

The Obama administration is stonewalling serious inquiries about sexual filth propagated by a senior presidential appointee who is responsible for promoting and implementing federal education policy. Democrats clearly are terrified of ruffling the feathers of their activist homosexual supporters, who are an influential part of the Democratic party's base. This scandal, however, is not merely about homosexual behavior; it is about promoting sex between children and adults—and it's time for President Obama to make clear that abetting such illegal perversion has no place in his administration.

It is curious why White House officials and Education Secretary Arne Duncan believe it's worth it politically to continue taking arrows for defending Kevin Jennings, who is Mr. Obama's controversial "safe schools czar." The evidence suggesting he is unfit to serve as a senior presidential appointee is startling and plentiful. It was revealed this week that Mr. Jennings was involved in promoting a reading list for children 13 years old or older that made the most explicit sex between children and adults seem normal and acceptable. This brought up anew Mr. Jennings' past controversies, such as his seeming encouragement of sex between one of his high school students and a much older man as well as his praise for Harry Hay, a notorious supporter of the North American Man Boy Love Association.

But there is more. There are shocking new revelations this week of tape recordings from a youth conference involving 14-year-old students. The conference, billed as a forum to encourage tolerance of homosexuality, was sponsored by Mr. Jennings' organization and was held at Tufts University in March 2000. Mr. Jennings was executive director of the Gay, Lesbian and Straight Education Network (GLSEN) from its founding in 1995 until August 2008. The conference sessions appear to have had less to do with promoting tolerance and more to do with teaching children how to engage in sex.

Andrew Breitbart's Biggovernment.com provides tapes of some of the sessions. Describing the subject matter as smut would be putting it lightly. The conference discussions were very graphic and cannot be relayed in full detail in a family newspaper. A few examples are sufficient to describe the depravity of the subject matter. During one session about oral sex, a presenter asked the 14-year-old students: "Spit or swallow? Is it rude?" In another session, the 14-year-olds are taught about a gross practice called "fisting," in which "the man leading the discussion position[ed] his hand and show[ed] 14-year-olds how to insert their entire hand into the rectum of their sex partner."

Teaching children sexual techniques is simply not appropriate. Unfortunately, it is part of a consistent pattern by some homosexual activists to promote underage homosexuality while pretending that their mission is simply to promote tolerance for so-called alternative lifestyles. It is outrageous that someone involved in this scandal is being paid by the taxpayers to serve in a high-powered position at the Education Department, of all places. At some point, Mr. Duncan, Mr. Jennings, Obama administration spokesmen and the president himself are going to have to start answering questions about all this. Refusing to do so won't make the issue go away.

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 Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MCGOVERN 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.)

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 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 Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. LANGEVIN 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 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.)

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

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

THE WAR POWERS ACT

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, yesterday I began circulating to Members of Congress a letter that would enable Members to be able to sign on to legislation that will be introduced when we return in January that would be aimed at creating a vote in this House on whether or not we keep our troops in Afghanistan and continue operations in Pakistan. This action is being done pursuant to the War Powers Act.

The War Powers Act was passed in 1973, and the intention of it was to claim Congress's constitutional authority under article I, section 8 to be able to take this Nation into war, commit our troops to war, or to continue to stay at war.

Congress cannot remain on the sidelines in this matter. We have the lives of our troops at stake. We have trillions of dollars at stake. Congress must engage in this debate over whether or not to stay at war in Afghanistan and to continue operations in Pakistan.

It's comforting to let the President do everything, but we can't do that, because whether we agree with the President or not, we have a responsibility, a constitutional responsibility, to make a decision on these wars.

□ 2220

Now, some will say the authorization for use of military force dispensed with that. Oh, no, it didn't. A reading of that authorization makes it very clear that it does not supersede the War Powers Act.

And so when I put this resolution to the Congress in January, it will be an automatic mandatory referral to the International Relations Committee. They will have 15 days to report it back to the House, where we can expect a debate. When the bill is introduced, it will be introduced with broad bipartisan support because this is not a Democrat or Republican issue.

We have learned recently that U.S. contractors are paying the Taliban to ensure safe shipment of U.S. goods to U.S. soldiers, who then use those supplies to strengthen their war with the Taliban. We have learned that Blackwater is involved in "black ops" in Pakistan working as independent contractors for the purposes of assassination. We cannot let these things happen without Congress being directly involved and taking direct responsibility.

All across this country people are worried about their jobs, their homes, their health care, their investments, their retirement security. Why is it that war becomes the centerpiece of our national experience? Some can say, well, it makes us safer. Oh, has it? Did the invasion of Iraq make us safer? Over 1 million innocent people perished in a war based on a lie; let us never forget that.

The policies of unilateralism preempted at first strike were a dead-end. And for those who say war is inevitable, I say you're dead wrong. Peace is inevitable if you tell the truth. Peace is inevitable if you're ready to confront the difficulties of diplomacy.

