

media have blindly accepted this false charge despite facts to the contrary. President Obama did not inherit the current budget which spends too much, taxes too much, and borrows too much. But he did vote for last year's budget as Senator. President Obama didn't inherit the \$787 billion so-called "stimulus package," he authored it. President Obama didn't inherit out-of-control government spending. He has presided over it.

At some point the national media needs to hold the current administration accountable for its own spending and the ballooning deficit which will increase inflation and slow economic growth.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

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

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

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

AMERICA'S TREASURY IS BARE

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

Mr. PAUL. Madam Speaker, today we passed the supplemental bill. And I'm deeply disappointed about that. I was disappointed also that I wasn't able to get any time to enter into the debate because the time was rather limited and it was a closed rule. But I did want to make a couple of comments and the concerns that I have had about this supplemental.

When the President sent the supplemental over, it was \$84.9 billion. And there were some of us that were hoping that we wouldn't be funding the war through supplementals, but it looks like that hasn't changed, the process would continue, even though there were some that believed there would be a change in the way we funded these wars. When that bill came to the House, there was a lot of expression about concern about spending too much money. But by the time it got to the floor, it was \$96.7 billion. And things were added, for instance, \$2 billion for the flu epidemic that didn't occur, but still, we are going to spend \$2 billion trying to figure out whether we are ever going to have an epidemic.

It was very disappointing that even though it was a closed rule, the minority had one chance to do something about it and maybe reduce some of the spending. But lo and behold, when that amendment was offered, it was offered to increase the spending by \$2.9 billion. There was a lot of expression of the outcry about this spending and the deficits we have and the deficits exploding and the Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid underfunded, and we are in the midst of a crisis. But it doesn't seem to bother anybody about spending. But the truth is, the Treasury is bare. The Treasury is empty. And yet we continue to spend all this money.

So where do they think they are going to get this money? Well, we can't tax the people any more. The people are broke. And yet still we resort to more borrowing and more printing of money which will not last forever. It will eventually come to an end. And I think that is what we are witnessing.

This process bothers me a whole lot that we come to the floor with the supplementals. We rush them through. We talk about this excessive spending. And lo and behold, when we finally vote, we get a total of 60 people who would say, Enough is enough. And besides, what are we doing? Where are we spending this money? I thought we were supposed to, with this change in administration, that we would be fighting less wars. But no. The war in Iraq continues. We expand the war in Afghanistan. We spread the war into Pakistan. And we always have on the table the potential danger of Iran.

So when will it ever end? We can't even define the enemy. Who exactly is the enemy over there? Is it the al Qaeda? The Taliban? Is it the Government of Pakistan? If you can't define the enemy, how do you know when the war is over? If we are in war, which we are, how can this be anything other than war? When was this war declared? Oh, well, we got this authority 5 or 10 years ago. Who knows when? Perpetual war. This is what we are involved with. Perpetual spending. And then we say, well, we have to do that to be safe. That is what is preposterous. It is the very policy that makes us unsafe. We pursue this policy, and the more we do, the less safe we are. There is a big argument now about whether we are safer now with the new administration or is it making us less safe?

The truth is the policies of the last 10, 15, 20 years have made us less safe. And as long as we occupy countries, as long as we kill other people and civilians are being killed, we are going to build enemies. And as long as we are known throughout the world that we torture people, we will incite people to hate us and want to come here to kill us. So we aren't more safe. We are less safe by this foreign policy. And some day we have to wise up, change our ways and not be the policeman of the world, not to pretend that we can be the nation builder of the world, swear off and make sure we don't torture, be-

cause you don't get worthwhile information from torture. All it does is incite people against us. And the occupations can never be of any benefit to us.

What about the financial calamity that is coming? I'm afraid this is the way this will end, through another financial crisis much bigger than the one we currently have, because you can't create \$2 trillion of new money every year and expect this system to continue.

The Soviet system collapsed because they couldn't afford it. Their economic system was a total failure. We did not have to fight the Soviets. Even though they were a nuclear power, they collapsed and disintegrated. And that is what we have to be concerned about, because we cannot continue to finance this system and pursue a policy which endangers us.

So if we care about the American people and care about our liberties and care about our Constitution, we ought to look seriously at our foreign policy and not continue to pursue the supplemental appropriations where we continue to spend money that we don't have.

H.R. 1924, TRIBAL LAW AND ORDER ACT OF 2009

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Dakota (Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to discuss H.R. 1924, the Tribal Law and Order Act of 2009. I was proud to reintroduce this legislation designed to address the serious deficiencies and systemic flaws within the Federal agencies charged with providing law enforcement and justice programs in Indian country.

As the at-large Member of Congress for South Dakota, I am proud to represent nine sovereign Native nations. The Federal Government has a unique relationship with the 562 federally recognized tribes. This government-to-government relationship is established in the U.S. Constitution, recognized through hundreds of treaties, and reaffirmed through executive orders, judicial decisions and congressional action.

Law enforcement is one of the Federal Government's responsibilities to federally recognized tribes. Yet on many counts, we are failing to meet that obligation. In April, Oglala Sioux Tribe president, Theresa Two Bulls, testified at the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies' oversight hearing on law enforcement issues in Indian country. President Two Bulls discussed the law enforcement crisis on the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation in southwestern South Dakota. She explained how large, land-based reservations struggle to maintain the level of officers needed to protect tribal members.

