



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 156

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 10, 2010

No. 34

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. SLAUGHTER).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 10, 2010.

I hereby appoint the Honorable LOUISE MCINTOSH SLAUGHTER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer: O God of all the living, at times You are silent or seem to be absent.

When we are busy or fully occupied, we often do not turn to You. But when we do seek Your presence or pray asking for an answer, You may be silent.

Sometimes You may draw back from our momentary attention just to make us pray all the more ardently and increase our desire for Your presence or refine our request.

Hopefully, when You break Your silence and speak to us or any Member of Congress, we will be ready to respond to Your inspiration and be prepared to do Your will.

Although we are not always faithful, You are faithful both now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HARE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. HARE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 3433. An act to amend the North American Wetlands Conservation Act to establish requirements regarding payment of the non-Federal share of the costs of wetlands conservation projects in Canada that are founded under that Act, and for other purposes.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will now entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

HONORING GERALDINE JORDAN

(Mr. HARE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HARE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a member of the Women's Air Force Service Pilots, Geraldine Hardman-Jordan of Moline, Illinois. And I would like to recognize her family who is sitting in the gallery with us this morning.

Madam Speaker, at the young age of 21, Geraldine was one of the first women in history trained to fly American military aircraft. Her call to serve

did not end after her military career. Geraldine also prevailed in her second battle, the one to achieve full veteran status for her WASP sisters.

Today, I also honor Geraldine as the mother of nine wonderful children and a community leader who advocated on behalf of several worthy causes.

Madam Speaker, later today, Geraldine and other WASP pioneers will be awarded the Congressional Gold Medal for their invaluable service more than 60 years ago. Unfortunately, Geraldine passed away in 2001 and cannot be here to receive the award in person, but I am very happy that her family will proudly represent her at the ceremony.

Madam Speaker, Geraldine is a true American hero and a great source of pride for the 17th Congressional District of Illinois, and I can think of no better recognition of her services to this country than the Congressional Gold Medal.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR). The Chair will remind Members to refrain from referring to occupants of the gallery.

AFGHANISTAN RETREAT RESOLUTION

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the House is considering today a dangerous resolution: the Afghanistan retreat. As a father of four sons in the military and as a former member of the 218th Brigade of the South Carolina National Guard, which served for a year in Afghanistan led by Major General Bob Livingston, I know we should trust our military leaders led by General David Petraeus and General Stanley McChrystal with

This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H1223

Major General Larry Nicholson of the Marines. These leaders will fight for victory to protect American families by defeating terrorists overseas.

Even liberal Newsweek highlights the success of the surge in the March 8 edition with the title, "The Surge is Working" with the subtitle, "All Signs Point America's Way."

Though the Taliban is entrenched in Helmand province, its grip is slipping in the rest of Afghanistan. These developments undercut the common belief that America is doomed to fail. In fact, Afghanistan's demography, sociology, military situation, and politics all favor Obama's counterinsurgency strategy. If the Taliban can't gain popular support or silence, it can't win.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

(Ms. SLAUGHTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I was honored to open the House this morning during this most important Women's History Month.

Our Nation's foremothers stood up to injustice and, by changing the course of history, opened the doors of opportunity to all of America's daughters. It is our duty to recognize and honor their tireless efforts.

This past summer, our great Nation celebrated the 160th anniversary of the 1848 Women's Rights Convention in Seneca Falls, New York. This groundbreaking convention was dedicated to the key principle in the Declaration of Independence that we are all created equal.

From securing a woman's right to vote in 1920 to serving our country in Iraq and Afghanistan, we have come a long way.

In this Congress alone, we have much to celebrate: Speaker PELOSI is the first woman to lead this esteemed body, and Senator Clinton made "18 million cracks" in the Nation's highest glass ceiling as the first woman to run a formidable Presidential campaign.

Yet as we celebrate these important milestones and look back at all we have achieved since 1948, we know our journey toward true gender equality is not complete. We must continue to fight for equality this month. We honor the women who blazed the trail for all women.

GIVE NAVY SEALS MEDALS

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, three of our tenacious Navy SEALs captured one of the worst terrorists in the world: Ahmed Hashim Abed.

In 2004, four Blackwater security guards were transporting supplies in Fallujah, Iraq. They were caught in an

ambush and murdered by those cowards in the desert. These Americans were set on fire, mutilated, dragged through the streets, and hung from a bridge over the Euphrates River.

Abed, the terrorist, was the mastermind behind the massacre of these Americans. But Navy SEALs McCabe, Keefe, and Huertas captured this outlaw. But now for some odd reason, they are being put on trial—the SEALs, not the terrorist.

The whiny terrorist later claimed he was punched in the stomach during his capture on the battlefield. It hurt his little terrorist feelings, it seems. Now the SEALs face a court martial.

Congress should commend the valiant actions of these Navy SEALs, and I have introduced a resolution to do just that. These SEALs should be given medals and sent out to bag another one.

And that's just the way it is.

CREATING JOBS

(Ms. WATSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, during the 111th Congress, we have made great strides in creating jobs. The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act was the largest middle class tax cut in history. One year ago, the economy that was declining by 6 percent is now expanding at about that rate because of this significant program.

The Recovery Act has already worked to save or create as many as 2 million jobs, according to the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office. In 1 year, the Recovery Act has provided \$120 billion in tax cuts for 95 percent of the working families as well as businesses across the country; loaned nearly \$20 billion to small businesses to expand and create jobs; and funded more than 12,500 transportation projects nationwide; kept teachers, police officers, and firefighters on the job; and accomplished much more.

IT'S THE ECONOMY, STUPID

(Mr. ROGERS of Alabama asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Many of you may remember in the 1992 campaign for the Presidency, James Carville made famous the phrase "It's the economy, stupid," because they posted that sign on the campaign war room to remind the candidate and the staff that that was the number one issue the American people wanted focused on.

Well, you know, Mr. Carville ought to pull that signage back out and take it over to the White House and maybe take one down the hallway here to the Speaker's suite to remind the majority and the leadership that that is what the American people want us focused on. It is not a government takeover of health care; they want us to focus on the economy and creating jobs.

I don't know why that seems to be something that they don't want to do. The President said at the beginning of the year that he was going to pivot from health care and focus "like a laser" on jobs and the economy. And here we are now demanding that we put our full attention on the government takeover of health care by the end of next week.

You just want to remind them: It's the economy, stupid. Let's focus on it.

BALANCED BUDGET CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

(Mr. BRIGHT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday I introduced a constitutional amendment bill to balance the Federal budget. I am proud that 36 of my colleagues have joined me in cosponsoring H.J. Res. 78, and I urge all Members of Congress who believe that government should live within a budget join me and my colleagues to pass this bill.

Balancing the budget is a simple concept that Alabama families follow every day. Without question, there are many steps that must be taken to improve our financial situation, but balancing the budget on a yearly basis is the only way to ensure that we don't repeat the mistakes of our past.

We know we can achieve this goal because we have done so in the past. From 1998 to 2001, our country achieved balanced budgets through adherence to PAYGO. Forty-nine States currently require an annual balanced budget. Passing a constitutional amendment is a long process but is absolutely necessary to ensure America remains strong for generations to come.

I urge the entire Congress to join me in this effort. I want to thank you for your support.

HONORING DAVID HAMES

(Mr. LAMBORN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in remembrance of a noble and humble man lost in the devastating earthquake in Haiti. David Hames of Colorado Springs, Colorado, left an enduring legacy of selflessness and faith.

David lived a life completely devoted to his family and to his Savior, Jesus Christ. He and his beloved wife of 13 years, Renee, have been blessed with two beautiful adopted sons, Aidan and Zander, who will remember their father's unending love.

He blessed the world with his talent for filmmaking. This was embodied in his award-winning and innovative children's educational video series, "Cranium's Ark."

On January 11, David arrived in Haiti for Compassion International to tell the story of orphans and widows as he had throughout the world. After a day of shooting footage, he was in the

Hotel Montana when the earthquake hit. God took David home at the age of 40. His life was an amazing journey filled with passion and faithfulness, and his legacy will endure.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. YARMUTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, just as we are about to reach the mountaintop of health care reform, just a few feet away, opponents of health care reform say, Start over. Well, you know, there are people in this country who do have to start over. The 1,800 people or 17 a day, 700,000 a year, who go into bankruptcy because of health care costs, they have to start over. They have to start rebuilding their lives all over again. And those 14,000 people every day who lose their health insurance, they have to start over as well. They have to start the search to find out how they can protect their family with affordable health insurance.

The only people who really get to start over are the insurance companies who, when people get very sick, say, We are going to start over with another customer because you are too expensive to care for.

No, we can't start over because, if we start over, life will be over for too many Americans.

□ 1015

MEDIA GIVES DEMOCRATS' SIDE ON RECONCILIATION

(Mr. SMITH of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Senate's reconciliation procedure is designed for legislation to balance the budget. Now the administration wants to use reconciliation to force a health insurance scheme on the American people. The health care scheme under reconciliation means decisions made by the government behind closed doors against the wishes of the American people.

A recent New York Times article claimed that Republicans have used reconciliation in the past, but failed to acknowledge that it has never been used before to enact a massive partisan policy change like a \$1 trillion government health care mandate. And the national media have largely ignored the fact that many Democratic leaders, including the President, previously voiced strong opposition to reconciliation. In fact, the nonpartisan fact checkers at PolitiFact determined that the President's support of reconciliation is a "full flop" from his earlier comments opposing it.

The national media should give Americans the facts, not just present the Democrats' point of view.

ECONOMY AND JOB MARKET ON THE RISE

(Ms. NORTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. NORTON. We've had to come to this floor, Mr. Speaker, to speak about the folks who drove this economy into the ground and just how bad it was, but there is good news to raise the spirits of the American people coming from the Labor Department and from analysts. We know that the economy has turned around, but until the job market turned around nobody wanted to hear it; now analysts tell us so has the job market.

All expected unemployment numbers to ratchet up during February because of the bad weather, including crippling snowstorms. Instead, it stood steady—too high at over 9 percent, but it showed confidence in the economy that so many employers stopped laying off people and kept people on. The biggest losses were where you might have expected, in construction, because of all the bad weather and the snowstorms.

The best sign that employers are feeling more confident is that they are getting their feet wet with many new temporary employees brought on, which is always the first sign that they are ready to bring on people full time and permanently, and the best sign may be the 2.7 million job openings. Now we have a mismatch. Thank goodness for the stimulus that went to community colleges to help us cure that mismatch.

CALLING ON PRESIDENT OBAMA TO REVERSE STEM CELL RESEARCH EXECUTIVE ORDER

(Mr. FLEMING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate a solemn occasion.

One year ago, President Obama issued an Executive order allowing for taxpayer dollars to incentivize the destruction of human life through the use of embryonic stem cells. As a physician, a father, and a grandfather, I know that all human life is precious and begins at the moment of conception, and it is paramount that we continue to seek better medical treatments and cures for diseases. Yet I also believe that our research and decisions must be life affirming.

Lives can be saved through techniques creating embryonic-like cells from adult cells, making it unnecessary to destroy embryos. Over 73 different diseases so far have been treated with adult or cord blood stem cells, including type 1 diabetes and heart disease.

I call upon the President to reverse this order and acknowledge that research that is both morally controversial and out of date does not need to be subsidized by the American taxpayer.

WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH AND SILVIA ICHAR

(Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize National Women's History Month and to honor a small business owner from Orange County, Silvia Ichar, publisher of Para Todos magazine.

Silvia exemplifies the principles of this month through her magazine, which showcases the women of the arts, business, community service, and politics. As a small business advocate and entrepreneur, she has demonstrated leadership in communicating the importance of women-owned and minority-owned businesses, in particular in the growing Hispanic business sector.

She has received numerous business awards, including the Small Business Administration's award of 2009 for Small Business Journalist of the Year. She has also served as a board member for various Hispanic business organizations, including the California and the Orange County Hispanic Chambers of Commerce, the Latin Business Association, and the National Latina Business Women Association. I am very proud of Silvia's achievement and her small business advocacy.

LET'S PASS HEALTH CARE

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, President Obama spoke about health care. He said, If not now, when? And if not us, who? President Obama was correct. He knew that the duty and the obligations of this House are to pass momentous legislation to help the American people. It's engraved above the Speaker's rostrum in words from Daniel Webster, Let us gather all resources and do something worthwhile and momentous and great while we are here with the resources of this country, something to be remembered.

Health care has been on the American agenda for 100 years, starting with Teddy Roosevelt in 1912. It went through Harry Truman, through Richard Nixon, Bill Clinton, and today Barack Obama. We are here to fulfill Ted Kennedy's dream and the work of many Congresses and the American people.

I have had several constituents come to me and tell me of serious, serious illnesses they've had, that they would have gone broke if they didn't have insurance. And if they didn't have insurance and their cancer surgeries weren't covered, we would pay for it in the tax we pay that we don't know about of \$1,000 per person for uncompensated care.

Let's do something worthwhile. Let's pass health care.

WOMEN AIR FORCE SERVICE PILOTS (WASPs)

(Mr. MAFFEI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MAFFEI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the forerunner of today's women military pilots, the Women Airforce Service Pilots, or WASPs, who served during World War II.

More than 1,100 women flew more than 60 million miles and provided crucial aid to our Nation in a time of war. From 1943 to 1944, they delivered aircraft from manufacturers in the United States to air bases throughout the country.

Three women from my district—Virginia Meloney, Ann Elizabeth O'Connor, and Aleta Johnson—are being awarded the Congressional Gold Medal today in recognition of their service to our country as WASPs. Their fearlessness led the way for future women military pilots. It is long overdue that we recognize these incredible women. Our country thrives because of the bravery and dedication of our citizens like the WASPs.

Ann O'Connor, a Syracuse resident since 1980, learned last year that this medal ceremony was going to happen. Her family told me it meant the world to her. Her daughter told me she would have loved to be here today, but Ann passed away in September of 2009. Her son and daughter and grandchildren are here and will attend the ceremony, and I know she is here today in spirit and through the eyes of her two lovely granddaughters.

I congratulate all of the extraordinary WASPs who served our country. Thank you for your dedication and service.

WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

(Mr. QUIGLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Constitution makes clear: Only Congress can declare war. While no one can dispute that we are at war, Congress has never been asked to make this declaration.

I disagree with the Congressman from Ohio's policy position; to leave Afghanistan at this moment would undermine our national security and imperil our troops. However, the War Powers Resolution is an important check on unfettered executive authority.

It is worth remembering the period in our Nation's history during which this act of Congress was passed. In 1973, during the height of the Vietnam War and following the Gulf of Tonkin, Congress overrode a Presidential veto to pass this measure into law. It did so because it was concerned with the erosion of congressional authority to decide when the United States should be-

come involved in a war. While Vietnam was a very different war, the frustration felt by the American public and Members of Congress at that point in time is similar to that of today.

In overriding a presidential veto and passing the War Powers Resolution, Congress was reclaiming a critical responsibility the Founding Fathers had granted to it: that such a declaration would be a product of robust discourse, one in which our leaders would identify the nature of the threat posed by our enemy, define the objective of the mission before us, and fully weigh the prudence of sending our troops into harm's way.

RECOVERING FROM THE GREAT RECESSION

(Mrs. MALONEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, this chart is a quick way to assess the direction things have been going in our efforts to recover from the Great Recession. While it is not success, it is definitely progress. It shows the monthly change in nonfarm payrolls over the past 2 years.

Point A on this chart is when the Great Recession and the job losses began in December of 2007. Back then, we were assured the fundamentals of the economy were sound. For over a year, the economy went straight downhill and shed jobs at an increasing rate, with no change in direction.

The last month that the former President was in office, President Bush, we lost over 700,000 jobs. Point C represents the jobs report from the last 2 months, clearly a dramatic improvement from 1 year ago—in fact, a 96 percent improvement, from over 750,000 jobs lost to 35,000 jobs; again, progress in the right direction.

In addition to this general trend, I would like to point out that the temporary help sector continues to improve. More than 40,000 workers have been added to the temporary help sector, a clear indication of improvement in the job market.

We still have a distance to go before we get every American back to work, but as this chart clearly shows, we are slowly and steadily moving in the right direction. Again, this is progress.

RECOGNIZING THE 60TH AIR MO- BILITY WING AT TRAVIS AIR FORCE BASE

(Mr. GARAMENDI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker and Members, I want to bring to your attention an extraordinary unit in our military in the Air Force located at Travis Air Force base in Fairfield, California. The 60th Air Mobility Wing does an extraordinary job providing services to the military as well as humanitarian efforts.

When the earthquake in Haiti occurred, it was that Wing that brought immediate assistance, using rapid deployment. They also have hospital services available that are immediately deployed. And when it comes time to open a new military base or a new field anywhere in the world, it's the 60th Air Mobility Wing located at Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield that provides those immediate services.

So I ask all the Members to recognize the good service, the good work this unit does, the extraordinary service provided by the men and women of the 60th Air Mobility Wing located at Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield, California.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

AUTHORIZING COMPENSATION FOR FURLOUGHED TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4786) to provide authority to compensate Federal employees for the 2-day period in which authority to make expenditures from the Highway Trust Fund lapsed, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4786

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. COMPENSATION AND RATIFICATION OF AUTHORITY.

(a) COMPENSATION FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.—Any Federal employees furloughed as a result of the lapse in expenditure authority from the Highway Trust Fund after 11:59 p.m. on February 28, 2010, through March 2, 2010, shall be compensated for the period of that lapse at their standard rates of compensation, as determined under policies established by the Secretary of Transportation.

(b) RATIFICATION OF ESSENTIAL ACTIONS.—All actions taken by Federal employees, contractors, and grantees for the purposes of maintaining the essential level of Government operations, services, and activities to protect life and property and to bring about orderly termination of Government functions during the lapse in expenditure authority from the Highway Trust Fund after 11:59 p.m. on February 28, 2010, through March 2, 2010, are hereby ratified and approved if otherwise in accord with the provisions of the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2010 (division B of Public Law 111-68).

(c) FUNDING.—Funds used by the Secretary to compensate employees described in subsection (a) shall be derived from funds previously authorized out of the Highway Trust Fund and made available or limited to the

Department of Transportation by the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010 (Public Law 111-117) and shall be subject to the obligation limitations established in such Act.

(d) EXPENDITURES FROM HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.—To permit expenditures from the Highway Trust Fund to effectuate the purposes of this section, this section shall be deemed to be a section of the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2010 (division B of Public Law 111-68), as in effect on the date of the enactment of the last amendment to such Resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 4786, and to include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

□ 1030

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, we are here on both sides of the aisle this morning on a mission of equity, fairness, even mercy, on behalf of 1,922 career Federal employees of the U.S. Department of Transportation. They were unintended victims of a standoff in the other body, which resulted in a 2-day lapse in the authorization of funding for Federal highway, highway and motor carrier safety, and public transit programs.

On February 25, the House passed by voice vote H.R. 4691, the Temporary Extension Act of 2010. The bill extended the authorization for Federal surface transportation programs which otherwise were scheduled to expire on February 28.

The Senate's efforts to pass the bill and to clear it for signature by the President were stalled by the actions of one Senator from the other party. His repeated objections held up consideration past the February 28 deadline.

As a result of those objections, the authority to reimburse States, metropolitan regions, and public transit agencies for federally approved Highway Trust Fund expenditures lapsed. Several States, like Missouri, immediately cancelled bid openings. DOT's authority to pay administrative expenses for Federal employees from the Highway Trust Fund also lapsed.

These authorities were restored only when the Senator relented on the evening of March 2, allowing the Senate to consider the bill. The Senate passed it, and the President signed it that evening, but these 1,922 employees were collateral damage. They were doing their jobs, career professionals, and they just happened to be hit by this roadside bomb. It affected them in a very specific way. Let me toll the numbers:

1,307 employees of the Federal Highway Administration, 434 employees of the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, 143 employees of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, and 38 employees of the Research and Innovative Technology Administration.

Well, in a few days, on March 16 to be exact, the DOT will process its payroll for the current March pay period. If Congress does not act to reinstate those career employees, those 1,922 public servants, through no fault of their own and having simply been doing their jobs as they have done for decades in many cases, will suffer a 20 percent pay cut in their biweekly paychecks. Now, this is not an abstraction. This is not a debating point. This is not something that, oh, we'll put this off, and we'll think about it later.

At the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, a long-term career secretary of NHTSA in Seattle, Washington normally would net \$1,540 per paycheck, but because of the furlough, would be paid \$1,150, a \$390 cut. A \$390 cut could affect your paying your mortgage, buying your weekly groceries, buying fuel for your car. Maybe it could even affect your sending a birthday card to a child or to a grandchild. It has a real effect, and I think the Senator on the other side just had no idea, no interest, and no care about what the effects would be of his actions.

An entry-level program analyst, a GS-7 in Chicago, Illinois at NHTSA, normally would net \$1,200 per paycheck in 2 weeks. Because of the furlough, he would be paid only \$900. That's a \$300 cut. If you're taking \$900 home over 2 weeks, \$300 out of that paycheck is serious money, a serious effect on your life, and it's a serious devaluation of appreciation for your service to the public.

These are career personnel. At any time, that's painful, but at this time, with this severe meltdown, economic recession, it's devastating. Miss a car payment; miss a tuition payment; miss part of your mortgage payment; miss your fuel bill; miss your electric bill. All of these things are the real-world consequences of one person's peak over some piece of this bill that had nothing to do with these personnel, with these careerists.

To the great credit of Secretary of Transportation Ray LaHood, a former colleague of ours in this body, he called and said, I am really concerned about these career personnel. We have to make them whole. They didn't do anything wrong. The department didn't do anything wrong. They were just stand-by victims of this action, and we will be able to restore their pay without any increase in budget. We will just shift dollars from one account to another.

The bill that we bring before you today does not require any new Federal funding. The Secretary, as I just described, will draw on administrative

funding previously authorized and appropriated to finance the lost compensation for those personnel. It is the right thing to do. We need to do this. We have got to pass it by a unanimous voice vote.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COBLE. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my strong support for H.R. 4786. The distinguished gentleman from Minnesota has pretty well covered this bill in detail. I will speak briefly to it.

Beginning at midnight on February 28 through March 2, all of the programs and the operations of the agencies funded under the Highway Trust Fund came to a halt because the extension of these programs was not passed by Congress, as the chairman has already pointed out. As a result, nearly 2,000 Department of Transportation employees were furloughed. This bill will ensure that those employees furloughed, at no fault of their own, will receive their normal compensation for that period of time.

Between February 28 and March 2, certain surface transportation activities were classified as "essential," such as the Federal safety inspection of trucks and buses. This bill approves these activities as essential actions taken to save lives and to protect property, allowing the DOT employees who worked on those activities during the furlough to be paid.

I urge my colleagues to support the passage of H.R. 4786. I support the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Northern Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY). I wish to express my great appreciation and admiration of his concern for these Federal employees. Many Federal employees reside in his district. Even some of these 1,900 likely reside in the gentleman's district. I appreciate his coming forward to champion this bill.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bipartisan legislation, compensating those Federal transportation employees who were unfairly furloughed on March 1 and 2 because of a lapse in the Highway Trust Fund.

I also want to thank my good friend, the chairman of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, Mr. OBERSTAR, and the ranking member, Mr. MICA from Florida, for their great leadership and for their sensitivity. I want to thank Mr. COBLE from North Carolina for his support on this on a bipartisan basis. Their leadership is critical to resolving this problem.

As the chairman has indicated, H.R. 4786 is a simple, commonsense bill. It would compensate the 1,922 Department of Transportation employees who were forced out of their jobs for 2 days because of political gamesmanship on the other side of the Capitol. These employees were spread across four agencies at the DOT: the Federal Highway

Administration, the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, and the Research and Innovative Technology Administration. These employees were furloughed through no fault of their own. They became unwitting victims of an arcane practice in the upper Chamber that allows one Member's objection, irrespective of merit, to grind to a halt the work of the American people.

As my colleagues will recall, an objection by one Senator from Kentucky led to the lapse of authorization for the Highway Trust Fund despite the objections of 21 of his Republican colleagues, a majority of the Republican caucus, who supported the ultimate extension on a 78-19 vote.

This bill does two simple things: It authorizes those workers who were furloughed to be compensated at their normal rate of pay for the 2 days in which they were laid off, and it ratifies actions taken by DOT during those 2 days to maintain minimum essential services. The Congressional Budget Office says this legislation has no new costs associated with it, as the chairman indicated, as the funding will come from existing expenses. By taking action now, this Congress will prevent a 20 percent cut in the next bi-weekly paycheck for these dedicated public servants.

There is a clear precedent for this type of restorative action dating back to the much longer government shutdown in the late 1995-early 1996 period during the Clinton administration. During that period, there were two funding gaps totaling 26 days which affected more than 800,000 Federal workers. As part of the final appropriations bill for FY 1996, the Republican-controlled Congress restored compensation for those employees. It was the right thing to do then, and it is the right thing to do now.

I thank Chairman OBERSTAR for his leadership and for his collaboration and generosity on this important legislation. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I wish to express my great appreciation to Mr. MICA, the senior Republican on our committee and my partner and good friend and co-participant, in all of the works of our committee.

I share with him this tragic fact of the loss of pay for these 1,922 employees. He immediately said, We have to fix that. We have got to make it right by them, and he volunteered to cosponsor the legislation, which he has done.

I am delighted he designated the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. Speaker, who a great advocate for our committee, a great participant in all of our work and who is also a very good, fair and decent-minded Member.

Today, we will do something really good and decent. We can all go home and feel we have accomplished something useful in a very specific and di-

rect fashion for 1,922 career professionals in transportation of the U.S. Department of Transportation.

Again, I express admiration for Secretary LaHood for taking the initiative to bring this issue forward and to find a funding solution for it as well.

We have got to be able to pass this on a voice vote and to do good by these 1,922, and we need to set a good example for the other body as well.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4786.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1045

COMMEMORATING THE 45TH ANNIVERSARY OF BLOODY SUNDAY

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 249) commemorating the 45th anniversary of Bloody Sunday and the role that it played in ensuring the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 249

Whereas brave people in the United States, known and unknown, of different races, ethnicities, and religions, risked their lives to stand for political equality and against racial discrimination in a quest culminating in the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965;

Whereas numerous people in the United States paid the ultimate price in pursuit of that quest, while demanding that the Nation live up to the guarantees enshrined in the 14th and 15th Amendments to the United States Constitution;

Whereas the historic struggle for equal voting rights led nonviolent civil rights marchers to gather on the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma, Alabama, on March 7, 1965, a day that would come to be known as "Bloody Sunday", where their bravery was tested by a brutal response, which in turn sent a clarion call to the Nation that the fulfillment of democratic ideals could no longer be denied;

Whereas, March 7, 2010, marks the 45th anniversary of Bloody Sunday, the day on which some 600 civil rights marchers were demonstrating for African-American voting rights;

Whereas Congressman John Lewis and the late Hosea Williams led these marchers across the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma, Alabama, where they were attacked with billy clubs and tear gas by State and local lawmen;

Whereas during the march on Bloody Sunday, Congressman Lewis was beaten unconscious, leaving him with a concussion and countless other injuries;

Whereas footage of the events on Bloody Sunday was broadcast on national television that night and burned its way into the Nation's conscience;

Whereas the courage, discipline, and sacrifice of these marchers caused the Nation to respond quickly and positively;

Whereas eight days after Bloody Sunday, President Lyndon B. Johnson called for a comprehensive and effective voting rights bill as a necessary response by Congress and the President to the interference and violence, in violation of the 14th and 15th Amendments, encountered by African-American citizens when attempting to protect and exercise the right to vote;

Whereas a bipartisan Congress approved the Voting Rights Act of 1965 and on August 6, 1965, President Lyndon B. Johnson signed this landmark legislation into law;

Whereas the Voting Rights Act of 1965 stands as a tribute to the heroism of countless people in the United States and serves as one of the Nation's most important civil rights victories, enabling political empowerment and voter enfranchisement for all people in the United States;

Whereas the Voting Rights Act of 1965 effectuates the permanent guarantee of the 15th Amendment that "the right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude";

Whereas the Voting Rights Act of 1965 has increased voter registration among racial, ethnic, and language minorities, as well as enhanced the ability of those citizens to participate in the political process and elect representatives of their choice to public office; and

Whereas the citizens of the United States must not only remember this historic event, but also commemorate its role in the creation of a more just society and appreciate the ways in which it has inspired other movements around the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress—

(1) commemorates the 45th anniversary of Bloody Sunday;

(2) observes and celebrates the 45th anniversary of the enactment of the Voting Rights Act of 1965;

(3) pledges to advance the legacy of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to ensure its continued effectiveness in protecting the voting rights of all people in the United States; and

(4) encourages all people in the United States to reflect upon the sacrifices of the Bloody Sunday marchers and acknowledge that their sacrifice made possible the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the concurrent resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHEN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, just this past Sunday, on March 7, we commemorated the 45th anniversary of Bloody Sunday, one of the most significant moments in the

civil rights movement. It was a day in which I was in Selma, Alabama, with JOHN LEWIS, one of the heroes of this United States of America, one of the great saints and heroes of this United States Congress. Other Congress people were there from both sides of the aisle.

We first went to Brown Chapel in Selma for a prayer service, where Rev. C.T. Vivian led us with a wonderful sermon. It was a civil rights pilgrimage that the Faith and Politics Institute put on.

The culmination of that, after going to Birmingham, where we went to the 16th Street Church and the Civil Rights Institute, and to Montgomery, where we saw the Rosa Parks Museum and went to Rev. Ralph Abernathy's church at the First Baptist Church and the Dexter Avenue Church, the church of Dr. Martin Luther King, as well as the Center for Poverty Law headed up by Morris Dees, culminated in Selma, and it was significant.

JOHN LEWIS marched there 45 years earlier. Alabama State troopers and Alabama police, the government, stopped them with horses and sticks and gas and all other means of oppression to stop people who were marching simply to have the right to vote and participate in this country's great democracy.

Voting is essential, and African Americans were denied voting. After the Civil War, they had the right to vote up until about the turn of century. But then Jim Crow laws came into place, and the effort to protest those, with JOHN LEWIS being a leader, culminated in Selma, where they were beaten.

After that and the retreat to Brown Chapel, the government came to the aid of JOHN LEWIS and others and saw to it they could march, and Dr. King joined that march and Ralph David Abernathy joined that march. They marched down Highway 80 from Selma to Montgomery, culminating just across from the capital, going straight to the capital. Just around the corner is the Dexter Avenue Church of Dr. Martin Luther King.

Eventually, the Voting Rights Act was passed, which Lyndon Johnson, in a speech to this Congress right from that lectern, said was the most important legislation that that Congress had passed and one of the most important pieces of legislation ever passed by this House.

It was fought by a lot of people, fought by a lot of people from the South. But that voting rights act was so important, and it started because a group of people said, We are not going to stand it anymore. We are going to stand up for our freedom. We are going to march and bring attention to this issue and participate in this democracy and start a change that is going to fulfill America's purpose and promise. That started in Selma. It started with JOHN LEWIS, and it culminated with that great march.

So it is important that this Congress take time to recognize the 45th anni-

versary of Bloody Sunday that forced this Nation to live up to its ideals of justice, freedom, and equality in society, generally, and in the realm of voting rights, specifically.

The pilgrimage was one of the best experiences I have had. I am from Memphis, Tennessee, where Dr. King was slain on April the 3rd. There were times when Mr. LEWIS and other Members came up to me and asked me to go on the pilgrimage. I thought, I was from Memphis. I had spoken at Mason Temple. I had been to Mason Temple. I had been to the Civil Rights Museum. I had been to the Lorraine Hotel so many times, and I knew about civil rights history.

But nobody really knows it until they go to the battleground, where this country's future and its promise was turned around and brought to bear because of a group of students and ministers, both black and white, who came together to march for civil rights and to make this country fulfill its destiny and its promise.

Mr. LEWIS is a man we are lucky to serve with, and I am lucky to serve with, and I appreciate him getting me to go, and for what I learned this weekend from being with him on the Edmund Pettus Bridge where the first march ended in violence, and later started on the long struggle to Montgomery and to freedom and to voting rights. Six hundred civil rights marchers stood strong in solidarity in the march to Montgomery 45 years ago.

Our democracy reflects a government of the people and by the people, a principle that had been articulated by President Abraham Lincoln in 1863. But until Bloody Sunday and Dr. King's participation and the successful march and the passage of the Voting Rights Act by Congress, it wouldn't have happened.

It had not been a government of the people and by the people. It was a government of the white people. It was a government of the wealthy people, the propertied people. In Alabama, there were literacy tests and there were taxes, and these stopped people from having the right to vote. There were intentional impediments to letting people participate in a democracy that you wouldn't have thought would happen in a country with our great Constitution. But the words in our Constitution were simply words. They needed to have purpose and a spirit put behind them and a fulfillment, and that didn't happen until Montgomery and Alabama.

Besides voting rights, that march led to other issues. There is economic justice as well as social justice, and we are working in those areas. Access to education, housing, health care, and more have not been available to all. Dr. King, in his famous speech in New York at the Riverside Church, talked about not only racism, but militarism and materialism.

There are still problems in this world today and problems that affect this

Congress, when too many times we do work on military solutions rather than peaceful solutions, and we worry about materialism rather than spiritual goods. We worry too much about people who have and not people who don't have enough. That is part of Dr. King's dream and part of the legacy that has not been fulfilled in this country, and this Congress needs to do more. That is why jobs bills are so important, to give people opportunities, and job training bills that we are working on.

So it was fortunate that we had this opportunity to participate in the pilgrimage. This country needs to reflect back on what happened 45 years ago, understand that the promise is not fulfilled, pay homage to those individuals that participated and made this country a better country, but know that the dream is not finished, the dream endures. We need to fulfill that destiny, and there are opportunities to do it here on this floor with jobs, with tax policy, and with other issues.

I urge my colleagues to support this important resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I support House Concurrent Resolution 249. This resolution commemorates the 45th anniversary of Bloody Sunday and the role it played in ensuring the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

On Bloody Sunday, March 7, 1965, JOHN LEWIS, now Congressman JOHN LEWIS and Chairman JOHN LEWIS, and the late Hosea Williams, led a march in Selma, Alabama, to demand racial and political equality in the United States.

They led 600 civil rights marchers east out of Selma, Alabama, toward the State's capital in Montgomery. They got as far as the Edmund Pettus Bridge six blocks away, where State and local lawmen attacked them with clubs and tear gas and forced them back into Selma. Congressman LEWIS was beaten unconscious, leaving him with a concussion and many other injuries.

The events on Bloody Sunday were televised nationally, and the Nation responded to these actions. As a result, within eight days, President Lyndon Johnson called for a comprehensive voting rights bill to protect African Americans and other citizens' right to vote, which is already guaranteed in the 15th Amendment.

Bipartisan majorities in both Houses of Congress approved the Voting Rights Act of 1965, and President Johnson signed this historic legislation into law on August 6, 1965, less than 5 months after Bloody Sunday.

I totally support this resolution's observance and celebrate the 45th anniversary of the Bloody Sunday marchers, whose sacrifices made it possible for the Voting Rights Act to come into being. I urge my colleagues to join in supporting this resolution.

I reserve balance of my time.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the majority leader, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), who joined us on this civil rights pilgrimage. I was so proud to be with him. He is one of the most constant attendees, and it reflects on his character that he goes and participates.

Mr. HOYER. I thank my friend for yielding, and I thank the ranking Republican for his comments. I thank Mr. COHEN for his leadership on this issue.

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness."

So spoke our Founding Fathers. Our Founding Fathers spoke, however, without a clear understanding of the impact of their words. Even as great as our Founding Fathers were, they did not live out the promise of those words in this land. Some were slave owners. Clearly, the contradiction between our words and the actions of our day-to-day lives were a contradiction from our stated values to our practices.

Martin Luther King, Jr., called America's attention to that paradox, to that contradiction, to that schizophrenic life that we had led. Martin Luther King, Jr., had a lieutenant who was a giant of a leader in his own right, and we are honored to serve with him; in my view, the most historic figure that serves among the 535 of us who have been given the privilege to represent our people and defend the Constitution and protect and preserve our democracy. JOHN LEWIS is a giant among us; a quiet, self-effacing, humble giant, but a giant nonetheless.

Forty-five years ago, civil rights activists attempted to march from Selma to Montgomery to demand that their Governor honor their right to vote and their God-given equality. Remember Jefferson's words, that our rights are not given by the majority. They are not given by Congress. They are not even given by the Constitution. They are given to us by a power higher than us. That is the glory of America, that every individual is an important being, endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights.

The world knows what happened to those marchers; how they were stopped by State troopers at the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma, how they were savagely beaten with nightsticks, and how this 23-year-old giant, whose name was then not known, this young man from Troy, Alabama, JOHN LEWIS, who was helping to lead the march from the front with Hosea Williams, was beaten to the ground and took life-threatening injuries.

Today, as a Member of Congress, JOHN LEWIS still bears those scars, but he does not bear resentment. What a lesson for all of us who suffer the verbal slings and arrows almost daily in this public profession which we pursue.

But JOHN LEWIS took more than rhetorical slings and arrows. He was beat-

en, subjected to hate, spit upon, subjected to prejudice and division and segregation and rejection. But still, Christ-like, JOHN LEWIS, following Gandhi's example, turned the other cheek and said, I seek justice, and I will continue to seek justice for myself and for others, no matter the opposition.

□ 1100

I will not do so violently. I will not do so by assaulting those who assault me. But I will appeal to the conscience of the Nation. I will appeal to the promise in our declaration, in our Constitution, and in the principles for which this Nation stands. And it was a powerful appeal.

This weekend, I and others—Mr. CAO was with us—were privileged to walk with that giant of a man, JOHN LEWIS, across that bridge. It is a bridge across a river, but it is also a bridge to brotherhood; a bridge to a realization of America's promise; a bridge to a better America; a bridge to a better country; a bridge, as my friend and brother JOHN LEWIS would say, to the beloved community; a bridge, then, over troubled waters, who have to some degree been stilled, but not silenced.

There is still prejudice in this land. There is still division in this land. There is still not the reconciliation that America still strives for. And that is why I return almost every year with my friend JOHN LEWIS to walk over that bridge, to remind myself—and I have taken my granddaughter to remind her as well—that although the mission of Martin Luther King, Jr., was extraordinarily successful, and the mission of JOHN LEWIS, which continues to this day, has been successful, it is not over. The mission and the commitment must continue. That is what we must remember on this anniversary of March 7, 1965, when a group of our fellow citizens peacefully walked to register to vote. Is there any more sacred right in a democracy than that—the ability to express your opinion, unbowed by government or unbowed or dissuaded by threats? That was JOHN LEWIS's mission then. He was so successful. But the mission is not over. And as we vote on this resolution, we ought to all commit ourselves to walking with the wind of justice, of which JOHN LEWIS spoke, of which he has written. But, much more importantly, the life that he has led teaches us the power of conscience, the power of peacefully standing up for the rights of which Jefferson spoke: the unalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

God has blessed America through the life of JOHN LEWIS and so many others whose courage and convictions have made us better. Support this resolution. But, more than that, live out its promise for all of our citizens.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. CAO).

Mr. CAO. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolu-

tion 249 to commemorate the 45th anniversary of Bloody Sunday and the role that it played in ensuring the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

Today, we remember a momentous occasion in our history. On March 7, 1965, 600 marchers, led by my esteemed colleague from Georgia, Congressman JOHN LEWIS, were savagely attacked by State and local police as they attempted to cross the Edmund Pettus Bridge into Selma, Alabama. These brave marchers used the power of non-violence to demand that most basic of democratic rights of a citizen: the right to vote. In return, the marchers were met with billy clubs and tear gas. But the marchers confronted terror with courage. Their dignity in the face of brutality moved this House to pass the Voting Rights Act, which reaffirmed this Nation's commitment that every citizen has the right to participate fully in the political life of the Nation.

This past weekend, my family and I traveled to Selma to honor the 45th anniversary of Bloody Sunday. Kate, my wife, our two daughters, Betsy and Sophia, and I marched from Brown Chapel to the top of Edmund Pettus Bridge. Along the way, not only did we learn of the significance of the march, but also the love and admiration that the people still have for the historical marchers. Among those was JOHN LEWIS. I commented then and firmly believe today that I owe so much of my personal and political success to the struggles of the African American community. Because of their perseverance and sacrifice, doors have been opened permanently to every minority community in America.

Mr. Speaker, it was an honor to have been a part of this momentous commemoration, to work with dedicated public servants like my good friend from Georgia, and I ask my colleagues to support this important resolution.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman who responded to Martin Luther King when he first met him as a young man in Alabama, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. I want to thank my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Memphis, Tennessee, Mr. COHEN, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, 45 years ago, on March 7, 1965, Hosea Williams and I led 600 peaceful, nonviolent protestors attempting to march from Selma, Alabama, to the State capitol in Montgomery to dramatize to the world that people of color wanted to register to vote. We left Brown Chapel AME Church that afternoon on a sacred mission, prepared to defy the dictates of man to demonstrate the truth of a higher law. Ordinary citizens with extraordinary vision walked shoulder-to-shoulder, two-by-two, in a silent, peaceful protest against injustice in the American South.

We were met on the Edmund Pettus Bridge crossing the Alabama River by

a sea of blue—Alabama State troopers. Some were mounted on horseback, but all of them were armed with guns, tear gas, billy clubs, and beyond them were deputized citizens who were waving any weapons they could find on that day. Some even had bullwhips.

Then we heard, “I am Major John Cloud. This is an unlawful march. You cannot continue. You have 3 minutes to go home or return to your church.” We were preparing to kneel and pray when the Major said, “Troopers advance.” And these troopers came toward us, beating us, spraying tear gas, chasing us. I was hit on the head by a State trooper with a nightstick and I fell unconscious on the bridge. On that day, Mr. Speaker, I thought I was going to die. I thought I saw death. The most brutal confrontation of the modern-day civil rights movement became known as Bloody Sunday. It produced a sense of righteous indignation in this country and around the world that led this Congress to pass the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

Eight days after Bloody Sunday, President Lyndon Johnson addressed a joint session of the Congress and made what I believe is the greatest and most meaningful statement of speech any President has ever made on the importance of voting rights in America. He began by saying, “I speak tonight for the dignity of man and for the destiny of democracy.” President Johnson went on to say, “At times, history and fate meet at a single time, in a single place, to shape a turning point in man’s unending search for freedom. So it was at Lexington and Concord. So it was a century ago at Appomattox. So it was last week in Selma, Alabama.”

In this speech, President Johnson condemned the violence in Selma, and called on the Congress to enact the Voting Rights Act. He closed his speech by echoing the words of the civil rights movement, and he said over and over again, “And we shall overcome. And we shall overcome.” I was sitting next to Martin Luther King, Jr., in the home of a local family in Selma, watching President Johnson on television as he said, “And we shall overcome.” And tears came down Dr. King’s face. He started crying. And we all cried a little to hear the President say, “And we shall overcome.” And Dr. King said, John, we will make it from Selma to Montgomery, and the Voting Rights Act will be passed. Congress did pass the Voting Rights Act, and on August 6, 1965, it was signed into law by the President.

Mr. Speaker, this past weekend we have heard from the majority leader and my colleagues, Mr. COHEN and Mr. CAO, that we went back to Selma, along with MIKE PENCE and Senator BROWNBACK and several others with the Faith and Politics Institute on the journey. During this journey, we brought our fellow Members of Congress on this unbelievable trip of the historic Civil Rights Act, not just in Selma, but Montgomery and Bir-

mingham. We ended our time together in Selma by crossing one more time on the Edmund Pettus Bridge, crossing that bridge.

I know at times here in this body we talk, we debate, maybe sometimes in not such a nonviolent way, but on this bridge we didn’t see ourselves as Democrats or as Republicans or adversaries. We saw ourselves as Americans on a journey to discover not just our history but to help create a more perfect union to help move us closer to a truly beloved community, truly closer to a multiracial democracy. We all come away from this journey with a deeper appreciation of our democracy and the power of people to make a difference in our society.

Mr. Speaker, with this resolution we honor the sacrifice and courage of those brave and courageous souls who used the power of peace, the power of love, the power of nonviolence to redeem the soul of our democracy; to remind ourselves that freedom is really not free; and that we must continue to struggle every day.

On this 45th anniversary of Bloody Sunday, we must use this occasion to renew our pledge to protect the right to vote for every American citizen. We have come a distance. We’ve made a lot of progress. But there’s still a distance to travel.

□ 1115

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I think it’s well said, as our majority leader pointed out, that in the Declaration of Independence, the basis for who we are, states “that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable Rights.” In other words, we get our rights from the Almighty. We don’t get our rights from government or from others or from the king. We get our rights because we get them from the Almighty. And as it states in the Declaration of Independence, that governments are instituted to secure those rights. And first it was the 15th Amendment, and yet there needed to be more legislation. Because of the events that occurred on Bloody Sunday, ironically a President from the South signed the Civil Rights Act of 1965, President Lyndon Baines Johnson from Texas. This was a bipartisan piece of legislation in that in this House of Representatives, the majority of the Democrats, 217, and the majority of the Republicans, 111, voted for this legislation with about 20 percent or less in both parties voting against it. Bipartisan legislation passed with a vast majority of both the Republicans and the Democrats, a sign that bipartisanship on important pieces of legislation is necessary, and it is effective.

So I totally support this resolution. I commend those folks 45 years ago when you and I, Mr. Speaker, were just in—I guess you’d be in elementary school. I was in junior high. And this event oc-

curred, those noble 600 that walked through the streets of Alabama, and thus, the Civil Rights Act, as we have today.

So I yield back the balance of my time, totally supporting this resolution.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to thank each of the speakers, particularly Mr. LEWIS, whom we are privileged to serve with and I was privileged to go to Montgomery with; and Leader HOYER, who made such eloquent remarks; and the other gentlemen and ladies who were on the trip, Mr. BARROW, Dr. McDERMOTT, Mr. FILNER, Ms. KIRKPATRICK, and others.

I want to remind, Mr. Speaker, this House that this is an important event to remember. And there are people that go to Montgomery and go to Selma and go to Birmingham to reflect on their history. And in Brown’s Chapel, there was a full church in Selma on Sunday, including Ms. Ruby Wharton, a distinguished attorney in my city and the mayor’s wife of my city, AC Wharton. She goes every year. Also there was John Nixon, district court judge in Middle Tennessee and then a Sixth Circuit Court judge. He goes every year because he was with the Civil Rights Division in 1965 when the march that succeeded with Dr. King took place. There are people that go back every year to renew their thoughts and their experiences because we shall overcome someday, and I submit that day hasn’t occurred yet, Mr. Speaker.

The 110th Congress passed a resolution apologizing for slavery and Jim Crow. And in that resolution, passed by voice vote by everybody up here, we said that we’re going to rectify the lingering effects of slavery and Jim Crow. And lingering effects include seeing that life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness are truly part of the American Dream. And you can’t have life without health care, and many of the people without health care don’t have it because they’ve been denied the opportunities to participate in the economic dream of America, to have jobs that give them insurance and to afford that opportunity. That’s part of what Bloody Sunday was about.

To pass this resolution is so important, but to pass it and not to carry out what will happen someday and overcoming the obstacles that have been placed before so many because of the horrific institution of slavery and those laws that were subsequent to it throughout this country of Jim Crow that denied people’s rights is wrong. So we must commit ourselves to someday, and that day is now—the fierce urgency of now that Dr. King talked to us about—and fulfill that life, which includes health care, and liberty and the pursuit of happiness, which gives people a job and an opportunity to participate. So I would ask all of the Members to vote “aye,” to pass this resolution today and move passage.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of

H. Con. Res. 249 to commemorate the 45th anniversary of Bloody Sunday and the role that it played in ensuring the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

As we commemorate this day, I am reminded of the pain and hardships that the African-American community faced prior to the enactment of the Voting Rights Act. The use of intimidation, literacy tests, and poll taxes throughout the South ensured the disenfranchisement of most blacks, and while we have a difficult time fathoming these realities today, these practices were very common in the period before this historic legislation became law.

It is often regarded that the marches from Selma to Montgomery in 1965 were key in bringing about the Voting Rights Act, and perhaps the first march, which took place on March 7, 1965, or Bloody Sunday, was the most important of these. On that day, roughly 600 people led by Hosea Williams and JOHN LEWIS were beaten and bombarded with tear gas at the Edmund Pettus Bridge on the Alabama River. From this, two subsequent marches took place that culminated with the gathering of roughly 25,000 people on March 25, 1965 on the steps of the Alabama capitol. A few short months later, on August 6, 1965, the Voting Rights Act was signed into law by President Lyndon B. Johnson to outlaw discriminatory voting practices.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to mention briefly how privileged I am to work with an American Hero and civil rights leader, Congressman JOHN LEWIS. His dedication to civil rights is unfaltering, and I am so fortunate to consider him a dear friend.

Mr. Speaker, Bloody Sunday and the march on Selma will continue to be infamous subjects in American history, and it is important for us to reflect on these events with solemn hearts. However, we have never been a nation to forget the future either, and as we continue to look towards tomorrow, we must not disregard our hope for that which is to come. For this reason, I ask my fellow colleagues to join me in commemorating the 45th anniversary of Bloody Sunday so that we can honor the civil rights leaders of yesterday and encourage the generation of tomorrow to continue to work towards a more democratic America.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for H. Con. Res. 249 which honors the 45th anniversary of Bloody Sunday and acknowledges the role that it played in ensuring the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. I would also like to commend Representative LEWIS, the sponsor of this resolution, for his continued commitment to preserving the importance of Bloody Sunday and to also acknowledge the unwavering courage of Congressman JOHN LEWIS, and all of those men and women who suffered the brutality of Alabama State Police on that Sunday on March 7, 1965. Much blood was shed when all white troopers and sheriff's deputies used tear gas, nightsticks and whips to break up the march. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

The Voting Rights Act of 1965 is pertinent today as it continues to provide much needed protection for minorities in my District and Americans across the country. Because of Bloody Sunday and the Voting Rights Act of 1965, all of my constituents in the Fourth District of Georgia have the opportunity to exercise their rights under the Fourteenth and Fif-

teenth Amendments of the U.S. Constitution. Indeed, it was because of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 that all Americans were extended the right to vote guaranteed under the U.S. Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, in the century following reconstruction, African Americans faced tremendous obstacles to voting. Despite the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments to the U.S. Constitution, which had enfranchised black men and women, southern voter registration boards used poll taxes, literacy tests, and other bureaucratic impediments to deny African Americans their legal rights. Southern blacks also risked harassment, intimidation, and physical violence when they tried to register or vote. As a result, African Americans had little if any political power. Sunday, March 7, 1965 was certainly a milestone for the United States. I am proud to say we have come a long way from that time. It is an honor to be an African American representative from Georgia and to be a legacy of the day on which 600 civil rights marchers were demonstrating for African-American voting rights. It is through the work of leaders like Representative LEWIS and the late Hosea Williams—who was a DeKalb County Commissioner, reverend, political activist, and science teacher from Georgia—that helped to codify civil rights in both the law and the heart of America that I am able to have the privilege of representing the great State of Georgia in the House of Representatives today.

Mr. Speaker, as the 45th anniversary of Bloody Sunday has come to pass, let us not forget the work of the 600 men and woman who marched across the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma, Alabama, and what they did for America and the world and let us recognize the importance of this anniversary.

I applaud Congressman LEWIS for his leadership in bringing this important legislation to the floor. Furthermore, I commend him for leading those brave marchers across the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma, Alabama to stand up for political equality and fight against racial discrimination. This resolution recognizes the heroism of these freedom fighters with respect to the events that occurred on Bloody Sunday and their commitment to ensuring equal voting rights for all Americans.

I strongly support H. Con. Res. 249.

Mr. COHEN. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 249.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

SUPPORTING NATIONAL TEEN DATING VIOLENCE AWARENESS AND PREVENTION MONTH

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the reso-

lution (H. Res. 1081) supporting the goals and ideals of National Teen Dating Violence Awareness and Prevention Month.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1081

Whereas dating, domestic, and sexual violence affect women regardless of age, and teens and young women are especially vulnerable;

Whereas approximately 1 in 3 adolescent girls in the United States is a victim of physical, emotional, or verbal abuse from a dating partner, a figure that far exceeds victimization rates for other types of violence affecting youth;

Whereas nationwide, 1 in 10 high school students (9.9 percent) has been hit, slapped, or physically hurt on purpose by a boyfriend or girlfriend;

Whereas more than 1 in 4 teenagers have been in a relationship where a partner is verbally abusive;

Whereas 20 percent of teen girls exposed to physical dating violence did not attend school on 1 or more occasions during a 30-day period because they felt unsafe either at school, or on the way to or from school;

Whereas violent relationships in adolescence can have serious ramifications for victims, including higher risk for substance abuse, eating disorders, risky sexual behavior, suicide, and adult revictimization;

Whereas teen girls who are physically and sexually abused are up to 6 times more likely to become pregnant, and more than 2 times as likely to report a sexually transmitted disease, than teen girls who are not abused;

Whereas nearly 3 in 4 children, ages 11 to 14 (hereinafter referred to as "tweens"), say that dating relationships usually begin at age 14 or younger, and approximately 72 percent of 8th and 9th grade students report "dating";

Whereas 1 in 5 tweens say their friends are victims of dating violence and nearly ½ of tweens who are in relationships know friends who are verbally abused;

Whereas more than 3 times as many tweens (20 percent) as parents of tweens (6 percent) admit that parents know little or nothing about the dating relationships of tweens;

Whereas teen dating abuse most often takes place in the home of one of the teens in the dating relationship;

Whereas a majority of parents surveyed believe they have had a conversation with their teen about what it means to be in a healthy relationship, but the majority of teens surveyed said that they have not had a conversation about dating abuse with a parent in the past year;

Whereas digital abuse and "sexting" are becoming new frontiers for teen dating abuse;

Whereas 1 in 4 teens in a relationship say they have been called names, harassed, or put down by their dating partner through cellular phones and texting;

Whereas 3 in 10 young people have sent or received nude pictures of other young people on their cellular phones or online, and 61 percent who have "sexted" report being pressured to do so at least once;

Whereas targets of digital abuse are almost 3 times as likely to contemplate suicide as those who have not encountered such abuse (8 percent versus 3 percent), and targets of digital abuse are nearly 3 times more likely to have considered dropping out of school;

Whereas the severity of violence among intimate partners has been shown to be greater

in cases where the pattern of violence has been established in adolescence;

Whereas primary prevention programs are a key part of addressing teen dating violence, and many successful community examples include education, community outreach, and social marketing campaigns that account for the cultural appropriateness of programs;

Whereas in addition to prevention programs, skilled assessment and intervention programs are necessary for youth victims and abusers;

Whereas the alarming trend of unhealthy and abusive youth relationships exists in communities across the country, and affects youth of every race, culture, sex, and socioeconomic status; and

Whereas the establishment of National Teen Dating Violence Awareness and Prevention Month in February will benefit schools, communities, families, and youth throughout the Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of National Teen Dating Violence Awareness and Prevention Week to raise awareness of teen dating violence in the United States;

(2) supports and encourages communities to empower teens to develop healthy relationships; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States, State and local officials, middle schools and high schools, law enforcement agencies, and other interested groups to observe National Teen Dating Violence Awareness and Prevention Week with appropriate programs and activities that promote awareness and prevention of the crime of teen dating violence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COHEN. I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHEN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1081 designates the month of February 2010 as National Teen Dating Violence Awareness and Prevention Month. By designating a month to teen dating violence awareness, Congress hopes to bring more attention to the problem. We also hope to underscore the need for more effective prevention and deterrence efforts to help young people break the cycle of violence.

Dating violence is a serious problem in this country, and many teens do not report it because they're afraid to tell family and friends. It often starts with teasing and name calling but escalates to more serious violence like physical and sexual assaults. Teen victims of dating violence are at greater risk of doing poorly in school and abusing drugs and alcohol. Fifty percent of young people reporting both dating vi-

olence and rape also reported increased rates of attempted suicide, compared to youth who had not been abused.

Physically abused teens are three times more likely than teens who have not been abused to experience violence during college. Teen victims also carry the patterns of violence into future relationships. According to a recent report by the American Bar Association, dating violence is occurring with people as young as 12 years of age. A Department of Justice study found that girls and young women between the ages of 16 and 24 experienced the highest rate of intimate partner violence at a rate almost triple the national average. As a result of the growing number of deaths and injuries resulting from teen dating violence, we must recognize this type of behavior is not only a crime but also is a serious public health concern.

Today's resolution should occur in families and communities around the country to educate their teenagers about this problem and help in preventing it. I would like to thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) for his leadership on this issue and this important resolution. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting House Resolution 1081.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H. Res. 1081 which supports the goals and ideals of National Teen Dating Violence Awareness and Prevention Month. This nationwide effort seeks to increase public awareness and to educate citizens about the prevalence of dating violence among American teenagers. The Teen Dating Violence Awareness and Prevention Initiative was spearheaded by teenagers across our Nation who chose to take a stand and put a stop to teen dating violence. The initiative began in 2004 and is now supported by numerous national, State and local organizations, and in 2005, this Congress noted the importance of addressing teen dating violence and highlighted the initiative in the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act.

The call to end dating violence was formally recognized by the House in 2006, and to bring more public awareness about teen dating violence, the House designated the first full week in February to be National Teen Dating Violence Awareness and Prevention Week over the last 3 years. However, the Justice Department worked with Congress to designate the entire month of February as National Teen Dating Violence Awareness and Prevention Month. This designation provides parity to the three other crimes—sexual assault, domestic violence and stalking—each of which has a designated month for public education and awareness activities. Across the country, dozens of States, cities and towns join Congress to designate February as National Teen Dating Violence Awareness

and Prevention Month. And in doing so, these jurisdictions demonstrated their collective commitment to ending teen dating violence and to support the numerous victims and survivors who live among us.

Research tells us that one in three adolescent girls in the United States is a victim of physical, emotional or verbal abuse from a dating partner. These violent relationships can have serious consequences for victims, putting them at higher risk for substance abuse, eating disorders, risky sexual behavior, suicide and adult revictimization. In fact, teen girls who are physically and sexually abused are six times more likely to become pregnant and more than two times as likely to report a sexually transmitted disease as teen girls who are not abused. Perhaps the most alarming statistic is how prevalent this violence is in our country. Studies show that one in three teens has suffered from some sort of violence in a dating relationship. We also know that dating violence among children is not limited to physical, emotional or sexual assault. It also can take the form of harassment via computer or cell phone text messaging or by e-mail.

National Teen Dating Violence Awareness and Prevention Month provides an opportunity for parents to engage their children about dating violence and abusive relationships. Surveys of teens indicate that parents often do not know their children are in a relationship that is abusive. To start the dialogue, parents or teens can call the National Teen Dating Abuse Helpline at 1-866-331-9474. The helpline promotes awareness of healthy dating relationships and offers tips on preventing abusive relationships. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), the sponsor of this resolution.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by thanking Chairman COHEN, Chairman CONYERS, Chairman SCOTT, Ranking Member POE and all of their staff for their support and work on this issue. I am proud to sponsor this resolution and hope that all of my colleagues will support this simple but important effort.

This is an important effort. It's an important step. Youth dating violence is spreading all across our country. In my congressional district, the Center for Disease Control, the Fulton County district attorney, the Partnership Against Domestic Violence, colleges, high schools, and yes, even middle schools have been seeing an increase in abusive teen relationships. Fear, stalking, bullying, violence and abuse are unacceptable and always shocking. But it is tragic that domestic abuse is a very real part of our children's relationships. We see it in the headlines. We see it on the streets. We see it with

our own children. Mr. Speaker, we must break this chain. We must stop the cycle from being repeated over and over again.

The CDC worked with Liz Claiborne, Inc. to develop Dating Matters: Understanding Teen Dating Violence Prevention. This is a free online training course for teachers, youth leaders and family members. I encourage all those watching this discussion and debate to research this issue, take the course and watch for the signs. I think the time has come, Mr. Speaker, for us to teach our young people the way of non-violence, our children, our teenagers, our college-aged students.

Last month, I know that many across the country recognized Teen Dating Violence Prevention Month. I hope they continue through Women's History Month and really the entire year. We used to think a week was enough time, but it is just not enough. Mr. Speaker, our communities must have the information and the training to stop teen dating violence. I urge all of my colleagues to support this commonsense resolution.

Mr. POE of Texas. I have no further requests for time, Mr. Speaker, and I am prepared to close. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This is an important piece of legislation to bring national awareness to this problem. Some of the violence that occurs among our teenagers is horrible, the things they are doing to each other and those especially in a relationship and dating. I think it's important that the country understand that teen violence among those who are dating is a tremendous problem. I have four kids, three of them are girls, and their safety has always been a concern as they were growing up. As all parents have that concern. So I totally support this resolution and urge its adoption.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 1081, which supports the goals and ideals of "National Teen Dating Violence Awareness and Prevention Month".

Mr. Speaker, allow these alarming statistics to speak on behalf of the importance of this resolution:

1 in 3 adolescent girls in the United States is a victim of physical, emotional, or verbal abuse from a dating partner, a figure that far exceeds victimization rates for other types of violence affecting youth.

1 in 10 high school students, nationwide, (9.9 percent) has been hit, slapped, or physically hurt on purpose by a boyfriend or girlfriend.

1 in 4 teenagers have been in a relationship where a partner is verbally abusive.

20 percent of teen girls exposed to physical dating violence did not attend school on 1 or more occasions during a 30-day period because they felt unsafe either at school, or on the way to or from school.

Since 2006, the United States has recognized "National Teen Dating Violence Awareness and Prevention Week" during the first week of February. Because of the severity of the issue, the awareness campaign was extended to include the entire month of February

in 2010. This initiative increases awareness and educates others about the very real dangers of teen dating violence. This epidemic of teen dating violence is perhaps one of the most complex and invasive problems facing teenagers today.

Technology has added an additional ubiquitous and hidden feature of teen dating violence, with the use and the availability of cell phones, text and instant messaging, e-mail, and community networks. About 30 percent of teenagers who have been in a dating relationship have been text-messaged between 10 and 30 times per hour by a partner seeking to find out where they are, what they are doing, and with whom they are with. Yet 67 percent of parents are unaware that their teen is being checked up on some 30 times per day on their teen's cell phone. The warning signs of teen dating violence for young females are:

Apologizes for his behavior and makes excuses for him; loses interest in activities that she used to enjoy; and stops seeing her friends and family members and becomes increasingly isolated.

Mr. Speaker, I stand before you today with a zeal and vigor about the goals and ideals that the "National Teen Dating Violence Awareness and Prevention Month"; because this issue, if not handled with properly, grows into domestic violence, the ugly older sister of teen dating violence. In Houston, 9 percent of Houston students surveyed in grades 9 to 12 reported being hit, slapped or physically hurt by their boyfriend or girlfriend in the past year. This is unacceptable! Teenagers' foremost concern should be achieving academic excellence, not dealing with physical and mental abuse, from anyone!

This Congress should be committed to tackling the roots of issues, such as teen violence and supporting this resolution will not only address with the root cause of domestic violence, but also; (1) support teen victims of abuse; (2) educate pre-teens and teenagers, both male and female, about the issue; and (3) give the support needed by organizations and groups to effectively distribute life saving information and awareness to those in need.

So in conclusion, I support H. Res. 1081 and I encourage my colleagues to join me.

□ 1130

Mr. POE of Texas. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this important resolution, H. Res. 1081.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1081.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HONORING JOHN H. "JACK" RUFFIN, JR.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1087) honoring the life of John H. "Jack" Ruffin, Jr.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1087

Whereas Jack Ruffin left a lasting impact on his State and the United States during his distinguished legal career as a civil rights attorney and as the first African-American chief judge of the Georgia Court of Appeals;

Whereas Jack Ruffin was born in the rural town of Waynesboro, Georgia, in 1934, where he spent his formative years and where today his portrait hangs in the Burke County Courthouse;

Whereas Jack Ruffin graduated from Morehouse College in 1957 and from Howard University School of Law in 1960;

Whereas Jack Ruffin became, in 1961, the first African-American admitted to the Augusta Bar Association, against the wishes of his mother who feared for his safety;

Whereas Jack Ruffin fought with great courage against injustices in his community throughout his life, most notably when he filed the lawsuits that desegregated the public school systems of Richmond County and of Burke County;

Whereas Jack Ruffin honorably served, from 1986 to 1994, as the first African-American Superior Court judge in the Augusta Judicial Circuit;

Whereas Jack Ruffin, having been appointed by Governor Zell Miller to the Georgia Court of Appeals in 1994, honorably served as a member of that Court until 2008;

Whereas Jack Ruffin became the first African-American Chief Judge of the Georgia Court of Appeals in 2005 and served honorably in that position until 2006;

Whereas the new Richmond County judicial center in Augusta, Georgia, will be named in Jack Ruffin's honor, a decision made by the Augusta-Richmond County Commission in 2009;

Whereas Jack Ruffin retired from the Georgia Court of Appeals in 2008 and spent the rest of his life giving back to his community by teaching students at his alma mater, Morehouse College;

Whereas Jack Ruffin died the night of January 29, 2010, at the age of 75, in Atlanta, Georgia, and is survived by his wife, Judith Ruffin, his father, John Ruffin, Sr., his son, Brinkley Ruffin, and two grandsons;

Whereas the passing of Jack Ruffin is a great loss to the legal community and to the State of Georgia, and his life should be honored with great praise and appreciation for the many contributions he made to the legal system in the United States and to the civil rights movement; and

Whereas it is the intent of the House of Representatives to recognize and pay tribute to the life of Jack Ruffin, his achievements for civil rights, his zeal for justice, and his passion for the law: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes Jack Ruffin as a great jurist in the State of Georgia and as an important figure in the civil rights movement; and

(2) recognizes the selfless and brave contributions that Jack Ruffin made to his community and to the law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5

legislative days to extend and revise their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution as they see fit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHEN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1087 honors the life of John H. "Jack" Ruffin, Jr. Judge Ruffin began his distinguished legal career as a civil rights attorney, and throughout his career blazed a trail to advance civil rights for all. Judge Ruffin spent most of his life in the great State of Georgia. He was born in Burke County, Georgia, and graduated from Waynesboro High and Industrial School. He attended Morehouse College, and then moved to Washington, D.C. to attend law school at Howard University School of Law. After graduating from law school, Judge Ruffin returned to Georgia to practice law.

Only 3 years into his legal career, he filed lawsuits to desegregate the public school systems of Richmond County and Burke County in Georgia. After several additional years of fighting for civil rights, Judge Ruffin became the first African American member of the Augusta Bar Association. After 33 years of practicing law, Judge Ruffin was administered the oath of office and took the bench as the 62nd judge of the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia.

He made history as the first African American Superior Court Judge in the Augusta Judicial Circuit, and later made history again when he served as the first African American Chief Judge of the Georgia Court of Appeals. At the time of his death, Judge Ruffin held a teaching position at Morehouse College, still actively engaged in inspiring those to follow.

To honor all of Judge Ruffin's accomplishments, the new Richmond County judicial center will be named in his honor. We mourn his passing, but are pleased to honor his many civil rights and legal accomplishments today. He stands, as did Thurgood Marshall and others, as great individuals who used the courts to advance civil rights.

I urge my colleagues to support this important resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of House Resolution 1087, which honors the life of Judge Jack Ruffin. Judge Ruffin was a pioneering civil rights lawyer in his community, and his impact on the civil rights movement affects many today.

He was born in Waynesboro, Georgia, where his portrait today hangs in the Burke County Courthouse. Growing up in the Deep South, his mother wanted him to be a school teacher and not a lawyer because she feared for his safety. But not to be intimidated, Judge

Ruffin went to law school anyway. And despite his mother's concerns about his safety, he became a lawyer.

After law school he moved to Augusta, Georgia, where he became the first African American member of the Augusta Bar Association. He argued countless cases for civil rights. In perhaps the most notable case, *Acree v. Board of Education*, he filed suit to desegregate the Richmond County school system, which included the City of Augusta. Litigation continued for decades before he finally obtained a Federal court order to integrate the system.

From 1986 to 1994 he served as the first African American Superior Court Judge in the Augusta Judicial Circuit. In 1994, he was appointed to the Georgia Court of Appeals. And in 2005, he became the first African American Chief Judge of the Georgia Court of Appeals. In 2009, the Augusta-Richmond County Commission decided to name the new Richmond County judicial center in Augusta in Jack Ruffin's honor.

Judge Ruffin's selfless and brave pursuit of equal justice for everyone earned him the respect and admiration of generations to come. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARROW).

Mr. BARROW. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 1087, a resolution honoring the life of my good friend, Judge Jack Ruffin of Augusta, Georgia. Judge Ruffin passed away on January 29 at the age of 75. He had a long and distinguished career of service in Georgia, and he will truly be missed.

Jack Ruffin was born in the middle of the Great Depression, and spent his formative years in the town of Waynesboro, Georgia. He left home to attend Morehouse College, and graduated in 1957. At the time his mother wanted him to be a teacher, but Jack Ruffin had other plans. He moved to Washington, D.C., attended Howard University School of Law, and got his J.D. degree in 1960.

Jack Ruffin could have built a successful law practice anywhere in the country, but he decided to return home to the deeply segregated City of Augusta to practice law. Throughout the course of his career, Jack Ruffin focused on rooting out the racial prejudice and discrimination which still held a firm grip on the political and economic livelihood of our State. Jack Ruffin fought for his own right to practice his profession, and became the first black lawyer admitted to the Augusta Bar Association and the first black Superior Court Judge in the Augusta Judicial Circuit. But more importantly, he fought for the rights of everyone in the community. Among other causes he took on, he was the lawyer who desegregated the Richmond and Burke County public school systems.

Judge Ruffin was appointed to the Georgia Court of Appeals in 1994. He became the first black Chief Judge of that court in 1996. After his retirement in 2008, Judge Ruffin spent the remainder of his life teaching students at Morehouse College, giving back to the college that gave so much to him.

The resolution before us today honoring Jack Ruffin's life is sponsored by every single member of the Georgia congressional delegation. That speaks not only to Jack Ruffin's character, but also to how far we have come as a State and as a Nation. Jack Ruffin did as much to change the laws and attitudes in Georgia as anyone else of his generation, and as a result we are a better and a freer people.

So today I urge my colleagues to adopt this legislation to express our lasting gratitude for Jack Ruffin's unyielding commitment to justice and equality for all.

Mr. POE of Texas. I urge the adoption of this resolution and commend the Georgia delegation for bringing it forward, Mr. BARROW especially.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I join with the gentleman from Texas and thank Mr. BARROW for bringing the resolution. Gentlemen such as Judge Ruffin need to be remembered and others encouraged to follow in their footsteps. And that is important.

So I yield back the balance of my time and ask all of my colleagues to join me in voting "aye" on House Resolution 1087.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1087.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BANKRUPTCY JUDGESHIP ACT OF 2010

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4506) to authorize the appointment of additional bankruptcy judges, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4506

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Bankruptcy Judgeship Act of 2010".

SEC. 2. ADDITIONAL PERMANENT OFFICES OF BANKRUPTCY JUDGES.

Section 152(a)(2) of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the item relating to the eastern and western districts of Arkansas by striking "3" and inserting "4";

(2) in the item relating to the eastern district of California by striking "6" and inserting "8";

(3) in the item relating to the district of Delaware by striking "1" and inserting "6",

(4) in the item relating to the middle district of Florida by striking "8" and inserting "9",

(5) in the item relating to the northern district of Florida by striking "1" and inserting "2",

(6) in the item relating to the southern district of Florida by striking "5" and inserting "7",

(7) in the item relating to the northern district of Georgia by striking "8" and inserting "10",

(8) in the item relating to the southern district of Georgia by striking "2" and inserting "3",

(9) in the item relating to the district of Maryland by striking "4" and inserting "7",

(10) in the item relating to the eastern district of Michigan by striking "4" and inserting "7",

(11) in the item relating to the northern district of Mississippi by striking "1" and inserting "2",

(12) in the item relating to the district of Nevada by striking "3" and inserting "5",

(13) in the item relating to the district of New Hampshire by striking "1" and inserting "2",

(14) in the item relating to the district of New Jersey by striking "8" and inserting "9",

(15) in the item relating to the northern district of New York by striking "2" and inserting "3",

(16) in the item relating to the southern district of New York by striking "9" and inserting "10",

(17) in the item relating to the eastern district of North Carolina by striking "2" and inserting "3",

(18) in the item relating to the western district of North Carolina by striking "2" and inserting "3",

(19) in the item relating to the middle district of Pennsylvania by striking "2" and inserting "3",

(20) in the item relating to the eastern district of Tennessee by striking "3" and inserting "4",

(21) in the item relating to the western district of Tennessee by striking "4" and inserting "5",

(22) in the item relating to the eastern district of Virginia by striking "5" and inserting "6", and

(23) in the item relating to the southern district of West Virginia by striking "1" and inserting "2".

SEC. 3. CONVERSION OF CERTAIN TEMPORARY OFFICES OF BANKRUPTCY JUDGES TO PERMANENT OFFICES.

(a) CONVERSION OF CERTAIN TEMPORARY OFFICES ESTABLISHED BY PUBLIC LAW 109-8.—The temporary offices of bankruptcy judges established by section 1223(b)(1) of Public Law 109-8 (28 U.S.C. 152 note) for the following districts are hereby converted so as to be included in the permanent offices of bankruptcy judges that are added by the amendments made by section 2 with respect to the corresponding districts:

- (1) The eastern district of California.
- (2) The district of Delaware.
- (3) The southern district of Florida.
- (4) The southern district of Georgia.
- (5) The district of Maryland.
- (6) The district of New Jersey.
- (7) The northern district of New York.
- (8) The southern district of New York.
- (9) The eastern district of North Carolina.
- (10) The middle district of Pennsylvania.
- (11) The western district of Tennessee.
- (12) The eastern district of Virginia.
- (13) The district of Nevada.

(b) CONVERSION OF CERTAIN TEMPORARY OFFICES ESTABLISHED BY PUBLIC LAW 102-361.—

The temporary offices of bankruptcy judges established by section 3(a) of Public Law 102-361 (28 U.S.C. 152 note) for the following districts are hereby converted so as to be included in the permanent offices of bankruptcy judges that are added by the amendments made by section 2 with respect to the corresponding districts:

- (1) The district of Delaware.
- (2) The district of New Hampshire.
- (3) The eastern district of Tennessee.

SEC. 4. EXTENSION OF CERTAIN TEMPORARY OFFICES OF BANKRUPTCY JUDGES ESTABLISHED BY PUBLIC LAW 109-8.

(a) EXTENSIONS.—The temporary offices of bankruptcy judges established for the eastern district of Pennsylvania and the middle district of North Carolina by section 1223(b)(1) of Public Law 109-8 (28 U.S.C. 152 note) are extended until the 1st vacancy occurring in the office of a bankruptcy judge in the respective district resulting from the death, retirement, resignation, or removal of a bankruptcy judge and occurring 5 years or more after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) APPLICABILITY OF OTHER PROVISIONS.—Except as provided in subsection (a), all other provisions of section 1223(b) of Public Law 109-8 (28 U.S.C. 152 note) remain applicable to the temporary offices of bankruptcy judges referred to in subsection (a).

SEC. 5. PAYGO OFFSET.

(a) BANKRUPTCY FILING FEES.—Section 1930(a) of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

- (1) in paragraph (1)—
 - (A) in subparagraph (A) by striking "\$245" and inserting "\$246", and
 - (B) in subparagraph (B) by striking "\$235" and inserting "\$236", and
- (2) in paragraph (3) by striking "\$1,000" and inserting "\$1,042".

(b) UNITED STATES TRUSTEE FUND.—Section 589a(b) of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

- (1) in paragraph (1)—
 - (A) in subparagraph (A) by striking "40.46" and inserting "40.28", and
 - (B) in subparagraph (B) by striking "28.33" and inserting "28.15", and
- (2) in paragraph (2) by striking "55" and inserting "52.78".

(c) COLLECTION AND DEPOSITION OF MISCELLANEOUS BANKRUPTCY FEES.—Section 406(b) of the Judiciary Appropriations Act, 1990 (Public Law 101-162; 28 U.S.C. 1931 note) is amended—

- (1) by striking "28.87" and inserting "28.74",
- (2) by striking "35.00" and inserting "34.77", and
- (3) by striking "25" and inserting "23.99".

SEC. 6. EFFECTIVE DATES.

(a) GENERAL EFFECTIVE DATE.—Except as provided in subsection (b), this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) SPECIAL EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by section 5 shall take effect 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHEN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4506, the Bankruptcy Judgeship Act of 2010, provides new resources for bankruptcy courts to handle the growing number and complexity of bankruptcy cases. This economy has resulted in many people having to seek bankruptcy who never would have dreamed they would have before. And the complexity of the cases, from our major automobile manufacturers on through other reorganizations, have grown in complexity for the bankruptcy judges to be involved in.

The bill authorizes the creation of 13 new permanent bankruptcy judges, the conversion of 22 temporary judgeships to permanent judgeships, and the extension of two judgeships for another 5 years. The act will help bankruptcy courts in 25 different Federal judicial districts around this country.

Bankruptcies had been steadily on the rise since October 2006. These events, bankruptcies rising and the financial crisis, combined with the continuing mortgage foreclosure crisis, consumer credit problems, and health care crises, have exacerbated this trend significantly and caused the bankruptcy courts much additional work.

According to the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, bankruptcy filings increased by over 300,000 from fiscal year 2008 to fiscal year 2009. That is a 34.5 percent increase in 1 year. The previous year they had increased by 30.2 percent. And the Wall Street Journal recently reported another sharp increase in personal bankruptcy filings in 2009, up 32 percent from 2008. According to the Wall Street Journal, these increases were driven by high unemployment rates and the continuing housing crisis, both of which have affected not only those on the economic margins, but also a growing number of middle class families who desire to work but have had to turn to our Nation's bankruptcy system for help as a last resort.

In addition to the growing numbers of bankruptcy cases, the cases have also grown more complex, particularly in business bankruptcies. As I mentioned earlier, in 2009 two of the big three, General Motors and Chrysler, two companies upon which tens of thousands of workers, thousands of dealers, hundreds of suppliers, and many communities across this Nation depended for their livelihoods, went through quick but nonetheless intense bankruptcy processes. Bankruptcy courts performed admirably but under strain.

Outside the automobile industry, as I mentioned earlier, businesses such as Delta Airlines to Lehman Brothers to Circuit City have all turned to bankruptcy for relief in recent years, with the same kind of extraordinary burden imposed on the bankruptcy courts.

While the workload for bankruptcy courts is increasing, judicial resources are in danger of decreasing. Many current bankruptcy judgeships are authorized on a temporary basis, and some are set to expire soon. A well-functioning bankruptcy system is absolutely essential to helping individuals and businesses weather our Nation's current economic difficulties. Having a sufficient number of bankruptcy judges is a key to making the system work, and has never been more important than today.

