

solar panels or windmills. If we are going to make things in America, if we aren't going to ship everything in our country to China, we have to have reasonable, workable energy strategies.

I have been working on alternative energy since I came to Washington. There is a company in Fort Wayne that has been highlighted in the New York Times and all the other publications on geothermal called "Water Furnace." California alone could save seven power plants by using geothermal. We need to push in every appropriations bill in every different way geothermal. I have an amendment proposed in the armed services bill to have many of our military facilities use geothermal.

I am working with Parker-Hannifin and Regal Boloit to improve air conditioning. Regal Boloit has a green energy process that saves 15 percent of energy in air conditioning. Parker-Hannifin, through an earmark and their own funds, has been working and they think they can get 20 percent more power out of wind turbines. Guardian makes windshields. It is converting part of one of their plants and working with Spain and other places to make windshields and to make solar panels that don't crack and are more efficient.

We are looking at major breakthroughs. But we cannot destroy the manufacturing base of America.

#### THE CONCEPT OF THE DIRECTION OF LEADERSHIP IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. CARTER. I thank the Speaker for allowing me to speak tonight. I'm back again to talk about issues that are important, I think, to this House. They are important to the American people, and they are especially important to the concept of leadership in this House of Representatives and just where it is going to go.

I want to go back for a moment before we go into current events and talk about some past events, when the Democratic majority took over the House of Representatives. In the lead-up prior to that time, we were having these speeches made by the presumed new Speaker of the House, Ms. PELOSI, about what we could expect from the new Congress. Now, this is not the first time I have mentioned this. But let's remind you again, to all the Members of this House, this is a quote from NANCY PELOSI in 2006: "The American people voted to restore integrity and honesty in Washington, DC, and the Democrats intend to lead the most honest, the most open, and most ethical Congress in history."

Now, this was the goal that was set up by the Speaker of the House. And she has now been serving as the Speak-

er of the House for two terms. And this was her mantra of what this House would stand for. And without getting off into the weeds of the internal politics of Rules Committee and stuff like that, which bores people to tears, I'm just talking about this honest, ethical and open-about-it Congress that we were promised.

In another speech, the Speaker of the House, the then presumed Speaker of the House, made the statement that what she was going to do was if the Democrats got to be in charge of this House, they were going to drain the swamp, that there was this culture of corruption that had created a swamp, and that they were going to drain the swamp and expose the corruption, and they were going to expose the misdeeds.

Now, I'm not here to tell you that there were not misdeeds that were brought forward. I'm not sure the Democrats had anything to do with exposing them. But they certainly came out through the process at that period of time. People went to prison, and rightfully so. They broke the law. But I will say that the leadership at that time went forward with those efforts, and they reached the unfortunate conclusion that several people went to prison. Several people had to leave the Congress.

But that doesn't mean because they found issues in the Republican Party that those were the only issues that were here. And for the last 6 or 8 weeks, I have been trying to say, who is going to look at these other issues? I'm not accusing anybody. I'm saying that accusations are being made by the press. Accusations are being made by other people. And they seem to fall on deaf ears. They seem to fall on the deaf ears of the leadership of the Democratic majority in this Congress. And they seem to fall upon the deaf ears of the so-called Ethics Committee, whose job it is to look into these things. And so we keep raising these issues wondering what is going on.

But now I have even more concerns. And these concerns are things that I think everybody is going to be concerned about. Because if you woke up on Sunday morning and you turned on the television, you saw that people are storming the streets of Iran. And people are getting killed because of an election. That is a pressure point now in our world that is as big a pressure point as Afghanistan or Iraq or any other place because it has the potential that nuclear weapons could be involved. We don't know exactly where Iran is on their development of their nuclear weapons, but we certainly know they are working on it. And they make no bones about it.

So we have got a possible nuclear power where there is a turmoil going on, and we are sort of sitting over here being quiet about it. And maybe that is the right thing to do. The President seems to be taking a position of kind of hands-off. And there certainly is a

school that believes that is the right thing to do. And I'm not criticizing that. But I am saying that that is a thing that every American, and certainly every Member of this body, should be concerned about, because it could be a world-changing event that comes out of Iran. And it could be a world-changing event for the negative.

So why do I raise this? Well, that very same day, that very same day we heard more from our longtime adversary, the North Koreans. I'm ashamed to have to say this, but I'm old enough to remember the end of the Korean war. I was just a little kid, but I do remember. And we never made peace with the North Koreans. We made an armistice. We decided that we would time-out, no more war. And they went on their side of the 38th parallel, and the South Koreans went on our side of the 38th parallel.

Since that time, one of the great, miraculous transformations of an area has taken place in South Korea. And now when you visit South Korea, it is a prosperous nation. It has a functioning democratic government. And the South Koreans have a lot of bragging rights. They have a lot to be proud of.

Meanwhile, the North Koreans stayed in their same Soviet socialist-type republic, a communist regime. And, basically, with the exception of building a gigantic army, they have accomplished nothing since 1954, 1956, except to stir up a lot of trouble in that area and to develop nuclear weapons and a missile system.

Now, there are some that think that the North Koreans are just in this business to sell these weapons to other people and to give them something that they can trade, because they basically are practically without trade resources. But others like me fear that the North Koreans are just unstable enough that they can use the weapons in this army to kick open the doors to the second Korean war, or worse, a regional war.

