

kids' events over the course of their careers, dedicating their lives to this company.

□ 1715

They are now finding themselves in a very difficult position as we go through this restructuring to where many of them have taken a buyout and were promised a supplemental to get them to Social Security, and now through the restructuring they may not only lose their pensions, but they are also going to lose their supplemental. They are also losing their health care. And this is a group of people that contributed to this company, contributed to this country, for many, many years, and deserve to be heard.

Our community that has suffered all of these blows can only stand so much. And here are another 15,000 salaried workers across the country, but probably about 1,000 in our community, that have done the right thing, have paid their taxes, paid their property taxes to fund the schools and the libraries, supported the communities, did the right thing, and now are being extremely hurt by the situation.

So I, along with many others in the Ohio delegation, Senator BROWN and others, Representative BOCCIERI and Representative CHARLIE WILSON, MARCIA FUDGE, a lot of others, have been spending time trying to raise awareness and push the auto task force to consider these 15,000 people across this great country who have contributed in such a significant way to the auto industry, and we want to make sure that the auto task force recognizes that as these decisions are being made, some already are made, that they are made fairly and equitably; that these people who have served the company as significantly as others get the same kind of recognition, the same kind of support, and they are not asked to bear the brunt of the whole burden.

As the new GM tries to reinvent itself and get back up on its feet, it is important that they don't lose, and I think it is important for the auto task force to recognize this, Mr. Speaker, that they don't lose a core constituency of General Motors consumers. Former employees who have been loyal to the company, 15,000 of them, should not only be considered, but it is a basic tactic for marketing purposes. These are people who want to be loyal to General Motors, who want to be supportive of General Motors, and feel like they are being forced to bear a major brunt of this.

Again, I rise today because I have lived and worked here, and these are people who have coached me growing up and been involved in all of our lives and are such a critical component to our community. Many times I have risen on this House floor to talk about the workers and the unions and how the Amwells and the Youngstown Steel Doors and the UAW workers and the steelworkers have been hurt, but workers are workers, and these people de-

serve to be heard just as much as anyone else.

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 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 Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

TOUGH LOVE FOR CALIFORNIA

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, the Governor of my home State of California has called for the Federal Government to underwrite as much as \$15 billion of revenue anticipation notes that the State has to issue to avoid bankruptcy. I think that would be a colossal mistake. Such an act would not only put at risk billions of dollars that our country cannot afford, it would actually make California's fiscal condition worse.

Today, California faces a paradox. Despite record levels of spending and record levels of borrowing, it can no longer produce a decent road system or educate its kids or lock up its prisoners. Those who blame the recession for California's budget crisis profoundly misunderstand the nature of that crisis.

Even before California's revenue began to shrink, the State government was running a chronic \$10 billion deficit and piling up unprecedented debt. The recession was merely the catalyst. The underlying cause is rampant mismanagement of the State's resources.

California spends about \$43,000 to house a prisoner per year, while many States spend just half of that. California spends over \$11,000 per pupil, but only a fraction of that ever reaches the classroom. California has one of the most expensive welfare systems in the country, and yet one of the worst records in moving people off of welfare.

That has never seemed to bother California's legislature or its Governor. They are like the shopkeeper who leased out too much space, ordered too much inventory, hired too many people and paid them too much. Every mo-

ment that shopkeeper covers his shortfalls with borrowing and bookkeeping tricks.

Ultimately he is going to reach a tipping point, where anything he does makes the situation worse. Borrowing costs are eating him alive and he is running out of credit. Raising prices causes his sales to decline and there is only so much discretionary spending that he can cut.

That is California's predicament in a nutshell. California's borrowing costs now exceed the budget of the entire University of California, and the reason for their loan guarantees is their credit is exhausted. They have just imposed the biggest tax increase by any State in American history, and it has actually reduced their revenues and made the budget gap wider.

Although there are many obsolete, duplicative or low-priority programs and expenditures that the State can and should abolish, there aren't enough of them to come anywhere close to closing California's deficit without directly impacting basic services.

Sadly, California has reached the terminal stage of a bureaucratic state, where government has become so large and so tangled that it can no longer perform even basic functions, a warning to all of us here in this House, I might add. Simply stated, there is now no substitute for a fundamental restructuring of the State's major service delivery systems and restoring the efficiencies that once produced a far higher level of service at far lower costs than what we see today.

Now, restoring that efficiency is going to require the Governor and the legislature to wrest control from the public employee unions, to dismantle the enormous bureaucracies that have grown up over the service delivery system, and to decentralize administration and decisionmaking, to contract out services that the private sector can provide more efficiently, to rescind the recent tax increases that are actually costing the State money, and to roll back the regulatory obstacles to productive enterprise.

These are the changes that cannot be implemented overnight and that will not begin to produce results for some time, and that brings us to the fine point of the matter. What Churchill called history's "chilling words" are about to be pronounced on California's failed leadership: Too late.

The Federal loan guarantee or bailout may be the only way to buy time for the restructuring of California's bureaucracies to take effect, but the discussion remains academic until and unless the State actually adopts the replacement structures, actually unburdens its shrinking productive sector and presents a credible plan to redeem the State's crushing debt and looming obligations. Without these actions, Federal intervention will only make California's problems worse by postponing reform, continuing unsustainable spending and piling up

still more debt that the State cannot redeem.

In short, if California won't help itself, the Federal Government cannot and it should not and it must not.