H.R. 4506, the Bankruptcy Judgeship Act of 2010, addresses these needs by authorizing the creation of 13 new permanent bankruptcy judgeships and the conversion of 22 temporary judgeships to permanent judgeships. Additionally, it extends the temporary authorization for two judgeships for another 5 years. These new, converted, and extended bankruptcy judgeships reflect the recommendations of the Judicial Conference of the United States. Those recommendations in turn are the culmination of an extensive and careful survey and review process that thoroughly assessed the bankruptcy judgeship needs of every Federal judicial district in the country. In essence transparent, fair, methodical, rational.

I note that a significant part of the conference's assessment of bankruptcy judges' workload depends on the use of case weights that were developed almost two decades ago, prior to the enactment of the Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act of 2005, which we still labor under. BAPCPA created numerous new motions that bankruptcy judges are now required to consider.

If anything, the Judicial Conference recommendations may underestimate the need of the workload and the need of new bankruptcy judges. In short, the conference's recommendations, as reflected in the new bankruptcy judgeships authorized by H.R. 4506, may actually be too conservative.

To pay for 13 new judgeships, the bill also raises the filing fees for chapter 7 and 13 cases by \$1, and for chapter 11 cases, which are business bankruptcies, by \$42. While I understand that filing fees are needed for the successful operation of the bankruptcy system, I believe they are already too high, particularly for consumer debtors seeking bankruptcy relief because they are in dire straits. In this one instance we ultimately determined that a fee increase was the only practical way to get the needed judgeships in a timely manner, which will allow for the efficient functioning of the bankruptcy system to the ultimate benefit of debtors.

So in passing a bankruptcy system, we wanted to have funds to make it self-sufficient. To put the bankruptcy system of our country in bankruptcy while saving the bankruptcy system seemed like an oxymoron.

□ 1145

But I would urge in the future we rely on something other than bankruptcy filing fee increases to pay for new bankruptcy judgeships. The last time Congress addressed the issue of bankruptcy judgeships was 5 years ago when it authorized 28 temporary judgeships in the Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act of 2005. Those temporary judgeships are now about to expire.

Moreover, the last time Congress authorized new permanent bankruptcy judgeships was in 1992. It is well past the time that we address the critical issue of bankruptcy judgeships needs, and I am pleased that we are able to do so today.

I thank the Judiciary Committee chairman, JOHN CONYERS, and Ranking Member LAMAR SMITH for being original cosponsors of this important legislation and our Judiciary Committee working in a bipartisan fashion to pass the bill. I also thank TRENT FRANKS, the ranking member of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Commercial and Administration Law, for his support of this bill. I guess it wasn't an oxymoron but an inconsistency.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, additional permanent bankruptcy judgeships have not been authorized since 1992. The Judicial Conference has requested more judgeships several times and the House has passed legislation to add them; however, the Senate has not acted on these requests.

Since Congress last authorized additional permanent judgeships, judicial workloads have increased substantially. The important bankruptcy reforms Congress passed in 2005, for example, called on judges to do more to prevent abuse.

Congress compensated for some of the court's increasing burden in recent years by creating temporary bankruptcy judgeships. Many of those judgeships are near their expiration dates.

The time has come for Congress to address bankruptcy judgeships needs on a permanent basis. Bankruptcy judges are essential to the bankruptcy process. They make certain that the process is fair and impartial to those who come before the bankruptcy courts. It is also their job to ensure that the bankruptcy courts effectively adjudicate parties' rights and responsibilities.

This bill is based on a comprehensive study done by the Judicial Conference. The conference has assured us that its request comes only after taking steps to maximize all other alternatives to reduce judicial workloads.

There are currently 352 bankruptcy judges, including 36 temporary judges.

This legislation creates 13 new permanent bankruptcy judgeships and converts 22 of the existing temporary judgeships to permanent status. It also provides a 5-year extension for two temporary judgeships.

Finally, this bill will not present any new cost for the taxpayers. The increased cost of these judgeships are paid by an increase in chapter 7, chapter 11, and chapter 13 bankruptcy filing fees. Those who do business in the courts will be paying the extra burdens, not the taxpayers.

We need a bankruptcy system that has a sufficient number of judges to manage the system's caseload in a just, economical, and timely manner. This bill helps ensure that we have such a system. I urge my colleagues to adopt this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, we have no other speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the bipartisanship under which we have worked on this bill. I thank Mr. POE and the minority ranking member, Mr. SMITH, and Chairman CONYERS and the staff who worked on this bill, and the Judicial Conference. I hope that we pass this bill. I call on Members to vote "aye" on H.R. 4506 and pass the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H.R. 4506 an act to amend the federal judicial code to authorize the appointment of additional permanent bankruptcy judges in various states. This legislation was introduced by Representative COHEN, my colleague from Tennessee. As a member of the judiciary committee, I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

As Chair of the Courts and Competition Policy subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee, I have long championed the increase in federal judgeships across the United States. In this Congress, I introduced H.R. 3663, The Federal Judgeship Act of 2009, which would have done exactly this: increase the number of federal judges.

The U.S. is also in need of more bankruptcy judges. According to Michael J. Melloy, Chair of the Judicial Conference Committee on the Administration of the Bankruptcy System, "Additional judgeships are critical to ensure that the bankruptcy courts have sufficient judicial resources to effectively and efficiently adjudicate the rights and responsibilities of parties in bankruptcy cases and proceedings". New bankruptcy judgeships have not been authorized by Congress since 1992, yet case filings have increased by 61 percent.

The current recession has had an adverse effect on the Bankruptcy Court system. The courts are now faced with much more complex and time-consuming bankruptcy cases, not to mention an increase in volume of cases. This has led to more cases per judge than they are able to handle. It is therefore necessary that we act and authorize additional bankruptcy judges.

In addition to authorizing new judges, H.R. 4506 would also convert certain temporary offices of bankruptcy judges to permanent offices, extend certain temporary offices of bankruptcy judges, reduce the amount of bankruptcy fees to be deposited as offsetting

collections to the United States Trustee System Fund, and increase bankruptcy filing fees. All of this would lead to a better and more efficient bankruptcy judicial system.

My state of Georgia has the third highest personal bankruptcy rate in the nation. According to the National Bankruptcy Research Center, Georgia's federal bankruptcy courts handled 66,925 filings during the first 11 months of 2009. This was 22 percent higher than the same period of 2008. This resolution will give the bankruptcy judicial system the resources necessary to review cases in a thorough yet timely manner, and turn the hectic bankruptcy process into a much more manageable one. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this legislation, and vote in the affirmative for H.R. 4506, the Bankruptcy Judgeship Act of 2010.

Mr. COHEN. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4506, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, on that, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

EXPRESSING APPRECIATION FOR ENRIQUE "KIKI" CAMARENA

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1115) expressing appreciation for the profound dedication and public service of Enrique "Kiki" Camarena on the 25th anniversary of his death.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1115

Whereas in March 1985, Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) Special Agent Enrique "Kiki" Camarena made the ultimate sacrifice in the fight against illicit drugs;

Whereas Special Agent Camarena, an 11-year veteran special agent of the DEA, was kidnapped, tortured, and murdered in the line of duty;

Whereas Special Agent Camarena joined the DEA in June 1974 as an agent with the Calexico, California, District Office;

Whereas Special Agent Camarena was assigned to the Fresno District Office in September 1977, and transferred to the Guadalajara Resident Office in July 1981;

Whereas, on February 7, 1985, when leaving the Guadalajara Resident Office to join his wife Geneva for lunch, Special Agent Camarena was surrounded by 5 armed men, forced into a vehicle and taken away;

Whereas the body of Special Agent Camarena was discovered on March 5, 1985, on a ranch approximately 60 miles southeast of Guadalajara, Mexico;

Whereas to date, 22 individuals have been indicted in Los Angeles, California, for their

roles in the Camarena murder, including former high ranking Mexican Government officials, cartel drug lords, lieutenants, and soldiers;

Whereas of the 22 individuals indicted in Los Angeles, 8 have been convicted and are imprisoned in the United States, 6 have been incarcerated in Mexico and considered fugitives as a result of outstanding warrants in the United States, 4 are believed deceased, 1 was acquitted at trial, and 3 remain fugitives believed to be residing in Mexico;

Whereas an additional 25 individuals were arrested, convicted, and imprisoned in Mexico for their involvement in the Camarena murder;

Whereas the men and women of the DEA will continue to seek justice for the murder of Special Agent Camarena;

Whereas fugitives Guillermo Chavez-Sanchez and Ricardo Chavez-Sanchez are still wanted as hostile material witnesses in Los Angeles, California;

Whereas during his 11-year career with the DEA, Special Agent Camarena received 2 Sustained Superior Performance Awards, a Special Achievement Award and, posthumously, the Administrator's Award of Honor, the highest award granted by DEA;

Whereas prior to joining the DEA, Special Agent Camarena served 2 years in the U.S. Marine Corps, as well as serving as a fireman in Calexico, a police investigator, and a narcotics investigator for the Imperial County Sheriff Coroner;

Whereas Red Ribbon Week, nationally recognized since 1988 and now the oldest and largest drug prevention program in the Nation, reaching millions of young people each year and celebrated annually from October 23 to 31, was established to help preserve Special Agent Camarena's memory and further the cause for which he gave his life, the fight against drug crime and addiction; and

Whereas Special Agent Camarena will be remembered as an honorable public servant, his sacrifice should also be a reminder every October during Red Ribbon Week of the dangers associated with drug use and trafficking: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) expresses appreciation for the profound dedication and public service of Enrique "Kiki" Camarena on the 25th anniversary of his death;

(2) offers its deepest sympathy and appreciation to his wife, Geneva, his three children, Enrique, Daniel, and Erik, and to the entire family, friends, and former colleagues of the Drug Enforcement Administration;

(3) encourages communities and organizations throughout the United States to commemorate the sacrifice of Special Agent Camarena through the promotion of drug-free communities and participation in drug prevention activities to support healthy, productive, and drug-free lifestyles; and

(4) directs the Clerk of the House to transmit a copy of this resolution to the family of Enrique "Kiki" Camarena.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1115 expresses appreciation for the profound dedication and public service of Enrique "Kiki" Camarena on the 25th anniversary of his passing.

On February 7, 1985, Special Agent Enrique Camarena, known to his friends as Kiki, left the American consulate in Guadalajara to meet his wife, Mika, for lunch. As Kiki walked to his truck, he was approached by five men who kidnapped him and sped away. He was found dead on March 5, 1985, after being tortured and brutally beaten by his captors. Kiki was 37 years of age—survived by his wife and three children, Enrique, Daniel, and Erik.

During his 11 years with the DEA, Kiki received two Sustained Superior Performance Awards and a Special Achievement Award as well. He also received posthumously the Administrator's Award of Honor, the highest award granted by the Drug Enforcement Agency.

Mr. Camarena was born on July 26, 1947, in Mexicali, Mexico. He graduated from Calexico High School in Calexico, California, in 1966. In 1968, he joined the U.S. Marine Corps, and after serving 2 years, he joined the Calexico Police Department as a criminal investigator in 1970.

In May 1973, he started working as a narcotics investigator with the El Centro Police Department. He stayed there until 1974, when he joined the DEA.

His first assignment as a special agent with DEA was in Calexico, California. In 1977, he was reassigned to the Fresno district office in northern California. After working in the Fresno office, he was later assigned to the Guadalajara, Mexico, DEA office for 4½ years and worked undercover on the trail of the country's biggest marijuana and cocaine traffickers. Before being kidnapped, Kiki was extremely close to unlocking a multibillion-dollar drug pipeline.

Officer Camarena gave his life in the fight against drug traffickers, and after his death, many people wanted to do something to remember the ultimate sacrifice he made. Soon after his death, people everywhere started wearing red ribbons to symbolize their commitment to help reduce the demand for drugs in their communities. The act of wearing red ribbons took on national significance and grew into what is now known as the Red Ribbon Campaign. During Red Ribbon Week, Kiki is remembered as a man who wanted to make a difference in the war on drugs, and his legacy still lives on.

In honor of Kiki Camarena's legacy and in recognition of the 25th anniversary of his death, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H. Res. 1115.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise in support of H. Res. 1115, honoring the legacy of Enrique “Kiki” Camarena on the 25th anniversary of his murder.

Words are not sufficient to express the debt that our country owes to Special Agent Camarena and to his family. His life of selfless service, courage of conviction, and dedication to protecting the American people will be remembered in our hearts and minds forever.

Twenty-five years ago, Agent Camarena gave his life in the line of duty after he was abducted. He was tortured and eventually was murdered. Agent Camarena was working undercover as a DEA special agent gaining valuable intelligence and evidence against Mexican drug cartels when he was kidnapped in broad daylight on a street in Guadalajara, Mexico. It is believed that he was tortured for around 2 days, and eventually he was bludgeoned to death.

We honor his life, we mourn his death, and we renew our commitment to ensure that his legacy is never forgotten.

When asked why he wanted to be a DEA agent, Special Agent Camarena replied, “Even if I am only one person, I can make a difference.” Thousands of individuals across our Nation can attest to the difference he has made in their lives.

Every day and every night, law enforcement officers across this Nation go to work aware of the dangers they face. These brave men and brave women put their lives at risk so the rest of us can sleep better at night and live safer lives. As we go about our daily lives, as we sleep in the safety of our homes, these individuals fight against the violence that threatens our neighborhoods, our communities, and our loved ones. And much of that violence is drug related.

I stand before the House today with heartfelt gratitude for every law enforcement officer who serves the communities throughout this country, and especially for those who have given their lives in the line of duty for the rest of us.

As we take a moment to pause and reflect on the heroic life and tragic death of this individual, the drug cartels continue. They continue to wage war on our borders and threaten the safety of so many people, and they do so all in the name of money. Yet they will soon come to learn that our pursuit of justice will not waiver and it will not weaken just because they continue their criminal enterprises north and south of our borders.

To the family of Special Agent Camarena, we share in their grief and we will ensure that his legacy lives on. We will relentlessly fight against the drug cartels and the border violence that they have caused. We want to

thank this family for sharing with our country a man who truly is an American hero.

To the individuals who continue to pursue those who abducted and tortured and murdered Special Agent Camarena, we thank them, we support them, and we have committed to those individuals that we will not rest until the perpetrators are brought to justice and tried for their evil deeds.

To our Nation’s law enforcement officers, we thank them for risking their lives each day to protect our lives and the lives of our loved ones. Their sacrifices and the sacrifices of their families shall always be remembered. Across our Nation, there are countless stories of men and women who have given their time, their resources, and their lives to protect and defend America.

Although we each have only one life to live, Special Agent Kiki Camarena has shown us the difference that one individual can make. Although we remember Special Agent Camarena’s tragic death today, I am encouraged by his life and the lives of so many who have dedicated themselves to public service. Without the sacrifices of these brave men and women, America would not be what we are today. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) will control the time.

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), the sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas, a great prosecutor and judge in his own right.

Mr. Speaker, we are all familiar with the dangerous duties undertaken by the men and women of the Drug Enforcement Administration. Oftentimes, their accomplishments go unnoticed, but these agents continue making significant contributions to the seemingly unending effort to protect our communities from drug crime and addiction.

This is a responsibility that DEA agent Enrique “Kiki” Camarena took seriously over the course of his career in law enforcement. It was 25 years ago this March that agent Camarena’s body was discovered after he was kidnapped by armed men in front of the U.S. consulate in Guadalajara, Mexico. He had been severely tortured by his captors. More than two dozen people, including Mexican Government officials, cartel leaders, and associates were convicted for Agent Camarena’s murder. Still, his memory has not been forgotten.

The circumstances surrounding his death are a vivid reminder of the violence and danger attributable to illegal drugs, whether it is directly along our borders, in our neighborhoods, or within the homes of families facing the struggles of addiction.

Today, Agent Camarena is perhaps the best-known hero of the war on drugs, and his story continues to inspire millions of Americans to lead drug-free lives. In fact, shortly after his death, Camarena Clubs were launched throughout southern California. Hundreds of club members wore red ribbons and pledged to lead drug-free lives in honor of Agent Camarena and others who gave their lives for the same purpose. In 1985, club members presented a proclamation to First Lady Nancy Reagan which brought the club national recognition, and ultimately prompted thousands of schools, communities, and States to recognize Red Ribbon Week, now celebrated during the last week of October.

□ 1200

So on this anniversary of Agent Camarena’s death, let us take time to honor the contribution and profound dedication and public service of Enrique “Kiki” Camarena on the 25th anniversary of his death.

I would like to offer my deepest sympathy and appreciation to his wife, Geneva, and his three children—Enrique, who is a prosecutor, Daniel and Erik—and the entire family, friends, and former colleagues at the Drug Enforcement Administration.

It is important that we focus on securing and enforcing our southern border so that these past sacrifices and future endeavors by those in the DEA are not in vain. Mr. Speaker, we in San Diego are honored to be home to this legacy of “Kiki” Camarena and his family.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POE of Texas. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the special agents that work in the Drug Enforcement Administration, the DEA, are special agents indeed. Many times they work alone, they work deep undercover, they work not only in the United States, but in foreign countries, and they work for the sole purpose of trying to capture those outlaws who are in the drug business, who, in the name of money, try to sell their wares and profit on that illegal enterprise. They are an international crime cartel syndicate. Our DEA agents do a wonderful job. We sometimes forget the work that they do. This is just one of many who have worked and dedicated their lives to helping protect the rest of us.

As my friend from California (Mr. HUNTER) has pointed out, much of this violence occurs on our borders because the drug cartels operate on international borders, on our border with Mexico especially. Because the drug cartels, in the name of money, are very violent, they are well armed, they are well financed, and they will do anything in their relentless effort to bring drugs into the United States.

We need to be aware that they have committed a war against the United States and all people who oppose their

activities. And so it is quite appropriate that today we honor and commemorate the life of one of those special agents who gave his life trying to protect us from the drug cartels.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am a proud original cosponsor of H. Res. 1115.

As my colleagues have explained, this resolution recognizes the life and public service of Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) Special Agent Enrique “Kiki” Camarena.

On February 7, 1985, Special Agent Camarena was on his way to meet his wife for lunch when he was kidnapped outside the U.S. Consulate in Guadalajara, Mexico by five armed men.

Almost a month later, his body was discovered on a ranch nearly 50 miles away, brutally murdered by the same kind of violent drug traffickers he had dedicated his life to fighting.

This month marks 25 years since that fateful day.

As an 11-year veteran of the DEA, Special Agent Camarena received two Sustained Superior Performance Awards, a Special Achievement Award and, posthumously, the Administrator’s Award of Honor, the highest award granted by DEA.

Prior to joining the DEA, he served in the U.S. Marine Corps, as a fireman, a police investigator, and a narcotics investigator.

Special Agent Camarena was deeply committed to public service throughout his life.

In honor of his memory, each October, thousands of schools, communities, and state and local drug abuse prevention organizations celebrate Red Ribbon Week.

Further, the anniversary of Special Agent Camarena’s death reminds us of the importance of continuing the close cooperation between the United States and Mexico in fighting the narcotraffickers.

The Mérida Initiative, a partnership between the Government of Mexico and the United States, has been successful in presenting new opportunities for expert collaboration on these fronts.

Through operations such as Operation Firewall and Operation Panama Express, the DEA and Mexican law enforcement authorities are dismantling drug cartels and seizing tons of illegal drugs destined for America’s streets.

I am sure that Special Agent Camarena would have been pleased to see how far we have come.

Again, I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this important measure in honor of Special Agent Enrique “Kiki” Camarena and his dedication to public service.

My most sincere thoughts and prayers are with his wife, Geneva, his sons Enrique, Daniel, and Erik, and his entire family.

I thank Congressman HUNTER for introducing this important measure.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of House Resolution 1115, which honors the profound dedication and public service of Enrique “Kiki” Camarena on the 25th anniversary of his untimely death.

Mr. Camarena led an exemplary life of service to his community and his nation. As a member of the Marine Corps, fire fighter, police officer, and DEA special agent, he demonstrated an extreme passion for fighting crime and eliminating drugs to ensure the safety and well-being of our communities. He led a commendable 11-year career at the

Drug Enforcement Administration earning him the distinguished Administrator’s Award of Honor.

In February 1985, Mr. Camarena lost his life in the line of duty. I had the opportunity to attend a memorial for Mr. Camarena and witness the impact his sacrifice made and hear from some of the many lives he touched. I am glad that twenty-five years after this tragedy, his passion and spirit still live on. His commitment to fighting drugs inspired millions of people around the world to live drug-free lives. We must continue to honor this legacy by promoting drug-free communities and supporting healthy drug-free lifestyles.

Again, I would like to express my appreciation for the outstanding service Mr. Camarena provided for this nation and offer my support and deepest condolences to his wife, children, and to the entire family, friends, and former colleagues at the Drug Enforcement Administration.

Mr. POE of Texas. With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SALAZAR). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1115.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HONORING OFFICERS’ ACTIONS DURING LAS VEGAS COURT-HOUSE ASSAULT

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1061) honoring the heroic actions of Court Security Officer Stanley Cooper, Deputy United States Marshal Richard J. “Joe” Gardner, the law enforcement officers of the United States Marshals Service and Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department, and the Court Security Officers in responding to the armed assault at the Lloyd D. George Federal Courthouse on January 4, 2010.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1061

Whereas, on January 4, 2010, during an assault at the entrance of the Lloyd D. George Federal Courthouse in Las Vegas, Nevada, Court Security Officer Stanley Cooper was fatally wounded and died heroically in the line of duty while protecting the employees, occupants, and visitors of the courthouse;

Whereas Deputy United States Marshal Richard J. “Joe” Gardner was wounded in the line of duty while protecting the employees, occupants, and visitors of the courthouse;

Whereas the Court Security Officers and members of the United States Marshals Service and the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department acted swiftly and bravely to subdue the gunman and minimize risk and injury to the public; and

Whereas the heroic actions of Court Security Officer Stanley Cooper, Deputy United

States Marshal Richard J. “Joe” Gardner, and the law enforcement officers who responded to the attack prevented additional harm to innocent bystanders: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) commends the brave actions and quick thinking exhibited by Court Security Officer Stanley Cooper during the assault at the entrance of the Lloyd D. George Federal Courthouse;

(2) offers its deepest condolences to the family and friends of Court Security Officer Stanley Cooper, who valiantly gave his life in the line of duty;

(3) commends Deputy United States Marshal Richard J. “Joe” Gardner for his actions and bravery in responding to the assault;

(4) wishes Deputy United States Marshal Richard J. “Joe” Gardner a speedy recovery from the wounds he sustained in the line of duty; and

(5) applauds the Court Security Officers and members of the United States Marshals Service and Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department for their brave and courageous actions in responding to the assault at the Lloyd D. George Federal Courthouse.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution honors the heroic actions of Court Security Officer Stanley Cooper, Deputy United States Marshal Richard J. “Joe” Gardner, the law enforcement officers of the United States Marshal Service and Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department, as well as the court security officers involved in responding to the armed assault at the Lloyd D. George Federal Courthouse in Las Vegas, Nevada, this past January 4, 2010.

On January 4, 2010, a man entered the lobby of the Lloyd D. George Federal Courthouse, pulled a shotgun from underneath his jacket, and began firing indiscriminately from outside the security area where visitors pass through the metal detectors. Through a swift response, law enforcement officers were able to chase the gunman from the courthouse and ultimately subdue him.

Court security officers and members of the United States Marshal Service and the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department acted bravely to subdue the gunman and minimize risk and injury to the public. Without regard for their own safety, they performed their

duty and protected all who were present in the courthouse that day from the threat of deadly harm through their swift and effective response.

Court Security Officer Stanley Cooper was a 26-year veteran of the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department and worked as a courthouse security officer since 1994. On January 4, 2010, Officer Cooper was fatally wounded and died heroically in the line of duty while protecting the employees, occupants, and visitors at the courthouse. Deputy United States Marshal Richard J. "Joe" Gardner was wounded in the line of duty while protecting the employees, occupants, and visitors of the courthouse.

This slaying and wounding of these two officers is a sobering reminder, Mr. Speaker, that law enforcement officers put themselves in dangerous situations every day in order to protect and serve the citizens of our country. Through our recognition today of the exemplary actions of these officers, we are celebrating the nameless, unrecognized acts of bravery and service performed every day by our brothers and sisters in law enforcement.

By way of this resolution, the House of Representatives commends the brave actions and quick thinking of the court officers, the United States Marshals, and the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department in responding to the assault at the Lloyd D. George Federal Courthouse. It also extends its deepest condolences to the family and friends of Officer Cooper, who valiantly gave his life in the line of duty. And it wishes Deputy Gardner a speedy recovery from the wounds that he sustained in the line of duty on that day.

All of these officers are heroes. We hope their families will take pride, and in the case of Officer Cooper, a small measure of consolation and comfort, in the knowledge that their actions were recognized by this body and they are celebrated today.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this important resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in total support of House Resolution 1061, honoring the heroic actions of Court Security Officer Stanley Cooper, Deputy United States Marshal Richard J. "Joe" Gardner, the law enforcement officers of the United States Marshal Service, the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department, and the court security officers in responding to an armed assault at the Lloyd D. George Federal Courthouse.

On the morning of January 4, 2010, an armed gunman walked into the Las Vegas Courthouse and opened fire, fatally wounding Court Security Officer Stanley Cooper and seriously wounding Deputy United States Marshal J. "Joe" Gardner.

The valiant actions of these two men saved the lives of many people and innocent civilians in the courthouse. In a time of tragedy and crisis, Court Security

Officer Cooper and Deputy United States Marshal Gardner responded immediately with selfless courage, placing the lives of others before their own.

Court Security Officer Cooper lived his life protecting the lives of other people. After 26 years of service with the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department, he retired to work at the Las Vegas Courthouse as a security officer. It was here that Officer Cooper died valiantly defending the halls of justice. For even after being fatally wounded, he continued to try to subdue the gunman, ultimately ensuring the safety of those that were in the courthouse that day. We join in the sorrow of his family and mourn the loss of this great individual. His legacy of a life dedicated to public service will not be forgotten.

In the moments that followed the fatal shooting, Deputy United States Marshal Joe Gardner and six other members of the United States Marshal Service, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department, and court security officers acted swiftly to subdue the gunman. Deputy United States Marshal Joe Gardner suffered gunshot wounds to his upper arm. We are grateful his life was not lost on that tragic day, and we honor his courageous actions as well.

The memory of that day serves as a haunting reminder of the dangers that our law enforcement officers face each day of their lives. In a split second, on a quiet Monday morning, it can turn into a battle between those who seek to harm innocent people and those who give their lives fighting to protect those same individuals.

Today, we honor Officer Cooper, Deputy United States Marshal Gardner, and law enforcement officers across this country. We remember the high price they pay for answering the call of duty, and they are on duty every day.

The tragic events that occurred on January 4, 2010 will be remembered by all of us. We will not forget the heroism and patriotism that was shown by Officer Cooper, Deputy U.S. Marshal Gardner, and the six other brave men and women.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished representative from Nevada, DINA TITUS.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of House Resolution 1061.

As you have heard, on January 4, 2010, an armed assailant with a history of violent behavior opened fire at the Lloyd D. George Federal Courthouse in downtown Las Vegas. The brave security personnel at the courthouse, U.S. marshals, and other emergency responders acted quickly and valiantly to ensure the safety of courthouse staff, visitors, and other bystanders in the area. Tragically, however, Officer Stanley Cooper was fired upon by the gunman and later succumbed to his wounds.

Officer Cooper had previously served as a Las Vegas Metropolitan Police officer for 26 years and had been a security officer at the courthouse for 15 years. He was a familiar face, a friendly hello when you walked in the building, and a person who gave his all to the job of protecting others.

Deputy U.S. Marshal Richard J. "Joe" Gardner, a member of the U.S. Marshal Service for the past 24 years, was also there. He bravely chased after the suspect and was shot in the arm.

The courthouse, which is home to many Federal offices and courts, including the U.S. District Court of Nevada, stands for justice and liberty for all Americans and fairness for all who enter. The building opened in 2002 and was one of the first new Federal buildings to be constructed according to safety standards that went into effect after the tragic Oklahoma City bombing. Those safety standards, combined with the bravery of the courthouse security force, ensured that no citizens were injured, the shooter did not get past security checkpoints, the situation was resolved quickly, and all of the judges and people who work in the building or who were there visiting were safe.

I wish Deputy U.S. Marshal Gardner a speedy recovery, and I offer my deepest condolences to the family of Officer Stanley Cooper. Today, we honor their brave service to our community.

So I would urge you to join me, as my colleagues, in supporting this resolution, a companion of which has already been passed by our Senate colleagues.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I now yield such time as she may consume to the distinguished congresswoman from Nevada, SHELLEY BERKLEY.

Ms. BERKLEY. I appreciate the congressman's yielding.

I particularly want to thank my colleague from Nevada, DINA TITUS, for introducing this resolution. I think it's very important to honor those in Las Vegas who have given so much to their country.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this resolution and the law enforcement personnel who put their lives at risk every day in order to protect their fellow Americans. Today, we honor two Nevadan heroes, Stanley Cooper and Joe Gardner, for their courageous actions while protecting the staff and visitors at the Lloyd George Federal Courthouse in Las Vegas during an armed assault earlier this year. Officer Cooper was downed during this senseless act of violence and gave his life while bravely serving his country.

□ 1215

We should never forget the heroic sacrifice he made, and my thoughts and prayers go out to his family.

U.S. Marshal Gardner thought quickly and acted bravely in responding to the armed assault, and I wish him a speedy recovery from the wounds he received in the line of duty.

I also commend the other court security officers, U.S. marshals and the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department for their quick and courageous responses to this attack and for protecting the public and preventing further loss of life.

This resolution honors these public servants' courageous actions and Officer Cooper's legacy of bravery and selflessness. This resolution serves as a tribute, not only to Officer Cooper and to U.S. Marshal Gardner, but to all public servants who put their lives on the line daily while serving their country. I encourage my colleagues to support this measure.

If I may take an additional minute, to those of our fellow citizens who are so frustrated with their government or who are so angry with life or with what is happening in this country or in their lives, there has to be a better way than this to express your anger and frustration.

In the aftermath of these tragedies, the government continues to function; Congress continues to meet; life goes on except for the lives of the perpetrators. More often than not, they are brought down by those who protect and defend the rest of us. Their families are destroyed, and they can't figure out why their loved ones reacted in this manner, and the misery they cause to their innocent fellow citizens, who are only doing their jobs, is beyond mention.

So I say to those who are angry and frustrated, do not do this. It creates misery in this country that has no place in the United States of America.

Again, I offer Officer Cooper's family my condolences and Officer Gardner a very speedy recovery.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I spent 30 years as a prosecutor and as a judge at the courthouse in Houston, all in the criminal courts building. I am very familiar with the individuals who work in the courthouse, who protect those who come to the seat of justice, to the bar of justice to seek grievances against our government.

Throughout those years, it became obvious to me that, in our country, the way we settle disputes is at the courthouse where we have two sides, sometimes more than two sides, who show up to argue their cases. Then there is a ruling by the judge on the law. Yet sometimes, as in this case, people show up at the courthouse and wish to take matters into their own hands in a violent manner.

We have folks at the courthouse who protect us, not just the lawyers and judges, but to protect those people who come to the courthouse to seek justice. Those people in our system are called the security officers, or bailiffs, as they are called in Texas.

More than once, unfortunately, I have had the unfortunate opportunity

of having seen people disagree with what took place in the courthouse and of having seen them get out of control. Yet those security officers, those bailiffs, those deputy sheriffs were there to protect the seat of justice. These are examples of two of those. One was killed, and one was wounded in making sure that justice prevails in our justice system and that the law is not taken advantage of in a violent manner.

So we honor those individuals, not just these two but the others who helped from the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department and all of those court officers who work every day in every courthouse in the United States to make sure we have a secure and a safe justice system.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, January 4, 2010, was a Monday morning, the first Monday morning of the new year. This incident happened that morning.

Monday mornings are always very busy, if not the busiest times, at courthouses throughout America. People are coming in to litigate their disputes, to answer calendar calls, to answer trial calendars. There are witnesses who have been subpoenaed. There are jurors who have come to court, having been notified that they need to be there. There are courthouse workers.

Of course, you pass through security. It's just like we do here at the United States Capitol and in our legislative office buildings. We pass through security. Sometimes, when people are in a hurry, they get a little antsy, and they take that out on the security officials.

Though, I will tell you, despite all that was ongoing on that morning, Judge POE, as you well know of these things that I just spoke of, on that day, a madman entered the courthouse and struck at a very soft part of security, which is when you walk right in the door and before you go through security. In the midst of all of that activity going on, he killed Officer Stanley Cooper, and he wounded Marshal Joe Gardner. Had it not been for their selfless and professional conduct at the time, there is no doubt that others could have lost their lives or could have been wounded as well.

So everywhere we have security checkpoints, the officers who man those checkpoints deserve our respect. They deserve our cooperation. They deserve our recognition as well for the fine jobs that they do. I want to take this opportunity to let all of those folks on the front lines know that we here in Congress, regardless of party affiliation, appreciate their service to us.

Lastly, we wish the family of Officer Cooper, as well as U.S. Deputy Marshal Joe Gardner and his family, the best in the future.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHN-

SON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1061.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ACCELERATING TAX BENEFITS FOR DONATIONS TO CHILE EARTHQUAKE VICTIMS

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4783) to accelerate the income tax benefits for charitable cash contributions for the relief of victims of the earthquake in Chile, and to extend the period from which such contributions for the relief of victims of the earthquake in Haiti may be accelerated.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4783

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. ACCELERATION OF INCOME TAX BENEFITS FOR CHARITABLE CASH CONTRIBUTIONS FOR RELIEF OF VICTIMS OF EARTHQUAKE IN CHILE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, a taxpayer may treat any contribution described in subsection (b) made after February 26, 2010, and on or before April 15, 2010, as if such contribution were made on December 31, 2009, and not in 2010.

(b) CONTRIBUTION DESCRIBED.—A contribution is described in this subsection if such contribution is a cash contribution made for the relief of victims in areas affected by the earthquake in Chile on February 27, 2010, for which a charitable contribution deduction is allowable under section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(c) RECORDKEEPING.—In the case of a contribution described in subsection (b), a telephone bill showing the name of the donee organization, the date of the contribution, and the amount of the contribution shall be treated as meeting the recordkeeping requirements of section 170(f)(17) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF PERIOD FROM WHICH CHARITABLE CASH CONTRIBUTIONS FOR RELIEF OF VICTIMS OF EARTHQUAKE IN HAITI MAY BE ACCELERATED.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 1 of Public Law 111-126 is amended by striking "before March 1, 2010" and inserting "on or before April 15, 2010".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to contributions made after February 28, 2010.

SEC. 3. BUDGETARY PROVISIONS.

(a) STATUTORY PAYGO.—The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled "Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation" for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

(b) EMERGENCY DESIGNATION.—

(1) STATUTORY PAYGO.—This Act is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 4(g) of the Statutory Pay-As-

You-Go Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-139; 2 U.S.C. 933(g)).

(2) HOUSE PAYGO RULES.—All applicable provisions in this Act are designated as an emergency for purposes of pay-as-you-go principles.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, Ranking Member DAVID CAMP is not here today because of a death in his family. The distinguished gentleman from Illinois is going to be handling the time on the minority side.

On behalf of my colleague and friend Mr. CAMP and the gentleman from Illinois, I ask that the nonpartisan Joint Committee on Taxation be asked to make available to the public a technical explanation of the bill. The technical explanation expresses the committee's understanding and legislative intent behind this important bill. It is available on the joint committee's Web site at www.jct.gov, and it is listed under document No. JCX-08-10.

Mr. Speaker, we rise today on this very important bill. It would allow for charitable contributions paid to victims of the Chilean earthquake on or before April 15 of this year, which is the tax return deadline, to be claimed as deductions on taxpayers' 2009 tax returns. Of course, absent this change, taxpayers would need to wait until next year to claim deductions for these contributions.

In addition—and this is very important—the bill would provide taxpayers with a little more time relating to the victims of the Haitian earthquake so that they could make charitable contributions through April 15, extending it beyond March 1.

So let me, if I might, say just a few words.

I think all of us know graphically what is involved here. I checked, and the catastrophe in Haiti is the largest of its kind on record in the Western Hemisphere. We have also seen the catastrophe in Chile. I think all of us want to be sure that the American people can join together to express their alliances with the people of Chile and with the people of Haiti.

Like lots of families, our family has had a connection with both countries. My son Andy has been to Haiti many times. He was there as a monitor for one of the elections when there was immense violence, and I was concerned

for his safety. He is able to speak Creole to express his interest in Haiti. So that's one way, in addition to my service in the Foreign Aid Agency, that our family has had contact with the people of Haiti.

Yet I think all of us have had that contact with the people of Haiti since the catastrophe, the worst of its kind on record in the Western Hemisphere, and I think all of us very much want to be sure that we can express our support, our alliance and can give our charitable contributions.

As to Chile, we could see the immense devastation. That country was prepared for an earthquake of virtually any magnitude; but this magnitude, one of the very worst in the history of the country, shook up the country. It shook up its foundations in many places, and it led to the loss of many, many lives.

So I come here today on behalf of the committee and, I think, on behalf of all of us in this Congress. I believe the gentleman from Illinois and I come here today on behalf of all of the American people, and we ask that we have unanimous consent for this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to a distinguished member of the committee, my good friend and pal, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), and I ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to control that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

□ 1230

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. ROSKAM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank and congratulate Chairman LEVIN for his leadership on this issue, and particularly want to thank him for the gesture of reaching out to the minority on this and hope it is a glimpse of things to come.

As the chairman indicated, this is one of these areas that clearly all of America comes together on. There are ample examples of where we have done this in the past, obviously with the tsunami back in 2005, and most recently you had members of the Ways and Means Committee that were on the floor together urging us to change the Tax Code to accommodate the relief efforts in Haiti.

This also is really worthy of us coming together quickly in this tax season and allowing Americans to make contributions to Chile and, in fact, extending the period of time that they are able to make contributions to Haitian relief efforts, all in the context of completing their 2009 tax returns.

Why is this important? It is important because in order to bring rescue and recovery in times of great crisis, it takes more than simply the American

Government working. That is important, but it also takes the American public.

I had an event in my district, Mr. Speaker, a couple of weeks ago, where we brought together folks to discuss Haitian relief efforts. My recollection is that there was a Red Cross official who was there, and she said a very interesting thing. She said that the event in Haiti, and I know we are talking about Chile today primarily, but she said the event in Haiti had redefined what it means to be local.

I thought, Isn't that interesting? Here we have folks that have responded incredibly generously, Americans have, at the sight and the sounds and the visuals of real suffering in our part of the world, and what have they done? They have taken their checkbook out. They have written a check. They have donated online. They have donated famously on their cell phones now in overwhelming numbers. But I think it was really poignant when she said local contributions and the definition of a local tragedy has been redefined. So here we are today, Republicans and Democrats together, saying that this is an area where we need to move forward.

I know that Mr. CAMP, the ranking member from Michigan, would have been here, but, as Chairman LEVIN mentioned, he has had a death in the family and he has that obligation. I know I speak for an overwhelming majority of Republicans when saying this is an area that we should all come together on and move quickly to move this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This has been a particularly difficult period of time for all of us as we witnessed the victims of these two enormous tragedies attempt to repair the devastation that resulted from two of the largest earthquakes that we have seen in recent times.

As we laid witness to the victims of the Haiti earthquake in January, I had a chance a couple of weeks ago to see for myself the magnitude of the devastation. As somebody who was on the scene shortly after the tsunami 5 years ago, I will say that what I saw in Haiti not only rivaled that, but was actually worse than anything I had seen in Banda Aceh or Buket or in Sri Lanka. Then, just a few weeks later, we had an earthquake even larger, an 8.8, rock the country of Chile.

But through these tragedies, one thing is abundantly clear, and that is the generosity and compassion of the American people being as strong as ever. It is hard to explain, really, the impact that we see of these dedicated volunteers on the ground, moving to provide services that in some cases were not available at all prior to the tragedy.

Then looking at the earthquake in Chile last week, the outpouring of

American support is even more remarkable, given the fact that everybody put all these resources just a few days before into Haiti. Clearly, there is no compassion fatigue on the part of the American public.

We need to take a step back and realize that we are talking about almost a quarter million people who have died between the two, and over 1 million people displaced, and we are still finding the definition of the problem. Particularly as it relates to Haiti, we are going to find that the death toll is likely to grow much higher if we are not able to deal with the problems of water and sanitation.

Here again, American voluntary efforts from nongovernment organizations are providing critical services, and donations in Haiti alone have already reached \$1 billion. They enable these charitable organizations and nongovernment organizations to expedite the care and services needed for those who are injured and homeless, to help our neighbors get to safety and begin picking up the pieces and rebuilding their lives.

We must be clear that the road to recovery will not be short in either country. We know that we need to expedite anything we can for Americans to be part of that process. American families who have given to facilitate the recovery ought to know that we are working to show appreciation of that compassion to incent further actions with this adjustment.

As both my colleagues have made clear, but we need to drive home, any contribution after February 26 and before April 15 to the victims of the earthquake in Chile, people can claim these contributions, charitable contributions, on the tax return that they are preparing now for the last tax year.

In addition, the adjustment being made for Haiti, extending it to April 15, is an important addition. This is in keeping with what we did with the tsunami that struck in 2004.

There is a special provision here that I want to call note to, because we have watched the innovation take place in the charitable sector. The era of the cell phone and text messaging has made it possible for hundreds of millions of dollars of charitable contributions to be made through cell phone text messaging. It enabled people to do it conveniently and quickly. It speeded the aid along and, no doubt in my mind, it increased the amount of money that went to these people in need.

Under current law, obviously, taxpayers must receive documentation from the charity or rely on bank records to claim a deduction on their tax return, but when you are making a contribution through a text message, the only paper documentation individuals receive is from the telephone company. Right now, it is unclear whether individuals will be able to rely on a telephone bill to claim a charitable deduction. As a result of this legislation,

we are clarifying that taxpayers making charitable contributions to victims of the Haiti earthquake through the text messaging effort will be able to rely on their cell phone bill when claiming a charitable deduction.

To be clear, we all know that Americans are not doing this primarily for a tax deduction. It is the generous spirit of the American public and concern for men and women around the world who suffer from tragedy. But providing this incentive and clarifying the law makes it a little easier for the families who have given of themselves and others, and I would urge my colleagues to support its passage.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART), a great champion of freedom and hope and rescue in the Americas.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I thank my dear friend Mr. ROSKAM for the time, and I simply rise to join my voice in praise and commendation for all those who have made possible that this resolution come to the floor. I think it speaks very highly of this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, there is no more generous nation in the world than the American Nation, the American people. One sees that generosity time and time again. As Mr. BLUMENAUER mentioned, we just saw an extraordinary outpouring of generosity toward the people of Haiti, and then we have seen another tragedy, and the American people, with regard to Chile, are demonstrating once again that extraordinary generosity.

So I think it is so appropriate, and that is why I rise to commend all of those that have made this resolution possible, to accelerate the deduction for the donations that Americans have made, extend that policy with regard to Haiti and to make it possible with regard to the donations that are being made or have been made or will be made for those who have suffered in Chile. Our hearts and our prayers go out to those who suffer in both of those neighbor, friendly nations. They are wonderful people, great friends of the United States.

Remembering the victims, I think the Congress, by this action today, not only takes a step that is consistent with the generosity of the American people, but I think makes a very commendable act. So I simply wanted to join my voice of commendation for all of those who have made this possible.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, in a nutshell, this bill does three things then: It extends the time period for contributions to Haiti for attribution to a 2009 tax return; it extends the contribution until April 15th for contributions to Chile for relief efforts for the 2009 tax return; and, as the gentleman from Or-

egon mentioned, it cleans up this ambiguity as it relates to contributions on cell phones. It is well thought out, it is timely, there is an urgency to it, and I urge its passage.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I would conclude by just saying that I do appreciate the rapid response of the committee, the bipartisan support, to honor the generosity of Americans in both these tragedies, to clean up the legislation and move it forward. But I hope, Mr. Speaker, that this is a symbol of a longer-term commitment on the part of this Congress, that we match the generosity of spirit of Americans and of our partners overseas. We have seen other countries step forward, along with charities and other nongovernmental organizations.

I am hopeful that we will exhibit a commitment to follow through after the initial dust has settled to be full partners with other countries, with the people in Chile and Haiti, to deal with the long and difficult recovery. Lives have been traumatized. There are still people at risk from disease. I am hopeful that we in Congress will have the support and the follow through to make sure that the United States Government is a full partner with these other critical areas to make sure that we make life hopefully return to normal as quickly as possible for the people who have suffered this devastation.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, as an original cosponsor of H.R. 4783, I rise in support of this bipartisan legislation and urge its immediate enactment to support the ongoing recovery efforts in Chile and Haiti.

This bill does two simple things. First, it allows anybody making a cash contribution for earthquake relief in Chile before April 15, 2010, to receive a charitable deduction for the qualifying contribution on their 2009 tax return. And second, it provides the same tax benefit to those wishing to support relief efforts in Haiti, by extending the original March 1, 2010, deadline for Haiti contributions to April 15, 2010, as well.

These simple steps are consistent with our nation's tradition of responding to those in need and will provide an extra incentive for generous Americans to make timely contributions to these crises when the assistance is needed most.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4783—a bill that will accelerate the income tax benefits for charitable cash contributions for the relief of victims of the earthquake in Chile.

As you know, on Saturday, February 27, 2010, a massive, 8.8 magnitude earthquake, one of the largest ever recorded, struck off of the coast of Chile. An estimated 2,000,000 people, including upwards of 1,500,000 displaced persons, have been directly affected by the earthquake, the tsunami, and its aftermath. As the casualties continue to grow, there is a great deal of extensive damage to highways, bridges, apartments, and infrastructure, have led the government of Chile to declare a 'state of catastrophe.' Since the initial earthquake, there have been over 100 aftershocks, which include 8 aftershocks registering above a 6.0 magnitude. These aftershocks continue to affect the coast and the rest of the country.

According to the United States Geological Survey, Concepcion, Chile's second largest city, was 70 miles from the earthquake's epicenter and suffered some of the worst damage. Thousands of its residents initially remained cut-off from the remainder of the country without any basic necessities, such as running water and electricity. The coastal town of Dichato and its 4,000 residents were among the hardest hit and is 80 percent destroyed. 80 percent of Talcahuano's 180,000 residents living on the Chilean coast were left homeless by the earthquake. Initial estimates of damages range from \$15,000,000,000 to \$30,000,000,000, and basic necessities across the country, including electricity, clean water access, telephone access, and communication systems continue to be restored on a progressive basis in many zones.

Chile's stringent building codes, which one local architect called 'our proud building standards,' as well as the Government of Chile's ability to implement them greatly mitigated the impact of this catastrophic natural event both in terms of casualties and physical damage to the infrastructure of this country. The Government of Chile has taken significant measures to maintain order and public security in the streets in order to prevent more widespread panic and chaos as damage assessments are made and relief is delivered.

America is again responding, and will continue to respond with immediate humanitarian assistance to help the people of this struggling nation rebuild their livelihoods. I send my condolences to the people and government of Chile as they grieve once again in the aftermath of a natural disaster. As Chile's neighbor, I believe it is the United States' responsibility to help Chile recover, and build the capacity to mitigate against future disasters.

Throughout my time in Congress, I have been highly involved in strengthening the relationship between the U.S. and countries abroad. I have worked to establish positive and productive partnerships with local development officials, nonprofit organizations, and various leaders to establish a strong web of support for countries abroad. In collaboration with the Congressional Black Caucus, I have been a continual advocate of providing assistance to various countries to strengthen their fragile democratic processes, continue to improve security, and promote economic development among other concerns such as the protection of human rights, combating narcotics, arms, and human trafficking, addressing migration, and alleviating poverty.

Once again, I am devastated by the immeasurable tragedy that occurred in Chile. Along with my colleagues, I hope to visit Chile in the near future to meet with their leaders and see what the United States can do to rebuild the shattered livelihoods.

America is responding to the earthquakes in Chile and will continue to respond with immediate humanitarian assistance to help the people of Chile rebuild their livelihoods. I send my condolences to the people and government of Chile as they grieve once again in the aftermath of a natural disaster. As Chile's friend, it is the United States' responsibility to help Chile recover, and build the capacity to mitigate against future disasters.

Financially, 2009 was not an easy year for many Americans. Although thousands of jobs were created and we are back on the road to economic recovery, Americans lived on tighter

budgets than usual. This legislation will allow those Americans who have generously donated money to Chile to receive their tax break this year instead of next year.

In January of 2005, Congress enacted this type of relief for individuals that made charitable contributions to victims of the Indian Ocean tsunami that occurred in late December of 2004. That bill (H.R. 241 in the 109th Congress) passed the House of Representatives without objection and subsequently passed the Senate by unanimous consent. Additionally, these same benefits were extended to people who donated to Haiti. I hope that this legislation, like our response to the 2004 tsunami, and January's earthquake in Haiti will encourage Americans to contribute more money to Chile. As Haiti starts on its long recovery, every dollar is critically important. Once again, I am proud to represent such a compassionate and generous nation.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4783.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1245

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 248, AFGHANISTAN WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1146 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1146

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 248) directing the President, pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution, to remove the United States Armed Forces from Afghanistan, if called up by Representative Kucinich of Ohio or his designee. The concurrent resolution shall be considered as read. The concurrent resolution shall be debatable for three hours, with 90 minutes controlled by Representative Kucinich of Ohio or his designee and 90 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution to final adoption without intervening motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 1146.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1146 provides for the consideration of H. Con. Res. 248, directing the President, pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution, to remove the United States Armed Forces from Afghanistan. The rule provides 3 hours of general debate in the House, with 90 minutes controlled by Representative KUCINICH and 90 minutes controlled by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the concurrent resolution and provides that the concurrent resolution shall be considered as read.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important day, and an important debate, in the House of representatives. Last summer, I had the privilege of traveling to Afghanistan and meeting with our brave troops. They are an incredible group of people, proud of their accomplishments, thoughtful and candid about the challenges that confront them. They deserve to know that we are thinking about them and do not take their lives or their fate for granted. It has been far too long since Congress had a full and open debate on the issue of U.S. policy in Afghanistan.

In 2001, I voted, along with the vast majority of my colleagues, to go after the terrorists who attacked us on September 11th. I believe we must have a comprehensive strategy to counter the global threat posed by al Qaeda and its affiliates, no matter where they are in the world—Afghanistan, Pakistan, Somalia, Yemen, North Africa, and elsewhere. But I also believe that we have serious challenges right here at home. Millions of Americans are out of work. Our economy is just now beginning to emerge from the worst recession in decades. Our schools, our health care, our tax code, our infrastructure—all must be updated for the 21st century if we are to create a better America.

Mr. Speaker, the war in Afghanistan has cost U.S. taxpayers well over \$200 billion—none of it paid for. None of it paid for. All of that money has been added on to our debt. And those costs will continue to rise as we fund increasing troop levels and provide the necessary care to our veterans when they return home. Our policy has drastically changed in those 8 years. We are no longer just going after the bad guys. We are engaged in a massive “nation-building” effort in Afghanistan.

Now, I certainly don't believe we should abandon the Afghan people. But instead of nation-building in Afghanistan, I'd like to do some more nation-building here at home.

Our allies in Afghanistan, the Karzai government, do not inspire confidence.

The recent election there was characterized by widespread fraud and corruption. Just 10 days ago, Mr. Karzai unilaterally rewrote the election law to ensure that he can handpick the members of the election monitoring commission that oversees voting irregularities. Talk about the fox guarding the chicken coop.

Over 1,000 U.S. servicemen and women have sacrificed their lives in Afghanistan. Over 670 more lives have been lost by our NATO military allies. Thousands more have been wounded, many severely, in ways that will affect the rest of their lives. Suicide and post-traumatic stress among our troops and veterans continue to increase at alarming rates.

Mr. Speaker, last summer I authored an amendment to require the administration to develop an exit strategy for our military involvement in Afghanistan. While my amendment did not carry the day, I believe it demonstrated to the administration that an open-ended commitment was not sustainable. As we know, President Obama outlined such a strategy in his speech at West Point. And I believe it is essential that we in the Congress work to keep the administration to its word. We must fulfill our constitutional responsibilities by making sure that taxpayer funds are spent wisely and with complete accountability and transparency for every dime and every dollar. No more Halliburton and Blackwater scandals. No more projects where fat-cat middlemen walk off with all the money while the Afghan people go without hospitals, schools, roads, or food.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this is just the first—not the last—debate that we have on the House floor this year over our policy in Afghanistan. The issue is simply too important. The future at stake is too grave. We have sacrificed too much—in the lives and well-being of our soldiers, in the cost to our economy—to wait another year or 2 or 3 for Congress to do its job. We must continue to ask the hard questions and demand straight answers.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I'd like to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for the time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, on Sunday the Iraqi people went to the polls to vote in their latest national parliamentary elections. Millions of Iraqis voted at thousands of voting stations throughout the country. The democratic process is succeeding in Iraq. The people there, despite extraordinarily difficult challenges, are able to express themselves in free elections.

Sunday was a good day for the future of Iraq. Those elections would not have taken place but for the decision of President Bush in 2007 to send over 20,000 surge troops to Iraq in order to establish "a unified democratic federal Iraq that can govern itself, defend

itself, and sustain itself." Those elections would not have been possible but for the sacrifices of our troops and their families. Just 4 months ago, Mr. Speaker, President Obama announced a surge strategy for Afghanistan. He committed 30,000 additional forces to a counterinsurgency strategy that I believe will help to strengthen the government in Afghanistan's security forces, as the surge did in Iraq.

Since President Obama's announcement, we've seen considerable results. For example, last month, our troops began what is known as the Marjah offensive. The joint offensive with the Afghan National Army and coalition partners has pushed the Taliban out of Marjah and has allowed the Afghan government to take control of significant areas that were previously controlled by the Taliban. This offensive is what General David Petraeus, the commander of the United States Central Command, has described as the "initial salvo" in a 12- to 18-month campaign to defeat the Taliban.

Now I have had and I continue to have, Mr. Speaker, disagreements with policies of President Obama, but I have said privately, I have said publicly, and I reiterate here today, that in the case of Afghanistan, President Obama has demonstrated great responsibility and a sense of the national security interest of the United States. He deserves our support.

Just as our military is making tangible progress, like the Marjah offensive demonstrates, just as this is occurring, many of our colleagues in the majority party now feel that it is time to withdraw from Afghanistan. The resolution that we are set to debate today would require the President to withdraw our troops in 30 days. I believe that that would be precipitous. I believe that precipitously withdrawing our troops would be reckless. I believe it would allow the Taliban to regain control of Afghanistan and thereby provide criminal groups such as al Qaeda with carte blanche to run terrorist training camps and plan terrorist attacks against the United States and our allies. I would remind my colleagues that it was the safe harbor and support that the Taliban gave bin Laden which allowed him to plan the September 11, 2001, attacks from Afghanistan against this country. A reconstituted Taliban will undoubtedly do the same and will pose a significant and grave risk to the national security of the United States.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we must never allow Afghanistan to once again fall into the hands of terrorists whose sole purpose is to destroy the United States and to kill innocent civilians. Precipitous withdrawal would not only be dangerous, I believe, to our national security, but would constitute a mortal blow to the Afghan people, who are relying on our support.

Although they have far to go, Afghanistan has made demonstrable progress. But if this resolution were to

become U.S. policy, all the improvements made by the Afghan people would disappear. Afghans would no longer be given the chance to vote in elections. The Taliban would rule by the edict of terror. It would mean the return of a nightmarish tyranny to Afghanistan. Women would see the rights they have gained disappear as the Taliban once again made women non-citizens and banned young girls, who for the first time are learning to read, from schools.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that now is not the time to turn our backs on the Afghan people. It is not the time to counter the mission of our troops, especially when they are engaged in the first major offensive of President Obama's reaffirmed counterinsurgency strategy. Let us send a message to the terrorists that the United States is committed to our mission to prevent the return to power of the Taliban. Let us soundly defeat this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1300

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I appreciated the gentleman from Florida's comments. He spent a great deal of time trying to compare Iraq to Afghanistan. I would remind my colleagues that Iraq and Afghanistan are very, very different countries, different cultures, different levels of education and a different history of centralized government. In Afghanistan, there is no tradition, there is no history of a centralized government. Comparing Iraq to Afghanistan is not comparing apples to oranges. It's like comparing apples to Volkswagens. There is no comparison. And we could have a debate about Iraq, but that should be on a separate day, and we could talk about whether there were any weapons of mass destruction; but today we're here talking about Afghanistan.

I think this is important, and it's an important discussion because this Congress, with the exception of a few amendments that got very little time, has not had a debate or a discussion in this Chamber on Afghanistan since after September 11, 2001. And our policy has changed in a number of different ways over those years, and we still have not had a debate or a discussion on Afghanistan.

So today, hopefully, we will. And my hope is that in this Chamber, where lots of Members talk all the time and very few Members listen, that this may be a day for Members to listen. It is important that we get this right, especially for the men and women who we have deployed over there.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE), a member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Thank you very much to my good friend from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for yielding me the time, for his excellent opening statement, and for his response to

our colleague from the Rules Committee as well. And I thank him for being here today.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule and the underlying concurrent resolution. It is a rare occurrence that Members of this body have the opportunity to devote 3 hours of debate to such an important issue, and it is even more unusual that Members are given a chance for a clean up-or-down vote on ending the war in Afghanistan. Each time an emergency war supplemental, a Defense appropriations bill or a Defense authorization bill has come to the floor, continued funding for the war in Afghanistan is hidden behind spending to create jobs, to provide humanitarian relief or to increase medical benefits to our troops, all of which I support. And privileged resolutions like this, which exercise the constitutional right of the United States Congress to decide whether or not to continue the use of the military force, rarely sees the light of day.

This country has spent over \$250 billion, Mr. Speaker, on the war in Afghanistan. The share of my home State of Maine is almost \$700 million. And in the next few months, the administration will likely ask this Congress to spend another \$30 billion to fund a surge of troops in Afghanistan. At a time when we cannot find \$30 billion to create jobs, continue unemployment benefits or help small businesses, we need to ask ourselves, Is the cost of this war worth it? Is it right to spend more money and lose more lives on a strategy that isn't working? Can we afford to turn our backs on the challenges we face at home and to pursue failed policies abroad?

I am an original cosponsor of this concurrent resolution because I firmly believe this war needs to end. We have asked our men and women in uniform to return to combat again and again. They have fought with bravery and helped the people of Afghanistan with compassion. They have risen to meet every challenge and paid every price to defend this country. But the cost of this war is too high. The economic situation in the country is too dire, and the lives of our brave men and women in uniform are too precious for this war to go on and for this issue to be muddled and tucked away in large spending bills.

It is time to end the war in Afghanistan and bring our troops home. It is time for this Congress to demand an open debate on Afghanistan and a clean vote on any future bills that fund this war. I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this rule and the underlying concurrent resolution.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. At this point, Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), a member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. POLIS. I thank my colleague from Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation does face a very real and immediate terrorist threat. The terrorist threat stems from al Qaeda, which is a stateless menace, a menace that is not rooted in any one location or has any dominion in any one particular area.

In fact, the two countries that our Nation continues to occupy, namely Iraq and Afghanistan, are not significant bases of operations for al Qaeda. It's been recently reported that there are, in fact, only around 50 al Qaeda operatives in the entire nation of Afghanistan, and there could very well be 10 times that number in nations like Yemen and Pakistan.

Yes, there is a very real threat, but the answer is not to continue to indefinitely occupy countries where we only breed more sympathy with those who would do us harm. The correct and more important way to leverage American military might to combat this menace is to have targeted and aggressive intelligence-gathering and targeted special operations against the terrorists no matter where they are.

Some have expressed concerns that if we leave Afghanistan precipitously, al Qaeda could reassert itself there. The answer to that is to go after al Qaeda in a targeted way in Afghanistan if the need arises again. It is not to engage in an indefinite occupation of one or two particular countries. How many more countries would we need to occupy? If they're in Yemen, do we occupy Yemen? If they're in Pakistan, do we occupy Pakistan? If we weren't already in and occupying Afghanistan, would we choose to go in there today? I would submit that the answer is no.

We need to continue our effort to battle terrorists wherever they are and focus on this stateless menace through intelligence-gathering, targeted special operations and a refocused emphasis on homeland security, all of which a very costly and expensive effort in Afghanistan continues to reduce our ability to do by soaking up our national time and resources as well as costing the lives of American soldiers.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Today, so very late, represents the first real House debate on Afghanistan since President Obama announced that the path to peace could only be found through wider war. I have continually challenged that policy. But because our security, I believe, will not be found in either the false choice of "more troops in" or "all out now," I cannot support the resolution, as I do not support our current strategy in Afghanistan.

This December escalation announcement by the President was counterproductive and somewhat misleading. He tried to have it both ways. He pledged to begin withdrawing troops in July 2011, but his plan continues send-

ing troops through near the end of this year. Defense Secretary Gates was more candid. He says that any withdrawal next year will be a "handful," that there is no real Afghanistan exit strategy, and that a large military presence is planned there for "a very long time."

With our unceasing commitment to American blood and treasure being poured into Afghanistan, there is no meaningful pressure on President Karzai and his drug dealer and warlord cohorts. They have been much less interested in undertaking the steps necessary to secure peace than in clinging to power and wealth, such as by stealing one-third of the votes in the last election. I believe that the calls for reform have been greeted since that time by Mr. Karzai only by taking over the independent election commission that questioned that election and by the appointment of multiple drug warlord types to the cabinet who are part of the problem. In Afghanistan, reform is a slogan, it is not a reality.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TIERNEY). The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. DOGGETT. We have exercised minimal leverage over Karzai and his cronies, who view our continuing presence there as an invitation to steal all they can get when they get it. The better exit strategy is having fewer troops who need to exit. I agree with General Eikenberry, our former commander and now ambassador, who last November questioned an escalation that would only "bring vastly increased costs and an indefinite, large-scale U.S. military role." He wisely concluded that further increases would "dig us in more deeply."

In 2001, I voted for the use of force against the enemies that attacked us, and I continue to support that effort. But unless we pursue a different approach with a more narrow military footprint and a pragmatic exit strategy, we will remain embroiled in a land that has entrapped so many foreign powers throughout the centuries. Afghanistan can consume as many lives and as many dollars as we are willing to expend there. As in Iraq, we are on a course for a trillion-dollar war waged on borrowed money. That must be changed to save American lives and America's future.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH), the author of the resolution.

Mr. KUCINICH. We're either in or we're out. Unless this Congress acts to claim its constitutional responsibility, we will stay in Afghanistan for a very, very long time at great cost to our troops and to our national priorities. Or we can set a date, December 31, 2010, by which we must leave. And this is exactly what the resolution seeks to do.

Congress has to be mindful of our responsibilities under this Constitution, article I, section 8, to claim responsibility for the true casualties, which are now close to 1,000, to claim responsibility for the cost, which is approaching \$250 billion and together with the Iraq war close to \$1 trillion. And this at a great cost to our priorities here at home for housing, for job creation, for health care, for education; to claim responsibility for the casualties to innocent civilians, the human costs of the war.

Congress must claim responsibility one way or another for challenging the corruption that my colleagues have talked about that has engulfed the Afghanistan administration. We must claim responsibility and understand exactly the role the Turkmenistan-Afghanistan-Pakistan-India pipeline has in all of this. We must claim responsibility for debating the wisdom of the counterinsurgency strategies which apparently have failed and claim responsibility for the logistics of withdrawal.

I brought this resolution to the floor of the House with the help of the Rules Committee and the support of the leadership, which believes the debate is merited, because after 8½ years it is time that this Congress be heard from. It is time that we claim our constitutional responsibility under article I, section 8.

The War Powers Resolution of 1973 was enacted to ensure that Congress has a role in the decision to send the United States Armed Forces into hostilities or the continued use of such forces and hostilities. And my legislation, if enacted, would require the President to bring the Armed Forces out of Afghanistan by December 31, 2010.

As the U.S. Armed Forces and our allies begin the first in a series of large military operations in Afghanistan, it is up to us to have our voice and our vote felt at this important moment.

Regardless of your support or opposition to the war, this resolution is about ensuring meaningful and open debate. And in the 3 hours ahead, I'm confident that this House will have the opportunity to do that so that people, no matter what their position is, can finally be heard from with respect to our constitutional responsibilities.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for his courtesy in permitting me to speak on this. I continue to have profound reservations about our troop commitments, first in Iraq and more recently with President Obama's decision to escalate our presence in Afghanistan.

History suggests we will not be successful in stabilizing Afghanistan with military force. No one has. I don't

think anyone ever will. Afghanistan today is perhaps the most corrupt country in the world, ranked next to last out of 180, according to Transparency International. If you have a culture of corruption, it's hard to plant seeds. It's hard to rent allies and have them remain loyal. Global economic development through roads and water are not esoteric, abstract issues. These are things that make a difference between people being thugs and, in some cases, feeding their families in any way they can, having little sympathy for infidels and drug problems.

The magnitude of spending that we're involved with here needs to be put in perspective. Each one of these additional troops that we are sending over costs \$1 million a year to support. We are going to be spending as a Nation \$7,000 for each of the 14.5 million Afghans in the workforce.

□ 1315

Our military spending per Afghan worker is 20 times what that worker will earn in an entire year in Afghanistan. At the same time, there is a dire need for the most basic of services. In rural Afghanistan, 80 percent drink polluted water and only 10 percent have adequate sanitation.

I have profound reservations about the course we are on and the ability to generate positive long-term, fundamental changes that will persist over time. I think it is absolutely essential that we have this debate. While I don't agree with the resolution that somehow we are going to be able to pull the plug and be able to end this in 30 days or 30 weeks, I do think it is important for Congress to focus on what is here, what is possible.

What we need to be doing is redirecting our effort. We need to start reversing the course that we are on there. We need to narrow our focus. We need to make more efforts to involve the Afghans themselves with water, with sanitation, with education. And we need to make sure that Congress has a voice and is pushing back as the elements come to us.

I don't agree that we are powerless on some of the defense appropriations, for instance. We can in fact push back. We can be heard. And we can start reversing what I think is an inappropriate course.

I welcome the debate today. While I am not going to support the particular resolution, I appreciate my colleagues bringing it forward. I think it is important to engage and for us to imagine how we can do a better job in that troubled country and in that troubled region. The time to begin the discussion is long overdue. I look forward to continued progress.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I think this has been a good discussion today. And I think it is appropriate to have it. I certainly hope that the result is clear, and that this Congress today strongly and in a bipartisan way rejects the resolu-

tion that is being brought forth. It would be a grave mistake for us to allow the Taliban to regain power in Afghanistan.

Sometimes the lessons of history may be a little bit more difficult to explain. In this case, when the Taliban was in power they opened the country up to training camps for terrorists to attack the United States. That was in 2001. It is not ancient history. So I hope we don't forget the lessons of history.

In addition, as I said before, Mr. Speaker, our Armed Forces with our coalition allies and the Afghan armed forces are in the midst of the first major offensive in President Obama's new strategy. So I think it would be a grave mistake if this Congress does not clearly and emphatically reject the resolution today.

Having said that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing wrong with demanding our troops come home, including forcing that debate by using the privileges of the war powers resolution. There is nothing unpatriotic in demanding that our troops and their families, their neighbors and their communities be told when they are coming home. And Mr. Speaker, there is every reason to debate how we go after al Qaeda and how we create a flexible, mobile, global strategy able to track, find, counter, and strike al Qaeda cells wherever they might be. And there is no reason to run away from a debate over whether 100,000 boots on the ground in Afghanistan is the best strategy to eliminating al Qaeda once and for all.

I do not doubt that our brave military men and women can and will achieve military successes in battle after battle after battle. But are Afghanistan's tribal disputes going to be solved on the battlefield or at the political negotiating table? And if it is going to take a political solution to resolve centuries of grievances, then who is willing to stand at the front of this Chamber and declare how many American lives that is worth?

Mr. Speaker, President Obama has said he will begin to bring our troops home next July, but he didn't say when the job will be complete. Representative KUCINICH says let's bring them home by New Year's Eve, this year. We must continue to debate this issue, debate it today, debate it on the supplemental, debate it on defense bills.

Let's debate it when we are begging for resources so our kids can go to quality schools, when we are trying to find the money so every American has a decent job and affordable health care, so we can maintain our roads and our bridges and our waterways, so we can guard our ports and our borders, so we can keep our cops on the beat and our seniors safe in their homes. Let's debate the war in Afghanistan, how we will pay for it, how it will end, when it will end, and when our sons and daughters, husbands and wives, friends and neighbors will be able to come home.

Let us continue to ask the hard questions and demand straight answers until we get it right and all our troops are safely home.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a “yes” vote on the rule and on the previous question.

I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of House Resolution 1146 will be followed by 5-minute votes on motions to suspend the rules on House Resolution 1088 and H.R. 4621.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 225, nays 195, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 95]

YEAS—225

| | | |
|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Ackerman | Engel | Lowey |
| Adler (NJ) | Eshoo | Lujan |
| Andrews | Etheridge | Lynch |
| Baca | Farr | Maffei |
| Baird | Fattah | Maloney |
| Baldwin | Filner | Markey (CO) |
| Bean | Foster | Markey (MA) |
| Becerra | Frank (MA) | Marshall |
| Berkley | Fudge | Matheson |
| Berman | Garamendi | Matsui |
| Berry | Gonzalez | McCarthy (NY) |
| Bishop (GA) | Gordon (TN) | McCollum |
| Bishop (NY) | Grayson | McDermott |
| Blumenauer | Green, Al | McGovern |
| Boswell | Green, Gene | McMahon |
| Boucher | Grijalva | McNerney |
| Boyd | Gutierrez | Meek (FL) |
| Brady (PA) | Hall (NY) | Meeks (NY) |
| Bralley (IA) | Hare | Melancon |
| Brown, Corrine | Harman | Michaud |
| Butterfield | Hastings (FL) | Miller (NC) |
| Campbell | Heinrich | Miller, George |
| Capps | Herseth Sandlin | Minnick |
| Capuano | Higgins | Mollohan |
| Carnahan | Hill | Moore (KS) |
| Carney | Hinchee | Moore (WI) |
| Carson (IN) | Hinojosa | Moran (VA) |
| Castor (FL) | Hirono | Murphy (CT) |
| Chandler | Hodes | Murphy (NY) |
| Chu | Holden | Murphy, Patrick |
| Clarke | Holt | Nadler (NY) |
| Clay | Honda | Napolitano |
| Cleaver | Hoyer | Neal (MA) |
| Clyburn | Israel | Oberstar |
| Cohen | Jackson (IL) | Obey |
| Connolly (VA) | Jackson Lee | Olver |
| Cooper | (TX) | Ortiz |
| Costa | Johnson (GA) | Owens |
| Costello | Johnson (IL) | Pallone |
| Courtney | Johnson, E. B. | Pascarell |
| Crowley | Jones | Pastor (AZ) |
| Cuellar | Kagen | Paul |
| Cummings | Kanjorski | Payne |
| Davis (CA) | Kaptur | Perlmutter |
| Davis (IL) | Kildee | Perriello |
| DeFazio | Kilpatrick (MI) | Peters |
| DeGette | Kilroy | Peterson |
| Delahunt | Kind | Pingree (ME) |
| DeLauro | Klein (FL) | Polis (CO) |
| Dicks | Kucinich | Pomeroy |
| Dingell | Langevin | Price (NC) |
| Doggett | Larsen (WA) | Quigley |
| Doyle | Larson (CT) | Rahall |
| Driehaus | Lee (CA) | Rangel |
| Duncan | Levin | Reyes |
| Edwards (MD) | Lewis (GA) | Richardson |
| Edwards (TX) | Lipinski | Rodriguez |
| Ellison | Loeb sack | Ross |
| Ellsworth | Lofgren, Zoe | Rothman (NJ) |

| | |
|------------------|---------------|
| Roybal-Allard | Shea-Porter |
| Ruppersberger | Sherman |
| Rush | Sires |
| Ryan (OH) | Slaughter |
| Sánchez, Linda | Smith (WA) |
| T. | Snyder |
| Sanchez, Loretta | Speier |
| Sarbanes | Spratt |
| Schakowsky | Stark |
| Schauer | Stupak |
| Schiff | Sutton |
| Schrader | Tanner |
| Schwartz | Thompson (CA) |
| Scott (GA) | Thompson (MS) |
| Scott (VA) | Tierney |
| Serrano | Titus |
| Sestak | Tonko |

| | |
|-------------|-------------|
| Towns | Wasserman |
| Tsongas | Schultz |
| Van Hollen | Waters |
| Velázquez | Watson |
| Visclosky | Watt |
| Walz | Waxman |
| Wasserman | Weiner |
| Schultz | Welch |
| Waters | Wilson (OH) |
| Watson | Woolsey |
| Watt | Yarmuth |
| Waxman | |
| Weiner | |
| Welch | |
| Wilson (OH) | |
| Woolsey | |
| Yarmuth | |

Messrs. LANGEVIN, ORTIZ, MINNICK, TANNER, PERRIELLO, CHANDLER, CUELLAR, ELLSWORTH, CAMPBELL, RYAN of Ohio, HILL and MARSHALL and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. MARKEY of Colorado and Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NAYS—195

| | |
|-----------------|------------------|
| Aderholt | Franks (AZ) |
| Akin | Frelinghuysen |
| Alexander | Gallely |
| Altmire | Murphy, Tim |
| Arcuri | Garrett (NJ) |
| Austria | Myrick |
| Bachmann | Neugebauer |
| Bachus | Nunes |
| Barrow | Nye |
| Bartlett | Olson |
| Barton (TX) | Paulsen |
| Biggart | Pence |
| Bilbray | Petri |
| Bilirakis | Pitts |
| Bishop (UT) | Guthrie |
| Blackburn | Hall (TX) |
| Blunt | Halvorson |
| Bocchieri | Harper |
| Boehner | Hastings (WA) |
| Bonner | Heller |
| Bono Mack | Hensarling |
| Boozman | Herger |
| Boren | Himes |
| Boustany | Hunter |
| Brady (TX) | Inglis |
| Bright | Issa |
| Broun (GA) | Jenkins |
| Brown (SC) | Johnson, Sam |
| Brown-Waite, | Jordan (OH) |
| Ginny | King (IA) |
| Buchanan | King (NY) |
| Burgess | Kingston |
| Burton (IN) | Kirk |
| Buyer | Kirkpatrick (AZ) |
| Calvert | Kissell |
| Cantor | Kline (MN) |
| Cao | Kosmas |
| Capito | Kratovil |
| Cardoza | Lamborn |
| Carter | Lance |
| Cassidy | Latham |
| Castle | LaTourette |
| Chaffetz | Latta |
| Childers | Lee (NY) |
| Coble | Lewis (CA) |
| Coffman (CO) | Linder |
| Cole | LoBiondo |
| Conaway | Lucas |
| Crenshaw | Luetkemeyer |
| Culberson | Lummis |
| Dahlkemper | Lungren, Daniel |
| Davis (KY) | E. |
| Davis (TN) | Mack |
| Dent | Manzullo |
| Diaz-Balart, L. | Marchant |
| Diaz-Balart, M. | McCarthy (CA) |
| Donnelly (IN) | McCaul |
| Dreier | McClintock |
| Ehlers | McCotter |
| Emerson | McHenry |
| Fallin | McIntyre |
| Flake | McKeon |
| Fleming | McMorris |
| Forbes | Mica |
| Fortenberry | Miller (FL) |
| Foxy | Miller (MI) |
| Foxy | Miller, Gary |

NOT VOTING—10

| | |
|---------------|------------|
| Mitchell | Wamp |
| Moran (KS) | Young (FL) |
| Murphy, Tim | |
| Myrick | |
| Neugebauer | |
| Nunes | |
| Nye | |
| Olson | |
| Paulsen | |
| Pence | |
| Petri | |
| Pitts | |
| Platts | |
| Poe (TX) | |
| Posey | |
| Price (GA) | |
| Putnam | |
| Radanovich | |
| Rehberg | |
| Reichert | |
| Roe (TN) | |
| Rogers (AL) | |
| Rogers (KY) | |
| Rogers (MI) | |
| Rohrabacher | |
| Rooney | |
| Ros-Lehtinen | |
| Roskam | |
| Royce | |
| Ryan (WI) | |
| Salazar | |
| Scalise | |
| Schmidt | |
| Schock | |
| Sensenbrenner | |
| Sessions | |
| Shadegg | |
| Shimkus | |
| Shuler | |
| Shuster | |
| Simpson | |
| Skelton | |
| Smith (NE) | |
| Smith (NJ) | |
| Smith (TX) | |
| Souder | |
| Space | |
| Stearns | |
| Sullivan | |
| Taylor | |
| Teague | |
| Terry | |
| Thompson (PA) | |
| Thornberry | |
| Tiahrt | |
| Tiberi | |
| Turner | |
| Upton | |
| Walden | |
| Westmoreland | |
| Whitfield | |
| Wilson (SC) | |
| Wittman | |
| Wolf | |
| Wu | |
| Young (AK) | |

□ 1354

Messrs. CARDOZA, WHITFIELD, KINGSTON, CHILDERS and HALL of Texas and Ms. KOSMAS changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

RECOGNIZING THE PLIGHT OF PEOPLE WITH ALBINISM IN EAST AFRICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1088, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1088, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 418, nays 1, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 96]

YEAS—418

| | | |
|----------------|---------------|-----------------|
| Ackerman | Buchanan | Delahunt |
| Aderholt | Burgess | DeLauro |
| Adler (NJ) | Burton (IN) | Dent |
| Akin | Butterfield | Diaz-Balart, L. |
| Alexander | Buyer | Diaz-Balart, M. |
| Altmire | Calvert | Dicks |
| Andrews | Campbell | Dingell |
| Arcuri | Cantor | Doggett |
| Austria | Cao | Donnelly (IN) |
| Baca | Capito | Doyle |
| Bachmann | Capuano | Dreier |
| Bachus | Cardoza | Driehaus |
| Baird | Carnahan | Duncan |
| Baldwin | Carney | Edwards (MD) |
| Barrow | Carson (IN) | Edwards (TX) |
| Bartlett | Carter | Ehlers |
| Bean | Cassidy | Ellison |
| Berkley | Castle | Ellsworth |
| Berman | Castor (FL) | Emerson |
| Berry | Chaffetz | Engel |
| Biggart | Chandler | Eshoo |
| Bilbray | Childers | Etheridge |
| Bilirakis | Chu | Fallin |
| Bishop (GA) | Clarke | Farr |
| Bishop (NY) | Clay | Fattah |
| Bishop (UT) | Cleaver | Filner |
| Blackburn | Clyburn | Flake |
| Blumenauer | Coble | Fleming |
| Blunt | Coffman (CO) | Forbes |
| Bocchieri | Cohen | Fortenberry |
| Boehner | Cole | Foster |
| Bonner | Conaway | Foxy |
| Bono Mack | Connolly (VA) | Frank (MA) |
| Boozman | Cooper | Franks (AZ) |
| Boren | Costa | Frelinghuysen |
| Boswell | Costello | Fudge |
| Boucher | Courtney | Gallely |
| Boustany | Crenshaw | Garamendi |
| Boyd | Crowley | Gerrett (NJ) |
| Brady (PA) | Cuellar | Gerlach |
| Brady (TX) | Culberson | Giffords |
| Bralley (IA) | Cummings | Gingrey (GA) |
| Bright | Dahlkemper | Gohmert |
| Broun (GA) | Davis (CA) | Gonzalez |
| Brown (SC) | Davis (IL) | Goodlatte |
| Brown, Corrine | Davis (KY) | Gordon (TN) |
| Brown-Waite, | Davis (TN) | Granger |
| Ginny | DeFazio | Graves |
| | DeGette | Grayson |

Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslie
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo

Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeke (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perrillo
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Radanovich
Rahall
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NAYS—1

Paul

Barrett (SC)
Becerra
Camp
Capps
Conyers
Davis (AL)
Deal (GA)
Hoekstra
Maffei
Wamp
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—11

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1402

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:
Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 96, H.R. 1088, had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

PREVENT DECEPTIVE CENSUS
LOOK ALIKE MAILINGS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4621, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4621, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 416, nays 0, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 97]
YEAS—416

Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggett
Bilbray
Watson
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Bocchieri
Boehner
Bonner
Cleave
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)

Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Clever
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)

Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Fleming

Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslie
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo

Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo

Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—14

| | | |
|--------------|------------|------------|
| Barrett (SC) | Davis (AL) | Roskam |
| Bartlett | Deal (GA) | Schakowsky |
| Boswell | Hoekstra | Wamp |
| Camp | Matsui | Young (FL) |
| Conyers | Peterson | |

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members have 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1409

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AFGHANISTAN WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1146, I call up the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 248) directing the President, pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution, to remove the United States Armed Forces from Afghanistan, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAPUANO). Pursuant to House Resolution 1146, the concurrent resolution is considered read.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 248

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. REMOVAL OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FROM AFGHANISTAN.

Pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1544(c)), Congress directs the President to remove the United States Armed Forces from Afghanistan—

(1) by no later than the end of the period of 30 days beginning on the day on which this concurrent resolution is adopted; or

(2) if the President determines that it is not safe to remove the United States Armed Forces before the end of that period, by no later than December 31, 2010, or such earlier date as the President determines that the Armed Forces can safely be removed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The concurrent resolution shall be debatable for 3 hours, with 90 minutes controlled by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) or his designee and 90 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) will control 90 minutes. The gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) each will control 45 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in 2001 I joined the House in voting for the Authorization for Use of Military Force. In the past 8½ years, it has become clear that the

Authorization for Use of Military Force is being interpreted as *carte blanche* for circumventing Congress' role as a coequal branch of government.

My legislation invokes the War Powers Resolution of 1973. If enacted, it would require the President to withdraw U.S. Armed Forces from Afghanistan by December 31, 2010.

The debate today will be the first opportunity we have had to revisit the 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force, which the House supported following the worst terrorist attack in our country's history. Regardless of your support or opposition to the war in Afghanistan, this is going to be the first opportunity to evaluate critically where the Authorization for Use of Military Force has taken us in the last 8½ years.

This 2001 resolution allowed military action "to prevent any future acts of international terrorism against the United States." Those of us who support the withdrawal from Afghanistan may or may not agree on a timeline for troop withdrawal, but I think we agree that this debate is timely.

The rest of the world is beginning to see the folly of trying to occupy Afghanistan: The Dutch Government recently came to a halt over the commitment of more troops from their country. In Britain public outcry over the war is growing. A recent BBC poll indicated that 63 percent of the British public is demanding that their troops come home by Christmas. In Germany opposition to the war has risen to 69 percent. Russia has lost billions of dollars in the 9 years it spent attempting to control Afghanistan.

Our supposed nation-building in Afghanistan has come at the destruction of our own. The military escalation cements the path of the United States down the road of previous occupiers that earned Afghanistan its nickname as the "graveyard of empires."

□ 1415

One year ago last month, a report by the Carnegie Endowment concluded "the only meaningful way to halt the insurgency's momentum is to start withdrawing troops. The presence of foreign troops is the most important element driving the resurgence of the Taliban."

So with this debate today, Mr. Speaker, we will have a chance for the first time to reflect on our responsibility for troop casualties that are now reaching 1,000; to look at our responsibility for the costs of the war, which approaches \$250 billion; our responsibility for the civilian casualties and the human costs of the war; our responsibility for challenging the corruption that takes place in Afghanistan; our responsibility for having a real understanding of the role of the pipeline in this war; our responsibility for debating the role of counterinsurgency strategies, as opposed to counterterrorism; our responsibility for being able to

make a case for the logistics of withdrawal.

After 8½ years, it is time that we have this debate.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the resolution, and I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to say I have quite enjoyed working with the gentleman from Ohio on this issue and a number of the issues we have had dealings with since I have become chairman, and I fundamentally agree with him and other supporters of the resolution that it is right for the House to have an open, honest debate on the merits of our ongoing military operations in Afghanistan, and outside, outside, the context of a defense spending bill or a supplemental appropriations bill. This is a good thing to be doing.

By vesting the power to declare war with the Congress, the Founders intended the United States would go to war only when absolutely necessary, and it is incumbent on this body to consider as thoroughly as possible the purpose and ongoing necessity of committing U.S. forces to battle.

Now, as a procedural matter, I take issue with the invocation of section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution as the basis for this debate, because that section authorizes a privileged resolution, like the one before us today, to require the withdrawal of combat forces when Congress has not authorized the use of military force.

There really can't be any doubt that Congress authorized U.S. military action in Afghanistan. The authorization for the use of military force passed by Congress in late September 2001 explicitly empowers the President to use force against the terrorists responsible for the 9/11 attacks and those who harbored them. President Obama is doing just that.

But putting aside procedure, the notion that at this particular moment we would demand a complete withdrawal of our troops from Afghanistan by the end of the year, without regard to the consequence of our withdrawal, without regard to the situation on the ground, including efforts to promote economic development, expand the rule of law, and without any measurement of whether the "hold" strategy now being implemented is indeed working, I don't think is the responsible thing to do.

Our troops are fighting a complex nexus of terrorist organizations—al Qaeda, the Taliban—all of which threaten the stability of the Afghan Government, and they have demonstrated their ability to strike our homeland. If we withdraw from Afghanistan before the government there is capable of providing a basic level of security for its own people, we face the prospect that the Taliban once again will take the reins of power in Kabul and provide safe haven to al Qaeda. That would be a national security disaster.

I am keenly aware that even if we remain in Afghanistan, and here I want to emphasize this, there is no guarantee we will prevail in this fight. But if we don't try, we are guaranteed to fail.

President Obama has taken a very deliberative approach. He has examined numerous options over the course of several months and consulted with all relevant military leaders and allies. He really left no stone unturned and no issue unvetted as part of this review. He deserves an opportunity now to implement his strategy. He has given us the timeline for when he expects to see results, and there will be a reassessment of our strategy in 18 months.

General McChrystal, the commander of the U.S. and international forces, indicated that we have made progress since the new strategy was announced on December 1. We are witnessing the first major joint NATO-Afghanistan military operation in the city of Marja, considered a strategic fulcrum for ridding the region of the Taliban.

Our troops are working side by side with their Afghan counterparts. They retook Marja in 3 weeks of hard but well-executed efforts. They are making the Afghan people their number one priority, which is the basis for this counterinsurgency strategy. And to that end, the State Department and USAID have been working very hard to develop a concrete governance and development strategy.

I was here during the frenzied debate following 9/11 when Congress authorized the use of force against those responsible for the horrors of that day and those who chose to provide the perpetrators a safe haven.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BERMAN. I yield myself 30 additional seconds.

And I was here for the vote a year later to authorize military force against Iraq. Please don't conflate the two. The fight in Afghanistan is the fight against those who attacked us.

I am not endorsing an open-ended commitment. I am not advocating that we remain without assessing our progress. But I do believe this strategy of our President deserves support, and I urge opposition to the resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong opposition to this resolution. As we are all aware, U.S. forces at this very moment are engaged in battle against heavily armed enemy forces in a strategically important region of Afghanistan. Our brave men and women are making steady progress against a deadly foe, and are doing so at great risk to their lives.

This offensive is part of a new strategy in Afghanistan focused on the immediate goals of disrupting, dismantling, and defeating al Qaeda, denying al Qaeda a safe haven, and reversing the momentum of the Taliban. This of-

fensive is already producing dramatic success, including the capture of senior Taliban leaders, the routing of their forces, and the stabilization of key areas.

A winning strategy should be supported, not undermined. We must not give Taliban leaders and fighters a shield against U.S. forces that they otherwise cannot stop. No enemy was ever vanquished, no victory was ever secured by running away. Those who wish to destroy us would surely follow us, convinced that we had been beaten and eager to attack us wherever we go, as they would be confident that we can, in fact, be beaten again.

Mr. Speaker, let us dispel any myths or illusions about the consequences of a forced withdrawal. As General Petraeus has warned, "I was in Kandahar. It was in Kandahar that the 9/11 attacks were planned. It was in the training camps in eastern Afghanistan where the initial preparation of the attackers was carried out before they went to Hamburg and flight schools in the U.S. It is important to recall the seriousness of the mission and why it is that we are in Afghanistan in the first place and why we are still there after years and years of hard work and sacrifice that have passed."

One of the principal reasons that we have been spared a repeat of those attacks is that U.S. forces quickly toppled the Taliban regime that was protecting the terrorists and drove it and its al Qaeda allies out of their safety zone and into the remote mountains. Years of constant U.S. military pressure have forced them to turn their attention from planning more attacks against our homeland to fighting for their own survival.

To leave Afghanistan now would pave the way for the reestablishment of a vast and secure base from which al Qaeda and other deadly enemies could strike Americans around the world. Having withdrawn and abandoned our hard-won positions, to our allies and the people of Afghanistan, U.S. credibility would be significantly and perhaps irrevocably damaged. This, in turn, could leave the U.S. alone and more vulnerable than ever to the threats of radical Islamic extremists.

Our retreat would be seen around the world by friends and opponents alike as a surrender, as a sign that America no longer has the will to defend herself. We might attempt to fool ourselves into believing that it was merely a temporary setback, that we have suffered no long-term blow, but no one else would be fooled. It would be proof to every group that wishes to attack and destroy us that we can be fought and we can be beaten, that eventually America will just give up, regardless of the consequences.

We should support our troops by supporting their efforts to disrupt and dismantle and defeat al Qaeda and the Taliban.

As many of you know, my daughter-in-law Lindsay served in Iraq and Af-

ghanistan. I also have two committee staffers, one in the Army Reserves and one in the Marine Reserves, who are on their way now to Afghanistan. This is not their first time in battle. Both of these gentlemen have served bravely in Iraq, but the prospect of entering combat never becomes routine. They, like my stepson Douglas, who served as a Marine fighter pilot in Iraq, have recounted to me how the debates in Congress to mandate a withdrawal of our forces in Iraq demoralizes U.S. troops.

The request of my staffers to me as they embark on their mission to Afghanistan is to provide them with all of the tools and all of the support that they need to defeat the enemy and to win. They ask that we strengthen our commitment, our resolve, to the mission in Afghanistan and Pakistan. Our enemies are redoubling their efforts. We must also.

In June of last year, Osama bin Laden noted that U.S. efforts had been, and I quote, "transferred to Afghanistan and Pakistan. Thus, jihad must be directed at that region."

Bin Laden later said in September, "Not much longer, and the war in Afghanistan will be over. Afterwards, not even a trace of the Americans will be found there. Much rather, they will retreat far away behind the Atlantic. Then only we and you will be left."

We must do everything possible to deny bin Laden and al Qaeda such a victory.

Mr. Speaker, the Afghan people are also listening to today's debate. For us to succeed in Afghanistan, we need their support. But the Afghan people will not be giving that support if they believe that we will abandon them.

As Admiral Michael Mullen, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has said, "When I am in Afghanistan, I get the same question asked as when I am in Pakistan, which is, are you going to leave us again? Because they remember very well that we have in the past. And so there is a trust here. There is uncertainty through Afghanistan's eyes as to whether or not we will stay."

In cooperating with us, in trusting us, they know that they are risking their lives and those of their families. Our troops are listening as well.

This debate today reminds me of the many times that I have come down to the floor to speak against a forced withdrawal from Iraq and the need to support our mission there.

Mr. Speaker, it is an illusion to believe that we can protect ourselves from our enemies by picking and choosing easy battles and turning away from those that require patience and sacrifice. This Congress cannot, must not, turn away from its responsibility to defend our country and our citizens simply because the task seems too difficult. The men and women in uniform who willingly risk their lives to defend our country do not believe that.

□ 1430

Mr. Speaker, as with all of my fellow Members and citizens, I hope for a

world one day without war. But in the world we live in, some wars are forced upon us. And we have no choice but to fight and to win them if we are to survive.

I urge my colleagues to resoundingly defeat this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this resolution. I am not convinced that the United States and its allies can end the 35-year civil war in Afghanistan, nor is that our responsibility. We should not use our troops to prop up a corrupt government. It is simply not justifiable to sacrifice more lives and more money on this war. We must rethink our policy. If we do not, we are doomed to failure and further loss of American lives.

In late 2001, we undertook a justified military action in Afghanistan in response to the attacks of 9/11, and with moral clarity and singular focus we destroyed the al Qaeda camps, drove the Taliban from power, and pursued the perpetrators of mass terrorism. I supported that action. Today, however, our presence in Afghanistan has become counterproductive. We are bogged down amidst a longstanding civil war between feuding Afghans of differing tribes, classes, and regions whose goals have little to do with our own. Moreover, our very presence in Afghanistan has fueled the rising insurgency and emboldened those who oppose foreign intervention or occupation of any kind, who see us as foreign invaders. In seeking security and stability in Afghanistan, we have supported corrupt leaders with interests out of sync with the interests of ordinary Afghans. By backing the Afghan government, we have further distanced ourselves from the Afghan people and empowered the insurgency.

If our mission in Afghanistan is indeed to prevent the safe harbor of terrorists within a weak or hospitable nation, that mission is largely accomplished, since we are told there are now fewer than a hundred al Qaeda in Afghanistan. In reality, terrorist plots can be hatched anywhere, in any nation, including our own. In fact, much of the planning for the 9/11 attacks took place in Western Europe.

This does not mean we should stop pursuing terrorists. On the contrary. We must continue the multipronged effort to disrupt, dismantle, and destroy their ability to harm the United States. We must continue to track and block terrorist financing across the globe, increase intelligence activities focused on terrorists, increase diplomacy to rally our allies to our cause against terrorism, and, if necessary, use our Armed Forces to attack terrorist targets wherever they may be—a function quite distinct from using the military to secure a nation so that it can be rebuilt. Rebuilding Afghanistan is beyond both our capability and be-

yond our mandate to prevent terrorists from attacking the United States. I believe that a short and definitive timetable for withdrawing our troops is the only way to minimize further loss of life and to refocus our efforts more directly at the terrorists themselves.

I do have one reservation, that the resolution before us seems to leave no room for a military role in Afghanistan under any circumstances. I believe we must reserve the right to use our Armed Forces to attack terrorist targets wherever they may be, and that would include terrorist training camps in Afghanistan, if they were reestablished there. But those camps are not there now, and our troops should not be there either. Mr. KUCINICH's resolution points us in the right direction, a direction far better than the direction in which we are now headed. Accordingly, I urge approval of the resolution.

Mr. BERMAN. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES).

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio, first, for presenting this resolution and, secondly, for fighting for so long to get us to have this debate. I want to say to Mr. BERMAN, thank you for agreeing to let this be debated.

I want to start by saying that Peggy Noonan has called for this debate in "A 'Necessary' War?" I want to read this: "So far, oddly, most of the debate over Afghanistan has taken place among journalists and foreign policy professionals." All of them have been honest in their opinions about the war in Afghanistan. But when you really look at the facts, nobody elected these people to debate the war. "Washington has to get serious, and the American people have a right to know the facts and options."

[From the Wall Street Journal, Oct. 10, 2009]

A 'NECESSARY' WAR? THE PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS, DISTRACTED, HAVE LEFT A VOID
(By Peggy Noonan)

So far, oddly, most of the debate over Afghanistan has taken place among journalists and foreign-policy professionals. All power to them: They've been fighting it out on op-ed pages and in journals for months now, in many cases with a moral seriousness, good faith, and sense of protectiveness toward the interests of the United States that is, actually, moving. But nobody elected them. We need a truly national debate.

So thank you both for allowing this debate to take place today. But I join my friends in saying that it's time to bring an end to this war. I have Camp Lejeune Marine Base in my district, Cherry Point Marine Air Station, and Seymour Johnson Air Force Base. Brave men and women. God bless them all.

I want to start my comments and would like to share this with you from the Marine Corps Times, March 1, 2010: "Left to Die. They called for help. 'Negligent' Army leadership refused—and abandoned them on the battle-

field." Four died, handcuffed to do their job for this country. That's awfully sad to me.

I would like to read also from the Marine Corps Times: "Caution killed my son. Marine families blast 'suicidal' tactics in Afghanistan." I would like to read the words from a father whose son died for this country. I would like to read the words of this man because he served in the Marine Corps, a sergeant himself. His frustration about how his son died because he was not helped led him to write to Admiral Mullen and also Senator COLLINS. This is his response back to the letters from Admiral Mullen and his response back to SUSAN COLLINS:

"Sergeant Bernard said the letter is 'smoke and mirrors' and overlooks his consistent concern: A counterinsurgency strategy won't work as long as Afghanistan is filled with warring tribes that have no empathy for the United States and its way of life."

He further stated in his letter to Senator COLLINS, "I have already spoken to your office," and he further said, "Don't let him," meaning Admiral Mullen, "spin this crap."

I'm quoting him now. These are not my words. This is what he said to Admiral Mullen. This is a father whose son died for this country. I repeat that: "Don't let him spin this crap," Bernard said. "There's no indication that Afghanistan has changed anywhere. Our mission should be very, very simple: Chase and kill the enemy."

Well, I just gave you two examples of where we're not really fighting the war in Afghanistan. Because why in the world would those marines have been killed who were asking for cover, and yet the Army said, No, we can't give you cover because of our policy—and our policy is: We don't want to kill civilians. But as Sergeant Bernard said, and he's right—I've never been to war, let me be honest about it, but he has been to war and knows that war is ugly. It's mean. And therefore we're saying to our troops we're going to "handcuff" you, and we're going to do what we can to protect those in Afghanistan, but you might have to give your life and you couldn't even fire a gun. That is not what we should be doing in Afghanistan.

Last point, the book that's called "The Three Trillion Dollar War," it is a book written by the economist Joe Stiglitz, and he says in the book that to take care of the wounded from Afghanistan and Iraq for the next 25 years, a minimum cost of \$2 trillion.

I want to end with this story: Three years ago, three years ago, Congressman GENE TAYLOR and WALTER JONES, myself, went to Walter Reed to visit the wounded, as many Members of Congress in both parties do. And we go into a room where a young man, 19 years old, had been shot in the neck, sitting in a wheelchair, will never walk again. As Gene and I speak to him and tell him we thank him so much for his service, his mom comes in and she looks at us like a deer in headlights.

Scared. She should be scared. She doesn't know what the future is for her son.

And then she said to GENE TAYLOR and myself, after we introduced ourselves, Can you guarantee me that this government will take care of my son 40 years from now? He is 19 years old.

And one of us said to her, This country should take care of your son 40 years from now. But you know what I would tell her today? I'm not sure we can take care of your son.

We need to understand we can't police the world anymore. It's time that we protect ourselves from the enemy, the terrorists. But going around the world and trying to police the world doesn't work anymore.

So I want to thank the gentleman for giving me this time. And I join you in this resolution and hope that these debates will continue and continue so we will meet our constitutional responsibility and we will be able to say one day to that 19-year-old soldier or marine: We will take care of you 40 years from now. Because right now we cannot do it.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. At this time I'd like to yield 5 minutes to an esteemed member of our House Foreign Affairs Committee, as well as the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE of Texas. This is about our troops. This is about Americans who have been willing to protect the rest of us when duty calls and in time of war. Army Specialist Jarrett Griemel was one of those noble Americans. He was a patriot. He joined the United States Army right out of high school. He had completed basic training before he graduated from high school in his junior year at La Porte High School in Texas. In 2008, Jarrett married his high school sweetheart, Candice, in a small ceremony before the justice of the peace. She joined him in Alaska, where he was deployed by the Army, to begin their young married lives together. He was a petroleum supply specialist assigned to the 425th Brigade Special Troops Battalion, 4th Brigade Combat Team, 25th Infantry Division Battalion.

Last June, Jarrett was killed at the age of 20 years in Afghanistan. This is his photograph. He is on this board—the board with 27 other Texans from our congressional district area. He is the latest to have been killed in Iraq or Afghanistan as a volunteer to go overseas and protect the rest of us in time of war. He believed in protecting our country. He believed in it so much he was willing to leave his wife and go halfway around the world to fight an enemy on the enemy's own turf. And he believed in it so much that he was willing to give his life for the rest of us. So if we pass this resolution, what message do we send to Jarrett's family or Jarrett's young bride—that his sacrifice just wasn't enough? That it was all for naught?

We don't quit war because war is hard. War has always been hard. Every

good thing this country has ever achieved has been hard. We don't quit and run because it is difficult. We stay because we believe, like Jarrett, that the fight against an enemy that is bent on our destruction is worth it. That is the reason these other 27 from all races and both sexes fought in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Last December, I had the privilege to go to Afghanistan and meet Americans like Jarrett and these others who are risking their lives for us here at home. They told me that they missed their families, they missed their kids, but also they believe the work they're doing is worth it, and they're eager to finish the job and get back home. They continue to fight, and fight hard, and they want success. And we must remember, Mr. Speaker, they're all volunteers. America's finest.

General McChrystal's new strategy is effective and already leading to key victories. It makes no sense to all of a sudden pick up and leave when we're the ones winning this war and the enemy is receiving crushing blow after crushing blow. We cannot pull the rug out from underneath our troops. Of course, al Qaeda and the Taliban would say, I told you so. The Americans, they just don't have the stomach for war. They would once again, these enemies of the world, creep back into the seats of power and darkness and would turn their countries back a thousand years. Women would once again not be allowed to go to school, political dissidents would be murdered, and Afghanistan would once again become a safe haven for terrorists to plot and plan their next attacks against people they don't like throughout the world, including Americans. All Americans would be in danger.

War is hard. The cut-and-run crowd do not understand if we retreat unilaterally and quit this war, the war will not be over, because our enemies will continue the war against us whether we continue against them or not. Our troops would return home with one question: Why? Why would you bring us home when victory was so close? Why did we fight so hard, make so many sacrifices, only to have those that believe in peace at any price say it's time to quit?

Now is not the time to retreat. This enemy is real. It must be defeated. This is not about the politics of fear with some hypothetical enemy but assessing reality and supporting these men and women and others that are over there and protecting our home from terrorists that want nothing more than to destroy us wherever they find us in the world. Past successes don't guarantee future success. Victory is close, but we have not obtained it yet. Abandonment and retreat—those are not strategies. We stay because it's in our interest to stay and secure a victory against the enemies of the world.

General Petraeus said, "We've got to show that we are in this; that we are going to provide sustained, substantial

commitment." Make no mistake about it, Mr. Speaker, the troops and their families are watching this debate today to see what we shall do here in Congress. They are looking for who will support them and who will not. We must defeat this resolution and the Taliban and the al Qaeda and support our military.

□ 1445

Last Saturday, March 6, was the 174th anniversary of the battle at the Alamo where those people walked across that line rather than give in to the enemy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the gentleman. They were led by a 27-year-old individual from South Carolina by way of Alabama. He said at the Alamo, "I shall never surrender or retreat," and they did not surrender or retreat because war was hard then, and it cost them all their lives. But victory was obtained later, and freedom was obtained.

War is hard. It is always hard. And we shall not give in. We shall not surrender or retreat. It is in our interest and in the interest of America to defeat the enemy and let them have no doubt in their minds that we will be victorious.

And that's just the way it is.

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER).

Mr. FILNER. Yes, Mr. POE, war is hard. I've got news for you: peace is harder. Talk to Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Talk to Nelson Mandela. Peace is harder. Peace is really hard. I've heard Mr. POE's words: Victory is close. What message are we sending to our troops? The Alamo as a metaphor for this? Come on, Mr. POE. And Mr. POE started with, "This is about our troops." That's exactly right: this is about our troops.

I would like to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) for allowing us to have a debate. Here we have spent hundreds of billions of dollars, and we've had no real debate. So I thank him for bringing this resolution and allowing us to debate. We need a debate in this democracy so that everybody understands the costs, the costs of war, the costs of not going to war. The material costs, the human costs. This is about our troops. I agree with Mr. POE.

You know, I have been to Iraq and Afghanistan. I have met these incredible young men and women who are fighting this war. As Mr. POE suggested, they are incredible. It's the policymakers I am worried about. We report as killed in our two wars almost 1,000 in Afghanistan and a little over 4,000 in Iraq. We report around 40,000 casualties. Let me tell you, I am chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee in this Congress. We have had

almost 1 million veterans from these wars show up at the VA for injuries received during the war, service-related injuries, hundreds and hundreds of thousands. This is not just a mathematical error by the Department of Defense. This is a deliberate attempt to keep the cost of war from our people.

We've got hundreds of thousands of people with post-traumatic stress disorder, hundreds of thousands with traumatic brain injury, all of whom were undiagnosed when they left the battle front. The military doesn't want to know about these injuries. They don't want to tell the American people about these injuries. This kind of war produces those injuries. I didn't hear that from Mr. POE. What do we tell the mom? We tell the mom that we shouldn't be sending her child there because of the nature of the war. There is no "Victory is close." I would like to have someone define for me what that victory is.

As I said, we have had almost 1 million veterans from these wars already come to the VA. The suicide rate among active duty troops in Iraq and Afghanistan is higher than the rate in Vietnam, which was the highest that we've ever had as Americans. These are our children. These are our children. They come home with these invisible wounds. They may kill themselves from the demons that they got from this war. A third of those who had been diagnosed with PTSD—and that's only a small fraction of those who actually have it—have committed felonies in this Nation, of which several hundred were homicides, usually of their own family members. These kids did not come home to kill their spouses or their children, but they were so wounded, and they were not taken care of by our people who sent them there. We bring them home, and we say, Okay, you're on your own. And then what do we have? Suicides, homicides.

This war is tearing apart those who have taken part in it. It will have the same influence that the Vietnam War had on our civilian society. Half of the homeless on the streets tonight are Vietnam vets.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield the gentleman 30 seconds.

Mr. FILNER. The rate of homelessness amongst our troops who served in Iraq and Afghanistan is higher. More Vietnam vets have died from suicide than died in the original war. That is what these wars are doing to our society. These are our children. It's time to take care of them. It's time to bring them home. Let's support the resolution on the floor.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 4 minutes to my very good friend, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, have we forgotten? Have we forgotten what

happened to America on 9/11? Have we forgotten who did it? Have we forgotten those who protected and gave them a safe haven?

Let me speak a word in favor of those young men and young women who wear a uniform today that are doing something about it. I'm so proud of them. Every American should be proud of them and their professionalism, their devotion to duty, their patriotism. Thus, I rise in strong opposition to this ill-timed resolution that threatens to undermine the recent gains by U.S. forces and our Afghan and coalition partners.

Six months ago, I wrote a letter to the President while he was conducting a full review of our strategy in Afghanistan, urging him to adopt and fully resource an effective counterinsurgency strategy in Afghanistan. I still maintain that pursuing such a policy offers the best chance for success in our mission there. Afghanistan is the epicenter of terrorism. We cannot forget that it was the genesis of multiple attacks that killed thousands of Americans—children, parents, spouses, neighbors. We must do everything we can to ensure that it will not happen again and be used as a safe haven for those who seek to do us harm.

Last December, after 8 long years with no strategy in Afghanistan, President Obama recommitted our Nation to defeating al Qaeda and reminded us that the success of this mission requires us to work with our international allies and Afghan partners, and we are. The President also announced that our military commander in Afghanistan, General Stanley McChrystal, the best we have in this type of conflict, would receive an additional 30,000 troops to implement this counterinsurgency strategy. These additional combat troops, combined with those already in theater, would allow our troops and civilian experts to partner with their Afghan counterparts, reverse the momentum of the Taliban and create conditions needed for governance and economic development.

Even with just a fraction of these reinforcements in place, we already see signs of success. Last month Afghan, allied, and U.S. forces launched an operation to push the Taliban out of Marjah, a town of about 50,000 people in central Helmand province that became a new hub of activity for the Taliban and insurgents after our marines drove them out of nearby Garmsir. They successfully pushed the Taliban out of Marjah and are now beginning to reestablish government in that area, the second phase of that operation. A new Afghan administrator has been put in place, and the process of building that government has begun. Additionally, in recent days, Pakistani forces made the most significant Taliban captures since the war began, detaining the Taliban's second in command, the former Taliban finance minister and two shadow governors of Afghan provinces.

This mission will be costly. It will not be easy. Hard fighting lies ahead

for our forces. The Afghan people have to recommit themselves to building a government that is mostly free of corruption and is capable of providing justice and security, and it is unclear if there will be future captures in Pakistan.

But this counterinsurgent strategy is the best we have to prevent Afghanistan from becoming a safe haven for al Qaeda and those who wish to kill Americans. If we vote to pull out now and abandon those Afghans who have only recently been freed from the Taliban, I have no doubt that the Taliban would be able to reestablish their hold on southern Afghanistan, if not the entire country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. BERMAN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. SKELTON. After 8 long years, we finally have a strategy for success in Afghanistan, and we have a President who has appointed the right leaders in General McChrystal and Ambassador Eikenberry, who's willing to provide those leaders with the military and civilian experts that they need.

Success is not guaranteed in this mission, but passing this resolution guarantees failure in Afghanistan and poses a serious risk that we will once again face the same situation that existed on September 11, 2001. I hope my colleagues will join me in opposition to this resolution.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I proudly yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. McKEON), the ranking member on the House Armed Services Committee.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I rise with the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), my chairman, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee. I join with my colleagues from the Foreign Affairs Committee and my colleagues from the Armed Services Committee in opposition to this resolution. I am very disappointed that the House Democratic leadership would allow this resolution to come to the floor at this time for a vote. One only has to look at the headlines to know that our military forces are making progress in their offensive against the Taliban insurgents in Helmand province, even as they face snipers, mines, improvised explosive devices, and a skeptical Afghan population.

The Kucinich resolution does nothing to advance the efforts of our military commanders and troops as they work side by side with their Afghan and coalition partners. Representative KUCINICH's resolution, if enacted into law, would mandate the withdrawal of all U.S. troops from Afghanistan by the end of 2010. Why consider this resolution now? Why second-guess the Commander in Chief and his commander so soon after the announcement of a new strategy? Four months ago, the President reminded us why we are in Afghanistan. It was the epicenter of

where al Qaeda planned and launched the 9/11 attacks against innocent Americans. The President recommitted the United States to defeating al Qaeda and the Taliban and authorized the deployment of 30,000 additional U.S. forces. A portion of those forces have arrived and others are readying to deploy.

Like most Republicans, I support the President's decision to surge in Afghanistan. I believe that with additional forces, combined with giving General McChrystal the time, space and resources he needs, we can win this conflict. We do not have a choice. We must defeat al Qaeda and the Taliban. This means taking all necessary steps to ensure al Qaeda does not have a sanctuary in Afghanistan or Pakistan.

At the end of last year, I had hoped that the war debate in this country had ended, and we would give a chance for that strategy to work, we would give a chance for those soldiers, marines, airmen, sailors who have been sent there to carry out their mission, to be successful. I had hoped, as a Nation, we could move toward a place of action; we wouldn't be in a position of second-guessing before we even had a chance to complete that mission. During the debate last year, no one said that it was going to be easy.

The current operation in Afghanistan has been successful but has not come without challenges. However, as we stand here today, the Afghan flag is flying in Marjah city center. The Taliban flag has been removed. This lone flag sends a clear message to Afghans that the central government is committed to people there, that we're not going to cut and run. We're going to be with them and help successfully conclude this mission so that they can finally have peace.

Some have compared our efforts there to Russians or others in the past and have talked about the defeat of other nations in this country. We're not there to take over this country. We're there to provide them freedom. That's why we're going to be successful.

□ 1500

However, this debate is not being conducted in a vacuum. Our troops are listening. Our allies are listening. The Taliban and al Qaeda also are listening. And finally, the Afghan people are listening. This resolution sends the message, "Pay no attention to the flag over Marjah. America cannot be trusted to uphold its own values and commitments."

I will be attending a funeral Saturday. Each of us I am sure here have had to perform that duty. It is not one I am looking forward to. I have attended several in the past. But at this point, for me to go to that funeral and tell the Geligs that their son, Sergeant Gelig, lost his life over an effort that we are going to cut and run from is something I cannot do.

Mr. Speaker, I want to send a clear message to the Afghan people and gov-

ernment that our coalition partners, our military men and women, this Congress believes in you, we support you, we honor your dedication and your sacrifice. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this resolution.

Mr. KUCINICH. I just want to say that you can talk about how the Democratic leadership is bringing this up at the time that there is obviously a surge about to begin, but why question the timeliness of the debate when in fact my friend in the minority, their party didn't bring this up for 8 years of debate? Eight years. I mean I think it's timely. That is the whole point.

I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

(Mr. PAUL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAUL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for bringing this issue up. It is late. This war started 9 years ago. It's about time we talked about it. It was said earlier on it is hard to quit a war, and we shouldn't be quitting. I will tell you what the real problem is, it is too easy to start a war. It is too easy to get involved. And that is our problem.

The founders of this country tried very hard to prevent this kind of a dilemma that we are in now; getting involved in no-win wars and nobody knowing exactly who the enemy is. The war was started and justified by quoting and using the war powers resolution written in 1973. That was written after the fiasco of Vietnam to try to prevent the problem of slipping into war. Yet that resolution in itself was unconstitutional because it literally legalized war for 90 days without Congressional approval. It did exactly the opposite.

So here we are, the 90-day permission for war at that time now is close to 9 years. I am afraid that this is too little, hopefully not too late for us to do something about this. Are we going to do it for 10 more years? How long are we going to stay? And the enemy is said to be the Taliban. Well, the Taliban, they certainly don't like us, and we don't like them. And the more we kill, the more Taliban we get.

But I want to quote the first line of the resolution passed back in 2001, explaining the purpose for giving the President the power, which was an illegal transfer of power to the President to pursue war at will. It said, "To authorize the use of United States Armed Forces against those responsible for the recent attacks launched against the United States." The Taliban didn't launch an attack against the United States. The Government of Afghanistan didn't launch it.

The best evidence is that of those 20 individuals who participated in the 9/11 attacks, two of them might have passed through Afghanistan. A lot of the planning was done in Germany and

Spain, and the training was done here in the United States. Oh, yes, the image is that they all conspired, a small group of people with bin Laden, and made this decision. Right now the evidence is not there to prove that. But certainly bin Laden was very sympathetic, loved it, and wanted to take credit for it.

One of the reasons why he wanted to take credit was that it would do three things he wanted: First, it would enhance his recruitment efforts for al Qaeda and his attacks against western powers who have become overly involved in control of the Middle East and have had a plan for 20 years to remake the Middle East. He also said that the consequence of 9/11 will be that we will bog the American people down in a no-win war and demoralize the people. There is still a lot of moral support, but there is a lot of people in this country now that the country is totally bankrupt and we are spending trillions of dollars on these useless wars that people will become demoralized, because history shows that all empires end because they expand too far and they bankrupt the country, just as the Soviet system came down. And that is what bin Laden was hoping for. He also said that the dollars spent will bankrupt this country. And we are bankrupt. And yet there is no hesitation to quit spending one cent overseas by this Congress.

We built a huge embassy in Baghdad, we built an embassy in Kabul, billion-dollar embassies, fortresses, and it's all unnecessary. Nobody is really concerned. If people were concerned about the disastrous effect of debt on this country, we would change our foreign policy and we would be safer for it. We are not safer because of our foreign policy. It is a policy of intervention that has been going on for a long time, and it will eventually end.

This war is an illegal war. This war is an immoral war. This war is an unconstitutional war. And the least you could say is it is illegitimate. There is no real purpose in this. The Taliban did not attack us on 9/11. You know, after we went into Afghanistan, immediately the concerns were shifted to remaking the Middle East. We went into Iraq, using 9/11 as a justification. It was nothing more than an excuse. Most Americans, the majority of Americans still believe that Saddam Hussein had something to do with 9/11. And I imagine most Americans believe the Taliban had something to do with 9/11. It is not true.

We need to change our foreign policy and come back to our senses and defend this country and not pretend to be the policeman of the world.

Mr. KUCINICH. Could I ask, Madam Speaker, how much time is remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California). The gentleman from Ohio has 68½ minutes. The gentleman from California has 36 minutes. The gentlewoman from Florida has 27½ minutes.

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

Let me just say at the outset while I am speaking on behalf of the same resolution the gentleman just before me spoke on behalf of, I couldn't disagree more that our interests do lie in protecting our national security by being in Afghanistan. My opposition is our strategy. My opposition is that somehow we are going to control the ground by maneuvering ourselves militarily to control the ground as if it is a nation-state.

I hear my colleagues talk about the flag of Afghanistan as if Afghanistan is a country. In case anybody has bothered to look at it, it is a loose collection of 121 different sovereign tribes, none of whom get along with each other, and it is a mountainous terrain of rock and gravel; and the notion that our soldiers are over there laying down their lives to secure ground. We ought to be after the Taliban and the terrorists, anybody who is organizing to strike at our country. I am for that.

But I am not for organizing an organized military campaign where we are having to go in and take in these towns and subject our soldiers to unnecessary threats where we are putting our treasure and the lives of our men and women in uniform on the line unnecessarily.

Now, someone, I can't even believe I heard this, said, oh, I can't go to a funeral and tell the parents of someone who just died that they lost their child in vain. Somewhere I heard that during the Vietnam war. So what is it we have to do? We have to double down on a bad policy to protect the honor of those who have already died? I don't think so. There isn't a soldier in this country who has laid down their lives for our Nation that isn't a hero. And no one in here disagrees with that.

What is shameful is our policy that puts them in harm's way when they don't need to be. And make no mistake about it, this is not about national security. Because if it is about national security, it is about whether we put our treasure and our lives on the line in Afghanistan, or whether we put it in Kuwait, or whether we put it in the Sudan, or whether we put it in some other place in the world, all of which is where we need it.

Where do we need it the most? That should be the question. Because we don't have the resources to put it everywhere. So don't come and tell me our national security requires that we have it in Afghanistan because that is not the only place we need it. The question is where our priorities should be. And you take it from one place, you have to put it somewhere else.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. KENNEDY. Finally, if anybody wants to know where cynicism is, cyni-

cism is that there are one, two press people in this gallery. We're talking about Eric Massa 24-7 on the TV. We're talking about war and peace, \$3 billion, a thousand lives, and no press? No press? You want to know why the American public is sick? They're sick because they're not seeing their Congress do the work that they're sent to do. It's because the press, the press of the United States, is not covering the most significant issue of national importance, and that is the laying of lives down in the Nation for the service of our country. It is despicable, the national press corps right now.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the chairman of the Middle East and South Asia Subcommittee of our committee, my friend from New York (Mr. ACKERMAN).

Mr. ACKERMAN. I thank the chairman.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the resolution. I am frankly astonished that the resolution has even come to the floor. I am afraid some of our colleagues either misunderstand the plain text of the War Powers Act or would like the House to initiate a legislative version of the so-called "memory hole" described by George Orwell in his foreboding novel 1984. The War Powers Act provides that in the event U.S. forces are engaged in hostilities without either a declaration of war or a specific statutory authorization, a concurrent resolution can be considered to force the withdrawal of our troops. An important piece of law to be sure, but one that is wholly irrelevant to the actual circumstances under which our troops are currently fighting.

Like many others in the House, I was present on September 14, 2001, when the House passed House Joint Resolution 64, to authorize the use of United States Armed Forces against those responsible for the then-recent attacks launched against the United States. The vote, I would remind you, was 420 in favor and one against. I would note that the gentleman from Ohio, along with myself, was present and voted aye, as was the gentleman from Texas, as were 420 of us.

I would like to quote from that resolution which we are seeking to deny existed, which became Public Law 107-40 on September 18, 2001. It says, quote, "That the President is authorized to use all necessary and appropriate force against those nations, organizations, or persons he determines planned, authorized, committed, or aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001, or harbored such organizations or persons, in order to prevent any future acts of international terrorism against the United States by such nations, organizations, or persons."

□ 1515

Members may like or dislike the war in Afghanistan. They may think the President's new strategy is wise or

foolish. They may regard the costs of the war as bearable or not, but they are plainly not entitled to argue that the hostilities were not pursuant to specific authorization by the United States Congress.

The 107th Congress authorized the use of force. The President of the United States signed that authorization into law. If a Member of this House is opposed to the war, and I am sympathetic to such views, then the proper remedy is to pass legislation to mandate withdrawal through the Congress under regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BERMAN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. ACKERMAN. They can likewise vote against the annual and supplemental appropriations that fund the war.

What Members ought not to be able to do is to waste 3 full hours of the House's time debating a resolution founded, at best, on a mistake and, at worst, a willful intention to pretend that recent history that we did authorize this war by a 420-1 vote can be dropped into the "memory hole."

No matter what Members believe about the war in Afghanistan, this resolution deserves to fail.

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, I would like to respond to my friend that the authorization for the use of military force, which passed September 14, 2001, had in its provision this particular line: "Nothing in this resolution supersedes any requirement of the War Powers Resolution."

So the war powers resolution is properly the subject of a debate and properly serves as a vehicle to bring this debate to the House of Representatives, and we don't need to cede our right under article I, section 8 at any time to determine whether or not we go to war. This is clearly a constitutional issue. And when I take an oath to defend the Constitution, I don't cross my fingers behind my back and say, Well, I will let the President make the final decision regarding war.

Our Founders didn't want to do that. Our Founders said in order to restrain the dog of war, they would put the ability to declare war in the legislative branch. They were very clear about that.

Do not disrespect this institution when it comes to the Constitution. Remember, the War Powers Act specifically was mentioned in the resolution that was passed on September 14, 2001. It was not superseded. And I might add that while I voted for the authorization for the use of military force because I believe America has a right to defend herself, I didn't give any President carte blanche to go and carry or prosecute a war wherever he or she, in the future, determines necessary.

I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me

this time, and I rise in support of this resolution.

There is nothing conservative about the war in Afghanistan. In fact, it goes against every traditional conservative position I have ever known. It has meant massive foreign aid which we cannot afford and of which conservatives have traditionally been the biggest critics. It has meant huge deficit spending, shortly after a time when the Congress has raised our national debt to over \$14 trillion. Conservatives have traditionally been against huge deficit spending. Conservatives have been the biggest critics of the U.N. and biggest opponents to world government, and certainly the war in Afghanistan has gone right along with that.

Fiscal conservatives should be the most horrified about the hundreds of billions that has been spent over there. This war has gone on for more than 8 years. At a time when the war in Iraq had gone on for a far shorter time than that, William F. Buckley, who opposed the war in Iraq, wrote this about that war: "A respect for the power of the United States is engendered by our success and engagements in which we take part. A point is reached when tenacity conveys not steadfastness of purpose, but misapplication of pride."

He went on to say, if this war drags on, talking about the war in Iraq, he said, "Where there had been skepticism about our venture, there will be contempt."

All of those words apply equally well to the war in Afghanistan. There is nothing conservative about the war in Afghanistan.

Georgie Ann Geyer, the conservative foreign affairs columnist, she wrote also about the war in Iraq, but it applies to this war as well. She said, "Critics of the war have said since the beginning of the conflict that Americans, still strangely complacent about overseas wars being waged by minorities in their name, will inevitably come to a point where they will see they have to have a government that provides services at home or one that seeks empire across the globe."

We should remember, Madam Speaker, that even General Petraeus said we should never forget that Afghanistan has been known as the "graveyard of empires." Our Constitution does not give us the power or the right to run another country, and that is what we have been doing.

It should have come as no surprise, Madam Speaker, that President Karzai of Afghanistan told ABC News recently that the U.S. needs to stay there for 15 to 20 years more, spending megabillions, of course. He wants our money, and he wants to stay in power.

But listen to what columnist George Will has said. He has now changed his position and has written about Afghanistan, that the budget will not support an expansion there. The military "will be hard-pressed to execute it, and America's patience will not be commensurate with Afghanistan's limitless

demands. This will not end well." Those are not my words. Those are the words of George Will.

A very small but very powerful group called neoconservatives, who are really not conservative at all, have almost totally controlled U.S. foreign policy for many years. They are supported by very large companies and government officials who benefit from perpetual war and the billions of spending it requires.

George Will wrote in that same column that the neoconservatives are "magnificently misnamed" and that they are really the "most radical people in this town."

The Pentagon now says it costs \$1 billion per year for each 1,000 troops we send there. We can't afford this. We can't afford to keep spending hundreds of billions in Afghanistan.

We are not cutting and running. We have been there over 8 years now. If this resolution passes, we will be there 9 years. That is too long. It is not only enough, it is far too long. It is time to do the best thing we can do for our troops and bring our young men and women home and start putting Americans first once again.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY), a member of our Committee on Foreign Affairs and the ranking member of the Agriculture Subcommittee on Department Operations and Oversight.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. I thank the gentlewoman from Florida for her leadership on Foreign Affairs and for the time.

Madam Speaker, the situation in Afghanistan is complex, and it has been difficult. And it has serious ramifications for regional and global stability. Congress understood this in the aftermath of September 11 and authorized the use of force in Afghanistan. The situation is no less serious today.

We would all like to see our troops come home as quickly as possible, leaving Afghanistan a stronger and better place. And we all deeply care about our troops, particularly those who are now wounded, who have fought so valiantly.

But, Madam Speaker, decisions regarding the disposition of our forces in Afghanistan should be made in concert with our commanders in the field who take seriously their responsibility for our troops and the success of that mission. I have confidence that General McChrystal, after a thorough and painstaking calculus, has provided a clear plan to increase stability in Afghanistan and allow our troops to withdraw as quickly and as responsibly as possible. Moreover, now is not the time to leave fledgling civil society programs more vulnerable to intimidation and attack.

So, Madam Speaker, I respectfully submit that we cannot afford to risk compromising the future of that region at this most difficult time, and I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this resolution.

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I was one of those Members who understood the horror of 9/11 and joined with the then-President of the United States to respond to an attack on the United States. Subsequently in the Iraq war, I voted against that war knowing that it had nothing to do with the attack on the United States on 9/11. So I do not stand on this floor with a heart that is not heavy-laden and an understanding of the importance of this resolution. This resolution is grounded in the Constitution and it has merit; for the question is, when we responded to 9/11, it was a war on terror.

Today, we find that this is a war of insurgents. There is no real documentation that al Qaeda still lingers in Afghanistan. But we do understand that we have lost 1,000 Americans to date—70 in 2010 and 316 in 2009—soldiers that we honor and respect. Never will there be one soldier that we don't call for an honor and respect of the United States. In fact, I filed legislation to have a day of honor for all of our returning soldiers. None of them should come home to silence. We should always provide great honor for them.

But here is where we are as it relates to the situation in Afghanistan. Today, although he has the right to do so, President Karzai is greeting the President of Iran. I hope they work together for peace. But the questions are: What are our soldiers doing to help impact the governance of Afghanistan? The governance that requires the fighting of corruption; the governance to fight for freedom and for human rights and the right to worship; governance to establish schools for the girls and boys and allow girls and boys to go.

Yes, we need nation building, but not with our soldiers out walking step by step trying to bypass IEDs, many times missing it and losing arms and legs and eyes. This is the time to give the President, who did do the right thing, who deliberated and who took time and responded to his generals—we salute him for that. But now is the time for the United States Congress and the constitutional separation of the branches of government to be able to assess whether or not this particular conflict must continue and whether there is a benefit to the American people.

I would make the argument there is much to do. There is much to do in cleaning up Afghanistan. There is much to do in providing for the opportunity of governance. We can do that in a way that will support the State Department with support staff from the military. And if there is a need to defend the United States, I have no doubt that the brave men and women of the United States military will stand at attention and will rise to the occasion. Now we owe their families,

these young men and women, 165,000 who came home from Iraq, many of whom are suffering from posttraumatic disorder.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield the gentlewoman an additional minute.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. When we send them into battle, we have the obligation of saying there is a beginning and an end. World War I, World War II, wars that we may have liked or disliked, but we knew as they went into battle that there was an ending. And how brave they were.

As we saluted the women who participated in the Air Army Corps for Women, the WASPs today, some hundreds of them, we know that there is no doubt that they are brave. But I would say to you, end this war with Afghanistan and end this partnership with Pakistan. There are ways to be able to support the structure of both governments without our soldiers losing their lives on and on and on.

This resolution says that if the President finds it necessary to extend, he can do so. But we are asking for the troops to be out by the end of this year. So many of us have spoken to that over and over again.

Madam Speaker, this is not something unusual. This is not a cause of the fearful. This is not a cause of those who are nonpatriotic. This is a cause for people who believe in the red, white, and blue, who stand here today loving their country and believe that our soldiers are owed this respect to bring them home as heroes. We ask that you support this resolution.

Madam Speaker, I rise in solemn opposition to a war that has cost too many American lives and too many American dollars. To date, over 1,000 Americans have lost their lives in the Afghan theatre, including 70 in 2010. In 2009, 316 Americans lost their lives. The war in Afghanistan should end as safely and quickly as possible, and our troops should be brought home with honor and a national day of celebration. I strongly believe that this can and must be done by the end of the year.

This stance is borne from my deeply held belief that we must commend our military for their exemplary performance and success in Afghanistan. As lawmakers continue to debate U.S. policy in Afghanistan, our heroic young men and women continue to willingly sacrifice life and limb on the battlefield. Our troops in Afghanistan did everything we asked them to do. We sent them overseas to destroy the roots of terror and protect our homeland; they are now caught in the midst of an insurgent civil war and continuing political upheaval.

Throughout the discussion of the administration's proposed surge, I expressed my concern for the cost of sending additional troops, as well as the effect that a larger presence in Afghanistan will have on troop morale. The White House estimates that it will cost \$1 million per year for each additional soldier deployed, and I believe that \$30 billion would be better spent on developing new jobs and fixing our broken healthcare system. Many leaders in our armed forces, including Secretary Gates, have said that it is optimal for troops to

have two years between overseas deployments; yet, today, our troops have only a year at home between deployments. Expanding the number of U.S. forces in Afghanistan by 30,000 will negatively impact troop morale and will bring us further away from the conditions necessary to maintain a strong, all-volunteer military. This is not President Obama's war and I applaud his thoughtful leadership—the Congress now needs to give counsel to have a time certain for the troops to come home.

I very strongly believe that our nation has a moral obligation to ensure that our veterans are treated with the respect and dignity that they deserve. One reason that we are the greatest nation in the world is because of the brave young men and women fighting for us in Iraq and Afghanistan. They deserve honor, they deserve dignity, and they deserve to know that a grateful nation cares about them. Whether or not my colleagues agree that the time has come to withdraw our American forces from Afghanistan, I believe that all of us in Congress should be of one accord that our troops deserve our sincere thanks and congratulations.

It is because I respect our troops that I am voting to bring them home from a war that has strayed far beyond its original mandate. The United States will not and should not permanently prop up the Afghan government and military. To date, almost \$27 billion—more than half of all reconstruction dollars—have been apportioned to build the Afghan National Security Forces. The focus should be on strengthening the civilian government for it to lead. And we should continue to chase the real terrorists that are now lodged in Pakistan. We must support governments with a diplomatic surge—more resources for schools, hospitals, and government reform.

U.S. military involvement in Afghanistan will come to an end, and when U.S. forces leave, the responsibility for securing their nation will fall to the people and government of Afghanistan. Governance is more than winning elections, it is about upholding human rights, especially the rights of women; it requires fighting corruption. Governance requires fighting corruption. Governance requires providing for the freedom to worship. Governance requires establishing schools that provide education from early childhood through higher education.

Yet, Afghanistan has largely failed to institute the internal reforms necessary to justify America's continued involvement. The recent elections did not reflect the will of the people, and the government has consistently failed to gain the trust of the people of Afghanistan. The troubling reports about the elections that were held on August 20, 2009 were the first in a series of very worrisome developments. The electoral process is at the heart of democracy, and the disdain for that process that was displayed in the Afghanistan elections gives me great pause. The Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction recently released his quarterly report which detailed our nation's efforts to work with contractors and the Afghanistan government to prevent fraud and enhance transparency. This is the 8th report by the Special Inspector General, but as a recent series in the Washington Post showed, we are unable to stem the flow of corruption and waste within Afghanistan, despite our efforts at reforming our own contracting procedures. This money likely comes from the opium trade and U.S. assistance and,

the Washington Post estimates, totals over one billion dollars each year.

The task of establishing legitimate governing practices remains formidable. A November 17, 2009 report from Transparency International listed Afghanistan as the second most corrupt country in the world, continuing its second straight year of declining in the corruption index. Such news is disparaging and provides an important dynamic to how we consider our strategy with regards to Afghanistan going forward. In January, a U.N. survey found that an overwhelming 59 percent of Afghans view public dishonesty as a bigger concern than insecurity (54 percent) and unemployment (52 percent). This is telling for a country with widespread violence and an unemployment rate of 40 percent.

As co-chair of the Congressional U.S.-Afghanistan Caucus, I have called for policies that allow the United States to provide benefits to the people of Afghanistan. Our effort must enhance our efforts at building both hard and soft infrastructure in Afghanistan. Change in Afghanistan is going to come through schools and roads, through health care and economic opportunity, and through increased trade and exchange. The Afghan people need our help to achieve these objectives, but I am not convinced that our military is the solution. If the Government of Afghanistan can demonstrate a responsible and non-corrupt commitment to its people, I believe that America should respond with appropriate and targeted foreign assistance.

I am also concerned that the United States is shouldering too much of the burden in Afghanistan. Although the terror attacks on American soil prompted NATO to respond with collective military action, no nation is immune from the threat of terrorism. Although the troops and resources provided by our allies have been invaluable to date, especially regarding development for the people of Afghanistan, questions must be raised about how long other nations will remain involved in Afghanistan. France and Germany, for example have already questioned whether or not to send additional troops. NATO resources must continue to focus on improving the livelihoods of the Afghan people, but if the support of these governments wavers, American troops and Afghan citizens will suffer the consequences.

I agree with our President that a stable Afghanistan is in the best interest of the international community, and I was pleased to see President Obama's outreach to our allies for additional troops. Currently, 41 NATO and other allied countries contribute nearly 36,000 troops. That number is expected to increase by nearly 6,000 with at least 5,000 additional troops coming from NATO member countries. Multilateralism is vital to ensuring that our operations in Afghanistan succeed.

Madam Speaker, today, we face difficult realities on the ground. The Taliban attacks our forces whenever and wherever they can. Agents of the Taliban seek to turn the people of Afghanistan against us as we attempt to provide them with help in every way we can. This situation is unsustainable. Afghanistan's history has earned it the nickname, "The Graveyard of Empires," and I believe that we should not take this grim history lightly. By including a timetable for our operations in Afghanistan, we focus our mission and place it in a long-term context.

Although development to improve the lives of the Afghan people is important, defeating al-Qaeda and the threat they pose to America and our allies is the most important objective of our operations. To that end, I believe that Pakistan, not Afghanistan, is now the key to success and stability in the region. Over the past eight years, coalition forces have successfully pushed most of al-Qaeda out of Afghanistan and into Pakistan. This has not only put them outside the mandate of our forces, but has also forced Pakistan to address an enlarged terrorist threat.

During his State of the Union Address, President Obama spoke of the importance of Pakistan when he noted "America will remain a strong supporter of Pakistan's security and prosperity long after the guns have fallen silent, so that the great potential of its people can be unleashed." As the co-chair of the Congressional Pakistan Caucus, I know, firsthand, of the great potential of the Pakistani people, and I strongly believe that the recently approved assistance package to Pakistan will work to this end. U.S. foreign assistance to Pakistan will improve Pakistan's capacity to address terrorist networks within its own borders, but I worry that a troop increase will cause even more refugees and insurgents to cross into Pakistan.

Ultimately, we in Congress must decide what is in the best interest of the American people. Fighting al-Qaeda was in the best interest of the American people in 2001, as it continues to be today. Yet, we are now fighting an insurgency—not al-Qaeda—in Afghanistan. This should not be their mission, and we must bring our troops home.

□ 1530

Mr. KUCINICH. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, before I yield to the gentlewoman from California, I just want to take 15 seconds to make a point with respect to the gentleman from Ohio that, while the authorization for the use of force in 2001 certainly referenced the War Powers Act, our point is that, while this debate makes sense and is appropriate, it is truly not pursuant to the War Powers Act because the War Powers Act says the direction to withdraw comes when there has not been an authorization for the use of military force, and here there was an authorization for the use of military force. I am for the debate; I am against the basis on which the debate is being held.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN), the chair of the Intelligence Subcommittee of the Homeland Security Committee.

Ms. HARMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, our colleague, Mr. KUCINICH, should be commended for causing us to debate this issue on the House floor. This is a good and thoughtful debate, and I applaud especially the passionate statement of PATRICK KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

Madam Speaker, the war in Afghanistan has continued for 9 years, and the Obama administration continues to rely on the almost decade-old authorization to use military force which

Congress passed, as we have heard, by an overwhelming vote a few days after 9/11/2001. Most who voted for it, including me, thought it was limited in time and place, but it became the basis for many actions taken by the Bush administration. In my view, the AUMF has been overused and abused as the basis for policy. It is time for us to consider whether it should sunset, and I believe that it should. But the resolution before us is not, in my view, the right place to address that issue.

After years of giving Afghanistan short shrift, tolerating rampant government corruption, and standing by as the Taliban reestablished itself, we now have a better strategy. That strategy, developed by President Obama late last year, includes a promised drawdown of our troops beginning in July 2011—or possibly sooner, according to Defense Secretary Robert Gates, who visited there earlier this week.

Let me be clear, I do not support the surge of an additional 30,000 additional American troops in Afghanistan. I do support multinational, NATO-led efforts to clear, hold, build, and transfer to a noncorrupt Afghan Government control over parts of that country which are or could become training grounds for terrorists intent on attacking the United States.

The good news is that Pakistan is making greater effort to crack down on Taliban and al Qaeda terror groups on its soil, and those efforts are yielding results which should help stabilize Afghanistan.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman's time has expired.

Mr. BERMAN. I yield the gentlelady an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. HARMAN. Like Mr. KUCINICH, I want the U.S. military out of Afghanistan at the earliest reasonable date, but accelerating the Obama administration's carefully calibrated timetable could take grievous risks with our national security. I share Mr. KUCINICH's sentiment, but not his schedule.

Mr. KUCINICH. I want to thank Mr. BERMAN for agreeing to make this debate possible. I do appreciate it very much. You have been open to that, and I think the country should appreciate that about you.

I also want to say that this CRS study, Congressional Research Study, on the Authorization for the Use of Military Force makes it very clear in it that the War Powers Act is not superseded, and I would like to submit this for the RECORD.

AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE
IN RESPONSE TO THE 9/11 ATTACKS (P.L. 107-40): LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

[From the Congressional Research Service,
Jan. 16, 2007]

(By Richard F. Grimmett)

SUMMARY

In response to the terrorist attacks against the United States on September 11, 2001, the Congress passed legislation, S.J. Res. 23, on September 14, 2001, authorizing the President to "use all necessary and appropriate force against those nations, organizations, or per-

sons he determines planned, authorized, committed, or aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001, or harbored such organizations or persons. . . ." The President signed this legislation into law on September 18, 2001 (P.L. 107-40, 115 Stat. 224 (2001)). This report provides a legislative history of this statute, the "Authorization for Use of Military Force" (AUMF), which, as Congress stated in its text, constitutes the legislative authorization for the use of U.S. military force contemplated by the War Powers Resolution. It also is the statute which the President and his attorneys have subsequently cited as an authority for him to engage in electronic surveillance against possible terrorists without obtaining authorization of the special Court created by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA) of 1978, as amended. This report will only be updated if events warrant.

On September 11, 2001, terrorists linked to Islamic militant Osama bin Laden hijacked four U.S. commercial airliners, crashing two into the twin towers of the World Trade Center in New York City, and another into the Pentagon building in Arlington, Virginia. The fourth plane crashed in Shanksville, Pennsylvania near Pittsburgh, after passengers struggled with the hijackers for control of the aircraft. The collective death toll resulting from these incidents was nearly 3,000. President George W. Bush characterized these attacks as more than acts of terror. "They were acts of war," he said. He added that "freedom and democracy are under attack," and he asserted that the United States would use "all of our resources to conquer this enemy."

In the days immediately after the September 11 attacks, the President consulted with the leaders of Congress on appropriate steps to take to deal with the situation confronting the United States. These discussions produced the concept of a joint resolution of the Congress authorizing the President to take military steps to deal with the parties responsible for the attacks on the United States. The leaders of the Senate and the House decided at the outset that the discussions and negotiations with the President and White House officials over the specific language of the joint resolution would be conducted by them, and not through the formal committee legislation review process. Consequently, no formal reports on this legislation were made by any committee of either the House or the Senate. As a result, it is necessary to rely on the texts of the original draft proposal by the President for a use of military force resolution, and the final bill, S.J. Res. 23, as enacted, together with the public statements of those involved in drafting the bill, to construct the legislative history of this statute. Between September 12 and 14, 2001, draft language of a joint resolution was discussed and negotiated by the White House Counsel's Office, and the Senate and House leaders of both parties. Other members of both Houses of Congress suggested language for consideration through their respective party leaders.

On Wednesday, September 12, 2001, the White House gave a draft joint resolution to the leaders of the Senate and the House. This White House draft legislation, if it had been enacted, would have authorized the President (1) to take military action against those involved in some notable way with the September 11 attacks on the U.S., but it also would have granted him (2) statutory authority "to deter and pre-empt any future acts of terrorism or aggression against the United States." This language would have seemingly authorized the President, without durational limitation, and at his sole discretion, to take military action against any nation, terrorist group or individuals in the

world without having to seek further authority from the Congress. It would have granted the President open-ended authority to act against all terrorism and terrorists or potential aggressors against the United States anywhere, not just the authority to act against the terrorists involved in the September 11, 2001 attacks, and those nations, organizations and persons who had aided or harbored the terrorists. As a consequence, this portion of the language in the proposed White House draft resolution was strongly opposed by key legislators in Congress and was not included in the final version of the legislation that was passed.

The floor debates in the Senate and House on S.J. Res. 23 make clear that the focus of the military force legislation was on the extent of the authorization that Congress would provide to the President for use of U.S. military force against the international terrorists who attacked the U.S. on September 11, 2001 and those who directly and materially assisted them in carrying out their actions. The language of the enacted legislation, on its face, makes clear—especially in contrast to the White House's draft joint resolution of September 12, 2001—the degree to which Congress limited the scope of the President's authorization to use U.S. military force through P.L. 107-40 to military actions against only those international terrorists and other parties directly involved in aiding or materially supporting the September 11, 2001 attacks on the United States. The authorization was not framed in terms of use of military action against terrorists generally.

On Friday, September 14, 2001, after the conclusion of the meetings of their respective party caucuses from 9:15 a.m. to 10:15 a.m., where the final text of the draft bill was discussed, S.J. Res. 23, jointly sponsored by Senators Thomas Daschle and Trent Lott, the Senate Majority and Minority leaders respectively, was called up for quick consideration under the terms of a unanimous consent agreement. S.J. Res. 23 was then considered and passed by the Senate by a vote of 98-0. As part of the Senate's unanimous consent agreement that set the stage for the rapid consideration and vote on S.J. Res. 23, the Senate agreed to adjourn and to have no additional votes until after the following Wednesday. That action effectively meant that if the House amended S.J. Res. 23, no further legislative action on it would occur until the middle of the following week. After the House of Representatives received S.J. Res. 23 from the Senate, on Friday, September 14, 2001, the House passed it late that evening, after several hours of debate, by a vote of 420-1, clearing it for the President. Prior to passing S.J. Res. 23, the House considered, and then tabled an identically worded joint resolution, H.J. Res. 64, and rejected a motion to recommit by Rep. John Tierney (D-Mass.), that would have had the effect, if passed and enacted, of requiring a report from the President on his actions under the joint resolution every 60 days after it entered into force.

S.J. Res. 23, formally titled in Section 1 as the "Authorization for Use of Military Force," was thus passed by Congress on September 14, 2001, and was signed into law by the President on September 18, 2001. The enacted bill contains five "Whereas clauses" in its preamble, expressing opinions regarding why the joint resolution is necessary. Four of these are identical to the "Whereas clauses" contained in the White House draft joint resolution of September 12, 2001. The fifth, which was not in the original White House draft, reads as follows: "Whereas, the President has authority under the Constitution to take action to deter and prevent acts of international terrorism against the

United States. . . ." This statement, and all of the other Whereas clauses in P.L. 107-40, are not part of the language after the Resolving clause of the Act, and, as such, it is not clear how a Court would treat such provisions in interpreting the scope of the authority granted in the law.

Section 2(a) of the joint resolution, authorizes the President "to use all necessary and appropriate force against those nations, organizations, or persons he determines planned, authorized, committed, or aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001, or harbored such organizations or persons, in order to prevent any future acts of international terrorism against the United States by such nations, organizations or persons." The joint resolution further states, in Section 2(b)(1), Congressional intent that it "constitute specific statutory authorization within the meaning of section 5(b) of the War Powers Resolution." Finally, Section 2(b)(2) of the joint resolution states that "[n]othing in this resolution supercedes any requirement of the War Powers Resolution."

A notable feature of S.J. Res. 23 is that unlike all other major legislation authorizing the use of military force by the President, this joint resolution authorizes military force against "organizations and persons" linked to the September 11, 2001 attacks on the United States. In its past authorizations for use of U.S. military force, Congress has permitted action against unnamed nations in specific regions of the world, or against named individual nations, but never against "organizations or persons." The authorization of use of force against unnamed nations is consistent with some previous instances where authority was given to act against unnamed states when they became aggressors or took military action against the United States or its citizens.

President George W. Bush in signing S.J. Res. 23 into law on September 18, 2001, noted the Congress had acted "wisely, decisively, and in the finest traditions of our country." He thanked the "leadership of both Houses for their role in expeditiously passing this historic joint resolution." He noted that he had had the "benefit of meaningful consultations with members of the Congress" since the September 11 attacks, and that he would "continue to consult closely with them as our Nation responds to this threat to our peace and security." President Bush also asserted that S.J. Res. 23 "recognized the authority of the President under the Constitution to take action to deter and prevent acts of terrorism against the United States." He also stated that "In signing this resolution, I maintain the longstanding position of the executive branch regarding the President's constitutional authority to use force, including the Armed Forces of the United States and regarding the constitutionality of the War Powers Resolution."

It is important to note here that Presidents frequently sign bills into law that contain provisions or language with which they disagree. Presidents sometimes draw attention to these disagreements in a formal statement at the time they sign a bill into law. While Presidential "signing statements" may indicate that the President views certain provisions to be unconstitutional, they do not themselves have the force of law, nor do they modify the language of the enacted statute. Should the President strongly object to the language of any bill presented to him, he has the option to veto it, and compel the Congress to enact it through voting to override his veto. Once a bill is enacted into law, however, every President, in accordance with Article II, section 3 of the U.S. Constitution, is obligated to "take care that the laws be faithfully exe-

cuted. . . ." Thus, unless its current language is changed through enactment of a new statute that amends it, or its effect is modified by opinions of the Federal Courts, the "Authorization for Use of Military Force" statute, P.L. 107-40, retains the legal force it has had since its enactment on September 18, 2001.

TEXT OF ORIGINAL DRAFT OF PROPOSED WHITE HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION (SEPTEMBER 12, 2001)

JOINT RESOLUTION

To authorize the use of United States Armed Forces against those responsible for the recent attacks launched against the United States.

Whereas on September 11, 2001, acts of treacherous violence were committed against the United States and its citizens; and

Whereas such acts render it both necessary and appropriate that the United States exercise its rights to self-defense and to protect United States citizens both at home and abroad; and

Whereas in light of the threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States posed by these grave acts of violence; and

Whereas such acts continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States,

Now, therefore be it
Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled—

That the President is authorized to use all necessary and appropriate force against those nations, organizations or persons he determines planned, authorized, harbored, committed, or aided in the planning or commission of the attacks against the United States that occurred on September 11, 2001, and to deter and pre-empt any future acts of terrorism or aggression against the United States.

TEXT OF S.J. RES. 23 AS PASSED SEPTEMBER 14, 2001, AND SIGNED INTO LAW

JOINT RESOLUTION

To authorize the use of United States Armed Forces against those responsible for the recent attacks launched against the United States.

Whereas on September 11, 2001, acts of treacherous violence were committed against the United States and its citizens;

Whereas such acts render it both necessary and appropriate that the United States exercise its rights to self-defense and to protect United States citizens both at home and abroad;

Whereas in light of the threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States posed by these grave acts of violence;

Whereas such acts continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States; and

Whereas the President has authority under the Constitution to take action to deter and prevent acts of international terrorism against the United States; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This joint resolution may be cited as the "Authorization for Use of Military Force."

SECTION 2. AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—That the President is authorized to use all necessary and appropriate force against those nations, organizations, or

persons he determines planned, authorized, committed, or aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001, or harbored such organizations or persons, in order to prevent any future acts of international terrorism against the United States by such nations, organizations or persons.

(b) WAR POWERS RESOLUTION REQUIREMENTS—

(1) SPECIFIC STATUTORY AUTHORIZATION—Consistent with section 8(a)(1) of the War Powers Resolution, the Congress declares that this section is intended to constitute specific statutory authorization within the meaning of section 5(b) of the War Powers Resolution.

(2) APPLICABILITY OF OTHER REQUIREMENTS—Nothing in this resolution supersedes any requirement of the War Powers Resolution.

I would also like to say that section 4 of the War Powers Act requires the President to report to Congress whenever he introduces U.S. Armed Forces abroad in certain situations. And of key importance is section 4(A)(1) because it triggers the time limit in section 5(B). Section 4(A)(1) requires reporting within 48 hours, in the absence of a declaration of war or congressional authorization, the introduction of U.S. Armed Forces into hostilities or into situations where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances.

The resolution that is before us, H. Con. Res 248, therefore directs the President, pursuant to section 5(C) of the War Powers Resolution, to remove the United States Armed Forces from Afghanistan.

I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I read a news article in which Defense Secretary Robert Gates, during a visit to Afghanistan just recently, cautioned against overoptimism about how the military campaign is going over there. Well, no worries there, Mr. Secretary. I can't muster optimism for a war that's been going on for 8½ years and still hasn't achieved its objectives, nor has it defeated the enemy. In fact, it's hard to be optimistic now that we have lost more than 1,000 brave Americans in Afghanistan, nearly one-third of them since this last summer.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I am downright pessimistic about the government we are propping up in Afghanistan, which seems to reach a new low for corruption and incompetence every single day. That is why I enthusiastically support the resolution offered by my friend, the gentleman from Ohio, to bring our troops home from Afghanistan by the end of the year at the latest. The fact is that our military presence is what is fueling the very insurgency we are trying to defeat. You would think we would have learned a lesson of history by now, actually. The Afghan people have always resisted occupation, whether it was Great Britain in the 19th century or the Soviet Union just 30 years ago.

Madam Speaker, ending the war does not mean ending American support. It would be completely irresponsible of us

to wash our hands of Afghanistan. There is too much humanitarian work to be done there. I propose that we replace our military surge with a civilian surge as part of a new smart security plan. We can protect America, fight terrorism, and stabilize Afghanistan with more compassion and good will than we can with rockets and guns. So let's bring the troops home. Let's replace them with more development workers, democracy promotion specialists, and economic development experts.

It costs, as we've all learned, a staggering \$1 million to deploy a single soldier to Afghanistan for 1 year. Smart security would not only be more effective and more peaceful, it would be fiscally responsible to do that in the first place. The money we are currently spending in Afghanistan desperately needs to be invested in our struggling families right here at home.

Soon, Madam Speaker, the Congressional Progressive Caucus, which I co-Chair with Congressman RAÚL GRIJALVA, will release its 2011 budget alternative. It will call for redirecting billions of dollars in military spending into domestic programs that have been overlooked for far too long right here at home, like school construction, affordable housing, transportation and infrastructure, job training, health care, on and on. It is nothing short of appalling that during a crippling recession we here in the United States are nickel and diming the American people over things like unemployment benefits while the Pentagon gets a blank check to continue a failed war.

Secretary Gates warns of dark days ahead. Well, I appreciate his refusal to be a Pollyanna about Afghanistan. The fact is that there have been more than 3,000 dark days in Afghanistan already and the patience of the American people is wearing thin.

I encourage my colleagues to support H. Con. Res 238, bring the troops home, bring them home safely, and end the dark days once and for all.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida, Congresswoman GINNY BROWN-WAITE, a member of the House Committee on Ways and Means.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

You know, earlier this afternoon, our Democrat colleague, Mr. SKELTON, a decorated war hero himself, came down to the floor and he posed the question, "Have we forgotten 9/11?" I think that this resolution perhaps sends the wrong message that this Congress has forgotten 9/11, and also the wrong message to Americans.

Just as our young men and women are always ready and always there for us in the military, we must show equally steadfast loyalty to them. Over 1.4 million men and women are bravely serving our Nation in active military duty today. I have attended sendoff

ceremonies for the troops from my district headed overseas, and I have welcomed them home. I have rejoiced with those mothers and fathers and wives who, after months of not being with their loved soldier, are able to spend time with him or her. I have also wept for those who made the ultimate sacrifice. I have wept with their families. They made the ultimate sacrifice for our country, for our safety.

Every single soldier that I have spoken to who has been to Iraq and Afghanistan would say that they would go back again. They believe in the mission. It is pretty sad that Congress doesn't. They believe in the work that they're doing out there, and they need our support, not this resolution, which is, I believe, a demoralizing resolution to our troops. Rather, I would encourage my colleagues to vote against this resolution because by voting against this resolution I believe you will be voting for our troops.

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN).

Ms. BALDWIN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the effort by my colleague from Ohio to draw our collective attention, both in this Congress and throughout the Nation, to bringing our troops home from Afghanistan.

In September, 2001, following the al Qaeda attacks on New York and Washington, D.C., Congress approved a resolution authorizing then-President Bush to "use all necessary and appropriate force against those nations, organizations, or persons he determines planned, authorized, committed, or aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001, or harbored such organizations or persons, in order to prevent any future acts of international terrorism against the United States by such nations, organizations or persons."

I voted in favor of that resolution and to continue to support all efforts focused on achieving that limited and specific mission. That resolution led to our military action in Afghanistan because at the time al Qaeda was using Afghanistan as a safe haven for its terrorist training camps, and the Taliban government in Afghanistan was supporting al Qaeda's presence within its borders.

As a result of the U.S. combat operations in Afghanistan, the Taliban was driven from power, many al Qaeda operatives were killed, and others fled to nearby Pakistan or other more distant countries. National and local democratic elections have been held, a constitution has been written and ratified by the people, and attempts have been made to establish stability and the rule of law in Afghanistan. Yet, after more than 8 years at war, there is evidence that the democratically elected government has little control outside the city of Kabul. Many parts of the country are ungoverned or lawless, opium production is increasing, and

the al Qaeda terrorists whom we seek to kill or capture are no longer present in Afghanistan.

I am deeply concerned that our brave men and women in harm's way in Afghanistan are now expected to perform functions not authorized in the September 2001 authorization of military force. And President Obama's strategy for moving forward in Afghanistan places insufficient emphasis on political, diplomatic, and development initiatives, contains no real exit strategy, and ignores the clear fact of mission creep.

Nobody can question the bravery of our men and women in harm's way in Afghanistan. Their service is courageous and admirable, bringing peace, stability, health, and well-being to a country that has suffered throughout years of conflict and war. But we can question whether these efforts extend beyond the very limited and specific mission articulated in the authorization of use of military force.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

□ 1545

Ms. BALDWIN. I remain deeply committed to keeping America and American interests abroad safe from acts of terrorism, but we cannot afford to have tens of thousands of troops remain in a country where al Qaeda no longer operates. At a time when our Nation is facing such extraordinary challenges at home, I believe we should focus on rebuilding our own Nation and on putting our people back to work.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to a member of our committee, to the Chair of the organization of NATO parliamentarians, known as the North Atlantic Assembly, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER).

(Mr. TANNER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TANNER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Madam Speaker, if we were in Afghanistan by ourselves, perhaps this debate would be worthwhile, but the fact is we are not.

I am presently serving as the president of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly. The Afghan effort is a NATO-led effort.

NATO, arguably, one, if not the most successful military alliances in the modern era, is not only involved with us as allies in Afghanistan, but we know that our military might is no longer a deterrent like it was most of my life, most of our lives, during the Cold War. With a doctrine of mutually assured destruction, even though you had the bipolar world of East versus West and even though you had the USSR and their buddies and the United States and our allies, there was this, not only feeling, but we were protected by our military might. 9/11 shattered

that. These people who are trying to kill us don't care how many aircraft carriers we have, how many tanks we have, how many submarines we have. It doesn't matter.

Therefore, if our military might is no longer our primary defense, what is? I would suggest that it is accurate, timely intelligence to know who, what, when, where, and how they want to try to attack us again so we can stop it.

How do we maximize that defense? We do it through allies. We do it through friends of ours. The French really have the best intelligence network in northern Africa. They are helping. They are helping in NATO.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BERMAN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. TANNER. If you look at all of the former Warsaw Pact countries that are now members of NATO, we are in a conflict that is global in nature. NATO is evolving from a static, land-based defense force to a security force that relieves our men and women to the extent they supply troops. It relieves the American taxpayer to the extent they help us pay for these efforts toward our common defense.

Again, were this just an American expedition, perhaps this debate would be more worthwhile, but it's not. So in the strongest possible terms, I would urge my colleagues to reject this.

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON).

Mr. GRAYSON. Madam Speaker, I have good news.

The good news is this: We won the war in Afghanistan. Now, it happened a while ago; so I may be the only person who actually remembers this, but after the 9/11 attack, within 3 months, we had expelled the Taliban government, and we did so with the use of only 1,000 U.S. Special Forces troops. Within 4 months, we had expelled al Qaeda from Afghanistan. If you don't believe me about that, you can listen to General Petraeus, who said a year ago that al Qaeda wasn't in Afghanistan anymore.

