

will save this soldier \$2,600 a year. If a person is off, they are away from their family, they are away from their kids, can we please provide a little bit of peace of mind for some of our soldiers who will be over there?

I think the Active Reservists and National Guard Student Loan Relief Act of 2003 has received thus far strong bipartisan support. The liberals, the conservatives and everyone in between have supported this legislation, and I think it is because it is good for the soldiers and it is good for this country, and I think it sets a tone, Mr. Speaker, that we are behind our servicemen and women. We are behind our soldiers, and those of us who have been opposed to the war and those who have been supportive of the war, regardless now, our job is to support our troops, and this is a simple piece of legislation I think where we can put the talk into action and make sure that we provide a little bit of peace of mind for some of the soldiers who have been in college and have student loans.

I encourage this body to pass this piece of legislation, and it really should be included in the supplemental that is going to fund the war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### FISCALLY CONSERVATIVE

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I believe and certainly hope that our Armed Forces will achieve a quick and decisive victory in Iraq, and certainly we all hope that this can be done without the loss of even one American life and very few, if any, and hopefully no innocent Iraqi civilians, but every article we read, every analyst we hear says that winning the peace, the aftermath will be much more difficult than the war itself.

I know that people in the White House, the State Department and the Defense Department have been working on this aftermath plan for many months now. Because of something I heard on a news broadcast last week, I want to briefly discuss this.

Last Wednesday night, as I drove to a meeting here in Washington, I heard on the national news that the Baghdad stock market was booming. The report said prices had gone up more than 50 percent in the last 7 months because investors there feel that the war will be very short and that the U.S. will then spend hundreds of billions of dollars there over the next 10 years or so. Last week, the National Journal, a

very nonpartisan publication, said we will spend at least \$156 billion in a best-case scenario and as much as \$1.9 trillion in a worst-case scenario over the next 10-years in Iraq.

Already, big multinational companies like Halliburton, Bechtel and others are lining up to get part of the pie and to make sure that we spend this money in Iraq. If I and my fellow conservatives, who were so critical of the previous administration about nation-building, do not speak out against this, this will end up being by far the biggest foreign aid program in the history of the world.

The same people who have told us how great the threat from Iraq is also tell us the war will be over with very quickly. Iraq's military budget is only about 2/10 of 1 percent of ours, counting our supplemental appropriations. So this will be about the most lopsided war in history if the mentally sick, evil Saddam Hussein does not back down. Everyone should hope that we achieve a quick and decisive victory, as I said, without the loss of even one American life.

Service in our Nation's Armed Forces is one of the most honorable ways one can serve this Nation. When we put young American soldiers and sailors into harm's way, I know all Americans hope for the best and support our troops. I wish we would get in and get out quickly and bring our troops home as soon as possible.

I have never believed that U.S. foreign policy or military decisions should be dictated or controlled by the United Nations. Yet it is also somewhat inconsistent to say, as some have, that this proves the U.N. is irrelevant and maybe we should get out, but then say we have to go to war because Iraq has violated 16 U.N. resolutions. It is not fair, Mr. Speaker, to the U.S. taxpayers or the U.S. military to place almost the entire burden of enforcing U.N. resolutions on them.

Also, the Congressional Budget Office has predicted we will run deficits of \$1.8 trillion over the next 10 years. This is not counting State and local deficits. If we spend hundreds of billions in Iraq over the next decade, we will not be able to meet all our own needs here at home. We have already spent about \$25 billion or so just moving our troops, planes, ships and equipment into place. Also, most of our allies are demanding billions for their support.

If we do not become more fiscally conservative, especially in regards to this war, we may have difficulty in paying all our Social Security, Medicare, veterans' and Federal retirements and so forth. We could end up then doing what most governments around the world have already done, and that is a combination of decreasing benefits, raising taxes, or, most likely, inflating our currency, which means pensions will buy less.

Iraq should use their humongous oil wells to rebuild their own country. U.S. taxpayers should not have to pay our bills and theirs, too.

Conservatives have traditionally been the strongest opponents to turning our military into international social workers. Conservatives have also been the strongest opponents of big deficit spending, huge foreign aid programs, nation-building and world government. Most conservatives are against an interventionist foreign policy, but all conservatives unify behind our troops and support the patriotic young men and women who are simply following orders.

However, after this war is over, I hope my fellow conservatives will unite once again and urge that our troops be brought home quickly and that we in the American Congress start putting Americans first once again. Let us achieve victory in Iraq, but not follow that up with the biggest foreign aid program in history.

#### PRESIDENT BUSH AND THE REPUBLICANS' BUDGET

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

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to discuss President Bush and the House Republicans' proposed budget. As my colleagues may recall, back in the year 2001, President Bush entered his office enjoying a fiscal surplus that no previous President had ever experienced, over \$127 billion in that fiscal year alone, a 10-year surplus projected at \$5.6 trillion. Our President also took office with an ambitious plan to provide tax cuts, the number of \$1.7 trillion.

Democrats warned that a tax cut of this magnitude and time would prove irresponsible. We warned that the tax cuts would reduce the size of the future economy, raise interest rates and prove fiscally unsustainable, but our President chose not to listen. Instead he squandered \$1.7 trillion of our Nation's surplus to advance his tax agenda, aiding a very small proportion of Americans, particularly the very wealthy.

By the summer of 2001, before the tragedies of September 11, our economy had begun to slow down, and our 10-year surplus was now down from \$5.6 trillion to only \$575 billion. I bring this point up because we cannot afford to ignore the connection between the current state of our economy and the President's first round of tax cuts.

Now that our economy is clearly faltering, Republicans would like to offer still more fiscally irresponsible tax cuts. How do Republicans expect to pay for the second round of \$1.7 trillion in tax cuts? By cutting the programs that are essential to our collective well-being and the well-being of our families.

