed to and frustrated with: the enemy is bad; we are good; we will never back down; we will achieve total victory.

To the extent that this strategy for victory contains specifics, they are completely divorced from reality.

In last week’s speech, the President mentioned that Haifa Street, formerly called Purple Heart Boulevard because of all of the U.S. attacks incurred there, is now safely under the control of Iraq’s security forces, but taking control of Haifa Street in Baghdad does not make Iraqi forces self-sustaining. Taking the battle to the enemy, as the President likes to put it, has not thwarted terrorism but, instead, made Iraq a hotbed of terrorism.

The President insists that fighting the terrorists “over there” means that we are not fighting them at home. I doubt the people who call London, Madrid, or Bali their home would agree with that assessment. Who is to say that next time it will not be Chicago, Las Vegas, or San Francisco? There is no evidence that we are any more secure at home because of the war in Iraq.

Iraqi democracy is anything but a certainty. We are undermining our own stated goal of advancing freedom when we torture prisoners and when we spend millions of dollars to spread propaganda in the Iraqi press.

When the White House’s statements are not divorced from reality, they contradict everything they once said about the war. Like this one, from the supposed “victory strategy” document: “It is not realistic to expect a fully functioning democracy, able to defeat its enemies and peacefully reconcile generational grievances, to be in place less than 3 years after Saddam was finally removed from power.”

Now they tell us. So much for “Mission Accomplished.” We have sure come a long way from the confident assertion that we would be greeted by grateful Iraqis throwing flowers at our feet, that we would be in and out in a flash, that all we had to do was depose Saddam and democracy would instantly take hold.

The President’s speech last week demonstrates his inability to recognize the intensity of people’s anxiety about this war. Americans are not looking for the administration to do the same thing but just do it a little bit better and to put it in a glossy booklet.

They want to see a fundamental shift in direction, like the plan outlined in a letter I wrote to the President, which was cosigned by 61 other House Members: one, engage in greater multilat-

eral cooperation with our allies; two, pursue diplomatic, nonmilitary initiatives; three, prepare for a robust postconflict reconciliation process; and, four, and most importantly of all, bring our troops home.

I wish this administration would step out of its bubble. They should break away from the yes men and listen to the American people who do not understand the cause for which more than 2,100 and countless thousands of Iraqis have died.

It is not just the American people that the administration is ignoring. It is the Iraqis also. Kurdish, Shiite, and Sunni leaders agree on practically nothing except that there needs to be a clear timetable for our troops to leave Iraq.

The President wants to have it both ways on Iraq. He will not change his underlying approach, an open-ended military commitment that will last as long as he deems it appropriate, but he can read the polls. So he wants to be perceived as doing something new and something different in order to rescue his administration from political oblivion; but, Mr. Speaker, repackaging a Twinkie does not improve its nutritional value, and the same goes for the Bush Iraq policy.

REBUILDING CASINOS IN THE GULF COAST REGION

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

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong opposition to the inclusion of any tax breaks to rebuild the gulf coast gambling industry in the tax package, which may reach the House floor in the near future. I believe that it is an extraordinarily controversial and improper measure to support the casino industry with tax incentives paid by other Americans. I would like to commend the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) for his active role in bringing attention to this important issue.

I certainly understand the need to provide general economic incentives for businesses to rebuild in the gulf region, which was so heavily devastated by the hurricanes earlier this year. I support efforts to encourage economic development and restore infrastructure in the area. However, I cannot support allowing casinos to access Federal tax breaks while at the same time we are proposing to achieve savings from a host of other governmental programs.

If Americans were given a choice, I believe that they would prefer not to use limited resources to support the casinos. Prudent use of hard-earned taxpayer money demands that we stay focused on concerns such as the defense of our Nation, education of our children, health care for veterans, and subsistence for the poor.

My constituents are aware of the proposal to potentially provide assistance

to gambling interests and have let me know of their opposition to such an effort. Nebraskans, and Americans generally, are generous people, willing to help others in need. Congress, however, has a responsibility not to abuse this generosity by providing tax breaks to wealthy gambling operations which have already signaled their intention to rebuild in the gulf region. In fact, even without the tax breaks, the gambling industry has announced its plan to come back “bigger and better” in the area.

Government is an instrument of societal order, establishing priorities for how we choose to live. For instance, we have worked to reduce the marriage penalty in the tax code. We provide tax incentives to save for retirement. We provide tax benefits for health care, and there is certainly a precedent for targeting incentives toward certain businesses while restricting the use of tax breaks for others.

□ 2000

In fact, it would be unusual, I contend, if the government did not restrict these tax breaks and exclude casinos.

As a Gulf Opportunity Zone package was under consideration, Alberto Lopez, Director of Strategic Communication For Harrah Entertainment, Incorporated, was recently quoted in The Washington Post as saying, “We are actually scratching our heads. We can’t ever remember an instance of being offered a tax credit. Ever.”

In another telling comment in the same Washington Post article, a gambling company official, who wished to remain anonymous, stated “Anything that the Federal Government can provide, obviously we’ll take advantage of it.” Unfortunately, these gambling conglomerates would be taking advantage not only of tax breaks but the generosity of American taxpayers as well.

Why should all Americans be forced to prioritize casinos in the Tax Code? How can Congress consider providing such incentives to the multi-billion dollar gambling industry when there are so many unmet needs in this Nation? Why should these incentives be considered when the gambling industry already plans to rebuild the casinos? To what extent were these casinos covered by insurance? These are a few of the questions that must be addressed before tax legislation reaches the House floor.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in expressing opposition to the inclusion of any tax breaks for gambling interests. Do not let the casino interests hit the jackpot through the Tax Code.

THE LOW-INCOME ENERGY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

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