

Worker accounts: all worker accounts would be owned by the worker and invested through pools supervised by the government. Regulations would be instituted to prevent people from taking undue risk. Until an account balance reaches \$2,500, a worker would be limited on the kind of index investments they could make; and after the balance reaches \$2,500, they would have more flexibility but only investing in safe accounts as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury.

The fairness to women's provision that we put in this bill: for married couples, account contributions would be pooled and then divided equally between the husband and wife. So whatever the husband and wife would be eligible to invest would be added together and divided by two so each spouse would have the same in their individual account. Second, it would increase surviving spouse benefits to 110 percent of the higher-earning spouse's benefits. Third, stay-at-home mothers with kids under 5 would receive retirement credit. In other words, we are saying for a spouse that stays home with those young kids, they can have those years credited at the average for the other years.

In conclusion, Social Security solvency, the Retirement Security Act has been scored by the Social Security Administration actuaries to keep the program solvent. There would be no increases in the retirement age, changes in benefits for seniors or near-seniors, or changes in the Social Security COLA.

Mr. Speaker, there are only 24 Members in the House and Senate that have ever signed onto a bill. We need to move ahead and save this program.

AMERICA DESERVES STRAIGHT TALK ON THE ENVIRONMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, this administration is well known for spinning the truth, a very polite term for a lamentable practice. For example, over two-thirds of the American public think that Saddam Hussein and the Iraqis have some linkage to the attack of September 11, when, 2 years after the fact, there remains no evidence, despite the efforts of the administration to rhetorically connect these events.

The administration's habit of using misleading language is at its worst with the environment. Their Clear Skies Initiative will actually permit dirtier air. Relaxation of the New Source Review rules will inhibit the intent of the Clean Air Act, which 30 years ago gave a reprieve to the dirtiest coal fired plants, a reasonable time to come into compliance. The New Source Review rules were designed so that when plants modernize, new anti pollution technology must be put in

place. Instead, the agencies have kept these aging dinosaurs in use because, simply, they make more money.

Rather than enforcing the Clean Air Act as previous administrations have done to encourage the industry, President Bush now proposes that these old plants continue to be grandfathered permanently. Changes to the New Source Rules announced last month will allow plants to make a 20 percent investment each year without triggering the New Source Rule. There is no reason for them to ever come into full compliance.

Because of the prevailing winds, the pollution is not just in the vicinity of the plant or in that State that allows it to operate. The effects are concentrated, particularly in the New England States. And attorneys general in New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, as well as some midwest States like Wisconsin and Illinois are lining up to challenge this rule in court.

Yesterday, the President was in Michigan to promote his Clear Skies Initiative; but he had the audacity to appear at one of the Nation's dirtiest power plants in Monroe, which is responsible, we are told, for approximately 300 premature deaths each year.

The Detroit Free Press points out that the mercury emissions at that plant have gone up over the course of the last 2 years, and this Clear Skies Initiative will allow more mercury emissions than simply enforcing the current law.

The President attempted to paint to this as a jobs-creation issue; but local labor leaders pointed out that when the Monroe plant owner, Detroit Edison, found out that the New Source Review rules were going to be relaxed, they promptly stop their efforts to install pollution controls required by law and fired 800 union workers who had been installing them. Lost jobs, dirtier air, health problems for thousands.

The pending energy bill should be an opportunity to rectify these problems with cleaner air, reducing the dependence on foreign oil and maybe even protecting the power grid recently proven vulnerable. Instead, we currently have a grab bag of incentives for special interests that shortchanges efficiency, continues reliance on expensive imported foreign oil, and delays the day of reckoning for electrical power to clean the air and a more fuel-efficient auto industry.

It is not too late for the administration and the Congress to deal meaningfully with two or three of these items that would actually help the American public. It is not just protecting the environment and the health of our citizens; it is a matter of long-term economic stability and security at a time when we have almost 140,000 American troops in and around Iraq in no small measure to secure Middle East oil.

The Bush administration should be straight with the American public about the economic, environmental, and security consequences. Rather

than a misleading photo-op, we should work for the meaningful environmental progress that America deserves.

VICTORY'S PRICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) is recognized during morning hour debates.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, a generation from now Iraq will either be a thriving democratic ally of the United States, or an enemy of unimaginable hatred, ruled by a violent government of, for, and by international terrorists.

A generation from now the battle of Iraq, now the central component of the war on terror, will have succeeded or have failed. America will have won or lost; and our brave heroes who gave their lives there will have sacrificed for virtue or died in vain.

The toppling of Saddam Hussein's status in Firdos Square will have been the dawn of an age of Middle East freedom and stability, or it will have been the cruel joke that ushered in an era of unspeakable terror in the region.

There is no middle ground. Freedom and terrorism cannot co-exist. This struggle between good and evil will be decided by victory or surrender, in security or in shame.

And the terrorists understand the stakes. That is why they swarmed like scorpions into Iraq. They know that their true enemy is not our weapons, but our own will. And thankfully, so does President George W. Bush. That is why he spoke to the Nation last week and announced his request for additional funds to prosecute the war.

The question now before us is whether we realize, as the terrorists do, that the separate stand they are making in Iraq is the last best hope for their evil ideology.

Mr. Speaker, our mission in Iraq is not related to the war on terror. It is the war on terror. The enemy has chosen to make his stand right there. And if victory is our aim, we must not yield until the last terrorist in Iraq is in a cell or in a cemetery. Whether it costs \$87 billion or \$187 billion, our absolute victory in the war and the peace is worth any price, because without victory, there will be no survival.

□ 1245

If we are to take the war on terror seriously, we must spend what it takes to win. Critics and candidates may measure wars by the dollars that they cost, but the American people will measure this war, as we did in World War II and the Cold War, by the lives it saves, the evil it destroys and the freedom it preserves.

ADMINISTRATION PLAYING FAST AND LOOSE WITH THE FACTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOOZMAN). Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr.