

classroom has been shown to do just that.

UTILITARIANISM BEAT DOWN HUMAN DIGNITY

(Mr. INGLIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. INGLIS. Madam Speaker, I rise to lament the fact that, today, in a stroke of a pen, utilitarianism beat down human dignity.

When President Obama lifted the ban on stem cell research additional lines, what he is saying really is that it's okay to kill some humans in order to improve the conditions of other humans. The problem with that is it devalues all humans when we say that you can kill some to benefit others.

We can do this research. We can do the more promising research on adult stem cells, and we can get to the place where we don't produce excess embryos. Other countries, Germany, for example, limits the number of fertilized eggs, but we produce excess embryos. We can stop that practice. We can also have adoptions of the existing excess embryos.

So Madam Speaker, it is a sad day when utilitarianism beats down human dignity. It's a sad day for America. This is a time when we should be, in a technological age, establishing bright-line tests so that we understand and preserve the dignity of human life. It's also not the interference of politics into science, but the bounding of science by ethics and morality.

MOURNING THE LOSS OF PASTOR FRED WINTERS

(Mr. SHIMKUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, yesterday, in my district, and close to my hometown in Maryville, Illinois, Pastor Fred Winters lost his life to an assailant who came into the church during the first service.

Pastor Winters was a friend, and had done a tremendous job in growing First Baptist Church in Maryville to a church of great size and a great ministry in the area.

My thoughts and prayers go out to the community of Maryville, Illinois. My thoughts and prayers go out to the church and congregants of First Baptist Church in Maryville.

We live in an age of sinful human beings. Sometimes we don't understand God's will, but the people at First Baptist Church in Maryville are trying to make sense of an issue that doesn't make sense. All they do know is that God is in control, and that Pastor Winters is joined in heaven with Christ, his Lord.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-

uary 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 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.)

BORDER WAR IN HUDSPETH COUNTY AND CULBERSON COUNTY, TEXAS

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. Madam Speaker, I bring you news from the second front. I'm talking about the front on the southern border of the United States with Mexico.

This past weekend, I had the opportunity to spend some time with two of the sheriffs of the Sheriff's Border Coalition. There are 20 counties in Texas that the sheriffs are members of the Border Coalition. And I spent time with two of those sheriffs, Sheriff Arvin West from Hudspeth County and Sheriff Oscar Carrillo of Culberson County. These two counties are directly east of El Paso County.

The size of these two counties put together are the size of Connecticut and Rhode Island put together. They're massive counties and sparsely populated. The sheriff in each of these counties and his deputies know everybody that lives in the county, unlike the Border Patrol, who come and go from the community. They never really know the people or the culture, or what takes place in those counties. But the border sheriffs and their deputies, since most of them grew up there and were born there, they know the people who should be there and those people that are outside, as they call them, "out-of-towners."

This past weekend, the Mexican Government sent 5,000 troops to Juarez, Mexico. That's the town across from El Paso. The reason is because of the drug cartels and the violence. Drug cartels are doing war with not only the United States, but they're doing war physically with the Mexican military. And it's so dangerous down there that Fort Bliss, which is across the river from Juarez, those soldiers that have been in Afghanistan and Iraq, are not permitted to go to Juarez. The State Department has warned Americans not to go to Juarez because of the danger of kidnappings and the violence that has occurred there all because of the drug cartels.

But going back to the two counties of Culberson County and Hudspeth County, the question keeps being asked, "Well, all that crime just stays there on the Mexican side, it never comes to the American side." Let me give you a

statistic, Madam Speaker, how all the border sheriffs have to fight the drug epidemic and the crimes of violence and the property crimes in their county.

Sheriff Arvin West, Hudspeth County, has two jails; one has 125 prisoners, the other one has 545 prisoners. And on Saturday night, every person in both of those jails except one was illegally in the United States. There was one citizen. And these people are not charged with immigration violations. They hadn't just been picked up for illegally entering the country. They had been arrested for crimes against the Federal Government, felonies and misdemeanors against the State of Texas. He said if he didn't have to keep arresting folks illegally coming into the country and committing crimes in his county, he could close his jail down because there was only one citizen in the whole county or in the county jails. And he said seldom does he have any local folks put in that jail.

So, yes, the border crime has come to the United States and will only get worse. But to show you how innovative these sheriffs are, these are poor counties, these are low-income counties where you've got hardworking people—sparsely populated, however—and so the sheriff have no budget for vehicles. Unlike the drug cartels that have Humvees, they have SUVs, pickup trucks, all of the things that they want. Border sheriffs—this sheriff especially—has no budget in the county for vehicles, so he has to confiscate drug vehicles—when he captures the bad guys with drugs—and then he uses those vehicles after they have been seized for his deputies. He has 20 vehicles that he uses for his 17 deputies, and he has two or three of these 18-wheelers.

□ 1930

Yes, he's captured an 18-wheeler that's seized by the good guys against the bad guys, and on all of these vehicles, he puts this little notice down here on the bottom. It's on the bottom of this cab. It says semi-truck, \$80,000. The drugs were worth \$40,000. The bad guy got 10 years in the penitentiary, and the seizure of this vehicle is priceless. So that's how he runs his sheriff's department: with seized vehicles. I commend him for doing that.