I have more good news about Iraq. The news is: We won. We won the war in Iraq years and years ago. Facing the fourth largest army in the entire world, we swept through Iraq, and within 3 weeks, we had deposed the Saddam Hussein government.

We won. Now we can go home. In fact, we could have gone home a long time ago.

What is happening now in Afghanistan and what is happening now in Iraq you can't even call a war. It is a foreign occupation. You could read the Constitution from beginning to end, and you would find nothing in the Constitution that permits or that authorizes a foreign occupation, much less one that goes on for almost a decade. Both in the price of money and in the price of blood, we simply can't afford these wars anymore.

I would like to call your attention to a report in the New England Journal of

Medicine, a report dated January 31, 2008. This report reads that 15 percent of all the troops who have served in Iraq return with permanent brain damage. That's right. Permanent brain damage. Here are some of the symptoms described: a loss of consciousness, general poor health, missed workdays, medical visits, and a high number of somatic and postconcussive symptoms.

Later on in the report, on page 459, this report reads that, in this study, nearly 15 percent of soldiers reported an injury during deployment that involves a loss of consciousness or altered mental state. These soldiers, defined as having what is euphemistically referred to as mild traumatic brain injury, were significantly more likely to report high combat exposure in a blast mechanism of injury than were the 17 percent of soldiers who reported other injuries.

So, Mr. President, when you say that you are sending 50,000 more troops to Afghanistan, what you are really saying is that you are condemning 7,500 young Americans to live for the rest of their lives with brain damage. That's what you are really saying.

Beyond that, we have spent over \$3 trillion on the war in Iraq. That's over \$10,000 for every man, woman, and child in this country. It's over \$70,000 for my family of seven. For what? What have we accomplished in 2010 that we could not have accomplished in 2009 or in 2008 or in 2007 or in 2006?

In fact, what have you heard from the other side today that they couldn't have said back then and that they will want to say next year and the year after that?

Now think about this: Our total national wealth is only \$50 trillion. We have spent \$3 trillion, 6 percent of that, on the war in Iraq. That kind of economic damage is something that could not have possibly been accomplished by al Qaeda itself. Osama bin Laden, on his best day, couldn't have done anything like that. He would have had to have vaporized all of New England to have come close.

Listen, we are the most powerful nation on Earth. Nobody can force us out of Iraq. Nobody can force us out of Afghanistan. We have to make that decision ourselves. Remember, we need not only strength; we need wisdom. We need to know that the worst things that happen to us as a country are the things that we do to ourselves, including these two wars.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), a member of the Armed Services Committee, who, during his service with the U.S. Marine Corps, served a combat tour in Afghanistan. We thank him for his service.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding.

I speak to you today, Madam Speaker, not just as a United States Congressman but as a United States marine. That's what my ballot title says

in San Diego. It reads: "U.S. Representative/Marine."

I've served in Iraq twice. I've served in Afghanistan once. I was part of the 1st Marine Division. I, for one, don't appreciate being lectured to, especially from a gentleman like the one from Florida who just spoke, about how I'm brain-injured, about how I might have PTSD, about how I'm less of a person because I've served overseas.

This is an ill-conceived resolution. It is a resolution that is hurtful to our troops on the ground who are fighting now, and it is a resolution that is hurtful to their families. If we had passed a similar resolution about Iraq, we wouldn't have been victorious in Iraq now. We wouldn't have less than 1,000 marines in Iraq now. They have all pulled out. Why did they pull out? Because we've won. Iraq is no longer a threat.

I've had friends give their lives for this great Nation in both Iraq and Afghanistan. A vote for this resolution is sending a message to their families that their sacrifices and willingness to stand in the gap against the forces of tyranny and destruction and radical Islam were false errands.

This is the wrong message to send. Our message should be one of support and encouragement. As congressional Representatives, we should be standing side by side with our troops in the field, not abandoning our cause when our military needs us the most. If we were to pull out of Afghanistan, we would be inviting those terrorists and al Qaeda to attack us here again on American soil. We don't need another 9/11.

This resolution could well be named "the retreat and abandonment of our military resolution." I don't believe the purpose of this resolution is to protect our men and women serving in harm's way. The point of this resolution, I think, would be to make America weaker.

I'll tell you why I believe this: Unlike any other Member of Congress, I have served both in Iraq and Afghanistan. Unfortunately, not any person who is in favor of this resolution has ever come and talked to me. The gentleman from Florida never came to me and asked me what I thought about it.

This isn't about the military. This is about a political ideology to make America weak and to lose our strength as a great Nation.

I would appreciate it if maybe I could be listened to next time. If we are going to work in a bipartisan fashion and if this resolution is truly for the men and women of the military, I've been here for 15 months, and I've never talked to anybody about it.

We need to make sure that we support our troops and their families and that we not allow al Qaeda to become stronger by passing this resolution.

Once again, I've raised my right hand like every other Member of Congress here to support and defend the U.S. Constitution, but I also did that as a

United States marine in one of the first officer candidate classes after 9/11. I graduated in March 2002. I deployed in 2003 to Iraq, in 2004 to the battle of Fallujah, and in 2007 to Afghanistan.

My wife and three kids have lived at Camp Pendleton. They've lived on the base. I know what families in the military live like. I know what marines on the ground are going through right now.

I know what victory costs. I know what victory takes. What it doesn't take is a misrepresenting resolution that is going to hurt our military when it needs us the most.

Did I enjoy going overseas? Did I enjoy leaving my three small kids and family behind? Did I enjoy leaving steak and all the great comforts of this Nation behind? No.

It was worth it because I know, in my heart, that what we are doing in Afghanistan is going to make my children not have to go over and fight the same Islamofascists that we are over there fighting now. I know that we are going to have a safer country because of me, because of people like me, and because of people who are over there serving now. Because they are over there, fighting, my kids aren't going to have to.

So was it fun going to war? No. Was it worth it? Yes.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this resolution.

Mr. KUCINICH. I just want to say to the gentleman who just spoke, to Mr. HUNTER, that we honor his service to our country both as a Member of Congress and in the military, as we honored your father's service. You have served this country well. You are well-spoken, and we appreciate that you are here.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 248, and I commend the gentleman, my friend from Ohio, for his introduction of it.

Madam Speaker, I yield to no man, no woman in terms of my support for the heroic sacrifices that our troops in the military make each and every day of their lives and each and every day of our lives. They make sacrifices on the battlefield. They fight the wars. We are elected to be decision makers, and we can decide whether there is war or whether there is peace or, at the very least, whether there is peaceful pursuit.

□ 1600

I believe, as the people do in my congressional district, that there is a time and a season for everything, and after several years of war and hundreds and thousands of casualties in Iraq and Afghanistan, that the time has come for us to draw a line in the sand and say that it is time to bring our troops home. It is time to have a concrete strategy and a concrete date by which we can extricate ourselves from Afghanistan.

I want to commend the gentleman from Ohio for having the courage and the strength of his conviction to provide the opportunity to debate this issue. The people in my congressional district unequivocally and without a doubt are in agreement, and I strongly support passage of this resolution.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to my friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SESTAK).

Mr. SESTAK. Madam Speaker, I was stationed at the Pentagon when 9/11 happened. A few months later, I was on the ground in Afghanistan as head of the Navy's anti-terrorism unit for a short mission. I watched as the Taliban and al Qaeda flowed across that border over to Pakistan. And then came that tragic misadventure in Iraq. We took that edifice of security of our Special Forces and others and placed them in that country. And what we might have done to truly have better won this global war of terror with the other elements of power, such as fix the illiteracy rate of women in Afghanistan, which is 98 percent, never occurred.

I support the President's policies not because of Afghanistan—it has spiraled too far downward to try to resurrect what we once might have done—but because of Pakistan, the most dangerous place in the world.

It should have sent chills down everybody's back when General Hayden, 3 years ago, said al Qaeda now has a safe haven in Pakistan where we cannot go, several hundred of those criminals there to plan safely against us.

I support the President's policy because, as General Gates said in a closed hearing in December, we need to seal that border. So as Pakistan, once united now again with us, moves to North Waziristan through the Taliban on its side of the border to eradicate the danger to us, the safe haven of al Qaeda, that they do not flow back over into Afghanistan whence Pakistan, who created the Taliban, might once again spread its bets.

If Pakistan becomes a failed state and al Qaeda remains, we may get out the nuclear weapons. But there are 2,000 nuclear-trained scientists in that nation who have access to the radiological material and the knowledge in a failed state potentially controlled by the Taliban and al Qaeda that endangers us.

I support this President's policy in a limited window of opportunity to help Pakistan eradicate, yes, the danger to them, but to us, that al Qaeda.

I strongly do believe that this President still needs to provide this Nation something, however, and that is what he promised us a year ago, and that was an exit strategy. Every warrior knows that when you go into battle, you have an exit strategy, which is merely benchmarks by which you measure success or failure. And if success succeeds, exit, and if the costs of failure become greater than success, exit to an alternative strategy. I believe that needs to be provided to this

Nation who, after 7 or 8 years of war, deserves to see how its national treasure is being used and if it is being successful.

But as I end, to my colleague from Ohio, I served for 31 years with the wonderful men and women of this Nation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BERMAN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. SESTAK. And I will always remember what the former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff said when asked about these debates here: Our men and women in the military are wise enough to know, this is your sacred duty here in the Halls of Congress, to have a debate about the use of their lives. When I led them into war, I would hope my lawmakers would have that debate if we were being used wisely.

So I thank you for bringing forward this debate, although I oppose the resolution.

Mr. KUCINICH. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT), the ranking member of the Homeland Security Subcommittee on Transportation, Security, and Infrastructure Protection.

Mr. DENT. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this House Concurrent Resolution 248 that directs the President to remove U.S. Armed Forces from Afghanistan within 30 days of adoption of this resolution unless the President determines that it is not safe to remove U.S. forces before the end of the 30-day timeline. But even if there is an identified danger, U.S. forces would still have to be removed by December 31.

Really, here is the catch: There is a clear and present danger in removing our men and women from the field while they are engaged in the first major assault of President Obama's reaffirmed counterinsurgency strategy in Afghanistan.

But here is another danger: damaging the morale of the troops who sacrifice their safety and well-being to fight to protect our homeland, our freedoms, by not providing them with the support and resources they need to complete their mission.

This is a very dangerous business, moving troops out of a country. I have sat with Secretary Gates on more than one occasion over the years talking about withdrawing troops, in this case from Iraq, and how complex a situation this is and how dangerous it is and the logistical realities of moving this many people safely.

But don't take my word for it. I think we should also listen to the words of our Commander in Chief, President Barack Obama, who, on December 1 in his address to the Nation, said, "I am convinced that our security is at stake in Afghanistan and in Paki-

stan. This is the epicenter of violent extremism practiced by al Qaeda. It is from here that we were attacked on 9/11, and it is from here that new attacks are being plotted as I speak." President Barack Obama's words.

He goes on. "This is no idle danger. No hypothetical threat. In the last few months alone, we have apprehended extremists within our borders who were sent here from the border region of Afghanistan and Pakistan to commit new acts of terror, and this danger will only grow if the region slides backwards and al Qaeda can operate with impunity. We must keep the pressure on al Qaeda, and to do that we must increase the stability and capacity of our partners in the region." Again, that was President Obama.

He goes on in another address on March 27 of 2009, where he made another statement. He says, "And if the Afghan Government falls to the Taliban or allows al Qaeda to go unchallenged, that country will again be a base for terrorists who want to kill as many of our people as they possibly can."

Secretary Gates, a very fine Secretary of Defense, and I am pleased President Obama has kept him on, said on February 5 of this year, "This is a critical moment in Afghanistan. I am confident that we can achieve our objectives, but only if the coalition continues to muster the resolve for this difficult and dangerous mission."

Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, on September 23, said, "Some people say, well, al Qaeda is no longer in Afghanistan. If Afghanistan were taken over by the Taliban, I can't tell you how fast al Qaeda would be back in Afghanistan." Secretary of State Hillary Clinton.

I also want to mention what General Petraeus has said.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I would like to yield an additional 30 seconds to Mr. DENT.

Mr. DENT. And our very fine commander, David Petraeus, I met with him in Florida a few months ago. He said, on January 25, "It was in Kandahar that 9/11 attacks were planned. It was in training camps in eastern Afghanistan where the initial preparation of the attackers was carried out before they went to Hamburg and flight schools in the U.S. It is important to recall the seriousness of the mission and why it is that we are in Afghanistan in the first place and why we are still there after years and years of hard work and sacrifice that have passed."

Again, I strongly urge that we defeat this resolution. We owe it to our troops. They are watching this debate as we speak. They want us to oppose it too.

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I want to thank my friend

and colleague from Ohio for bringing this resolution before us today.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in speaking out against the war in Afghanistan. How much death must we bear, how much pain must we suffer, how much blood should we spill before we say enough is enough? Can we lay down the burden of war and lift up the power of peace?

Now is the time for the elected representatives of the people to give peace a chance. Now is the time for those of us who believe in peace, and not war, to speak up, to speak out, and to find a way to get in the way.

Madam Speaker, war is bloody, war is messy. It tends not just to hide the truth, but to sacrifice the truth, to bury the truth. It destroys the hopes, the dreams, and the aspirations of a people.

As one great general and President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, once said, "Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired, signifies in the final sense a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and not clothed."

As I said some time ago, I urge to heed the words of the spiritual: "I'm going to lay my burden down, down by the riverside. I ain't gonna study war no more." We should follow the wisdom of that song.

Madam Speaker, this war has gone on long enough. Enough is enough. It is time to bring this war to an end. I urge all of my colleagues to vote for this resolution.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 3½ minutes to my friend and colleague from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON), a member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Speaker, what a dubious situation I find myself in, having to go behind the Honorable John Lewis, my colleague from Georgia, and to be in opposition to his view. But that is the position that I am in, and I will take on the responsibility.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Afghan War Powers Resolution which is before us today and give the reason why, although I do want to commend Representative KUCINICH for enabling the House to have a debate on such an important issue, and I thank you for that.

□ 1615

But I cannot foresee any good coming out of a situation where we enable the Taliban to regain control over Afghanistan and to thus become a safe haven for terrorist recruitment, development, and deployment. I'm concerned that passage of this resolution would be an extraordinary usurpation of the power of the Commander in Chief in favor of a Congress where petty, partisan politics have lately been trumping policy.

Our strategy in Afghanistan and Pakistan is achieving some promising successes. Pakistan is increasingly cooperating against militants within its

border and our military campaigns in Afghanistan are routing the Taliban from their strongholds while decimating Taliban and al Qaeda leadership. The President clearly stated that he would bring focus to our efforts in Afghanistan and he would seek to improve conditions prior to drawing down U.S. forces. Passage of this resolution would prevent him from implementing that strategy and force a premature withdrawal.

Madam Speaker, let me be clear. My intent is always to oppose war. I believe that the President shares that instinct. However, I oppose this resolution, not because I support war, but because this resolution is ill-timed and ill-conceived. Now is not the time for Congress to start a constitutional turf war. I find the premise of this resolution to be flawed at the outset. Remember, we have authorized ongoing operations in Afghanistan, and we are having enough trouble managing our ordinary legislative duties as it is. Let the President execute the strategy he said he would implement and which is yielding positive results. Passage of this resolution would send a message to the world that our President's authority to conduct foreign policy has weakened in favor of a Congress that bickers over arcane Senate rules when major policy decisions are left hanging in the balance.

After too many years wasted in Iraq, an unfocused deployment of our troops in Afghanistan, this President has finally chosen to use the authority of Congress to provide a focus on the real threat. I'm happy to hear Republicans saying that the President is doing a good job, and I urge my colleagues to oppose this resolution.

Mr. KUCINICH. I would gently remind my colleague from Georgia that article 1, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States places expressly in the hands of Congress the power to declare war. This resolution does not seek to usurp our Commander in Chief. It seeks to reset the balance in our Constitution so that we reclaim what the Founders rightly intended—that the war power be in the Congress and, by reference, that we have the power to determine not just when a war starts, but when a war stops. It is also telling that in this war, in this surge, we're essentially announcing to the Taliban where we are proceeding and when.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I'm so pleased to yield 6 minutes to the chairman of the House Republican Conference and a wonderful and esteemed member of our Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENCE. I thank the distinguished ranking member of the committee and the chairman of the committee for their words and efforts today.

I think the gentleman from Ohio knows that I respect his passion, but I

rise in strong opposition to this resolution today. I believe that it should be opposed because H. Con. Res. 248, directing the President pursuant to the War Powers Resolution to remove United States Armed Forces from Afghanistan, is not supported by the law, is not supported by the facts, and it is not supportive of our troops, and it should be opposed.

Let me speak to each of those issues. First, with regard to facts. The War Powers Resolution requires the President to notify Congress within a specific time of committing forces. Its constitutionality has been questioned over the years. This is a matter of clear public record. The gentleman cites the Constitution frequently. There is great constitutional debate about the very foundation of that legislation. But specifically, and I believe the distinguished chairman has made this point several times during the debate, the powers that are being cited here only apply in moments where there has not been a declaration of war or a statutory authorization for use of force.

I was here on September 11th. I was here for debates, Madam Speaker, over the resolution authorizing the use of force in Afghanistan. Therefore, I believe this resolution is out of order. And while I don't raise a procedural motion on that basis, I think it's worth noting.

Secondly, I think this resolution is not supported by the facts. I just returned from a bipartisan delegation trip to Kabul and Kandahar. I met with General McChrystal. Stanley McChrystal is the commander of the ISAF forces. I met with our soldiers at Camp Eggers. I went out into Afghanistan. And I have strongly supported President Obama's decision to send reinforcements into Afghanistan.

The sense that we receive from our military leaders in Afghanistan, from Afghani military and political leaders, and, most importantly, from our soldiers on the ground is that we are leaning into the fight. We are providing our soldiers with the resources and the reinforcements they need to come home safe. So now is not the time for the Congress of the United States to be second-guessing our commanders in the field and second-guessing the Commander in Chief. And so I believe, based on what I've seen and heard within the last month and a half in Afghanistan, that we have the right strategy, we have the right tactics, and we ought to continue to proceed on the course that we are proceeding on.

We're talking about real lives. I can't help but reflect on the experience of having been just north of Kandahar, where we visited with the governor of the Arghandab River area. He spoke about the Taliban's being on the run. In Kandahar there's an old proverb that says, He who controls Kandahar controls Afghanistan. The Taliban was in effect born in Kandahar, and this spring there is, as is evidenced on the

evening news, an effort by the Taliban to reclaim that historic city. But as I talked to the governor of the Arghandab River province, he simply said that the only thing the Taliban has anymore with the population is threats. They don't have popular appeal, or so he told me.

But the very idea that U.S. forces or forces in the NATO coalition would precipitously withdraw would leave a vacuum into which the Taliban would readily flow. And as has been discussed here eloquently by Congressman DUNCAN HUNTER, who wore the uniform in harm's way, that vacuum would be filled not just by the Taliban but by their evil twin, al Qaeda, to, no doubt, nefarious effects.

So I think this resolution is wrong on the law. I think it's wrong on the facts. But, lastly, let me just say that I believe it's also not supportive of our troops. In the many trips that I have made downrange to visit soldiers in Iraq and Afghanistan, it's impossible for me to meet with those soldiers without being profoundly inspired. And I will acknowledge the gentleman from Ohio has spoken in glowing terms about those in uniform. I do not suggest that he has done otherwise. But I believe with all my heart that a resolution of this nature in the midst of a moment when we are, in fact, providing our soldiers with the reinforcements and the resources to be successful in Afghanistan has the potential of having a demoralizing effect on the very men and women who, separated from their families and in harm's way, are doing freedom's work.

And so I believe this resolution, however intended, should be opposed. It's not supported in the law, it's not supported by the facts, and it's not supportive of our troops. I believe it should be rejected.

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield myself 5 minutes.

To my friend from Indiana, who cited his disagreement based on law and facts and the troops, I would like to respond categorically.

First of all, section 4(a)(1) of the War Powers Act requires the President to report to Congress any introduction of U.S. forces into hostilities or imminent hostilities. When the President reports, he does so consistent with but not pursuant to the War Powers Resolution. That's nuance when we're speaking about reporting requirements, because if President Obama did submit a report pursuant to the War Powers Resolution, it would trigger a vote on withdrawal from Afghanistan. Or Congress, on the other hand, has the ability, as I have, to bring a privileged resolution forward.

Now, I have heard a lot of talk about the troops here. I don't take a backseat to anyone in support of the troops. There are some that believe the way that we support the troops is to keep them in Afghanistan. There are others who believe that the way to support the troops is to bring them home.

The Washington Post this week carried one of a series of presentations of what they call "Faces of the Fallen." We owe our gratitude to each and every person who has served this country. We support those who served. But it is our obligation to be able to question the mission at any time. We should honor those who serve and those who have given their lives and made the supreme sacrifice. We owe it to them to continually critically analyze the cost of the war, the purpose of the war, and the continuation of the war.

I never had the opportunity to serve. I had a heart murmur during the Vietnam era. But my father was a World War II marine veteran who had his knee shot out in a campaign in the South Pacific. My brother Frank, who is now deceased, served in combat in Vietnam and came home with post-traumatic stress. It changed his whole life. My brother Gary, a Vietnam-era Marine veteran; my sister Beth Ann, who recently passed, an Army veteran; my nephew Gary, an Iraq combat veteran. I come from a family which believes in service. The American family, the large family of our Nation, believes in service to our country. Yet, it is true that the death toll, as The Washington Post reports in Afghanistan, is at least at 1,000, and we have to have this debate to either recommit to continuing the war and giving the reasons to the troops why we're doing that or to suggest that maybe this is the opportunity for us to take a new direction.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1630

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. KIRK. Madam Speaker, I feel compelled to rise today as the only Member of this body who has deployed twice to Afghanistan, both times as a Navy Reserve intelligence officer in Kandahar in 2008 and 2009. I'm not worried about the outcome of this debate. My colleague from Ohio will be defeated today more decisively than during his Presidential campaign.

I am worried about why the Speaker scheduled this debate. In the face of record job losses, a trillion-dollar health care takeover bill, and serious corruption charges leveled by the bipartisan Ethics Committee on some of the most powerful Members of this House, the Speaker has thrown an irresponsible bone to the far fringe of her party by scheduling this debate on the only unqualified success of the Obama administration, his surge to Afghanistan. By setting up this pointless debate, she risks undermining the Obama administration's admirable combat record in Afghanistan. Parts of this debate will now be replayed and misquoted by the Taliban and Iranian radios in ways that will hurt the elected government of Afghanistan, our NATO allies and Americans who wear the uniform now in the field.

I can speak from personal experience. There are no Republicans or Democrats in Afghanistan. There are American troops, our troops, who delivered a stunning set of military successes just in the last 3 months. General Nicholson and his marines took the narco-Taliban stronghold of Marjah in a single week, sending the Taliban fleeing. This is the heroic heartland that has funded the heroin of the Taliban.

In a quiet shadow war, our allies then captured the Taliban's top military commander, the equivalent of our Secretary of Defense. And when he was interrogated, we then followed up by capturing the Taliban governors of several provinces and key military leaders. If the Taliban military was a company, it has lost its CEO, its vice president, and its best salesman. At this rate, the guy who is running the mail room will now be attempting to run the Taliban soon.

We all witnessed 9/11. Especially for those of us representing large cities, the lessons that we learned on that day have now come to the core of our public service. It's obvious to say that President Obama, Secretary of State Clinton, and Secretary of Defense Gates fiercely oppose this resolution. Given our overwhelming bipartisan opposition to the resolution, many of our troops would ask, Don't they know that we're winning? What are they doing in Congress? And I would ask, given the growing ethical cloud over this House, given record unemployment in the United States, given a trillion-dollar flawed health care bill, why would the Speaker choose to schedule a forum to question one of the biggest successes of our President?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I yield an additional 30 seconds so Mr. KIRK can finish his thoughts.

Mr. KIRK. I will just say that we know the resolution will be defeated. But given the opportunities that it gives Taliban propagandists on the radio, we should ask, Why did the Speaker even schedule such a lopsided debate on this floor?

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to deal with the comments of my friend, the previous speaker.

I would suggest that the decision to schedule this debate did not come out of a desire to make a gesture to the extreme left or any such particular move. It was rather some sense of fealty to the institution of Congress, the institution vested with the war-declaring authority, the oversight of how our expenditures are spent. And I don't understand why you and I, who both have feelings about the wisdom of pursuing the current strategy of this administration on this issue, should be afraid of that debate or wanting to attribute motivations to the willingness to have that debate other than the congressional responsibility to have such discussions and have such debate.

Mr. KIRK. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. BERMAN. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. KIRK. I would just say that we probably spend enough time naming post offices in the House of Representatives during the worst economy in our country—

Mr. BERMAN. To reclaim my time, this is not a discussion of post offices. This is not a discussion of suspension legislation, and both parties seem to like naming post offices and introducing other kinds of resolutions. This is a discussion about the decision to send our forces into harm's way. It's worthy of a serious debate. There is nothing wrong with that debate. I don't believe our troops are going to get demoralized by our having that debate. I believe for the country, they are going to say, We are proud to represent a country that is willing to undertake that debate.

Mr. KUCINICH. I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN), who, you know, we do have a difference of opinion about this resolution, but we're united in the fact that this House should debate it, and any Member of this House, whatever their opinion is on this resolution, has the right to debate it. And to try to diminish this institution by saying, Well, this is not a proper subject for debate—we're about to begin a surge. This is a proper subject for debate, and this is why we're here.

If we wait 8½ years to debate this, and people say, Well, why are we debating it now? Should we wait another 8½ years to have a debate? Or should we have it now before we commit more and more people into combat?

I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO).

(Mr. SERRANO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SERRANO. It is time for us, as a Congress, to have this long overdue discussion on our involvement in Afghanistan. According to the War Powers Resolution, we have a role to play; and it is time that we, as a Congress, exercised our authority. Whether you agree or disagree with the escalation in Afghanistan, we need to debate it. We need to vote on it, and we need to make a decision. We must not give up the powers that we were given in the Constitution.

In the wake of 9/11, I did support a military response to the direct threat that Afghanistan posed to our Nation. I believed then that it was the correct response, and I believe now that it was in concert with our NATO allies. Nine years later, I believe that Congress has the duty to reevaluate America's involvement in a war that seems to have gotten bogged down, with very few signs of success. I believe that had we not taken our focus off Afghanistan in order to invade and occupy Iraq, we would not be in the situation we're in today. But pressing ahead without regard to our Nation's best interests and ignoring Congress' war powers prerogative is the wrong course.

Let us be clear: We cannot tolerate the presence of terrorists seeking to harm our Nation anywhere in the world, but we must ask ourselves if long-term occupations are the correct answer to this threat. We must also be clear in our analysis of our situation in that country. We have a partnership with a government that seems to be increasingly unstable, corrupt and almost completely incapable of maintaining control over vast stretches of the country.

We seem unable to eradicate the Taliban enemy. They scatter before our troops into lawless regions and then return once our troops leave. Without an effective government in Afghanistan, it's hard to see this pattern changing, as the local population cannot count on the Taliban ever being gone for good.

This is a costly war without an end in sight. It's a costly war to our brave soldiers and to their families. It is costly because resources desperately needed to feed the hungry, to find a way forward on health care reform, and to fix our failing schools are being redirected to an effort whose success is questionable.

Here at home, we have had precious little debate over this war. We have seen our troops' numbers rise to above those in Iraq, and yet we have no real benchmarks or goals after which we can leave. We continue to spend massive amounts of money to maintain the occupation of both countries; and worst of all, we ask our brave men and women in uniform to continue to sacrifice their lives and bodies for this war without our Nation sacrificing similarly. The least we can do to honor their service is to debate and vote properly on this floor and to ensure that our Nation is not sending them into battle without careful thought and reflection.

Let me conclude by saying that I am from New York City, the place where 9/11 took place; and so I know firsthand the devastation that this caused to my own community. Although I supported the effort to confront bin Laden and the perpetrators of that act, I cannot now, 9 years later, agree to an effort which has moved in a different direction with different goals.

To the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH), I commend you for raising this painful subject and allowing our Chamber to engage in an honest and an open debate. Your courage is beyond anything that other Members can ever think of. Our troops and our Nation deserve no less, and you've given us the chance to debate this, and I thank you.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN), the ranking Republican member on the Appropriations Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development.

(Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I rise in opposition to the resolution.

My colleagues, this is clearly the wrong resolution offered at precisely the wrong time. Can you imagine being a soldier in Afghanistan hearing of this resolution? Instead of debating a withdrawal from Afghanistan, we should be adopting a resolution praising the all-volunteer men and women of our Armed Forces and their families for their courage, dedicated service, and their continuing sacrifice in the name of protecting Americans everywhere.

Our Nation's Commander in Chief, our President, made the decision to act in Afghanistan, a difficult decision that was supported overwhelmingly by Congress. By the skill and bravery of our soldiers and marines, sailors and airmen, we've eliminated al Qaeda's operations in Afghanistan. But it is clear that we must ensure that our efforts to prevent Afghanistan from becoming a safe haven once again do not falter, do not weaken, and do not waver.

I concurred with the administration's decision to support General Stanley McChrystal's counterinsurgency strategy. That was an important step towards stabilizing Afghanistan. The President's reinforcement of our marines and soldiers, the so-called surge, helps achieve that objective and does provide additional security. The reinforcements have worked. There is success in Afghanistan. Our troops deserve support, and this resolution deserves to be soundly defeated.

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

One of the things that really doesn't often get discussion here on this floor with respect to a war is the specifics about how it affects people back home. And because I come from Cleveland, I just want to share with you some things just about my community.

Cleveland, as some of you may know, was the epicenter of the subprime mortgage meltdown. Predatory lenders descended on neighbors in our community and were able to take people into contracts that eventually led them into foreclosure and losing their homes.

Now, I don't think that even the most powerful camera would be able to pick up the sea of red dots across our metropolitan area that represents foreclosures, but you get an idea that we have a desperate need not only in Cleveland but across the country for helping to keep people in their homes. And yet more and more, our priorities are to spend money not just on these wars but to increase the Pentagon budget.

I would like to point out that just with respect to the amount of money that is being spent, allocated by congressional districts—this is the National Priorities Project that I am quoting which includes the fiscal 2010 budget. They point out that taxpayers in the 10th Congressional District that I represent will pay \$591.9 million for total Afghanistan war spending, counting all the spending since 2001.

And they go on to say, Here's what that money could have been spent for instead. It could have been used to provide 209,812 people with health care for 1 year. Or it could have been used to provide 13,404 public safety officers for 1 year, or 9,063 music and arts teachers for 1 year, or 68,299 scholarships for university students for 1 year. Or it could have been spent for 106,658 students receiving Pell grants of \$5,550. Or it could have been spent to provide for 5,521 affordable housing units. It could have been spent for providing 355,972 children with health care for 1 year, or 92,161 Head Start places for children for 1 year, or 9,433 elementary school teachers for 1 year, or 662,950 homes with renewable electricity for 1 year.

□ 1645

When we spend money on wars and we spend money expanding the budget for military spending, we may say we are making things safer at home, but there is plenty of evidence to suggest that the shift in allocation of funds and the shift for spending towards wars, which were off-budget for quite a while, have put our country in a position where we are not really able to meet our needs.

When you look at this, this is from the Friends Committee on National Legislation, they say for each dollar of Federal income tax we paid in 2009, the government spent about 33 cents for Pentagon spending for current and past wars; 27 cents supporting the economy, which is the recovery and the bailouts; 17 cents for health care; 11 cents responding to poverty; 9 cents for general government, and of that 7 cents goes for interest on the public debt; 2 cents for energy, science and environment; and a penny of the Federal dollar for diplomacy, development, and war prevention.

We are setting our priorities here constantly. When we remain silent about war spending, we actually have put ourselves in a position where we go headlong. And the headlong momentum that occurs from being silent about a war just carries us into all these reshaped priorities, whether we realize it or not. That is why I have asked this resolution to be brought forth, so we could talk about this.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON), the ranking member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, FDA, and Related Agencies.

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution, but I do appreciate Mr. KUCINICH for bringing it up. And I think it is proper to debate this. I am a member of the Appropriations Committee. And many years ago in committee we voted to support the Skaggs amendment to an appropriations rule that would have put the war powers in effect during something in the Clinton administration, but I don't remember what the

skirmish was. So I think it is appropriate for us to debate this. However, I think the timing is not exactly optimal, particularly with troops in the field.

I also want to point out that it does appear to me that if the Democrat leadership was serious about this, they would have allowed hearings in the committee, and they should have had a committee vote rather than just put it on the House floor. But I am glad that you brought it up, and I know your absolute sincerity in this.

I also want to point out to you, as somebody who voted “no” on the litany I am about to give on spending, that if we are looking for money, perhaps in May of '08 we should not have passed a stimulus program of \$168 billion; in July of 2008, a \$200 billion bailout of Fannie Mae; in August '08, \$85 billion by the Federal Reserve for AIG, which is now up to \$140 billion; and in November of '08, \$700 billion for the TARP bailout; and in January of '09, \$787 billion for a stimulus program which was designed to keep us from getting to 8 percent unemployment, and we are now pushing 10 percent unemployment. That was followed by a \$410 billion omnibus spending bill. And then we had in December of '09, a \$165 billion jobs program. So we're spending a lot of money. And there's a lot of it out there.

But I would suggest if we're looking for money, what we need to do is get out of the bailout business, from General Motors to the banks. And I think we could find a lot of money on a bipartisan basis. And I know the gentleman is one of the strongest critics of corporate welfare, and yet that is what we have spent 2 years doing, Democrats and Republicans alike. I won't say it started with President Obama.

I do want to say this about the troops in the field. And I do respect your support of troops. I just got back from Afghanistan. I was there Saturday, and I was in Pakistan Sunday, meeting with General McChrystal, meeting with our leadership on the ground over there. We do have a new strategy. It is shape, clear, hold, build, and transfer. And in our first muscle movement under this, as you know we went to Marja, we went to the Helmand Province, and we had a military victory. But rather than leave it there, we have now worked on a successful civilian transfer to make sure that the Afghans are ready to take on this new conquered territory.

Karzai was briefed from the beginning on the battle for Marja. One-third of the troops were Afghans. They fought shoulder to shoulder with the coalition forces. The governor of the Helmand province was briefed. There is a new police force that is coming in there to crack down on the corruption in the Afghan police force, because that is one of the problems.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I am pleased to yield 30 additional seconds to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman.

Thirdly, we now have an engaged Pakistan. One hundred forty-seven thousand troops have closed off the safe havens the Taliban has been running to in Pakistan itself in the meantime. Things are happening. And while I support the gentleman's concept of making sure the War Powers Act is followed, I think the timing is poor. So I will not support it at this time because of the progress on the ground, because of the troops that are on the ground.

But again, I want to congratulate the gentleman in his strong conviction of this. I do think it is something that we in Congress need to look at. We need to look at it carefully. I hope that the committee will have some hearings on this. And I hope that we might have some regular order and have an opportunity for the minority party to maybe even offer an amendment or a motion to recommit or something like that that I think would be very beneficial for us to have this national debate.

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia for the collegial manner in which he has approached this debate, and also to suggest that I think that while this is a very emotional matter, that it is possible for us to talk about it in terms that are clear and logical. I also want to say to my friend that I think I probably joined you in voting against the Wall Street bailouts. That was the fiscal conservative in me.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for bringing this resolution.

I think it is high time that we actually had this debate here in Congress. While it may seem untimely, there is never enough time to have a debate about war and peace that this Congress should be engaged in, and not just the actions of any President.

I want to also join with my colleagues in expressing my support for the men and women who serve this Nation. And as a daughter of one who served through Korea and Vietnam and subsequently, you couldn't find a stronger supporter of our servicemen and women. So I would hope that on both sides of the aisle that we don't confuse our debate about policy and about a resolution with support for our men and women in uniform. Because that would be unfortunate for them and it would be disrespectful of us.

I believe that this Congress has an obligation to send a strong message to the White House that the war must come to an end. And as others have pointed out, we began this war effort to fight al Qaeda following the tragedy of September 2001. But as National Security Adviser Jim Jones has told us, there are only 100 al Qaeda left in Afghanistan. Who are we fighting? Well, now we are fighting the Taliban. And that just shows you that over the

course of this time, this war and its mission and its goals have morphed and morphed and morphed to the point that we find ourselves in now.

I have no doubt that our well-trained and brave and dedicated Armed Forces will continue to be victorious on the field of battle. I am humbled by their service. But bringing stability to Afghanistan can only happen by rebuilding a truly functioning civil society—forget that, building a truly functional civil society, something that Afghanistan has not had the privilege to enjoy. This won't come by military force.

The question remains really as to the future capacity of Afghanistan's military and government to do what is required of them to build their country. We really have little evidence, if any, that this outcome is likely given the levels of corruption in the existing Karzai government that continue as well as the intertribal violence that also changes over time.

I am struck, there was a Time magazine article just this past week on the Taliban, on the fighting in Marja, and the limited success, the success that our NATO forces are having. But as was pointed out there, the take and hold and build strategy only happens if you really can transfer. And it is the transfer that I am concerned about. It is the transfer that actually endangers our troops to the point where they may transfer at one point and then have to go back and start the fight over again because that is the nature of the battle in Afghanistan.

Even more troubling is that Afghanistan shouldn't be our top national security priority.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Our military risk their lives and our Nation spends resources in a country that has so little hope of future success, that international terrorism actually flourishes in so many countries. Estimates are that this kind of terrorism actually flourishes in about 70 countries. And yet we are so heavily invested in Afghanistan that it leaves us little time, opportunity, or resources to really fight the battle where that needs to happen. By focusing our military and our energy and our treasury on Afghanistan, we are really operating under the inaccurate Bush era philosophy that the threat we face is both well-organized, centralized, and advanced.

We know that violent fundamentalism often operates with little centralization and little organization. It is part of the reason that it can be so successful. This war is a constant reminder that our response to the quickly evolving threat of international terrorism is static, and we must end this war and look for ways to more effectively disrupt violent plots to protect our citizens, our national security, our

safety and security, and to build nations in a way that they respect processes and people.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, first I would like to yield at the end of the ranking member's time an additional 5 minutes from our time on the assumption that 2 of those 5 minutes will be given to someone from California.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Florida will control 5 additional minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. BERMAN. Second, I would like to now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOCCIERI), one of only two Members of this body who actually have been deployed in our uniformed services in Afghanistan.

Mr. BOCCIERI. Madam Speaker, as Chairman BERMAN has said, I am one of just a handful of Members who have served in Afghanistan. I remember serving on the ground there as I was deployed as a tactics officer in Operation Vigilant Sentinel. As a C-130 pilot, they sent some forward-deployed troops there to make sure that our troops got the right supplies, and that the missions that we were doing were safe, and that our crews would come home very honorably and soon.

I have to tell you that I remember that day walking to the chow hall. I had my 9-millimeter strapped to my side, walking in my uniform. And there were soldiers gathered along the streets on either side. I kind of peeked my head around, and then a Humvee drove by with the flag on it. And everybody was standing at perfect attention. I was asking somebody what that was. And they said, well, that was one of the soldiers who had recently been killed in action, and he is on his journey back to the United States.

I began to think about that soldier. Who were they? What branch of service were they in? How did they meet their fate? Did they know after C-130 pilots would fly in and unload them, cargo and troops on that very geographic spot, if they knew that they were going to fly home that way. And I remember that anonymous soldier because the mission that we have there is very important.

□ 1700

Whether we agree with this war or not, we have to understand that those troops deployed in Iraq and Afghanistan are there only because our country asked them to go. I believe that we do need to bring our troops home safely, honorably, and soon, but not yet. Discussion is good, but arbitrary deadlines are not. I am concerned about walking away from Afghanistan too prematurely. We must ensure some stability not only in Afghanistan, but also in Pakistan, because of their arsenal of nuclear weapons. It would be disastrous if we allowed some terrorist to get their hands on that arsenal of weapons.

So our policy in Afghanistan has a direct impact on the stability of our re-

gion. That is important to me, and we must continue our pursuit of those perpetrators of 9/11 in that region.

The gentleman I serve with from Ohio is a deeply honorable man, and he believes, as I do, that we need to bring our troops home safely, honorably, and soon. However, the only person that is in a position to judge the number of troops needed in Afghanistan, after considering the advice and counsel of the Secretary of Defense and the generals tasked with executing our strategy, in my opinion, is the President of the United States.

Congress's responsibility is to judge the President's strategy, making sure it meets our national defense goals, and provide him with the resources required for success. The war in Afghanistan is a top national security priority for our country. Having flown dozens of missions in and out of Bagram and Kandahar, I understand that success can only be achieved when the Afghan Government stands on its own and defends itself against any threats, whether those threats are physical, economic, or constitutional.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BERMAN. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. BOCCIERI. This means that the Afghan Government needs to be fully functional, standing on its own with an army and police force capable of defending the country, and sealing the border with Pakistan; an economy that provides its citizens with an acceptable standard of living; and a reliable government and judicial structure that delivers critical services and enforces a uniform rule of law throughout the country.

Afghanistan needs civilian investments, comparable if not bigger than our military investment. While securing Afghanistan is important to our national security, our troops cannot do it alone.

It has been said that we need a foreign policy based on realism rather than idealism, and I concur with that. That's why I will not be supporting this resolution today. While I do support the gentleman's efforts to have this discussion, we need to take a very long-term strategy and find out how we do bring our troops home safely, honorably, and soon.

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, I just would like to talk for a minute about the mission in the context of what is going on with the government in Kabul. The Washington Post did a story on February 25 which talks about "Officials puzzle over millions of dollars leaving Afghanistan by plane for Dubai," and I will include that for the RECORD.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 25, 2010]
OFFICIALS PUZZLE OVER MILLIONS OF DOLLARS LEAVING AFGHANISTAN BY PLANE FOR DUBAI

(By Andrew Higgins)

KABUL.—A blizzard of bank notes is flying out of Afghanistan—often in full view of cus-

toms officers at the Kabul airport—as part of a cash exodus that is confounding U.S. officials and raising concerns about the money's origin.

The cash, estimated to total well over \$1 billion a year, flows mostly to the Persian Gulf emirate of Dubai, where many wealthy Afghans now park their families and funds, according to U.S. and Afghan officials. So long as departing cash is declared at the airport here, its transfer is legal.

But at a time when the United States and its allies are spending billions of dollars to prop up the fragile government of President Hamid Karzai, the volume of the outflow has stirred concerns that funds have been diverted from aid. The U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration, for its part, is trying to figure out whether some of the money comes from Afghanistan's thriving opium trade. And officials in neighboring Pakistan think that at least some of the cash leaving Kabul has been smuggled overland from Pakistan.

"All this money magically appears from nowhere," said a U.S. official who monitors Afghanistan's growing role as a hub for cash transfers to Dubai, which has six flights a day to and from Kabul.

Meanwhile, the United States is stepping up efforts to stop money flow in the other direction—into Afghanistan and Pakistan in support of al-Qaeda and the Taliban. Senior Treasury Department officials visited Kabul this month to discuss the cash flows and other issues relating to this country's infant, often chaotic financial sector.

Tracking Afghan exchanges has long been made difficult by the widespread use of traditional money-moving outfits, known as "hawalas," which keep few records. The Afghan central bank, supported by U.S. Treasury advisers, is trying to get a grip on them by licensing their operations.

In the meantime, the money continues to flow. Cash declaration forms filed at Kabul International Airport and reviewed by The Washington Post show that Afghan passengers took more than \$180 million to Dubai during a two-month period starting in July. If that rate held for the entire year, the amount of cash that left Afghanistan in 2009 would have far exceeded the country's annual tax and other domestic revenue of about \$875 million.

The declaration forms highlight the prominent and often opaque role played by hawalas. Asked to identify the "source of funds" in forms issued by the Afghan central bank, cash couriers frequently put down the name of the same Kabul hawala, an outfit called New Ansari Exchange.

Early last month, Afghan police and intelligence officers raided New Ansari's office in Kabul's bazaar district, carting away documents and computers, said Afghan bankers familiar with the operation. U.S. officials declined to comment on what prompted the raid. New Ansari Exchange, which is affiliated with a licensed Afghan bank, closed for a day or so but was soon up and running again.

The total volume of departing cash is almost certainly much higher than the declared amount. A Chinese man, for instance, was arrested recently at the Kabul airport carrying 800,000 undeclared euros (about \$1.1 million).

Cash also can be moved easily through a VIP section at the airport, from which Afghan officials generally leave without being searched. American officials said that they have repeatedly raised the issue of special treatment for VIPs at the Kabul airport with the Afghan government but that they have made no headway.

One U.S. official said he had been told by a senior Dubai police officer that an Afghan diplomat flew into the emirate's airport last

year with more than \$2 million worth of euros in undeclared cash. The Afghan consul general in Dubai, Haji Rashoudin Mohammadi, said in a telephone interview that he was not aware of any such incident.

The high volume of cash passing through Kabul's airport first came to light last summer when British company Global Strategies Group, which has an airport security contract, started filing reports on the money transfers at the request of Afghanistan's National Directorate of Security, the domestic intelligence agency. The country's notoriously corrupt police force, however, complained about this arrangement, and Global stopped its reporting in September, according to someone familiar with the matter.

Afghan bankers interviewed in Kabul said that much of the money that does get declared belongs to traders who want to buy goods in Dubai but want to avoid the fees, delays and paperwork that result from conventional wire transfers.

The cash flown out of Kabul includes a wide range of foreign currencies. Most is in U.S. dollars, euros and—the bafflement of officials—Saudi Arabian riyals, a currency not widely used in Afghanistan.

Last month, a well-dressed Afghan man en route to Dubai was found carrying three briefcases stuffed with \$3 million in U.S. currency and \$2 million in Saudi currency, according to an American official who was present when the notes were counted. A few days later, the same man was back at the Kabul airport, en route to Dubai again, with about \$5 million in U.S. and Saudi bank notes.

One theory is that some of the Arab nation's cash might come from Saudi donations that were supposed to go to mosques and other projects in Afghanistan and Pakistan. But, the American official said, "we don't really know what is going on."

Efforts to figure out just how much money is leaving Afghanistan and why have been hampered by a lack of cooperation from Dubai, complained Afghan and U.S. officials, who spoke on the condition of anonymity. Dubai's financial problems, said a U.S. official, had left the emirate eager for foreign cash, and "they don't seem to care where it comes from." Dubai authorities declined to comment.

Previous to that, the Post did a story about money funneled through a Kabul bank and companies owned by the bank's founder to individual friends, family, and business connections of Hamid Karzai. When you consider the amount of corruption that is going on in Afghanistan, it can only be called, charitably, "crony capitalism." In fact, The Washington Post printed an article on February 22, entitled "In Afghanistan, Signs of Crony Capitalism," and I include this for the RECORD.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 22, 2010]

IN AFGHANISTAN, SIGNS OF CRONY CAPITALISM
(By Andrew Higgins)

KABUL.—Afghanistan's biggest private bank—founded by the Islamic nation's only world-class poker player—celebrated its fifth year in business last summer with a lottery for depositors at Paris Palace, a Kabul wedding hall.

Prizes awarded by Kabul Bank included nine apartments in the Afghan capital and cash gifts totaling more than \$1 million. The bank trumpeted the event as the biggest prize drawing of its kind in Central Asia.

Less publicly, Kabul Bank's boss has been handing out far bigger prizes to his country's U.S.-backed ruling elite: multimillion-dollar loans for the purchase of luxury villas in

Dubai by members of President Hamid Karzai's family, his government and his supporters.

The close ties between Kabul Bank and Karzai's circle reflect a defining feature of the shaky post-Taliban order in which Washington has invested more than \$40 billion and the lives of more than 900 U.S. service members: a crony capitalism that enriches politically connected insiders and dismays the Afghan populace.

"What I'm doing is not proper, not exactly what I should do. But this is Afghanistan," Kabul Bank's founder and chairman, Sher Khan Farnood, said in an interview when asked about the Dubai purchases and why, according to data from the Persian Gulf emirate's Land Department, many of the villas have been registered in his name. "These people don't want to reveal their names."

Afghan laws prohibit hidden overseas lending and require strict accounting of all transactions. But those involved in the Dubai loans, including Kabul Bank's owners, said the cozy flow of cash is not unusual or illegal in a deeply traditional system underpinned more by relationships than laws.

The curious role played by the bank and its unorthodox owners has not previously been reported and was documented by land registration data; public records; and interviews in Kabul, Dubai, Abu Dhabi and Moscow.

Many of those involved appear to have gone to considerable lengths to conceal the benefits they have received from Kabul Bank or its owners. Karzai's older brother and his former vice president, for example, both have Dubai villas registered under Farnood's name. Kabul Bank's executives said their books record no loans for these or other Dubai deals financed at least in part by Farnood, including home purchases by Karzai's cousin and the brother of Mohammed Qasim Fahim, his current first vice president and a much-feared warlord who worked closely with U.S. forces to topple the Taliban in 2001.

At a time when Washington is ramping up military pressure on the Taliban, the off-balance-sheet activities of Afghan bankers raise the risk of financial instability that could offset progress on the battlefield. Fewer than 5 percent of Afghans have bank accounts, but among those who do are many soldiers and policemen whose salaries are paid through Kabul Bank.

A U.S. official who monitors Afghan finances, who spoke on the condition of anonymity because he was not authorized to comment publicly, said banks appear to have plenty of money but noted that in a crisis, Afghan depositors "won't wait in line holding cups of latte" but would be "waving AK-47s."

Kabul Bank executives, in separate interviews, gave different accounts of what the bank is up to with Dubai home buyers. "They are borrowers. They have an account at Kabul Bank," said the bank's chairman, Farnood, a boisterous 46-year-old with a gift for math and money—and the winner of \$120,000 at the 2008 World Series of Poker Europe, held in a London casino.

The bank's chief audit officer, Raja Gopalakrishnan, however, insisted that the loan money didn't come directly from Kabul Bank. He said it was from affiliated but separate entities, notably a money-transfer agency called Shaheen Exchange, which is owned by Farnood, is run by one of Kabul Bank's 16 shareholders and operates in Kabul out of the bank's headquarters.

The audit officer said Farnood "thinks it is one big pot," but the entities are "legally definitely separate."

A NEW ECONOMY

In some ways, Kabul Bank is a symbol of how much has changed in Afghanistan since

2001, when the country had no private banks and no economy to speak of. Kabul Bank has opened more than 60 branches and recently announced that it will open 250 more, and it claims to have more than \$1 billion in deposits from more than a million Afghan customers.

Kabul Bank prospers because Afghanistan, though extremely poor, is in places awash with cash, a result of huge infusions of foreign aid, opium revenue and a legal economy that, against the odds, is growing at about 15 percent a year. The vast majority of this money flows into the hands of a tiny minority—some of it through legitimate profits, some of it through kickbacks and insider deals that bind the country's political, security and business elites.

The result is that, while anchoring a free-market order as Washington had hoped, financial institutions here sometimes serve as piggy banks for their owners and their political friends. Kabul Bank, for example, helps bankroll a money-losing airline owned by Farnood and fellow bank shareholders that flies three times a day between Kabul and Dubai.

Kabul Bank's executives helped finance President Hamid Karzai's fraud-blighted reelection campaign last year, and the bank is partly owned by Mahmoud Karzai, the Afghan president's older brother, and by Haseen Fahim, the brother of Karzai's vice presidential running mate.

Farnood, who now spends most of his time in Dubai, said he wants to do business in a "normal way" and does not receive favors as a result of his official contacts. He said that putting properties in his name means his bank's money is safe despite a slump in the Dubai property market: He can easily repossess if borrowers run short on cash.

A review of Dubai property data and interviews with current and former executives of Kabul Bank indicate that Farnood and his bank partners have at least \$150 million invested in Dubai real estate. Most of their property is on Palm Jumeirah, a man-made island in the shape of a palm tree where the cheapest house costs more than \$2 million.

Mirwais Azizi, an estranged business associate of Farnood and the founder of the rival Azizi Bank in Kabul, has also poured money into Dubai real estate, with even more uncertain results. A Dubai company he heads, Azizi Investments, has invested heavily in plots of land on Palm Jebel Ali, a stalled property development. Azizi did not respond to interview requests. His son, Farhad, said Mirwais was busy.

Responsibility for bank supervision in Afghanistan lies with the Afghan central bank, whose duties include preventing foreign property speculation. The United States has spent millions of dollars trying to shore up the central bank. But Afghan and U.S. officials say the bank, though increasingly professional, lacks political clout.

The central bank's governor, Abdul Qadir Fitrat, said his staff had "vigorously investigated" what he called "rumors" of Dubai property deals, but "unfortunately, up until now they have not found anything." Fitrat, who used to live in Washington, last month sent a team of inspectors to Kabul Bank as part of a regular review of the bank's accounts. He acknowledged that Afghan loans are "very difficult to verify" because "we don't know who owns what."

Kabul Bank's dealings with Mahmoud Karzai, the president's brother, help explain why this is so. In interviews, Karzai, who has an Afghan restaurant in Baltimore, initially said he rented a \$5.5 million Palm Jumeirah mansion, where he now lives with his family. But later he said he had an informal home-loan agreement with Kabul Bank and pays \$7,000 a month in interest.

"It is a very peculiar situation. It is hard to comprehend because this is not the usual way of doing business," said Karzai, whose home is in Farnood's name.

Karzai also said he bought a 7.4 percent stake in the bank with \$5 million he borrowed from the bank. But Gopalakrishnan, the chief audit officer, said Kabul Bank's books include no loans to the president's brother.

Also in a Palm Jumeirah villa registered in Farnood's name is the family of Ahmad Zia Massoud, Afghanistan's first vice president from 2004 until last November. The house, bought in December 2007 for \$2.3 million, was first put in the name of Massoud's wife but was later re-registered to give Farnood formal ownership, property records indicate.

Massoud, brother of the legendary anti-Soviet guerrilla leader Ahmad Shah Massoud, said that Farnood had always been the owner but let his family use it rent-free for the past two years because he is "my close friend." Massoud added: "We have played football together. We have played chess together." Farnood, however, said that though the "villa is in my name," it belongs to Massoud "in reality."

Haseen Fahim, the brother of Afghanistan's current first vice president, has been another beneficiary of Kabul Bank's largesse. He got money from Farnood to help buy a \$6 million villa in Dubai, which, unusually, is under his own name. He borrowed millions more from the bank, which he partly owns, to fund companies he owns in Afghanistan.

In an interview at Kabul Bank's headquarters, Khalilullah Fruzi, who as chief executive heads the bank's day-to-day operations, said he didn't know how much bank money has ended up in Dubai. If Karzai's relatives and others buy homes "in Dubai, or Germany or America . . . that is their own affair," Fruzi said, adding that the bank "doesn't give loans directly for Dubai."

Fruzi, a former gem trader, said Kabul Bank is in robust health, makes a profit and has about \$400 million in liquid assets deposited with the Afghan central bank and other institutions. Kabul Bank is so flush, he added, that it is building a \$30 million headquarters, a cluster of shimmering towers of bulletproof glass.

The bank is also spending millions to hire gunmen from a company called Khurasan Security Services, which, according to registration documents, used to be controlled by Fruzi and is now run by his brother.

The roots of Kabul Bank stretch back to the Soviet Union. Both Fruzi and Farnood got their education and their start in business there after Moscow invaded Afghanistan in 1979.

While in Moscow, Farnood set up a successful hawala money-transfer outfit to move funds between Russia and Kabul. Russian court documents show that 10 of Farnood's employees were arrested in 1998 and later convicted of illegal banking activity. Fearful of arrest in Russia and also in Taliban-ruled Afghanistan, Farnood shifted his focus to Dubai.

In 2004, three years after the fall of the Taliban regime, he got a license to open Kabul Bank. His Dubai-registered hawala, Shaheen Exchange, moved in upstairs and started moving cash for bank clients. It last year shifted \$250 million to \$300 million to Dubai, said the chief audit officer.

The bank began to take in new, politically connected shareholders, among them the president's brother, Mahmoud, and Fahim, brother of the vice president, who registered his stake in the name of his teenage son.

Fahim said two of his companies have borrowed \$70 million from Kabul Bank. Insider borrowing, he said, is unavoidable and even

desirable in Afghanistan because, in the absence of a solid legal system, business revolves around trust, not formal contracts. "Afghanistan is not America or Europe. Afghanistan is starting from zero," he said.

Fahim's business has boomed, thanks largely to subcontracting work on foreign-funded projects, including a new U.S. Embassy annex and various buildings at CIA sites across the country, among them a remote base in Khost where seven Americans were killed in a December suicide attack by a Jordanian jihadiist. "I have good opportunities to get profit," Fahim said.

"LIKE WILD HORSES"

Kabul Bank also plunged into the airline business, providing loans to Pamir Airways, an Afghan carrier now owned by Farnood, Fruzi and Fahim. Pamir spent \$46 million on four used Boeing 737-400s and hired Hashim Karzai, the president's cousin, formerly of Silver Spring, as a "senior adviser."

Farnood said he also provided a "little bit" of money to help Hashim Karzai buy a house on Palm Jumeirah in Dubai. Karzai, in brief telephone interviews, said that the property was an investment and that he had borrowed some money from Farnood. He said he couldn't recall details and would "have to check with my accountant."

Noor Delawari, governor of the central bank during Kabul Bank's rise, said Farnood and his lieutenants "were like wild horses" and "never paid attention to the rules and regulations." Delawari said he didn't know about any property deals by Kabul Bank in Dubai. He said that he, too, bought a home in the emirate, for about \$200,000.

Fitrat, the current central bank governor, has tried to take a tougher line against Kabul Bank and its rivals, with little luck. Before last year's presidential election, the central bank sent a stern letter to bankers, complaining that they squander too much money on "security guards and bulletproof vehicles" and "expend large-scale monetary assistance to politicians." The letter ordered them to remain "politically neutral."

Kabul Bank did the opposite: Fruzi, its chief executive, joined Karzai's campaign in Kabul while Farnood, its poker-playing chairman, organized fundraising events for Karzai in Dubai. One of these was held at the Palm Jumeirah house of Karzai's brother.

The government has returned the favor. The ministries of defense, interior and education now pay many soldiers, police and teachers through Kabul Bank. This means that tens of millions of dollars' worth of public money sloshes through the bank, an unusual arrangement, as governments generally don't pump so much through a single private bank.

Soon after his November inauguration for a second term, President Karzai spoke at an anti-corruption conference in Kabul, criticizing officials who "after one or two years work for the government get rich and buy houses in Dubai." Last month, he flew to London for a conference on Afghanistan, attended by Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton and other leaders, and again promised an end to the murky deals that have so tarnished his rule.

Also in London for the conference were Farnood, who now has an Afghan diplomatic passport, and Fruzi, who served as a financial adviser to Karzai's reelection campaign and also owns a house in Dubai. "If there is no Kabul Bank, there will be no Karzai, no government," Fruzi said.

As a result, U.S. taxpayers and aid organizations are investing billions of dollars in Afghanistan, but the leaders of the country are investing in real estate in Dubai. We care about democ-

racy. Try building democracy in a place which is rife with narcotraffic, crony capitalism, and villas in Dubai. What is this about? Why are we there? I mean, I am from Cleveland, Ohio. The people I represent are very basic people. When you tell them that the head of Afghanistan has his hands in all of these crooked deals, you start to wonder, We are going to build a democracy on this person's shoulders? I don't think so.

We are supporting a government where corruption is epidemic. Last year, USAID reported that corruption in Afghanistan is significant, a growing problem, and that pervasive, systemic corruption was at an unprecedented scope in the country's history. On November 17, Transparency International ranked Afghanistan as the second most corrupt nation in the world. And to compound the fears, in President Karzai's fraud-filled election late last year, he recently took over the country's election watchdog group. Is this the kind of person that we can trust to have a partnership with for democracy? I don't think so.

A January 2010 report by the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime reveals that Afghan citizens were forced to pay an estimated \$2.5 billion a year in bribes. According to evidence collected through wiretaps and bank records, a senior border police official in Kandahar allegedly collected salaries of hundreds of ghost policemen and stole money from a government fund intended to pay orphans and widows. Is this the kind of environment where we can build a democracy?

Our troops in Afghanistan have to deal with corrupt officials on a daily basis. A commander of the Afghan border police offered to give the U.S. military prime land at a crossing with Pakistan to build a waiting area for supply vehicles needed for President Obama's troop increase. The same man, U.S. officials believe, earns tens of millions of dollars a year trafficking opium and extorting cargo truck drivers. Is this the kind of person that we can create movement toward a democracy with?

[From the Nation, Nov. 30, 2009]

HOW THE U.S. FUNDS THE TALIBAN

(By Aram Roston)

On October 29, 2001, while the Taliban's rule over Afghanistan was under assault, the regime's ambassador in Islamabad gave a chaotic press conference in front of several dozen reporters sitting on the grass. On the Taliban diplomat's right sat his interpreter, Ahmad Rateb Popal, a man with an imposing presence. Like the ambassador, Popal wore a black turban, and he had a huge bushy beard. He had a black patch over his right eye socket, a prosthetic left arm and a deformed right hand, the result of injuries from an explosives mishap during an old operation against the Soviets in Kabul.

But Popal was more than just a former mujahedeen. In 1988, a year before the Soviets fled Afghanistan, Popal had been charged in the United States with conspiring to import more than a kilo of heroin. Court records show he was released from prison in 1997.

Flash forward to 2009, and Afghanistan is ruled by Popal's cousin President Hamid Karzai. Popal has cut his huge beard down to a neatly trimmed one and has become an immensely wealthy businessman, along with his brother Rashid Popal, who in a separate case pleaded guilty to a heroin charge in 1996 in Brooklyn. The Popal brothers control the huge Watan Group in Afghanistan, a consortium engaged in telecommunications, logistics and, most important, security. Watan Risk Management, the Popals' private military arm, is one of the few dozen private security companies in Afghanistan. One of Watan's enterprises, key to the war effort, is protecting convoys of Afghan trucks heading from Kabul to Kandahar, carrying American supplies.

Welcome to the wartime contracting bazaar in Afghanistan. It is a virtual carnival of improbable characters and shady connections, with former CIA officials and ex-military officers joining hands with former Taliban and mujahedeen to collect U.S. government funds in the name of the war effort.

In this grotesque carnival, the U.S. military's contractors are forced to pay suspected insurgents to protect American supply routes. It is an accepted fact of the military logistics operation in Afghanistan that the US government funds the very forces American troops are fighting. And it is a deadly irony, because these funds add up to a huge amount of money for the Taliban. "It's a big part of their income," one of the top Afghan government security officials told The Nation in an interview. In fact, US military officials in Kabul estimate that a minimum of 10 percent of the Pentagon's logistics contracts—hundreds of millions of dollars—consists of payments to insurgents.

Understanding how this situation came to pass requires untangling two threads. The first is the insider dealing that determines who wins and who loses in Afghan business, and the second is the troubling mechanism by which "private security" ensures that the US supply convoys traveling these ancient trade routes aren't ambushed by insurgents.

A good place to pick up the first thread is with a small firm awarded a US military logistics contract worth hundreds of millions of dollars: NCL Holdings. Like the Popals' Watan Risk, NCL is a licensed security company in Afghanistan.

What NCL Holdings is most notorious for in Kabul contracting circles, though, is the identity of its chief principal, Hamed Wardak. He is the young American son of Afghanistan's current defense minister, Gen. Abdul Rahim Wardak, who was a leader of the mujahedeen against the Soviets. Hamed Wardak has plunged into business as well as policy. He was raised and schooled in the United States, graduating as valedictorian from Georgetown University in 1997. He earned a Rhodes scholarship and interned at the neoconservative think tank the American Enterprise Institute. That internship was to play an important role in his life, for it was at AEI that he forged alliances with some of the premier figures in American conservative foreign policy circles, such as the late Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick.

Wardak incorporated NCL in the United States early in 2007, although the firm may have operated in Afghanistan before then. It made sense to set up shop in Washington, because of Wardak's connections there. On NCL's advisory board, for example, is Milton Bearden, a well-known former CIA officer. Bearden is an important voice on Afghanistan issues; in October he was a witness before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, where Senator John Kerry, the chair, introduced him as "a legendary former CIA case officer and a clearheaded thinker and writer." It is not every defense contracting

company that has such an influential adviser.

But the biggest deal that NCL got—the contract that brought it into Afghanistan's major leagues—was Host Nation Trucking. Earlier this year the firm, with no apparent trucking experience, was named one of the six companies that would handle the bulk of US trucking in Afghanistan, bringing supplies to the web of bases and remote outposts scattered across the country.

At first the contract was large but not gargantuan. And then that suddenly changed, like an immense garden coming into bloom. Over the summer, citing the coming "surge" and a new doctrine, "Money as a Weapons System," the U.S. military expanded the contract 600 percent for NCL and the five other companies. The contract documentation warns of dire consequences if more is not spent: "service members will not get food, water, equipment, and ammunition they require." Each of the military's six trucking contracts was bumped up to \$360 million, or a total of nearly \$2.2 billion. Put it in this perspective: this single two-year effort to hire Afghan trucks and truckers was worth 10 percent of the annual Afghan gross domestic product. NCL, the firm run by the defense minister's well-connected son, had struck pure contracting gold.

Host Nation Trucking does indeed keep the US military efforts alive in Afghanistan. "We supply everything the army needs to survive here," one American trucking executive told me. "We bring them their toilet paper, their water, their fuel, their guns, their vehicles." The epicenter is Bagram Air Base, just an hour north of Kabul, from which virtually everything in Afghanistan is trucked to the outer reaches of what the Army calls "the Battlespace"—that is, the entire country. Parked near Entry Control Point 3, the trucks line up, shifting gears and sending up clouds of dust as they prepare for their various missions across the country.

The real secret to trucking in Afghanistan is ensuring security on the perilous roads, controlled by warlords, tribal militias, insurgents and Taliban commanders. The American executive I talked to was fairly specific about it: "The Army is basically paying the Taliban not to shoot at them. It is Department of Defense money." That is something everyone seems to agree on.

Mike Hanna is the project manager for a trucking company called Afghan American Army Services. The company, which still operates in Afghanistan, had been trucking for the United States for years but lost out in the Host Nation Trucking contract that NCL won. Hanna explained the security realities quite simply: "You are paying the people in the local areas—some are warlords, some are politicians in the police force—to move your trucks through."

Hanna explained that the prices charged are different, depending on the route: "We're basically being extorted. Where you don't pay, you're going to get attacked. We just have our field guys go down there, and they pay off who they need to." Sometimes, he says, the extortion fee is high, and sometimes it is low. "Moving ten trucks, it is probably \$800 per truck to move through an area. It's based on the number of trucks and what you're carrying. If you have fuel trucks, they are going to charge you more. If you have dry trucks, they're not going to charge you as much. If you are carrying MRAPs or Humvees, they are going to charge you more."

Hanna says it is just a necessary evil. "If you tell me not to pay these insurgents in this area, the chances of my trucks getting attacked increase exponentially."

Whereas in Iraq the private security industry has been dominated by US and global

firms like Blackwater, operating as de facto arms of the US government, in Afghanistan there are lots of local players as well. As a result, the industry in Kabul is far more dog-eat-dog. "Every warlord has his security company," is the way one executive explained it to me.

In theory, private security companies in Kabul are heavily regulated, although the reality is different. Thirty-nine companies had licenses until September, when another dozen were granted licenses. Many licensed companies are politically connected: just as NCL is owned by the son of the defense minister and Watan Risk Management is run by President Karzai's cousins, the Asia Security Group is controlled by Hashmat Karzai, another relative of the president. The company has blocked off an entire street in the expensive Sherpur District. Another security firm is controlled by the parliamentary speaker's son, sources say. And so on.

In the same way, the Afghan trucking industry, key to logistics operations, is often tied to important figures and tribal leaders. One major hauler in Afghanistan, Afghan International Trucking (AIT), paid \$20,000 a month in kickbacks to a US Army contracting official, according to the official's plea agreement in US court in August. AIT is a very well-connected firm: it is run by the 25-year-old nephew of Gen. Baba Jan, a former Northern Alliance commander and later a Kabul police chief. In an interview, Baba Jan, a cheerful and charismatic leader, insisted he had nothing to do with his nephew's corporate enterprise.

But the heart of the matter is that insurgents are getting paid for safe passage because there are few other ways to bring goods to the combat outposts and forward operating bases where soldiers need them. By definition, many outposts are situated in hostile terrain, in the southern parts of Afghanistan. The security firms don't really protect convoys of American military goods here, because they simply can't; they need the Taliban's cooperation.

One of the big problems for the companies that ship American military supplies across the country is that they are banned from arming themselves with any weapon heavier than a rifle. That makes them ineffective for battling Taliban attacks on a convoy. "They are shooting the drivers from 3,000 feet away with PKMs," a trucking company executive in Kabul told me. "They are using RPGs [rocket-propelled grenades] that will blow up an up-armed vehicle. So the security companies are tied up. Because of the rules, security companies can only carry AK-47s, and that's just a joke. I carry an AK—and that's just to shoot myself if I have to!"

The rules are there for a good reason: to guard against devastating collateral damage by private security forces. Still, as Hanna of Afghan American Army Services points out, "An AK-47 versus a rocket-propelled grenade—you are going to lose!" That said, at least one of the Host Nation Trucking companies has tried to do battle instead of paying off insurgents and warlords. It is a US-owned firm called Four Horsemen International. Instead of providing payments, it has tried to fight off attackers. And it has paid the price in lives, with horrendous casualties. FHI, like many other firms, refused to talk publicly; but I've been told by insiders in the security industry that FHI's convoys are attacked on virtually every mission.

For the most part, the security firms do as they must to survive. A veteran American manager in Afghanistan who has worked there as both a soldier and a private security contractor in the field told me, "What we are doing is paying warlords associated with the Taliban, because none of our security elements is able to deal with the threat." He's

an Army veteran with years of Special Forces experience, and he's not happy about what's being done. He says that at a minimum American military forces should try to learn more about who is getting paid off.

"Most escorting is done by the Taliban," an Afghan private security official told me. He's a Pashto and former mujahedeen commander who has his finger on the pulse of the military situation and the security industry. And he works with one of the trucking companies carrying US supplies. "Now the government is so weak," he added, "everyone is paying the Taliban."

To Afghan trucking officials, this is barely even something to worry about. One woman I met was an extraordinary entrepreneur who had built up a trucking business in this male-dominated field. She told me the security company she had hired dealt directly with Taliban leaders in the south. Paying the Taliban leaders meant they would send along an escort to ensure that no other insurgents would attack. In fact, she said, they just needed two armed Taliban vehicles. "Two Taliban is enough," she told me. "One in the front and one in the back." She shrugged. "You cannot work otherwise. Otherwise it is not possible."

Which leads us back to the case of Watan Risk, the firm run by Ahmad Rateb Popal and Rashid Popal, the Karzai family relatives and former drug dealers. Watan is known to control one key stretch of road that all the truckers use: the strategic route to Kandahar called Highway 1. Think of it as the road to the war—to the south and to the west. If the Army wants to get supplies down to Helmand, for example, the trucks must make their way through Kandahar.

Watan Risk, according to seven different security and trucking company officials, is the sole provider of security along this route. The reason is simple: Watan is allied with the local warlord who controls the road. Watan's company website is quite impressive, and claims its personnel "are diligently screened to weed out all ex-militia members, supporters of the Taliban, or individuals with loyalty to warlords, drug barons, or any other group opposed to international support of the democratic process." Whatever screening methods it uses, Watan's secret weapon to protect American supplies heading through Kandahar is a man named Commander Ruhullah. Said to be a handsome man in his 40s, Ruhullah has an oddly high-pitched voice. He wears traditional salwar kameez and a Rolex watch. He rarely, if ever, associates with Westerners. He commands a large group of irregular fighters with no known government affiliation, and his name, security officials tell me, inspires obedience or fear in villages along the road.

It is a dangerous business, of course: until last spring Ruhullah had competition—a one-legged warlord named Commander Abdul Khaliq. He was killed in an ambush.

So Ruhullah is the surviving road warrior for that stretch of highway. According to witnesses, he works like this: he waits until there are hundreds of trucks ready to convoy south down the highway. Then he gets his men together, setting them up in 4x4s and pickups. Witnesses say he does not limit his arsenal to AK-47s but uses any weapons he can get. His chief weapon is his reputation. And for that, Watan is paid royally, collecting a fee for each truck that passes through his corridor. The American trucking official told me that Ruhullah "charges \$1,500 per truck to go to Kandahar. Just 300 kilometers."

It's hard to pinpoint what this is, exactly—security, extortion or a form of "insurance." Then there is the question, Does Ruhullah have ties to the Taliban? That's impossible to know. As an American private security

veteran familiar with the route said, "He works both sides . . . whatever is most profitable. He's the main commander. He's got to be involved with the Taliban. How much, no one knows."

Even NCL, the company owned by Hamed Wardak, pays. Two sources with direct knowledge tell me that NCL sends its portion of US logistics goods in Watan's and Ruhullah's convoys. Sources say NCL is billed \$500,000 per month for Watan's services. To underline the point: NCL, operating on a \$360 million contract from the US military, and owned by the Afghan defense minister's son, is paying millions per year from those funds to a company owned by President Karzai's cousins, for protection.

Hamed Wardak wouldn't return my phone calls. Milt Bearden, the former CIA officer affiliated with the company, wouldn't speak with me either. There's nothing wrong with Bearden engaging in business in Afghanistan, but disclosure of his business interests might have been expected when testifying on US policy in Afghanistan and Pakistan. After all, NCL stands to make or lose hundreds of millions based on the whims of US policy-makers.

It is certainly worth asking why NCL, a company with no known trucking experience, and little security experience to speak of, would win a contract worth \$360 million. Plenty of Afghan insiders are asking questions. "Why would the US government give him a contract if he is the son of the minister of defense?" That's what Mahmoud Karzai asked me. He is the brother of President Karzai, and he himself has been treated in the press as a poster boy for access to government officials. The New York Times even profiled him in a highly critical piece. In his defense, Karzai emphasized that he, at least, has refrained from US government or Afghan government contracting. He pointed out, as others have, that Hamed Wardak had little security or trucking background before his company received security and trucking contracts from the Defense Department. "That's a questionable business practice," he said. "They shouldn't give it to him. How come that's not questioned?"

I did get the opportunity to ask General Wardak, Hamed's father, about it. He is quite dapper, although he is no longer the debonair "Gucci commander" Bearden once described. I asked Wardak about his son and NCL. "I've tried to be straightforward and correct and fight corruption all my life," the defense minister said. "This has been something people have tried to use against me, so it has been painful."

Wardak would speak only briefly about NCL. The issue seems to have produced a rift with his son. "I was against it from the beginning, and that's why we have not talked for a long time. I have never tried to support him or to use my power or influence that he should benefit."

When I told Wardak that his son's company had a US contract worth as much as \$360 million, he did a double take. "This is impossible," he said. "I do not believe this."

I believed the general when he said he really didn't know what his son was up to. But cleaning up what look like insider deals may be easier than the next step: shutting down the money pipeline going from DoD contracts to potential insurgents.

Two years ago, a top Afghan security official told me, Afghanistan's intelligence service, the National Directorate of Security, had alerted the American military to the problem. The NDS delivered what I'm told are "very detailed" reports to the Americans explaining how the Taliban are profiting from protecting convoys of US supplies.

The Afghan intelligence service even offered a solution: what if the United States

were to take the tens of millions paid to security contractors and instead set up a dedicated and professional convoy support unit to guard its logistics lines? The suggestion went nowhere.

The bizarre fact is that the practice of buying the Taliban's protection is not a secret. I asked Col. David Haight, who commands the Third Brigade of the Tenth Mountain Division, about it. After all, part of Highway 1 runs through his area of operations. What did he think about security companies paying off insurgents? "The American soldier in me is repulsed by it," he said in an interview in his office at FOB Shank in Logar Province. "But I know that it is what it is: essentially paying the enemy, saying, 'Hey, don't hassle me.' I don't like it, but it is what it is."

As a military official in Kabul explained contracting in Afghanistan overall, "We understand that across the board 10 percent to 20 percent goes to the insurgents. My intel guy would say it is closer to 10 percent. Generally it is happening in logistics."

In a statement to The Nation about Host Nation Trucking, Col. Wayne Shanks, the chief public affairs officer for the international forces in Afghanistan, said that military officials are "aware of allegations that procurement funds may find their way into the hands of insurgent groups, but we do not directly support or condone this activity, if it is occurring." He added that, despite oversight, "the relationships between contractors and their subcontractors, as well as between subcontractors and others in their operational communities, are not entirely transparent."

In any case, the main issue is not that the US military is turning a blind eye to the problem. Many officials acknowledge what is going on while also expressing a deep disquiet about the situation. The trouble is that—as with so much in Afghanistan—the United States doesn't seem to know how to fix it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING), a member of the Agriculture and Small Business Committees and the ranking member on the Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration, Citizenship, Refugees, Border Security, and International Law.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida for yielding to me.

I rise in opposition to H. Con. Res. 248. It is not with disrespect for my colleague from Ohio, and I am confident that the gentleman from Ohio is aware of that, but I read the resolution, and to me it reads as a retreat resolution. I think about the times that America has been characterized as retreating. As I look back through the history that I have lived through and the history that I have studied, I think of a little book I have in my office that I wish I would have brought over here. It is the book, "How We Won the War," by General Giap of Vietnam, North Vietnam at the time. And I ran across that book randomly, and I began to read through that, and what would be going through the mind of a Vietnamese general.

First, I would make the point that we didn't lose the war tactically in Vietnam; it was lost here in the United

States, and a lot of it exactly on the floor of this Congress and in debates that began and flowed through similar to these debates that we have today.

As I read that, it is on page 8, it is not worth reading the book, it says that they got the inspiration because the United States had negotiated an agreement with Korea. Where did they get their inspiration to win the war against us in Vietnam? They saw that we didn't fight the Korean war through to a final victory but negotiated a settlement. And then I would fast-forward to June 11, 2004, where I was sitting waiting to go into Iraq the next day, and on the screen of Al Jazeera TV came Muqtada al-Sadr speaking in Arabic with English closed caption. He said, If we continue to attack Americans, they will leave Iraq the same way they left Vietnam, the same way they left Lebanon, the same way they left Mogadishu. That is the inspiration not just for our enemies of al Qaeda in Iraq and in Afghanistan and around the world, it is the inspiration for all of our enemies around the world, and it was the inspiration for Osama bin Laden when he ordered the attack on the United States on September 11.

We cannot lose our will. When we engage in an operation, we have to push it through to success. In fact, that legacy of Lebanon, Vietnam, and Mogadishu has been put to rest by a victory in Iraq, a victory that would not have been achieved if the people who brought these debates to the floor 44 times in the 110th Congress, resolutions that were designed to unfund, underfund, or undermine our troops, we fought off all of those resolutions. Now we have a victory in Iraq that is being claimed by this administration who opposed it back then.

I don't trust the judgment of people who have always been against armed conflict. I trust the judgment of the people who fight and win wars and the people who lead us through those wars that we fight and win.

This is an American destiny question that is before us. If we walk away from this conflict in Afghanistan for any reason, America's destiny will forever be diminished, and they will never take us seriously again.

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, I rise today for this opportunity to speak as an original cosponsor of this bill on what I believe is the foremost foreign policy issue facing the United States today. There is perhaps no more important matter on the table right now than Afghanistan, not least because every dollar we spend abroad for war is a dollar of investment lost to all of our communities here at home.

We have spent more than \$250 billion fighting and occupying Afghanistan. President Obama is now implementing his plan to send an additional 30,000 troops to Afghanistan, which will cost another \$33 billion. This is an enor-

mous amount of money, and the security gains are dubious when there are more al Qaeda in other parts of the globe.

So long as the United States has a major military presence in Afghanistan, long-term stability will continue to be a goal just out of our reach. More troops are not the answer.

We need to turn the corner. We must rebuild. We must build a governing capacity among the Afghans, not military fighting capacity. As long as Afghanistan is able to depend exclusively on the United States for stability, the longer they will continue to do so. The quicker we prepare for transfer authority to the Afghans, the sooner we will be able to leave the country.

Over a year ago, President Obama announced his strategy to disrupt, dismantle, and defeat al Qaeda in its safe havens of Afghanistan and Pakistan. I made clear that I would not rubber-stamp his strategy for more troops. The only way we can solve this mess is to put in place a regional strategy with international buy-in. That strategy must include a strong civilian component capable of achieving diplomatic and development objectives, as well as security goals.

I was distressed to read several months ago that Special Envoy Richard Holbrooke acknowledged that we had built almost no capacity in the Afghan authorities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield the gentleman another 30 seconds.

Mr. FARR. We sent our troops to war in Afghanistan, but after more than 8 years of war, we are only now actively trying to support peace. For years, I have worked to develop a Civilian Response Corps that can bring the whole of government approach to winning the peace.

We have proven time and time again that we can kick down doors, but we have not yet proven that we can build peace. We are finally standing up the Civilian Response Corps, and we are finally developing the capacity so that war without end is not our only option.

In the recent operation in Marjah, the military aspect of the operation started in February 12, and by February 25 the Afghan flag was raised. This week, Afghan President Karzai, together with General Stanley McChrystal, visited Marjah. They met with elders who told President Karzai they wanted Afghan troops, not international forces, in their town. They expressed frustration at the government's lack of ability to provide services. It is those public services—provided by a civilian corps supported by Afghan security—that will win the peace.

The long-term solution in Afghanistan will be a civilian solution, and the sooner we move to this next phase the better. For this reason, I believe a vote for success in Afghanistan is a vote for this resolution to remove our military troops by year's end.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the major-

ity leader, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution, which would urge the withdrawal of American troops from Afghanistan, in my opinion, at great cost to America's security and, indeed, the Afghan people. But I want to rise as well to thank my friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH), with whom I work closely. This issue needs to be debated. This issue needs to be raised. The American people have a right to have us debate this issue.

□ 1715

Their young men and young women are in harm's way. They are in harm's way at our insistence, or at least at our sufferance. So it is right to have this debate. And while I disagree with the gentleman from Ohio, I appreciate the fact that he provides this opportunity to discuss this very, very important issue.

Madam Speaker, after years in which Afghanistan was a secondary concern, in my view, President Obama has set our policy on a new course which is already showing significant results. I believe that this is not the time to change that policy.

There is vast agreement that an indefinite presence in Afghanistan or Iraq is unacceptable. In Iraq we have reached the transition point of handing over responsibility to the central Government to take care of its own people. We see positive signs, such as the recent Iraq election in which 62 percent of the voters turned out in the face of terrorist violence. Was it perfect? It was not. Are there concerns yet about who could run and who could not? There are, appropriate concerns. But nevertheless, we see progress.

Given the increasing stability of the Iraq Government, President Obama is proceeding with responsible troop withdrawals. Today, 96,000 American troops remain, down from 140,000 troops, and calculated and careful drawdowns continue. All American combat troops are set to leave Iraq by the end of August.

At the same time, the President conducted a comprehensive reevaluation of our Afghanistan policy, one in which all viewpoints were heard. Some thought it took too long; some of us believed it was a careful, thoughtful, and correct attention to an important decision.

The Obama administration came to the conclusion that a failed Afghanistan was the launching pad for terrorist attacks that killed thousands of Americans as well as a source of regional instability, and that a newly failed Afghan state could pose the same danger again. That is why we, in a bipartisan way, authorized troops to go to Afghanistan about a decade ago. That is why the President committed to a strategy of troop increases, not as an open-ended commitment, but as part of a limited strategy of counterinsurgency with withdrawals set to begin in the summer of 2011.

This is not a war we fight alone. Our allies understand that the threat of terrorism affects us all and have pitched in accordingly. Since the President's December 1 speech announcing his new policy, we have seen a sharp increase in international cooperation with our allies, pledging approximately 10,000 additional troops and more military trainees.

Our new Afghan strategy has already seen real success in Afghanistan and in Pakistan, which demonstrates that this resolution is especially ill-timed. Among the highlights of that success have been the capture of Mullah Baradar, the second-highest ranking member of the Taliban and most significant Taliban capture since the beginning of the war, and Mullah Abdul Kabir, a senior Taliban leader. Both were captured in Pakistan, which illustrates increased cooperation from the Pakistan Government, thanks in large part to the administration's careful diplomacy.

As The Washington Post put it on February 23, "Pakistani security forces have long supported or turned a blind eye to Afghan Taliban members seeking sanctuary in Pakistan. The recent arrests seem to mark a change in that attitude." Clearly, success in Afghanistan will be posited on the success of those in Pakistan to act against sanctuaries. At the same time, the leadership of al Qaeda and Taliban has been severely damaged through strikes in Pakistan. And the new counterinsurgency strategy has been put to work in Marjah, an important district in Helmand province, where American, coalition, and Afghan troops have worked and fought successfully together to strengthen the central Government against Taliban fighters.

Let me say, the gentleman has made some comments about the Afghan central Government. All of us share the gentleman's concerns about the central Government. These are concerns that are properly raised and need to be addressed. However, there is no doubt that years of war against the Taliban and terrorists have imposed a heavy cost on the Afghan people. Despite those heavy costs, the Afghan people support the coalition's continued presence in their country, perhaps because they know that reprisals from an unchecked Taliban would be fierce and unforgiving. In fact, our failure to follow through when the Soviets withdrew resulted, very frankly, in the Taliban's presence.

According to a recent poll conducted by the BBC, ABC, and German television, 68 percent of Afghans want American troops to stay in their country and 56 percent of Afghans believe their country is headed in the right direction, compared to just 30 percent last spring. Just since last spring, we have seen almost a doubling of the view that Afghanistan is heading in the right direction on behalf of Afghan citizens.

Madam Speaker, there is no question that our strategy in Afghanistan and

Pakistan has suffered from neglect, poor planning, and minimal diplomacy, but passing this resolution would show that we've learned the wrong lessons from those years of relative neglect. Abandoning Afghanistan just when a new strategy and new leadership has begun to bear fruit I think would be a mistake. And although I appreciate the gentleman's leadership and incisive analysis, which bears listening to, on this issue we disagree.

I would urge, therefore, my colleagues to vote "no" on the resolution before us.

Mr. KUCINICH. I want to thank our majority leader for his participation and also for his cooperation in ensuring that this debate could happen. You and our Speaker and Mr. BERMAN are appreciated for your willingness to provide for this moment to happen so that the House could be heard from, so thank you.

I would ask, Madam Speaker, how much time remains in the debate? I am sure we're winding down here.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio has 13½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 9 minutes remaining. And the gentlewoman from Florida has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield myself 3 minutes.

One of the areas of concern that I have about our presence in Afghanistan that I haven't seen discussed that much deals with the role of oil and gas, particularly in Afghanistan. Paul Craig Roberts, who was an Assistant Secretary of Treasury under the Reagan administration, reported in November of last year on a former British ambassador to Uzbekistan, Craig Murray, who was fired from his job when he spoke out about documents he saw "proving that the motivation for U.S. and U.K. military aggression in Afghanistan had something to do with the natural gas deposits in Uzbekistan and Turkmenistan." He continues, and these are his words, "The Americans wanted a pipeline that bypassed Russia and Iran and went through Afghanistan. To ensure this, an invasion was necessary."

I did some additional research on that and I found an article by Craig Murray where he claims that Mr. Karzai "was put in place because of his role with Unocal in developing the Trans-Afghanistan Gas Pipeline project. That remains a chief strategic goal. The Asian Development Bank has agreed finance to start construction in spring, 2011. It is, of course, a total coincidence that 30,000 extra U.S. troops will arrive 6 months before, and that the U.S. (as opposed to other NATO forces) deployment area corresponds with the pipeline route."

I have a map of the pipeline. It's probably not easily visible, but it starts on the west in Turkmenistan, goes through Afghanistan, south to Pakistan and India, and it touches near both Helmand and Kandahar province,

which is exactly where our troop buildup is occurring. I will put this article by Mr. Murray into the RECORD.

OBAMA IS WRONG ON BOTH COUNTS

(By Craig Murray)

Obama loves his rhetoric, and his speech on the Afghan surge was topped by a rhetorical flourish:

"Our cause is just, our resolve unshaken". He is of course wrong on both counts.

The occupation of Afghanistan by the US and its allies is there to prop up the government of President Karzai. Karzai's has always been an ultra-corrupt government of vicious warlords and drugs barons. I have been pointing this out for years, http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-469983/Britain-protecting-biggest-heroin-crop-time.html#ixzz0VS78HVR1

The CIA is up to its usual tricks again supporting the drug running of key warlords loyal to them. They are also setting up death squads on the Central American model, in cooperation with Blackwater.

Fortunately Karzai's rigging of his re-election was so blatant that the scales have fallen from the eyes of the public and even the mainstream media. Politicians no longer pretend we are promoting democracy in Afghanistan.

Karzai comes directly from the Bush camp and was put in place because of his role with Unocal in developing the Trans Afghanistan Gas Pipeline project. That remains a chief strategic goal. The Asian Development Bank has agreed finance to start construction in Spring 2011. It is of course a total coincidence that 30,000 extra US troops will arrive six months before, and that the US (as opposed to other NATO forces) deployment area corresponds with the pipeline route.

Obama's claim that "Our cause is just" ultimately rests on the extraordinary claim that, eight years after the invasion, we are still there in self-defence. In both the UK and US, governments are relying on the mantra that the occupation of Afghanistan protects us from terrorism at home.

This is utter nonsense. The large majority of post 9/11 terror incidents have been by Western Muslims outraged by our invasion of Afghanistan and Iraq. Put bluntly, if we keep invading Muslim countries, of course we will face a violent backlash. The idea that because we occupy Afghanistan a Muslim from Dewsbury or Detroit disenchanted with the West would not be able to manufacture a bomb is patent nonsense. It would be an infinitely better strategy to make out theoretical Muslim less disenchanted by not attacking and killing huge numbers of his civilian co-religionists.

Our cause is unjust.

We are responsible for the deaths of tens of thousands of civilians in Afghanistan and Pakistan, and for the further of radicalisation of Muslim communities worldwide. That threatens a perpetual war—which is of course just what the military-industrial complex and the security industry want. They have captured Obama.

Fortunately, our resolve is shaken.

The ordinary people of the UK and US have begun in sufficient numbers to see through this perpetual war confidence trick; they realise there is nothing in it for them but dead youngsters and high taxes. That is why Obama made a very vague promise—which I believe in its vagueness and caveats to be deliberate deceit—that troops will start to leave in 2011.

Today's promises of 5,000 additional NATO troops are, incidentally, empty rhetoric. I gather from friends in the FCO that firm pledges to date amount to 670.

A well-placed source close to the Taliban in Pakistan tells me that the Afghan Taliban

and their tribal allies have a plan. As the US seeks massively to expand the Afghan forces, they are feeding in large numbers of volunteers. I suspect that while we may see the odd attack on their trainers, the vast majority will get trained, fed, paid and equipped and bide their time before turning en masse. This is nothing new; it is precisely the history of foreign occupations in the region and the purchase of tribal auxiliaries and alliances.

I will also have this article called "Unocal and the Afghanistan Pipeline" submitted in the RECORD because he talks about how "Unocal was not interested in a partnership. The U.S. Government, its affiliated transnational oil and construction companies, and the ruling elite of the West had coveted the same oil and gas transit route for years.

"A trans-Afghanistan pipeline was not simply a business matter, but a key component of a broader geostrategic agenda: total military and economic control of Eurasia." This is supposedly described in Zbigniew Brzezinski's book, "The Grand Chessboard: American Primacy and Its Geostrategic Imperatives" as "the center of world power."

"Capturing the region's oil wealth and carving out territory in order to build a network of transit routes was a primary objective of U.S. military interventions throughout the 1990s in the Balkans, the Caucasus, and Caspian Sea."

[From Centre for Research on Globalisation, March 2002]

UNOCAL AND THE AFGHANISTAN PIPELINE

(By Larry Chin)

CRG's Global Outlook, premiere issue on "Stop the War" provides detailed documentation on the war and the "Post-September 11 Crisis." Order/subscribe. Consult Table of Contents

PART ONE OF A TWO-PART SERIES PLAYERS ON A RIGGED GRAND CHESSBOARD: BRIDAS,

After the fall of the Soviet Union, Argentine oil company Bidas, led by its ambitious chairman, Carlos Bulgheroni, became the first company to exploit the oil fields of Turkmenistan and propose a pipeline through neighboring Afghanistan. A powerful US-backed consortium intent on building its own pipeline through the same Afghan corridor would oppose Bidas' project.

THE COVETED TRANS-AFGHAN ROUTE

Upon successfully negotiating leases to explore in Turkmenistan, Bidas was awarded exploration contracts for the Keimar block near the Caspian Sea, and the Yashlar block near the Afghanistan border. By March 1995, Bulgheroni had accords with Turkmenistan and Pakistan granting Bidas construction rights for a pipeline into Afghanistan, pending negotiations with the civil war-torn country.

The following year, after extensive meetings with warlords throughout Afghanistan, Bidas had a 30-year agreement with the Rabbani regime to build and operate an 875-mile gas pipeline across Afghanistan.

Bulgheroni believed that his pipeline would promote peace as well as material wealth in the region. He approached other companies, including Unocal and its then-CEO, Roger Beach, to join an international consortium.

Unocal was not interested in a partnership. The United States government, its affiliated

transnational oil and construction companies, and the ruling elite of the West had coveted the same oil and gas transit route for years.

A trans-Afghanistan pipeline was not simply a business matter, but a key component of a broader geo-strategic agenda: total military and economic control of Eurasia (the Middle East and former Soviet Central Asian republics). Zbigniew Brzezinski describes this region in his book "The Grand Chessboard—American Primacy and Its Geostrategic Imperatives" as "the center of world power." Capturing the region's oil wealth, and carving out territory in order to build a network of transit routes, was a primary objective of US military interventions throughout the 1990s in the Balkans, the Caucasus and Caspian Sea.

As of 1992, 11 western oil companies controlled more than 50 percent of all oil investments in the Caspian Basin, including Unocal, Amoco, Atlantic Richfield, Chevron, Exxon-Mobil, Pennzoil, Texaco, Phillips and British Petroleum.

In "Taliban: Militant Islam, Oil and Fundamentalism in Central Asia" (a definitive work that is a primary source for this report), Ahmed Rashid wrote, "US oil companies who had spearheaded the first US forays into the region wanted a greater say in US policy making."

Business and policy planning groups active in Central Asia, such as the Foreign Oil Companies Group operated with the full support of the US State Department, the National Security Council, the CIA and the Department of Energy and Commerce.

Among the most active operatives for US efforts: Brzezinski (a consultant to Amoco, and architect of the Afghan-Soviet war of the 1970s), Henry Kissinger (advisor to Unocal), and Alexander Haig (a lobbyist for Turkmenistan), and Dick Cheney (Halliburton, US-Azerbaijan Chamber of Commerce).

Unocal's Central Asia envoys consisted of former US defense and intelligence officials. Robert Oakley, the former US ambassador to Pakistan, was a "counter-terrorism" specialist for the Reagan administration who armed and trained the mujahadeen during the war against the Soviets in the 1980s. He was an Iran-Contra conspirator charged by Independent Counsel Lawrence Walsh as a key figure involved in arms shipments to Iran.

Richard Armitage, the current Deputy Defense Secretary, was another Iran-Contra player in Unocal's employ. A former Navy SEAL, covert operative in Laos, director with the Carlyle Group, Armitage is allegedly deeply linked to terrorist and criminal networks in the Middle East, and the new independent states of the former Soviet Union (Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, and Kyrgistan).

Armitage was no stranger to pipelines. As a member of the Burma/Myanmar Forum, a group that received major funding from Unocal, Armitage was implicated in a lawsuit filed by Burmese villagers who suffered human rights abuses during the construction of a Unocal pipeline. (Halliburton, under Dick Cheney, performed contract work on the same Burmese project.)

BRIDAS VERSUS THE NEW WORLD ORDER

Much to Bidas' dismay, Unocal went directly to regional leaders with its own proposal. Unocal formed its own competing US-led, Washington-sponsored consortium that included Saudi Arabia's Delta Oil, aligned with Saudi Prince Abdullah and King Fahd. Other partners included Russia's Gazprom and Turkmenistan's state-owned Turkmenrozas.

John Imle, president of Unocal (and member of the US-Azerbaijan Chamber of Com-

merce with Armitage, Cheney, Brezezinski and other ubiquitous figures), lobbied Turkmenistan's president Niyazov and prime minister Bhutto of Pakistan, offering a Unocal pipeline following the same route as Bidas.'

Dazzled by the prospect of an alliance with the US, Niyazov asked Bidas to renegotiate its past contract and blocked Bidas' exports from Keimar field. Bidas responded by filing three cases with the International Chamber of Commerce against Turkmenistan for breach of contract. (Bidas won.) Bidas also filed a lawsuit in Texas charging Unocal with civil conspiracy and "tortuous interference with business relations." While its officers were negotiating with Pakistani and Turkmen oil and gas officials, Bidas claimed that Unocal had stolen its idea, and coerced the Turkmen government into blocking Bidas from Keimir field. (The suit was dismissed in 1998 by Judge Brady G. Elliott, a Republican, who claimed that any dispute between Unocal and Bidas was governed by the laws of Turkmenistan and Afghanistan, rather than Texas law.)

In October 1995, with neither company in a winning position, Bulgheroni and Imle accompanied Niyazov to the opening of the UN General Assembly. There, Niyazov awarded Unocal with a contract for a 918-mile natural gas pipeline. Bulgheroni was shocked. At the announcement ceremony, Unocal consultant Henry Kissinger said that the deal looked like "the triumph of hope over experience."

Later, Unocal's consortium, CentGas, would secure another contract for a companion 1,050-mile oil pipeline from Daulatabad through Afghanistan that would connect to a tanker loading port in Pakistan on the coast of the Arabian Sea.

Although Unocal had agreements with the governments on either end of the proposed route, Bidas still had the contract with Afghanistan.

The problem was resolved via the CIA and Pakistani ISI-backed Taliban. Following a visit to Kandahar by US Assistant Secretary of State for South Asia Robin Raphael in the fall of 1996, the Taliban entered Kabul and sent the Rabbani government packing.

Bidas' agreement with Rabbani would have to be renegotiated.

WOOLING THE TALIBAN

According to Ahmed Rashid, "Unocal's real influence with the Taliban was that their project carried the possibility of US recognition, which the Taliban were desperately anxious to secure."

Unocal wasted no time greasing the palms of the Taliban. It offered humanitarian aid to Afghan warlords who would form a council to supervise the pipeline project. It provided a new mobile phone network between Kabul and Kandahar. Unocal also promised to help rebuild Kandahar, and donated \$9,000 to the University of Nebraska's Center for Afghan Studies. The US State Department, through its aid organization USAID, contributed significant education funding for Taliban. In the spring of 1996, Unocal executives flew Uzbek leader General Abdul Rashid Dostum to Dallas to discuss pipeline passage through his northern (Northern Alliance-controlled) territories.

Bidas countered by forming an alliance with Ningarcho, a Saudi company closely aligned with Prince Turki el-Faisal, the Saudi intelligence chief. Turki was a mentor to Osama bin Laden, the ally of the Taliban who was publicly feuding with the Saudi royal family. As a gesture for Bidas, Prince Turki provided the Taliban with communications equipment and a fleet of pickup trucks. Now Bidas proposed two consortiums, one to build the Afghanistan portion, and another to take care of both ends of the line.

By November 1996, Bidas claimed that it had an agreement signed by the Taliban and Dostum—trumping Unocal.

The competition between Unocal and Bidas, as described by Rashid, “began to reflect the competition within the Saudi Royal family.”

In 1997, Taliban officials traveled twice to Washington, D.C. and Buenos Aires to be wined and dined by Unocal and Bidas. No agreements were signed.

It appeared to Unocal that the Taliban was balking. In addition to royalties, the Taliban demanded funding for infrastructure projects, including roads and power plants. The Taliban also announced plans to revive the Afghan National Oil Company, which had been abolished by the Soviet regime in the late 1970s.

Osama bin Laden (who issued his fatwa against the West in 1998) advised the Taliban to sign with Bidas. In addition to offering the Taliban a higher bid, Bidas proposed an open pipeline accessible to warlords and local users. Unocal’s pipeline was closed—for export purposes only. Bidas’ plan also did not require outside financing, while Unocal’s required a loan from the western financial institutions (the World Bank), which in turn would leave Afghanistan vulnerable to demands from western governments.

Bidas’ approach to business was more to the Taliban’s liking. Where Bulgheroni and Bidas’ engineers would take the time to “sip tea with Afghan tribesmen,” Unocal’s American executives issued top-down edicts from corporate headquarters and the US Embassy (including a demand to open talks with the CIA-backed Northern Alliance).

While seemingly well received within Afghanistan, Bidas’ problems with Turkmenistan (which they blamed on Unocal and US interference) had left them cash-strapped and without a supply.

In 1997, they went searching for a major partner with the clout to break the deadlock with Turkmenistan. They found one in Amoco. Bidas sold 60 percent of its Latin American assets to Amoco. Carlos Bulgheroni and his contingent retained the remaining minority 40 percent. Facilitating the merger were other icons of transnational finance, Chase Manhattan (representing Bidas), Morgan Stanley (handling Amoco) and Arthur Andersen (facilitator of post-merger integration). Zbigniew Brezezinski was a consultant for Amoco.

(Amoco would merge with British Petroleum a year later. BP is represented by the law firm of Baker & Botts, whose principal attorney is James Baker, lifelong Bush friend, former secretary of state, and a member of the Carlyle Group.)

Recognizing the significance of the merger, a Pakistani oil company executive hinted, “If these (Central Asian) countries want a big US company involved, Amoco is far bigger than Unocal.”

CLEARING THE CHESSBOARD AGAIN

By 1998, while the Argentine contingent made slow progress, Unocal faced a number of new problems.

Gazprom pulled out of CentGas when Russia complained about the anti-Russian agenda of the US. This forced Unocal to expand CentGas to include Japanese and South Korean gas companies, while maintaining the dominant share with Delta. Human rights groups began protesting Unocal’s dealings with the brutal Taliban. Still riding years of Clinton bashing and scandal mongering, conservative Republicans in the US attacked the Clinton administration’s Central Asia policy for its lack of clarity and “leadership.”

Once again, violence would change the dynamic.

In response to the bombing of US embassies in Nairobi and Tanzania (attributed to bin Laden), President Bill Clinton sent cruise missiles into Afghanistan and Sudan. The administration broke off diplomatic contact with the Taliban, and UN sanctions were imposed.

Unocal withdrew from CentGas, and informed the State Department “the gas pipeline would not proceed until an internationally recognized government was in place in Afghanistan.” Although Unocal continued on and off negotiations on the oil pipeline (a separate project), the lack of support from Washington hampered efforts.

Meanwhile, Bidas declared that it would not need to wait for resolution of political issues, and repeated its intention of moving forward with the Afghan gas pipeline project on its own. Pakistan, Turkmenistan and Afghanistan tried to push Saudi Arabia to proceed with CentGas (Delta of Saudi Arabia was now the leader). But war and US-Taliban tension made business impossible.

For the remainder of the Clinton presidency, there would be no official US or UN recognition of Afghanistan. And no progress on the pipeline.

Then George Walker Bush took the White House.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE), the ranking member of the Veterans’ Affairs Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigation.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and I rise in strong opposition to this resolution.

If passed, this would send a terrible message to our troops in harm’s way and only serve to boost morale among our enemies who now have to face the reality that they are being tracked night and day.

I served in the Army in 1973 and 1974 in the infantry in Korea. I felt abandoned at that time by my country. I never want a soldier to feel like I felt at that time. I saw what happened in Vietnam when Washington bureaucrats and lawmakers micromanaged the war and prevented commanders from having the resources available which they thought would win. I will never support a plan for this or any other war in which I think we are tying the hands of our brave servicemembers.

In my judgment, the strategy devised by our military leaders and being implemented by our Armed Forces is the correct one. I have always said I will support this military plan so long as we do not set arbitrary dates for withdrawal from the country, which will only set a target date for those who would try to kill our young men and women.

It is important that we do not forget why we are in Afghanistan. We are fighting this war because a previous Afghan regime allowed al Qaeda, the terrorist group responsible for countless attacks around the globe, including the September 11 attacks against the United States, to operate freely within its borders. If the coalition forces leave, the Taliban could regain control of the country and once again provide safe harbors for those who hate America and want to destroy our country.

Winning the war in Afghanistan will also help deter a radical Islamic government from taking over Pakistan, a country with over 15 nuclear weapons. It seems that in recent months, since our surge in force has begun, we have seen Pakistan become more willing to confront the radical elements within its own borders. And while there is much work left to be done, there is no question that our more aggressive strategy against the enemy is having many positive results.

In April of 2009 I participated in a congressional delegation to visit Afghanistan to observe our operations firsthand. I can tell you without hesitation that we have every reason to be proud of our men and women serving in Afghanistan; they’re doing a great job. What they need now is support and a clear signal from Washington that the job they are accomplishing is appreciated and in our national interests. By soundly defeating this resolution today, hopefully we will send such a message. And it is my hope and prayer that we never have to enter another war.

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I would like to speak for a moment about civilian casualties in Afghanistan.

According to the United Nations, airstrikes continue to be a leading cause of civilian casualties. Days into the Marjah military offensive, 12 Afghans died when two rockets fired by NATO forces hit the wrong house. Ten of the 12 Afghans killed were from the same family. U.S. military officials initially apologized for the death of the civilians, but later backtracked, claiming they were insurgents. An Italian aid group working at a hospital just outside of Marjah accused allied forces of blocking dozens of critically wounded citizens from receiving medical attention at the hospital. A February 21 NATO airstrike conducted by U.S. Special Forces helicopters killed over 27 civilians and wounded dozens more after minibuses were hit by helicopters “patrolling the area hunting for insurgents who had escaped the NATO offensive in the Marjah area,” over 100 miles outside of Marjah in the southern province of Uruzgan.

□ 1730

The Wall Street Journal cited Afghan and NATO representatives, explaining that the air strike was ordered because it was believed that the minibus carried fresh Taliban fighters who were sent to help those under attack. However, the source of intelligence used to determine that the minibus carried insurgents has not been made known.

Admiral Mike Mullen, Chair of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, claimed the goal of the Marjah operation was to have no civilian casualties.

I submit for the RECORD a Brookings Institution 2009 report estimate that 10 civilians die for every militant killed in a drone strike.

I submit for the RECORD an article published in *The Nation*, written by journalist Anand Gopal, titled “America’s Secret Afghan Prisons,” which reveals the existence of secret detention facilities at Bagram.

The daily night raids and indiscriminate aerial bombings must stop. The alleged torture of Afghans who are accused of supporting the Taliban who are captured in such night raids and the slaughter of innocent civilians in drone attacks only serve to embolden popular support against the United States.

[From the Brookings Institution, Mar. 10, 2010]

DO TARGETED KILLINGS WORK?

(BY DANIEL L. BYMAN)

JULY 14, 2009.—Killing terrorist leaders is difficult, is often ineffective, and can easily backfire. Yet it is one of the United States’ few options for managing the threat posed by al Qaeda from its base in tribal Pakistan. By some accounts, U.S. drone activity in Pakistan has killed dozens of lower-ranking and at least 10 mid- and high-ranking leaders from al Qaeda and the Taliban.

Critics correctly find many problems with this program, most of all the number of civilian casualties the strikes have incurred. Sourcing on civilian deaths is weak and the numbers are often exaggerated, but more than 600 civilians are likely to have died from the attacks. That number suggests that for every militant killed, 10 or so civilians also died.

To reduce casualties, superb intelligence is necessary. Operators must know not only where the terrorists are, but also who is with them and who might be within the blast radius. This level of surveillance may often be lacking, and terrorists’ deliberate use of children and other civilians as shields make civilian deaths even more likely.

Beyond the humanitarian tragedy incurred, civilian deaths create dangerous political problems. Pakistan’s new democratic government is already unpopular for its corruption, favoritism, and poor governance. U.S. strikes that take a civilian toll are a further blow to its legitimacy—and to U.S. efforts to build goodwill there. As counterterrorism expert David Kilcullen put it, “When we intervene in people’s countries to chase small cells of bad guys, we end up alienating the whole country and turning them against us.”

And even when they work, killings are a poor second to arrests. Dead men tell no tales and thus are no help in anticipating the next attack or informing us about broader terrorist activities. So in any country with a functioning government, it is better to work with that government to seize the terrorist than to kill him outright. Arresting al Qaeda personnel in remote parts of Pakistan, however, is almost impossible today; the Pakistani government does not control many of the areas where al Qaeda is based, and a raid to seize terrorists there would probably end in the militants escaping and U.S. and allied casualties in the attempt.

When arrests are impossible, what results is a terrorist haven of the sort present along the Afghanistan-Pakistan border today. Free from the threat of apprehension, terrorists have a space in which to plot, organize, train, and relax—an extremely dangerous prospect. In such a haven, terrorist leaders can recruit hundreds or even thousands of potential fighters and, more importantly, organize them into a dangerous network. They can transform idealistic but incompetent volunteers into a lethal legion of fighters.

They can also plan long-term global operations—terrorism “spectaculars” like the September 11 attacks, which remain one of al Qaeda’s goals.

Killing terrorist operatives is one way to dismantle these havens. Plans are disrupted when individuals die or are wounded, as new people must be recruited and less experienced leaders take over day-to-day operations. Perhaps most importantly, organizations fearing a strike must devote increased attention to their own security because any time they communicate with other cells or issue propaganda, they may be exposing themselves to a targeted attack.

Given the humanitarian and political risks, each strike needs to be carefully weighed, with the value of the target and the potential for innocent deaths factored into the equation. In addition, the broader political consequences must be evaluated; the same death toll can have vastly different political consequences depending on the context. But equally important is the risk of not striking—and inadvertently allowing al Qaeda leaders free reign to plot terrorist mayhem.

We must not pretend the killings are anything but a flawed short-term expedient that at best reduces the al Qaeda threat—but by no means eliminates it. Even as U.S. strikes have increased, Pakistan has suffered staggering levels of terrorism as groups with few or limited links to al Qaeda have joined the fray. Al Qaeda itself can also still carry out attacks, including ones outside Pakistan in Europe and even the United States. Thanks to the drone strikes, they are just harder to pull off. The real answer to halting al Qaeda’s activity in Pakistan will be the long-term support of Pakistan’s counterinsurgency efforts. While this process unfolds, targeted killings are one of America’s few options left.

[From the Nation, Feb. 15, 2010]

AMERICA’S SECRET AFGHAN PRISONS

(By Anand Gopal)

One quiet, wintry night last year in the eastern Afghan town of Khost, a young government employee named Ismatullah simply vanished. He had last been seen in the town’s bazaar with a group of friends. Family members scoured Khost’s dusty streets for days. Village elders contacted Taliban commanders in the area who were wont to kidnap government workers, but they had never heard of the young man. Even the governor got involved, ordering his police to round up nettlesome criminal gangs that sometimes prey on young bazaargoers for ransom.

But the hunt turned up nothing. Spring and summer came and went with no sign of Ismatullah. Then one day, long after the police and village elders had abandoned their search, a courier delivered a neat handwritten note on Red Cross stationery to the family. In it, Ismatullah informed them that he was in Bagram, an American prison more than 200 miles away. US forces had picked him up while he was on his way home from the bazaar, the terse letter stated, and he didn’t know when he would be freed.

In the past few years Pashtun villagers in Afghanistan’s rugged heartland have begun to lose faith in the American project. Many of them can point to the precise moment of this transformation, and it usually took place in the dead of night, when most of the country was fast asleep. In its attempt to stamp out the growing Taliban insurgency and Al Qaeda, the US military has been arresting suspects and sending them to one of a number of secret detention areas on military bases, often on the slightest suspicion and without the knowledge of their families. These night raids have become even more

feared and hated in Afghanistan than coalition airstrikes. The raids and detentions, little known or understood outside the Pashtun villages, have been turning Afghans against the very forces many of them greeted as liberators just a few years ago.

ONE DARK NIGHT IN NOVEMBER

November 19, 2009, 3:15 am. A loud blast woke the villagers of a leafy neighborhood outside Ghazni, a city of ancient provenance in the country’s south. A team of US soldiers burst through the front gate of the home of Majidullah Qarar, the spokesman for Afghanistan’s agriculture minister. Qarar was in Kabul at the time, but his relatives were home, four of them sleeping in the family’s one-room guesthouse. One of them, Hamidullah, who sold carrots at the local bazaar, ran toward the door of the guesthouse. He was immediately shot but managed to crawl back inside, leaving a trail of blood behind him. Then Azim, a baker, darted toward his injured cousin. He, too, was shot and crumpled to the floor. The fallen men cried out to the two relatives—both of them children—remaining in the room. But they refused to move, glued to their beds in silent horror.

The foreign soldiers, most of them tattooed and bearded, then went on to the main compound. They threw clothes on the floor, smashed dinner plates and forced open closets. Finally they found the man they were looking for: Habib-ur-Rahman, a computer programmer and government employee. Rahman was responsible for converting Microsoft Windows from English to the local Pashto language so that government offices could use the software. The Afghan translator accompanying the soldiers said they were acting on a tip that Rahman was a member of Al Qaeda.

They took the barefoot Rahman and a cousin to a helicopter some distance away and transported them to a small American base in a neighboring province for interrogation. After two days, US forces released Rahman’s cousin. But Rahman has not been seen or heard from since.

“We’ve called his phone, but it doesn’t answer,” said his cousin Qarar, the agriculture minister’s spokesman. Using his powerful connections, Qarar enlisted local police, parliamentarians, the governor and even the agriculture minister himself in the search for his cousin, but they turned up nothing. Government officials who independently investigated the scene in the aftermath of the raid and corroborated the claims of the family also pressed for an answer as to why two of Qarar’s family members were killed. American forces issued a statement saying that the dead were “enemy militants [who] demonstrated hostile intent.”

Weeks after the raid, the family remains bitter. “Everyone in the area knew we were a family that worked for the government,” Qarar said. “Rahman couldn’t even leave the city, because if the Taliban caught him in the countryside they would have killed him.”

Beyond the question of Rahman’s guilt or innocence, it’s how he was taken that has left such a residue of hatred among his family. “Did they have to kill my cousins? Did they have to destroy our house?” Qarar asked. “They knew where Rahman worked. Couldn’t they have at least tried to come with a warrant in the daytime? We would have forced Rahman to comply.”

“I used to go on TV and argue that people should support this government and the foreigners,” he added. “But I was wrong. Why should anyone do so? I don’t care if I get fired for saying it, but that’s the truth.”

THE DOGS OF WAR

Night raids are only the first step in the American detention process in Afghanistan.

Suspects are usually sent to one of a series of prisons on US military bases around the country. There are officially nine such jails, called Field Detention Sites in military parlance. They are small holding areas, often just a clutch of cells divided by plywood, and are mainly used for prisoner interrogations.

In the early years of the war, these were but way stations for those en route to Bagram prison, a facility with a notorious reputation for abusive behavior. As a spotlight of international attention fell on Bagram in recent years, wardens there cleaned up their act, and the mistreatment of prisoners began to shift to the little-noticed Field Detention Sites.

Of the twenty-four former detainees interviewed for this article, seventeen claim to have been abused at or en route to these sites. Doctors, government officials and the Afghan Independent Human Rights Commission, an independent Afghan body mandated by the Afghan Constitution to investigate abuse allegations, corroborate twelve of these claims.

One of these former detainees is Noor Agha Sher Khan, who used to be a police officer in Gardez, a mud-caked town in the eastern part of the country. According to Sher Khan, American forces detained him in a night raid in 2003 and brought him to a Field Detention Site at a nearby US base. "They interrogated me the whole night," he recalled, "but I had nothing to tell them." Sher Khan worked for a police commander whom US forces had detained on suspicion of having ties to the insurgency. He had occasionally acted as a driver for this commander, which made him suspicious in American eyes.

The interrogators blindfolded him, taped his mouth shut and chained him to the ceiling, he alleges. Occasionally they unleashed a dog, which repeatedly bit him. At one point they removed the blindfold and forced him to kneel on a long wooden bar. "They tied my hands to a pulley [above] and pushed me back and forth as the bar rolled across my shins. I screamed and screamed." They then pushed him to the ground and forced him to swallow twelve bottles of water. "Two people held my mouth open, and they poured water down my throat until my stomach was full and I became unconscious," he said. "It was as if someone had inflated me." After he was roused, he vomited uncontrollably.

This continued for a number of days. Sometimes he was hung upside down from the ceiling, other times he was blindfolded for extended periods. Eventually he was moved to Bagram, where the torture ceased. Four months later he was quietly released, with a letter of apology from US authorities for wrongfully imprisoning him.

An investigation of Sher Khan's case by the Afghan Independent Human Rights Commission and an independent doctor found that he had wounds consistent with the abusive treatment he alleges. American forces have declined to comment on the specifics of his case, but a spokesman said that some soldiers involved in detentions in this part of the country had been given unspecified "administrative punishments." He added that "all detainees are treated humanely," except for isolated cases.

THE DISAPPEARED

Some of those taken to the Field Detention Sites are deemed innocuous and never sent to Bagram. Even then, some allege abuse. Such was the case with Hajji Ehsanullah, snatched one winter night in 2008 from his home in the southern province of Zabul. He was taken to a detention site in Khost Province, some 200 miles away. He returned home thirteen days later, his skin scarred by dog bites and with memory dif-

iculties that, according to his doctor, resulted from a blow to the head. American forces had dropped him off at a gas station in Khost after three days of interrogation. It took him ten more days to find his way home.

Others taken to these sites seem to have disappeared entirely. In the hardscrabble villages of the Pashtun south, where rumors grow more abundantly than the most bountiful crop, locals whisper tales of people who were captured and executed. Most have no evidence. But occasionally a body turns up. Such was the case at a detention site on a US military base in Helmand Province, where in 2003 a US military coroner wrote in the autopsy report of a detainee who died in US custody (later made available through the Freedom of Information Act): "Death caused by the multiple blunt force injuries to the lower torso and legs complicated by rhabdomyolysis (release of toxic byproducts into the system due to destruction of muscle). Manner of death is homicide."

In the dust-swept province of Khost one day this past December, US forces launched a night raid on the village of Motai, killing six people and capturing nine, according to nearly a dozen local government authorities and witnesses. Two days later, the bodies of two of those detained—plastic cuffs binding their hands—were found more than a mile from the largest US base in the area. A US military spokesman denies any involvement in the deaths and declines to comment on the details of the raid. Local Afghan officials and tribal elders steadfastly maintain that the two were killed while in US custody. American authorities released four other villagers in subsequent days. The fate of the three remaining captives is unknown.

The matter could be cleared up if the US military were less secretive about its detention process. But secrecy has been the order of the day. The nine Field Detention Sites are enveloped in a blanket of official secrecy, but at least the Red Cross and other humanitarian organizations are aware of them. There may, however, be other sites whose existence on the scores of US and Afghan military bases that dot the country have not been disclosed. One example, according to former detainees, is a detention facility at Rish-Khor, an Afghan army base that sits atop a mountain overlooking the capital, Kabul.

One night last year US forces raided Zaiwalat, a tiny village that fits snugly into the mountains of Wardak Province, a few dozen miles west of Kabul, and netted nine locals. They brought the captives to Rish-Khor and interrogated them for three days. "They kept us in a container," recalled Rehmatullah Muhammad, one of the nine. "It was made of steel. We were handcuffed for three days continuously. We barely slept those days." The plain-clothed interrogators accused Muhammad and the others of giving food and shelter to the Taliban. The suspects were then sent to Bagram and released after four months. (A number of former detainees said they were interrogated by plainclothed officials, but they did not know if these officials belonged to the military, the CIA or private contractors.)

Afghan human rights campaigners worry that US forces may be using secret detention sites like the one allegedly at Rish-Khor to carry out interrogations away from prying eyes. The US military, however, denies even having knowledge of the facility.

THE BLACK JAIL

Much less secret is the final stop for most captives: the Bagram Theater Internment Facility. These days ominously dubbed "Obama's Guantánamo," Bagram nonetheless now offers the best conditions for captives during the entire detention process.

Its modern life as a prison began in 2002, when small numbers of detainees from throughout Asia were incarcerated there on the first leg of an odyssey that would eventually bring them to the US detention facility in Guantánamo, Cuba. In later years, however, it became the main destination for those caught within Afghanistan as part of the growing war there. By 2009 the inmate population had swelled to more than 700. Housed in a windowless old Soviet hangar, the prison consists of two rows of barred, cage-like cells bathed continuously in light. Guards walk along a platform that runs across the mesh tops of the pens, an easy position from which to supervise the prisoners below.

Regular, even infamous, abuse in the style of Iraq's Abu Ghraib prison marked Bagram's early years. Abdullah Mujahid, for example, was apprehended in the village of Kar Marchi in the eastern province of Paktia in 2003. Although Mujahid was a Tajik militia commander who had led an armed uprising against the Taliban in their waning days, US forces accused him of having ties to the insurgency. "In Bagram we were handcuffed, blindfolded and had our feet chained for days," he recalled. "They didn't allow us to sleep at all for thirteen days and nights." A guard would strike his legs every time he dozed off. Daily, he could hear the screams of tortured inmates and the unmistakable sound of shackles dragging across the floor.

Then one day a team of soldiers dragged him to an aircraft but refused to tell him where he was going. Eventually he landed at another prison, where the air felt thick and wet. As he walked through the row of cages, inmates began to shout, "This is Guantánamo! You are in Guantánamo!" He would learn there that he was accused of leading the Pakistani Islamist group Lashkar-e-Taiba (which in reality was led by another person who had the same name and who died in 2006). The United States eventually released him and returned him to Afghanistan.

Former Bagram detainees allege that they were regularly beaten, subjected to blaring music twenty-four hours a day, prevented from sleeping, stripped naked and forced to assume what interrogators term "stress positions." The nadir came in late 2002, when interrogators beat two inmates to death.

According to former detainees and organizations that work with them, the US Special Forces also run a second secret prison somewhere on Bagram Air Base that the Red Cross still does not have access to. Used primarily for interrogations, it is so feared by prisoners that they have dubbed it the "Black Jail."

One day two years ago, US forces came to get Noor Muhammad outside the town of Kajaki in the southern province of Helmand. Muhammad, a physician, was running a clinic that served all comers, including the Taliban. The soldiers raided his clinic and his home, killing five people (including two patients) and detaining both his father and him. The next day villagers found the handcuffed body of Muhammad's father, apparently killed by a gunshot.

The soldiers took Muhammad to the Black Jail. "It was a tiny, narrow corridor, with lots of cells on both sides and a big steel gate and bright lights," he said. "We didn't know when it was night and when it was day." He was held in a windowless concrete room in solitary confinement. Soldiers regularly dragged him by his neck and refused him food and water. They accused him of providing medical care to the insurgents, to which he replied, "I am a doctor. It's my duty to provide care to every human being who comes to my clinic, whether they are Taliban or from the government."

Eventually Muhammad was released, but he has since closed his clinic and left his home village. "I am scared of the Americans and the Taliban," he said. "I'm happy my father is dead, so he doesn't have to experience this hell."

AFRAID OF THE DARK

In the past two years American officials have moved to reform the main prison at Bagram, if not the Black Jail. Torture has stopped, and prison officials now boast that the typical inmate gains fifteen pounds while in custody. In the early months of this year, officials plan to open a dazzling new prison that will eventually replace Bagram, one with huge, airy cells, the latest medical equipment and rooms for vocational training. The Bagram prison itself will be handed over to the Afghans in the coming year, although the rest of the detention process will remain in US hands.

But human rights advocates say that concerns about the detention process remain. The US Supreme Court ruled in 2008 that inmates at Guantánamo cannot be stripped of their right to habeas corpus, but it stopped short of making the same argument for Bagram (officials say that since it is in the midst of a war zone, US civil rights legislation does not apply). Inmates there do not have access to a lawyer, as they do in Guantánamo. Most say they have no idea why they have been detained. They do now appear before a review panel every six months, which is intended to reassess their detention, but their ability to ask questions about their situation is limited. "I was only allowed to answer yes or no and not explain anything at my hearing," said former detainee Rehmatullah Muhammad.

Nonetheless, the improvement in Bagram's conditions begs the question: can the United States fight a cleaner war? That's what Afghan war commander Gen. Stanley McChrystal promised last summer: fewer civilian casualties, fewer of the feared house raids and a more transparent detention process.

The American troops that operate under NATO command have begun to enforce stricter rules of engagement: they may now officially hold detainees for only ninety-six hours before transferring them to the Afghan authorities or freeing them, and Afghan forces must take the lead in house searches. American soldiers, when questioned, bristle at these restrictions—and have ways of circumventing them. "Sometimes we detain people, then, when the ninety-six hours are up, we transfer them to the Afghans," said one marine who spoke on the condition of anonymity. "They rough them up a bit for us and then send them back to us for another ninety-six hours. This keeps going until we get what we want."

A simpler way of dancing around the rules is to call in the Special Operations Forces—the Navy SEALs, Green Berets and others—which are not under NATO command and thus not bound by the stricter rules of engagement. These elite troops are behind most of the night raids and detentions in the search for "high-value suspects." Military officials say in interviews that the new restrictions have not affected the number of raids and detentions at all. The actual change, however, is more subtle: the detention process has shifted almost entirely to areas and actors that can best avoid public scrutiny—small field prisons and Special Operations Forces.

The shift signals a deeper reality of war, say American soldiers: you can't fight guerrillas without invasive raids and detentions, any more than you can fight them without bullets. Seen through the eyes of a US soldier, Afghanistan is a scary place. The men

are bearded and turbaned. They pray incessantly. In most of the country, women are barred from leaving the house. Many Afghans own an assault rifle. "You can't trust anyone," said Rodrigo Arias, a marine based in the northeastern province of Kunar. "I've nearly been killed in ambushes, but the villagers don't tell us anything. But they usually know something."

An officer who has worked in the Field Detention Sites says that it takes dozens of raids to turn up a useful suspect. "Sometimes you've got to bust down doors. Sometimes you've got to twist arms. You have to cast a wide net, but when you get the right person, it makes all the difference."

For Arias, it's a matter of survival. "I want to go home in one piece. If that means rounding people up, then round them up." To question this, he said, is to question whether the war itself is worth fighting. "That's not my job. The people in Washington can figure that out."

If night raids and detentions are an unavoidable part of modern counterinsurgency warfare, then so is the resentment they breed. "We were all happy when the Americans first came. We thought they would bring peace and stability," said Rehmatullah Muhammad. "But now most people in my village want them to leave." A year after Muhammad was released, his nephew was detained. Two months later, some other residents of Zaiwalat were seized. It has become a predictable pattern in Muhammad's village: Taliban forces ambush American convoys as they pass through it, and then retreat into the thick fruit orchards nearby. The Americans return at night to pick up suspects. In the past two years, sixteen people have been taken and ten killed in night raids in this single village of about 300, according to villagers. In the same period, they say, the insurgents killed one local and did not take anyone hostage.

The people of Zaiwalat now fear the night raids more than the Taliban. There are nights when Muhammad's children hear the distant thrum of a helicopter and rush into his room. He consoles them but admits he needs solace himself. "I know I should be too old for it," he said, "but this war has made me afraid of the dark."

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, initially, I yield an additional 2 minutes of my time to that of the ranking member. It is to be added onto her time and is to be subtracted from our time.

Now I yield 3 minutes to the chairman of the Asia, the Pacific, and the Global Environment Subcommittee, the delegate from American Samoa, Mr. ENI FALEOMAVAEGA.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. I thank the gentleman, the distinguished chairman of our Committee on Foreign Affairs, for allowing me to say a few words concerning the proposed resolution.

Madam Speaker, despite my reservations about our strategy in Afghanistan, I do want to say that I have the utmost respect for the gentleman from Ohio for bringing this resolution forward for the purpose of having a public debate among our colleagues.

I also want to say that I associate myself with the remarks made earlier by my colleague from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) in asking, Why not, why not debate the issue? We should not deprive ourselves of understanding a little more about the situation that we face right now in Afghanistan.

Madam Speaker, after 8 long years in that country for the United States and

after 30 years for the Afghan people, I remain skeptical that adding 30,000 U.S. troops and that focusing more on local and provincial levels of government will bring lasting stability and success in Afghanistan. I do, of course, want our new strategy to succeed, and I know that our military and civilian personnel on the ground will give it a supreme effort. They represent the very best this country has to offer.

Yet Afghanistan's history is replete with the failures of outside powers, or countries, in their attempting to take over or to remake the Afghan people—from Alexander the Great, to Genghis Khan, to the United Kingdom, to the Soviet Union, and now even to us.

It is my understanding that by adding 30,000 additional troops to the 68,000 troops that we now have on the ground in Afghanistan, we are adding approximately 100,000 additional troops, with NATO forces, to go after some 27,000 Taliban and a couple of hundred al Qaeda.

By the way, I wanted to ask, Was it the Taliban or the al Qaeda people who attacked us on 9/11? I believe it was al Qaeda, and 15 of the 19 terrorists who attacked us on 9/11 were Saudi Arabs. It's interesting to note that.

Another thing is that, indeed, most objective observers believe it will take a commitment of years, perhaps even decades, by our troops and that it will take hundreds of billions of dollars by our taxpayers for Afghanistan to overcome its divisions and to develop and to maintain a stable, functional government.

When I weigh the likely costs in terms of lives and resources against the potential benefits for U.S. security, I am left wondering whether we are, in fact, on the right track.

As I am not a genius when it comes to military strategy, here is something that I am trying to figure out: the Taliban are Pashtuns, and 12 million Pashtuns live in Afghanistan. They make up almost 50 percent of Afghanistan's population. President Karzai is even a Pashtun. There are an additional 27 million Pashtuns who live on the other side of the border, right on the border between Pakistan and Afghanistan.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BERMAN. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Is it any wonder we have had such a difficult time locating Osama bin Laden? He has been moving between Pakistan and Afghanistan for all of these years.

Madam Speaker, I do not believe invoking the 1973 War Powers Act to require the U.S. withdrawal from Afghanistan is appropriate at this time. In September 2001, Congress passed a joint resolution, signed by the President 4 days later, which granted the President the authority to use all necessary and appropriate forces against those whom he determined planned, authorized, committed or aided the September 11 attacks in 2001.

So, whether one agrees with the war in Afghanistan or not, whether one agrees with the administration's new strategy or not, there should be no doubt that House Concurrent Resolution 248, with all due respect to my friend from Ohio, is not the way to force a withdrawal of U.S. troops. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to vote against this proposed resolution.

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, I would like to speak about the failure of the counterinsurgency strategy.

The Brookings Institution recently reported that, in terms of raw violence, the situation is at an historic worst level with early 2010 levels of various types of attacks much higher than even last year at this time. Much of that is due to the recent Marjah campaign and, more generally, to the deployment of additional U.S. and Afghan troops to parts of the country where they have not been present before.

The President has called this war a just war. The framing of war as "just" is served to legitimize the slaughter of innocent civilians in Iraq and Afghanistan.

A 200-page report by the RAND Corporation is entitled, "Counterintelligence in Afghanistan Deals a Huge Blow to our Ideas of Counterinsurgency." It reads: In many cases, a significant direct intervention by U.S. military forces may undermine popular support and legitimacy. The United States is also unlikely to remain for the duration of most insurgencies. This study's assessment of 90 insurgencies indicates that it takes an average of 14 years to defeat insurgents once an insurgency develops. Occupations fuel insurgencies. In other words, this assessment does not fit into the President's supposed rapid increase and the shaky plan to withdraw by the summer of 2011.

The Brookings report continues: Second, the United States and other international actors need to improve the quality of local governance, especially in rural areas of Afghanistan. Field research in the east and south show that development and reconstruction did not reach most rural areas because of the deteriorating security environment. Even the provincial reconstruction teams, which were specifically designed to assist in the development of reconstruction projects, operate inside pockets in east and south because of security concerns.

NGOs and State agencies, such as USAID and the Canadian International Development Agency, were also not involved in the reconstruction and development in many areas of the south and east.

The irony of this situation is that rural areas which were at most risk from the Taliban, which were unhappy with the slow pace of change, a population with the greatest unhappiness, received little assistance. The counterinsurgency in Afghanistan will be won or lost in the local communities of

rural Afghanistan, not in urban centers such as Kabul, says the Brookings Institution.

Now, someone I'm not used to quoting, conservative columnist George Will, wrote in The Washington Post that the counterinsurgency theory concerning the time and level of forces required to protect the population indicates that, nationwide, Afghanistan would need hundreds of thousands of coalition troops, perhaps, for a decade or more. That is inconceivable.

For how long are we willing to dedicate billions of dollars and thousands of lives before we realize that we can't win Afghanistan militarily? Our biggest mistake in the Afghanistan strategy is to think that we can separate the Taliban from the rest of the population. We cannot. The Taliban is a local resistance movement that is part and parcel of an indigenous population. We lost Vietnam because we failed to win the hearts and minds of local populations without providing them with a competent government that provided them with basic security and with a decent living. That message can and should be applied to Afghanistan.

The strategy for winning Afghanistan is simple: Stop killing the people and they will stop killing you.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS), a member of the Veterans' Affairs and Energy and Commerce Committees.

Mr. STEARNS. I thank my distinguished colleague.

My colleagues, this debate is reminiscent of a debate we had 3 years ago, almost to the day, on February 14, 15, and 16.

You will remember, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH), that the debate was that you tried to force us to pull out of Iraq before the job was done. I hope you remember that.

From the moment we got there, many of the folks wanted us to leave. Most remarkable is that these same folks wanted us to leave just before we stabilized Iraq. They were not in favor of the surge. Yet the surge worked. Now they want us to leave Afghanistan in 30 days without giving this new strategy a chance to succeed.

The President of the United States has indicated he wants to stay there for 18 months. Why won't his opponents just allow the President to have the opportunity to fulfill his own commitment which he has made publicly? Are they so up in arms that they would undermine the President, especially in light of the fact they were wrong in Iraq?

We have an opportunity to let General McChrystal apply the successes in Iraq to Afghanistan, which, I might add, are successes my friends on the other side of the aisle opposed, and to possibly win there and to possibly stabilize the country. We need to let the strategy work and achieve the successes like we had in Iraq.

It is ironic that Iraq recently held parliamentary elections. Without the success of the surge and the United States' presence for this short amount of time, Iraq would not have had these elections. Imagine what Iraq would look like if we had listened to the naysayers a few years ago.

Is it possible that this resolution means all the work and sacrifice that occurred would be for naught because these people today want to pull out within 30 days? They opposed our successful strategy in Iraq and oppose it in Afghanistan.

There is no logic in that they want to undercut their President and undercut the troops. They have provided no justification. While no proposal guarantees success, a precipitous withdrawal of U.S. support would guarantee failure.

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to another Florida colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROONEY), a member of the Armed Services and Judiciary Committees.

Mr. ROONEY. First, I want to acknowledge and thank Congressman JOHN BOCCIERI and Congressman DUNCAN HUNTER for their service in Afghanistan.

Madam Speaker, as a former captain in the Army in the 1st Cavalry Division and as an instructor at West Point, I had the distinct honor of teaching some of the men and women who are now serving in Afghanistan. I heard from them directly about the progress being made and about the need for the continued support of this Congress. It is for that reason that I will vote "no" on this resolution.

Withdrawal now would destabilize that area of the world, and it would create a vacuum for terror. Groups like al Qaeda and the Taliban would increasingly gain access to weapons that would cause great damage to our allies and, eventually, to us.

General McChrystal's implementation of President Obama's counterinsurgency strategy is producing dramatic successes, including the capture of key Taliban leaders and the rooting out of Taliban forces.

A withdrawal now undermines what our troops have done. It undermines the winning strategy we are pursuing in Afghanistan, a strategy we all know the United States can achieve. It is for that reason I encourage my colleagues to send a message to our troops and to vote "no."

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes, the balance of my time, to the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN), the ranking member of the Committee on House Administration and a member of the Homeland Security and Judiciary Committees. I can think of no better person with whom to close the debate on our side.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I thank the gentlewoman.

Madam Speaker, I join the chairman and ranking member of the committee in opposing this resolution.

Sometimes in public debate, we ask the wrong question or we place ourselves in the wrong context. I am reminded of a headline that I saw not too long ago on a domestic issue. The headline read simply: "Prison Population Increases Despite Drop in Crime." For those of us involved in the criminal justice system, we thought maybe it never dawned on the writer that the crime rate was dropping precisely because we were putting the bad guys in prison.

Similarly today, this resolution sets an arbitrary deadline for troops to leave Afghanistan, and it is a terribly misguided reading of the facts we face today. Our troops are succeeding. No one questions that. Our allies are helping us. Why then would we handicap them today with such a terrible message from our Congress? The message is, despite what you are doing on the ground, despite your successes, we are going to pull you out with an arbitrary date. What could be more demoralizing? What could be more wrong?

Madam Speaker, this resolution, unfortunately, is the wrong question. It sends the wrong message. It is being sent at precisely the wrong time.

I hope that we have a strong vote against this resolution so that our troops will have an unquestioned message of support from us that we recognize what they are doing, that we follow what they are doing, that we support what they are doing, and that we rejoice in their victorious work today and in the days ahead.

□ 1745

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield myself 1 minute.

The more troops we send into Afghanistan, the more support the Taliban gains as resistors of foreign occupation. We say we want to negotiate with the Taliban in the future while, at the same time, conducting air strikes to take out Taliban strongholds across the country.

Just yesterday, The Washington Post published an article about the Zabul province and the pouring in of Taliban fighters following a retreat of U.S. Armed Forces from Zabul in December. If we accept the premise that we can never leave Afghanistan until the Taliban is eradicated, we may be there for a very long time.

The justification for our continued military presence in Afghanistan is that the Taliban, in the past, has provided a safe haven for al Qaeda, or could do so in the future. General Petraeus has already admitted that al Qaeda has little or no presence in Afghanistan.

We have to be careful about branding al Qaeda and the Taliban as a single terrorist movement. Al Qaeda is an international organization, and, yes, they are a threat to the United States. The Taliban is only a threat to us as long

as we continue our military occupation of Afghanistan.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, first let me thank the gentleman from Ohio for this very important resolution. Today's debate and discussion on the path forward in Afghanistan and the proper role of Congress in determining the United States' commitment of our country while at war, this debate and discussion is long overdue. So thank you, Congressman KUCINICH, for bringing this to the floor.

Now in our 9th year of war, this body has yet to conduct a full and honest accounting of the benefits, costs, affordability, and strategic importance of the United States military operations in Afghanistan.

In order to understand Afghanistan and where we are today in terms of our commitment, I think it is really useful to point to how we got here. Of course, after the horrific events, the tragic events of 9/11 in 2001, I had to vote against the authorization to use force, this use of force authorization, because I knew that that authorization was a blank check to wage war anywhere, at any time, and for any length.

Almost 9 years later, in reflecting on the rush to war in Afghanistan and the Bush administration's war of choice in Iraq, the sacrifices made by our brave, young men and women in uniform and the cost to our economic and national security, all of these costs are totally immeasurable. Countless innocent civilians have lost their lives in Afghanistan, and just a few weeks ago the number of American troops killed in Afghanistan rose to over 1,000.

Where does this end? Where does it end? We have already given \$1 trillion to the Pentagon for the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, and the economic impact of these wars is estimated to be as much as \$7 trillion in direct and indirect costs to the United States.

It is our responsibility as Members of Congress to really develop a more effective U.S. foreign policy for the 21st century. After a decade of open-ended wars, I encourage my colleagues to finally stand firm in asserting their constitutional prerogative to determine when the United States enters into war.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, in closing, I would like to build on something that our colleague from California (Mr. HUNTER) had said earlier about the need to fight and defeat the enemy in Afghanistan so that our children or our grandchildren don't have to.

Our men and women in uniform are fighting for their families, for our families, for our Nation, for our future. They embrace their mission. They are honored by the opportunity to serve. They volunteered for it. Let us show our appreciation by voting "no" on this damaging resolution before us today.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, because I have no further requests for time and I understand that the sponsor of this resolution has both the right and the intention of closing, I will yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KUCINICH. I want to thank Mr. BERMAN and my colleagues for this opportunity to engage in this important debate.

At the current estimated deployment rate, the number of troops in Afghanistan will increase from about 70,000 at the end of 2009 to the stated goal of 100,000 by July of this year. My resolution calls for the withdrawal of all U.S. Armed Forces from Afghanistan no later than December 31 of this year. And it can be done. Unlike Iraq, where we have significant infrastructure built in and around the country to support our presence there, prior to last year, the United States invested very little in permanent infrastructure for U.S. Armed Forces in Afghanistan.

President Obama has called on the logisticians for the U.S. military to triple the amount of troops we have had in the country since the war started. If the administration expects the U.S. military to figure out a way for a rapid increase of troops on the ground, we can figure out how to have a method of rapid withdrawal.

Getting supplies into Afghanistan is one of the biggest obstacles to providing adequate support for troops on the ground. Due to frequent attacks on U.S. convoys traveling to Afghanistan through Pakistan, the U.S. is forced to deliver most of the supplies by air.

Madam Speaker, we have, in the last 3 hours, talked about 1,000 troop casualties; we have talked about a cost of a quarter of a trillion dollars and rising; we have spoken of civilian casualties and about the incredible amount of corruption that is going on in Afghanistan; we have spoken of the role of the pipeline, which is sure to deserve more critical inquiry; and we have talked about the failure of doctrines of counterinsurgency. That strategy doesn't work, and there are logistics of withdrawal that we can pursue.

The question is should the United States' people continue to bear the burden of this war when we have so many problems at home, with 15 million people unemployed, with millions of people losing their homes, with so many people without health care, with so many people not being able to send their children to good schools.

We have to reset our priorities. Our priorities should begin by getting out of Afghanistan, and then we can turn to getting out of Iraq.

Thank you very much for this debate. I urge approval of the resolution.

Mr. STARK. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 248 to bring our troops home from Afghanistan.

Despite the wishes of the people who voted him into office, President Obama is escalating the War in Afghanistan. It's now up to Congress to end the war. This resolution would invoke the War Powers Resolution of 1973, and

remove troops from Afghanistan no later than the end of the year.

This war has no clear objective. We have spent \$258 billion on the War in Afghanistan, with billions more to come this year. American soldiers and their families are paying a greater price. Over 1,000 soldiers have died, and over 5,000 have been wounded in action. According to the UN Assistance Mission in Afghanistan, Human Rights Watch, and other humanitarian organizations, tens of thousands of Afghan civilians have been killed.

It is time for Congress to assert its constitutional authority over matters of war and bring our troops home. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution, so that we can focus on diplomacy and infrastructure development that will bring a lasting peace to Afghanistan.

Mr. McMAHON. Madam Speaker, I rise as a supporter of our men and women in uniform who put their lives on the line every single day to strongly oppose H. Con. Res. 248.

Setting aside legitimate procedural objections to H. Con. Res. 248, this is the wrong time to withdraw our troops from Afghanistan. Secretary Gates just wrapped up a visit to Afghanistan and our troops have successfully lifted the Taliban flag off of Marja, and are preparing to expand security to other Afghan regions.

We are just beginning to implement General McChrystal's strategy to drive insurgents, terrorists and narco-traffickers out of Afghanistan, where they have comfortably plotted against the U.S. for years. U.S. and International Security Assistance Forces are laying the groundwork for the next push into the Taliban heartland of Kandahar, as we speak. Securing Kandahar will allow us to secure Afghanistan. If we have a peaceful Kandahar, we will have a peaceful Afghanistan.

I support our Commander in Chief in his plan to send an additional 30,000 troops to Afghanistan on December 1, 2009. It is time to give this strategy a chance. This Administration has made the elimination of Al-Qaeda and the stability of Afghanistan a top priority. In addition, many of our coalition partners particularly the United Kingdom, and Canada and Muslim allies like Pakistan, have also stepped up their engagement and cooperation. They are committed to the fight and we should be as well. They know that a stable Afghanistan will bring stability and security to Pakistan and all of South Asia.

Our troops now have the leadership and the vision to complete this mission. Their success militarily is working hand in hand with American and international humanitarian assistance and NGOs which are helping to educate women, clean drinking water and provide healthcare.

Obviously sending Americans to war is our most serious obligation as Members of Congress. But equally serious is our obligation to care for our veterans. In my first year in Congress, working with Members on both sides of the aisle, we have already secured a record amount in mental health funding for our troops and to expand the number of mental health professionals at the DoD. This Administration and Congress is committed to making sure that our Veterans receive the highest quality of care possible both in the field and at home.

Until then, our troops should be proud to help stabilize the region that has fanned the flames of radical hostility and extreme terrorist ideology that led to the horrors of September

11th. Afghanistan should never again be a launching pad for terrorist activities.

We are the United States, and it is our duty to fight for democracy and fight against terror. I urge my colleagues to vote against H. Con. Res. 248 today and give the Afghanistan mission the fighting chance to succeed.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of Representative KUCINICH's resolution to call our troops home from Afghanistan. When the President announced in December that he wanted 30,000 additional troops sent to Afghanistan, I said that I was unconvinced his plan would work. And now that many of those troops are in place, I'm still not convinced. We recently watched the start of Operation Mushtarak, the largest coordinated offensive since 2001, which is intended to loosen the Taliban's grip in the Southern region of the country. It was originally supposed to take a few weeks, but now estimates say that it may take 12 to 18 months. I think this is a perfect example of the biggest obstacle we face: we are asking troops to fix problems that the military is not capable of solving.

American soldiers have been in Afghanistan for nearly a decade and have been doing a magnificent job of what's been asked of them. But with every passing year, I grow more doubtful that we have the ability to build a stable democracy with the military alone. And I certainly do not believe that committing more troops will bring about the change necessary to stabilize the country, nor do I believe that it will hasten the process.

But that's the course that many continue to advocate, including President Obama. And while I know that the President wants to get out of Afghanistan as fast as possible, I also believe that if we want to help the Afghani people form a stable democracy and functioning economy, we need to help them with even more aid and support, not an increase in troops.

Over the last 30 years, Afghanistan has served as a battlefield in a series of devastating conflicts, first between the Soviet Union and the United States, and then between the United States and the Taliban. We hear a lot about the problems with poppy farming in the region, but we don't hear much about the cause. Before any of these incursions, Afghanistan was considered the orchard capital of central Asia, with nearly 80 percent of the population working on the land. But now it is estimated that more than 60 percent of the orchards and vineyards have been destroyed, which led many Afghans into poppy production and the drug trade. This is in part due to the fact that the Soviets thought that orchards were too good a place to hide, so they cut them all down.

The kinds of problems that Afghanistan faces are not the kinds of problems the U.S. military or NATO are equipped to solve. That is ultimately up to the Afghani government and its people, and we need to realize that our involvement can only do so much. The sooner we understand that, the sooner we can make a strategically acceptable exit.

I rise today to voice my support for Representative KUCINICH's resolution to invoke the War Powers Act to call all of our troops home from Afghanistan within the next 30 days—or, as the legislation outlines, by the end of the year if 30 days is deemed too dangerous. I refuse to watch as we send soldier after soldier into a battle I do not believe the military can win.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, the war in Afghanistan has entered its ninth year without clearly defined objectives or an exit strategy. With a deteriorating security situation and no comprehensive political outcome yet in sight, many experts view the war in Afghanistan as open-ended.

The open-ended nature of this conflict is evident in the complexities of defining the enemy. The U.S. invaded Afghanistan shortly after 9/11 because of the Taliban's support and refuge of al-Qaeda. We have had to combat the ever changing Taliban, foreign al-Qaeda fighters, and the revolving loyalties of numerous tribal war lords. Furthermore, our close relationship with the Pakistan government has been seriously challenged by the jihadist threat now in Pakistan. We have no clear response to this new threat beyond drone attacks that also have high rates of civilian casualties.

President Bush's disregard for the complexities of Afghanistan and the damage that came from his disregard has severely undermined any prospect of stability and a successful conclusion to this conflict. The unnecessary war in Iraq also diverted critical resources when we needed them the most in Afghanistan. These failures by the Bush Administration encouraged the division of Afghanistan and allowed al-Qaeda to move effortlessly into Pakistan.

President Obama's surge strategy in Afghanistan is counterproductive and sends the wrong message. The President sent an additional 17,000 troops in early 2009 and then another 30,000 troops late last year. Beyond nation building, the additional troops have no clear mission and do not resolve the problems in Pakistan.

Much like President Obama's exit strategy in Iraq, we need a clear exit strategy for Afghanistan. The Afghani and Pakistani people need to know our troops are not permanent. Unfortunately, President Obama has doubled down in Afghanistan.

Afghanistan will not become stable until a political consensus is found across ethnic, tribal, religious and party affiliations. The government must be able to provide basic security for its population without the corruption that exists today. These same needs are just as true in Pakistan.

H. Con. Res. 248 is flawed because it offers a blunt directive to bring all the troops home in a short time frame. The resolution also offers an opportunity send a message to the President that his Afghan strategy is failing. My vote in favor of this resolution is a vote against the President's surge strategy in Afghanistan, a vote to demand an exit plan, and a vote to demand a regional diplomatic response to undercut the radicalization of Pakistan.

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for initiating this needed debate on our policy in Afghanistan. Indeed, I opposed the war in Iraq because I felt it distracted us from finishing the job we had started in Afghanistan—finding and bringing to justice those who attacked us on 9/11. I think we have to acknowledge that the current Administration has accomplished more in less time to address the deteriorating situation in Afghanistan than the previous Administration did during its eight years in power. The capture of Mullah Baradar and the disruption of the Quetta, Pakistan-based Taliban leadership group headed by Mullah Omar—these significant tactical successes are the direct result of

President Obama's current policies, particularly his success in pressuring the government of Pakistan to live up to its obligations to help us root out the remaining Al Qaeda and Afghan Taliban elements at large in Pakistan. That's the good news. The bad news is that every time we take out one of their field commanders, several more rise to take their place. This is the nature of insurgency, it is the nature of the problem that confronts us, and it is not a problem that will be resolved by the continuous, endless use of military force. I came to the floor in December 2009 and posed a series of questions about our policy in this war, and many of those questions remain unanswered. However, several events over the last few months have answered at least one question: Are we fighting on the wrong battlefield?

Congress must push the Administration to think anew about this problem, as this conflict is not confined to Afghanistan and Pakistan. We saw that with the Ft. Hood terrorism incident, and with the near-tragedy on Christmas Day in the skies above Detroit. The ideas that motivated Major Hasan and Mr. Abdulmuttalab are propagated around the world via the mass media and the internet. Going to a training camp in the Pakistani tribal areas is no longer a requirement for a radicalized individual who wants to commit an act of terror.

The extremist ideology that is used to motivate these people itself occupies a safe haven—the internet and the global mass media. Unless and until we confront that reality, we will not prevail in this struggle. That is why we must think anew about how we're approaching this problem. I encourage the President to do that, and I encourage my colleagues to do that.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, there are few issues of state as weighty as those we discuss today. The decision to engage in military conflict affects us all in innumerable ways. There are the obvious effects on our military men and women who risk their lives abroad, while also giving up many of the small joys associated with sharing life's meaningful moments with family and friends.

Similarly, each of us bears the costs associated with domestic investments sacrificed at home when we decide to instead spend vast sums of money abroad. Each dollar spent in Afghanistan on a Blackwater mercenary is a dollar that could be spent keeping a teacher in the classroom, putting a cop on the beat, or retraining a Detroit steelworker so he or she can compete in the emerging industries that will underpin the global economy.

Lastly, and perhaps most importantly, waging war tests our values as a nation. During these periods of conflict, the eyes of the world, rightly, are trained on our actions abroad. The ability to inflict violence upon large numbers of our fellow human beings demands that the American people be allowed to sit in judgment about what is being done in their name—to determine if the potent weapons at our disposal are wielded in a just manner. The question of whether or not we are living up to this highest of burdens could not be more important and that is why we must debate the War in Afghanistan here on the House Floor today.

While the number of Members who will join my good friend from Ohio and myself in supporting this resolution may be small, this vote will not accurately represent the views of the public at large. A poll commissioned by CNN

this January found that a majority of the American people oppose the War in Afghanistan. Apparently, as with many issues in Washington, those who are forced bear the costs of war are the first to recognize a flawed policy, while those who profit from perpetual war do their best to blunt any change in course.

As a co-founder of the Out of Iraq Caucus, I remember that it took some time for official Washington to comprehend the scope of the public's opposition to that war. Thankfully, that caucus eventually grew to bloc of 70 Members and we were able to successfully match the will of the people with the priorities of the Congress. As a result, our troops will pull out of Iraqi cities this summer and leave the country by the end of the year.

I believe that, as with Iraq, the Administration and Congress will, and must, adopt a course in Afghanistan that will benefit both the Afghan and American people. That is why I have founded the "Out of Afghanistan Caucus," which acknowledges that peace and security in Afghanistan will only occur when the United States reorients its commitment to the Afghan government and people by emphasizing indigenous reconciliation and reconstruction strategies, rigorous regional diplomacy, and swift redeployment of the US military.

It is increasingly clear that our military presence in Afghanistan inflames ethnic Pashtuns—many of whom would have nothing to do with the Taliban if they did not view the United States as an existential threat to their distinctive tribal culture and way of life. By picking sides in a 35-year-old civil war, the United States has made the necessary reconciliation between all parties in Afghanistan all but impossible. Similarly, I oppose the constant Predator drone strikes in both Afghanistan and Pakistan, in which one in three casualties is an innocent civilian. This violence will breed enmity, when we really need to be bringing these warring parties together.

I hope that the House votes today in support of this War Powers Privileged Resolution. Regardless of the outcome, I and many others in the Congress will continue to organize against additional troop funding and for Afghan-centric development policies that will speed peaceful and permanent reconciliation. I hope that you will join me as a Member of the Out of Afghanistan Caucus and you will support this historic resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1146, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 248 will be followed by 5-minute votes on the motion to suspend the rules on House Concurrent Resolution 249 and House Resolution 1144.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 65, nays 356, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 98]

YEAS—65

| | | |
|---------------|----------------|------------------|
| Baldwin | Johnson Lee | Payne |
| Campbell | (TX) | Pingree (ME) |
| Capuano | Johnson (IL) | Polis (CO) |
| Chu | Johnson, E. B. | Quigley |
| Clarke | Jones | Rangel |
| Clay | Kagen | Richardson |
| Cleaver | Kucinich | Sánchez, Linda |
| Crowley | Larson (CT) | T. |
| Davis (IL) | Lee (CA) | Sanchez, Loretta |
| DeFazio | Lewis (GA) | Schakowsky |
| Doyle | Maffei | Serrano |
| Duncan | Maloney | Speier |
| Edwards (MD) | Markey (MA) | Stark |
| Ellison | McDermott | Stupak |
| Farr | McGovern | Tierney |
| Filner | Michaud | Towns |
| Frank (MA) | Miller, George | Tsongas |
| Grayson | Nadler (NY) | Velázquez |
| Grijalva | Napolitano | Waters |
| Gutierrez | Neal (MA) | Watson |
| Hastings (FL) | Obey | Welch |
| Jackson (IL) | Oliver | Woolsey |
| | Paul | |

NAYS—356

| | | |
|----------------|-----------------|------------------|
| Ackerman | Coble | Heller |
| Aderholt | Coffman (CO) | Hensarling |
| Adler (NJ) | Cohen | Herger |
| Akin | Cole | Herseth Sandlin |
| Alexander | Conaway | Higgins |
| Altmire | Connolly (VA) | Hill |
| Andrews | Cooper | Himes |
| Arcuri | Costa | Hinchey |
| Austria | Costello | Hinojosa |
| Baca | Courtney | Hirono |
| Bachmann | Crenshaw | Hodes |
| Bachus | Cuellar | Holden |
| Baird | Culberson | Holt |
| Barrow | Cummings | Honda |
| Bartlett | Dahlkemper | Hoyer |
| Barton (TX) | Davis (CA) | Hunter |
| Bean | Davis (KY) | Inglis |
| Becerra | Davis (TN) | Inlee |
| Berkley | DeGette | Israel |
| Berman | Delahunt | Issa |
| Berry | DeLauro | Jenkins |
| Biggart | Dent | Johnson (GA) |
| Bilbray | Diaz-Balart, M. | Johnson, Sam |
| Bilirakis | Dicks | Jordan (OH) |
| Bishop (GA) | Dingell | Kanjorski |
| Bishop (NY) | Doggett | Kaptur |
| Bishop (UT) | Donnelly (IN) | Kennedy |
| Blackburn | Dreier | Kildee |
| Blumenauer | Driehaus | Kilpatrick (MI) |
| Blunt | Edwards (TX) | Kilroy |
| Bocchieri | Ehlers | Kind |
| Boehner | Ellsworth | King (IA) |
| Bonner | Emerson | King (NY) |
| Bono Mack | Engel | Kingston |
| Boozman | Eshoo | Kirk |
| Boren | Etheridge | Kirkpatrick (AZ) |
| Boswell | Fallin | Kissell |
| Boucher | Fattah | Klein (FL) |
| Boustany | Flake | Kline (MN) |
| Boyd | Fleming | Kosmas |
| Brady (PA) | Forbes | Kratovil |
| Brady (TX) | Fortenberry | Lamborn |
| Bralley (IA) | Foster | Lance |
| Bright | Fox | Langevin |
| Broun (GA) | Franks (AZ) | Larsen (WA) |
| Brown (SC) | Frelinghuysen | Latham |
| Brown, Corrine | Fudge | LaTourette |
| Brown-Waite, | Gallegly | Latta |
| Ginny | Garamendi | Lee (NY) |
| Buchanan | Garrett (NJ) | Levin |
| Burgess | Gerlach | Lewis (CA) |
| Burton (IN) | Giffords | Linder |
| Butterfield | Gingrey (GA) | Lipinski |
| Buyer | Gohmert | LoBiondo |
| Calvert | Gonzalez | Loebsock |
| Cantor | Goodlatte | Lofgren, Zoe |
| Cao | Gordon (TN) | Lowey |
| Capito | Granger | Lucas |
| Capps | Graves | Luetkemeyer |
| Cardoza | Green, Al | Luján |
| Carnahan | Green, Gene | Lummis |
| Carney | Griffith | Lungren, Daniel |
| Carson (IN) | Guthrie | E. |
| Carter | Hall (NY) | Lynch |
| Cassidy | Hall (TX) | Mack |
| Castle | Halvorson | Manzullo |
| Castor (FL) | Hare | Marchant |
| Chaffetz | Harman | Markey (CO) |
| Chandler | Harper | Marshall |
| Childers | Hastings (WA) | Matheson |
| Clyburn | Heinrich | Matsui |

McCarthy (CA) Petri Shuler
 McCarrthy (NY) Pitts Shuster
 McCaul Platts Simpson
 McClintock Poe (TX) Sires
 McCollum Pomeroy Skelton
 McCotter Posey Slaughter
 McHenry Price (GA) Smith (NE)
 McIntyre Price (NC) Smith (NJ)
 McKeon Putnam Smith (TX)
 McMahan Radanovich Smith (WA)
 McMorris Rahall Snyder
 Rodgers Rehberg Souder
 Mc Nerney Reichert Space
 Meek (FL) Reyes Spratt
 Meeks (NY) Rodriguez Stearns
 Melancon Roe (TN) Sullivan
 Mica Rogers (AL) Sutton
 Miller (FL) Rogers (KY) Tanner
 Miller (MI) Rogers (MI) Taylor
 Miller (NC) Rohrabacher Teague
 Miller, Gary Rooney Terry
 Minnick Ros-Lehtinen Thompson (CA)
 Mitchell Roskam Thompson (MS)
 Mollohan Ross Thompson (PA)
 Moore (KS) Rothman (NJ) Thornberry
 Moore (WI) Roybal-Allard Tiahrt
 Moran (KS) Royce Tiberi
 Moran (VA) Ruppertsberger Titus
 Murphy (CT) Rush
 Murphy (NY) Ryan (OH) Tonko
 Murphy, Patrick Ryan (WI) Turner
 Murphy, Tim Salazar Upton
 Myrick Sarbanes Van Hollen
 Neugebauer Scalise Visclosky
 Nunes Schauer Walden
 Nye Schiff Walz
 Oberstar Schmidt Wamp
 Olson Schock Watt
 Ortiz Schrader Waxman
 Owens Schwartz Weiner
 Pallone Scott (GA) Westmoreland
 Pascrell Scott (VA) Whitfield
 Pastor (AZ) Sensenbrenner Wilson (OH)
 Paulsen Sessions Wilson (SC)
 Pence Sestak Wittman
 Perlmutter Shadegg Wolf
 Perriello Shea-Porter Wu
 Peters Sherman Yarmuth
 Peterson Shimkus Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—9

Barrett (SC) Deal (GA) Wasserman
 Camp Diaz-Balart, L. Schultz
 Conyers Hoekstra Young (FL)
 Davis (AL)

□ 1822

Messrs. GENE GREEN of Texas, CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. CAPPS, Messrs. BACHUS, COSTELLO, and Mrs. LOWEY changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. CROWLEY changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the concurrent resolution was not agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 98, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

COMMEMORATING THE 45TH ANNIVERSARY OF BLOODY SUNDAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 249, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr.

COHEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 249.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 409, nays 0, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 99]

YEAS—409

Ackerman Crowley Issa
 Aderholt Cuellar Jackson (IL)
 Adler (NJ) Culberson Jackson Lee
 Akin Cummings (TX)
 Alexander Dahlkemper Jenkins
 Altmire Davis (CA) Johnson (GA)
 Andrews Davis (IL) Johnson (IL)
 Arcuri Davis (KY) Johnson, E. B.
 Austria Davis (TN) Johnson, Sam
 Baca DeFazio Jones
 Bachmann DeGette Jordan (OH)
 Bachus Delahunt Kagen
 Baird DeLauro Kanjorski
 Baldwin Dent Kaptur
 Barrow Diaz-Balart, M. Kennedy
 Bartlett Dingell Kildee
 Barton (TX) Doggett Kilpatrick (MI)
 Bean Donnelly (IN) Kilroy
 Becerra Doyle Kind
 Berkeley Dreier King (IA)
 Berman Driehaus King (NY)
 Berry Duncan Kingston
 Biggart Edwards (MD) Kirk
 Bilbray Ehlers Kirkpatrick (AZ)
 Bilirakis Ellison Kissell
 Bishop (GA) Ellsworth Klein (FL)
 Bishop (NY) Emerson Kosmas
 Bishop (UT) Engel Kratovil
 Blackburn Eshoo Kucinich
 Blumenauer Etheridge Lamborn
 Boccheri Fallin Lance
 Boehner Fattah Langevin
 Bonner Filner Larsen (WA)
 Bono Mack Flake Latham
 Boozman Fleming Latta
 Boren Forbes Lee (CA)
 Boswell Fortenberry Levin
 Boucher Foster Lewis (CA)
 Boustany Foxx Lewis (GA)
 Boyd Linder Lewis (GA)
 Brady (PA) Frank (MA) Linder
 Brady (TX) Franks (AZ) Lipinski
 Braley (IA) Frelinghuysen LoBiondo
 Bright Fudge Loeb sack
 Broun (GA) Gallegly Lofgren, Zoe
 Brown (SC) Garamendi Lowey
 Brown, Corrine Garrett (NJ) Lucas
 Brown-Waite, Gerlach Luetkemeyer
 Ginny Giffords Luján
 Buchanan Gingrey (GA) Lummis
 Burgess Gohmert Lungren, Daniel
 Butterfield Gonzalez E.
 Buyer Goodlatte Lynch
 Calvert Granger Mack
 Campbell Graves Maffei
 Cantor Grayson Maloney
 Cao Green, Al Manzullo
 Capito Griffith Marchant
 Capps Guthrie Markey (CO)
 Capuano Gutierrez Markey (MA)
 Cardoza Hall (NY) Marshall
 Carnahan Hall (TX) Matheson
 Carney Halvorson Matsui
 Carson (IN) Hare McCarthy (CA)
 Carter Harman McCarthy (NY)
 Cassidy Harper McCaul
 Castle Hastings (FL) McClintock
 Castor (FL) Hastings (WA) McCollum
 Chaffetz Heinrich McCotter
 Chandler Heller McDermott
 Childers Hensarling McGovern
 Chu Herger McHenry
 Clarke Herseht Sandlin McIntyre
 Clay Higgins McKeon
 Cleaver Hill McMahon
 Clyburn Himes McMorris
 Coble Hinchey Rodgers
 Coffman (CO) Hinojosa Meek (FL)
 Cohen Hirono Meeks (NY)
 Cole Holden Melancon
 Conaway Holt Mica
 Connolly (VA) Honda Michaud
 Cooper Hoyer Miller (FL)
 Costa Hunter Miller (MI)
 Costello Inglis Miller (NC)
 Courtney Inslee Miller, Gary
 Crenshaw Israel Miller, George

Richardson Souder
 Mitchell Rodriguez Space
 Mollohan Roe (TN) Speier
 Moore (KS) Rogers (AL) Spratt
 Moore (WI) Rogers (KY) Stark
 Moran (KS) Rogers (MI) Stearns
 Moran (VA) Rohrabacher Stupak
 Murphy (CT) Rooney Sullivan
 Murphy (NY) Ros-Lehtinen Sutton
 Murphy, Patrick Roskam Tanner
 Murphy, Tim Ross Taylor
 Myrick Rothman (NJ) Teague
 Nadler (NY) Roybal-Allard Terry
 Napolitano Royce Thompson (CA)
 Neal (MA) Ruppertsberger Thompson (MS)
 Neugebauer Rush Thompson (PA)
 Nunes Ryan (OH) Thornberry
 Nye Ryan (WI) Tiahrt
 Oberstar Salazar Sánchez, Linda
 Obey Olson T. Tierney
 Olver Sanchez, Loretta Titus
 Ortiz Sarbanes Tonko
 Owens Scalise Towns
 Pallone Schakowsky Tsongas
 Pascrell Schauer Turner
 Pastor (AZ) Schiff Upton
 Paul Schmidt Van Hollen
 Paulsen Paulsen Velázquez
 Payne Payne Schrader
 Pence Pence Schwartz
 Perlmutter Perlmutter Scott (GA)
 Perriello Perriello Scott (VA)
 Peters Peters Sensenbrenner Wamp
 Peterson Peterson Serrano Wasserman
 Petri Sessions Schultz
 Pingree (ME) Sestak Waters
 Pitts Shadegg Watson
 Platts Shea-Porter Watt
 Poe (TX) Sherman Waxman
 Pomeroy Shimkus Weiner
 Posey Shuler Welch
 Price (GA) Shuster Westmoreland
 Price (NC) Simpson Whitfield
 Putnam Sires Wilson (OH)
 Quigley Skelton Wilson (SC)
 Radanovich Slaughter Wittman
 Rahall Shimkus Smith (NE) Wolf
 Rangel Smith (NJ) Woolsey
 Rehberg Smith (TX) Wu
 Reichert Smith (WA) Yarmuth
 Reyes Snyder Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—21

Barrett (SC) Diaz-Balart, L. Hoekstra
 Blunt Dicks Kline (MN)
 Burton (IN) Edwards (TX) Larson (CT)
 Camp Farr LaTourrette
 Conyers Gordon (TN) Lee (NY)
 Davis (AL) Grijalva Polis (CO)
 Deal (GA) Hodes Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. HALVORSON) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1830

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 99, had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, on March 10, 2010, I was called away on personal business. I regret that I was not present to vote on H. Res. 1146, H. Res. 1088, H.R. 4621, H. Con. Res. 248, and H. Con. Res. 249.

Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on all votes.

EXPRESSING CONDOLENCES TO CHILE EARTHQUAKE VICTIMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 1144.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1144.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. ANDREWS. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 404, noes 1, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 100]

AYES—404

| | | |
|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Ackerman | Carney | Forbes |
| Aderholt | Carson (IN) | Fortenberry |
| Adler (NJ) | Carter | Foster |
| Alexander | Cassidy | Fox |
| Altmire | Castle | Frank (MA) |
| Andrews | Castor (FL) | Franks (AZ) |
| Arcuri | Chaffetz | Frelinghuysen |
| Austria | Chandler | Fudge |
| Baca | Childers | Galleghy |
| Bachmann | Chu | Garamendi |
| Bachus | Clarke | Garrett (NJ) |
| Baird | Clay | Gerlach |
| Baldwin | Cleaver | Giffords |
| Barrow | Clyburn | Gingrey (GA) |
| Bartlett | Coble | Gohmert |
| Barton (TX) | Coffman (CO) | Gonzalez |
| Bean | Cohen | Goodlatte |
| Becerra | Cole | Granger |
| Berkley | Conaway | Graves |
| Berman | Connolly (VA) | Grayson |
| Berry | Cooper | Green, Al |
| Biggart | Costa | Green, Gene |
| Billray | Costello | Griffith |
| Bilirakis | Courtney | Guthrie |
| Bishop (GA) | Crenshaw | Gutierrez |
| Bishop (NY) | Crowley | Hall (NY) |
| Bishop (UT) | Cuellar | Hall (TX) |
| Blackburn | Culberson | Halvorson |
| Blumenauer | Cummings | Hare |
| Bocieri | Dahlkemper | Harper |
| Boehner | Davis (CA) | Hastings (FL) |
| Bonner | Davis (IL) | Hastings (WA) |
| Bono Mack | Davis (KY) | Heinrich |
| Boozman | Davis (TN) | Heller |
| Boren | DeFazio | Hensarling |
| Boswell | DeGette | Hergert |
| Boucher | DeLauro | Herseth Sandlin |
| Boustany | Dent | Higgins |
| Boyd | Diaz-Balart, M. | Hill |
| Brady (PA) | Dingell | Himes |
| Brady (TX) | Doggett | Hinche |
| Braley (IA) | Donnelly (IN) | Hinojosa |
| Bright | Doyle | Hirono |
| Broun (GA) | Dreier | Holden |
| Brown (SC) | Driehaus | Holt |
| Brown, Corrine | Duncan | Honda |
| Brown-Waite, | Edwards (MD) | Hoyer |
| Ginny | Edwards (TX) | Hunter |
| Buchanan | Ehlers | Inglis |
| Burgess | Ellison | Inslee |
| Burton (IN) | Ellsworth | Israel |
| Butterfield | Emerson | Issa |
| Buyer | Engel | Jackson (IL) |
| Calvert | Eshoo | Jackson Lee |
| Campbell | Etheridge | (TX) |
| Cantor | Fallin | Jenkins |
| Cao | Farr | Johnson (GA) |
| Capito | Fattah | Johnson (IL) |
| Capps | Filner | Johnson, E. B. |
| Capuano | Flake | Johnson, Sam |
| Carnahan | Fleming | Jones |

| | | |
|------------------|------------------|---------------|
| Jordan (OH) | Minnick | Schiff |
| Kagen | Mitchell | Schmidt |
| Kanjorski | Mollohan | Schock |
| Kennedy | Moore (KS) | Schrader |
| Kildee | Moore (WI) | Schwartz |
| Kilpatrick (MI) | Moran (KS) | Scott (GA) |
| Kilroy | Moran (VA) | Scott (VA) |
| Kind | Murphy (CT) | Sensenbrenner |
| King (IA) | Murphy (NY) | Serrano |
| King (NY) | Murphy, Patrick | Sessions |
| Kingston | Murphy, Tim | Sestak |
| Kirk | Myrick | Shadegg |
| Kirkpatrick (AZ) | Napolitano | Shea-Porter |
| Kissell | Neal (MA) | Sherman |
| Klein (FL) | Neugebauer | Shimkus |
| Kosmas | Nunes | Shuler |
| Kratovil | Nye | Shuster |
| Kucinich | Oberstar | Simpson |
| Lamborn | Obey | Sires |
| Lance | Olson | Skelton |
| Langevin | Olver | Slaughter |
| Larsen (WA) | Ortiz | Smith (NE) |
| Larson (CT) | Owens | Smith (NJ) |
| Latham | Pallone | Smith (TX) |
| LaTourette | Pascrell | Smith (WA) |
| Latta | Pastor (AZ) | Snyder |
| Lee (CA) | Paulsen | Souder |
| Levin | Payne | Space |
| Lewis (GA) | Pence | Speier |
| Linder | Perlmutter | Spratt |
| Lipinski | Perriello | Stark |
| LoBiondo | Peters | Stearns |
| Loeback | Peterson | Stupak |
| Lofgren, Zoe | Petri | Sullivan |
| Lowe | Pingree (ME) | Sutton |
| Lucas | Pitts | Tanner |
| Luetkemeyer | Platts | Taylor |
| Lujan | Poe (TX) | Teague |
| Lummis | Polis (CO) | Terry |
| Lungren, Daniel | Pomeroy | Thompson (CA) |
| E. | Posey | Thompson (MS) |
| Lynch | Price (GA) | Thompson (PA) |
| Mack | Price (NC) | Thornberry |
| Maffei | Putnam | Tiahrt |
| Maloney | Quigley | Tiberi |
| Manzullo | Radanovich | Tierney |
| Marchant | Rahall | Titus |
| Markey (CO) | Rangel | Tonko |
| Markey (MA) | Rehberg | Towns |
| Marshall | Reichert | Tsongas |
| Matheson | Reyes | Turner |
| Matsui | Richardson | Upton |
| McCarthy (CA) | Rodriguez | Van Hollen |
| McCarthy (NY) | Roe (TN) | Visclosky |
| McCaul | Rogers (AL) | Walden |
| McClintock | Rogers (KY) | Walz |
| McCollum | Rogers (MI) | Wamp |
| McCotter | Rohrabacher | Wasserman |
| McDermott | Rooney | Schultz |
| McGovern | Ros-Lehtinen | Waters |
| McHenry | Ross | Watson |
| McIntyre | Rothman (NJ) | Watt |
| McKeon | Roybal-Allard | Waxman |
| McMahon | Royce | Weiner |
| McMorris | Ruppersberger | Welch |
| Rodgers | Rush | Westmoreland |
| McNerney | Ryan (OH) | Whitfield |
| Meek (FL) | Ryan (WI) | Wilson (OH) |
| Meeks (NY) | Salazar | Wilson (SC) |
| Mica | Sánchez, Linda | Wittman |
| Michaud | T. | Wolf |
| Miller (FL) | Sanchez, Loretta | Woolsey |
| Miller (MI) | Sarbanes | Wu |
| Miller (NC) | Scalise | Yarmuth |
| Miller, Gary | Schakowsky | Young (AK) |
| Miller, George | Schauer | |

NOES—1

Paul
NOT VOTING—25

| | | |
|--------------|-----------------|-------------|
| Akin | Diaz-Balart, L. | Lee (NY) |
| Barrett (SC) | Dicks | Lewis (CA) |
| Blunt | Gordon (TN) | Melancon |
| Camp | Grijalva | Nadler (NY) |
| Cardoza | Harman | Roskam |
| Conyers | Hodes | Velázquez |
| Davis (AL) | Hoekstra | Young (FL) |
| Deal (GA) | Kaptur | |
| Delahunt | Kline (MN) | |

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1837

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTING A MEMBER TO A CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I send to the desk a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1156

Resolved, That the following named Member be and is hereby elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET.—Mr. Moore of Kansas.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H. Con. Res. 248.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE CAROLYN C. KILPATRICK, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable CAROLYN C. KILPATRICK, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 1, 2010.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a grand jury subpoena for testimony by the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan.

After consulting with my attorney, I will make the determinations required by Rule VIII.

Sincerely,
CAROLYN C. KILPATRICK,
Member of Congress.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE JOHN D. DINGELL, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable JOHN D. DINGELL, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, March 10, 2010.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives that I have been served with a subpoena for testimony and documents by the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York.

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

Sincerely,

JOHN D. DINGELL,
Member of Congress.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Brian E. Pate, one of his secretaries.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on the motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken later.

HAITI DEBT RELIEF AND EARTH- QUAKE RECOVERY ACT OF 2010

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4573) to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to instruct the United States Executive Directors at the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank, and other multilateral development institutions to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States to cancel immediately and completely Haiti's debts to such institutions, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4573

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Haiti Debt Relief and Earthquake Recovery Act of 2010".

SEC. 2. DEBT RELIEF FOR HAITI.

Title XVI of the International Financial Institutions Act (22 U.S.C. 262p et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 1628. CANCELLATION OF HAITI'S DEBTS TO INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury should direct the United States Executive Director at the International Monetary Fund, the International Development Association, the Inter-American Develop-

ment Bank, the International Fund for Agricultural Development, and other multilateral development institutions (as defined in section 1701(c)(3)) to use the voice, vote and influence of the United States at each such institution to seek to achieve—

"(1) the immediate and complete cancellation of any and all remaining debts owed by Haiti to such institutions;

"(2) the suspension of Haiti's debt service payments to such institutions until such time as the debts are canceled completely; and

"(3) the provision of emergency, humanitarian and reconstruction assistance from such institutions to Haiti in the form of grants or other assistance such that Haiti does not accumulate debt.

"(b) USE OF CERTAIN FUNDS FOR ASSISTANCE TO HAITI.—The Secretary of the Treasury should instruct the United States Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund to advocate the use of some of the realized windfall profits that exceed the required contribution to the Poverty Reduction and Growth Trust (as referenced in the IMF Reforms Financial Facilities for Low-Income Countries Public Information Notice (PIN) No. 09/94) from the ongoing sale of 12,965,649 ounces of gold acquired since the second Amendment of the Fund's Article of Agreement, to provide debt stock relief, debt service relief, and grants for Haiti.

"(c) SECURING OTHER RELIEF FOR HAITI.—The Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of State should use all appropriate diplomatic influence to secure cancellation of any and all remaining bilateral, multilateral and private creditor debt owed by Haiti."

SEC. 3. INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT.

(a) TRUST FUND.—The Secretary of the Treasury should support the creation and utilization of a multilateral trust fund for Haiti that would leverage potential United States contributions and promote bilateral donations to such a fund for the purpose of making investments in Haiti's future, including efforts to combat soil degradation and promote reforestation and infrastructure investments such as electric grids, roads, water and sanitation facilities, and other critical infrastructure projects.

(b) INCREASE IN TRANSFER OF EARNINGS.—The Secretary of the Treasury should direct the United States Executive Director of the Inter-American Development Bank to seek to increase the transfer of its earnings to the Fund for Special Operations and to a trust fund or grant facility for Haiti.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY G. MILLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation, and to insert extraneous materials thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Today, Madam Speaker, we consider an issue that is close to all of our hearts. Haiti suffered a devastating earthquake on January 12 of this year.

The country, which was finally making strides to more stable economic and political growth after so many failed governments of the past, was rocked by a natural disaster of historic proportions. The images from the disaster are fresh in our minds. The immediate needs of the people are clear, and the desire of the global community and the average American citizens to help Haiti recover as fast as possible are clear and give us all hope.

Earlier today, I joined with President Obama and other members of this House at the White House in restating America's commitment to stand by our brothers and sisters in Haiti, and to lend them a hand up to get back on a path to economic growth and social healing. In speaking with President Preval today, I told him that Haiti debt relief was but the first of a broader set of initiatives that we will undertake to enable the people of Haiti to rebuild their country, their lives, their businesses, and their communities.

□ 1845

As Chair of the International Monetary Policy and Trade Subcommittee, I am proud to have moved this bill successfully in a strongly bipartisan manner. I thank the woman whose name will appear on this bill who has worked very hard to make this bill happen, the chairwoman of the Subcommittee on Housing, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) who has been a long and strong supporter for Haiti.

Forgiving Haiti's debts to the World Bank, the IMF, the IDB, and IFAD is good policy and is the right thing to do. But forgiving these debts alone will not deliver the desperately needed tents to provide shelter from the impending rainy season. Debt relief alone will not rebuild roads, hospitals, churches, schools, and the physical infrastructure that Haiti needs to get back to work. Debt relief alone will not heal the physical and psychological wounds of the injured and traumatized or develop the human capital the country needs so desperately. As our agencies, from USAID to the Treasury Department, to the State Department, to our Armed Forces, to average citizens from around the country, lend support to Haiti in the immediate aftermath of the earthquake, we must not lose sight of the longer-term needs of this country, its government, and its people.

Indeed, we are now moving to the second and third phase of a long and arduous process; namely, moving from the immediate rescue and survival concerns, though they are still critical, to reconstruction and ultimately long-term economic recovery. Doing this will require leadership of the Haitian people and government as they take ownership for the future they care to build. It will also require effective coordination of our aid and development efforts to limit waste, duplication and, ultimately, loss of goodwill.

As we do all of this and as implementation is planned, special attention

needs to be paid to the need to rebuild Haiti's human capital. Several of our government agencies are already at work doing this, and I will keep pressure on them, as I am sure others in this House will, as well as the development banks and international financial institutions, to ensure that they invest heavily in developing the people of Haiti and the institutions of Haiti, to enable them to effectively govern and set their own path to a brighter future with dignity and independence.

Lastly, I will keep the pressure on the international institutions to deliver the necessary resources to Haiti without adding to that nation's long-term debt burden. In over 200 years of independence, Haiti has always been saddled with unsustainable debts, whether extraordinarily high debt obligations owed to the French as a condition of independence in the early 1800s, as is often brought out by Congressman GREEN of Houston, or from international institutions unscrupulously saddling the people of Haiti with debts diverted by dictators in the second half of the 20th century, or over \$1 billion in debts still owed today, despite the country having earned \$1.2 billion in debt forgiveness from the international institutions last year.

The people of Haiti have worked far too long and far too hard to repay debts they had little say in accruing and which have yielded very little benefit to the average citizen. This cynical game of debt accrual and debt forgiveness must end, and as Chair of the International Monetary Policy Subcommittee, I will be doing my part to see that happens. The people of Haiti deserve better than that and deserve a chance to invest in their own futures.

MARCH 8, 2010.

Hon. BARNEY FRANK,
*Chairman, Committee on Financial Services,
Rayburn House Office Building, Wash-
ington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN FRANK: I am writing to you concerning H.R. 4573, the Debt Relief for Earthquake Recovery in Haiti Act of 2010, introduced by Rep. Maxine Waters on February 2, 2010.

This bill contains provisions within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. In the interest of permitting your Committee to proceed expeditiously to floor consideration of this important bill, I am willing to waive this Committee's right to mark up this bill. I do so with the understanding that by waiving consideration of the bill, the Committee on Foreign Affairs does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill which fall within its Rule X jurisdiction.

Further, I request your support for the appointment of Foreign Affairs Committee conferees during any House-Senate conference convened on this legislation.

Please include a copy of this letter and your response in the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor.

Sincerely,

HOWARD L. BERMAN,
Chairman.

MARCH 8, 2010.

Hon. HOWARD BERMAN,
*Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, House
of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter concerning H.R. 4573, the "Debt Relief for Earthquake Recovery in Haiti Act of 2010." This bill will be considered by the House shortly.

I want to confirm our mutual understanding with respect to the consideration of this bill. I acknowledge that portions of the bill fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and I appreciate your cooperation in moving the bill to the House floor expeditiously. I further agree that your decision to not to proceed with a markup on this bill will not prejudice the Committee on Foreign Affairs with respect to its prerogatives on this or similar legislation. I would support your request for an appropriate number of conferees in the event of a House-Senate conference.

I will include a copy of this letter and your response in the Congressional Record. Thank you again for your cooperation.

BARNEY FRANK,
Chairman.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) such time as he may consume.

Mr. BACHUS. I thank the ranking member for yielding, and I want to commend him for his work on this legislation. I also want to commend Chairman WATERS and Chairman MEEKS for their work, and other Members who I think have worked in a bipartisan way for an excellent legislation and a very worthy legislation. I rise in complete support for the Debt Relief for Earthquake Recovery Act.

If you picked a country and a capital in a country anywhere in the world which could least deal with a devastating earthquake, it would be Port-au-Prince, Haiti. You could not visualize a worse scenario.

The immediate legacy, other than which you have witnessed on the TV screens here in America, is that there will be virtually a generation of orphans who have lost their parents. That alone would be a challenge for any country. Think of New Orleans and what a challenge that has been for our country. For Haiti, it is a monumental undertaking. And, quite frankly, it is hard to visualize in our lifetime seeing Haiti recover.

The human tragedy following that earthquake is overwhelming. As Haiti's citizens seek to rebuild, I think it is very important for us to stand with them and alongside them. And I commend the administration for their efforts since the earthquake. Many of our agencies are there. Many of our charities are there. Many of our church groups are there. Many of our NGOs are there: the Jubilee Act, Melinda St. Louis, her organization; Tom Hart of the One Campaign. I think those two organizations have done a wonderful job of highlighting the need not only in Haiti, but in many of the impoverished countries.

The first measure we can take—other than the efforts that we have wit-

nessed, many American volunteers and government efforts—to ensure that all of Haiti's remaining resources are devoted to reconstruction and not to development loans that it is unrealistic to expect can ever be repaid, this legislation is a part of that step.

Haiti's impoverished condition dates back to its origins under French colonial rule, to 1804, 205, 206 years ago, when Haiti's citizens won their independence in a revolution similar to our revolution from the French colonial regime. France imposed a blockade and imposed and extracted a promise of \$21 billion in reparations, and that is \$21 billion in today's currency. That is greater than the debt incurred at that time by the United States, a much bigger government. So Haiti, when they were born as a country, they were immediately impoverished, and their enslavement continued. I will say that.

The amazing thing, if you look at that debt that the French imposed and you read about it, part of the debt was repayment for compensation for property, which included the slave population. I mean, that's amazing. That's amazing. That is something that we can't go back and do anything about, but we can certainly do something today. But when the French lost their ability to enslave that population, they extracted, because of their navy, a blockade and that debt.

With the country's economic productivity being drained, since its inception, to pay this enormous debt, which has never been paid off, never paid off because there were other debts added, economic development stifled since 1804.

Sometimes we say, Why Haiti? Why is it so poor? Why has it always been so poor? It never stood a chance.

In more recent times, and one would think that things couldn't get worse than that, Duvalier, under his dictatorship, was responsible for more than 40 percent of the additional loans to Haiti. I mean, think about loaning to a dictator who is suppressing his people. We have seen that in Africa and other places, and it is an absurdity that we ought to address in Haiti and we ought to address in other places because, in that way, countries that did that contributed. The brutal regime further despoiled the country by diverting funds borrowed for development to their own personal enrichment to bank accounts out of the country.

With this history, it is no surprise that Haiti was deeply impoverished since the beginning, their foundation as a nation. And this bill by Ms. WATERS and others takes a very fine first step toward the goal of eliminating Haiti's uncollectible debts so that the country can begin, for the first time, really, the process of becoming self-sustaining, and they are going to need a lot of help.

The text to be considered says the Treasury Secretary should direct U.S. representatives at international financial institutions to work with their

colleagues to try to achieve cancellation of debt owed by Haiti to those institutions. Since any cancellation would take months to accomplish, it seeks suspension of debt payment services until the cancellation takes place. None of these institutions realistically expects Haiti to service its debt at a time Haiti is lying in ruins.

As a former Treasury Under Secretary before our committee last week said, it is a "cruel hoax" on both the people of developing countries and on the taxpayers of donor nations to pretend that even without an earthquake, Haiti, a country whose citizens subsist on a dollar or two a day, is ever going to be able to pay back billions of dollars in development loans.

The United States has always been a benevolent and caring country. Even during our current economic challenges, we have not lost our compassion. In fact, our present travails have, in some respects, I believe, given us a greater appreciation for the desperation and suffering of those facing challenges and hardships in Haiti, although theirs are much greater than anything that we are undergoing.

The United States, and let me stress this, if you don't hear anything else, if you are thinking about voting against this bill, hear this: The United States has forgiven all of its bilateral debt to Haiti. What we are asking is we are asking others to do what we have done. What we are doing with this is directing the Secretary of the Treasury to use his voice and influence to seek debt cancellation from others. Among them are Venezuela and Taiwan. By far, Venezuela is the largest bilateral creditor. Taiwan is a distant second. Forgiving the debt Haiti owes to multilateral agencies is consistent with our principles, and we can lead by example while we lend a helping hand.

In conclusion, Madam Speaker, this bill before us contains some minor changes to the bill that came out of the Committee on Financial Services, all of which I support. The changes don't add any cost. They don't change the intent of the bill.

Added at the end of original committee text is a section very similar to the bill that the Senate passed last week by unanimous consent. The section says the Secretaries of State and Treasury should support the creation and use of a multinational trust fund that could include and leverage any future U.S. aid to Haiti, and that aid ought to be in the form of grants, not loans, and that the Secretary of the Treasury should seek a speed-up in interbank transfers at the Inter-American Development Bank so they may be used in Haiti's recovery.

These are sensible steps, and I support the changes and I commend my colleagues who are also here in support of this very worthy legislation.

Mr. MEEKS of New York. I want to thank the ranking member of the full committee as well as the ranking member of the subcommittee for the

cooperative spirit in working together in getting this bill to where it is today. Thank you for working in a very bipartisan manner to this point.

At this time, I would like to yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) who is the author of this bill and who has been a long-time supporter for the people of Haiti.

Ms. WATERS. First, I would like to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) for the time, and I appreciate all of the work that he has done on this bill.

Indeed, I would also like to thank all of the Members who support this bill, including BARNEY FRANK, the chairman of the Financial Services Committee, who made sure we got the bill up and going and we could expedite it in a way I have never seen any other bill expedited.

I thank SPENCER BACHUS, the ranking member of the Financial Services Committee, whom I have worked with for over 10 years, appreciating that he understands so very thoroughly the history of Haiti and what it means to the world.

I thank GREGORY MEEKS, again, the chairman of the International Monetary Policy and Trade Subcommittee, whose manager's amendment added so much in the way of improvement to this bill, and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee; ELIOT ENGEL, chairman of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee, and all of the other cosponsors of the bill, and especially the Congressional Black Caucus.

□ 1900

I would also like to thank Kathleen Sengstock, my senior legislative assistant, who worked very hard on this bill. Kathleen is an expert on debt relief and has worked for the past 10 years on debt relief for all of the poor countries of the world.

I would also like to thank Daniel McGlinchey and other professional staff persons with the Financial Services Committee.

Ladies and gentlemen, Haiti was struck by a devastating earthquake on January 12, 2010. According to the U.S. Agency for International Development, 230,000 people were killed and 1.3 million people were displaced from their homes. There is still a desperate need for clean water, food, shelter, and basic sanitation. Three million people, one-third of the country's population, were affected by the earthquake.

Today, we are very fortunate to have in this country the President of Haiti, President Preval. The CBC—that is, the Congressional Black Caucus—held a meeting with President Preval, and he thanked us all, not only the members of the Congressional Black Caucus, but all of the Members of Congress and the American people for the aid and support we have provided for Haiti. He thanked all of the American agencies for the lives that they have saved,

the food that they have distributed, along with the water and the medical care and much more.

He reminded us that the rains are coming, and perhaps hurricanes, and there is still a need for emergency adequate shelter, and of course long-term housing. But today we are talking about one of the simplest but most important things we can do to help Haiti: That is to cancel its debt.

Haiti's democratic government has worked very hard in recent years to qualify for debt relief. In order to qualify, the Government of Haiti successfully developed and implemented a comprehensive poverty-reduction strategy paper under the direction of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. As a result, multilateral financial institutions provided Haiti \$1.2 billion in debt relief last June. This was a critical step forward for Haiti. Nevertheless, Haiti still has a significant debt burden that will interfere with recovery and development efforts unless the remaining debts are canceled.

According to the U.S. Treasury Department, Haiti still owes \$328 million to the multilateral development institutions. This includes \$447 million to the Inter-American Development Bank, \$284 million to the IMF, \$39 million to the World Bank Group's International Development Association, and \$58 million to the International Fund for Agricultural Development. In addition, Haiti owes approximately \$400 million to other individual countries.

I introduced H.R. 4573, the Debt Relief for Earthquake Recovery in Haiti Act of 2010, to free Haiti from the burden of these debts. The bill directs the Secretary of the Treasury to instruct the U.S. executive directors at the multilateral development institutions to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States to achieve several things: The immediate and complete cancellation of all debts owed by Haiti to these institutions; the suspension of Haiti's debt service payments until such time as the debts are canceled; and the provision of emergency humanitarian and reconstruction assistance to Haiti in the form of grants so that Haiti does not accumulate additional debt.

This bill also directs the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of State to use all appropriate diplomatic influence to secure the cancellation of all remaining bilateral, multilateral, and private creditor debt owed by Haiti. Debt cancellation will allow the Government of Haiti to focus its meager resources on essential humanitarian relief, reconstruction, and redevelopment.

The people of Haiti are poor, but they are physically and spiritually resilient. I know that with the support of the international community they will recover from this tragedy and create a brighter future for their children.

I urge my colleagues to support the Debt Relief for Earthquake Recovery in Haiti Act of 2010.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of this bill, the Debt Relief for Earthquake Recovery in Haiti Act of 2010.

Representatives MEEKS and WATERS wasted no time responding with this legislation. They have been the most stalwart proponents of the Haitian people, and the Haitian people are very fortunate to have them on their side. I want to applaud them for their efforts with this act.

As the Members of this body know, on January 12, 2010, Haiti experienced a 7.0 magnitude earthquake centered approximately 15 miles southwest of the nation's capital, Port-au-Prince. What followed were 50 aftershocks with magnitudes over 4.0, all occurring within 24 hours.

As of now, the Haitian Government has estimated 230,000 deaths and 300,000 injured. Additionally, 700,000 people have been displaced in the Port-au-Prince area. Damage caused by the earthquake is estimated between \$8 billion and \$14 billion, with reports speculating that reconstruction costs could approximate \$14 billion.

As the people of Haiti strive to put the pieces of their lives and the country back together, Congress clearly needs to help. This bill would have the Secretary of the Treasury instruct the U.S. representatives at the World Bank, the IMF, the Inter-American Development Bank, and other multilateral institutions to use their influence at these institutions to reach an agreement on relieving Haitian debt to these entities and to suspend Haiti's debt service payments until those debts are canceled.

Additionally, U.S. representatives at these institutions would advocate that future aid provided to Haiti be grant-based to avoid placing the country immediately back in debt as they seek to rebuild. In the shadow of a tragedy this size, this is an important first step, but I think the body must consider how much more can be done.

So often American efforts to provide aid to impoverished nations come in the form of a check, which does provide a significant boost, but the goal here is to mitigate the impact of the disaster on the people. I hope this body can look at areas where American resources and know-how can be invested in Haitian society. In addition to feeding the people and providing shelter and medical care, we can leverage American resources so that we aren't simply sending a check.

Americans are the most generous people in the world. In the aftermath of this tragedy, the citizens of this country have raised tens of millions of dollars to help the Haitian people. We should also be looking to send our heavy machinery and engineering capabilities along with qualified American workers—many of whom have been out of work themselves—to assist

the Haitian people rebuild their nation quicker and more effectively.

We will be holding a hearing next week in Financial Services to discuss many of these issues, and I look forward to working with my colleagues on ways that we can further leverage our Nation's great resources.

In conclusion, I want to thank Representatives WATERS and MEEKS for introducing this legislation. You have been strong advocates, and I really applaud you for the efforts. I thank you for allowing me to participate here tonight.

I strongly urge support of this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKS of New York. It is my honor to yield 1 minute to the distinguished Chair of the Financial Services Committee who has led us this far, the gentleman from Massachusetts, the Honorable BARNEY FRANK.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I hope people will take note that there is not a correlation between the importance of what we do and the attention that what we do gets. This is not controversial because it is a product of genuine cooperation.

I am delighted to be on the floor with my friend, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS). A few years ago, along with him and the gentleman from California and our former colleague, the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. Leach, we, frankly, beat the leaderships of both parties and the Clinton administration to get debt relief through. They've learned, so we don't have to fight so hard this time for a very important cause.

I am very pleased to be joining in this wholly cooperative way in a morally compelled response to the problems of the people of Haiti. And I join in thanking the gentlewoman from California again, the gentleman from New York, and my colleagues on the other side from California and Alabama for letting us bring this forward.

Various Members and their staffs have been congratulated, as they should be. It's not as easy to do the right thing as it sometimes seems; you want to make sure you get it done well.

I just want to single out Daniel McGlinchey on the staff of the Financial Services Committee, who has been working at this for a long time, in cooperation with the others. This is a day in which the House can be proud, even if, because we're not yelling at each other, the press won't notice.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Madam Speaker, it is my honor to yield 2 minutes to the chairwoman of the Congressional Black Caucus, a longtime fighter for Haiti, the Honorable BARBARA LEE.

Ms. LEE of California. Thank you very much, Chairman MEEKS.

Let me just first say how much I want to support this bill today and

thank Chairman MEEKS for his steady and consistent support for Haiti, and also Chairman FRANK.

Also, let me just say, as Chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, I have to extend our thanks to Congresswoman MAXINE WATERS for her work on this bipartisan resolution, especially also for her long-term leadership on the campaign for debt relief for Haiti and for all countries in the developing world. Congresswoman WATERS has been a friend, an ally of the Haitian people for many years, long before this devastating earthquake struck.

Also, to the ranking members, your support and your sense of justice for Haiti is deeply appreciated.

The Congressional Black Caucus has a long history of working with the Haitian and Haitian-American communities, and many of us have traveled to Haiti several times. During the current crisis, the Congressional Black Caucus has and will continue to work closely with the Obama administration, the Government of Haiti, and the non-governmental organizations to provide whatever assistance we can on an ongoing basis to help with the recovery and reconstruction efforts.

Debt relief is not a matter of charity; it is really a matter of economic justice. Over half of Haiti's debt was borrowed under Haiti's dictatorships, some of which were brutally repressive. Thus, moneys borrowed by these regimes should not be borne by the Haitian people who had no say whatsoever on how these moneys were spent.

But more to the point, I think that it is obvious that Haiti is not in a position to service debt—nor should it be—while it is struggling to meet the basic needs of its people like food, water, health care, and shelter. It is looking to rebuild from the most devastating tragedy to strike the island nation in its history. I know that the leaders of the international financial institutions feel the same way, and they understand this bill and that Haiti should not have to repay its debt. The United States Government and other donor nations must work with these institutions to fashion a plan for it, and this bill offered by Congresswoman WATERS offers a legal framework and mandate to do just that.

Finally, I just want to say that I hope this bill passes on a bipartisan basis.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Madam Speaker, am I correct that we have 7 minutes remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Mr. MEEKS, I would be happy to yield 4 minutes of our time to you because I see you have numerous speakers, and I think you could probably utilize that time in additional speaking.

I yield myself 1 minute at this point in time.

As I have spoken to my good friends, Mr. GREEN, Mr. MEEKS and Ms. WATERS, about introducing legislation to

help employ American workers in Haiti, we are going to be giving—and other groups are giving—tremendous amounts of money to Haitians and to the Haitian Government to basically rebuild. We all believe that it is important, with the amount of American workers, especially construction industries, that we have that are unemployed, to utilize many of our dollars to send the expertise and skills we have in contractors and workers and laborers from the United States to work with the labor and the Haitian people to rebuild their country.

I want to commend my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for working with me on this. We are close to having legislation done. Ms. WATERS, I spoke to you today, and we will be getting that to all of you to review before I introduce it. Hopefully we can bring this up in committee within a couple of weeks to start implementing American manpower and resources to help the Haitian people, and also, at the same time, to benefit those Americans that are out of work.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Madam Speaker, how much time do we have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman currently has 7½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. I would be happy to yield 4 of our minutes to my good friend from New York (Mr. MEEKS).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from New York will control 11½ minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. MEEKS of New York. It is my pleasure now to yield 1½ minutes of that to the gentlelady from the great State of Florida, the Honorable CORRINE BROWN.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Madam Speaker, I stand in strong support of the Debt Relief for Earthquake Recovery in Haiti Act introduced by my dear friend and colleague, Representative MAXINE WATERS.

Like so many of my colleagues here in the Congress, and particularly in the CBC, we have been working to improve the lives of the people of Haiti for many, many years.

I was in Haiti last October with Chairman OBERSTAR and Congressman GREGORY MEEKS, and we met with President Preval and members of the Haitian Cabinet to discuss ways to improve the nation's infrastructure system, which is absolutely vital to Haiti's future economic development.

Haiti is an island filled with good-willed, hardworking people, yet their lives are extraordinarily difficult because their country has been in great turmoil for decades, long before the terrible earthquake that hit Port-au-Prince.

Being from Florida, Haiti has always been very, very near and dear to my heart. In my congressional district of Florida, we worked with numerous

area churches, businesses, and nonprofit organizations to make about 60 donations of tractor-trailers filled with supplies for the Haitian people.

□ 1915

We worked with nonprofit organizations and with Food For The Poor, and it was transported by the Royal Caribbean Cruise Line—all at no cost to the people of Haiti. You know, because Haiti is not on the front pages of the paper, their needs are very important, and we need to continue to work to help the people of Haiti.

I want to thank all of my colleagues for doing it. This is a really wonderful first step.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKS of New York. I yield 1½ minutes to one who is called from the Caribbean, the gentlewoman from the great State of New York, the Honorable YVETTE CLARKE.

Ms. CLARKE. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4573, the Debt Relief for Earthquake Recovery in Haiti Act.

I would like to acknowledge the tremendous leadership of the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) and the leadership of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), who is the author of this legislation.

As Representative of the second largest Haitian population in the country, I commend the Obama administration's swift response to the Haitian crisis. Without the President's comprehensive relief campaign, which included food, water, medical, and military assistance, as well as the \$100 million in aid, we would not be at the point we are, which is ready to discuss the next step. Thankfully, we are.

We must remember that the January earthquake did not create the troubling conditions in Haiti, although it certainly exacerbated them. Haiti is already the poorest nation in the Western Hemisphere. H.R. 4573, the Debt Relief for Earthquake Recovery in Haiti Act, will achieve three distinct goals which will help to keep the focus on humanitarian assistance.

First, the Secretary of the Treasury would instruct the U.S. executive directors of the institutions which lent money to the Haiti Government to immediately cancel all debts owed to Haiti to their respective institutions.

Next, Haiti's debt service payments would be suspended.

Lastly, grants would be provided for additional assistance so that Haiti would not accumulate additional debts.

It is my hope that, as we continue to rebuild, our rebuilding effort will not begin until the relief effort has concluded, and it will be dependent on all allowing Haiti to focus solely on humanitarian aid. To do this, it is imperative that we cancel the debts of the Haitian Government.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKS of New York. I yield 1½ minutes the hardworking gentleman from the great State of Texas, the Honorable AL GREEN.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. I want to thank the team that worked on this effort. Of course, that would be the honorable Chair of the subcommittee, Mr. MEEKS. It would be the Honorable MAXINE WATERS. It would also be Mr. MILLER, the ranking member on the subcommittee and, of course, the ranking member of the full committee, Mr. BACHUS.

Madam Speaker, I must tell you that my comments have been revised because I cannot allow this moment to go by without speaking to the comments that were made by Mr. BACHUS.

He spoke to our hearts and he spoke truth. It's not easy to stand in the well of the House of Representatives and speak the kind of truth that we heard. A son of the South and a Representative from Alabama stood in the well of the House, and he spoke the truth about one of the greatest atrocities ever imposed upon humankind and about how one country, in an effort to extricate and liberate itself, had to pay for the very liberation that it accorded itself. It meant something to me to hear this son of the South speak this kind of truth in the well of the Congress of the United States of America.

So I commend you and I salute you.

Mr. MILLER, I thank you as well.

The two of you deserve to have it said that you truly spoke truth to power tonight. Thank you.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Madam Speaker, I yield to the ranking member of the committee, the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BACHUS. Madam Speaker, I would like unanimous consent for an additional minute on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, each side will control 1 additional minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. BACHUS. Madam Speaker, I now ask unanimous consent to yield our 1 minute to the majority.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEEKS of New York. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from the great State of Texas, Ms. SHEILA JACKSON LEE.

(Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. This is a very historic occasion.

I would like to thank Congresswoman WATERS for her continued and persistent leadership on debt relief for countries around the world.

I thank the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. MEEKS of New York, for his persistence and guidance on passing this bill so quickly with Mr. BACHUS and Mr. MILLER. Thank you for your commitment and for your interesting and very good idea about putting Americans to work.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to support this legislation to acknowledge that we are talking about a country right now that has only 20 percent of the revenue that it needs to run its nation. They need seed. They need fertilizer. They are living some 80 percent below the poverty line, owing some \$709 million in debts to multilateral financial institutions—\$447 million to the Inter-American Development Bank—and also to countries such as Venezuela. This legislation will, in essence, help us clear the slate of all of those debts, and it will help us track what the United States has done.

I would like to take this time to thank all of the first responders, USAID and so many who stood tall when Haiti called. Today, in the White House, it was good to be able to acknowledge those first responders from around the world, from around the Nation, in addition to the United States military.

Helping them with this debt relief over all the land will allow the President to focus on building and on rebuilding—rebuilding Port-au-Prince, rebuilding the suburbs in the outlying areas—and to focus on creating jobs for the Haitian people and on bringing contractors there who will work with Haitians in a joint venture with agencies. So the relief of this debt, I believe, is an enormous step in making a difference in the lives of Haitians.

I want to thank you and ask support of this legislation.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4573—the Debt Relief for Earthquake Recovery in Haiti Act of 2010. As, a co-sponsor of this bill, I strongly believe that it is a necessary step to ensure a successful recovery in Haiti.

Haiti's long term development is currently hampered by its debt burden. January's earthquake struck Haiti during a time of economic vulnerability. Before the earthquake, Haiti was, by far, the poorest country in the Western Hemisphere.

Before the earthquake, Haiti also has among the world's lowest levels of gross domestic product per capita. An estimated 80 percent of the population lived under the poverty line with 54 percent living in abject poverty, according to the CIA World Factbook. According to the United Nations Human Development Report, more than two-thirds of the labor force is believed to not have formal jobs, and just 62.1 percent of adults over age 15 are literate. Additionally, 18 percent of Haitians did not live to the age of 40.

Yet, despite the destruction wreaked by multiple tropical storms in 2008, Haiti's economy and infrastructure-building seemed to be turning a corner in recent years, aided by international support and debt relief programs.

In fact, according to the New York Times, "Haiti was one of only two Caribbean countries expected to grow in 2009. There were hopes of a tourism revival, reinforced by the announcement that a new Comfort Inn would open there this May. In a sign of its growing structural sophistication, Haiti even recently announced that it would begin collecting better national statistics, with the help of the International Monetary Fund, so that it could better assess and calibrate its economic policies."

The earthquake on January derailed this progress.

As this legislation states, the Government of Haiti cannot afford to invest in reconstruction and development efforts while continuing to make payments on debts owed to multilateral financial institutions like the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank, and the Inter-American Development Bank and to other international creditors.

Prior to the earthquake, debt service payments to multilateral financial institutions and other international creditors already were a tremendous burden that interfered with the ability of the Government of Haiti to meet the needs of its people.

On June 30, 2009, the World Bank announced that Haiti qualified for and received \$1.2 billion in debt relief from the IMF, the World Bank, and other multilateral financial institutions. In order to qualify for this debt relief, the Government of Haiti successfully developed and implemented a comprehensive Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper, under the direction of the IMF and the World Bank.

According to the U.S. Department of the Treasury, despite previous debt relief, Haiti still owes a total of \$709 million in debts to multilateral financial institutions, including \$447 million to the Inter-American Development Bank, \$165 million to the IMF, \$39 million to the World Bank, and \$58 million to the International Fund for Agricultural Development.

According to the IMF, Haiti owed Venezuela \$167 million and Taiwan \$92 million at the end of September, 2008; furthermore, the amounts of these debts may have grown since that time. The cancellation of Haiti's debts to multilateral financial institutions and other international creditors will allow the Government of Haiti to use its meager resources for essential reconstruction and development efforts.

As important as this legislation is, it is only one part of a much larger American assistance response to the earthquake. America will continue to respond with humanitarian assistance to help the people of this struggling island nation rebuild their livelihoods. I send my condolences to the people and government of Haiti as they grieve once again in the aftermath of a natural disaster. As Haiti's neighbor, I believe it is the United States' responsibility to help Haiti recover, and build the capacity to mitigate against future disasters.

To date the United States Government has contributed over \$402 million in earthquake response funding for Haiti. It has also deployed approximately 17,000 military personnel in support of the relief effort. Subsequently, as part of the new Government of Haiti-led effort, the U.N. World Food Program will provide commodities, non-governmental organizations will manage distributions, and U.S. military will provide security escorts.

America and her allies have already initiated a comprehensive, interagency response to the earthquake. The State Department, Department of Defense, Department of Homeland Security, Coast Guard, USAID—all worked overnight to ensure critical resources were positioned to support the response and recovery effort, including efforts to find and assist American citizens in Haiti.

Once again I stand in solidarity with the people of Haiti and will do everything in my power to assist them with rebuilding their country and livelihoods. I am proud of our first responders and pledge that America's long

term commitment to Haiti will live up to the standard that the first responders set.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKS of New York. It is my honor to yield 2 minutes to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa and Global Health, a longtime fighter for Haiti, the gentleman from New Jersey, the Honorable DONALD PAYNE.

Mr. PAYNE. Let me begin by commending Mr. MEEKS from New York and Ms. WATERS from California for this very important legislation, H.R. 4573, Debt Relief for Earthquake Recovery in Haiti.

I also would like to acknowledge Mr. BACHUS for his very impassioned speech. Yet I am not surprised.

Mr. BACHUS, you may recall, when we were fighting the brutal Government of Sudan, we tried to get capital market sanctions. You supported our legislation that brought Mr. Greenspan to the Senate to say, Defeat the Payne-Bachus legislation because it would disrupt the stock market. So I commend you again for the great work that you have done.

Madam Speaker, as we have mentioned, Haiti has had such a tremendous history. Since we know what is in the bill, I might also mention that it was during the Revolutionary War that Haitian soldiers fought in one of the key battles, the Battle of Savannah, where just recently a statue was completed in Savannah. I spoke at the dedication a year or so ago. It turned the tide of the war.

Haitian soldiers fought in a number of battles to help the original colonies of the United States become independent from Britain. So they shed blood for our independence. Many people didn't know that.

Then, as you know, with the defeat of Napoleon's army by Haiti, as was talked about, the reparations that had to be paid back caused France to be cash poor and land rich. It therefore forced them to sell the Louisiana Territory to the United States because it had lost the cash that Haiti had produced. Over 50 percent of all the commodities of tea and coffee and sugar in Europe came from Haiti. France lost that and therefore needed the cash from the Louisiana sale to have its treasury boosted. As a result, the Lewis and Clark expedition began in St. Louis, and the United States was able then to take the rest of this Nation. Once again, Haiti had a tremendous part of this.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEKS of New York. I yield 2 minutes to the Chair of the subcommittee for the Western Hemisphere, the gentleman from New York, the Honorable ELIOT ENGEL.

Mr. ENGEL. I thank my good friend and fellow New Yorker for yielding to me. I want to commend him for the work he has done.

I want to commend my friend and colleague, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) for this bill.

Madam Speaker, like all of my colleagues, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4573, which pushes for the cancellation of debts owed by Haiti to multilateral financial institutions.

I am the chairman of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee, and I also have a large Haitian population in my district in Spring Valley, New York.

I am honored to say that, last Friday, I traveled to Haiti. You can see the devastation in the newspapers; you can look at it on television, but until you are there in person, you cannot imagine how horrible it is.

The other things you see are thousands upon thousands upon thousands upon thousands of people in the streets with nothing to do and with no place to go—with no place to go to work and with no place to call home. There are rows of tents and shacks and of things put up for people to seek shelter. There are people just in the streets, and they are friendly towards the United States. We have a special obligation to help the people of Haiti.

We met President Preval in Port-au-Prince last Friday. Today, I had the honor and pleasure of meeting him again twice—once at the White House with President Obama and then, after that meeting, at a private meeting with Members of Congress. I will tell everyone what I told him and what all of my colleagues are saying:

We must help Haiti. We have a responsibility to help Haiti. It is clear that Haiti faces a very long road of recovery from the impact of the earthquake, and this bill will allow the Government of Haiti to focus its efforts and attention on the present and future recovery of the country and on the Haitian people.

We all know Haiti's early history and independence. It is tragically marked by the onerous debts it was forced to pay by major powers, depriving Haiti of many years of needed resources and development. We shouldn't allow Haiti's present debts to pose similar obstacles in the wake of this earthquake.

People say that Congress can't agree on anything and that there is no bipartisanship here. What we are seeing now is bipartisanship at its best. We are all working together to help the people of Haiti.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

My daughter, Elizabeth, lived with me here in Washington for about 4 years. She was one of the directors for a group called Witness for Peace, which is a human rights organization.

I recall very well a trip she led of a group to Haiti. She spent a week in Haiti with individuals from the United States, looking at the situation that the people were in and trying to come up with ways that we could help the people of that country.

My daughter passed away about 2 years ago, and I am proud to be part of

this bill because she believed in this. She believed in the people. She believed that there was a lot of good that the American people could do for people in this part of the world. So I am just glad to chair this side of the hearing tonight. I would like to do it in honor of my daughter, if you don't mind.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1930

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Let me just first thank the chairman of the committee, BARNEY FRANK, Ranking Member BACHUS, and again my ranking member on the International Monetary Policy and Trade Subcommittee, Mr. MILLER. We came together because of the hard work and dedication that the gentlelady from California put forward in writing this bill to make sure we did the right thing for the people of Haiti. This is one of those times where you are proud of being a Member of Congress, working together for the good of human beings.

Though oftentimes we say that Haiti is poor, when I think of Haiti, they are rich; rich in spirit, rich in human capital, rich in hope. These are a people suffering the most unimaginable tragedy, which still have the hope and desire of moving forward, who have overcome and survived all of the things that Mr. BACHUS and others have said today, when you think about it, from the very beginning of their independence.

Indeed, the people of Haiti are a rich people, and we are doing the right thing today and sending the right message to the people of Haiti, that we will stand by you, not just for the short haul, but for the long haul.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to be a Member of Congress and proud of my colleagues who have worked so hard to get this bill done, and I am proud that we are doing the right thing by the great people of Haiti.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4573, the Debt Relief for Earthquake Recovery in Haiti Act.

It is almost 2 months to the date since the already struggling nation of Haiti was rocked by a 7.0 magnitude earthquake.

Approximately 3 million people were affected and 230,000 are estimated to have died. Those that survived are facing unimaginable conditions, with a crumbling infrastructure that has hindered the delivery of humanitarian aid.

Out of this destruction, however, the Haitian people have been given the incredible opportunity to right the wrongs of the past and rebuild their nation stronger than ever before.

Though I commend our government's generous contributions of humanitarian assistance and that from foreign nations, Haiti cannot be self-sufficient and its recovery cannot be sustainable if a substantial amount of its resources must go to paying debts that were amounted out of desperation or by repressive, irresponsible regimes.

Despite previous debt relief, Haiti still owes a total of \$709 million in debts to multilateral financial institutions. Meanwhile, the IDB has estimated earthquake damages to total nearly \$14 billion.

How can we in good conscience expect Haiti to send money to foreign governments and international financial institutions when there are people sleeping in the streets, children going hungry, and schools and hospitals reduced to rubble?

I have long fought for the people of Haiti, both on the island and in our own Nation. On this issue in particular, last Congress, I offered an amendment which passed the House of Representatives unanimously that put Congress on record encouraging the expedited cancellation of Haiti's international debt.

At a time of extreme instability and crisis, Congress and the United States government must do all within our power to help ensure a long-term sustainable recovery for Haiti.

I applaud Congresswoman WATERS for her long-standing commitment to debt relief for Haiti and for other deserving nations and urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4573. This legislation would direct the Secretary of the Treasury to instruct the United States Executive Directors at the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank to immediately cancel Haiti's debts and urge donors to disburse grants. While Haiti is rebuilding, we should allow them to turn a new leaf and not be burdened by overwhelming debt.

Last month I visited Haiti and witnessed firsthand the destruction caused by the massive earthquake of January 12, 2010. It is estimated by the Haitian government that well over 200,000 Haitians have been killed and 3 million have been affected by the natural disaster. It is imperative that this body help its neighbor in its time of need and make a significant long-term reconstruction commitment.

Haiti has had a long history of multilateral institutions distributing aid in the form of loans. At its peak, Haiti had a total external debt of \$1.8 billion. In recent years the United States has advocated debt forgiveness and the international community recently responded last summer by forgiving \$1.2 billion in debt to multilateral institutions.

I strongly support the legislation, which rightly argues that future aid to Haiti should be in the form of grants instead of loans. This must be kept in mind at the Haiti donor conference scheduled for later this month at the United Nations.

Madam Speaker, I am heartened by the public and private support given to the victims by millions of our generous fellow Americans. I also commend President Obama's unwavering commitment to alleviate the suffering.

Passing today's legislation would help free our struggling neighbor from the shackles of debt and offer a glimmer of hope during this time of need.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Speaker, the earthquake on January 12, 2010, was the worst disaster to afflict Haiti in over two centuries. According to recent estimates, the earthquake has killed 230,000 people and displaced another 1.3 million.

Haiti is the poorest country in the Western Hemisphere, with a long history of exploitation at the hands of world powers. Now, with severe damage to roads, ports, and hospitals,

and a desperate need for clean water, food, shelter, and basic sanitation, Haiti faces reconstruction burdens that may exceed \$14 billion. With such expenses in the future, Haiti is in no position to repay the debts it owes wealthy international creditors.

Madam Speaker, with that in mind I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4573, legislation I cosponsored that would promote debt relief for our Haitian brothers and sisters.

The bill urges the Secretary of the Treasury to instruct the United States executive directors at the International Monetary Fund, IMF, the World Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank, and other multilateral development institutions to use the "voice, vote, and influence of the United States" to cancel immediately and completely all debt owed by Haiti to such institutions; suspend Haiti's debt service payments to these institutions until the debts are canceled completely; and provide additional assistance from these institutions to Haiti through grants so that Haiti does not accumulate additional debt.

Despite significant debt relief last summer, Haiti owes a total of \$828 million in debt to multilateral financial institutions, including \$447 million to the Inter-American Development Bank, \$284 million to the IMF, \$39 million to the World Bank, and \$58 million to the International Fund for Agricultural Development. Haiti also owes about \$400 million to other individual countries.

Madam Speaker, it is abundantly clear that extraordinary circumstances render impossible Haiti's timely repayment of this debt. Furthermore, our humanity should compel us to extend a compassionate hand to our neighbors in need.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I am proud to be an original cosponsor of H.R. 4573.

As my colleagues have explained, this bill calls on the U.S. Secretary of the Treasury to take certain measures to enable Haiti's debt relief and to provide additional assistance to Haiti from multilateral development institutions in the form of grants.

The United States cancelled all of Haiti's outstanding debt to the U.S. in September of last year.

Similarly, Haiti has already received hundreds of millions of dollars in debt relief from the World Bank and Inter-American Development Bank, IDB.

However, it still retains significant debt to various bilateral donors, the IMF, and the IDB.

By passing this measure, we can help to minimize the enormous fiscal pressures facing the Government of Haiti in the aftermath of its tragic earthquake so that its limited resources may be used for more immediate priorities.

Also, by encouraging the use of grants versus loans, Haiti will have the opportunity to take advantage of certain resources from these institutions without increasing its future financial burdens.

This bill will help prevent Haiti from getting in over its head at a time when every penny counts.

It also recognizes the important role that other bilateral donors play in the long-term recovery efforts of Haiti.

By calling on other bilateral, multilateral and private creditors to provide debt cancellation to Haiti, H.R. 4573 underscores the concept of shared responsibility.

An integrated approach based on a coordinated and transparent distribution of responsibilities will prove essential to a successful response to Haiti's catastrophic disaster.

I thank Congresswoman WATERS for introducing this important measure.

Mr. MEEKS of New York. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4573, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to urge the Secretary of the Treasury to instruct the United States Executive Directors at the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank, and other multilateral development institutions to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States to cancel immediately and completely Haiti's debts to such institutions, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO IRAN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 111-97)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice to the *Federal Register* for publication stating that the Iran emergency declared on March 15, 1995, is to continue in effect beyond March 15, 2010.

The crisis between the United States and Iran resulting from actions and policies of the Government of Iran that led to the declaration of a national emergency on March 15, 1995, has not been resolved. The actions and policies of the Government of Iran are contrary to the interests of the United States in the region and pose a continuing unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared with respect to Iran and maintain in force comprehen-

sive sanctions against Iran to respond to this threat.

BARACK OBAMA,
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 10, 2010.

SUPPORT NASA'S CONSTELLATION PROGRAM

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the President's proposal to cancel the NASA Constellation Program, which covers the Orion Crew capsule, the Altair Lunar Lander, and the Ares I and Ares V rockets. These programs, which together comprise our human spaceflight program, were authorized in both 2005 and 2008 by Republican and Democratic Congresses.

It is under the Constellation Program that NASA is currently developing new launch vehicles and spacecraft capable of traveling to the Moon, Mars, and other destinations. Not only does canceling the Constellation Program jeopardize America's leadership role in human space exploration, but it will have detrimental effects on our economy.

The issue is it will take years for the commercial spaceflight industry to get up to speed to where the level of competence exists in NASA today. Our government has already invested literally years and billions of dollars in this program. We should build upon these investments and not abandon them.

Our country can support the commercial spaceflight industry, but not at the expense of our human spaceflight programs.

It is my hope, Madam Speaker, that this Congress will continue NASA's Constellation Program.

PROVIDING FOR NASA SPACE EXPLORATION

(Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring H. Con. Res. 1150, which establishes NASA and all of its assets as a national security interest.

We need to work with the President in moving forward on restoring the funds for the Constellation Program and to reemphasize and recommit ourselves to human space exploration. In the current budget of the NASA program, funds have been increased, but funds have been taken away from the Constellation Program. In essence, it has been canceled.

My request is that we have our task before us, and the answer is simple: to reprogram the funds that are in the NASA budget to ensure that this great asset of NASA, NASA Johnson, the NASA centers in Alabama and Mississippi and Florida and elsewhere, are maintained.

The international space station has been built over the last 10 years. It has been built with the genius, the intellect, and the research of the United States. That research and genius and that kind of data requires protection as a national security interest. The funding that needs to be restored will help create this opportunity and save jobs.

Let us save jobs and provide for NASA space exploration.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

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

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HONORABLE CHARLIE WILSON

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

Mr. ORTIZ. Madam Speaker, today we are here to honor the life and work of my good friend Representative Charlie Wilson, whom I had the pleasure of serving with in the House of Representatives for 13 years. Charlie was a unique person, one of a kind, and he will be missed dearly by his family, friends, and colleagues in the House.

Charlie had a very special and unique side to him. He knew when to be tough, he knew when to laugh, he knew when to speak his thoughts, but, above all, he knew how to serve the people of this great country and his district.

At the age of 23, after graduating with a bachelor of science degree from the U.S. Naval Academy, Charlie joined the United States Navy, where he attained the rank of lieutenant. After serving as a surface fleet officer for 4 years, he was assigned to the Pentagon as part of an intelligence unit that studied the Soviet Union's nuclear forces.

At the age of 27, Charlie was elected to the Texas Legislature, and in 1961 he was sworn into office in the State's capital in Austin, Texas. For more than 12 years, Charlie was known as the tough dog in the State capitol, and he was also often called the "liberal from Lufkin, Texas." During his time in the State legislature, he fought for Medicaid, tax exemptions for the elderly, the Equal Rights Amendment, and a minimum wage bill.

In 1972, while I was an elected county commissioner in Texas, Charlie was elected to the House of Representatives from the Second District of Texas near Houston. He served in Congress for 11

terms and did not seek reelection to the 105th Congress and resigned on October 8, 1996.

Charlie was known in the Halls of Congress as "Good Time Charlie," but it was an appropriate name for him. He was very funny, joyful, and full of life—and very humorous. After he retired from Congress, he settled down, he got married, and he was at peace with himself and looked more comfortable and at ease. Charlie truly enjoyed life.

In 2006, we asked him to come and visit with us in Corpus Christi, and this was when his book came out, "Charlie Wilson's War." He gave time to the people in the district and signed and autographed every book.

I remember one of the stories—and some of the stuff that I know about Charlie we probably wouldn't be able to say here in the House, but he enjoyed life. He brought a beautiful young lady from Russia to visit the United States, and they asked Charlie, "Are you going to give her secrets?" He said, "The only thing I am going to give her are Victoria's Secrets."

That was Charlie Wilson. He was a great guy.

There is much I can say about Charlie—he was one-of-a-kind. I served with him diligently in the House of Representatives. I will miss him dearly, as well as my colleagues from the Texas Delegation. We all loved and cared for Charlie dearly, and I know we will continue to work together in unison for the betterment of our state and country.

On February 10, 2010, this country lost a great person and my friend, Charlie Wilson. May he rest in peace.

I offer my condolences to Charlie's wife, Barbara Alberstadt. May God bring peace to her, his family, friends and loved ones. May Charlie be with the Lord.

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

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

AMERICAN INVOLVEMENT IN AFGHANISTAN

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

Mr. JONES. Madam Speaker, today during the debate about Afghanistan, I joined Mr. KUCINICH and several others in our concerns about Afghanistan, and I wanted to further read to the House. I had used a Marine Times article that has a photograph of a marine who is retired now and his son, Joshua, who was killed in Afghanistan. The article says "Caution Killed My Son. Marine Families Blast Suicidal Tactics in Afghanistan."

In addition to this article about his son and the tighter rules of engagement, "families voice outrage over new restrictions in Afghanistan," they also

have an article about four marines who were killed that asked the Army to give them cover. The Army didn't say "no"; they just didn't even respond.

The rules of engagement are so different for our troops that I think at some point in time we in the Congress, particularly on the Armed Services Committee, I am going to ask for a hearing about the rules of engagement.

I want to explain and then read a couple of comments from the father which was in this article, Sergeant Bernard, retired Marine, whose son Joshua was killed. What had happened was the marines had been in a firefight. Then there was an Afghan that came to the marines and said, Listen, there are other Taliban enemy down the road, and if you follow me, I will show you where they are located.

□ 1945

This is where I want to pick up the story by the father's writing. He said, When the ambush began, the tipster could not be found, and the interpreter took cover, raising questions in Bernard's mind about whether they led the Marines into a trap. There's no question they did. I further quote Sergeant Bernard, who's retired now: "Call me cynical if you want, but some rogue element led them there. The bottom line is both of those guys were gone. It's just another indication of how this counterinsurgency strategy can't work."

I further want to read: "In an October 13 letter to Collins, Mullen addressed Bernard's concerns by saying that 'the new tactical directive did not change the ROE in Afghanistan, but rather provided more clarification and guidelines regarding the use of force. We have refined our procedures in order to reduce civilian casualties, but at no time have the ROE been modified to place our troops at greater risk,' Mullen wrote. 'Our troops still operate under a set of ROE that allows them to protect themselves against enemy actions in balance with the Afghan populace.'"

Sergeant Bernard, a retired Marine who served this Nation, said "the letter is 'smoke and mirrors' and overlooks his consistent concern: A counterinsurgency strategy won't work as long as Afghanistan is filled with warring tribes that have no empathy for the U.S. and its way of life."

I further want to read down in his response in the Marine Corps Times: "I already talked to Collins' office and said, 'Don't let him spin this crap.' There's no indication that Afghanistan has changed anywhere. Our mission should be very, very simple: Chase and kill the enemy."

Madam Speaker, that's exactly what they should be doing, instead of this other type of strategy.

Bernard said he is frustrated that the senator's office, one of his home State senators and a member of the Senate Armed Service Committee, has handled his complaints as that of a single constituent—and I'm not getting into

whether they did or didn't, but just reading what he said—rather, seeing for what he is: representative of the hundreds of people—hundreds of people—he says have contacted him about this whole rules of engagement. I want to quote, and this will be the close: “You can't turn this into one lone idiot in the backwoods of Maine mourning his son,” he said. “This is bigger than that.”

So, Madam Speaker, I intend to ask the Armed Services Committee, which is chaired by a wonderful man from Missouri, and the ranking member from California, we need to have this debate on behalf of the families as well as the Marines and the Army. What are the rules of engagement? What can they do and cannot do? When I read these articles about the number that have died just because we could not give them cover in certain situations, if that's the way we're supposed to fight a war, then that's a poor way to fight the war.

Madam Speaker, with that, I'm going to close as I always do. I know the gentleman from Texas has a tribute to pay to a former Member who I happened to serve one term with and thought the world of him. My daddy knew him and thought Charlie Wilson was a great guy. Let me get that on the RECORD.

My close is this: I ask God to please bless our men and women in uniform. I ask God to please bless the families of our men and women in uniform. I ask God to please bless this country and bless the President, that he will do what is right for this country. And I ask God to please bless America.

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.)

TRIBUTE TO CHARLIE WILSON

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. I'm proud to follow my colleague from North Carolina. We share his support and his prayers for our men and women serving this country. That's why it's so important tonight to be here to honor the late Member of Congress, Charlie Wilson, from east Texas.

I first met Charlie Wilson in 1972, as a young State representative. He had just been elected to Congress. It was a fundraiser for him at the Intercontinental Airport, The Marriott, in Houston. I was 25-years-old and went out there, and the State senator who was just elected to Congress, and heard Charlie tell the folks stories. And this is 1972—long before Afghanistan, long before Charlie Wilson became known as “good-time Charlie.” In fact, in Texas,

as a State senator he's known as “Timber Charlie” because he represented the timber trees of east Texas. But a great Member. He was elected in 1972, like I said, to the U.S. House of Representatives from the Second District. He was elected 11 times. He did not run for reelection in 1996. In fact, he resigned in October of 1996.

Charles Nesbitt Wilson was born in Trinity, Texas, where his father was an accountant for a lumber company, on June 1, 1933, in the depths of the Depression. He attended the Naval Academy in Annapolis and graduated in 1956. He served 4 years in the Navy, from 1956 to 1960, and came back to Texas, where he was elected to the State house and the State senate.

Charlie Wilson died on February 10, 2010, at Lufkin Memorial Hospital in Lufkin, Texas, where he had been taken after collapsing earlier in the day and suffered from a cardiopulmonary arrest. He was pronounced dead at 12:16 p.m. Central Time. Congressman Wilson received a graveside service with full military honors at the Arlington National Cemetery on February 23, 2010.

Now for some of the stories about Charlie Wilson as a friend. I'm glad my colleague from Texas, JOE BARTON, is here, and Congressman CHET EDWARDS and AL GREEN and SHEILA JACKSON LEE, because Charlie had some stories that we couldn't tell on the floor of the House. But I'm going to tell you some of the good ones.

He is survived by his wife, Barbara, the former Barbara Alberstadt, and his sister, Sharon Allison. Charlie told me many times, like he told other Members, that he credited his wife Barbara with saving his life because it got him off a lot of things that he shouldn't have been on to begin with. In having seen him many times after he left Congress, Charlie was still Charlie.

Charlie entered politics as a teenager. He began by running a campaign against his next-door neighbor, a city council member in Trinity, Texas. When Charlie was 13, his dog entered that neighbor's yard—a city council member—and he retaliated by mixing glass in the dog's food and causing fatal internal bleeding. Being a farmer's son, Charlie was able to get a driver's permit at age 13. And so he was going to pay that council member back. So he drove 96 people to the polls on the next election at age 13—it was mainly black citizens, African American citizens from the poor side of town—to make sure they knew what happened to his dog. That incumbent lost by 16 votes. So Charlie Wilson entered politics at 13 years of age by defeating a city council member in his neighborhood.

Charlie had so many things I could tell you; wrapping his arm around us and giving us that counsel. But I think he's best known outside of Texas for being the leader in Congress during the 1980s and known for supporting Operation Cyclone, the largest-ever Central

Intelligence Agency covert operation, under President Reagan's administration, by supplying military equipment, including anti-aircraft weapons such as Stinger anti-aircraft missiles and paramilitary officers from their Special Activities Division to the Afghan Mujahideen during the Soviet war in Afghanistan. From a few million dollars in the 1980s, his support for the resistance grew to \$750 million a year by the end of the decade.

I remember Charlie Wilson telling us in 1996, when he was leaving, and earlier, that we made a mistake by abandoning Afghanistan. And literally after 9/11, he came and talked to the delegation and said we made a mistake, and we're paying the price for it right now because we left Afghanistan in turmoil and ended up with the Taliban. We don't need to make that mistake again. That's why tonight I'm proud to honor Charlie Wilson in his service to our country.

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

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

IN HONOR OF CHARLIE WILSON

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

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I rise in support and honor of the late Congressman Charlie Wilson of the Second Congressional District of Texas. I didn't know Congressman Wilson in his salad days. I didn't get elected until 1984. By that time, he had calmed down, apparently quite a bit. But I can now state it, since the statute of limitations has expired, I voted for Congressman Wilson six times. I lived in east Texas, in Crockett, Texas, in Houston County, in the Second Congressional District, and we didn't have a Republican primary, and I don't recall that we had a Republican opponent against Congressman Wilson in the time that I lived in Crockett. And so my choice was to vote for him or not vote at all. I chose to vote for him.

I never went to one of his town hall meetings down at the courthouse on the square because I felt like he was doing a very good job for those constituents in east Texas, including myself. He was a strong defender of the military, very strong on what we call Texas values. He worked quite a bit on the Big Thicket in east Texas. He was an environmentalist ahead of his time.

When I got elected in 1984, I made it a point to get to know Congressman Wilson, or Charlie Wilson, because I had been his constituent and I knew of his reputation. I just felt like he would be a good guy to get to know. And he was. He was a really, really good person. When his mother died, I felt as a

courtesy that I should attend the funeral so that there would be some Texas Congressmen at his mother's funeral in Trinity, Texas. As it turned out, I was the only Congressman that attended. I went up to him. And we didn't really know each other that well, but I said, Charlie, I'm here if you need me to do anything. I didn't really know your mother very well, but I know she must have been a good woman if you were her son. And he never forgot that. From then on, anything I needed from Congressman Wilson, if he could do it, he did it. But he also asked you things.

I will never forget out on the steps of the Capitol one time he came up to me and he said, JOE I need a favor. I said, What is it, Charlie? He said, Well, I need a Republican sponsor for an amendment in the Appropriations Committee. I said, Okay. What is it? He said, I can't tell you. I said, Well, how much money is it? He said, I can't tell you. I said, Well, how many years is it? He said, I can't tell you. I said, Well what can you tell me? He said, If you do this for me, I will do almost anything you want in the Appropriations Committee for you. So I didn't know. To this day, I don't know what that amendment was. But after reading some of the history of that time and that era, my assumption is that I was the Republican sponsor of an amendment that got funding for the black box programs in Afghanistan for Stinger missiles. Now I don't know that, Madam Speaker, but that's kind of the way he operated.

Another story I can tell you is that I was standing here back behind the rail one afternoon and we had a series of votes going on, and Charlie came up to me and he said, What are you doing in a month or so? I said, I don't know. He said, Well, I'm going to take a little trip. I said, Where are you going? He said, We'll go anywhere you want to go. I said, Where do you want to go? He said, Well, I have to go to Afghanistan, and I have to go to Morocco. And if you'll come with me, after that we'll go anywhere you want to go. I said, Well, I'll think about it. Well, I asked my chief of staff and she said no. I asked my wife, and she said no. So then I had to tell Congressman Wilson that I couldn't go. That's the trip that he took the Miss World on where he ended up going to Afghanistan.

Another story that I can tell you is that a couple of us Congressmen were walking down the street one day, and we saw Congressman Wilson walking over to the Capitol, and he had this very strikingly beautiful young woman that he was walking with. Congressman DAN BURTON said, Charlie, that woman is as pretty as Miss Universe. And he says, It is Miss Universe. And it was.

He also loved cats—I mean the four-legged cats. They ran all over his office and all over the Rayburn building on the floor. As far as I know, House Administration never chastised him.

When you walked into his office, right after Afghanistan, he had a live Stinger missile. He was very proud of that.

I see that my time is about to expire. So for all of his family members and constituents, there were a lot of Republicans that loved Charlie Wilson. He will be missed. He was a great patriot, a great son of Texas, and somebody that those who knew him, he was very, very loyal to. So God bless Charlie Wilson and his family.

□ 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SCHRADER). 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.)

REMEMBERING REPRESENTATIVE CHARLIE WILSON

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

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to pay respects to my former colleague and friend, Texas Congressman Charlie Wilson. Charlie Wilson was bigger than life, and he was as real as the Texas day is long. I considered it a privilege and a joy to know him as a colleague and as a friend. Most Americans will forever know Charlie Wilson from the movie "Charlie Wilson's War." I have been asked by people who knew that I knew and served with Charlie whether he was really as colorful as he was portrayed to be in that movie. My answer is that that movie was the only time ever that Hollywood had to tone down reality in order to make it believable.

I have no idea whether Charlie ever read Shakespeare, but whether he did or not, the truth is, he personified Polonius' wise observation in Hamlet: "This above all: To thine own self be true, And it must follow, as the night the day, Thou canst not then be false to any man." It makes me wonder if somehow Polonius didn't know Charlie Wilson.

Charlie Wilson was not false to any man, any person or any constituent, not ever. He was the real thing, and I think in this sometimes cynical world, that is what all of us blessed to know him as a friend found so very endearing about him. In fact, Mr. Speaker, a number of Charlie's former colleagues who had served with him, members of the Texas delegation, have asked that we include their remarks with respect to Charlie, his life and his spirit.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the RECORD the remarks of Ralph Hall who also served many years with Charlie, and I would only just summarize one statement made by Ralph about his good friend Charlie. He said, He was a courageous and kind man with a strong sense of justice that

compelled him to work for the good of others.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's request will be covered under general leave.

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. Thank you.

While he was known as Good Time Charlie—and yes, he did enjoy life—the truth is that Charlie Wilson spent his entire adult life in the serious business of public service to our Nation. He graduated from the Naval Academy and then served our Nation as a lieutenant and as a naval intelligence officer. At the age of 27, he was elected to the Texas legislature where he was known as the liberal from Lufkin, supporting such progressive causes as the minimum wage, Medicaid, and the Equal Rights Amendment.

In 1972, he was elected to Congress where he became known as a champion of a strong national defense, a friend of average working families, and yes, someone who played a key role in bringing down the Communist Soviet Union. Who would have ever guessed, my friends and colleagues from Texas, that Charles Hazard of Trinity, Texas, many years ago, killing his 13-year-old neighbor's dog, would lead to the mighty Soviet Union falling someday. History is an interesting thing, and Charlie Wilson certainly will always be a part of it, as playing a key role in one of the most monumental achievements in our Nation's history.

Charlie Wilson did what every one of us, Republican or Democrat, would dream to do and would dream that it be said about us at the end of our public service careers: Charlie Wilson made a difference. He made a difference for his State of Texas, for his beloved constituents in east Texas. He made a difference for America, and, yes, he made a difference for the world.

To his widow, Barbara, and to his sister, my dear friend Sharon Allison in my hometown of Waco, Texas, I hope they know that our thoughts and prayers are with them. I thank you and your family for sharing with us and for sharing with the world this great treasure that God brought into this world. His spirit will be with us always. May God bless Charlie Wilson and the great land that he loved.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take a few minutes to remember a patriot, a great Texan, and a great friend, Charlie Wilson. I had the pleasure of serving with Charlie in the Texas State Senate and then in the House for another 17 years, and though we didn't see eye to eye on every issue, it was not often we disagreed.

Charlie was a courageous and kind man with a strong sense of justice that compelled him to work for the good of others. I think that, more than anything else, will be the enduring part of his legacy. He decided to commit his energy, and the efforts of this country, to helping the Afghani people against the Soviets, not just because it was the Cold War and it was us versus them, but because he saw the atrocities committed against the Afghani people and he knew that the United States could

not sit by and just allow it to happen. It was actions like that and his dedication to American values that ultimately helped President Reagan bring down the wall between East and West and bring democracy to so much more of the world.

Charlie was also known for his ability to party, and it is true that he knew how to have a good time. He was married earlier in his life before coming up here to Washington, and I remember once, he had been dating this Russian beauty, and there were loud talks and rumors in the tabloids that wedding bells were inevitable, and then one day I woke up and the headlines read that the matrimony was off. So I asked him what happened, and he said to me, "Ralph, you knew I wasn't going to marry that girl," and I said, "Charlie, how was I supposed to know that?" And he said, "You ever see a three legged fox get near a trap again?"

Well, he was a wise old fox indeed and managed, himself, to trap the love of his life, the beautiful Barbara Alberstadt, and she blessed the last 11 years of Charlie's life. We're all sad that he's gone, but I for one am proud to have served in this Congress with such an outstanding man, Charlie Wilson.

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

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

REMEMBERING REPRESENTATIVE CHARLIE WILSON

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I do rise in tribute to Charlie Wilson. He was a constituent of mine. He was an inspiration to me. For those that don't know, he was born in Trinity, Texas, and had education at Sam Houston State University, but he also attended the U.S. Naval Academy. He loved this country. He was willing to lay down his life for this country.

Between 1956 and 1960, Charlie Wilson served in the United States Navy, obtained the rank of lieutenant, and the man knew about defending America. It was a part of his heart and soul and was something he carried with him throughout his life. His political career began in 1960 when he was elected to the Texas House of Representatives. And as my friend Mr. EDWARDS mentioned, the official version is that it began in 1960 when he was elected to the House of Representatives in Texas, but actually, it did begin when his neighbor poisoned his dog, and Charlie got so active as a young high school kid that he started taking people to the polls to make sure there were enough people to defeat the man that poisoned his dog. That was really his start in politics. But he saw what one person could do if they were deter-

mined enough and sincere enough and gave it their all.

But to give a little more of his history, he served in the Texas House of Representatives for 6 years and was then elected to the Texas Senate in 1960. Then in 1972, the Second Congressional District of Texas elected Charlie to the U.S. House of Representatives. And it wasn't until 1996 that he decided not to run again. The slogan that he used throughout his campaign—it really pretty well summarized the man, "Wilson gets it done," and Charlie did.

He is from what some people call the Bible Belt, and what I've heard from constituents many times is, Yes, we knew about Charlie's issues, but the thing about Charlie, he was always honest about them. And I will never forget when we were naming the VA clinic for the man who is the reason it's in Lufkin, Texas. The VA Secretary came and he spoke, and then I had the honor of introducing Charlie, and Charlie got up and he was really emotional. He told the crowd there—there was a huge crowd there that assembled in his honor there at the civic center—and he said very emotionally, I love you people. Sixteen times you overlooked my personal indiscretions and allowed me to represent you.

Now, there are not many politicians that would stand up and say, You overlooked my personal indiscretions 16 times and let me represent you, but Charlie did. That was Charlie, and he made no bones about who he was or what he was.

And in fact, when Tip O'Neill had put him on the Ethics Committee and a reporter said, Well, what are you doing on the Ethics Committee? He responded a famous quote: "Well, I love women, and I love whiskey, and we deserve to be represented on that committee too." He made no bones about it. His constituents loved him. He was always honest about things, and that goes so far, and everyone should take notice of that fact, that America loves people who are honest with them. He took care of his seniors. I heard that over and over. You know, Charlie Wilson took care of those who couldn't take care of themselves. And it was one of the reasons that people loved him in east Texas, and it's one of the things that inspires me, having seen what he did.

You know, here I was a Republican, he was a Democrat. He always made time if I had questions: What do you think about Afghanistan? Because nobody knew more about Afghanistan than Charlie. He always had sage advice, and I really appreciated that. And I would like to also quote Jim Turner that followed Charlie in Congress. Jim described him as a dedicated public servant who fought hard for the people of his district.

And I would just like to also pay tribute—and I know that Barbara, his widow, is still mourning his loss and will for a long time to come. Barbara Wilson made a difference in Charlie's

life. Barbara sustained and prolonged Charlie's life. He loved her. He loved her family. They loved him. And she made a difference in his life, just as he made a difference in this country. Just as Charlie showed what one man can do when he puts his mind to it, this body ought to always be inspired by the memory of the great, late Charlie Wilson.

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

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

REMEMBERING REPRESENTATIVE CHARLIE WILSON

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

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I did not know Charlie Wilson, but I know friends of Charlie Wilson, and based upon what his friends say, he was truly a remarkable person. I admire people who march to the beat of a different drummer. I admire people who are original, who do things in a very good way, but they do the things that they do in their very own way.

It appears that Charlie Wilson was such a person. While he could easily have been a great Congressperson representing the people of his district and not traveling abroad, he took it upon himself to not only help the people of Afghanistan but to go there and be a part of it and to actually take others into Afghanistan as well to help people with a resistance movement. He marched to the beat of a different drummer. He did not allow the circumstances of what we call "the norm" to prevent him from doing unusual things in a most significant way.

I regret that I did not have the opportunity to meet him, because I believe that such a person has a positive impact on the lives around him; and as I listen to his friends speak so highly of what he was able to do here in the Congress of the United States of America, I only can say, Charlie, I didn't have an opportunity to meet you on this side, but I know that at some point, I'll have an opportunity to meet you, and I want you to share some of those many stories with me.

You have been a friend of this country, and this country loves you. God bless you, Charlie, I know that wherever you are, there's a good time being had.

OUR FUTURE IN AFGHANISTAN

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

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon we had a serious and earnest

debate about our future role in Afghanistan. I firmly believe that there are respectful differences of opinion on this war, and that support for a war is not a litmus test for one's support for America. However, I'm grateful that this House has overwhelmingly rejected running from America's vital interests and the people of Afghanistan.

Our debate today presented a stark choice to Members, quite literally, to stay or to go in Afghanistan. It is one in which there is no middle ground, no hedging, no fudging. In the most unequivocal terms I can muster, I resolutely oppose our retreat from Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, more times than I can count in the past few years, we have been reminded that the war in Afghanistan was the good war, that it was the war of necessity over the war of choice. I stand here today to remind my colleagues of their many statements in that regard. We did not seek this war. Our enemy sought us out. We did not march into Afghanistan for profit or pleasure or plunder. We went to ensure that Afghani soil is never again used to wage war or terrorize civilians.

We did not ask for this war; but now that it's come, we cannot loosen the amount of responsibility that we have taken up. To be certain, our goals in Afghanistan are difficult. Continuing to forge a partnership with the Afghans will take military might, diplomatic finesse, and our hard-earned taxpayers to succeed.

□ 2015

However, these are costs that we must bear and should bear. The President and our military leadership understand the seriousness of our task. Time and again in speeches and testimony and interviews they have repeated that Afghanistan is the epicenter of Islamic extremism, and that defeating al Qaeda in central Asia is essential to securing peace both in the region and here at home.

Our partners in bringing peace to Afghanistan are the Afghan people themselves. It is their homes that have been destroyed and their children who have perished in 30 years of war. Yet these beaten and downtrodden people have stood next to our soldiers to fight for their future and their country because we told them that we will help them bring order to the chaos of their homeland.

Many of my colleagues have discussed the costs of war, and they are right to consider what we have paid in blood and treasure to fight this fight. However, they have failed to weigh what giving up would cost us. Practically speaking, to retreat today means the Afghan central government will fail. When it fails, the Taliban will return to reclaim what was theirs and again plunge the country into the despotism of blind religious zealotry. The Taliban will welcome home radical Islamic jihadists back to their soil to again plan their acts of murder

and destruction. They will also expand their fight to the tribal areas of Pakistan, which has the potential to destabilize a nuclear power, and inflame the simmering tension between Pakistan and India, another nuclear power.

While it is relatively easy to estimate what we have spent so far and what we will spend in the coming years in Afghanistan, it is impossible to know the value of the calamities that have been prevented because we remain. There is no value that can be put on the growth of a civil society, no cost that can be put on stabilizing Pakistan, and no price that can be put on the recent rapprochement of Pakistan and India. Failure in these developments will hurt our national security, yet a retreat will make them more likely.

I believe, as we all do, that Americans want peace above all else. None of us desires our friends and families to be deployed overseas, battling among the rocks and caves of the foreign countryside. However, peace will not come until our enemies end their drive for our destruction. Until that day, talk of leaving Afghanistan means only that our enemies will bring the fight back to us.

There can be no peace in Afghanistan without a cessation of hostilities. Whether we leave today, tomorrow, or at the end of this year, this war does not end simply because we choose not to be engaged in it. The Taliban will return. With their return, they will expand their efforts to destabilize our ally Pakistan, and again provide sanctuary for radical Islamic jihadists who will continue to try to murder Americans in the name of their faith.

Mr. Speaker, I hope and pray fervently for a day when our Armed Forces do come home. However, until our enemies lay down their arms and give up their fight to destroy our civilization, our military must remain out there on the wall, doing their duty to uphold America's democracy and our safety.

That we have spent so much time today discussing abandoning our allies deeply saddens me. Halfway around the world I know that our Afghan partners were watching what was said and trying to divine our intent by holding this debate. It is my firm hope that they see today's vote for what it is, the unqualified, overwhelming voice of the House of Representatives announcing that we will not abandon our friends in their deepest hour of need.

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

(Mr. GONZALEZ 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 Texas (Mr. CUELLAR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

HONORING CHARLIE WILSON

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

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life and honor the accomplishments of Congressman Charlie Wilson who passed away on February 10, 2010.

Charlie Wilson was a remarkable Congressman, and in his time in the U.S. House of Representatives, he worked diligently for his constituents in East Texas. During his tenure in the House, he gained a seat on the House Appropriations Committee and through his position on the Subcommittee on Defense, he helped to fund the Afghan Mujahideen during the Soviet War in Afghanistan. Additionally, his support for progressive politics led him to be an advocate for the Equal Rights Amendment, a minimum wage bill, and Medicaid.

All of these actions have garnered Congressman Wilson a place in the history books, but it was his personality that earned him a place in the hearts of so many people across Texas. When everything was said and done, we all knew that his deepest concern was for the people of his district in East Texas, and as a fellow Texas Democrat, I am privileged to have served with him. His love for life will reverberate through the halls of Congress for years to come, and he will be truly missed by his fellow Texans, and especially me.

Mr. Speaker, Texas has lost a great leader and legislator with the passing of Congressman Wilson, and I ask my fellow colleagues to join me today in honoring his memory.

ECONOMIC RECOVERY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOCCIERI) is recognized for the remainder of the hour.

Mr. BOCCIERI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Sorry for the confusion this evening.

Tonight I am joined by several of my colleagues from around the country who want to talk to you about the economy and how we are working hard here in Congress to set the record straight, but also, more importantly, to put our people back to work.

If you remember when we took office, Mr. Speaker, we were suffering from one of the worst recessions since the Great Depression. In fact, many have called this the Great Recession. And ironically, of all commercials, there is a contemporary insurance commercial out on the airwaves today that says, "How will we remember the time and our experience? Will we remember this time as the great recession or the recession that made us great?" I think

tonight you are going to hear from my colleagues who say that we are going to be remembered for the recession that will once again make this country as great as it has been in the past by focusing on real things, real challenges, and offering up real solutions.

When we took office, Mr. Speaker, the economy was in freefall. We didn't know where we were going to land. Record job losses were across the airwaves, people were standing in lines waiting for unemployment checks, and we found out that it was the most significant job loss since the Great Depression.

Record job losses. We didn't know where the economy was going to fall. Two undeclared, unfunded wars. A banking system in chaos. Greed on Wall Street. It was a perfect prescription for a perfect storm, and one that has led us to where we now have enormous challenges in front of us. The job market was losing 750,000 jobs a month, and unemployment was climbing just as fast. The economy was contracting at a rate of over 6 percent, the worst in decades. Foreclosures were at record levels. Home prices had plummeted by 30 percent. The decline of home prices, stock values, pensions and other retirement plans had cost American households over \$10 trillion in wealth.

In fact, since the Great Recession had started, Mr. Speaker, since 2007, Americans' wealth had plummeted by \$17.5 trillion according to the Federal Reserve. Seventeen and a half trillion dollars of loss of wealth since the recession started in June of 2007. It didn't start to pick up until the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act.

Now, we have heard a lot of hype about the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. We heard a lot about the fact that this was the largest investment of capital in our Nation's history. We have heard a lot about the fact that this was the largest tax reduction in our country's history. Faced with this economic meltdown that we were handed when we walked into the door here in the 111th Congress, it required swift action.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that Members of Congress will be judged by two measures: by action or inaction. And the Congress took swift action to act as a backstop against further job loss, to create some jobs along the way. That is what the stimulus was about. And every economic expert you speak to today says that this brought us back from the brink of a great depression.

So I want to tell those detractors today that it wasn't until we enacted the stimulus bill, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, that Americans' wealth started to grow again. And in fact we see pensions are starting to climb, we see the fact that Americans' IRAs and 401(k)s are back on the path towards prosperity, and in fact we have recognized a \$5 trillion recovery since the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, the stimulus.

We are starting to create jobs, albeit not at the pace that I would like to see.

But we have to understand the ditch that we are trying to climb out of. And I want to say to you that while we see manufacturing increasing, while we see home sales increasing, we need to see more and more people get back to work. And that is what my colleagues are focusing on here today.

Around the world over the last century the typical financial crisis caused jobless rates to rise almost 5 years, according to the economist Carmen Reinhart. Over the timeline our rate would still be rising by early 2012. And as Ben Bernanke and Henry Paulson, who were both Republicans, said, that many others warned in 2008 if dramatic action was not taken to break back the recession, the United States could spiral into another Great Depression. These are experts. These are economists. These are people who have distinction and recognition all around the world. It is important that we recognize that we had to take swift action here.

In the fourth quarter of 2009, the economy grew by almost 6 percent. Six percent. Job losses for the fourth quarter in 2009 were one-seventh of what they were when we took office, Mr. Speaker. The nonpartisan Center for Budget and Policy Priorities said that the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act kept more than 6 million Americans out of poverty and reduced the severity of poverty for more than 33 million more.

Can you imagine what it would be like if we didn't enact a robust policy to extend unemployment benefits, to extend coverage for health care so folks could keep their health care during this time of great need? Could you imagine if we didn't help our people what kind of condition we would find the people that we represent?

Well, it is disappointing because the challenges that confront us, Mr. Speaker, aren't Democrat or Republican challenges. They are not conservative or liberal challenges. They are not even moderate challenges. They are American challenges. And it is so frustrating to me that we have got to find the courage to stand up and confront these together. That is why I am so disappointed in my colleagues who didn't lend their support to help America recover in her greatest time of need.

□ 2030

A few more facts before I ask some of my colleagues to be recognized here.

According to economists polled in a recent USA Today survey, unemployment would have hit 10.8 percent higher than December's 10 percent rate without the Recovery Act. The difference would have translated into another 1.2 million jobs lost. These problems were years in the making, and they are not going to be fixed overnight. In fact, I can argue it is a decade of failed economic policies that have led us here.

A lot of our colleagues on the other side like to talk about the national

debt. You know, when President Clinton left office, our country was facing a \$5.6 trillion surplus, a \$5.6 trillion surplus, and when President Bush left office, we were facing almost a \$13 trillion deficit. So it is very clear that after two tax cuts to the wealthiest among us, after two undeclared, unfunded wars and a prescription drug plan that left a huge doughnut hole for average working families and seniors, we have a deficit now that has put us on the brink. And that's why we had a quick reaction and that is why we passed the American Recovery Act.

Now I want to call on my colleague from California, because she is going to talk about how this has impacted one of the largest States in the country, and I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU).

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a member of the Democratic Congressional Jobs Working Group. Together, we are proposing solutions to our job crisis. In fact, one of those proposals is H.R. 4564, the Emergency Jobs Program and Assistance for Families Act. This bill extends an extremely successful employment program that we call Jobs NOW. It has created over 156,000 jobs over 29 States and is still developing more.

In Palmdale, California, Jobs NOW helped Jody, a single mother of two, find a job at a local coffeehouse working as a barista. The regular paycheck puts food on the table and is helping her get through a rough patch. Her boss is impressed with her work and plans to permanently hire her and the other three subsidized employees they brought in. It is this kind of success story that makes Jobs NOW such a model for job creation. Without it, the coffeehouse would not have been able to grow its business or take on new employees. Jody would not have had a chance to learn new skills and support her family.

I first learned of this innovative program in Los Angeles County. One of the supervisors, Don Knabe, created 11,000 jobs over the last year, using stimulus funds to create subsidized jobs.

How does it work? Eligible participants are placed into subsidized jobs in all sectors of the economy, from nonprofits to government agencies to private businesses, and are matched with jobs that complement their employment goals. The employer must provide supervision equal to 20 percent of the wage cost and ensure that the job does not displace an existing employee or replace someone who was to be promoted. This means the county is paying for 80 percent or more of payroll costs in Recovery Act funds.

Some examples of these jobs include park rangers, receptionists, teacher assistants, dental assistant trainees, customer service clerks, and child care workers. Workers get paid \$10 per hour for up to 40 hours per week. Jobs NOW allows businesses to succeed and the employee to succeed.

I have spoken to countless people in my district about this program, and I keep hearing about how this program is a win/win. It works for both workers and businesses. Workers benefit beyond the paycheck by getting hands-on experience in a setting where they earn wages, develop new skills, and enhance existing skills. Businesses benefit by getting the help they need to grow or expand while temporarily reducing payroll costs. Companies may ultimately decide to hire these subsidized workers permanently as the economy improves. The jobs generated by this program can help businesses expand in these difficult times by reducing their economic risk and need for expensive loans.

California is leading the Nation in creating these subsidized jobs. For instance, V-Cube, a high-tech firm in Torrance, California, hired two subsidized employees with very little experience. Very quickly, these two employees showed they were motivated and quick to learn. Now one of the employees runs Web seminars and the other is a project coordinator. It is only through Jobs NOW that V-Cube and other businesses feel secure in taking on new workers in this economic environment.

You can see that across California, in this map here, many, many jobs were created. In Fresno, 1,000 jobs were created. In San Francisco, over 1,500 jobs were created. In Los Angeles, an astonishing 11,000 jobs were created by the country's Jobs NOW program in less than a year. The State predicts that 25,000 jobs will be created through the Jobs NOW program by the end of present funding.

However, we must act quickly or the job placements will stop when the program expires on September 30. Because subsidized employment programs often run for at least 6 months, many localities are planning to discontinue their jobs program between March and June of this year in anticipation of the emergency funds expiration date. Almost 60,000 jobs will disappear if the fund expires.

In California, L.A. County will stop placing participants in new jobs in June. San Bernardino County has to stop creating new jobs in April. Sacramento County will stop putting people in 6-month-long jobs in March. It will pay people for shorter periods until June 2010, and then stop the program altogether.

But the full amount of funding has yet to be claimed by the States. The Recovery Act authorized \$5 billion for Jobs NOW employment subsidization programs, but actually less than \$1.5 billion has been accessed by the States. And the program is still in the process of expanding. That's why I am proposing, along with the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT), a bill that will allow more States to help residents get back on their feet and into a job.

In fact, all across the country there have been programs such as this. We

can see that all across the country in the dark green spots there have been successful programs.

In Tennessee, the State focused on rural Perry County, which was hard hit by a plant closure. The unemployment rate had risen to 27 percent. Tennessee brought local workforce development and human service agencies and the business community together and developed a subsidized employment program for over 500 individuals.

In Mississippi, the State has developed the Steps Program, which uses Jobs NOW money to create private sector jobs that transition into permanent employment. The State begins by funding all of the wages of a new employee and steadily reduces its commitment until the business can support the employee on its own.

As you can see, 29 States across the country have implemented programs that created subsidized jobs, and even more want to jump on the bandwagon. That's why people on each side of the aisle are in strong support of this proposal. President Obama is a strong supporter. Besides its funding in the Recovery Act, he has proposed a \$2.5 billion increase and a year-long extension for this upcoming year's budget.

But it is not just the President who thinks this is a good idea; there is deep bipartisan support. The American Enterprise Institute's Kevin Hassett recently wrote in *Business Week* that this program should be renewed and said, "Given the state of the labor market, it is hard to imagine how any sensible person could oppose such a move."

Jobs NOW allows States to be in the driver's seat for this program, and that is why the National Governors Association also supports this, urging Congress to pass an extension because of the outsized benefits to the States.

The human cost of the recession has been high. It is easy to think of unemployment in terms of numbers and statistics, but numbers cannot describe the anxiety and fear a person feels when they are unemployed. Numbers can't show the hope and pride a person feels when they find a job.

I was moved by the words of Ms. Taylor in Los Angeles about the Jobs NOW program and its effect on her life. Ms. Taylor is a mother of two children, one with autism. She has been living on her aunt's couch because she couldn't find work. Because of a job through Jobs NOW, she was able to get back on her feet and into her own apartment. She told California Social Services, "You guys gave me a chance when the whole world seemed like they were saying 'No, not this time.' Without this program, I could not have paid my rent, and my babies and I would be on the streets."

She is not the only one. There are millions of economically disadvantaged people on the front lines of this economy. They are struggling every day. The Jobs NOW emergency fund gives them a chance to find work and start

moving towards a future. It helps businesses expand in these tough times.

I strongly urge the House leadership and my colleagues not to forget the thousands of people who need this help. We must pass H.R. 4564 for Jobs NOW.

Mr. BOCCIERI. I thank the gentle lady from California who made some very compelling arguments about why California needs to have this investment.

While we are joined by several of my colleagues tonight, let me just say a little bit about what we are doing to create jobs in Ohio.

In Ohio's 16th Congressional District, we have had some good news recently. Rolls Royce, an international company, has announced that they are going to move their fuel cell research from Singapore to Stark County, Ohio. They are going to expand their fuel cell research and development activities, investing \$3 million in equipment, creating up to 60 jobs and retaining 32, while offering apprenticeship and training programs with the local college.

Barbasol Shaving Cream invested \$7.2 million to buy land and a new plant in Ashland, Ohio; a 78,000-square-foot plant to start, 30 new employees, and grow up to about 75.

Scotts Miracle-Gro is opening a manufacturing plant in Orrville, where they are expected to create nearly a hundred jobs in the next several months.

Shearer's Foods, they make potato chips, and they are mighty good, I might add. They broke ground earlier this summer to build a new production facility in Massillon's Northeast Commercial Park. They will hire as many as a hundred employees in the first phase of development. These are the type of success stories that have been helped, if not augmented, by the efforts of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act.

With that, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio for his leadership in bringing us together to make sure that we can discuss the importance of creating jobs. As we discuss jobs, I think it is important that we put our job efforts in perspective, because a little over a year ago when this administration came into office, we were losing jobs at the rate of over 700,000 per month, every month; 700,000 jobs a month. And we reacted to it by passing the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, and we have slowly made progress, losing fewer and fewer jobs every month. But that is obviously not sufficient. We have to do better than that. But we have to put this in perspective. We were losing all of those jobs, and we found ourselves not only in the ditch with the economy, but also in the ditch with the Federal budget. We had a huge deficit which limited our ability to respond to this challenge.

We are also shooting at a moving target. Just this week, the Virginia Legislature, my home State of Virginia, will pass a budget that will cut approximately \$4 billion out of the budget. Virginia is about 2 percent of the population, \$4 billion. California is cutting \$20 billion out of their budget, a little over 10 percent of the population. If you extrapolate that nationally, that is about \$200 billion that the States will be cutting out of their budgets this year on top of about \$300 billion to \$350 billion that they cut last year. So that is \$500 billion that would have been cut out of budgets in the last 2 years. So the first \$500 billion of job creation that we do will do nothing but just hire the people who have been laid off on the State level.

So as much we are doing on the Federal level, it is obvious that we are shooting at a moving target. States are laying off people as fast as they can, and our job is to make sure that we try to create jobs.

Part of the Federal investment will help States retain some of their critical employees, particularly the public safety first responders and teachers. The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act made significant reinvestments in funding States and helping with their health care and other critical needs so that they would not have to lay off as many as they were doing.

□ 2045

But obviously some of the major investments I think that are doing the most good are those that were made in infrastructure and transportation. We still have a 10 percent unemployment rate, so obviously a lot has to be done. And it's those investments in infrastructure and transportation that can be the most effective in creating jobs.

When responding to a recession, we use the shorthand of three Ts: We want the response to be timely, targeted, and temporary. Timely because sooner or later the recession is going to be over even if we don't do anything, so we want to make sure we take timely action. Targeted—you want to put the money where it's most needed, people that are out of work and people that will actually spend the money to help stimulate the economy. So it has to be targeted. And it is temporary. When we recover from the recession, we don't want to be stuck with ongoing programs and expenses that we will have to continue to fund.

Transportation and infrastructure projects fulfill the three Ts for a successful stimulus plan; they are timely, targeted and temporary. They're timely. We are aiming at programs that are shovel ready, ready to go, no environmental needed, nothing else needed, no architectural anything, ready to go. We are targeted at industries that are most in need. The construction industry in many States has unemployment rates of 25 percent or more. And it's temporary. When you fund a project, when the project is completed, you

stop spending the money. When you finish building the school, you don't have to spend any more money. It's not like you would set up a program where you would have to continue paying salaries on and on and on.

The Recovery Act, for example, put money into transit systems. Throughout the Nation, transit systems are cutting back on employment. St. Louis, for example, eliminated 25 percent of its workforce and cut services by 17 percent. Chicago laid off 1,000 workers. And so investments in the transit systems are areas where we can make timely and targeted investments.

Across the Nation these are necessary projects. Across the Nation, 78 metropolitan areas have identified over \$240 billion in needed transit investments that need to be done. These jobs not only put people back to work, they complete needed projects. Now, these investments are also very effective in creating jobs. For every \$1 billion the Federal Government puts in infrastructure the economic activity is about \$6 billion and about 35,000 jobs are created.

Now, we need these projects, and we found that a lot of them are ready to go now. The Public Transportation Association identified \$15 billion worth of projects that are ready to go. As soon as we fund them they are ready to go. Highway associations across the country identified 7,000 ready-to-go highway projects and bridge projects, almost \$50 billion ready to go. As soon as we come up with the money, they can go. And so not only are these projects needed, they can be timely and they can put people to work. We have found that when we fund a construction project, when it's ready to go, the contractors can hire the employees within a couple of weeks, and they're on the job right then. So we have timely projects that are ready to go. We have put money into it. Two-thirds of the projects that have been funded, the construction has already started.

We have more work to do. We still have a 10 percent unemployment rate because the States are still laying people off, so we still have to keep creating jobs. I am happy to report that today the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER), the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee, has introduced a bill with significant new investments in infrastructure and transportation. These will make sure that we will have these workers on the job in very short order.

The Miller jobs bill will create jobs quickly and efficiently. As States continue to lay people off, we need to make sure that we are creating as many jobs as we possibly can on the Federal level. We should give the Miller jobs bill quick consideration so that jobs can be created when they are needed, and that's right now.

So I thank you. I would like to thank the gentleman from Ohio for bringing us together, for talking about jobs and encouraging us to continue doing what

we need to do to create jobs and end the unemployment problems that we're having today.

Mr. BOCCIERI. Well, I thank the senior gentleman from Virginia.

I just want to be clear about your chart. It looks as if we stabilized the job losses in this country and started to grow them again after the Recovery Act was passed.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. The Recovery Act was passed right down here, and since then we have been making progress. But losing fewer jobs is not good enough. We need to continue this chart. In short order, we will be creating hundreds of thousands of jobs, putting people back to work. Those who have lost their jobs need to be rehired. We need to create about 100,000 jobs a month just to keep up with the population growth. So this chart is just the beginning. By the middle of this year we hope to be well into the plus, creating jobs, hiring people, and bringing people back from the unemployment lines.

Mr. BOCCIERI. Well, these are exciting numbers. We have got to get people back to work. And I concur with the gentleman from Virginia.

Let me revisit for just a moment exactly what the Recovery Act and the stimulus bill included.

Thirty-seven percent of the package was tax cuts. \$288 billion was given to small businesses so that they could help grow and invest in our new economy. In my opinion, that is going to be our investment in energy. \$288 billion was invested back so small businesses could start growing again and investing back.

Largest tax cut in America's history, largest tax cut for working middle class families. In fact, 95 percent of middle class families in our country got some tax relief through their employer. \$144 billion, or 18 percent of the Recovery Act, was allocated to State and local fiscal relief. More than 90 percent of the State aid is going to help folks who are finding themselves on Medicaid rolls. Fighting to make sure that we didn't have double-digit increases in tuition across State universities and so that our local school districts could keep teachers hired and we could keep custodians in the building. This is very important, Mr. Speaker, that we understand that we help bring our economy back from the brink of a great recession.

As that contemporary commercial says today, How will we remember this time? How will we remember it? Will we remember it as the great recession or the recession that made us great? I think with these key investments into our people, into our workforce, and into our country, we are definitely making our country stronger.

I want to take a moment to recognize a distinguished gentleman that I have a lot of respect for. Not only do we share a common heritage, but we share a common belief that we should invest in our people, in our country, and in

our way of life. Congressman PASCRELL from New Jersey is a man who I have a lot of respect for, and I would like to yield him some time so that he can talk about exactly what we're doing to help put America back to work. Congressman PASCRELL, my friend, you have the floor.

Mr. PASCRELL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, if you look at the data, it is clear that since the start of the Obama administration and the passage of the Recovery Act—which you've heard depicted by the three former speakers—we are stemming the number of job losses per month; there is no doubt about that. But we need to do everything we can to actually start gaining jobs instead of just losing fewer. It would seem like the charts, it would seem by the facts that in the next several months we will see, finally, for the first time in several years a plus in terms of the creation of jobs.

The U.S. jobs deficit has reached millions. Our unemployment rate is 9.7 percent. That is an intolerable rate. The problem we are facing is how to address the shortfall in employment opportunities and articulate a new strategy that targets and engages our small businesses and American workers. Mr. Speaker, we simply need jobs.

Which brings me to what I think is the most obvious answer. It was obvious many years ago, it's obvious now: Our infrastructure. Our infrastructure is in disrepair. And it's not just our roads, and it's not just our bridges that are falling down. Earlier this year, the American Society of Civil Engineers gave the Nation's wastewater systems and water systems the lowest grade of any infrastructure category, a D-minus. I want to have our viewers in the House see this. This is a rotted water main pipe, much like the pipes in many of our districts and many of our communities. I like to call these the out-of-sight, out-of-mind pipes; you don't see them until you have a problem with your water main. But as we have learned over the last couple of years, just because our infrastructure needs are not visible doesn't mean that they are not deteriorating.

A quick look at the recent news headlines across the country illustrates the state of our water infrastructure, and I can only list a few because time does not permit: "Franklin Water Main Break Closes Roads and Schools"; "Boil your water," says Franklin, New Jersey"; "Lancaster Water Main Breaks"; "Sinkhole Swallows Car in California"; "Water Main Break in Manhattan Causes Evacuations in Traffic, Subway Disruptions in New York City"; "Water Main Break Cuts Off Water Service to the Medical Center in West Virginia."

Here we have an illustration of the water main break on River Road in Bethesda, Maryland, watching people airlifted out of their cars. We're not making this stuff up; this is real. In metropolitan D.C. on Christmas Eve, 2008, it

was quite a spectacle. One headline actually read, "Water main break forces dramatic rescue of nine." The road literally exploded.

We cannot turn a blind eye to two realities: America needs jobs, and our infrastructure cannot put people to work fast enough. As a former mayor of Paterson, New Jersey, I understand the significance of local water and wastewater systems. A strong water infrastructure is essential to the community's public health and economic vitality.

The Environmental Protection Agency and the General Accounting Office estimate that community water systems will require \$500 billion above their expected rate of investment in order to meet safe drinking water standards and sanitation needs just over the next 20 years.

As Congress struggles with historic deficits, I strongly believe that we must leverage private capital investment and look at options for public-private partnerships. That is what we are talking about this evening.

In order to encourage this possibility, I introduced the Sustainable Water Infrastructure Investment Act, H.R. 537, which will generate significant investment through the use of tax-exempt bonds for water infrastructure, and that is water and wastewater projects.

Congress already exempts airports, intercity rail, and solid waste disposal sites from those bond caps. My bill would remove water infrastructure projects from the cap as well.

By exempting water projects from the bond cap, we can get people working on the very projects to my right in 90 to 120 days. This isn't hot air; this is real relief. This is real jobs. Standard & Poor's estimates that \$180 billion in new money infrastructure is available for investment. This capital cannot be deployed until a private activity bond cap exemption is created.

□ 2100

This legislation aims to repair our crumbling water infrastructure while leveraging private capital to create jobs. Every dollar invested in public water and sewer infrastructure will add \$8.97 to the national economy. This is a win-win situation. Economists estimate a \$1 billion investment in water infrastructure will create 28,500 local jobs. You cannot in any manner, shape or form produce any other job plan that is going to do what this can do, because these are our needs. These need to be done because things are only going to get worse.

That pipe, which I showed you before, is not going to cleanse itself. It has led that pipe and many other pipes like it to this particular situation of people being airlifted, to rescue workers having to go to a particular community and, of course, to vehicles that have been raised in the air because of the explosion of our water mains.

This would be 28,500 jobs in 1 year. This is bipartisan legislation. Both

sides of the aisle have signed onto this. It could put Americans in every State to work within 120 days of its enactment. It is time to focus on creating jobs and on building a strong infrastructure for future generations. Let's stop talking about what needs to get done, and let's actually get this done.

There are huge economic benefits that come with water and wastewater infrastructure projects. In fact, a recent study found that every \$1 billion invested in water and wastewater infrastructure creates 27,000 new jobs with average annual earnings of more than \$50,000. Each \$1 billion invested generates approximately \$82.4 million in State and local tax revenue at a time when States and localities need it most.

This chart shows how construction dollars ripple through local communities. Right here, an estimated 20,000 to 26,669 jobs can result from a national investment of \$1 billion in water and wastewater infrastructure—everything from construction, to real estate, to retail, to legal services, to the management of companies and enterprises, to private households, and to maintenance and repair. This chart shows how these construction dollars ripple through our entire communities.

Let's face it: as of this unemployment situation that we are in today, 40 percent of those jobs will never return, and 40 percent of those jobs that have been lost—get this—are by people who have been out of work for more than 6 to 8 months. They will not return to those jobs. We need to invest with the private community in order to do things that must be done that communities cannot afford. We have found that every \$1 billion invested in these projects creates jobs in 325 other industries, and they are listed.

I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to take action to support this legislation and to push its passage for measures that will empower American workers and that will provide them with opportunities.

Eligible and essential public health and environmental projects approved for 2010 are waiting for funding. They are waiting for private and public investment, which we can leverage with a very small amount of money. The resulting jobs are important. In California, 285,000 jobs can be created and, in Illinois, 133,950 jobs. In New Jersey, \$1.8 billion will mean 51,300 jobs on projects that are needed. In every State we go over, this is the case.

There are 60 different organizations which support this legislation—from engineers to waterworks associations, to equipment manufacturers—Caterpillar, Coca Cola, Design-Build Institute of America. There are 60 different organizations which support this bipartisan legislation that will create jobs and not hot air. We have had a lot of hot air in Washington. I think this legislation is what we need.

My good friend, Mr. BOCCIERI, I thank you for bringing us together tonight.

America needs jobs. This is our priority. I have presented an idea which, I hope, will be accepted. I hope that America can get back to work again. Our people need jobs—jobs that will be needed and that are needed so that we don't have to make work. Remember school? Make work. Keep the kids busy. These are things we need. We understand this, but we don't look at it because these waterworks, whether they are sewers, whether they are water or whether they are watersheds, are all mostly under the ground. It's not a romantic or a sexy thing to talk about, but I have presented to the House a way to put people to work. These jobs need to be done, and the private and public sectors must be brought together.

With that, I yield back. I thank you for allowing me to share in this important evening.

Mr. BOCCIERI. The gentleman from New Jersey has some very good ideas, which we have got to look at very seriously, about putting our country back to work and about long-term investments.

You know, I have often said that we have got to be the producers of wealth, not just the movers of wealth, and that we have got to build things here.

In 1950, over half the jobs in our country were in manufacturing. Today, one out of 10 of our jobs is in manufacturing. We are actually building. Some of that has been because of the fact that we have gained in productivity and because we have gained in efficiency. Yet we have still outsourced too many of our jobs. In States like New Jersey, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Michigan, and Illinois, we have seen some of those manufacturing jobs go overseas.

Our great trade imbalance that we have, the trade deficit that we have every year, is very troubling to me. We have a trade imbalance with China—\$280 billion every year. We have a trade imbalance with oil-producing countries because they send \$330 billion of oil over to the United States. Those two account for some of the largest imbalances our country has ever known in terms of our trade policy.

We know that 95 percent of the marketplace is outside the United States, and Ohio is leading the Nation. Some of our local municipalities have begun to start exporting some of their goods overseas, creating their own trade relationships. We need more help here from the American Government, from the Federal Government, so that States like Ohio, Virginia, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania can help make those needed investments into our local communities.

We have to be the producers of wealth. We have to build things again in this country. It's not only a matter of our economic security. It's a matter of our national security. That's why it is so key and strategic that the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act invests in our people, in our country

and in our future, and that we also lay the groundwork for future prosperity by investing in energy.

Energy is a key component of our Nation's economy, but it is very troubling when we import 66 percent of our oil from overseas and 40 percent from the Middle East. We see that the largest user of energy in our country is our Nation's military. The Department of Defense is the largest user of energy in our country. So it is very key, not only to our economic interests but to our national security interests, that we move away from our dependence on foreign oil, that we invest and create jobs here that cannot be outsourced, and that we make sure that we put our people back to work. That's why it is so important that we make these needed investments.

According to Andrew Stettner, I have to say—he is a deputy director of the National Employment Law Center—14.9 million jobless Americans have been out of work for an average of 30 weeks, which is the highest level since the government began keeping those records in the 1950s. It is the highest record.

We have some on the other side who are suggesting that we shouldn't have extended unemployment benefits. I've even heard some who have had the audacity to say that we shouldn't be giving them government/taxpayer money because they don't want to work. Are you kidding me? We have millions of people out of work in this country who are now just being called back to work. In fact, some of my friends on the other side voted against an extension of unemployment benefits which would have helped 11,600 Ohioans who have found themselves struggling just to put bread on their tables for their families.

To me, we have got to invest in our people. If we can spend \$1 trillion on war, we can spend money to invest in our people, in our country, and we can put Americans back to work.

I want to yield some time before we close today, Mr. Speaker, to a good friend of mine from Virginia, a gentleman who has the passion and vigor to take on the challenges of our great country, TOM PERRIELLO.

Congressman PERRIELLO, enlighten us for a few moments, sir.

Mr. PERRIELLO. Grazie to my paisan from Ohio. I appreciate that, and I appreciate your remarks on where we are with this economy, both with where we have come and with where we have to go.

I think both the present statistics in the history books will make clear that we have prevented a depression, which is no small feat; but I am not satisfied until we see robust economic growth that reemploys America. We should be willing to look back and say, Here is an opportunity, when we were going off a cliff into a depression, where we said, No, we will not allow that, not on our watch. We will make sure that that depression is prevented. Yet I'm not satisfied until we see the kind of job cre-

ation we need to see back on Main Street. We need to shift our focus from that speculation on Wall Street to that job creation on Main Street. These ideas are not Republican ideas or Democrat ideas. These are ideas about putting people back to work.

You know, in Ohio and I know in Virginia that we are right on the cusp of the summer construction season. We have an opportunity to start building again. Americans are ready to do it. Small businesses are ready to do it. Unfortunately, we are not going to see the housing starts pick up which many would like to see, but we know we can still build things. We can build our infrastructure, and we can retrofit our existing building stock. We have had a tool belt recession, and it is time to see growth in the tool belt sector.

These may not be the sexiest jobs to talk about in Washington or on Wall Street, but the fact is we must rebuild America's competitive advantage, and we must rebuild it one community at a time, one commonwealth at a time, one country, together, rebuilding our competitive advantage and putting people back to work. We have a chance to do that.

Now, most of the gentlemen on the other side of this building, down in the Senate, may be through this recession. The media elites may be through this recession, but working class America and middle class America are not through it. We have prevented the worst from happening, but we will not be satisfied until we see the kind of robust economic growth that will bring us back together. We will rebuild that competitive advantage, and we will need to do it in time for the summer construction season.

I appreciate all that you have done to keep that focus on jobs, jobs, jobs in Ohio, in Virginia, and around this country. We must be deadly focused on jobs, and we must do it with the urgency that does not miss the construction season ahead.

Mr. BOCCIERI. I agree with the gentleman from Virginia. We have seen almost a flip from a 6 percent job loss, when we began the 111th Congress in January of 2009, to nearly a 6 percent job growth in our gross domestic product. Yet we know that this is not about the GDP. This is about the j-o-b-s. We have got to put people back to work. That's why we are focusing on doing that.

There are some things that we have done for our small businesses, to help struggling small businesses stay open:

There is the net operating loss carry-back. We have also extended tax credits for renewable energy production because, as my colleague and I know, the cheapest energy is the energy we never use. Small businesses can save a lot by writing that off. They can save by weathering their businesses and by weathering their homes. That's what is going to save money in the long term.

We are also going to give bonus appreciation, which extends to businesses

that are buying equipment, such as computers. It speeds up the appreciation through 2009. That is helping our small businesses write off those losses so that they can get folks back to work.

Mr. PERRIELLO. This is an opportunity. What we have made is the down payment on America's future. We know that jobs of the future are going to come in the energy sector and that they are going to come in research and development. We need the strong universities, and we need the strong infrastructure.

A year ago, we made a down payment, which is starting to pay off now in the kind of rebound that we are starting to see; but we cannot be satisfied, and we cannot take that foot off the gas. This is the time. Americans are ready to build.

Again, this should not be a partisan idea. We all have construction companies in our districts. We all have roads and bridges and water and sewer systems in our districts. We all have small businesses that help supply that construction sector. We must see that this can be a chance to come together and to understand the urgency of this moment.

We have made that down payment. Now it is time to start seeing that growth. We are going to do that, not by saying "no" to everything but by saying "yes" to America's future, by saying "yes" to America's competitive advantage. There are many in the top echelon of this country who have stopped believing that America can manufacture, that it can grow things, that it can be strong again.

□ 2115

Those include elites on the left and elites on the right. Well, they are wrong. America's working and middle class is still strong. If we invest in them, they will outcompete every country on Earth.

We can outcompete the rest of the world, but only if we invest in education and workforce development, if we get a 21st century infrastructure, and we understand that two out of three new jobs in this country come from small businesses. Instead of bailing out the biggest businesses, it is time to reward and support the small businesses. They are the engine of innovation and growth. They are the civic leaders in our community.

That is what our agenda needs to be about. It is what we started on. It is what we must push forward, regardless of party line, and get America growing again.

Mr. BOCCIERI. Well, Mr. Speaker, he is exactly right. The gentleman from Virginia is exactly right that we have got to invest in our people, in our country, in our way of life. As that contemporary commercial says on the airwaves, Is this going to be remembered as the great recession or the recession that makes us great?

I believe that we can do this if we work together, if we invest in our peo-

ple. Again, if we can spend \$1 trillion on war, we can certainly spend money to make sure that we invest in our people and do the things that are going to set us on the track towards prosperity.

We are starting to begin to see the glimmers of light. We are starting to see the glimmers of hope that people once again are going to be on to a path of prosperity.

I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia, because he believes that our greatest days are still yet to come. We will be stronger, we will be more robust, and we will be smarter on how we handle these future downturns. This is the time that we cannot let go away from us. We have got to invest in our people, in our country, and that is why I am so proud of the gentleman from Virginia, who stands with me saying that we will again be the producers of wealth, not just the movers of wealth.

THE QUESTION OF HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to join you here once again as we get a chance to take a look at Special Orders, and also I am joined by some of my distinguished colleagues. We are going to be looking once again at a subject that has really absorbed the attention of Americans now for almost 9 months, the question of health care. It is still before us.

Today was a little bit of a unique day for me because the President came to my district in the St. Louis area, and he wanted to deliver speeches and tell everybody that they should vote for the health care bill.

He and I have a difference of opinion on the bill. I think his opinion is that if people just know more about this bill, they will like it. My opinion is the more we have looked at it, the more that people have taken a look at it publicly, the uglier they think it gets and the more they hate it. Fortunately, the poll data seems to be on my side, and the more you look at the bill, the more it seems it has problems with it.

We have, today, joining us some distinguished colleagues from all over the country. We have two doctors and an attorney, and just, I think, a businessman and an engineer. It almost sounds like the start of some sort of a joke. But this isn't a joke, unfortunately. This is a very serious subject, indeed.

So I am going to recognize Dr. BROUN from Georgia, a gentleman who has spent a lifetime practicing medicine and then got elected to Congress, and now he is trying to straighten things out. I am going to have him, followed by Dr. FLEMING as well.

So, Dr. BROUN, thank you for joining us tonight. Let's talk a little bit about this health care bill.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Well, thank you, Mr. AKIN. You have been a stalwart friend in this fight to try to stop the government overtaking of the health care system. I, as a medical doctor, have been fighting for my patients for their economic well-being for years. I just wanted to come tonight and bring up a few things.

The Wall Street Journal yesterday, there was an editorial written, coauthored by Scott Rasmussen, the famous pollster. The title of it is "Why Obama Can't Move the Health Care Numbers." One of the lines in here right at the end is basically giving the bottom line. It says most voters believe the current plan will harm the economy—they are right about that—cost more than projected—absolutely—raise the cost of care—without any shadow of a doubt—and would lead to higher middle class taxes—and that is just undoubtedly a fact.

The American people get it. And one thing that the American people do get is that it is going to cost millions of Americans their jobs if this is put into place.

I thank you for bringing this forward tonight so we can talk about jobs and health care. I look forward to this discussion as we go along.

Mr. AKIN. I really appreciate your bringing that up. I am just thinking, picture yourself instead of being a doctor as being a salesman, and you are given an assignment that you are supposed to go out and sell something.

Say you are the President and your job is to go out and make this case. We have three huge entitlements that are destroying the solvency of our country. One of them is Medicare, one of them is Medicaid, both methodical things, and the government is running these things and they are destroying the economy because they are out of control, they are spending so much money. So your assignment is to go out and sell people that we ought to have the government take over the rest of the medical part. That is a little counterintuitive. You could be a good salesman, and it is hard to make that case. We have it messed up in this and this area, so give us the whole thing. It takes a little bit of courage to even try to do that.

Dr. FLEMING, please.

Mr. FLEMING. I want to thank the gentleman again, faithful virtually every week to have this leadership hour and talk about such weighty issues as health care.

But to follow up on your very point, and that is today, the big question is why all these increases in private insurance rates. Well, there are several reasons, but the main reason is that private insurance premiums help subsidize Medicare and Medicaid. Why? Medicare and Medicaid underpays the providers, the gap is getting larger, and so providers have to make it up in order to survive in business on the private insurance which has to escalate in relation to that.

So that is something you will not hear from Speaker PELOSI or the President. He wants to demonize the insurance companies. As a physician, I am no big friend of the insurance companies. But fair is fair. If we are going to fix this problem, we have got to start, in my opinion, by looking at cost savings. We are going to have to be real about and realistic about where the real costs are coming from.

Again, you are right. Half of medicine today is under government control, and that is the part that is bankrupting the system.

Mr. AKIN. That is interesting. What I think I am hearing you say is, as much as you want to knock the insurance companies, the fact that people have insurance and the insurance pays claims, in a way they are the ones that are helping to balance out the cost of health care, because Medicare and Medicaid are underpaying the actual cost of what it takes.

That gets to a point, and I would like to ask you, I am going to go to my good friend from Texas too, Congressman GOHMERT, but sometimes we get into the weeds a little bit too much. So let's say you get way up on an airplane and take a look at the health care question.

What someone told me is, he said, Look, look at health care in America as two parts. The front end is the medical service we provide to the people who are sick in America. They said that is the best health care anywhere in the world. If you are a millionaire sheikh from Bahrain, you want to come over here to get some of that health care. So we have the best health care service, in terms of providers.

What the problem is is how we pay for it that has gotten messed up, and I think that is a little bit to your question.

My good friend from Texas, Congressman GOHMERT.

Mr. GOHMERT. Well, looking at the chart you have there that has the quote on it about reconciliation, it brings us back to what is being discussed. The reporters all out here in the hall have been there for much of the night, and they are starting to go away because apparently they think there is not going to be any agreement. But what people need to understand is what is being pushed here called reconciliation. What a misnomer. Reconcile? That is not what happens.

The Senate has passed a bill, and they are not going to get 60 votes to do a new bill, so they are trying to push the House into passing exactly what the Senate did. But we have got fine, upstanding pro-lifers like BART STUPAK and a dozen others, and they say if you are going to have a bill that pries tax money out of the hands of people who believe with all their heart, as I do, that it is immoral to kill unborn children, and you are going to take their money and use it to do that, then we can't vote for this bill.

So what we hear being discussed is, Well, if you will just vote for the Sen-

ate bill that allows the government to take away taxpayer money and use it for abortions, then we may be able to get you an amendment to come back. It has to be signed into law, has to become law before you can amend it, but then we may be able to amend that to then put in the Stupak language that prevents tax dollars from being used for abortion.

But the thing that our colleagues have to understand is please don't get roped into that. The Speaker knows how the process works. But if it becomes law and the bill provides for the funding of abortion, you may or may not get the amendment passed. It may pass through the House, but then the Senate has to pass it, and there is no way anyone in the House can guarantee what the Senate will do. Then the people who everybody, well-intentioned, no intention to deceive, but anyway, the bottom line is they end up not getting what they are promised, not because of deception. It just doesn't happen.

Mr. AKIN. I would like to just run over to our good friend from Pennsylvania, Congressman THOMPSON, and I just wanted to get your perspective on what you are seeing. It has been almost 9 months, and people have been looking more and more into the details of the bill. The more they see it, the more they don't like it. Yet the majority seems to be determined, they have the pedal to the metal, they have the battleship at ramming speed, and they are going to just try and drive this thing through.

What is your impression of where we are?

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Well, first of all, I want to thank my good friend from Missouri for providing the leadership for this evening. It is just so important.

The American people, I have to tell you, I am very proud of the American people on this issue. During this past 15 months, I think they fulfilled the responsibility that our Founders intended. Our Founders have to be smiling right now, because the American people have woken up and are paying attention and engaging on this issue.

When it comes to health care, I think the large majority of Americans share the same perspective I do, and it is a perspective I developed as a health care professional. I started out as a therapist over 30 years ago, and for 28 years I was a health care manager, licensed as a nursing home administrator, worked in all areas of health care, in nonprofit community health care.

The four principles I have always led my professional life by have been the same four principles that have guided me in my role working for the people as a Member of Congress, and it is the same principles that I see the people agreeing with when it comes to health care. They want to improve our health care system, not throw it out, not create some government-run system.

My principles that I have always led my life by, and I think they are prin-

ciples that are important in this debate, let's do what we can to make sure that we lower the cost of health care for all Americans. The bill that is coming at us at light speed from the Senate raises costs for most Americans. It doesn't address real cost reduction.

The second principle for me is increasing access, improving quality, and making sure that we strengthen that decisionmaking relationship between the physician and patient. We don't need the government or a bureaucrat making those decisions.

The bill that is coming at us, in particular I will just talk about one aspect. I started at that last principle of strengthening the decisionmaking relationship between the physician and the patient. This bill creates a health care czar, and this czar is going to have the ability to impose not just health care prices and controls, but that czar is going to dictate what kind of benefits we should get and not get. And just as my good friend from Texas was talking about, we will wind up paying for procedures, such as abortions, something that we would never use, that we certainly, based on my faith, would be very much in objection to.

So that type of imposition of a czar making decisions, inserting themselves between the patient and physician, is just absolutely wrong.

□ 2130

Mr. AKIN. I appreciate your perspective on that. I bet you that has got to, even after all these months, has got to really bother those of you who are doctors. I mean you invested I don't know how many years in med school. I flunked fetal pig. I would never have made it. Part of the reason was because you wanted to treat patients. And to have some insurance person sticking their nose in that relationship has got to really rub you the wrong way. But what happens if—at least if it's the insurance company, you can get rid of the insurance company. But what happens if it's the Federal Government? That would drive me crazy.

Congressman BROUN, please.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. The Federal Government already sticks its nose in the doctor-patient relationship in Medicare-Medicaid. The insurance company executives do in managed care. But in my medical practice for the last 5 years prior to being elected to Congress, I saw Medicare patients, Medicaid patients, managed care patients, but they just paid me at the time of service. If they couldn't pay me, that was all right too. I've given away hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of my services over my medical career.

We hear from Democrats, the President particularly, that the doctors are all in favor of this Obama care bill. I've got a letter here from the Medical Association of Georgia that was just sent to me and other members of the Georgia delegation that says, We oppose the Senate-passed health care bill. They

list a number of things that they see as problems with the bill. Among these include undermining the patient-physician relationship and empowering the Federal Government with even greater authority. It's unsustainable from a financial standpoint. The Federal Government will have unprecedented authority to change the Medicare program through these new boards without Congress or the courts or anybody having any oversight to that. It's devoid of proven medical liability reform.

They're concerned about many things that aren't in this bill, two of which are: it takes away the right to make a private contract between two individuals, particularly doctor and a patient or any provider and patient. Another one is, there's nothing to stop the sustainable growth rate formula that is killing physicians.

It goes back to what you were just saying a few minutes ago, Mr. AKIN, where doctors are being underpaid. We have this SGR, sustainable growth rate formula, that needs to be thrown out. But we don't do anything about that. What that's going to do to the American public, and particularly Medicare patients need to understand, if this bill is passed, it's going to be exceedingly difficult for a senior to find a doctor who's going to accept their government insurance. It's already a problem, but it's going to be even much more of a problem and exceedingly difficult because the Federal Government is going to pay a lower rate, and doctors just can't afford to do that.

Mr. AKIN. So this is going to be a good deal. Everybody is going to have medical insurance, but you just won't have any doctor to go to see.

Dr. FLEMING.

Mr. FLEMING. Well, first of all, let me say something that I think is not as obvious, but if you think about it, it should be very clear. Coverage under health care does not mean access to health care. Look at Cuba. In Cuba, you have universal health care, you have universal access, and it's all free. The problem is there is no health care in Cuba. They have one colonoscope for the whole country. Antibiotics, medications. Nonexistent. So what good is 100 percent universal coverage?

Now how does that apply to us? Well, what we're really doing in effect with this bill is taking two big entitlements, which is Medicare-Medicaid. The States can't afford Medicaid. The Federal Government cannot afford Medicare. Medicare will run out of money in 8 years. On top of that, we're taking out half a trillion dollars for Medicare, not knowing how we're going to make up for it, and then we're going to take the money and tax people and create a whole new entitlement, stacking one entitlement after another.

Bottom line here is, there's two ways to save costs, to bend the cost curve down in health care. One is to have a giant system like that, and create bureaucrats who are going to control things and micromanage, and ulti-

mately save money through long lines, a waiting list, and rationing. The other, the one I prefer, is a free market where we attack the doctor-patient-relationship and we empower the patient, make him into a consumer, where he has clarity and transparency, where he has health savings accounts, for instance, and he can go and decide and have patient choice as to what the cost, what the providers are going to be, and where he can get his best value for the money.

Mr. AKIN. You know, I just today was talking to my constituents back in the State of Missouri and we were having this forum. I spoke in pretty strong terms. I told my constituents that this bill, first of all, would destroy the quality of health care in America. The second thing it was going to do was it was going to destroy the Federal budget. And that if I were to put this bill on a scale of all the legislation I've seen since I've been in Congress—and I'm getting a little older; this is my tenth year—that this bill is more than twice as bad as the next worst bill that I've ever seen. So this bill is altogether in another category.

I spoke before a group this last weekend, and I looked out and there were a lot of other legislators I'd served with in the State of Missouri. I said, We've all served in the majority, we've served in the minority. But I said, The last year and a half, we've served in the wilderness. I said, The difference of the wilderness is that I walk up as though I were walking up to the edge of the Grand Canyon and contemplated what happens if you go over that abyss.

It appears to me tonight, gentlemen, and tell me if I'm not overstating this, that we are standing on an abyss. And that if we step off the edge by passing this bill, America will not be the same country she's ever been in the past, and we will not be able to recover from that.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AKIN. I do yield.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Absolutely. You're correct about that. In fact, we're at a tipping point where this country is either going to be totally socialistic—government controls everything in everybody's life from Washington, D.C. And that's what this health care bill is designed and geared to do. Or, we are going to walk away from that and start fighting for freedom and cutting down the size of the Federal Government and let people live their own lives without all the government intrusion. That's exactly where we are.

I wanted to bring up another issue to throw this out then: That people should understand that this bill that we are supposedly going to vote upon—I guess we will, the Senate bill, H.R. 3590—the CBO, the Congressional Budget Office, says that it will increase premiums for everybody who's buying private insurance today by \$2,100 per family. So not only is it going to destroy

the Federal budget, it's going to destroy the State's budget, but it's going to destroy everybody's family budget. It's going to be horrendously expensive, and it's also going to destroy jobs. There are going to be over 5 million people that are going to lose their jobs if this bill ever becomes law.

Mr. AKIN. You know, when we're running at whatever it is—and these numbers, I don't really believe them, because these numbers are worse—but 10 percent unemployment, and you dump 5 million more jobs lost on a bill that is already going to cost trillions of dollars that we don't have, this thing, it just seems like somebody has to have some sort of blind faith to have their foot down on the pedal of the battleship and just try to drive the battleship through the dock.

In my district, this is a working day today. We rented a facility at the St. Charles Convention Center. It had seating for 800 people. Now where are you going to find 800 people that care about politics in the middle of a Wednesday? Wednesday morning at 10 o'clock in St. Louis. When the beginning of the town hall started, we had over a thousand. By the time it had gotten going a little bit, we had 2,200 people. You couldn't even get any more people in the room. And their sentiment was along the lines of what we sense here. They said, We don't like this bill. We really don't like this bill. They were begging, What can we do to stop this thing? So my sense is that we're not the only people that are thinking like this in this country.

My good friend from Texas, Congressman GOHMERT.

Mr. GOHMERT. Well, I think there's actually great wisdom in what President Obama said that's on the chart right behind you, and that is, Reconciliation is therefore the wrong place for policy changes. In short, the reconciliation process appears to have lost its proper meaning. A vehicle designed for deficit reduction and fiscal responsibility has been hijacked to facilitate reckless deficits and unsustainable debt. The President called that exactly right.

I need to ask my friend, I can't see the date there. Was that last week that he said that? When was that?

Mr. AKIN. You know, that's the ironic thing about this quote and the reason why we put it on this chart. The President has been saying a lot of things. I think the most truthful thing he said was that, I'm going to bring you change. I think he's been fair in doing that. Not much else that I've heard that doesn't seem to have some contradiction.

But this quote here, Reconciliation is therefore the wrong place for policy changes, such as the government taking over one-sixth of the economy. In short, this process seems to have lost its proper meaning. A vehicle designed for deficit reduction. That's what it was supposed to be for—deficit reduction, fiscal responsibility. It's been hijacked.

I'm glad you asked that question because the date here says December, 2005. So I don't think he really wants us to remember what he said in 2005, because if you were to take this today, this would mean that they aren't going to pass this bill.

Mr. GOHMERT. That's right.

Mr. AKIN. So it kind of depends whether it's your bill or my bill, I guess.

Mr. GOHMERT. And as we understand now, in 2005, Senator Obama was moving forward, campaigning, moving toward a Presidential run. But I tell you, it just blessed my heart to hear President Obama say in the summit at the Blair House, when he said to Senator MCCAIN, We're not campaigning any more. I said, Hallelujah. The President's going to stop campaigning. I tell you, that was such good news to me because that means the President's going to quit campaigning and just try to govern. If he were to go to campaign, he would probably have gone off to who knows where—Missouri or somewhere today—and given another speech. The fact that we're not campaigning anymore means he's back here trying to figure out how we can reform health care without cramming it down the throats of 60 to 70 percent of Americans that don't want this bad medicine that's about to be rammed down their throat.

Mr. AKIN. I appreciate your perspective and particularly calling attention to the fact that this reconciliation is hijacking the entire legislative process. He is willing to do this, to pass this particular piece of legislation.

My good friend from Pennsylvania, somebody said that if you've got a busted faucet or sink in your kitchen, a smart thing to do is to fix the faucet or the sink, not to remodel the whole kitchen. Does it appear to you that the difference between the two political parties on this issue is that the Democrats have really decided they're going to remodel the kitchen, whether you want it or not, and the Republicans, we have a lot of different health care bills as Republicans, but ours are all fix the sink or fix the drain. We're taking a look at what we have, seeing what needs to be fixed to make it better, and we're selectively doing that, whereas it seems the Democrats have the concept they're just going to re-create everything. Take one-sixth of the economy, have the government run it.

Does that seem like it fits for you?

Mr. THOMPSON. I think that comes close. Actually, I believe that the health care issue is more like a leaky faucet. And what my good friends on the Democratic side of the aisle are choosing to do is to burn the house down versus just—

Mr. AKIN. So remodeling the kitchen—

Mr. THOMPSON. They're burning the entire house down and taking it from a system that has been a model for the world, actually. I give you one example. One of the issues we talk about—

and we agree we need to improve access to quality health care. I would have been much happier if this whole debate, when we started it—in fact, I came to Congress thinking that we would have that debate—how do we improve access to quality health care. No. What are we debating? Health insurance. Not even the right topic.

I want to put it in the perspective of probably an example that I think touches all the colleagues here on the floor. I'm from a very rural district. I have probably almost 24 different rural hospitals in my congressional district. Those hospitals, in addition to the economic engines, they're incredibly important to those communities. They're the source of positions. They're really good jobs. They purchase resources. They're good neighbors. They purchase resources in the community. So they're good for the community. But beyond that, having those in those rural communities provides access to quality health care.

You never want to see a hospital close. I don't believe that. But if you close one in the city, probably within about a six-block radius you're going to find another hospital that's going to be able to provide you access to life-saving care.

□ 2145

You close a hospital in my congressional district, and what you wind up with is a commute that makes the difference between life and death. We're talking hours to get the same type of, or any type of, access to health care. So here's the rub when it comes to this bill that's being proposed, \$500 billion cuts to Medicare. And my good friend already talked about the fact that Medicare only pays maybe 80 to 90 cents for a dollar's worth of care that a hospital or a physician provides. So Medicare is already underfunded.

We've talked about how that is one of the contributing factors to why commercial health insurance is so expensive. Commercial health insurance nationally pays 135 percent of costs. The Federal Government only pays 80 to 90 percent of costs. So what are we going to do? What's the solution to that obvious problem? Let's cut more Medicare. Let's throw in \$500 billion in cuts.

Mr. AKIN. There you go. That's another counterintuitive thing. This whole bill seems to be counterintuitive, doesn't it?

Let me ask a question. We have two of you who are medical doctors here, one who's a judge, one's a former medical professional. I'm an engineer by training, and now we're Congressmen. And one of the things that we have to do and we should pay attention to is our constituents. We get calls from people saying, Hey, I've got a problem with this, Congressman. You need to help me. And they ask us to do some weird stuff sometimes. Like, I remember the first time they asked me to get them a job. And I'm thinking, Hey, I'm not a job agency. I'm a Congressman.

But we're asked to do a lot of different things, and we try to help out.

Now, my question to you is, let's say we jump off the abyss, and now we've got this mess, and we have people back home calling us saying, My mom, my mom is sick. She got cancer. She got it bad, and she's going to need help right away. So I went to get some health care for my mom. They said I have got to wait 6 months. What I'm asking you is this question: How, as Congressmen, are we going to get through this mess to try to help our constituents? And even worse, how are our constituents ever going to get from here over to get their medical care? Does that concern you? Congressman GOHMERT, do you want to take a shot at that? This doesn't look friendly to me.

Mr. GOHMERT. Well, it's because it's not friendly. I was privileged back in 1973 for the summer to be an exchange student in the Soviet Union. I saw socialized medicine firsthand, and that's where this is going. It's socialized medicine where the government controls it. I don't want the insurance companies between me and my doctor, and that means I also don't want any of that just massive amount of government between me and my doctor, but that's where this takes us.

And you wonder, Why would a group risk losing the majority in Congress to pass a bill like this when they know what's at stake politically? And the answer is, it puts in place so much government that once it's in place, it won't matter which party is in the majority. It's kind of like the Department of Education or other things that are not enumerated powers in the Constitution. Once it's there, you can't do anything about it. The school districts lose billions of dollars over the years that have been usurped by just a bureaucracy in Washington. It's going to happen with health care.

And just quickly, let me tell you, what inspired me to get with professionals, health care professionals, economists to come up with a solution was, when I saw that if you added together the amount of money we spend on Medicare and Medicaid and divide that by the total number of households in all of the United States, it's an average of over \$10,000 from every household in America to fund Medicare and Medicaid.

When I saw that, I was thinking, My goodness, all that government, all that we're paying for, we're better off if we said to every household that has people on Medicare or Medicaid or even SCHIP, here's \$3,500 cash from the Federal Government in a health savings account you control with a debit card, and we will buy you private insurance that's catastrophic care to cover everything above that. You don't have to buy any more supplemental coverage or wraparound coverage.

And I know that scares AARP because they made a lot of money off of that supplemental insurance. But this will help seniors. You give them a

choice. You want to keep having Medicare, you want to keep having Medicaid, or do you want us to give you cash you control and get the insurance company and the government out between you and your doctor? And I think people, when you give them that voluntary choice, they will make the choices that will save us from bankruptcy that Medicare is driving us to. I yield back.

Mr. AKIN. Now wait a minute. You have got me all confused, Congressman GOHMERT because my understanding is, Republicans—from what the President has said—don't have any ideas. We don't have any bills. Of course he also said that he read our bills, so that was a little confusing too. But what you just outlined was basically getting up at 50,000 feet, looking at the problem and saying, We really don't need the government to get into all this detail. We simply take the amount of money that the government's spending right now. You break it into pieces, just designate the number of families in our country, and you've already got something that's going to work.

Mr. GOHMERT. That's actually a lot cheaper than what we're doing now. It would save money. But let me just say this: I know a lot of people kowtow to CBO. Let me tell you that in this Congress—and the director has called me and said, Oh, we are very objective. And I know they do the best they can to being objective. But I'm telling you, since he got woodshedded at the White House, let me tell you, there have been I believe it's been 56 health care bills that have been scored by CBO.

We have about 70 bills from Republican Study Committee members to reform health care. Seventy bills, they are bills. And you know how many we have gotten scored on the Republican side? Six, six bills. I have been begging and writing all kinds of ways. I have had ranking member of the committee of jurisdiction, JOE BARTON, request my bill be scored. I've had DAVE CAMP when they said, Well, you don't have the Joint Commission ranking member. Well, then, DAVE CAMP requested. I can't get it scored. And I realize by making a big deal about CBO not scoring Republican plans, that they may say, Oh, GOHMERT, we'll take your bill, and we'll score it, and you're not going to like the way it comes out. I realize that's a risk. But I'm telling you, it has been so abusive that CBO has done virtually nothing.

About a tenth of the Republican bills that they have scored are Democratic bills. And if they want to bring some equity to this and some objectiveness, it is time CBO started scoring Republican bills and not just Democratic bills. I had to get that out.

Mr. AKIN. Well, I appreciate that, Congressman GOHMERT. You know, those of us who know Congressman GOHMERT—and I know my colleagues do—know that he has a gift of persistence. And I recall one of his more persistent moments. It was right here on

this floor when there was a bill that I would say is probably the second worst bill I have seen. It's only half as bad as this bill, and it was a bill that was amended with 300 pages of amendments at 3 o'clock in the morning. I think it was the late part of spring of this last year.

I remember Mr. GOHMERT had the same sense of persistence, and he got this idea that maybe if we're going to vote on a bill that it ought to be here in the Chamber because there is a rule that the bill we're debating and voting on is supposed to be in the Chamber. I remember just asking, is it north, south, east or west? It was like a kid looking for a button that's hidden in a room somewhere. And he's back and forth and back and forth. Finally they said, The bill is right up there in that desk. He went up and looked for it. And guess what? It wasn't there.

So I don't know, people like to hide things on you, Congressman. I don't know what to tell you, but it would be interesting if we knew what the financial score on some ideas, such as what you had, that are innovative. And it's the fact that Republicans, of course, don't have any ideas except that the President did read them and all. So that makes it kind of interesting.

I notice we're joined by some other good friends of mine. Congressman SCALISE from Louisiana is here, and I just wanted to let you have a chance. We're going to talk a little bit about this really amazing medical bill that's being pushed forward.

Mr. SCALISE. Well, I want to thank my colleague from Missouri for hosting this and my other colleagues who are expressing leadership and really trying to make this last stand because we are at the last stand for health care, as the President continues to try to ram down the throats of the American people this government takeover. And here we are on the House floor as Speaker PELOSI is trying in the next week, possibly, to have a vote here on the House floor on a bill that the American people have said in every way possible that they don't want.

You had the elections, of course, in Virginia and New Jersey; and then you had the election in Massachusetts, of all places, where SCOTT BROWN said, I'll be the 41st vote against health care, and he won. And even after that, this tone-deaf liberal leadership here in Congress is saying that they're going to continue to try to ram down this government takeover. What you're pointing out and my colleagues are pointing out are some incredibly important facts that I think the American people themselves have been seeing as they've been reading the bill, and this latest version is over 2,400 pages long.

But there's a couple of points in there, and I want to touch on one of them, and I know you have touched on a few others. Clearly there is over \$500 billion in new taxes in this bill. There is over \$500 billion in cuts to Medicare

in this bill, things that would devastate medical care in this country as people know and enjoy it. We want to reform health care. We want to fix real problems to lower costs, to address preconditions. They don't want to do that. They want a government takeover.

But there are some other things in this bill that also show some of their real intentions. And the issue of abortion funding, taxpayer funding of abortion has been one of those at the core of, you know, who do you believe and what are the myths. And of course you've got Speaker PELOSI out there saying, Oh, don't worry. Abortion funding won't be in this bill.

There are two pieces of information I want to point out, and I think a lot of people have started to see all of this, but it really clarifies what's going on. This first letter I want to read a few sentences from is from the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops. Catholic bishops, they don't have a vested interest in whether the Republican approach or the Democratic approach is moving forward. But they have two real concerns. One is, they don't want abortion funding, and they want a conscience clause protection. So I'm going to read a few quick sentences.

First on human life: "Disappointingly, the Senate-passed bill in particular does not meet our moral criteria on life and conscience. Specifically, it violates the longstanding Federal policy against the use of Federal funds for elective abortions and health plans that include such abortions." It goes on to say: "We believe legislation that fails to comply with this policy and precedent is not true health care reform and should be opposed until this fundamental problem is remedied." This is the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops.

And then one other I'm going to read for you is National Right to Life, a very respected organization, a bipartisan organization. National Right to Life also addresses the Senate language as it relates to taxpayer funding of abortion: "Any House Member who votes for the Senate health bill is casting a career-defining pro-abortion vote." This is National Right to Life. And the final sentence I will read: "The Senate health bill is a 2,407-page labyrinth strewn with the legislative equivalents of improvised explosive devices—disguised provisions that will result in Federal pro-abortion mandates and Federal subsidies for abortion." That's National Right to Life.

So as the American people are contemplating all of this, they're going to have to ask themselves, who do they believe as this information and misinformation is out there? Do they believe Speaker PELOSI who says, Don't worry, taxpayer funding of abortion is not in this 2,400-page bill? Or do they believe the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops and National Right to Life who both clearly state that the Senate bill does contain taxpayer funding of

abortion? Yet one of just many big points of opposition we have to this government takeover of health care.

Mr. AKIN. I certainly appreciate the gentleman making that point. And it is usually presented as a pro-life position that we don't want the government funding abortions. It almost struck me as kind of two different things almost. One, Do you think it's a good idea to abort little children? But the second question is a conscience question, Do you think it's a good idea to force people to pay taxes and then use those taxes for something that they believe is the destruction of a human life?

You know, one of the things that has really encouraged me—you just talked about that election in Massachusetts. You know, in America there's always been a few people that say they're agnostic or an atheist. And what really encouraged me about that election is that nobody can claim they're an atheist or agnostic anymore in America because only God could have elected a Republican in the State of Massachusetts. I mean, it couldn't have been done by anybody else. So I'm glad at least we won't have too many of those kicking around.

□ 2200

I am joined here also by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN), and you have been a voice for conservative values and so strong on this bill, and I am so thankful we have the A-Team out here this evening as we are coming down to the finish line, and that is the bill will be finished. I appreciate your giving us a northern perspective as well as some other perspectives as well.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Thank you so much. Congressman AKIN, you were also involved with the Declaration of Health Care Independence. I believe every Member here was involved with putting that document together. This weekend I was with Congressman GOHMERT, and one of his constituents walked up to me and handed me another thousand signatures that she gathered to sign the Declaration of Health Care Independence. Just in her sphere in east Texas, she got a thousand people to sign. I thought one voice that hasn't been heard real loud in the health care debate is that of the American people. She gave me not only a thousand signatures, she also took comments from the people. I wanted, if I could, just to read one page as my contribution tonight, because I think it is important here in the most important democratic body in the history of the world, the United States House of Representatives, the American people should have their voice heard tonight because they haven't had it.

So with your permission, let me read a few of those comments.

Mr. AKIN. That sounds like it would be very interesting, because we just had 2,200 people come to our town hall meeting today. We should have had our Declaration of Health Care Independ-

ence there because you would have had another 2,200 people.

Please share their comments.

Mrs. BACHMANN. This is from Cheri Hamilton, who said, Stop trying to destroy this country. The health care system can be fixed without a takeover. Listen to the American people. Stop this socialist agenda.

Ted Mesjak: ObamaCare is a can of socialized medicine worms.

Duane Anderson: My wish for signing this petition is that it adds more fuel to fight the government takeover of my health care. The despair is that the government so far has not listened to my views or the views of others who share the same viewpoint.

Kathleen Somers: I do not want the current health care reform bill. It will put this country into further debt, and Obama and his administration need to work with Republicans.

Herbert Rudolph: As a senior citizen, I am absolutely sick and tired of the Federal Government interfering in my personal life.

Kerry Ferguson: It is our President and his congressional bullies began respecting the will of the American people. Please keep up the good fight for intelligent health care reform. We must get this right.

Mike Tarbert: Stop these idiots and have them change their meds.

Beverly Harper: This bill is a travesty.

Mary Baptista: I do not want the inefficiency of the DMV and the compassion of the IRS to be part of my health care. Less government and more freedom to choose.

They have a good sense of humor in east Texas.

Lorrie Breed: Let the States handle this. Governors can do this if the Feds will get out of the way.

Shirley Wahl: I expect that the Congress will vote what the American citizens want, and set aside their preferences in favor of their constituents.

Nancy York: Hear, hear.

And this goes on for a thousand different comments from people across the country.

And today I heard that a lot of the Blue Dogs, the so-called conservatives here in Congress, are starting to weaken. Their spines are starting to go. We all know this is going to break the bank, this bill, and yet it is these dear, sweet people from all across America who have been begging and fighting their own government to get their government to listen to what they want. And no less than CNN has reported that three out of four Americans don't want this current health care bill.

Time magazine last week reported, not exactly a right-wing news source, that the Obama administration is laying the foundation that within 10 years, we will have to pay double taxes before this health care bill passes.

So the American people have been desperately trying to get into this debate and get the American Congress to hear them, and the President. I think

it is important, Mr. AKIN, that the American people know that we have tried to let their voices be heard here in the House. We are hearing them and we are trying to speak back to the American people. We hear you. We are fighting. Don't give up. We are not giving up.

I still believe it is not inevitable. If the people call, if the people go to their Member's office, we can still defeat this. I really appreciate you leading this Special Order tonight.

Mr. AKIN. I appreciate you, Congresswoman.

When we were at this last summer, the President said, I want a vote before we go on summer break. And you were pleading the charge last summer, saying, No, we are going to hold the line. Even though we are 80 votes short in the House, we are going to talk. We are going to take this battle to the American public. We are going to win the war of ideas.

What we have seen is we got past the summer. We got into the fall. After we got through the fall, it looked like if we could just get into 2010, it will be election year, maybe people will listen then. We saw at Christmastime, we saw the situation where the 60 Democrats got together and they passed it and it looked like we were really in trouble.

And what struck me, you and those on the floor tonight, and my friends and comrades, a band of brothers and sisters, have been discovering in our hearts what our minds knew for a long time, and that is when a group of people stand and do everything in their power to do what is right, they can call on the power of God to help them, just as our forefathers did, and expect to see unusual results.

When I saw Massachusetts with a Republican Senator, I had to start laughing. I thought, Boy, does God have a sense of humor. And we saw, while we didn't have any power at all, all we could do, as you are doing, just tell the hearts of the American people. Let people understand, you are not the only one out there who is feeling like you are crazy. You are not the only one who is starting to see that government is not the answer; government is the problem. The American public is making their voices heard, and they will make them heard in the elections coming up.

Thank you for joining us.

Congressman THOMPSON.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. AKIN, I want to come back to the chart you have there. It is a perfect capture of bureaucracy. Bureaucracy, one of the things that we talked about. We are all committed to lowering the health care costs for every single American. That is a principle that we all should be doing the right things towards. And there are solutions out there that we have worked on and introduced. The Putting Patients First Act is just one of them that would bring the cost of health care down for everyone.

But I want to talk about the consequences of that chart, of this Senate bill which is being shoved like a freight train through Congress and on the American people. Over a hundred different mandates, well over a hundred different new bureaucracies are being created in health care. I will just come back to one that was created, and the practical impact of that, under President Clinton: the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act, HIPAA.

Everyone wants privacy when it comes to health care. It is a very intimate subject. That is why we don't want a bureaucrat involved in our health care. The portability part, I have to say, if that worked back in the 1990s, we would all be better if we could take our insurance with us where we went. But it didn't; it failed. But what it did do is put a layer of bureaucracy in our health care system that has just piled tons and tons of layers and money, money that is required to be spent to implement and execute that bureaucracy.

And you know where that money comes from? It comes from direct care. That is money that goes into—and when they talk about waste in health care, government mandates are a tremendous waste. That is how I got involved in public policy, actually, out of frustration, because I saw what the Medicare regulations, many of them, were doing to add cost and decrease access to cost-effective health care.

Mr. AKIN. So what you are talking about isn't exactly a surprise to us. You've been there, and what you are saying is health care is just what you expect. When the government does it, it is inefficient and it is a tremendous waste. And so to try and say, Now we have got Medicare and Medicaid that have gone bankrupt, and so give us the rest of health care to take over, there is a problem with that line of reasoning somehow.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Absolutely. And what we are talking about today goes well beyond Medicare. I thought Medicare and Medicaid were complex. This new proposal, this Senate bill that is being pushed at us, HIPAA, the impact of costs on health care just from HIPAA were significant. If you multiply that times a hundred new Federal mandates on health care, and you multiply that by 150 new bureaucracies within the health care system, the ultimate cost of what this will cost our country, our citizens, and our health is just devastating.

□ 2210

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AKIN. I'm going to yield to my good friend, Congressman BROUN, but I can't help but think that we need somebody who's a songwriter. Do you remember there was a guy in Boston that won a political race by writing that song, "Charlie the MTA?" It was a sad song about poor old Charlie be-

cause he's bound to ride forever because he doesn't have the last nickel for the fare that some politician was pushing, an increase in the rate of the train. But we could have poor Charlie trying to get through this mess, lost forever in this system trying to get his cold medicine, or whatever it is; he's going to get lost forever in that mess.

Congressman BROUN from down in Georgia.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. AKIN, you made a very astute observation just a moment ago, and our good friend, G.T. THOMPSON, was just talking about something that I want to come back to, back to your comment that government is the problem.

Practicing medicine, I've seen the cost of health care go up for everybody in this country because of government regulations. And let me just tell you about a couple of things; one is HIPAA that G.T. was just talking about. HIPAA was totally unneeded, totally unwarranted. It's a law passed by Congress. It's a regulatory burden that's been placed on the health care system. It has cost billions of dollars and has not paid for the first aspirin to treat the headaches it has created.

Another bill that was passed, HENRY WAXMAN, Ted Kennedy, PETE STARK, and others, passed a bill a couple of years ago called CLIA, the Clinical Laboratory Improvement Act. I was practicing medicine in a small, rural community down in southwest Georgia. Prior to HIPAA, I had a fully automated lab in my office, quality controlled so that I knew that the results I got out of my lab were absolutely correct so I could give good, quality care to my patients. Congress passed CLIA, which shut my lab and every doctor's lab down in this country.

Prior to CLIA, if a patient came in to see me with a red sore throat, running a fever, coughing, runny nose, headache, I would do a CBC, a complete blood count, to see if they had a bacterial infection which needs antibiotics to treat it or a viral infection, which does not need antibiotics. They don't need to spend the money, they don't to be exposed to the antibiotics. I could do that test in 5 minutes. It cost 12 bucks. That's what I charged, \$12. HIPAA shut me down so I couldn't do that anymore, and I had to send patients over to the hospital to get the same test or else I just had to arbitrarily give them antibiotics so that they had the huge cost of going to buy those antibiotics. But if they went to the hospital, it took two to three hours and cost \$75. For one test, it went from one \$12, 5 minutes to \$75, two to three hours for one test, for one regulatory burden. Now, you can multiply that over the whole course of the health care system in the United States and you will see that it drove up, markedly, the cost of everybody's insurance in this country.

Government is the problem. And getting the regulatory burden off of the health care system, getting the tax

burden off of small businesses, we can literally lower the cost of health care and make it affordable for those that don't have the ability to buy it today. So government is the problem, and adding more government to it is going to drive the cost up.

Mr. AKIN. I think a lot of Americans have come to the same conclusion, government is the problem, and they want a whole lot less of it down here threatening them from D.C.

My good friend from Texas, Congressman GOHMERT.

Mr. GOHMERT. What you're talking about is exactly what Thomas Jefferson talked about when he said the natural course of things is for liberty to yield and government to gain. And I thought Steve Moore from the Wall Street Journal made a great point this morning, in talking with him, when he said, people inherently know in America that if you add 30 million people to the same health care coverage you're not going to save money. If you were to save money by adding 30 million people to our health insurance or Medicare, then, as he said, we might as well say, you know what? We'll insure everybody in China, and that will get us out of the deficit. It's not true; it doesn't work. We've got to be practical and stop government from taking over where liberty is yielding.

Mr. AKIN. Now I've got a question: Do you think that the guy that came up with the idea that if we add people that are uninsured to the health care situation it's going to save money maybe was the same guy that said the economy will get better if you spend a whole lot more money? I thought maybe they were twins or something like that.

Dr. FLEMING, just got a minute.

Mr. FLEMING. We're in the closing moments. I just want to touch on the process. We've heard about the Corn Husker kickback, the Louisiana Purchase, the Gatorade Carve-out for the Medicare Advantage in Florida.

Mr. AKIN. All special deals, yeah.

Mr. FLEMING. All special deals. And today we find out that yesterday or the day before our Speaker, Speaker PELOSI, made this comment, she said, We're going to have to pass this bill in order to find out what's in it. Now, we're talking about one-sixth of the entire economy here, and our Speaker has the audacity to say that we need to pass this crazy 3,000-page bill just to find out what's in it? And with that she's referring to reconciliation.

Mr. AKIN. That's an amazing quote, isn't it? We have to pass the 3,000-page bill just to find out what's in it.

Mr. FLEMING. Well, we learned with the stimulus bill that you didn't have to read it to pass it, so I guess maybe it just correlated with that.

Mr. AKIN. Well, there does seem to be some parallelism here, but it seems like it's close to insane almost.

We've got just a minute or so left, and MICHELE, I wanted to give you the last minute or two here.

Thanks, everybody.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Thanks, I appreciate it.

I want to go back to a little sign that LOUIE GOHMERT held up at the State of the Union speech, or something, the joint session, that said, "What plan?" Remember the President, at the 7-hour infomercial that was supposedly a summit on health care, he had a 12-page proposal. There was no legislative plan, there were no words on paper, and we didn't know how much it cost.

We Republicans are still in the dark, and I don't know if the American people know that. There is still no bill out there that we've been able to see. All these backroom deals that my good friend, JOHN FLEMING, is talking about, they're being cut on a bill not one of us has ever had a chance to read. Nobody has read the bill that these deals are being cut on. Every bit of this, every word in this bill is all behind closed doors, and these backroom deals. And no one is going to know about what all these deals are until it goes through.

But just to give the American people a chance, let me read a couple more. Judith Kaminsky: "To force unwanted, expensive, unconstitutional health care laws on the United States is not only a blow to capitalism, but a dismembering of our way of life and our rule of law. It's criminal to push so hard for something as unhelpful, unsafe, unpopular, and uneconomical as the current administration's want list. There are better ways to achieve a desirable outcome for the changes that might be necessary."

Mr. AKIN. Let's elect her to Congress. That's a good idea.

I think we're about out of time here. I just want to thank the A team for coming out tonight, just a great discussion.

PRESIDENT'S BUDGET ON NASA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. CHU). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. OLSON. Madam Speaker, tonight, my colleagues and I would like to share with you and the American people our deep concern with the effects of the President's budget on NASA.

By overwhelming concern with the decision to cancel the Constellation program, there are several reasons why this is bad for America, about which my colleagues and I will go into more detail over the next hour.

□ 2220

Madam Speaker, Constellation was and is the right path forward to maintain America's leadership in space.

Just this past week, the Constellation program successfully completed its preliminary design review. This is a milestone towards future development. This is a major programmatic milestone that should be noted and ap-

plauded by all of us in addition to the successful test launch of the Are's I-X rocket back in September.

Madam Speaker, I am going to talk tonight about a couple of issues: national priority; national security and how important NASA and human spaceflight is for that; inspiration for our youth; and our educational purposes, particularly in the discipline of STEM—science, technology, engineering, math—and the technological benefits that every American, every person in the world, has gotten from NASA and human spaceflight.

America's global dominance in space exploration has always been for so much more than just the race to be first. It has signaled a commitment from our Nation to forge a path. Previously unimaginable scientific and technological discoveries are born both from necessity and from risk-taking. They are born out of unexpected consequences. It has been said many times before that it is not just the destination but the journey.

The journey on which our space exploration program has taken the United States has given rise to our global leadership on many, many fronts. Our Nation's global dominance in human spaceflight has coincided with our status as the world's only superpower, which is not by accident. The national commitment to be the best in national security and in space exploration goes hand in hand. That is precisely why there is always such strong bipartisan support for NASA and for human spaceflight.

Abandoning the enterprise of space exploration is a striking decision because it violates something that makes us human—the desire to know new things through personal experience. As Americans, our heritage is about exploration. Our nature is to seek out the unknown and to explore. The administration's decision to kill the Constellation is an affront to that heritage.

America cannot escape the irrefutable fact that to fly regularly into space is the most difficult technological challenge that we know is possible under complicated and expensive scenarios. Even when done successfully, it is difficult and dangerous. In the half century we have been putting human beings into space, we have lost three brave crews. The support that is needed requires an overarching vision that requires political courage. As he stood on the football field at my alma mater, Rice University, President Kennedy had that political courage when he made the commitment to go to the Moon by the end of the decade.

A person either believes that expanding the range of human action is a noble undertaking, worthy of the cost and the risk, or a person does not. I fundamentally believe that this goal represents the heart of American entrepreneurialism. It is what sets our Nation apart from the rest of the world. It is why Russia, China, and India are making the investments nec-

essary to catch up or to even surpass us.

Is human exploration worth the cost? If Americans question this, then we should ask why other nations are desperately ramping up their human space exploration.

What do China, India, Japan, and Russia know that we don't know? They clearly know what America has known for years, which is that the direct investment alone is worth the cost and that the indirect benefits have provided economic drivers and scientific discoveries that have far exceeded expectations.

Think about what human spaceflight has done for America. There is the Hubble space telescope, one of the greatest pieces of technological advancements in our society. Unfortunately, when it was launched, it was launched in a flawed vehicle. It had a flawed refractory mirror on it. It was basically a \$2 billion piece of junk that we put into orbit.

Yet, because we had a human spaceflight capability and because we had men and women who were willing to take the risk to go into space, they went up and repaired the Hubble telescope four times. They brought it back, and made it one of the most incredible pieces of technology in our society. They brought back images from across the solar system and the universe. It wouldn't have happened without human spaceflight.

We risk losing this with the President's budget. The President's decision of NASA's role in human spaceflight is not only a step back for America; it is a calculated decision that says we aren't up to the challenge.

Yes, our Nation is in a fiscal situation that should force us to examine our spending priorities. We may disagree on how our limited resources should be spent, but there are fundamental national priorities that are worth the investment. Abandoning human space exploration isn't the tough decision that America needs.

We need leadership that clearly states we will not cede our leadership in human spaceflight to any other nation on Earth. We should not hand over space to the Russians, to the Chinese, or to India. If we stay on the path the President's budget lays out, the United States faces the very real and very humiliating prospect of paying billions of dollars to Russia for years to hitch rides to the international space station, which has been largely built by American taxpayer funds.

We used to pay the Russians just over \$20 million to take one of our astronauts to the space station. They have learned capitalism very well; and now, this year, it is going to cost us \$50 million, which is more than double the price that it was last year. That contract only extends through 2013. So, in all likelihood, we are going to have to renew another contract with them in the future. They have got a monopoly. They are going to charge us whatever

they want, and we are going to have to pay it if we want access to the space station, which, again, the American taxpayers have largely funded.

This is unacceptable. We need to stay the course with the Constellation to make sure that we minimize that gap and to make sure we get our astronauts delivering our people to the space station and beyond—to the Moon and beyond.

Even more unsettling is knowing, when we finally have the ability to get there on our own, we may find the Chinese are already there and working it. Their goal is to be to the Moon by 2023. The United States' goal: question mark. We don't know when we're going to be back to the Moon, if at any time in the near future. Americans have rightly grown accustomed to serving as the global leader in human space exploration. Sadly, we will be in for a huge shock when reality sets in that we no longer hold that title.

NASA has long been a cradle for innovation. Without human spaceflight, where is the incentive for future scientists and engineers to take up these careers?

Human spaceflight is so much more than the basis for an inspirational movie. It is the heart of American ingenuity; and in our pioneering nature as Americans, we say, Place our Nation at the forefront of technology and science. Madam Speaker, we must make the commitment that America will always stay number one.

I urge my colleagues to look closely at what our Nation has achieved through our leadership on human space exploration and to think about what is at stake if we walk away.

I have some of my colleagues here tonight whom I would like to recognize. One is my good colleague from Louisiana, Congressman CAO.

Thanks for coming tonight, ANH. I look forward to your comments.

Mr. CAO. Thank you very much, PETE.

I know that the NASA program is extremely important to your district, and I know that it is very integral in providing good jobs to your people in your district. It is also the same with mine. I have a NASA facility plant in New Orleans East, a facility that is called Michoud.

Earlier this year, President Obama released his 2011 budget. To my surprise and to the surprise of many other Members—I'm pretty sure you're included—the President recommended canceling NASA's Constellation human spaceflight program. During a time when our space shuttle program is phasing out, I am very concerned that this decision will leave our Nation with no means of transporting our astronauts to and from the international space station. It could set the U.S. space program back decades.

Nearly 50 years ago, President John F. Kennedy showed remarkable vision when he directed NASA to launch the Apollo program to the Moon. America

remains the only country in the world to have landed a person on the Moon and to have brought him back to Earth safely. We have achieved what people once thought to be impossible because we pushed ourselves and because we challenged our understanding of science and the universe. To this day, we still enjoy the countless benefits reaped from the first spaceflight.

Technologically, NASA is regularly commercialized, and it can be found in countless products, like in improved medical devices, in household smoke detectors, in barcode scanners, and in every computer.

□ 2230

So we see that the technology from spaceflight is incorporated into our everyday lives.

It has also allowed us to improve weather forecasting, which is extremely important in Louisiana, given the threats of hurricanes and tornadoes and what have you in the region. If you were to listen to the former NASA Administrator, Dr. Mike Griffin, he wrote, "I believe that this budget request advocates a strategy that is, frankly, disastrous for the U.S. human spaceflight program."

Harrison Schmitt, former U.S. Senator and Apollo 17 astronaut, said, "It is simply bad for the country."

With the loss of our manufacturing base, many jobs have been moved to other countries. The manufacturing of the space vehicle is among the very few areas where we still enjoy a technical advantage, and I think it is extremely unwise to give it up.

Like you said, the Chinese are pushing to bring a person to the Moon. The Russians are continuing their space program, and I am pretty sure that they are catching up with us in the technical field to put a person on the Moon and beyond. And we, as one of the most powerful countries in the world, the most advanced country in the world, we are scaling back on our space program, one of the few areas where we still have a technical advantage beyond other countries.

The Michoud facility in my own district was slated to build components of the Orion crew module and the Ares 1 and Ares 5 cargo rockets. Michoud faces the prospect of losing thousands of high-skilled jobs. In a time in which we are trying to preserve jobs, trying to create jobs, this cut will destroy jobs. With the Michoud facility facing a reduced workforce of 1,000 employees, that is 1,000 good-paying jobs that we can preserve and we can retain.

We have this world-class manufacturing facility in New Orleans which has been used to build the Saturn rockets for the Apollo program and the main fuel tanks for the space shuttle, among many other notable achievements, and we will lose all of the experience and all of the manufacturing jobs, along with \$9 billion of taxpayer money that could have been spent on the Constellation Program.

Some have made the argument that the future of manned spaceflight is best outsourced to the private sector, as indicated in the budget proposal. But I think, though, commercial spaceflight is a promising and exciting endeavor, and we need to keep those programs in our country, in our districts, to provide those good-paying jobs to our people. If we are trying to preserve jobs in the United States, I think it is unwise to outsource those good-paying jobs to other countries. Institutional knowledge of over 40 years of human spaceflight would be lost under the current budget proposal.

Just to close, I just want to quote a statement given by Charlie Duke, an Apollo 16 astronaut. He said, "We cannot afford to lose our leadership in space. The Constellation Program must be continued."

You know what, PETE? I cannot agree with him more. I am pretty sure you can also agree with me on that assertion. Thank you very much for your hard work and dedication to this project.

Mr. OLSON. Thank you for those very kind comments, and I couldn't agree with you more. One of the problems I have with this decision is how it was sprung upon all of us.

I am the ranking member on the subcommittee that has jurisdiction over NASA, and I found out, like probably all of you, everybody here in the Chamber, by reading the newspaper. No one ever gave me a heads-up that this was coming. Nobody ever gave our ranking member a heads-up this was coming. I don't think even the chairman of the committee had any knowledge that this was coming. It seemed to be a small little cabal in the White House that made this decision that has a tremendous impact on our society.

You mentioned the loss of jobs. There are going to be thousands and thousands and thousands of good-paying, high-tech jobs, the kind of jobs we want here in America, that are going to go away. As you alluded to, once those people walk out, they are gone.

Mr. CAO. And I do recognize that we are facing a budget problem, a budget crisis in this country, and we have to cut costs, but I believe that we have to do it in a responsible manner. Cutting one of the few areas in which we have an advantage over every other country in the world seems to me to be a very unwise decision.

Mr. OLSON. Again, there is no reason why we should ever, ever, give up our leadership in human spaceflight. We have worked for it from the onset, over 50 years ago now, almost 50 years ago since NASA was formed.

Again, you referred to President Kennedy's speech. The ultimate called shot; we are going to be on the Moon by the end of this decade. And we were behind the Soviets, as you remember, at that time. We hadn't done anything. Yet because of American ingenuity, American persistence, and American innovation, on July 20, 1969, Neil Armstrong backed down that ladder, put

that foot on the lunar surface, and uttered the famous words that every American knows, “one small step for man; one giant leap for mankind.”

I agree with you, we cannot give that up. I think if you could talk to Astronaut Schmitt, Apollo 17, that was the last Moon mission, and if you could have talked to him when he got back home and said, Well, you know, sir, we are not going to be back for at least 40 years, he would have taken money and said, No, we are going to go back. We are going to be there over and over. We are going to be at Mars by 40 years from now.

Unfortunately, we are looking at cutting the program and continuing our domination of low-Earth orbit, which the Augustine Commission that the administration cites as sort of the bible for their action also here basically said, the front page of their summary, we are done with low-Earth orbit. There are no more challenges for our Nation in low-Earth orbit. We have got to fund a fantastic space station up there that is delivering science and discoveries to us every day, but we are not challenging ourselves from an exploration perspective going beyond low-Earth orbit.

We have to do that, and the Augustine Commission recognized that, and killing the Constellation just completely curtails that. There is no plan to get beyond low-Earth orbit. And, quite frankly, that is not what our country wants. That is not what we need. As you alluded to, we are number one, we have been number one throughout history, and we should never give that up.

Thank you for your comments.

Very briefly, I would like to talk about sort of the education perspective, some of the issues involved with promoting our youth and getting them involved again in the STEM disciplines, the science, technology, engineering, and mathematics.

When we think about the new competitive global economy, we know that China and India don't hesitate to encourage their top students to pursue science and math careers. They know that it is this expertise that will dictate their countries' futures. Unfortunately, these are the careers which America is losing ground on, calling into question our own future.

The problems with U.S. test scores and recruiting teachers in science, math, and engineering fields are well publicized. U.S. students lag well behind their Asian and Indian counterparts, and we risk losing the level of excellence in science, research, and innovation that is necessary to meet the needs of our future.

Harvard University and many others recruit top students from China to be educated here in America. Why? Because Chinese students are laser-focused on a top education, and their test scores reflect that. Unfortunately, after those students receive a top-tier degree at an American school, they go

back home and return to their country and we will not benefit from that knowledge that they got here in America. And here at home we have some American students graduating from high school needing remedial math courses to begin college level math.

□ 2240

We have a shortage of teachers to inspire young minds and we have deemphasized the pursuit of solving difficult problems and seem to choose the path of least resistance. While the solutions to those problems may require a great national epiphany, we do see small but important steps taking place every day across America. The Johnson Space Center in the district I'm fortunate to represent in Houston hosts several programs in which employees volunteer their time to mentor students in math, science, and engineering.

Just recently, just this past Monday, I was pleased to be present when Hannah Gorse, a student at Pearland High School in the district I represent, won a slot at the prestigious NASA High School Aerospace Scholars Program. Hannah is a junior there at Pearland High School. She told me that all she wants to do when she grows up is become an astronaut or an aerospace engineer and work in human spaceflight exploration. As part of this program, she designs things. I was stunned. She designed a CEV—a crew exploration vehicle. A lunar rover, for those of you who have been following the space program. She's designed parts to a shuttle; she designed components for the international space station, all as part of this program.

Madam Speaker, Hannah is the kind of student we want to get the math or science degree and channel her intellect toward great achievements in human spaceflight. We cannot take that inspiration and opportunity away from our students. And we do exactly that by killing the Constellation Program.

The NASA High School Aerospace Scholars Program allows students to write essays, solve math problems, design upgrades for the international space station, like Hannah did, among other projects. It's coordinated, as I said, through the Johnson Space Center, and serves as a valuable tool for students like Hannah to encourage them to pursue the career degrees in math and science. These innovative initiatives encourage and inspire students to be the pathfinders we want when we show the way forward. These young leaders will scale greater heights in their critical careers that will help develop new technologies in science, engineering, and health care.

There's another opportunity for our Nation through the government to have a role in this solution, but to do so we must fully commit to our Nation's human spaceflight program. The Constellation Program is that program. A robust national program like Constellation maintains our global

leadership in human space exploration and inspires generations of young minds like Hannah Gorse to create the next level of American superiority. As we speak, China and India are demonstrating their commitment to human space exploration, and they have the students graduating with the degrees to get the job done. Again, the Chinese plan to be back to the Moon between 2025 and 2030. The United States has no plans to go back to the Moon at this time.

Space exploration has always been a primary motivator for students to pursue careers in math, science, and engineering. Children stare up at the stars or watch grainy footage of the first man on the Moon or watch a shuttle blast off at nighttime, and a future scientist, astronaut, or engineer is born. As it stands now, the administration's budget is putting the U.S., the global leader in human spaceflight exploration, firmly into fourth place. Without a manned space program, again, we will be forced to pay Russia over \$50 million per astronaut to give access to the international space station.

The United States has been a beacon of cutting-edge technology when it comes to pioneering the path in science and space exploration. We were the first to set foot on the Moon because we made a national commitment to being first and being the best. That's what America does. We must continue that investment so our next generation reaps the benefits of excellence in science, math, engineering. Human space exploration is part of that national plan. There's still time to correct our national decline in both education and space exploration. They go hand-in-hand.

Madam Speaker, a strong human space exploration program is a key motivator for America's students to pursue careers, again, in science, math, and engineering that we desperately need to compete globally. It requires a national commitment, both public and private. That is America at its best—and that's what we want to keep. We do that by maintaining the Constellation Program.

If my colleague from Utah would like to speak to some of these issues, I yield the floor to him.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I thank my good friend from Texas for yielding me some time on this significant issue. I have read some of the comments that have been made in the past, saying, You're a conservative. NASA is saying in this new budget that they want to commercialize and privatize the program. Why aren't you supporting that? I have to admit, I think it comes down to an issue of semantics. When I think of privatization, I make three assumptions: It will cost the taxpayer less money, there will be a smaller government force in use, and there will be a better product.

I think, as the gentleman from Texas would agree with me, this plan that NASA has put forward doesn't do any

of those. Indeed, it costs more for a NASA budget. It increases the cost that the taxpayer will be spending on NASA. There are no Federal jobs that will be eliminated, only private-sector jobs, to the tune of about 30,000 jobs nationwide of scientists, engineers, mathematicians, those kinds of jobs that we don't really want to lose and we're trying to encourage young students to go into, and there is not a better product.

As the gentleman from Texas said, it was ironic that the other day the Constellation Program passed their predesign review, which means after expensive engineering and technical checks, they passed everything. There is nothing technologically wrong with Constellation. It is ready to go forward. Ironically enough, on that very same day, one of the alternatives that the NASA administration would like us to fund was having a test on their engine, and it was a total failure. Ironically, NASA didn't publicize either of those events—the engine failure or the complete success in the predesign and review of Constellation.

So let me just spend a moment and talk about these commercial startup enterprises that NASA administrators are telling us they want to transfer all American taxpayer moneys into going into this direction. These are programs like Rocketplane Kistler, which after a 14-month review or alliance with NASA, was terminated because it failed to meet any of its goals. Or, SpaceX, which over 8 years working with NASA and being funded by taxpayer money, has had a 40 percent success rate. The Falcon 9 was supposed to be ready for flight in 2009. It's not there yet. It is now scheduled for sometime in 2010, but that was the engine failure that I talked about that happened this very week. They are behind. They have already received \$158 million of tax money, but obligations of NASA run in the multibillions of dollars.

Orbital, another of those companies, is 7 months late on all of their assignments, which means if you actually look in the proposed budget, there is \$312 million assigned to a category called: Additional incentives for commercial cargo providers. If you want to take the spin off of it, it's a bailout for these companies who are not meeting their deadlines, who are not providing the product.

After \$600 million to these kind of companies, NASA can clearly say they have no hardware to show for it. They have no services that have been delivered with it. There are no intellectual property rights. And this is what certain administrators within NASA call the "bold new direction for this country." It is ludicrous.

When the *Columbia* accident occurred—and was a tragic event all of us mourned—there was an intense study to find out what went wrong and how to prevent it. And they came up with two goals: that if there is an entity that's going to be successful, they have

to first have a clear goal of what their mission is. And second, they have to have an ultimate emphasis on safety.

Let me talk about safety for just a moment, because the Bowman report, as much as we may not like it, clearly said the Federal Government's supervision in this area produces a safer project. But in that report as well there was a mandatory report given by the Aerospace Safety Advisory Panel after that *Columbia* accident. In the report in 2008, in which the current chairman—General Bolden was a member—as well as this year's report, at no time were they supportive of making entrepreneurial commercial options the primary means of U.S. human spaceflight.

□ 2250

So what were they supportive of? Well, Constellation. Time magazine this year—actually I'm sorry, the end of last year—came up with their 50 Great Inventions of the Year. And what was the invention they rated number one? Ares, the Ares rocket which is part of the Constellation program. That's what they did.

In the official report to NASA, it says, The simplicity of the Ares design makes the mature Ares 1 clearly superior to all other vehicles no matter what choice of qualification method. Even accounting for error bars on method and model inputs, Ares 1 is superior to all other options with more than a 90 percent confidence.

In short, results suggest that the Ares 1 launch vehicle is clearly the safest launch vehicle option and the only one that can meet the goal post-*Columbia* of having a launch vehicle that was 100 times safer than the space shuttle which it was designed to replace. What they are doing, simply, is Constellation is meeting the goals.

Now, once again, the goals are somewhat nebulous. If you don't have a goal, almost anything you appropriate can meet your goal. And I am suggesting that the NASA administrators right now do not have a clear goal.

Deputy Administrator Garver gave a speech today over in Maryland in which she said that the President's budget should be approved by Congress because it will enable NASA to align with the priorities of the Nation. And those priorities, these key national priorities that I am referring to are: economic development, ending poverty, hunger and creating jobs; international leadership in geopolitics, or world peace; education; and environment.

Now, I hate to say anything, but in 1958 when NASA was started, their goal was to—and I will quote, Provide for research into problems of flight within and outside Earth's atmosphere and to ensure that the United States conducts activities in space devoted to peaceful purposes for the benefit of humankind. Nearly 50 years later, NASA proudly pledges to redefine what is possible for the benefit of all humankind by using NASA's unique competencies in scientific and engineering systems to ful-

fill the agency's purpose, to pioneer the future in space exploration, scientific discovery and aeronautics research.

Mr. OLSON. If my colleague would yield for a quick question. So economic development, international global leadership and education?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. And environment. I think at some time, Ms. Garver needs to explain what she meant, as this is the priority of NASA now when, in reality, this should have been the priority of NASA. And once again, if you have those goals, I think it makes sense to take away the program that everyone who knows what they are talking about says is clearly the best innovation we have and the only way of supplanting the space shuttle with safe vehicle mechanisms for the future and for manned space flight. But once again, if your goals are to eliminate anything that deals with the traditional role of NASA, then perhaps those goals aren't significant whatsoever.

I have one last area, and if the gentleman from Texas has time, I would like to go into that or I could wait if you would like to.

Mr. OLSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Let me try one last thing. We talk a lot about the industrial base. It's a term that maybe not a lot of people understand. As I define the industrial base, I simply want to say that the kinds of people, the kinds of jobs that put a man on a rocket and shoot him to the Moon are the same kinds of people and the same kinds of jobs that build our missile defense against those who wish to attack this country. That is our industrial base.

Last year, this country engaged in some significant—and I think unwise—decreases in our military missile defense system, and it had the effect of putting our industrial base in disarray.

However, if now NASA goes through with this, I think, unwise and naive approach of canceling Constellation, it is going to destroy that industrial base, which means not only will you not have the ability of putting a man in space very quickly with a program that works. If, indeed, our projections of the threat of countries like North Korea and Iran are underestimated, we will have no capacity to ramp up for a missile defense future.

Now, what that simply means is—and the Pentagon has recognized this—last year, three different reports came to us. In April of last year, the Defense Department report to Congress on the solid rocket motor industrial base said, If there was a delay in Constellation, it would have a negative impact on our defense system. Next month after that, there was another report. This time the solid rocket motor capabilities report to Congress in June which had a different conclusion. This report said, If there was a delay in Constellation, there would be a significant negative impact on the military capabilities of this country.

Later, the Assistant Secretary for Defense for Acquisitions sent us a letter in which he simply said that the technological base in the world is not a birthright which means several years ago the Air Force dropped all of its military missile plants to build these projects. We are relying on the private sector, and it's into the birthright. It's about certain kinds of jobs, very rare kinds of skills that are not easily replicated in the commercial world. And if we allow them to erode, it would be difficult to rebuild.

Mr. OLSON. Would my colleague yield for a question?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Please.

Mr. OLSON. What kind of consultation went on with DOD, with NASA and this decision? I heard press reports that said there was little, if none. DOD, just like you and I, woke up and read the paper and saw what had happened had not had any opportunity to let the powers that be, the administration know that you are putting our national security at risk by cutting the Constellation program. I wonder if my colleague has heard anything along those lines.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. If you would yield, I will try to come up with that because, indeed, the deputy administrator of NASA said that she did have consultations. But one she said she consulted is the very same person who said that if it's allowed to erode, it would be difficult to rebuild.

I'm on the Armed Services Committee, and we had the opportunity to question Secretary Gates when he came in. I asked if there was any consultation. He said no. I asked the same thing of the Air Force chief, if they had had any consultation. His response was over this entire issue—and I added the Minuteman III issue as well—We recognize not just the Minuteman challenge going forth but a broader industrial base issue which we're going to have to wrestle with this year. So we do not right now have a long-term solution to that in hand, which means that the Defense Department was caught unaware.

There was no communication between NASA and Defense. If, indeed, there was, then clearly NASA was not listening to what was being told to them because we have had a year of comment from the Defense Department and from the Pentagon, saying that this is a significant issue, that if, indeed, North Korea and Iran have a greater capacity than we think, and you've destroy the industrial base, we do not have the capacity to react to it and defend this country.

Now, what we are simply doing in this program is not just dismantling our manned space mission. We're not just losing the ability to go up to the Moon and beyond. We are also destroying our defense capability at the same time, and that is a consequence of this rash and naive proposal that has to be fully explored, and this Congress needs to address because it is the future of this country.

This NASA opinion, in my estimation, is nothing more than managing America's decline in the world, and that is not the role we should be doing. That is not the purpose of this country. That's not the purpose of this Congress. This Congress needs to make the clear statement that NASA is going on the wrong approach. It has to have a proper goal for its mission. It has to properly fund its goal for its mission. This, the Constellation, is the solution to the space shuttle and beyond.

Mr. OLSON. Yes, sir, I couldn't agree more with my colleague from Utah. And just to reinforce some of your things for my people back home, one of the things I heard being at the Johnson Space Center this past Monday, numerous people came up to me and said, What's our plan? I mean, what's our mission? This is an organization that has been focused on a mission for 40 years. And right now, they have no idea what they're working towards. Some nebulous stuff about global warming research, climate change research, developing the private sector doesn't do anything to inspire them.

Again, these are the best, most qualified engineers, propulsion people, defense, as well, in the world. And we are giving them no mission and possibly letting them walk out the door. Once they walk, they're gone.

□ 2300

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. It is not wise for us to take our 30,000 best scientists and engineers and give them pink slips.

One thing you said as well, when John Kennedy gave us the challenge to go to the Moon, those people who started to study engineering, science, and math, it skyrocketed because there was a challenge. There was a mission there.

NASA is talking about all kinds of programs to encourage kids to get excited about space with their summer school programs. They instituted a new computer simulation game so students could pretend to go up to the space shuttle. I am contending to you, it is cruel to excite these kids about this future when you give them no realistic way of exercising that dream because we have stopped the mechanism of doing it.

Once again, as we should have learned out of *Columbia*, we have to put safety first. This program is not. And secondly, we have to have a clear goal. If we don't do those two things, we are courting another disaster. This plan of certain NASA administrators is courting another national disaster.

Mr. OLSON. My colleague, getting into the safety issue, which is a big issue, has NASA published any safety regulations or requirements for the commercial spaceflight operators? I have had many come in my office and say they are working towards that, and I have gotten information from other people who say, no, NASA has not published anything yet. Have you heard anything?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. To my understanding, that has not taken place because those other commercial endeavors are not far enough along in their testing and their success pattern to be to that stage. Once again, it goes back to why we should keep Constellation. It was designed to have that factor of safety. That was the purpose for its design. That is its simplicity. For example, there has to be a way of escaping. That is the Orion capsule, where people will be kept. It has to have an escape process. None of the other commercial ventures have any kind of plan or design for that component yet, and it is a long, long way away.

Mr. OLSON. Yes, sir. And there was an issue with that as well. The administration put out, as I understand it, the test was supposed to be in your district. It was supposed to happen in April, and there was a notice to cease and desist, and we contacted the administration, a bipartisan letter, saying I'm sorry, Constellation is the law of the land. You don't have the ability to cut and choose programs that you don't think are going to be valuable or project into the future, because the President only has a voice in this. Congress is the final authority.

I thank my colleague for coming here late because you speak the truth. It is a battle that we can win. The American people get this. Thank you again for your time tonight.

Finally, I would like to finish up with talking about some of the technology issues associated with Constellation and its cancellation.

The administration's budget plan again cancels NASA's Constellation to develop vehicles that will ensure America has access to space and capabilities to go beyond low-Earth orbit. But what they have done, they have eliminated Constellation which does that in favor of undefined "game-changing technology efforts" without clearly defined goals and metrics.

This is exactly what my constituents back home are saying: What is our goal? What is our mission?

In my experience, whenever someone, whether it is a company or government agency, proposes that some new radical breakthrough is just around the corner and will provide the solutions to all of our problems, I want to immediately grab my wallet, button my back pocket, and hunker down. Spaceflight is governed by the laws of chemistry and physics, and there are very few game-changing technologies.

I want to say that I am an avid supporter of NASA, and I think technology development is an important part of what we have gotten from NASA. New technology is one of the many benefits we get from human spaceflight, but that technology development must be the result of a mission-driven pursuit with clearly defined goals and objectives. Like my colleague mentioned, the difficulty of the mission is what forces the development of technology. The proponents

are always ardent and sincere in their desire to make a difference, but history shows that it is not an effective way to manage programs.

I want to explain how the misguided quest for game-changing technologies and flexible paths similar to what is currently proposed have led to wasteful and ultimately futile spending efforts over the past 18 years.

This is a chart of NASA's human spaceflight development programs from 1992 to 2010. The red areas are cancelled programs; blue, completed programs; ongoing, yellow. As you can see, we only have two ongoing programs out there right now, and they are the commercial private programs. We have got the international space station still rolling strong, probably going to go beyond 2015 to 2020. We have completed a superlightweight tank, completed the X-43A, but then ran into the X-43B and cancelled that program. And then the only other thing we have was the DARPA program, which failed. This is one of the challenges of NASA. We have gone through all of these programs and changes with different administrations, and we are looking to do that right now, another change, a huge change in our human spaceflight path by shifting gears to the program of record, the Constellation Program, and going to some unknown, unproven technology from the private sector.

I support the private sector. I think they have a role in certainly some cargo resupply of the space station, but they need to prove that they have the capabilities, and they are not close. As my colleague from Utah alluded to earlier, they had a firing of an engine, and I believe some of the fire came out towards the side. Everybody here knows that rockets, it needs to come out the bottom and generate propulsion up. Coming out the side is not something that you want to see. That is what we are dealing with right now. That is what the administration has chosen to hang our future in human spaceflight on. I think it is an incredibly poor decision.

Congress, we have seen a number of game-changing proposals over the years. Again, this graph shows all of the different programs that have been "game changers," and the blue ones are the only ones that actually came to fruition.

What this represents are billions of dollars being spent without anything to show for it. Again, the Constellation is on track. We have had a very successful test launch of the Ares I-X. We passed our PDR this week. This program is the program of record. It deserves to go forward. It is in America's best interest, and we need to stay the course, put Constellation, bring it up and get U.S. astronauts in space again, get rid of that gap with the space shuttle being retired, get our astronauts up there again, going to the space station and going to the Moon and going beyond.

It is up to Congress to remember the lessons of the past and ensure that the administration's ill-conceived proposals are thoroughly reviewed. We should not agree to open-ended, unproven, unconstrained technological demonstrations. Anything we agree to must be clearly defined. NASA must show us how and why it is included, and it should be part of an as yet to be defined broader goal for human spaceflight exploration.

Would my colleague like to add anything?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I would just like to echo what you have said in all of these particular areas. It is important that we move forward. I think it is common sense that we do not cede space to the Russians and the Chinese. The United States has been a leader in this area. It has been very productive for us. We ought to ensure that our goal is to be number one and to continue to be a leader.

Having our astronauts standing on the edge of space trying to catch a Russian taxi where the meter will say \$51 million as soon as they sit down is not the way America becomes a leader in this particular world. We have the ability to do the right thing. It is planned. We need to follow through with the original plan and not change courses right now to an experiment that is unproven and has a history of failure.

I appreciate the gentleman for allowing me to join him tonight. This is an important issue for all of us, and it is important for America's future.

Mr. OLSON. You raise some great points. Again, \$51 million to put our astronauts on facilities to get up to the international space station. As I understand it, that contract has been signed through 2013, and it is highly unlikely given the current situation, and certainly a cancellation or with the attempted cancellation of the Constellation Program, that we will have the capability to get our astronauts up to the station by 2013. It will probably be 2015 or somewhere in that window.

The Russians were a communist country when I was born. They have moved over to capitalism. They have figured it out. They have it down. It was \$20 million last year. Now that we are in the throes of this, getting rid of the Constellation and having this gap, it is up to \$50 million, and who is to say what it is going to be after 2013 when the contract expires.

□ 2310

So we've got ourselves in a big pickle, and we need to stick with the program of record.

Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my colleagues who have joined me here tonight, and I saw my colleague from Houston, my fellow Texan come here.

It's just stunning that this decision has been made, and again, the manner in which it was made. No one at the NASA centers—not the director of the Johnson Space Center, he was not con-

sulted—had any input into this decision.

Across the center, again, Congress, no one that I'm aware of, had any inclination of what was going to happen until he got up and read the paper and saw that the Constellation Program had been canceled. And again, if it's allowed to stand—and we're going to do everything we can here in this Congress to ensure that it doesn't stand—but if it's allowed to stand, it condemns the United States to being an average country in terms of human spaceflight, giving up the leadership that we've had for almost 50 years now. It will ensure that we will lose hundreds of thousands of jobs here in America, good paying high-tech jobs, the kind of jobs we are trying to generate particularly in this economy. And it will take away the inspiration—you can't put a dollar value on this, but the ability to inspire America's youth to get into science, technology, engineering, and math degrees.

The Constellation Program is the right program for our human spaceflight efforts at this time in our history. We can't cancel it. We need to go forward and do everything we can to minimize that gap.

To my colleague from Texas, from the 18th Congressional District of Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), thank you for coming out tonight, Congresswoman.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Thank you very much, Congressman OLSON, and to the colleagues that have joined you tonight and who recognize the importance of this hour, albeit how late it might be, to really emphasize the uniqueness of America's space program and the uniqueness of, if you will, the human space exploration.

As I was listening to the debate, I was very much convinced that we do have an opportunity to save this valuable asset. I think we know that the NASA budget actually, as I understand it, has seen an increase in 2011. And I think all of us would admit—and thank the President—that's a good thing that the budget itself has increased, but we know that the program that deals with exploration to the Moon and Mars have suffered a blow.

So I would say that we have an easy fix, a reprogramming of the moneys to allow for a program that has now had a sufficient start to be able to redesign itself, to be able to focus on what's important about human space exploration. But the main thing is to save it, because when we save it, we not only save jobs of today—Johnson, Huntsville, Mississippi, Florida, and places around the Nation—but we save the jobs for 2020, 2030, 2040, and beyond.

I think it's important for our colleagues to know that we built the space station. I was on the Science Committee. That space station is barely a decade old—it is a decade-plus. We put it together piece by piece. And when our friends, the Russians, were delayed, they had bad economic times, we moved on.

The space station is the size of a football field. And the necessity of human space exploration is to be able to tend to that space station which has the possibilities of massive research that creates jobs.

Let me thank my friends on the floor. And Congressman OLSON, let me thank you for your leadership—we have joined you in this bipartisan effort—for signing onto the legislation, H. Res. 1150, which establishes or, if you will, determines that NASA is a national security asset, and it is. Because involved in NASA is much of our military science, climatic science, and technology not yet discussed or discovered.

And so I would rise today to support the moving forward on the Constellation Program, but also the working with this administration. I think we all know that we have a leader at NASA who knows Houston, for example, but also knows the human space exploration program. General Bolden was an astronaut and a marine. That's good news for us. And the reason why it is good news is because that is a voice that can be part of this discussion.

I don't take the initial budget by the President as a statement that human space exploration is not good. And I think it is important tonight to take a stand for our continued effort and energy in working to bring about the right kind of response between the Congress and the administration, a budget that is right there in the President's budget, one that can be reprogrammed, reformed, enhanced, if you will, to emphasize the importance of saving the space exploration, this Constellation Program.

Now, let me say this, Constellation is Moon and Mars. And there are scientists who probably have different perspectives, but I don't think anyone can have a different perspective on the pushing of the human capacity and what it brings about in terms of our own enhancement, both in terms of the knowledge that we gain—and I remember when we were trying to gain votes, Congressman OLSON, that we would say things which were really true—the kind of research on the space station had to do with heart disease, cancer, HIV/AIDS. And discoveries today are being utilized. Those discoveries are saving lives, but they also create jobs, medical jobs.

So I, one, want to continue to raise the question. I want to put in the RECORD that the potential of jobs lost at Johnson Space Center could be anywhere from 4,000 to 7,000 high-tech jobs. And each day jobs are being created more and more. And then of course the idea of the national security information—classified, climatic, as I've said, the weather research that's being done—and the need I think most of all—let me not say most of all because we stand on our own merit here in the United States, we are inventors, we are world leaders, but there are other countries that have looked to our lead-

ership, Russia, India, China, all competing to be part of space exploration.

Let me close and yield back to you by saying this: I want to see business involvement in this industry, but I believe it is important for NASA to, in essence, be part of the government and for the jobs we save all over this Nation on behalf of the American people.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of NASA programs across the country and to express my concerns about the Administration's proposal to cancel NASA's Constellation Program, which includes the Orion Crew Capsule, the Altair Lunar Lander, and the Ares I and Ares V rockets.

These programs, which together comprise our human spaceflight program, were authorized in both 2005 and 2008 by Republican and Democratic Congresses respectively. It is under the Constellation program, that NASA is currently developing new launch vehicles and spacecraft capable of travel to the moon, Mars and other destinations. Not only does cancelling the Constellation Program jeopardize America's leadership role in human space exploration, but it will have detrimental effects on our economy and national security.

Take, for example, the Johnson Space Center in Houston, Texas. The Johnson Space Center has the lead to manage the Constellation Program and several of its major elements, including the Orion Crew Exploration Vehicle and the Altair Lunar Lander. Without Constellation, the Johnson Space Center could lose anywhere from 4,000 to 7,000 high-tech jobs. If the JSC loses 4,000 direct jobs, an additional 2,315 indirect jobs would be lost, totaling 6,315; loss of income and expenditures locally would be over \$567 million. If the JSC loses 7,000 direct jobs, an additional 4,052 indirect jobs would be lost, totaling 11,052; loss of income and expenditures locally would total almost \$1 billion.

When speaking of the decision to cancel the Constellation Program, Administrator Bolden stated that "NASA intends to work with the Congress to make this transition smooth and effective, working responsibly on behalf of the Taxpayers." To the contrary, I believe that the best use of taxpayers' money is to continue the investment in NASA to build America's scientific future. That future will create jobs. Finally, I would like to reiterate that the present Administration's plan for the Constellation Program would cause drastic job loss across America and would place America in a behind the edge position as it relates to competitiveness in scientific research.

NASA and the space industry are critical to Houston's economic success in both the short and long term. According to the Bay Area Houston Economic Partnership, NASA accounts for nearly 16,800 direct federal jobs and serves as the engine for another 3,100 civilian jobs that together supply more than \$2.5 billion in payroll into Houston's regional economy. As you are aware, the Johnson Space Center is the primary location for training Astronauts for spaceflights and this move; yet, the proposed budget will effectively cancel America's human spaceflight program.

In his statement announcing NASA's budget, Administrator Bolden stressed that changes in the FY 2011 budget would be "good for NASA, great for the American workforce, and essential for our nation's future prosperity."

While I seek the same objectives, I strongly disagree with the closing of this project and I believe it will hurt America's scientific progress.

Additionally, the aerospace industry would lose as many as 20,000–30,000 jobs nationally in either of these scenarios.

Given our current economic downturn, we cannot take the possibility of these job losses lightly and the Johnson Space Center is just one example of what the cancellation of this program would do to other NASA centers nationally.

It will take years for the commercial spaceflight industry to get up to speed to reach the level of competence that exists at NASA today. Our government has already invested literally years and billions of dollars into this program. We should build upon these investments and not abandon them. Our country can support the commercial spaceflight industry, but not at the expense of our human spaceflight program, which for years has inspired future generations and driven technology that enhances our quality of life.

This technology is crucial to our national security. NASA conducts aeronautics research to address aviation safety, air traffic control, noise and, emissions reductions and fuel efficiency. NASA's contribution to our knowledge of air and water supports improved decision making for natural resource management and emergency response, thus enabling us to better respond to future homeland security threats.

Knowledge of Earth's water cycle is a critical first step in protecting our water supply; water flows over the Earth's surface in oceans, lakes, and streams, and is particularly vulnerable to attack.

NASA sensors provide a wealth of information about the water cycle; and contributes to improving our ability to monitor water resources and water quality from space; we must also protect the quality and safety of the air we breathe; airborne contaminants can pose danger to human health; and chemical, nuclear, radiological, and biological attacks are plausible threats against which we can protect.

Thus, join me in my efforts to restore funding for the Constellation to the FY 2011 budget for the following reasons:

(1) Elimination of the Constellation program, will present Homeland security implications for Cyberspace, critical infrastructure, and Intelligence community of the United States;

(2) Elimination of the Constellation program will compromise the effectiveness of the International Space Station as it relates to the strategic importance of space station research, and intelligence;

(3) Continuation of NASA's Constellation program is crucial to improving national security, climate, and research in science and medicine.

It is my hope, Madam Speaker, that this Congress will continue to support NASA's Constellation Program and to support balanced energy policies that promote economic growth and will help us meet our clean energy goals.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 9, 2010.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: I hope you will consider joining me as a co-sponsor for the resolution I will introduce expressing the sense of Congress that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) is a national

security interest and asset, and that the elimination of funding for the NASA Constellation program in the President's proposed FY 2011 budget presents national security concerns.

The President's proposed FY2011 budget eliminates funding for the Constellation Program which includes the Orion Crew Capsule, the Altair Lunar Lander, and the Ares I and Ares V rockets. These programs, which together comprise our human spaceflight program, were authorized in both 2005 and 2008 by Republican and Democratic Congresses respectively. It is under the Constellation program, that NASA is currently developing new launch vehicles and spacecraft capable of travel to the moon, Mars and other destinations. Not only does cancelling the Constellation Program jeopardize America's leadership role in human space exploration, but it will have detrimental effects on national security.

NASA conducts aeronautics research to address aviation safety, air traffic control, noise and, emissions reductions and fuel efficiency. NASA's contribution to our knowledge of air and water supports improved decision making for natural resource management and emergency response, thus enabling us to better respond to future homeland security threats.

Knowledge of Earth's water cycle is a critical first step in protecting our water supply; water flows over the Earth's surface in oceans, lakes, and streams, and is particularly vulnerable to attack.

NASA sensors provide a wealth of information about the water cycle; and contributes to improving our ability to monitor water resources and water quality from space; we must also protect the quality and safety of the air we breathe; airborne contaminants can pose danger to human health; and chemical, nuclear, radiological, and biological attacks are plausible threats against which we can protect.

Thus, join me in my efforts to restore funding for the Constellation to the FY 2011 budget for the following reasons:

(1) Elimination of the Constellation program, will present Homeland security implications for Cyberspace, critical infrastructure, and Intelligence community of the United States;

(2) Elimination of the Constellation program will compromise the effectiveness of the International Space Station as it relates to the strategic importance of space station research, and intelligence;

(3) Continuation of NASA's Constellation program is crucial to improving national security, climate, and research in science and medicine.

(4) The United States should maintain its funding of the Constellation program and should begin funding commercial space in five years and not sooner.

To join as a co-sponsor, please call my office for Mona K. Floyd of my staff or email (Mona.FloydP@mail.house.gov).

Very truly yours,

SHEILA JACKSON LEE,
Member of Congress.

Mr. OLSON. Very briefly, I would like to thank my colleague from Texas for all her support of the Johnson Space Center. True hero back home. And I couldn't agree with you more about every American has benefited from the human spaceflight.

I thank all my colleagues for coming here tonight.

CHARLIE WILSON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-

woman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Earlier this evening, Madam Speaker, colleagues came to the floor of the House to salute our late colleague, the Honorable Congressman Charles Wilson, who made the people of the world happy because of his enthusiasm and leadership.

Congressman Wilson was born June 1, 1933, in the small town of Trinity, Texas. He attended public schools there and graduated from Trinity High School in 1951.

While attending Sam Houston State University in Huntsville, Texas, Wilson was appointed to the United States Naval Academy. He received his B.S. degree, graduating eighth from the bottom of his class in 1956.

□ 2320

However, that was not a testimony to how Charlie Wilson would serve this Nation.

He served in the Navy, attaining the rank of lieutenant. He graduated as a gunnery officer. He was assigned to a destroyer to search for Soviet submarines. He then took a top secret post at the Pentagon as part of an intelligence unit that evaluated the Soviet Union's nuclear forces.

Wilson came into politics by volunteering for John F. Kennedy's Presidential campaign in 1960. After a 30-day leave from the Navy, he entered his name into the race for Texas Representative from his home district. While back on duty, his mother, sister and their friends went door-to-door, campaigning. It worked. At age 27, he was sworn into office. For the next dozen years, Wilson was known as "the liberal from Lufkin."

In 1972, he came to the United States Congress. He was a power. He was a man who enjoyed the friendship of many of our colleagues. He was a staunch supporter of the elderly, of women, and of equal rights. He was unique in his time.

He came to this Congress in a segregated time, coming from Houston, Texas, and the surrounding areas; but he knew my colleagues Congressman Mickey Leland and Congresswoman Barbara Jordan.

I know that he had a relationship that showed no discrimination, no bias. I know he loved this country. He wanted to do well by our allies; and, yes, he was the star of "Charlie's War." He was the one who led quietly an opposition to the Russians' takeover of Afghanistan. That story will always be his—brave, quiet, but successful. As the story is told, he didn't do a lot of talking about it, but he got the job done.

We will miss Congressman Charlie Wilson. I am so honored and privileged to have had the opportunity to serve with him for 2 years when I first came to the United States Congress. He was a joy to serve with. He was a defined Member of this body, who respected this body but who had a great time. We will miss him as he has lost his life just recently.

We say to his lovely wife who shared times with him for 11 years, Thank you for sharing Charlie Wilson. Thank you for giving him the joy of his life, and thank you so very much for recognizing what a special treasure he was to the American people and to the great State of Texas.

Madam Speaker, my words, I hope, will be a mere comfort to his family and friends.

To my colleagues in the Texas delegation, yes, we have a fallen hero; but we have a friend we will be able to remember for a lifetime.

God bless you, Charlie Wilson. May you rest in peace.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize the contributions Congressman Charles Wilson made to the people of Houston, Texas, and the nation. He served the people of Houston, Texas with vigor. Congressman Wilson was born June 1, 1933 in the small town of Trinity, Texas. He attended public schools there and graduated from Trinity High School in 1951.

While attending Sam Houston State University in Huntsville, Texas, Wilson was appointed to the United States Naval Academy. Wilson received a B.S. degree.

From 1956 to 1960, Wilson served in the U.S. Navy, attaining the rank of lieutenant. Having graduated as a gunnery officer, he was assigned to a destroyer that searched for Soviet submarines. He then took a top secret post at the Pentagon as part of an intelligence unit that evaluated the Soviet Union's nuclear forces.

Wilson stumbled into politics by volunteering for John F. Kennedy's presidential campaign in 1960. After a 30-day leave from the Navy, he entered his name into the race for Texas State Representative from his home district. While back on duty, his mother, sister and their friends went door to door campaigning. It worked. And at age 27, he was sworn into office.

For the next dozen years, Wilson made a name for himself as the "liberal from Lufkin." In 1972, Wilson was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives from the Second District of Texas, taking office the following January.

Though he did not speak much on the House floor, he spoke through his actions. He was a staunch supporter of the elderly, women, and equal rights. Charlie Wilson supported abortion rights and the Equal Rights Amendment. Wilson also battled for regulation of utilities, Medicaid, tax exemptions for the elderly and a minimum wage bill.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to recognize the contributions of Charlie Wilson as a representative of the people of Houston and this nation.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. YOUNG of Florida (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today and March 9 on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ORTIZ) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

- Mr. BRIGHT, for 5 minutes, today.
- Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.
- Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. ORTIZ, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. CUELLAR, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.
- Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.
- Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

- Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, March 17.

- Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, March 17.
- Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, March 17.
- Mr. BARTON of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. BISHOP of Utah, for 5 minutes, March 11.
- Mr. CONAWAY, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. GOHMERT, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. MCCOTTER, for 5 minutes, March 11 and 12.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 22 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 11, 2010, at 10 a.m.

BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF PAYGO LEGISLATION

Pursuant to Public Law 111-139, Mr. SPRATT hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, the attached estimate of the costs of H.R. 4783, as introduced, a bill to accelerate the income tax benefits for charitable cash contributions for the relief of victims of the earthquake in Chile, and to extend the period from which such contributions for the relief of victims of the earthquake in Haiti may be accelerated, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 3433. An act to amend the North American Wetlands Conservation Act to establish requirements regarding payment of the non-Federal share of the costs of wetlands conservation projects in Canada that are funded under that Act, and for other purposes.

CBO ESTIMATE OF THE STATUTORY PAY-AS-YOU-GO EFFECTS FOR H.R. 4783, A BILL TO ACCELERATE THE INCOME TAX BENEFITS FOR CHARITABLE CASH CONTRIBUTIONS FOR THE RELIEF OF VICTIMS OF THE EARTHQUAKE IN CHILE, AND TO EXTEND THE PERIOD FROM WHICH SUCH CONTRIBUTIONS FOR THE RELIEF OF VICTIMS OF THE EARTHQUAKE IN HAITI MAY BE ACCELERATED AS INTRODUCED ON MARCH 9, 2010

[Millions of dollars, by fiscal year]

| | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2010-2015 | 2010-2020 |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-----------|-----------|
| Net Impact on the On-Budget Deficit | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total On-Budget Changes | 25 | -24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Less: Designated as Emergency Requirements ¹ | 25 | -24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Impact | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

¹ Section 3 of the bill would designate all sections of the Act as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 4(g) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010. Notes: Positive numbers for "Net Impact on the On-Budget Deficit" denote an increase in the deficit; negative numbers denote a decrease in the deficit. Sources: Congressional Budget Office and Joint Committee on Taxation.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

- 6477. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Sale and Disposal of National Forest System Timber; Special Forest Products and Forest Botanical Products (RIN: 0596-AB81) received February 23, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.
- 6478. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — 1,2,3-Propanetriol, Homopolymer Diisooctadecanoate; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0213; FRL-8813-8] received February 24, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.
- 6479. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — *Trichoderma asperellum* strain ICC 012; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0750; FRL-8800-9] received February 24, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.
- 6480. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the De-

- partment's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Limitation on Procurements on Behalf of DoD (DFARS Case 2008-D005) (RIN: 0750-) received February 1, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.
- 6481. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Additional Requirements Applicable to Multiyear Contracts (DFARS Case 2008-D023) received February 1, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.
- 6482. A letter from the Director, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Financial Crimes Enforcement Network; Expansion of Special Information Sharing Procedures to Deter Money Laundering and Terrorist Activity (RIN: 1506-BA04) received February 22, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.
- 6483. A letter from the Legal Information Assistant, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Risk-Based Capital Guidelines; Capital Adequacy Guidelines; Capital Maintenance: Regulatory Capital; Impact of Modifications to Generally Accepted Accounting Principles; Consolidation of Asset-Backed Commercial Paper Programs; and Other Related Issues [Docket No.: OTS-2010-0020] (RIN: 1550-AD36) received February 3, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

- 6484. A letter from the Deputy to the Chairman for External Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Community Reinvestment Act Regulations (RIN: 3064-AD54) received February 23, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.
- 6485. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — School Improvement Grants; American Recovery and Reinvestments Act of 2009 (ARRA); Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as Amended (ESEA) [Docket ID: ED-2009-OESE-0010] (RIN: 1810-AB06) received January 27, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.
- 6486. A letter from the Director, Office of Policy, Reports and Disclosure, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Trust Annual Reports (RIN: 1215-AB75) received February 1, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.
- 6487. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Grants for Research Projects [Docket No.: NIH-2007-0929] (RIN: 0925-AA42) received February 2, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.
- 6488. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — National Practitioner Data Bank for Adverse Information on Physicians and Other Health

Care Practitioners; Reporting on Adverse and Negative Actions (RIN: 0906-AA57) received January 28, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6489. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard; Air Brake Systems [Docket No.: NHTSA-2009-0038] (RIN: 2127-AK44) received January 29, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6490. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Regulation of Fuels and Fuel Additives: Federal Volatility Control Program in the Denver-Boulder-Greeley-Ft. Collins-Loveland, Colorado, 1997 8-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area [EPA-HQ-OAR-2008-0924; FRL-9119-3] (RIN: 2060-AP40) received February 24, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6491. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Operating Permits Program; State of Iowa [EPA-R07-OAR-2009-0860; FRL-9120-2] received February 24, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6492. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Ohio New Source Review Rules [EPA-R05-OAR-2004-OH-0004; FRL-9107-4] received February 24, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6493. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Illinois; NO_x Budget Trading Program [EPA-R05-OAR-2009-0964; FRL-9116-8] received February 24, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6494. A letter from the Assistant Bureau Chief, WTB, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Revisions to Rules Authorizing the Operation of Low Power Auxiliary Stations in the 698-806 MHz Band, Public Interest Spectrum Coalition, Petition for Rule-making Regarding Low Power Auxiliary Stations, Including Wireless Microphones, and the Digital Television Transition, Amendment of Parts 15, 74 and 90 of the Commission's Rules Regarding Low Power Auxiliary Stations, Including Wireless Microphones [WT Docket No.: 08-166, WT Docket No. 08-167, ET Docket No. 10-24] received February 3, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6495. A letter from the Executive Director, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Annual Update of Filing Fees [Docket No.: RM10-14-000] received February 23, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6496. A letter from the Legal Advisor, International Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Elimination of Part 23 of the Commission's Rules [IB Docket No. 05-216] received January 29, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6497. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting a report submitted in ac-

cordance with Section 36(a) of the Arms Export Control Act, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6498. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 10-12, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6499. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting addendum to a certification, Transmittal Number: DDTC 10-002; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6500. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting addendum to a certification, Transmittal No.: DDTC 10-011; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6501. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — General Services Administration Acquisition Regulation; Rewrite of Part 512, Acquisition of Commercial Items [GSAR Amendment 2010-01; GSAR Case 2008-G504 (Change 43); Docket GSAR-2010-0001; Sequence 1] (RIN: 3090-A161) received February 3, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6502. A letter from the Deputy Archivist of the United States, National Archives & Records Administration, transmitting the Administration's Final rule—Photography in Public Exhibit Space [FDMS Docket NARA-09-003] (RIN: 3095-AB60) received January 27, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6503. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Spiny Dogfish Fishery; Commercial Period 2 Quota Harvested [Docket No.: 060418103-6181-02] (RIN: 0648-XT98) received February 23, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6504. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drug and Alcohol Testing Program; Correction [Docket No.: FAA-2008-0937; Amendment No. 120-0A, 135-117A] (RIN: 2120-AJ37) received January 29, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6505. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Effluent Limitations Guidelines and Standards for the Construction and Development Point Source Category; Correction [EPA-HQ-OW-2008-0465; FRL-9118-7] (RIN: 2040-AE91) received February 24, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6506. A letter from the Director, National Legislative Commission, American Legion, transmitting the financial statement and independent audit of The American Legion, proceedings of the 91th annual National Convention of the American Legion, held in Louisville, Kentucky from August 21-27, 2009 and a report on the Organization's activities for the year preceding the Convention, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 49; (H. Doc. No. 111-93); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed.

6507. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue

Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Tier I Industry Director's Directive on the Planning and Examination of Repairs vs. Capitalization Change in Accounting Method (CAM) #1 received February 3, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. STARK (for himself, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Ms. WATSON):

H.R. 4800. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to eliminate the 1-year deadline for application for asylum in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERMAN (for himself, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BAIRD, and Mr. HOLT):

H.R. 4801. A bill to establish the Global Science Program for Security, Competitiveness, and Diplomacy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Science and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MOORE of Kansas (for himself, Mr. CAMPBELL, and Ms. KOSMAS):

H.R. 4802. A bill to modernize the Liability Risk Retention Act of 1986 and expand coverage to include commercial property insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BARTON of Texas (for himself, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. BURGESS, and Mr. STUPAK):

H.R. 4803. A bill to ensure health care consumer and provider access to certain health benefits plan information and to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide transparency in hospital price and quality information; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. KOSMAS (for herself, Mr. POSEY, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. LATOURETTE, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. GRAYSON, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. MICA, Mr. COSTA, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, and Mr. TEAGUE):

H.R. 4804. A bill to reauthorize the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Human Space Flight Activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Ms. MATSUI (for herself and Mr. EHLERS):

H.R. 4805. A bill to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act to reduce the emissions of formaldehyde from composite wood products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STARK (for himself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms.

BERKLEY, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. CHU, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida):

H.R. 4806. A bill to prohibit discrimination in adoption or foster care placements based on the sexual orientation, gender identity, or marital status of any prospective adoptive or foster parent, or the sexual orientation or gender identity of the child involved; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. LANCE, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. SCHOCK):

H.R. 4807. A bill to amend the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 to require the President to investigate possible violations of that Act within a specified period, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. DEGETTE (for herself, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. DENT, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. KIRK, and Mr. PERLMUTTER):

H.R. 4808. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for human stem cell research, including human embryonic stem cell research, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 4809. A bill to provide greater technical resources to FCC Commissioners; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FILNER (for himself, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mr. HALL of New York, Mrs. HALVORSON, Mr. PERRIELLO, Mr. TEAGUE, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. WALZ, and Mr. ADLER of New Jersey):

H.R. 4810. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to make certain improvements in the services provided for homeless veterans under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. CAPITO (for herself, Mr. BACHUS, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. LANCE, Mr. HENSARLING, and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California):

H.R. 4811. A bill to protect the American taxpayers by improving the safety and soundness of the FHA mortgage insurance programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. HARE, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. SABLON, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. HOLT, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. LOEBESACK, Mr. POLIS of Colorado, Mr. DINGELL, and Mr. TIERNEY):

H.R. 4812. A bill to provide funds to States, units of general local government, and community-based organizations to save and create local jobs through the retention, restoration, or expansion of services needed by local communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 4813. A bill to provide for insurance reform (including health insurance reform), amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to reform Medicare Advantage and reduce disparities in the Medicare Program, regulate the importation of prescription drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on

Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Oversight and Government Reform, Ways and Means, and Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. SHAD-EGG, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona):

H.R. 4814. A bill to prohibit the further extension or establishment of national monuments in Arizona except by express authorization of Congress; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GRAVES (for himself, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. EHLERS, and Mr. PETRI):

H.R. 4815. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to allow through-the-fence access to general aviation airports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HINCHEY:

H.R. 4816. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for the deposit in the general fund of the Treasury of fees that are collected from manufacturers of drugs and devices under chapter VII of such Act, to terminate the authority of the Food and Drug Administration to negotiate with the manufacturers on particular uses of the fees, to establish a Center for Postmarket Drug Safety and Effectiveness, to establish additional authorities to ensure the safe and effective use of drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TEAGUE (for himself, Mr. LUJÁN, and Mr. HEINRICH):

H.R. 4817. A bill to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to clarify that uncertified States and Indian tribes have the authority to use certain payments for certain noncoal reclamation projects; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. RICHARDSON (for herself, Ms. BORDALLO, and Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas):

H.R. 4818. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to improve the program under section 8(a), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Ms. RICHARDSON:

H.R. 4819. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to expand the Senior Community Service Employment Program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. NADLER of New York, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. CROWLEY):

H. Res. 1155. A resolution commending the progress made by anti-tuberculosis programs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H. Res. 1156. A resolution electing a Member to a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to, considered and agreed to.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (for himself, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. NORTON, Mr. TURNER, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. MOORE

of Wisconsin, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. CHU, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. COHEN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. GRAYSON):

H. Res. 1157. A resolution congratulating the National Urban League on its 100th year of service to the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas:

H. Res. 1158. A resolution recognizing Certified Nurses Day; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York:

H. Res. 1159. A resolution supporting efforts to address the crisis faced by Haitian orphans following the earthquake of January 12, 2010; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MEEKS of New York (for himself, Mr. GUTERREZ, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. NORTON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HONDA, Mr. KINGSTON, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. WATSON, Mr. CLAY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FALCOMAVAEGA, Ms. WATERS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. BACHUS, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. ENGEL):

H. Res. 1160. A resolution calling for the establishment of a Haiti Marshall Plan Committee to coordinate aid and development initiatives from multilateral development banks, international financial institutions, United States bilateral aid programs, and major international charities and non-governmental organizations in response to the earthquake that struck Haiti on January 12, 2010, and encouraging them to work in a coordinated manner and to do even more to support Haiti as it recovers and rebuilds following the greatest natural disaster to hit this nation in over 200 years; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin (for herself, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. PETRI, Mr. KIND, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. KAGEN, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. AUSTRIA):

H. Res. 1161. A resolution honoring the Centennial Celebration of Women at Marquette University, the first Catholic university in the world to offer co-education as part of its regular undergraduate program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

237. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, relative to House Resolution No. 125 memorializing the Congress to appropriate the \$475 million called for in President Obama's FY 2010 budget for a Great Lakes Restoration Initiative; to the Committee on Appropriations.

238. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, relative to House Resolution No. 175 urging the Congress of the United States to enact and put into effect the Humphrey-Hawkins Full Employment Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

239. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, relative to House Resolution No. 186 urging the Congress and the Army Corps of Engineers to take immediate actions to prevent the Asian carp from entering the Great Lakes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

240. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 33 urging the Congress and the Army Corps of Engineers to take steps to prevent the Asian carp from entering the Great Lakes; jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary and Transportation and Infrastructure.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 85: Mr. FORBES.
 H.R. 197: Ms. GIFFORDS.
 H.R. 208: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
 H.R. 273: Mr. NUNES.
 H.R. 275: Mr. HELLER.
 H.R. 336: Mr. GARAMENDI.
 H.R. 442: Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. SHULER, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. ISSA, and Mr. MELANCON.
 H.R. 537: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
 H.R. 618: Mr. RUSH.
 H.R. 624: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
 H.R. 658: Mr. ANDREWS.
 H.R. 690: Mr. MCNERNEY.
 H.R. 734: Ms. Velázquez, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. OLVER, Mr. PASCARELL, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. TURNER, Mr. POSEY, Mr. HODES, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
 H.R. 775: Mr. SHULER, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. PETERS.
 H.R. 795: Ms. BERKLEY.
 H.R. 877: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
 H.R. 919: Mr. ISRAEL.
 H.R. 932: Mr. RAHALL.
 H.R. 1067: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California and Ms. DELAURO.
 H.R. 1074: Mr. MELANCON, Mr. SHULER, and Mr. TAYLOR.
 H.R. 1177: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. COSTELLO, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. HOYER, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Ms. PELOSI.
 H.R. 1210: Mr. ROSS.
 H.R. 1240: Mr. PLATTS and Mr. KAGEN.
 H.R. 1258: Mr. ADLER of New Jersey, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. POLIS.
 H.R. 1324: Mr. LATOURETTE.
 H.R. 1362: Mr. AUSTRIA, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, Mr. MICHAUD, and Mr. MARSHALL.
 H.R. 1581: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
 H.R. 1587: Mr. LATHAM.
 H.R. 1616: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Mr. FILNER.
 H.R. 1740: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
 H.R. 1806: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.
 H.R. 1831: Mr. GARAMENDI.
 H.R. 1879: Mr. BUYER and Mr. SULLIVAN.
 H.R. 1895: Mr. SIRES.
 H.R. 1964: Mr. WATT and Mr. CUMMINGS.
 H.R. 1995: Mr. KISSELL.
 H.R. 2000: Mr. GORDON of Tennessee.
 H.R. 2024: Mr. MICHAUD.
 H.R. 2067: Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 2089: Ms. KILROY.
 H.R. 2105: Mr. ARCURI and Mr. BILBRAY.
 H.R. 2273: Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 2296: Mr. TAYLOR.
 H.R. 2373: Mr. GRIFFITH.
 H.R. 2377: Mr. SIRES and Mr. SHERMAN.
 H.R. 2378: Mr. GERLACH.
 H.R. 2381: Ms. FUDGE.
 H.R. 2472: Mr. KING of Iowa.
 H.R. 2492: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
 H.R. 2811: Mr. PASCARELL.
 H.R. 2849: Mr. COSTA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. TSONGAS, and Mr. WAXMAN.
 H.R. 2879: Mr. KISSELL.
 H.R. 3077: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
 H.R. 3212: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts and Mr. TOWNS.
 H.R. 3365: Ms. BERKLEY.
 H.R. 3445: Mr. HELLER.
 H.R. 3464: Mr. SOUDER, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. BRIGHT, and Mr. PUTNAM.
 H.R. 3516: Mr. MCCOTTER.
 H.R. 3560: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
 H.R. 3579: Mr. HEINRICH and Mr. TEAGUE.
 H.R. 3580: Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.
 H.R. 3592: Mr. DEFAZIO.
 H.R. 3668: Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. DENT, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. CHILDERS, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. HILL, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. FILNER, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. HIMES, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. HALL of Texas, and Mr. LOBIONDO.
 H.R. 3719: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky.
 H.R. 3734: Mr. DOYLE.
 H.R. 3757: Mr. PERRIELLO.
 H.R. 3764: Mr. FILNER.
 H.R. 3787: Mr. KING of Iowa.
 H.R. 3964: Mr. CHAFFETZ.
 H.R. 4000: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
 H.R. 4060: Mr. MCKEON.
 H.R. 4129: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
 H.R. 4133: Mr. COURTNEY and Mrs. CAPITO.
 H.R. 4241: Mr. TANNER.
 H.R. 4311: Mr. BOUCHER.
 H.R. 4325: Mr. WEINER.
 H.R. 4356: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. PASCARELL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. WAXMAN.
 H.R. 4360: Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. WAMP, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. TERRY, Mr. CAO, and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
 H.R. 4402: Ms. FUDGE, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. PALLONE.
 H.R. 4404: Mr. CLEAVER.
 H.R. 4405: Mr. CAPUANO.
 H.R. 4429: Mr. FLEMING.
 H.R. 4480: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. LUJÁN, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. MCINTYRE.
 H.R. 4496: Mr. HINCHEY.
 H.R. 4502: Mr. POLIS of Colorado.
 H.R. 4509: Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida.
 H.R. 4527: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. GRAYSON, and Mr. HIMES.
 H.R. 4529: Ms. FOXF.
 H.R. 4556: Ms. JENKINS.
 H.R. 4564: Mr. COSTA, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
 H.R. 4592: Mr. BUYER.
 H.R. 4599: Mr. SESTAK.
 H.R. 4616: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. WEINER.
 H.R. 4621: Mr. LOEBSACK.
 H.R. 4632: Mr. SESTAK.
 H.R. 4635: Ms. NORTON, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. GRAYSON.

H.R. 4637: Mr. ACKERMAN.
 H.R. 4650: Mr. GRAYSON and Mr. DEFAZIO.
 H.R. 4667: Mr. BUYER.
 H.R. 4678: Ms. CHU.
 H.R. 4700: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 4709: Ms. GIFFORDS.
 H.R. 4720: Mr. SCHAUER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. WITTMAN.
 H.R. 4722: Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. STARK, and Ms. WOOLSEY.
 H.R. 4752: Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. TONKO, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN.
 H.R. 4755: Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.
 H.R. 4757: Mr. COURTNEY and Mr. KILDEE.
 H.R. 4783: Ms. BERKLEY.
 H.J. Res. 79: Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. UPTON, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. OLSON, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. HERGER, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. LANCE, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mrs. MYRICK, and Mr. SOUDER.
 H.J. Res. 80: Mr. FILNER, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. POE of Texas, and Mr. GARAMENDI.
 H. Con. Res. 49: Mr. DINGELL and Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
 H. Con. Res. 98: Mr. GARAMENDI.
 H. Con. Res. 242: Mr. STARK, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, and Mr. ROSS.
 H. Con. Res. 246: Mr. RANGEL and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
 H. Con. Res. 248: Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland and Mr. KAGEN.
 H. Res. 173: Ms. JENKINS, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. GUTHRIE, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
 H. Res. 213: Ms. CLARKE, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. SALAZAR, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
 H. Res. 311: Mr. ALEXANDER and Mr. OLVER.
 H. Res. 704: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DICKS, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. HARE, Mr. HODES, Mr. JONES, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.
 H. Res. 767: Mr. SESTAK.
 H. Res. 874: Mr. OLSON.
 H. Res. 886: Mr. SOUDER and Mr. BARTLETT.
 H. Res. 899: Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. WATSON, and Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
 H. Res. 947: Mr. BACA, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
 H. Res. 989: Mr. POLIS and Mr. QUIGLEY.
 H. Res. 996: Mr. STARK and Mr. CASSIDY.
 H. Res. 1075: Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. KIND, and Mr. LATTA.
 H. Res. 1078: Mr. CARTER, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. FORBES, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. JONES, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, and Mr. POE of Texas.
 H. Res. 1099: Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. OWENS.
 H. Res. 1116: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. THORNBERRY, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H. Res. 1145: Mr. MITCHELL, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. HODES, Mr. PASCARELL, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. WU, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. COOPER, Mr. NYE, Mr. FARR, Mr. BERRY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. HOLT, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. MINNICK, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. REHBERG, and Mr. INGLIS.