President Two Bulls illustrated the seriousness of the public safety crisis by telling the committee of one case. A young woman living on the reservation received a restraining order against an ex-boyfriend who battered her. One night she was home alone and woke up as he attempted the break into her home with a crowbar. She immediately called the police, but due to the lack of land lines for telephones and the spotty cell phone coverage, the call was cut off three times before she reported her situation to the dispatcher. However, the nearest officer was 40 miles away. Even though the young police officer who took the call started driving to her home at 80 miles per hour, by the time he arrived, the woman was severely bloodied and beaten. The perpetrator was nowhere in sight.

All Americans should be outraged by this grossly inadequate law enforcement infrastructure which is clearly ill-equipped to deter, prevent or prosecute crimes and criminals. For families who take a basic sense of safety and security for granted, these stories should serve as a wake-up call.

And it is not an isolated incident. As I meet with tribal leaders throughout South Dakota and Indian country, I know that these tragic stories are not unique to the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation. Amnesty International has reported that violence against Native women is particularly widespread. American Indian and Alaska Native women are more than 2½ times more likely to be raped or sexually assaulted than women in the United States in general. Yet the majority of these crimes go unpunished.

While addressing the lawless conditions in Indian country will require significant changes in the way that the Federal Government works with tribes, as well as a meaningful influx of resources into reservations in most need, H.R. 1924, the Tribal Law and Order Act, is an important step to addressing the complex and broken system of law and order in Indian country. This bill would establish accountability measures for the Department of the Interior and the Department of Justice with regard to tribal law enforcement. This bill also seeks to increase local control to tribal law enforcement agencies and to authorize additional resources for tribes to address the safety and security needs of their communities.

Specifically, this bill would clarify the responsibilities of Federal, State, tribal and local governments with respect to crimes committed in tribal communities. It would increase coordination and communication among Federal, State, tribal and local law enforcement agencies. It would empower tribal governments with the authority, resources and information necessary to effectively provide for the public safety in tribal communities. It would reduce the prevalence of violent crime in tribal communities and combat violence against Indian and Alaska Native women. It would address and prevent

drug trafficking and reduce rates of alcohol and drug addiction in Indian country and increase and standardize the collection of criminal data and sharing of criminal history information among Federal, State, and tribal officials responsible for responding to and investigating crimes in tribal communities.

Native American families, like all families, deserve a basic sense of safety and security in their communities. The Tribal Law and Order Act is an important step toward meeting the Federal Government's responsibility to Native communities. And I urge my colleagues to join me in moving this important legislation forward.

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 CAP-AND-TAX BILL

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, it looks like the Energy and Commerce Committee is moving forward in addressing and moving on the cap-and-tax bill. And I'm coming to the floor to just talk about the real-world implications of what this bill might do. The basic premise is this: carbon fuels are bad, whether that is coal or whether that is petroleum crude oil. And because it is bad, we are going to have to monetize it, which means put additional cost on that to decrease people's use of that fuel.

There are problems with that premise. We went through the last Clean Air Act amendments in 1990 in the State of Illinois. In the Midwest particularly there were a great deal of problems. This is a picture of miners from the Peabody No. 10 mine in Kincaid, Illinois. They were part of the 14,000 United Mine Workers that lost their jobs in the last Clean Air Act amendments. At this one mine location, over 1,200 miners lost their jobs, and that has caused a devastating effect in southern Illinois.

Now, Illinois wasn't the only State affected. I always like to highlight the State of Ohio. The State of Ohio lost 35,000 mine worker jobs in the last Clean Air Act amendments—35,000 people. And that is not just individuals. That means that affects their families, the small rural communities in which they reside, the tax base for the school districts, the spin-off effects of folks having good-paying jobs averaging from 50 to \$70,000 a year with benefits, gone.

□ 1700

This is an editorial in the Wall Street Journal yesterday. They used this pic-

ture. Again, a picture paints a thousand words. We know that the economy is struggling today. So this identifies "Ship USS Recovery" with Uncle Sam. You would think that Uncle Sam would want to help lift this economy up by throwing a lifesaver to the people who need it and create jobs. Well, Uncle Sam is doing it, but he's showing an anvil which is listed as a big tax to the drowning citizens. Now, we all may chuckle with this, but that is exactly what the cap-and-tax, cap-and-trade bill will do.

And you don't have to take my word for it. Take the word of someone highly respected, the dean of the House, Chairman Emeritus JOHN DINGELL, who said this in a committee hearing just 2 weeks ago, "Nobody in this country realizes that cap-and-trade is a tax, and it's a great big one."

If you don't want to take his word for it, take the word of now President Barack Obama, who was quoted as saying, "Under my plan of the cap-and-trade system, electricity rates would necessarily skyrocket. That will cost money. They will pass that money on to consumers."

Now, that's real money to real citizens, citizens like these folks right now who are drowning in the inability to either make their own payments or for the manufacturing sector of our society to compete today.

What we fear, if the Democrats are successful, is that we have a hard time competing in the manufacturing sector around the world. We usually are able to compete because of low-cost power and a very efficient manufacturing sector. We can't compete on wages. We can't compete on environmental restrictions of sovereign nations. So if we take another variable off the table of how we can compete, what will happen is this: We will drive more manufacturing companies offshore to countries that aren't going to comply with monetizing carbon. Who are these countries? China, India, who have stated over and over again they don't care what the United States is going to do, they are going to continue to build, in the case of China, one new coal-fired power plant every 10 days. What we could do is we could go all the way down to zero and the world's carbon dioxide emissions are going to increase.

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

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

COST OF THE WAR IN AFGHANISTAN

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