It's important that we understand that the drug smugglers have more vehicles, better vehicles, more money, more men, and better equipment. They use GPS tracking devices to keep up with their drug loads. As I mentioned, they use Humvees. We have occurrences of the Mexican military helping move the drugs into these counties. Of course, Homeland Security denied that occurred. They said that didn't happen. But they didn't understand that Arvin West, Sheriff West, had the whole Mexican infiltration into his county on videotape, and once he videotaped it and showed it to Homeland Security, they said, well, maybe they are intruding and helping the drug cartels.

And these people don't make any money. The sheriff of Hudspeth County makes \$39,000 a year. Sheriff Carrillo of Culberson County makes \$32,000 a year, and their deputies make about \$27,000 a year. And they are protecting us from the drug cartels moving into the country. A guy just bringing drugs into the United States is going to make up to \$1,500 a load, making far more than our own border protectors.

There are four commodities being traded on the border. Two are going north and two are going south. The two going north are people and drugs, and they're being worked together. In other words, the coyotes work with the drug cartels to smuggle people. The two commodities going south: guns and money, and that's what's being traded on the border with Mexico.

It's important, Madam Speaker, that we provide our border protectors with the Humvees they need. We need to give them better equipment, and we need to put troops on the border because the purpose of government is to protect the people.

And that's just the way it is.

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.)

CHARITABLE DEDUCTIONS AND GOVERNMENT SPENDING

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. Madam Speaker, we have an organization in this country called the Independent Sector. It's a nonprofit, nonpartisan coalition of charities, foundations, and corporate philanthropic programs collectively representing tens of thousands of charitable groups in every State across the Nation. The mission of this organization is to advance the common good by leading, strengthening, and mobilizing the nonprofit community.

The reason that I bring this up tonight is that the way that the administration, through the budget, wants to help fund health care reform is they want to reduce the amount that people can deduct when they make charitable contributions. And this organization that represents the Volunteers of America, the Salvation Army, the Red Cross, all these organizations, says that if the legislation passes in the

budget in its present form, they will lose \$4 billion a year in charitable contributions because people won't be able to deduct the same amount that they've been deducting before when they make a contribution to these charities. And I think that's tragic because people who need help from the Salvation Army or the Red Cross or these other philanthropic organizations really need help, and if they can't get it from those organizations, the place they are going to go to try to get it is where? From the taxpayers, from their local trustee, their State government, their city government, or the Federal Government. So what we are going to see is a transfer of responsibility from these independent philanthropic organizations to these local government entities and the Federal Government if we start reducing the amount that people can deduct in charitable contributions. I think that's tragic.

The Secretary of the Treasury, Geithner, appeared before the Senate this past week, and he was asked about this, and he said, well, he thinks there might be other ways that they could fund the health care changes in this country without dipping into the charitable contribution deductions. Well, the head of OMB indicated, I think, yesterday on Face the Nation that Mr. Geithner probably wasn't right, that once the American people see how this money is going to be used, they'll understand it.

I don't believe that, Madam Speaker. I believe the American people, when they give money to a charity, want to make sure that that money is going to that charity and that they get their charitable deduction for that. If they don't get that charitable deduction, they're going to start cutting back on the money they give to charities, and the minute they start doing that, Madam Speaker, then you're going to see these charities start wanting for money because they won't be getting the money they have been getting in the past.

These organizations have said collectively they are going to lose \$4 billion a year if the budget proposed by the administration and proposed by the House leadership and the Senate leadership, if that goes through. And it may go through tomorrow. Then these charities are not going to get that money, \$4 billion in losses, and it's going to be borne by other institutions. And I submit to you it will be the local governments, the State governments, and probably the Federal Government. I think that's just dead wrong.

I want to end up tonight by saying one more thing, Madam Speaker, to my colleagues back in their offices. We have been increasing the money supply, printing more money very rapidly, and we are indebting the people of this country to the tune of trillions of dollars. The Secretary of the Treasury is going to have another \$3 trillion that he's going to have to print to give to fi-

nancial institutions to keep them above water. The budget that we're talking about, the bailout bill that we're talking about, the stimulus package, all of those add up to trillions of dollars more in spending.

If you look at this chart, you will see that the money supply in this country has been pretty level up through the year 2000, and then it starts going up like a rocket, and now it's going straight up. And what that means to the American people, and I hope the American people, if they happen to be paying attention, and I can't talk to them, I know, but if they happen to be paying attention, I hope they realize that the increase in the money supply is going to come directly to them eventually. It's going to affect them in higher taxes and higher costs of goods and services when they go to buy them. If you have more money in circulation, and we're looking at trillions of dollars more that's going to be printed, that money is going to be chasing fewer goods and services. What that means simply is if you go to buy a loaf of bread, it's going to cost more. If you buy a gallon of gas, it's going to cost more. If you buy electricity in your home, when you turn the switch on, it's going to cost more.

So I would just like to say to my colleagues, we really need to do something about spending. We have got to say to the administration and our colleagues in the House and the Senate it's time to cut spending. We don't need to spend more. We don't need to spend these trillions of dollars. We ought to be cutting taxes instead of doing that to stimulate economic growth, and we need to make sure that the American people and the future generations of this country are not saddled with more debt and hyperinflation.

There are so many things going on right now, Madam Speaker, that troubles me, it's not even funny. And it all comes down to spending more money and imposing more burden on the American taxpayers and the future of this country.

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.)

ENERGY INSECURITY

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

Mr. INGLIS. Madam Speaker, I have been doing this series on our energy insecurity problem and opportunity. And it clearly is that. It's both a danger and an opportunity. Our energy insecurity, the fact that we are dependent on foreign nations for our transportation