We have a right to defend ourselves, and I stand upon that right. I voted for this country to defend itself in those days in September of 2001. But we can never mistake defense for offense. We can never claim the right to aggress against another nation in the name of trying to make us safer because all we do is create more enemies. Occupations

fuel insurgencies. If you want peace, you work for peace. If you want war, you create war, but we can never claim that war is peace. It's not. It often is a path to more war.

The Constitution, when it was written, our Founders were very clear they didn't want an imperial government, they wanted to make sure the dog of war was chained. And the way to do it, they put that decision in the hands of the Congress. This is about our Constitution, our Constitution, which I always carry a copy of. This Constitution requires us to take a stand and to have a vote. And in January, we will have a vote whether to remain in Afghanistan and continue operations in Pakistan.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes. (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN 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 gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Mrs. DAHLKEMPER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. DAHLKEMPER addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

AMERICA NEEDS REAL BANKING REFORM

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, maybe someday real banking reform will be considered by this Congress. Real reform means breaking up the big banks. Real reform means empowering community banks and local capital accumulation. Real reform means separating speculation and investment. Real reform means restoring prudent lending. Real reform means restructuring troubled housing mortgages. Real reform means rewarding institutions that play by the rules and don't over-leverage. Real reform means prosecuting financial white-collar criminals and keeping them out of finance permanently.

Real reform means directly connecting executive pay and bonuses to the performance of the company and recouping the \$145 billion in unwarranted bonuses for the American taxpayer. Real reform means regulating all derivatives openly and clearly. Real reform means limiting interconnectedness between large financial institutions. Real reform means independent supervisory and regulatory agencies that do their job—independent supervisory and regulatory agencies.

The bill that will be considered tomorrow, as it was today, merely bunts at wrestling casino capitalism to the ground. This bill, like so many before

it, will simply lead to more abuse, more risky behavior, and more reward for the most hazardous and imprudent characters.

Wall Street needs our help in rescuing them from their own bad behavior, not because Wall Street deserves it or is worthy; they need to be disciplined because our natural interest is more important than Wall Street.

Let's dissect America's economic predicament and what Congress has passed to fix it. In the fall of 2008, Congress passed the "Wall Street bailout." It told America that the TARP would work to steady the housing market. It not only didn't steady the housing market, but its purpose was totally changed by Secretary of Treasury Paulson, who gave the money to the biggest banks in our country whose risky behavior caused the meltdown. And Congress, it just looked the other way.

Now the housing foreclosure crisis has worsened coast to coast; 2 million Americans have lost their homes, and another 6 to 12 million are projected to lose their homes. Meanwhile, the biggest perpetrators of this disaster—the Bank of America, JPMorgan Chase, Citigroup, Wells Fargo and Goldman Sachs—have gone from controlling 30 percent of all deposits in this country when this mess began to 40 percent now.

The big 5 are just eating us up and taking bigger bonuses too. It is estimated they will reward themselves with that \$145 billion in bonuses this year. Credit remains frozen across our country until today, seizing up economic recovery, and this bill calls itself the "Wall Street Reform Bill."

This bill, like those before it, will not meet the serious challenges crippling our financial system and it surely will not give a good signal to the future. Congress said the TARP bailout would save us from depression, but TARP passed, and the American people went into depression. Only the big banks were saved.

The bills passed by Congress today protect Wall Street and their shareholders. Main Street pays the price. Is this bill a reform bill? No. It will not break up the big banks. It will not create a strong, independent financial institution regulatory agency. It will not separate speculation from investment activity. It will not require loan workouts to stem rising foreclosures. It will not recoup undeserved Wall Street bonuses to help pay for this economic mess and put America back to work. In fact, the bill merely asks for non-binding votes of shareholders.

It will not rein in nonbanking firms, but instead provide them with a golden sandbox. It will not rein in the power of the Federal Reserve. It will not regulate all over-the-counter derivatives. It will not provide the requisite number of FBI agents and prosecutors to put behind bars the financial world's white-collar criminals whose fraudulent behavior caused this mess. It will

not bring to justice the wrongdoers at Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. There are bills in this House to do that; they're not included in this bill.

And it places the Treasury Department, a politically appointed superstructure, so much a part of the problem, in charge of the Finance Services Oversight Council. Importantly, it fails to institute and strengthen independent financial regulatory and supervisory agencies. The political appointees on this oversight council are surely clapping in the wings. This bill gives more power to the opaque Federal Reserve.

You know, you would think that after all the damage that has been done in the Republic, this Congress would have the guts for real reform. This bill isn't it, and I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on final passage.

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.)

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

(Ms. WOOLSEY 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 New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SMITH of New Jersey 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 the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SABLAN 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 Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PITTS 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 Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. STUPAK 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 gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) is recognized for 5 minutes.