□ 2045

They have done some things that in the past would have created havoc in countries. They fired missiles in the direction of Japan two or three times, and shot a couple of them over Japan. Here is a sovereign nation having a missile fired over their territory. They don't know what that missile is carrying or what it could do to their country if it came down. That is as close to an aggressive act as I think you can get without hitting somebody.

And now they have announced to us specifically and to the world in general that they are going to test one of their longer-range missiles by firing it at Hawaii, a State in this Union. They could just as well be firing it at Idaho, or Alaska, or Texas, or Georgia or Maine. A sovereign State of this Nation—they have told us that they are going to fire a missile in that direction, basically at that State.

Now they are pompous and blowhards, but we don't know what they are really going to do. And we do know that they have tested nuclear weapons very recently, so they have nuclear capability.

Why do I bring these things up in relationship to the atmosphere created in this House by the failure of leadership to address issues that are part of draining the swamp? It is because I am going to make the argument that what has gone on in this House in the conversation between our Speaker and the CIA about who is telling the truth and who is not has a direct influence on these two Sunday morning news stories and others. Because yes, we folks sitting around the breakfast table, we get our information about what is going on in the world from the press. But you better hope, and having been a trial judge and told juries this for 20 years, you better hope that somebody is getting better information than what is in the press. And no offense to the press, but let's face it; they get it wrong once in awhile. And what we depend on is an intelligence system that doesn't get it wrong. We depend on an intelligence system that when they come to us and tell us that this is what our intelligence tells us, we feel that is fairly reliable news. We can't disclose it because it is top secret, but we can depend on our intelligence officials to come forward and give us information.

Now we have had this issue of enhanced interrogation of prisoners that has been an ongoing issue throughout the election, and now that the Democrats are in charge it continues to be, that we are a torturing Nation. Some people label it as torture and some people label it as enhanced interrogation. Whatever you call it, there was an issue whether or not the members of the Intelligence Committee of this House were informed about this when they started to do it.

Now those Members that have had the opportunity to speak have indicated, and that which was not top secret, that there were briefings on this issue. The Speaker of the House has said they are lying, I was never told about these enhanced interrogations. And she has repeated that until she realized, which we pointed out on the floor of the House, that lying to the United States Congress is a crime. Here is the statute: Except as otherwise provided in this section, whoever in any manner within the jurisdiction of the executive, legislative, or judicial branches of the Government of the United States, knowingly and willfully falsifies, conceals, or covers up by any trick, scheme, or device a material fact, makes any material, false, fictitious, fraudulent statement or representation, or makes or uses any false writing or document knowing the same to contain any materially false or fictitious fraudulent statement or entry, shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 5 years if the offense involves international or domes-

tic terrorism, as defined in section 2331, imprisoned not more than 8 years, or both. If the matter relates to an offense under chapter 109A, 109B, 110, or 117, of section 1591, then the term of imprisonment imposed under this section shall be not more than 8 years.

Without going off on what is in these other sections, what this says, under our criminal law of the Federal Government, if you are lying about a material fact, and there can be nothing more material than the functions of our Intelligence Committee and our intelligence community and their relationship and whether or not something happened, and to accuse them of being unreliable and lying is accusing them of a crime.

By this accusation, by saying they didn't tell the truth, they never briefed me, she is accusing those people who did that, made that statement that we briefed of committing a crime. It may be a crime that only puts you in prison for 5 years and gives you a fine, or it could carry over to whatever these sections pertain to to carry it up to 8 years, or it could be as little as, what was the lowest, 4 years? I guess 5. Whatever it is, whatever the time, that incarceration for that period of time is serious incarceration. This is a serious accusation. These are serious contentions by the Speaker when she says: They didn't do that, they are lying.

They are lying to you, they are lying to the Congress, they are lying to the press. But most importantly, they are lying to Congress.

Now that is an issue that we should be concerned about because not just we need it resolved, and that is what I keep raising. I have been a judge in this country for 20 years, and its purpose is to resolve issues. My question is, who is going to resolve this issue? This issue needs to be resolved. Why does it need to be resolved? I gave you two examples: North Korea and Iran. Two hotspots boiling up. We are getting information. We should be, I assume we are getting, information from our intelligence community. If they are liars, can we trust them? Can we put the security of Hawaii on the shoulders of our intelligence community and trust their report as to whether or not there is a nuclear warhead on that missile that they have said they are going to fire at Hawaii? Can we, after the Speaker's accusations, trust this community? That's the question that I think we ought to be asking ourselves.

And once again, the 50th time I have probably said this in the last 6 weeks, what I am asking for is a place, someone to resolve these issues. And I have raised this resolution. The Speaker is the leader. She is the leader of this House, and she needs to resolve this issue. This is putting a crimp in our intelligence community. If I am an agent and I am reporting and I get accused of lying, I face criminal prosecution. And intelligence at its best is, like every other human endeavor, it has its flaws.

So once again, failure to show the leadership that it takes to resolve issues causes consequences we can't imagine until they look us in the face. And that is what I wanted to talk about here tonight. We have talked about the issues with Mr. RANGEL and the Rangel rule. And we have talked about issues of other Members of this Congress: Ms. WATERS, MOLLOHAN, MURTHA, VISCLOSKEY, and all those guys. And I have talked about those issues and I have said, I don't know whether these accusations are true or not, but somebody needs to resolve them. If we are draining the swamp, someone needs to resolve those issues. If there is a lie going on to Congress and we are draining the swamp, somebody needs to drain that part of the swamp that has to do with this lie. That is what this is about. That is all I am trying to do. I am raising the question for you Members of this House and for the American public to think about.

What about this culture of corruption that obviously seems to be here? What about this issue of lying? It needs to be resolved. The security of our Nation is at stake.

I am not here by myself, and I have been talking way too long without recognizing a really good friend who has come down here to have a friendly visit about some of these issues that are unresolved, PHIL GINGREY from Georgia, one of my classmates and a good, close personal friend. And I yield to Mr. GINGREY.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Texas, Judge CARTER, yielding to me.

As the gentleman points out, this is a very, very serious time to be on the floor speaking to all of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle, and Representative CARTER and myself and others on our side of the aisle, as we bring these concerns to our fellow Members, Madam Speaker, it is not something that we do lightly. It is not something that we do lightly, and I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle understand that.

We have all grown up with the little sayings, the aphorisms or adages that you hear from your parents, or maybe at school or church, things like, If you live in a glass house, you shouldn't throw rocks. I remember my dad told me one time a story about Huey Long, the governor of Louisiana. I don't know whether it was in a reelection campaign or maybe even his first campaign for governor, he had a critic, maybe even an opponent in that race, a General Hugh Johnson, and General Hugh Johnson was awfully critical of Governor Huey Long and accused him of corruption and that sort of thing. Huey Long said to General Hugh Johnson something to the effect that, Don't criticize a speck in my eye if you have a plank in your own. In fact, Madam Speaker, that may be in Proverbs in the Bible as well. Maybe that is where

Governor Huey Long got that from. But the point is you are reluctant, aren't we, we are reluctant to bring criticism against our colleagues knowing that we are not perfect. No one, indeed, is; except the one true Savior.

So it is a very serious thing when we come and express concern on the House floor about the action of our colleagues. But yet we are here tonight. We are obviously here tonight, and we are speaking about that. Judge CARTER, Madam Speaker, started off talking about the seriousness of the consequences of our integrity or lack of integrity as he talked about what happened years ago, and I remember it, too, in regard to the Korean Conflict, and then brought us into current time and talked about what is going on in North Korea now and what is going on in Iran.

The intelligence that we receive about things that are really bad things occurring across the globe has got to be wisdom, and it has got to be honest. You can't modify those two terms and say it is conventional wisdom or it is relative honesty. Wisdom and honesty don't have modifiers. It is either wisdom or it is not. It is either honest and truthful or it is not.

So as Judge CARTER talks about this situation with our distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives in regard to whether or not what she said about the CIA was honest and truthful, or whether the CIA was honest and truthful in regard to their response, in fact John Podesta, I think, basically said, Look, the CIA spoke the truth.

□ 2100

The consequences, Madam Speaker, are so serious to this Nation, and indeed, to the world, that it is important. If you ask any citizen of this country and you say, "Who do you think you depend on most to tell the truth, would it be the Speaker of the House or the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency?" I'm not sure how most people would respond, Madam Speaker. I'm not sure how I would respond. You expect both of them, at that level of government, to be honest and truthful.

So it is disturbing to me as a Member of the House of Representatives, it's disturbing to me as a citizen of this country, as a dad, as a granddad, as a husband, as a father, to find out that maybe the Central Intelligence Agency is not telling the truth. And even worse than that, Madam Speaker, that possibly there is a pattern of the Central Intelligence Agency not telling the truth. That is just about as frightening a concept as you can possibly imagine.

What can we rely on? Should we have done what we did in Operation Enduring Freedom in regard to taking out al Qaeda and the Taliban and that regime change back in 2001, 2002 before Representative CARTER and I became Members of the Congress?

You know, it's a very, very disturbing thing, and that's why we're

here tonight. And again, it is painful, but I'm not standing up here, Madam Speaker, I'm not standing up here saying that our Speaker, the Speaker, the first female Speaker in the history of this body who is now serving her third year as Speaker of the House of Representatives, I'm not saying that she was dishonest. I just simply am here to say we need to know, the American people need to know. And if the CIA lied once, even, but certainly if there was a pattern of giving misleading information to members of the Select Committees on Intelligence, then we've got some serious problems, Madam Speaker, we have some serious problems, and something needs to be done about that and needs to be done right now. Because, as Judge CARTER was saying, these things that are going on in Iran, in North Korea, and in other parts of the world, this can't wait. If we've got a problem, we need to solve this right now. So that's why we're here tonight.

And again, I appreciate my colleague from Texas for doing this gutsy thing because he's not perfect, Madam Speaker, and I'm not perfect. And again, I may have a little speck in my eye, you know, and the house I live in may have too much glass in it, but on the other hand, if we see things, and again, I'm not suggesting anybody—certainly not suggesting that our Speaker, the Speaker was lying, but if there's a problem, it needs to be brought forward for the betterment of this body. We owe that to the American people. We owe that to the American people.

Unfortunately, Madam Speaker, it seems that our House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, the Ethics Committee, has been dysfunctional since the day I came here 7 years ago. I'm in my fourth term, Madam Speaker, and that body has been dysfunctional since the day I came here. It's supposed to be bipartisan. You have five members of each party, and yet we seem to be just sweeping things under the rug and not addressing problems like we should.

I'm going to yield back to the gentleman who controls the time here in just a second, but the point is just exactly what he said at the outset, Madam Speaker. I remember it so painfully well, because back in 2006, when we Republicans still were in the majority, I mean, every day, every evening during Special Order hours the then minority party, the Democrats, just pounded, pounded over and over again what they called a "culture of corruption." And we did, on our side of the aisle, Madam Speaker, have a few Members—thank God not many, but three or four. That is too many, of course. One is too many—that were not conducting themselves in the manner that this House demands, that the sanctity of this House demands.

