

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I have come to this floor repeatedly. In fact, I have come to the floor over 300 times to discuss the human costs of war. Our brave men and women in uniform have given their lives in service to our Nation, and tens of thousands have returned home with physical and mental scars. And it isn't over yet.

The costs in treasure and blood will be felt for generations. The National Priority Project has done a comprehensive review of the costs, and they are actually staggering.

Since 2001, 675 U.S. troops have been killed in Afghanistan and more than 2,600 soldiers have been wounded in action. The trend is not encouraging: The U.S. death toll has escalated each year, from 12 in 2001 to 99 in 2005, 117 in 2004, and 155 in 2008. And it's not over.

The war in Afghanistan has cost taxpayers \$171 billion. With the supplemental that was passed today, we have just added \$77 billion to fund the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan through the year 2009. Obviously, it's not over. An additional \$130 billion will fund both wars anticipated in the 2010 budget.

It appears from today's vote that many here in the House of Representatives haven't learned the lesson from our occupation of Iraq. And according to policy experts, Iraq is going to look like a cakewalk compared to the battles that we will be seeing in Afghanistan.

Let's look at what the occupation of Iraq has actually brought: The occupation of Iraq has cost \$656 billion so far, with another \$52 billion voted on today as part of the fiscal year 2009 war supplemental. At least \$2 trillion in future budgetary costs, including veterans' benefits, will be spent in the very near future. Almost 4,300 U.S. servicemembers have died in Iraq so far. And hundreds of thousands of Iraqi civilians have been maimed and killed.

Madam Speaker, the costs are too great. We don't have a defined mission in Afghanistan. We do not have a development plan. Our endless military presence will only serve to fuel anti-Americanism throughout the region. But it continues to go on.

So what's the cost here at home? As we experience one of the worst economic recessions in our Nation's history, every taxpayer dollar becomes more valuable. Today the majority in the House decided that funding an endless occupation of two countries is more important than education, health care, and renewable energy right here at home.

For my State of California, the war in Afghanistan has already cost us \$21 billion. That means 2.6 million new Head Start places for children that need to go to school. It means 9 million individuals could have been provided with health care, 38.7 million homes could have been provided with renewable electricity.

We make choices every day on the House floor. Today that choice reflects a decision to keep our troops in Iraq

until the end of 2011 and in Afghanistan indefinitely. This vote does not invest in SMART Security. It does not take us into the 21st century, because for every dollar in the supplemental dedicated for smart humanitarian investment, \$8 will be spent on the military. And it keeps going on.

I want to say we either change the way we meet our obligations and have a different way of coming together with nations that we don't agree with or we're going to be in a lot of trouble as human beings.

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.)

TROUBLES IN THE AUTO INDUSTRY ARE NOT JUST A MICHIGAN PROBLEM; TODAY WE SEE THEY ARE AN AMERICAN PROBLEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I represent a district in southeast Michigan. We are a part of the very heart and soul of our domestic auto industry, an industry that has served our country very well. It's built the weapons that America needed in times of war when our freedom itself was at risk. It's provided millions of Americans an opportunity for a good job with good benefits and a secure retirement.

We all understand that the American auto industry has fallen on very, very hard times. Those of us in southeast Michigan understand it well. It's not a new development. We are painfully aware of it. We've dealt with plant closings and thousands of jobs lost. We've dealt with families torn apart, home foreclosures, and communities devastated. And we've endured massive new unfunded Federal mandates placed upon our industry, which have made it very difficult to compete. We've watched as Federal and State incentives have been offered to foreign competitors to come into our home market on equal terms, even though similar access to foreign markets has not been offered to our domestic companies. We've seen this government negligent in not formulating a manufacturing policy that protects vital American interests and good-paying American jobs. And for years we never asked for help.

But when Wall Street melted down last year, our problems were made even worse because 80 percent of the people who are going to buy an automobile require credit and not enough credit was available, and, of course, auto sales have just fallen through the floor. And when the auto companies came to Cap-

itol Hill to ask for similar assistance that's been given to the Wall Street banks, those whose actions made their problems even worse, the auto industry was treated with disdain and their pleas for help were rejected by this Congress, which seemed indifferent to the problem and to the desire to protect American jobs.

This was a Michigan problem we were told, not an American problem. We tried to remind our colleagues of everything that this industry has meant to our great Nation, and again we received indifference and we were told, Just let them go into bankruptcy.

We were told that these companies needed to shed their legacy costs. Well, guess what. Legacy costs have names. They are people. And we're told that this has to be done because these foreign competitors who were given free access to our market do not have such legacy costs. Or imports which are built by low-wage workers overseas do not have these legacy costs. We are told we need to drive American wages down to match Third World competitors in order to compete.

Well, today we see that this is not just a Michigan problem anymore; today it is an American problem. Today Chrysler is in bankruptcy court, exactly what many in this Congress advocated for. And today Chrysler filed a list of 789 dealerships whose franchise agreements it is asking the bankruptcy court to sever. That means the closure of 789 dealerships in communities all across our great Nation.

These businesses represent not just a place to buy a car, but they represent community leaders, the sponsors of the Little League teams or the chairman of the Rotary. In many cases the biggest job provider in the town. The average dealer in this Nation, Madam Speaker, employs over 50 people. So this move means the loss of over 40,000 more jobs. Now 789 communities across this Nation will feel the pain of a contracting domestic auto industry. The pain of a business shutting down, the pain of jobs lost, the pain of families who will be devastated.

