

THE SHAMBLES OF THE  
LEGISLATIVE AGENDA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to recap what we have done today and what we are doing in this House. There are certain protocols that prohibit us from saying things like wake up, America, listen to the debates of this House, and to the concerns of this Nation. This is the holiday time, the time that schools are getting out, families are coming together for vacations. So this is a good time for the smoke and mirrors legislation of this body, dominated by those who have no simple or at least appreciation for the enormous task that we have in putting this Nation back together again.

Let me simply recount, Mr. Speaker, the journey that we are taking. We realize that 21 days this Nation was at war, and that we were able to come under budget for a war that many disagreed with but not with the valiant work of our young people. Unfortunately, as we projected about the needs of this Nation and a war with Iraq, we failed to take into consideration the aftermath, the tragedy of 51 young men and valiant heroes that have lost their lives since the ending of this war, the cost of maintaining 160,000-plus soldiers on the front lines, the \$1 billion a month that we are spending in Afghanistan in the war against terrorism, the large number of dollars that are necessary and not yet expended with respect to homeland security.

As a member of the Select Committee on Homeland Security, I realize that many of our local governments are asking and pleading for dollars for their first responders.

In the backdrop of that, we have a growing deficit and an increasing unemployment. College graduates are coming out with wonderful diplomas and great smiles of admiration by their family, and yet they can find no work.

This body of course is now trying to grapple with the issue of a guaranteed Medicare prescription drug benefit for the seniors that we promised them for now 8 years, and what are we giving to them? A mere \$400 billion. It sounds like a big number, but we are going to leave the seniors holding the bag by, in actuality, having a gap. That means rather than getting a guaranteed prescription drug benefit in Medicare, we are going to tell seniors to go out and be fishers of men, fishers of HMOs, fishers of low-cost drugs. This is what we are going to give them. They have to go out and shop for HMOs that will give them a drug benefit, and then if they spend up to \$2,000, forget about it.

They have got to pay for it the rest of it until they hit \$5,000. Some seniors will fall through the cracks, and maybe some will lose their lives because of their inability to get the prescription drugs. We can spend a whole bunch of

money on doing things that are really not necessary, \$1 trillion tax cut to the likes of Warren Buffett, who said that he is paying less taxes than his receptionist, one of the richest men in the world. We gave a big tax cut with a big deficit, and now we cannot give our seniors a protection that we have been pleading for for 8 years.

We now have come to the floor of the House and the eloquent statesmen who were making these points about the taxpayer bill that we just passed, or that we will vote on, and I wish all of us could have voted on it in a bipartisan way, the eloquence of saying we are giving a tax credit, but what they are doing is they are eliminating the opportunity for some laid-off workers to get health care by the State by passing this bill. So they are undermining the very needs of those who are in most need, working men and women.

Right now we have been trying to pass a child tax credit for those making between \$11,000 and \$26,000. Those are our young men and women in the United States military. They make \$1,000 a month. Their families are back home. We are trying to give them a tax credit. What is happening? Republican friends want to give an \$82 billion tax giveaway, stalling the bill so we cannot get the bill to the President's desk. The President said he would sign the Senate bill, the same bill we want to pass. Within hours, that bill could be signed right now at the picnic that they are getting ready to have. That bill could be signed, and we would be providing a tax cut to the young men and women, families that are overseas, military men and women making \$1,000 a month.

Mr. Speaker, I have got to say that we have got to fix the shambles of the legislative agenda, begin to stand up and speak for the American people who are in need, and it is time for the American people to wake up and understand what is occurring on the floor of the House.

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

(Mr. GUTKNECHT 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 Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

PRESIDENTIAL INQUIRY

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, the House has adjourned its regular busi-

ness for today, and they have gone off to the White House for a picnic; so I do not suppose very many of them will be in their office listening to this, but I think they should at least consider the fact that today's newspapers and the BBC news, the ABC news, the Economist, all come together in saying the war is not over, boys. Three more dead in Baghdad in violence. There was a drive-by shooting at a petrol station. It sounds a little like some of our cities. And we are there bringing them democracy. I guess that is what democracy means to our President. I do not know. It is hard to know. But when I was reading these articles, I thought of one that I read recently. This is dated March 21, not so long ago. "A United Nations survey of civilian damage caused by the allied bombardment of Iraq calls the results near apocalyptic. The survey, which was made public today, recommends an immediate end to the embargo on imports of food and other essential supplies to prevent imminent catastrophe."

This article went on further to say that the U.S. position is that by "making life uncomfortable for the Iraqi people, it," meaning sanctions, "will eventually encourage them to remove President Saddam Hussein from power." This is what the situation was. This is from 1991. We intended to get rid of Saddam Hussein from 1991 on, at least. And for the President and his advisers to come around here saying it just happened since 9/11 and all that kind of stuff is absolutely nonsense.