And by campaigning on that, along with, of course, the unpopularity of a prolonged conflict in Iraq and too

much spending, absolutely too much spending, but of course it seems like a penny ante compared to what's going on now, but it caused us to lose our majority status, Madam Speaker, and it's painful. It's painful to find ourselves in this situation and to think that, Madam Speaker, and the Democratic minority at the time talked about, Ladies and gentlemen of the United States, you give us an opportunity, you let us control, and we will drain the swamp. We will end this culture of corruption.

And here again, I am mighty disappointed. We're not seeing any end to the culture of corruption, and it seems like more and more is being swept under the rug. And it shouldn't happen on either side of the aisle, and so that is why we're here. Again, it's painful, and we're not trying to hurt anybody. We're just trying to help the American people.

And I yield back to my colleague from Texas.

Mr. CARTER. And I thank my friend.

Let me say first, not being a Biblical scholar, but that's from The Sermon on the Mount. Jesus talks about trying to get the cinder out of your neighbor's eye before you take the plank out of your eye. And that's fine.

I know that most everybody thinks this is a very contentious place, and so when people start talking about these things, they think, oh, it's that same old stuff. I want you to know that the announced date of the firing of that rocket by North Korea is Independence Day, July 4. That is the day they say they are going to shoot a rocket at Hawaii.

Now, I'm assuming that the White House and the Select Committees on Intelligence of the House and Senate are very, very interested in knowing accurate information about what's going to be on the nose of that rocket when it's fired because, quite frankly, if you want to restart the Korean War, how spectacular could it be that they will have an armed missile fired at one of our States and then invade across the 38th parallel. It could be disastrous.

Now, that's not my imagination working. It's happened before. I mean, the invasion took place. That's what started the Korean War. They've got one of the largest armies in the world. They're saying that they have canceled the armistice. Now, under technical rules of war, canceling an armistice reinstates the war. We're not treating it that way because regular rules of war kind of have been changed, not by what's written in the books but by usage. So we never really called it a war. We called it a conflict and so forth, like we've done in so many other things we do. But the reality is they said the armistice is off, which means that we should be technically back fighting. They said they're going to fire a missile on our Independence Day, the 4th of July.

Now, why do I bring that up? Because by my watch, this is the 23rd day of

June. We've got to be able to trust our Intelligence Committee and our intelligence community in, what? That's the next 10 days. In the next 10 days we have to be able to have that confidence in them. And we've already got the third person in line for the Presidency of the United States telling this body that the intelligence community lied about what they said about a briefing.

Now, you know what? I'll even give you the way it could be handled. I mean, this place is full of things that go on that are very confusing. It could be: I made a mistake. I didn't understand the briefing. Yeah, I heard it, but I didn't realize what he was saying. There's lots of things to be said. But to sit here with this—it's trying to just go away. The President isn't talking about it anymore so it will just go away. But it's not going to go away if, on the 4th of July and the missile is on its way, we have the decision to make, do we take it down, shoot down that missile as it heads towards Hawaii, which it probably can't get there, but if it can, do we shoot it down or do we let it fall in the ocean and take our chances? Or do we let it fall on one of the islands in Hawaii and take our chances? Or what are we going to do?

Intelligence community, how safe do you think that launch is? They give us the facts. Now, the meeting is behind closed doors and somebody says, Well, yeah, they tell us it's got a nuclear warhead on it. But they lied to PELOSI. Are they lying to us? Do we want that? Is that good governance of this country?

And the reason you have to raise this issue is because there's so much politics that's involved around this. It's all about politics as well as what really happened. And at this point, with somebody announcing on the 4th of July they're firing a long-range missile, you've got to put politics aside at that point in time and say, Trust the community. They don't lie, because they're usually going to tell us what is happening with that missile. That's my whole thinking of this deal.

And the truth is, what I've been trying to talk about since day one of this conversation I've had when I brought up the Rangel rule and all these other things, is that if we, as Members of this House, have questions that we think need to be resolved, we have only one place to go, and that's to our colleagues in this House and say, These issues need to be resolved.

If there is nothing to them, we need to find out there's nothing to them, but they need to be resolved. And if you're draining the swamp, that means you're going to address issues as they come up. If something stinks over in this part of the swamp, you drain that swamp and find out what's stinking. That's what she meant when she said "draining the swamp."

Now, we pointed out parts of the swamp which our colleagues on the other side seem to be dwelling in right now, by accusation only, by press accu-

sation. Let's clear those people's names. If there's nothing in that swamp, let's drain it. Let's find out. And that's the responsibility of the leadership of the majority and that's the responsibility of the Ethics Committee, and that's why we keep talking about those ethical issues.

Unfortunately, there may be more. We have to be prepared to do what we promised the American people, and the first thing we need to address is this issue of whether or not the community was lying to the American people.

I see we are joined by my good friend and loyal stalwart who always shows up when he sees me all by myself with PHIL on the floor, my friend STEVE KING from Iowa.

I will yield to you whatever time you would like to have, Mr. KING.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the judge from Texas for yielding and for also organizing this Special Order, and the gentleman doctor from Georgia as well, who has been persistent and relentless here standing up for truth, justice, and the American way, and fiscal responsibility, constitutionality.

