

Marcus on his 20th anniversary as the pastor of Turner Chapel AME Church in Marietta.

But he did not do that alone. With God's help, God provided him with an extraordinary partner in Ms. Cassandra Young Marcus, who not only is his partner and his wife but is also the assistant pastor at Turner Chapel. What a great story, what a great American story of achievement and attainment, and we are so proud to, in this Congress, celebrate and recognize his 20 years of service.

You know, Madam Speaker, God calls people for various purposes, and God each Sunday calls this individual, Reverend Kenneth E. Marcus, and gives him utterance to speak boldly as he ought to speak about the mysteries of the Gospel. And he does it with boldness and vision and inspiration each Sunday.

And in conclusion, when you talk about greatness, Madam Speaker, and in this measure we are talking about a great man in Reverend Marcus, that greatness is measured by three people that I would like to mention. When the word "greatness" or what it means to be a great person was put to the great philosopher Aristotle, he said in order to be great, you have to, first of all, "know thyself." Well, Reverend Marcus not only knows himself but he knows whose he is as well.

And Marcus Aurelius, the great Roman general, said in order to be great, you need to have discipline. But just a measure of moving a church from 150 parishioners to 6,000 is that.

And then, finally, when the question was put to the great Messiah, Jesus Christ, Jesus said in order to be great and certainly a great minister, you must, first of all, sacrifice yourself. And this is a story of a great man who has sacrificed himself so that the world can be a better place.

It is with great pride that this Congress of the United States commemorates and recognizes Pastor Marcus on his 20th anniversary as the pastor of Turner Chapel AME Church in Marietta, Georgia.

Mr. CANNON. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Yes, I will.

Mr. CANNON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I simply want to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks about our friend TED KENNEDY. I'm going to do a Special Order in a little while about energy. I think he would disagree with most of what I say, but he would do it in an agreeable fashion. He has been a good friend and great legislator. And I want the gentleman to know that, with him, my prayers and the prayers of many others on our side of the aisle go out to the Senator in this time of great difficulty.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Absolutely. And as this indicates, Madam Speaker, Senator KENNEDY is beloved by all of us, both Democrats and Republicans.

RECOGNIZING PIZZA HUT ON ITS 50TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. TIAHRT. "Gather 'round the good stuff." That's what Pizza Hut says in their ads today. But they have been gathering around the good stuff for 50 years.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 50th anniversary of an American success story, Pizza Hut. It has grown from a single brick building in Wichita, Kansas, to more than 11,000 stores worldwide with sales of more than \$1.8 billion in the last fiscal quarter alone.

Founded on May 31, 1958, by Dan and Frank Carney, Wichita, Kansas, natives, Pizza Hut represents the very essence of the American Dream. The Carney brothers borrowed \$600 from their mother, purchased used kitchen equipment, and rented a 550 square foot brick building and began selling pizzas.

The business grew quickly, and in 1959 they opened their first franchise restaurant in Topeka, Kansas. By 1966, just 8 years after opening, Pizza Hut established its first home office in Wichita to oversee the booming business of 145 restaurants.

In the late 1960s, a pizza company from California was beginning to expand eastward, and the Carney brothers were faced with new business challenges. They decided that Pizza Huts would be the neighborhood pizza restaurants, with standard layouts and looks. In 1969 the red roof was instituted as the national standard for Pizza Hut locations. The move paid off, as Pizza Hut became the number one pizza chain in the world, both in term of sales and in the number of restaurants.

Frank Carney attributes the early success of Pizza Hut to the good values and solid work ethic he and his brother learned from helping their father at his neighborhood grocery store. They believed that growth would come through a commitment to quality and an attitude of service from dedicated employees.

The 1970s were a significant time of growth for Pizza Hut. They became a publicly traded corporation in 1970, opened their 1,000th store in Wichita, Kansas, in 1972, and their first international restaurant in Costa Rica that same year. Four years later the 100th international store opened in Australia and the 2,000th Pizza Hut store worldwide. In 1977 they merged with PepsiCo.