OUR WONDERFUL HISTORY WITH PAKISTAN

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, let me acknowledge the very hard work that was accomplished by the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, Chairman BERMAN and Subcommittee Chairman ACKERMAN, and say that we did the right thing today. By passing the Pakistan Enduring Assistance and Cooperation Enhancement Act, the American people have made a few more steps toward their own personal security, their own ensuring of the security of the homeland, and recognizing a long-standing relationship that has had, frankly, its hills and valleys.

Many of us don't know the history of other countries, and obviously we have our own wonderful history. But, interestingly enough, when Pakistan was founded by a person named Muhammad Ali Jinnah, it was founded on democratic principles, and we have had a longstanding 50-plus year relationship, although it has been uneven.

So today we have restored that relationship, and I hope Pakistani Americans and their own Embassy that is here representing Pakistan really realizes that we made a strong statement today for the respect and for the relationship of this nation.

We have in essence put together a document that would enhance significantly economic, social and democratic assistance for Pakistan. We have recognized the importance of public diplomacy and engagement. That is a reinvestment, a reordering of the relationship.

We have also recognized the importance of a regional process or coordination between Afghanistan, India and Bangladesh, recognizing that this area, South Asia, is an important part of our security and their security. We must recognize that the people of Pakistan love democracy. And, yes, what we have seen over the last couple of days really has given us pause.

Well, I want you to know that the Pakistan military under their Secretary of the army is doing something they don't usually do. Their structure has been that they have been monitoring or, if you will, watching the border. That has been their task. For the first time, they have accepted the responsibility of internally ridding their country of the terrorists, the ones who have taken over the Swat, who have undermined them, people whose faith may have drawn them to a particular situation where they thought the government wasn't functioning, so they al-

lowed the Taliban and insurgents to take over.

And this is what we have, frankly, the devastation of 2.5 million people who are now moving from one place to the next. But the army is fighting the terrorists. And do you know what is more important? The people are standing up against the terrorists.

The legislation we have today will provide an investment through a prosperity fund. It will have certain criteria for Federal funding, for taxpayers' dollars to go to Pakistan. They must ensure that their nuclear materials are protected. They must make sure that they are fighting radicalism. And we can stop this kind of human devastation.

We know the international help that came to us during Hurricane Katrina. We know what we did with the tsunami. This is a terrorist tsunami. And I want to say that the Government, whether we agree or disagree with its strength, I believe they love democracy. These conditionalities that may be opposed will work their way through Congress. But if we didn't act today, we would continue to have the burials of so many people that are going on in this country, the kind of massive bombing that the terrorists think they can do to intimidate the people of Pakistan.

So, as a co-Chair of the Pakistan Caucus, I am grateful that we made a first step. I want the American people to know that your neighbors are Pakistani Americans. They are doctors, they are entrepreneurs, they are retailers. They love this country, and they want to help their country as well. I am glad we made this first step.

Let me move quickly to a domestic issue and put an explanation point on what we did right for Pakistan and say that I stand here today and support a restoration and bailout for automobile dealers. We missed the boat. We have dealerships who have gotten these ugly letters saying that even though you are a pillar of the community, you are in good financial shape, you can sell the cars, you must close.

Mr. Speaker, I stand against it, and I believe that as we move forward, we must have a carve-out for our automobile dealers who in fact can maintain their independence, who can sell cars. Whether or not it is by Fiat or whether or not it is someone else, Chrysler and GM cannot close by caveat, despite the bankruptcy structuring, the reordering, the reorganization under chapter 11. They cannot come and close hardworking automobile dealerships, and we as Americans and Members of Congress cannot forget them.

I will be looking forward to supporting legislation and writing legislation for automobile dealers carve-out and bailout.

RAMMING A DANGEROUS AND CONTROVERSIAL AGENDA THROUGH CONGRESS

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my growing alarm with the Democrat leadership's clear intention to use the conference report on the war supplemental appropriations bill to ram a dangerous and controversial agenda through this Congress.

It is now clear that Senate and House Democrats have decided to let their own political agenda subvert a bipartisan agreement on providing the men and women of our military with the support they need to continue the fight against terrorism in Iraq and Afghanistan.

□ 1730

I proudly supported the House version of this bill when it originally passed this Chamber. However, Democrats are now preparing to use the conference report, which cannot, cannot be amended, to add unrelated, politically motivated poison pills to the measure.

My Democrat colleagues are proposing to add up to \$108 billion for the International Monetary Fund as part of the global bailout for foreign nations. Not only is this a bad idea on its own, I have yet to hear any explanation of how on Earth this will benefit our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan.

In fact, this money will have precisely the opposite effect. Iran, which the State Department has repeatedly certified as "the most active state sponsor of terrorism in the world," would be eligible for these funds. Venezuela's Hugo Chavez, who describes America as "the biggest menace on our planet" and supports narcoterrorists in neighboring nations, he, too, would be eligible for these funds.

The purpose of this bill is to make sure our Armed Forces have the men and material they need to defeat terrorists. That this bill would include funding that could benefit the sponsors of terrorism, it's outrageous.

All of this being said, I'd welcome an honest, open debate and vote in this Chamber on the IMF funding, but my Democrat colleagues apparently would rather not risk a separate up-or-down vote. Therefore, they've resorted to playing games with funding for our troops by shoe-horning this measure in a war spending bill with no opportunity for debate here in the people's House.

And it won't end there. Unbelievably, reports are that Democrats are looking to include language to permit the transfer of terrorists being held in Guantanamo Bay to the United States, and they intend to require the immediate release of photographs of detained terrorists, likely, likely inflaming Islamists across the globe and further endangering our Armed Forces deployed overseas.