

COMMUNICATION FROM THE ATTENDING PHYSICIAN OF THE CONGRESS

The Speaker pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Attending Physician of the Congress of the United States:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, March 6, 2003.

Hon. J. DENNIS 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 of Representatives, that I have been served with a grand jury subpoena for documents and testimony issued by the Superior Court for the District of Columbia.

After consulting with the Office of General Counsel, I will make the determinations required by Rule VIII.

Sincerely,

Dr. JOHN EISOLD,
Attending Physician.

MAKING THE CASE AGAINST IRAQ

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

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to cover two points. One will cover recent rulings in the FCC regarding the 1996 Telecommunications Act, and the other is we are going to talk about our foreign policy with Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, in 1996 the Telecommunications Act was heralded as a grand attempt to move the telecom markets toward competition. I was a conferee on that bill. It was a great compromise between the House and the Senate. That bill was greatly heralded by many people, but 7 years later the Act's intent has been overrun by the FCC's recent decision that has effectively blocked competition and created disincentives for investment by maintaining the UNE-P status quo.

□ 1415

It is not only the intent of the act that is being circumvented. More tangibly, the already-fragile telecom industry has suffered another financial setback. In response to the FCC's decision, many of Wall Street's analysts have made their voices heard on the negative effects that the decision will have on the economy, including Morgan Stanley, Goldman Sachs, Lehman Brothers and others.

An analogy of the FCC's decision would be to allow McDonald's, or Burger King, a competitor, to come into their restaurants and use their entire facilities. You bring your meat, you fry it up, you bring your own drinks, you use it all, you use their advertising, you use their building, you use their drive-up window, you use their cash registers, and you are in competition with the McDonald's or Burger King franchise?

No one in America would ever allow a competitor to do such a thing. But

that is what is happening in the telecommunications industry. What incentive is there at all to allow investment, if that in fact is what is going to occur?

As a matter of public policy, the FCC's decision simply makes no sense. On one hand, the commission deregulates broadband, and on the other hand it complicates and multiplies regulation on UNE-P.

Last year, this body passed the Tauzin-Dingell broadband legislation, 273 to 157. I think we could argue that the will of the Congress had an impact on how the FCC views broadband. Do we now pass another bill to show the FCC that further regulation on UNE-P offers no help to the Nation's economy? Mr. Speaker, if that is what it takes, then I say, let us do it.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services has joined us here for this Special Order on behalf of the Republican leadership.

There were some what I call the voices of dissent that came to the floor, the voice of dissent with regard to war. I call it the sounds of freedom. One was asking, please give peace a chance. The other one was saying I am concerned about the long-term damage to our alliances if we do not follow what Germany, Russia, China, and France are asking for. The other says we just need to continue our diplomacy and we should follow the lead of the French. That was the voice of dissent that came here to the floor today.

I would say to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), to those voices out there that say give peace a chance, it is easy to say that when you sit in freedom, and peace is truly the consequence of freedom. America represents freedom, and we export hope and opportunity; and Iraq and some of the sub-national terrorist organizations that represent tyranny, they export fear and terror.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HUNTER. If the gentleman would yield on that point, I agree with the gentleman that the folks who express their dissent and have been expressing their dissent in government, basically giving the other side of the debate, are providing a public service by doing that. But I think there are a few observations that are important here.

There have been people demonstrating worldwide in large numbers, hundreds of thousands of people, against the prospect of war with Iraq. I do not think any of those people demonstrated when the Kurdish babies were laid low by the gas attacks with poison gas that Saddam Hussein spread over their villages.

I do not think any of those folks demonstrated when he gassed Iranians by the tens of thousands, or when he executed his own people, cut off their ears and did the myriad of reprehensible acts that have now been ascribed to him, both in closed-door sessions by

our intelligence officers and in open sessions by various human rights agencies.

So I think it is always important to set the record straight, or to come into these debates with a full understanding of where they come from. And I think one of the most honest talk shows that was ever devised for television was "Crossfire," where the conservative would say "from the right," and the liberal would say "from the left."

But it is obvious that the people who are demonstrating by the hundreds of thousands, some of them well-meaning people, also include lots of people who are not necessarily demonstrating because they have a great love of mankind, or that they are special peace people or have a special care about humanity, because, if they did, they would have been demonstrating when Saddam Hussein gassed those Kurdish babies by the hundreds. They were not demonstrating there, so that did not bother them.

It did not bother them because it was not destabilizing. I think a lot of folks do not like the idea that war in itself is something unsure, it is destabilizing, that it potentially affects the cost of gasoline in your automobile, it potentially affects your community, it may affect relatives who may have to go off to war. So it is something that brings about a feeling of unsettlement.

But let us answer that question the gentleman brought up, why are we entering into this confrontation, it appears? I think one question that could be well thrown back is this: in 1991, when we had not only lots of folks in this country and around the world against us taking action against Iraq when they invaded Kuwait, we not only had lots of folks on the streets around the world, but we also had a majority of the Democrat leadership. I do not fault that Democrat leadership for having taken their position, which they have a political right to do, and taking that side of the debate. But we found afterwards, to answer those people who said give peace some time, give it a chance, give us another 10 months, 18 months, whatever, we found out that according to United Nations estimates, Saddam Hussein at the time that we defeated him in battle was 6 months away from having a nuclear weapon.

So certainly those well-meaning folks who thought that time was on our side discovered afterward, and to the surprise of everyone, conservatives, liberals, Democrats, Republicans, none of us knew how close he was to having that system. So time is not always on our side.

It is my estimate, after having conducted some closed hearings and some open hearings, eight hearings in total, it is my judgment that this country is going to have a nuclear device in about 3 years, and, along with that capability, possessing that capability, because we have allies who have nuclear devices, Britain has nuclear devices and we are not worried about them,