And as I'm reading The Washington Post language, the statement that came from our Speaker on November 8, 2006, "The American people voted to restore integrity and honesty in Washington, D.C., and the Democrats intend to lead the most honest, the most ethical, and the most, perhaps, moral Congress in history." And "the most honest, most open, and most ethical Congress in history" is that language.

I heard that constant drub of criticism that was coming here for several years. The 30s group came down here to the floor almost every night and made those kind of allegations. And I was looking at people over on this side of the aisle that were clearly committed to this cause and people that I would trust with everything I have, working hard, struggling to represent the American people. They took that kind of criticism, and some of the American people bought that kind of promise.

□ 2115

But today they know different. Today they know this Congress doesn't meet that standard.

The other statement here on National Public Radio: "Under strong attack from Republicans, House Speaker PELOSI accused the CIA and Bush administration of misleading her about waterboarding detainees in the war on terrorism."

Again: "They mislead us all the time. I was fighting the war in Iraq at that point too, you know."

Not really. Not really, Mr. Speaker. Here's what I remember. I remember when Speaker PELOSI grasped the gavel up here in January of 2007, and from that point in that Congress, she led at least 45 votes here on the floor of the House of Representatives that were designed to either unfund, underfund, or undermine our troops. And that's all a matter of record. It's all on a spread-

sheet in my office, and I can lay it all into this CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and actually I probably put it all into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at one point or another. But this isn't fighting the war in Iraq. She was fighting against the war in Iraq. And the goal was to get our troops out of there, declare defeat, and bring disgrace down upon the Bush administration for whatever that motive might be. But it was clear in the rhetoric that came that it wasn't in support of victory in Iraq, but every move, all 45 votes, as a matter of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, undermined our troops.

And yet President Bush issued the surge order, and the surge strategy has clearly been a success. I traveled to Iraq with the gentleman from Texas, and I recall some real hot days over there. And I can remember that there was a time when we couldn't go to places like Ramadi or Fallujah because they were too dangerous, and I can remember coming back 6 months later and going shopping in Ramadi. And I can remember coming back a little later and meeting with the mayor of Fallujah, who declared Fallujah to be a city of peace. This all happened because of the nobility and the sacrifice and the courage and the bravery and the dedication of our U.S. military.

And you cannot talk about our military without talking about the Commander in Chief, and it was President Bush who gave the order. And now we have reached this point where we have achieved as a Nation a definable victory in Iraq. And it's definable in a lot of ways, but it wasn't because of this quote that we're reading here about the Speaker fighting the war in Iraq at that point too, you know. No. She was fighting against it here on this floor, and it's a matter of record, and that point can't be allowed to pass.

So what has been achieved is a definable victory that's there. The ethnosectarian deaths have dropped 98 percent from their top. The civilian deaths have dropped 90 percent. Our American casualties there over the last year, and my data will be brought up to date on the 30th of this month, but as of the last day of June last year, and I pray to God that we don't have any more casualties there for all time, but the roughly accidental deaths in Iraq to Americans are roughly equivalent to those deaths that are hostile deaths, categorized as hostile deaths.

Now, that is a very good statistic if you are looking at war zone statistics. If you are at as great a risk from getting killed in a rollover of your Humvee as you are by the enemy, there has been a lot of progress that's been made there; a lot of progress made in the local governments with free elections. They've had a number of free elections and ratified a constitution. The last election they had was at least as peaceful as our last election and probably at least as legitimate as our last election as well. I think there is a lot to be celebrated in Iraq in the Middle East.

And I didn't mean to divert from the subject matter, but I think we should raise up to the CIA subject and ask what about the national security of the United States of America when the Speaker of the House declares those who are briefing her up in the secure room on the fourth floor to be a group of felonious liars that have continually, according to her, misled the Congress of the United States of America and lied to the Speaker of the House. And why would the Speaker go back up and be briefed again by people that she declared to be liars, and how could anyone separate the CIA from the other 14 members of the intelligence community? Would anyone actually go brief the Speaker after they had been declared to be a liar, summarily declared to be a liar, with no evidence, with no proof, simply an allegation?

Now, in this country if you believe that someone is not telling the truth, you don't raise that subject. You just accept what they say without challenging them unless you can prove they're wrong. That's the way it is in a Western Christendom, as Winston Churchill declared Western Civilization. And I believe it's rooted in the Book of John when Christ stood before the high priest Caiaphas and Caiaphas said, Did you really do those things? Did you really preach these things? And Jesus said, Ask them. They were there. This all happened openly. And the guard struck Jesus for his insolent answer, supposedly. And Jesus said, If I speak wrongly, then you must prove the wrong, but if I speak rightly, why do you strike me?

If someone speaks wrongly, the one who challenges their integrity has the responsibility to prove they're wrong. Jesus said that to the high priest. The least we could do is ask the same standard of our Speaker to prove the wrong of the CIA.

And this will not go away. We cannot tolerate a situation where there's a mistrust between the highest levels of intelligence-gathering services in the United States of America that gather the intelligence information, that direct our military, our overt and our covert operations, and that go in and preempt terrorist strikes against Americans and other free people in the world and to have them intimidated by an allegation of telling a lie, which would be a felony, and there's a specific section in the code punishable by 8 years in the Federal penitentiary if a member of the intelligence community should lie to the United States Congress. And there it is: title XVIII, U.S. Code 1001, 8 years in the penitentiary for that. It's very specific.

So this has got to stop. It's got to be resolved. And this Congress has got to bring it to a head.

I appreciate the gentleman from Texas for having this Special Order and raising these issues, an opportunity to echo this out to the American people.

Mr. CARTER. I thank my friend.

Now I yield again to my friend from Georgia. He seems like he has something he wants to say.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Of course I appreciate the gentleman's yielding, and once again I appreciate his having the courage, as well as the courage of my colleague from Iowa, Representative STEVE KING, to come to the floor and to talk about issues like this. As I said earlier in my remarks, it's very painful, very hard to do, but it is something that has to be done.

If the CIA, as I said before, if they are lying to someone who is third in line to the President, the Speaker of the House, and there's a pattern of that lying, we have got some serious problems. And it would seem to me that something of this magnitude would rise to the level of an Iran Contra issue or, indeed, a Watergate issue where you absolutely have to know who's lying, who knew what and when and who's telling the truth and who is not telling the truth. And we all know the consequences of those actions.

Again, I'm not suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that our Speaker, the Speaker, has lied. In my earlier remarks this evening, I misstated something. I said John Podesta. John Podesta is not the Director of the CIA. That's Leon Panetta. So we all have senior moments. I'm maybe a little older than the Speaker. I certainly look older. She's a very attractive Speaker, as we all know. But she could have had a senior moment in regard to this.

And, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, don't you know that after this happened and she said that, don't you know that there was a meeting of the powers that be with the Speaker and with the CIA, with the Director of the CIA, and information was presented which would have shown that she either misspoke or didn't misspeak. And if she misspoke, how simple, Mr. Speaker, how simple it would have been to just say, ladies and gentlemen, not of the Congress, not of the House of Representatives, but more importantly ladies and gentlemen of the country, I was wrong about that. I didn't deliberately lie. I was just wrong about that. I didn't remember. I didn't remember that briefing. Or the opposite, that the CIA was wrong and didn't inform. And that puts the issue to rest.

Mr. Speaker, that's all our minority leader, the gentleman from Ohio, JOHN BOEHNER, the respected leader of the Republican House conference, that's all he said that should be done. Let's get to the bottom of this thing, put it to rest, and tell the truth. The truth will always serve you well, and the truth is not painful.

Mr. CARTER. Reclaiming my time, I don't want to keep belaboring this issue, but I think somebody ought to be thinking about it before they light the first firecracker on the 4th of July, that we have a country that has basically said as far as they are concerned they're back at war with us, telling us they're going to fire a missile at one of

our 50 States and they're going to do it on the 4th of July.

Now, let's assume that we are going to get some intelligence on that. Let's start off with them saying it doesn't carry a warhead, let it go forward. And then the man that's going to have to make the decision is going to be the President of the United States. This is not a decision you do by committee. That's why we have an executive branch. He will collect that data, and then the question is do we shoot it down. We're pretty sure it doesn't carry a nuclear missile. But somewhere in the back of his mind he says, wait a minute. Wait a minute. They lied to NANCY PELOSI. How do I know they haven't done their work and they're telling me this to feel good about it? Maybe there is a missile on board. Or he thinks, I don't know what to do because I don't know whether I can trust my intelligence.

But he knows that the firing of our missile, which, by the way, according to my friend TRENT FRANKS, we have got missiles that can take this thing down. So let's assume we execute one of those and we bring it down. And the North Koreans say, that's it, act of war, and here they come swarming across the 38th parallel into South Korea and they are marching that 80 miles to Seoul. And we get accused of starting a war. Or worst case scenario say, well, we can't trust the intelligence, don't shoot it down, and it hits the big island of Hawaii and goes boom. And now we're in it, and it's nuclear or maybe less than nuclear. Who knows. The point of this conversation is intelligence matters.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. If the gentleman would yield.

Mr. CARTER. I yield.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I thank the gentleman.

We were just before the Rules Committee, Mr. Speaker, submitting an amendment to the Defense Authorization Act of 2010, our National Defense Authorization Act, something like \$525 billion. But \$1.2 billion, as the gentleman from Texas was alluding to, was cut from the missile defense program. It was cut from the missile defense program at a time when Kim Jong Il is firing missiles and testing nuclear weapons, violating the nuclear test ban treaty. And our intelligence is telling us, as the gentleman from Texas just said, that these ballistic missiles that they're testing could reach Hawaii. Well, we are getting that information, Mr. Speaker, not necessarily from the CIA but from all of our intelligence agencies. Heck, there are 16 of them, and most of them are within the Department of Defense. The Defense Intelligence Agency is an example.

And, of course, we have a National Intelligence Director, which was insisted upon by the 9/11 Commission and the families of the victims. So, you know, it seems now to me, Mr. Speaker, that we are kind of getting a little

loosey-goosey about all this stuff and thinking gosh, you know, the Speaker of the House said that the CIA lies. You can't trust them. So maybe that's why we are so ready to cut missile defense. We don't believe the intelligence.

Mr. CARTER. All the time she says they lie. All the time. It's not just this instance. Her statement was they lie to us all the time.

Mr. KING.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

You've raised a scenario here that disturbs me a great deal about what happens to the indecision when you don't trust your intelligence community because of an allegation that's made by the person that's third in line from the President of the United States. This isn't somebody sitting on a street corner somewhere. This is the person third in line to the President of the United States. The indecision that could come because of the doubt that's been planted, and every day that goes by there's no doubt because it's not resolved.

Let me submit another way that this hurts America's security beyond this point that you made, Judge, about the indecision that could allow a missile to land and hit the United States or to do an early strike, because we don't really know. But here's another scenario.