The President's budget cuts domestic programs important to our livelihood while enacting tax cuts that will add to our public debt. More specifically, the Bush budget sacrifices the health of

our Nation. In fact, 41 million Americans right now have no health insurance. Many of them are Hispanics.

The Bush budget cuts funding for Medicaid coverage for children, low-income seniors and the disabled. The budget also eliminates funding for programs that increase the number of minority health care providers, desperately needed in communities like mine, where we need linguistically and culturally appropriate health care providers.

It is also important to note that the President's budget will only create 190,000 jobs this year, less than the number of jobs that we lost this February. The Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that the U.S. economy lost 308,000 jobs this past month. Latinos are also particularly heavily impacted. In my own district, unemployment rates are far beyond the 9 percent, way above what the national level is at 5.6.

These unemployment rates are outrageous, and our President's solution to create only 190,000 jobs is not even nearly enough where we need to be. The President should focus his budget on funding important Federal programs that create opportunity or self-sufficient jobs for the 8.5 million unemployed Americans, and instead, the President's budget cuts job training and employment programs for dislocated workers. It fails to extend unemployment benefits for the 1 million Americans who cannot access Federal assistance, but are still jobless.

As bad as the President's budget is, I am even more disappointed by the budget that the Republicans want to offer, and the Republican budget resolution requires that almost every authorizing committee cut spending within its jurisdiction, and it fails to explain which programs those will be that will be on the chopping block. I think it is questionable that we somehow implement a 2.9 percent across-the-board cut in these programs without giving us specifics. In reality, what it means is there will be more cuts for veterans, our children and the elderly.

For example, the Republican budget fails to provide any specific funding for a Medicare prescription drug benefit. It provides only \$28 billion in new funding over 10 years for all the programs under the jurisdiction of two committees that are responsible for this, for Medicare, the Committee on Ways and Means and Committee on Energy and Commerce. From my own home district it would actually translate into \$233.2 million of cuts in Medicare over the next 10 years, and the State of California would lose more than \$18 billion.

Let us take a closer look at the Republican's budget and how it will impact education. Republicans, running on the assumption that every program harbors substantial waste and fraud, are requesting the Committee on Education and the Workforce to cut out \$10 million from their budget. So what is it going to be, school lunch programs for kids or student loans?

We need to be responsible in our budget deliberations.

□ 1930

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE ATTENDING PHYSICIAN OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONNER) laid before the House the following communication from the Attending Physician of the House of Representatives:

U.S. CONGRESS,

Washington, DC, March 12, 2003.

Hon. DENNIS J. HASTERT,  
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House, that I have determined that the grand jury subpoena for documents and testimony issued to me by the Superior Court for the District of Columbia is not consistent with the privileges and rights of the House. Accordingly, I have instructed the Office of General Counsel to move to quash the subpoena.

Sincerely,

DR. JOHN EISOLD,  
Attending Physician.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE ASSOCIATE ADMINISTRATOR, HUMAN RESOURCES, OFFICE OF CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Kathy A. Wyszynski, Associate Administrator, Human Resources, Office of the Chief Administrative Officer:

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, March 17, 2003.

Hon. DENNIS J. HASTERT,  
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House, that the Office of Payroll and Benefits has been served with a subpoena duces tecum issued by the Superior Court of San Bernardino County, California.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

KATHY A. WYSZYNSKI,  
Associate Administrator, Human Resources.

#### RESPONSIBILITIES IN WAR AGAINST IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, Members who were not here during the first Persian Gulf War, the next few days will probably be some of the most serious time that we have served in the House. The consequences of the action of our Nation will be consequences that will go down in history. I think it is a good

time this evening for us to sit back and take a look at what are our responsibilities.

What are our responsibilities as Republicans? What are our responsibilities as Democrats? On what issues should we act in a bipartisan fashion? On what issues should we go out and be willing to stand up for the issues, for the very standards that this country stands for? I think in the next 48 hours or so, our country, it is pretty obvious, will engage in a military conflict; and I think it is for the right reasons.

President Bush's speech last night was simple, not a lot of fancy language. It was straightforward. He did not mince any words; but more than anything else, it was appropriate. It spoke of the responsibility of the Commander in Chief. It spoke of the responsibility of the United States of America. It spoke of the responsibility of the allies and the willing coalition that has the gumption, has the foresight to stand up to one of the most vicious men and one of the most vicious regimes in the history of the world. It is time for us to stand united.

When we speak about responsibility, let us talk about what another President thought about responsibility. Let us talk about Bill Clinton, the former President of the United States. He recognized, and whatever issues Members have with Bill Clinton, he recognized what Iraq was about and what Saddam Hussein was about. Unfortunately, in the last few days I think the former President has violated kind of an unspoken rule and that is past Presidents do not interfere or try to interfere or play politics on foreign matters especially at a time of war. But President Clinton and, of course, former President Jimmy Carter have decided to speak out.

But I want to relate to Members and show exactly what President Clinton recognized; he recognized what the responsibility of this Nation was against the horrible regime of Saddam Hussein. This is what Bill Clinton said about it on February, 18, 1998. President Clinton on Saddam Hussein and Saddam's threat: "What if Saddam Hussein fails to comply and we fail to act, or we take some ambiguous third route which gives him yet more opportunities to develop his program of weapons of mass destruction and continue to ignore the solemn commitments that he made? Well, he will conclude that the international community has lost its will. He will then conclude he can go right on and build an arsenal of devastation and destruction." Bill Clinton 1998.

That President recognized the responsibility of this country, and President Bush and his team at the White House have correctly recognized and stood up for the responsibility of this country and our willing allies. I want to talk about what are the responsibilities of the United Nations; what can the United Nations do and what should we expect from the United Nations; and