And tomorrow that pain will only get worse as General Motors is also set to release a list of dealers it hopes to shed and a list that will be much, much larger than 789 dealers.

Madam Speaker, this list was submitted as a part of that bankruptcy filing, a bankruptcy that many Members were advocating for when they believed it was just a Michigan problem. And now we see Members lamenting the fact that dealerships in their districts are closing. And they fail to realize that if this bankruptcy had happened last December, when they voted against bridge loans for the auto industry, it would have included every Chrysler dealer, because a disorderly bankruptcy would have led to the liquidation of Chrysler. So some Members got what they advocated for, Chrysler in bankruptcy, which today has led to the loss of 40,000 jobs. And tomorrow it will get worse.

It is time to understand that preserving, protecting, and defending our auto industry doesn't just solve a Michigan problem, it solves an American problem, and it defends jobs in every community in our great Nation.

It is a shame, Madam Speaker, that we had to learn this lesson on the backs and the livelihoods of another 40,000 of our fellow Americans.

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

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

□ 1715

EMBRACE MARRIAGE EQUALITY

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

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Today I want to recognize some actions in my home State. Last week Maine became the fifth State in the country to embrace marriage equality.

Same-sex couples live all over our State in loving, committed relationships, raising families and growing old together, yet they have not been afforded the rights and responsibilities that come with marriage. Last week our legislature took a major step towards correcting that injustice.

In the week leading up to the vote, thousands of people filled the Augusta Civic Center to testify on the marriage equality bill. People came from all over our State, men and women, straight and gay, young and old, couples and single people. Many of them waited hours for their turn to speak. When they got to the microphone, the overwhelming majority said it was time for Maine to recognize same-sex marriage.

Maine moved the country one step closer to federally recognizing and protecting the right for two people, regardless of their gender, to be married. Maine has always been an independent State with a forward-looking legislative body and citizens with common sense.

I stand here today to congratulate my home State on the passage of this landmark victory.

The landmark victory didn't come easily or without long debate. Many personal journeys began and ended with this lengthy discussion.

My daughter happens to be the Speaker of the House, and she shared her own personal story, which, with pride, I would like to share a few of her words which reflected our family's feelings. She said, when she got up to testify, "This issue was brought home for me two summers ago when my husband and I were married. Our island pastor was on a trip abroad and unavailable to perform our wedding ceremony. My

husband and I wanted to be married by someone we knew and trusted. We asked a good family friend to perform our wedding; we knew his tone, his presence, and his sense of humor would be perfect. He was honored to do it, and we immediately got to work planning the ceremony. Throughout the preparations for the wedding, he gave us honest and valuable advice about the joys and challenges of a lifetime of commitment to another person. He gave us some of the best advice either of us has ever received about marriage.

"As we drove away from our wedding rehearsal, all of us happy and relieved that everything seemed to be going well, my friend said to me, 'I am honored to perform your wedding. It is going to be great. But it is important to understand that you and Jason have the right to do something very special, and it's a right that I don't have. The friend that married us is a gay man who has been living in a committed and loving relationship with the same man for more than 30 years.

"I was struck in that moment that a person whom I respected and trusted, a person as close to me as some of my dearest relatives, a person whose relationship was a model for trust, compassion, longevity, was legally denied a right and status that my husband and I were about to be granted. There is nothing fair about giving some committed couples in Maine the right to the legal responsibilities and privileges of marriage and denying it to others."

That was my daughter, Hannah, the Speaker of the House's story, and one that held great meaning to my family and to so many of us across Maine as we considered the plight of many of our friends in committed relationships who haven't been allowed the right to make it legal.

When the deliberation ended at the public hearing and it was time to vote, many of Maine's State legislators found themselves in new territory. As Governor Baldacci made clear just after signing the marriage equity bill into law, he said, "In the past, I opposed gay marriage while supporting the idea of civil unions. I have come to believe that this is a question of fairness and of equal protection under the law, and that a civil union is not equal to civil marriage."

Madam Speaker, as we in this body consider the future of issues of equality, it is important that we all take a moment to reflect on the history that was made in Augusta, Maine, this month. Eighty-nine State representatives, 21 State senators, and one Governor put themselves on record supporting fairness and equality, and one more State voted to do the right thing.

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.)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(Mr. QUIGLEY 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 Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

HONORING NEUMANN COLLEGE ACHIEVING UNIVERSITY STATUS

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

Mr. SESTAK. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor a remarkable institution of higher education focused on developing graduates, who understand that true reward comes not only through acquiring knowledge, but also the use of that knowledge in the service of others.

In the fall of 1965, the Sisters of St. Francis of Philadelphia opened Our Lady of Angels College, based in both liberal arts and Franciscan traditions, with just 115 female students in Aston, Pennsylvania. In 1980, male students were admitted for the first time and the board of trustees approved changing the college's name to Neumann as a tribute to the significant role former Bishop, and now St. John, Neumann played in the order's early formation.

Forty-four years later, through the tireless efforts of the Sisters of St. Francis of Philadelphia and their many supporters, the Seventh Congressional District of Pennsylvania is home to a new university. On April 30, the Pennsylvania Department of Education recognized more than 2 years of research, planning, applications, and campus