At the time that one of the Air Force planners said big picture, we want people to know, get rid of this guy and we will be more than happy to assist in the rebuilding. We are not going to tolerate Saddam Hussein and his regime. Fix that and we will fix their electricity. That is what the United States was saying in 1991. This is the country that wants to bring democracy to Iraq. And it goes on.

I mean, it is really wonderful. One planner said, people say you did not recognize that it was going to have an effect on water or sewage? Well, what were we trying to do? Help out the Iraqi people? No. What we were doing with the attacks on infrastructure was to accelerate the effect of sanctions. We bombed the sewer pumping stations. We bombed the water pumping stations. We bombed the television. We bombed the telephone. We bombed the electrical. We bombed everything because we were going to inflict pain on the Iraqi people.

Now if we roll fast forward to today, people in the White House, and I do not know how they could have been thinking about it, Mr. Speaker, that these people were going to be just waiting, so excited to have the Americans come in and bring them democracy.

What kind of fools could plan and state publicly what they were doing and then expect people to be grateful that they were bombed, that their hospitals had no electricity for the refrigeration to save the children and the

blood and all the things that go on in a hospital that require electricity? We did it deliberately. And the President says, well, we had to wage this war because they had these weapons of mass destruction that were an imminent threat to us. We had destroyed their electrical system. We destroyed all kinds of things. We had reduced the value of their money.

I mean, I carry a 250 Dinar note in my wallet just to remind me of what this country can do. This is a 250 Dinar note. These are printed in Iraq. This was worth \$875 in 1991; today, 12 cents. Do the Members think we did not crush their economy? Of course we did. And it was all because we wanted to bring them democracy, because we were going to free the world from weapons of mass destruction.

Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to have an inquiry in this House, conducted in public, as to what the President knew, when he knew it. How could he come to the well of the House and give us information that was known to be forgery about nuclear material?

It is time, Mr. President, when the picnic is over, you had better come up here and tell us the truth.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind all Members to address their remarks to the Chair.

#### FILNER-McHUGH LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS EQUITY ACT

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

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation with the gentleman from the State of New York (Mr. McHUGH). The purpose of our bill, called The Law Enforcement Officers Equity Act, H.R. 2442, is simply stated: Give law enforcement status to law enforcement officers.

Many Federal officials, for example, the Border Patrol, are classified as law enforcement officers because that is a classification that comes with certain salary and retirement benefits. But many other officers, officer who are trained to carry weapons, who wear body armor, who face the same daily risk as law enforcement officers are not so classified. These officers, for example, inspectors who work for the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection and the Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement under the Department of Homeland Security, Veterans Affairs police officers, U.S. Mint police officers, Internal Revenue Service officers, and police officers in about two dozen other agencies, are not eligible for early retirement and other benefits designed to maintain a young and vigorous law enforcement workforce that we need to combat those who pose life-threatening risks to our society.

The tragic irony, Mr. Speaker, is that the only time these officers are classified as law enforcement officers is when they are killed in the line of duty. Then their names are inscribed on the wall of the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial right here in Washington.

□ 1630

Let me say that again. It is only when they are killed that they are called law enforcement officers, and that is a tragic irony.

My district encompasses the entire California-Mexico border and is home to two of the busiest world border crossings in the entire world, so I am very familiar with the work of border inspectors. They wear bulletproof vests, they carry firearms, and, unfortunately, have to use them. Most importantly, these inspectors are subject to the same risks as other officers with whom they serve side by side and who do have the benefits of law enforcement status.

Our Law Enforcement Officers Equity Act will make important strides toward ensuring the safety of our country as these officers protect our borders, our ports of entry, our military and veterans installations and other sensitive government buildings. The bill ensures the strong and vigorous workforce necessary for our country to have the finest level of protection. Our country deserves no less, and these valiant officers who protect us deserve no less.

Any cost created by this act is offset by savings in training costs and increased revenue collection. A 20-year retirements bill for these employees will reduce turnover, increase yield, decrease recruitment, and development costs and enhance the retention of a well-trained and experienced workforce.

Mr. Speaker, the simple fact is that these officers have dangerous jobs and deserve to be recognized as law enforcement officers, just like others with whom they serve, side by side, and who share the same level of risk. I encourage my colleagues to join the gentleman from New York (Mr. McHUGH) and me in cosponsoring H.R. 2442, the Law Enforcement Officers Equity Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES of North Carolina 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 Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. KING of Iowa 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 Illinois (Mr. RUSH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. RUSH 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 Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. BIGGERT addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### ILLEGAL ALIENS TAKING AMERICAN JOBS

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

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, a great deal of discussion has been undertaken on this floor for the purpose of addressing the issue of unemployment and for talking about the needs of workers in the United States.

We continually look at pieces of legislation that are designed to improve the economic conditions within the