Since then Pizza Hut has grown in terms of restaurants and menu options. In 1986 they began offering delivery services. In 2000 Pizza Hut joined with several other restaurant holdings, including KFC and Taco Bell, to become YUM! Brands.

A number of events are planned to celebrate the 50th anniversary of Pizza Huts' founding, culminating in a gala

at the Gaylord Hotel in the DC area here on the evening of May 31. I want to especially commend Bev Jeskie for all her hard work in organizing these events and for making sure that I remained informed of their activities.

Madam Speaker, the idea began 50 years ago in a little hut in Wichita, Kansas. It has been immensely successful. Dan Carney cites the relationships he developed, strengthened with friends, family members, co-workers, and franchisees, as being the most important aspect of Pizza Hut. Madam Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to take a cue from a couple of good Kansans: "Gather 'round the good stuff."

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 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.)

SECURITY OVERREACTION

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, Ian Lustick, a professor of the University of Pennsylvania and research fellow at the Independent Institute in California, wrote an article in *The Hill* newspaper a few days ago which made a great deal of sense. He wrote this:

"Nearly 7 years after September 11, 2001, what accounts for the vast discrepancy between the terrorist threat facing America and the scale of our response? Why, absent any evidence of a serious domestic terror threat, is the war on terror so enormous, so all-encompassing, and still expanding? The fundamental answer is that al Qaeda's most important accomplishment was not to hijack our planes but to hijack our political system. For a multitude of politicians, interest groups, professional associations, corporations, media organizations, universities, local and State governments, and Federal agency officials, the war on terror is now a major profit center, a funding bonanza, and a set of slogans and sound bites to be inserted into budget, project, grant, and contract proposals.

"For the country as a whole, however, it has become a maelstrom of waste and worry that distracts us from more serious problems."

Michael Chertoff, Secretary of Homeland Security, testified before the Senate a few months ago in a way no other Cabinet member probably ever has. He

essentially said we are spending too much on security and should not let an over-exaggerated threat of terrorism "drive us crazy," into bankruptcy, trying to defend against every conceivable threat. He went on to say: "We do have limits and we do have choices to make. We don't want to break the very systems we're trying to protect. We don't want to destroy our way of life trying to save it. We don't want to undercut our economy trying to protect our economy, and we don't want to destroy our civil liberties and our freedoms in order to make ourselves safer."

Secretary Chertoff was exactly right. I believe that most Members of Congress will vote for almost anything if the word "security" is attached to it so that they will not be blamed if something bad happens later. We should do some things to protect against terrorism, but we should not go overboard if we still believe in things like freedom and liberty.

Actually, most security spending is more about money for government contractors and increased funding for government agencies than it is about any serious threat. Just 3 weeks after 9/11, when security requests for money were already pouring in, the Wall Street Journal hit the nail on the head in an editorial:

"We'd like to suggest a new post-September 11 rule for Congress: Any bill with the word 'security' in it should get double the public scrutiny and maybe four times the normal wait lest all kinds of bad legislation become law under the phony guise of fighting terrorism."

□ 1830

The Wall Street Journal was exactly right. Unfortunately, Congress has not followed this good advice. But it is just as relevant today as it was when it first written.

Bruce Fein was a high ranking Justice Department official during the Reagan administration. He says the Federal Government has, "inflated the international terrorism danger in order to aggrandize executive power." This is true, in part. Most agencies and departments do exaggerate the threats or problems they are confronting to get more power. But they primarily do so to keep getting increased appropriations.

Certainly, we need to take realistic steps to fight terrorism. But if we gave the Department of Homeland Security the entire Federal budget, we still could not make everyone totally safe. In a cost benefit analysis, you fairly quickly reach a point in the terrorism threat where more spending is almost totally wasted. People are hundreds of times more likely to be killed in a wreck or die from a heart attack or cancer. We need to spend more on the greatest threats. Also, we need to make sure we do not lose our liberty in a search for an illusive security.