□ 2130

This cloud has been cast over the intelligence community, and it echoes over the top of our entire defense network that's there. There are people in this Capitol that work to please the Speaker, and many of them are staff.

And these are staff that are on committee. They are the Speaker's staff. They are in a position to write these bills in the middle of the night that get dropped on us about the time that the rooster crows in the morning. And then we are to figure out what's in them and what's not in them on a closed rule or a modified closed rule, and the Rules Committee deciding the debate now is in the Rules Committee.

And so we don't even get any debate here on the floor on the \$1.2 billion, an opportunity to put people on the record—we may not, I think we probably will not, at least get that vote, but to put people on record and find out what this Congress thinks the collective wisdom of the American people is to be reflected here. And we can see the funding for the defense intelligence all the way across the board systematically and summarily undermined and reduced by staff people who are protected because we can't even offer the amendments here on floor, who are seeking to please the Speaker because she has made a comment into the record.

And how do you fix that lack of trust? It undermines the resources, I believe, going into the intelligence community that's there, and it causes others to look more critically upon the

intelligence group all together with the CIA and others, which undermines the support of the public, undermines the support of Congress and undermines the resources that they will have to use.

And if we have people whose lives are out there on the line every day, and we do, they have got to be questioning themselves as to why do they do this. Do they really want to put themselves up for this kind of scrutiny, this kind of allegation. And if I were Leon Panetta, and if I was seeking to send somebody up here to brief the Speaker, I don't think you would ask for volunteers, because I don't think you would get any.

I think that has to be a direct order from the CIA. If you like your job, brief the Speaker. You might have it when you are done.

Mr. CARTER. As much as we don't want to get off process, so everybody is clear, let's put it this way: If you are listening to what we are talking about here today and you would like for us to have this addressed by the Members of the House, it takes the ability under the rules to raise the issue. And if we have what they call a closed rule or a modified closed rule, where only certain agreed-to amendments to a bill can come forward, we hate to talk about process, but that's how we are prevented from asking the questions that I would hope that many of the people that might be watching this would say somebody ought to ask the whole House about this.

Do we need that missile defense Mr. GINGREY mentioned? I kind of think we do. I would like my Member of Congress to do something about that. Maybe they might even go to the trouble to write their Member of Congress and say I would like to see you vote on this, vote in favor of it. But how are they going to see it if we are closed off from even offering it on this beloved floor, which is, of course, this sacred people's House. And that's why we think the rules ought to be open.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Just briefly, that is exactly right, that people in these 435 congressional districts, Republican or Democrat, they need to know how their Member would vote on an issue such as that, something that important to this country in this time, they need an opportunity to hear that debate on this floor. You know, up or down, they need to know how their Member votes, and the point made by the gentleman from Texas is absolutely on target, and I just wanted to emphasize that.

Mr. CARTER. I think most everybody understands that these bills that come before this Congress have sometimes a thousand, well you saw the one JOHN BOEHNER dropped on the floor—it's about that thick.

I mean, they have got thousands of pages of things in them. So how you vote on a bill doesn't necessarily tell you what's in the weeds, like a couple of million dollars for missile defense, a

couple billion dollars for missile defense. It doesn't tell you that. And if it's not discussed, you don't know and there is not any way we can tell you.

That's why the openness of this House is so important, why an open rule is so important.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Texas, and I think I am watching the clock tick down here, and I will just conclude in a couple of minutes.

But as I said, I just came from the Rules Committee. And there is really not room in there for a tripod and a camera and not really room for the press to operate the way they need to, and there is not room there for staff to come and make sure they are there to run the errands we need.

I know the gentleman from Georgia knows this very well. He served on the Rules Committee. It occurs to me that if the debate is where the rules will take place in this Congress, let's move the Rules Committee down to the floor of the House of Representatives. And let's elect the members of the Rules Committee from the full House and let's make sure they are equally represented between Republicans and Democrats and put the C-SPAN cameras on them and have an opportunity to have a full-throated debate on every amendment that would be offered to the Rules Committee as if this were actually the full House.

Because they are functioning, with the function of the House of Representatives in the Rules Committee, we have got to turn the sunlight on what's going on up there. Either that, or we are going to have to go back to the open rule process that has been the long-standing tradition here in the United States Congress. This is unprecedented to see the systematic destruction of deliberative democracy taking place up there on the third floor out of sight of the public eye.

Mr. CARTER. Well, we have raised a lot of issues, we have talked about a lot of things. I think we expressed our personal concern about this issue of the veracity of our CIA and whether or not they have been lying to the Congress and to the Speaker of the House, the third most powerful person and the most important person in line for the presidency.

These are issues, as the ethics issues we have raised previously, issues that have places they could be resolved, either in the leadership of this House or the Ethics Committee, they need to be resolved, Madam Speaker. We need these issues resolved, and I would finalize this argument by saying, especially this intelligence issue, before the world blows up in our face.

I want to thank our colleagues for being here with us and for helping me with this today. And I really value their opinions, and I appreciate them expressing it.

Now, we will yield back the balance of our time, Mr. Speaker.

## HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAFFEI). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, it's a great honor to be here tonight. The freshmen members like to take a little bit of time and come to the floor and talk about issues that we find are of great concern both to our country and back home in our district. And so tonight I am going be joined by a couple of my freshmen colleagues and we want to devote our time to talk about the issue of health care. Given the late hour, we may not see as many of our colleagues as we would at other hours of the day, but we know this is an important issue any hour of the day, and I am very happy to be here and to have this opportunity to talk a little bit about it.

