

the founder and administrator of St. Joseph's Hospital in Syracuse, the city's first hospital.

In 1883, Mother Marianne received a letter that would change her life. It was from Father Leonor Fouesnel, a missionary in Hawaii, who was desperately searching for volunteers to take charge of the hospitals that served people with Hansen's disease. More than 50 religious congregations had already declined, but Mother Marianne was different. She eagerly accepted the mission. She wrote back to Father Leonor:

I am hungry for the work and I wish with all my heart to be one of the chosen ones. I am not afraid of any disease.

Mother Marianne left for Hawaii, along with six sisters from Syracuse, in 1883, where she began a 30-year mission caring for those diagnosed with Hansen's disease. Mother Marianne accepted a government plea to start a new home for women and girls with Hansen's disease at the Kalaupapa settlement. Mother Marianne arrived in Kalaupapa just months before Father Damien's death. She oversaw the expansion of health services and programs to provide education and tend to the spiritual needs of the patients.

Mother Marianne lived until the age of 80. On August 9, 1918, she died in Kalaupapa. She was deeply mourned and is still revered. I have visited her grave site, where I left ho-okupu, a traditional Hawaiian offering. I was deeply moved by the devotion of this woman from New York who left all that was familiar to live on an isolated peninsula 5,000 miles from home. Kalaupapa became her home and its people her family.

Mother Marianne recognized the rights and inherent dignity of all people. She dedicated her life to caring for those who needed it the most. People of all faiths can admire her spirit of aloha—encompassing love, compassion, mercy, and grace—and malama—to care for others.

ONE LESS PLACE SETTING AT THE HOLIDAYS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, it's the time of year when families reunite and renew their very close connections—connections that are actually, in most instances, the most precious parts of our lives. This Thanksgiving I know all of us were grateful for the company of those we love the most. But more than 2,000 American families sat at tables where there was one less serving of the Thanksgiving meal just a week ago. Those families lost a loved one in the deadly war in Afghanistan—now more than 11 years long and a tragically reckless policy.

I'm personally grateful for the service of all of our Afghanistan veterans and for their sacrifice and for the sac-

rific of our military families. But sometimes I don't know how we as a Congress and a Nation can look them right straight in the face after everything we've put them through. The benefits of this war don't come close to justifying the devastating human cost—not just fatalities, but disfiguring wounds, lost limbs, traumatic brain injury, and demons of post-traumatic stress. They all add up to tragedy at the utmost.

For too many of our veterans, the transition back to civilian life is a daily struggle. Many face not just health care challenges but joblessness, housing and credit troubles, and overall economic anxiety and stress. We've had enough of this. Why would we want to extend a war that has given so much misery and so much heartache and so few actual national security benefits?

The American people have rendered their verdict on the occupation of Afghanistan. Poll after poll shows they want it over. Who can blame them? In fact, the public opinion was so clear during the last Presidential election that both candidates for President in this year's campaign were saying that they would end the war. But the question, Mr. Speaker, is, When? The current 2014 timetable is not nearly aggressive enough—not when we're losing brave servicemembers every single week, not when our military presence is sustaining the very extremists we're trying to defeat, and not when American taxpayers are paying the bill to the tune of \$10 billion a month, at least.

And now it seems that our policymakers might be planning for a significant military presence in Afghanistan beyond 2014. According to a new New York Times article last weekend, one of the options on the table calls for 10,000 American troops and several thousand more NATO troops to remain on the ground after 2014. Sources say that General John Allen, our top commander in Afghanistan, prefers to keep as many as 60,000 troops for another year. As The Times editorial board points out, this is not the "steady pace" of troop withdrawal that the President has promised.

This is unacceptable. We ought to have a role in Afghanistan, but it cannot and must not be a military role. We need more humanitarian aid, more support for education, health care, democracy promotion, civil society, and so much more. But we will not make America safer and we will not make Afghanistan stronger by continuing this war. The only morally decent and strategically sensible approach is to bring our troops home now—certainly before 2014.

INVESTING IN R&D AND STEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) for 5 minutes.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Today, I would like to empha-

size the important role that Federal investments in research and development, or R&D; and science, technology, engineering, and mathematics, or STEM, education play in stimulating growth, creating new industries and jobs, and delivering long-term benefits to our citizens.

As a member of the House Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and now as ranking member, I have had the privilege of hearing countless witnesses from industry, academia, and government over the past several years testify that investments in R&D are essential to keeping America competitive in a challenging international marketplace. In fact, according to a paper by the National Bureau of Economic Research, changes in technology are the only source of permanent increases in productivity.

If we are to reverse the trend of the last 20 years, where our country's technology edge in the world has diminished, we must make the investments necessary today. The statistics speak for themselves. It is estimated that more than 50 percent of our economic growth since World War II can be attributed to development and adoption of new technologies. The path is simple: research and education lead to innovation. Innovation leads to economic development and good-paying jobs and the revenue to pay for more research.

□ 1050

As private firms underinvest in research and development because the returns are too far off in the future, there is a clear and necessary role of government to help our Nation keep pace with the rest of the world.

More than 50 years ago, when DARPA was first created, no one had any idea that the research that they would fund would be responsible for the creation of the Internet or the proliferation of GPS technology, but it did. Those inventions started with Federal dollars, as did countless other game-changing technologies.

It is clear that Federal investments in R&D bring significant returns for decades to come. In 1987, MIT Professor Robert Solow was awarded the Nobel Prize in Economics for his work proving that improved technology and improved education in the workforce was clearly and chiefly responsible for long-term growth, much more than increases in labor or capital. The current best estimate for the return on academic research alone is 28 percent. Federal efforts are underway now to more vigorously and rigorously quantify the return on Federal investments in R&D.

Today we find ourselves at a crossroads. The United States remains a leader in science, technology, and innovation but no longer the unchallenged leader. While our own world-class innovation infrastructure is under stress, our competitors in other countries, even as they institute austerity measures in other parts of their budgets, are