Bruce Fein wrote that if the, "war against international terrorism is not

confronted with corresponding skepticism, the Nation will have crossed the Rubicon into an endless war, a condition that Madison lamented would be the end of freedom."

Madam Speaker, to sum up, a few people are getting rich at the expense of many by claiming that they are trying to increase our security. We don't need to make our already bloated Big Brother government even bigger just because some company or some bureaucrat callously uses the word "security" just to get more money and power.

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

(Mr. WELLER of Illinois 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 (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE ACRE PROGRAM

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

Mr. FLAKE. Madam Speaker, Congress recently approved the farm bill and it's now on its way to a Presidential veto. Any farm bill that increases the size and scope of government, lacks real reform, continues to provide for wasteful agricultural subsidies, and even allows millionaires to continue to receive these subsidies, deserves the veto that it's going to get. It also uses a lot of budget gimmicks to get under the level that would allow it to pass in the first place. So I am glad that the President has decided to veto the bill. We should sustain it.

There's another big reason to sustain a Presidential veto of the farm bill. It's recently come to light, and we only know this because we got the final draft of the bill I believe on the day or just the day before that we voted on it so very few of us were able to actually look through it and to see what was in it. One of the programs in it is called the Average Crop Revenue Election, or ACRE program. This will allow farmers starting in 2009 the option of taking a 20 percent reduction in direct payments and other farm supports in return for a Federal guarantee on their revenue.

Now as we talked about during the debate on the farm bill, farmers can receive direct payments that don't relate to the price of commodities at all. They simply receive payments based on acreage that they had way back when.

These payments total about \$5 billion a year. They should be done away with completely. But they are now seen as an entitlement. We tried and failed to remove those direct payments from the bill. Those are received, as I mentioned, by millionaires. In fact, a couple, a farm couple, husband and wife in farm and nonfarm income, can make as much as \$2.5 million and still receive direct payments in this legislation.

If that wasn't enough, this new ACRE program will allow farmers to actually claim subsidies at a level far higher than they used to under the old bill. Under the farm bill, 2002, which was bloated in itself, once crops dropped below a certain price, then some subsidies would kick in. But apparently those prices were too low for this new bill. And so under this new program, at a far higher threshold, new subsidies will kick in.

The Department of Agriculture estimates that if the price of corn drops, for example, to \$3.25 per bushel, the program, this new ACRE program that is new to this bill would dole out nearly \$10 billion just to corn farmers. If the price of wheat drops to \$4.50 a bushel, wheat farmers would be eligible for \$2.5 million in assistance. Again, this is assistance above and beyond what we have done in the past, or what the bill calls for, anyway.

This is new money that taxpayers are exposed to. This is a lot of exposure. It's indecent exposure for the taxpayers. If soybeans, for example, drop to about \$7 per bushel, that is another \$7 billion in assistance that will be going out to farmers. Now CBO's estimate of this program showed a net savings, but that was largely due to being forced to use outdated projections associated with the 2007 baseline.

The bottom line is we have skyrocketing corn, wheat, soybean prices. When we base a new subsidy program off these high level prices, then we are going to kick in a lot more readily than we would have otherwise, and we are going to be paying out a lot more. The taxpayers will be on the hook for a lot more.

These estimates, I think had they been available, had more people been aware of this new subsidy program, I think we would have had a lot more votes against the farm bill. It provides Members with a good reason, even if they voted for the farm bill last week, to sustain the President's veto and say let's go back to the drawing board. We simply cannot, cannot expose the taxpayers to this much subsidy.

Way back when, part of what is driving corn prices so high, for example, are the ethanol subsidies that we are providing. We have been told for decades these were just to prime the pump. Once we get it started, get this program started, we won't need to subsidize ethanol any more. Yet, here again the bill we passed last week subsidizes ethanol heavily. It also imposes tariffs on imported ethanol.

Now I believe that some people are worried that those ethanol subsidies,