This is certainly an important time about the—for the issue of universal access to health care and expanding the access to health care. I don't know about other Members, but I would think it's a universal feeling out there that this is the number one issue for so many Americans.

I started campaigning a long time ago. I got sworn into office last January. And I can say, during the entire time I was campaigning and since I have been elected to office, for so many people, this is their number one issue.

I hear this from individuals who don't have health care coverage, people who have insurance and don't find that their company is there when they need it. I hear it from big business owners who are challenged by the cost of health care, from small business owners who don't know if they can continue to cover their employees.

It is a universal issue. I hear it from providers, from doctors and nurses and others who say, You know, when I signed up to take care of people, to make sure that their health care needs were going to be met, I didn't expect a system that would fall apart in the way that it has. This is, as I say, a universal issue. People say to me, Health care ought to be a basic right. It is extremely important that this Congress does something about the issue of health care, and we want to see you do something.

The good news is that this Congress is working very hard on putting together legislation. The President budgeted \$634 billion for health care reform in the budget that we have already passed, and the Speaker of the House is committed to passing a bill by the end of July. The President has asked us for a bill on his desk this fall.

The discussion draft was released in the House just this Friday, and I, personally, can say that I am happy to see a lot of the good things that are included in there, a public plan option, better insurance regulation, insurance companies won't be able to cut people

out who have preexisting conditions, reasonable amount of cost-sharing and emphasis on prevention and wellness, investments in Medicare and Medicaid, many of the things that we have been talking about and that I hear about all the time from constituents in my district are in this bill.

More than anything else, people say to me you need to pass universal access to health care. You need to do something now. And I feel like we are right here in the middle of this, and we are moving forward on this.

In my own district, like many other of my freshmen colleagues, every chance I get during the break, on weekends, we have been meeting with groups of individuals. And as I said, this spans from constituents who I meet in the grocery store, who tell me about their individual challenges, to doctors, nurses, providers, nontraditional providers, to chambers of commerce. And, once again, what I hear is they all want change, and they want things to move forward.

I had the good fortune of being a State legislator in the past, and this was, back when I first ran for office in 1992 as a State legislator, again, one of our number one issues. And it's amazing to me now, 17 years since then, it hasn't gone away, in spite of the many things we attempted to do in my home State, the State of Maine, to take on the pricing of prescription drugs to attempt to expand access to more individuals in our State. On each and every one of those we made progress but we haven't gone far enough.

And when I hear from my colleagues, my former colleagues in the State legislature, my daughter, who is the Speaker of the House—and as you can imagine, I am very proud of her—the one thing they say to me is, You have got to do something about this. We have tried as hard as we can in our home State, but we can't go it alone. States across the country are feeling the exact same challenge, but they want now to have us at the congressional level to do something about this.

Now there are many things that we could talk about tonight. We even have a few charts and graphs, but let me just get started by recognizing my good friend and colleague, Mr. BOCCIERI from Ohio. I know he is hearing about this quite a bit in his home district, and it would be great if you could just talk a little bit about some issues and concerns and then we can keep going on this topic.

Mr. BOCCIERI. I thank the gentlelady from Maine not only for her extraordinary work on the House floor here but also on the Rules Committee. We appreciate your efforts to help move the country forward. There is no question, perhaps, the biggest issue that we will address in our freshmen tenure and perhaps for the time that we serve here in the United States Congress is health care. And there is perhaps arguably no more important issue that we could tackle as a Nation than

to get our health care costs under control.

And I know the gentlelady from Maine is hearing what I am hearing back in my district, and that is that people, working families in our district, are one accident, one medical emergency, one diagnosis away from complete bankruptcy. And, in fact, in 2007, 60 percent of all bankruptcies were due to medical costs, some accident that a family had sustained or some unsustainable costs that had arisen because they had contracted a disease or some sort of cancer. And we need to do our part here in Congress to make sure that we are working on this issue and getting these costs under control.

They predict right now that 16 percent of our gross national product is for paying health care. And that in a few decades that cost could grow as high as half of our gross national product. That is absolutely unsustainable for our future.

And we have an obligation to make sure that our country can be competitive, that we can have a workforce that is not only well educated and trained but has access to the basic fundamentals of prevention and healthy lifestyles and access to seeing the doctor that they choose.

And when I speak to my constituents back in Ohio, in northeast Ohio, I talk about the five Ps of health care, the five Ps, the fact that we need to cover all people. Now, when we talk about covering all people, we need to understand that by not doing so it's actually costing all of us paying into the system more money. Those 46 million uninsured or underinsured people who can't seek access to their doctor because their health care effectively ended when they got their pink slip at the job, because they can't afford a COBRA payment, they are uninsured or underinsured.

And when they use the hospital emergency room as their primary care physician, they are costing all of us paying into the system four if not five times more by using the hospital room, the emergency room as their primary care physician. We need to cover all people.

And to those Americans who might be listening tonight, we need to understand that the American taxpayer right now is paying to make sure that every man, woman and child in Iraq has access to universal health care coverage. Now, it's inconsistent that we would pay for Iraqis to see the doctor they want to but yet not Americans.

The second P is that we have portability, that our workers, when they get that pink slip, God forbid, that they can take their health care from job to job to job. Portability, covering all people.

The third P that we have in our five Ps is making sure that we provide incentives for prevention, because prevention should be tied into all of this