

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.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I have come to this floor repeatedly. In fact, I have come to the floor over 300 times to discuss the human costs of war. Our brave men and women in uniform have given their lives in service to our Nation, and tens of thousands have returned home with physical and mental scars. And it isn't over yet.

The costs in treasure and blood will be felt for generations. The National Priority Project has done a comprehensive review of the costs, and they are actually staggering.

Since 2001, 675 U.S. troops have been killed in Afghanistan and more than 2,600 soldiers have been wounded in action. The trend is not encouraging: The U.S. death toll has escalated each year, from 12 in 2001 to 99 in 2005, 117 in 2004, and 155 in 2008. And it's not over.

The war in Afghanistan has cost taxpayers \$171 billion. With the supplemental that was passed today, we have just added \$77 billion to fund the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan through the year 2009. Obviously, it's not over. An additional \$130 billion will fund both wars anticipated in the 2010 budget.

It appears from today's vote that many here in the House of Representatives haven't learned the lesson from our occupation of Iraq. And according to policy experts, Iraq is going to look like a cakewalk compared to the battles that we will be seeing in Afghanistan.

Let's look at what the occupation of Iraq has actually brought: The occupation of Iraq has cost \$656 billion so far, with another \$52 billion voted on today as part of the fiscal year 2009 war supplemental. At least \$2 trillion in future budgetary costs, including veterans' benefits, will be spent in the very near future. Almost 4,300 U.S. servicemembers have died in Iraq so far. And hundreds of thousands of Iraqi civilians have been maimed and killed.

Madam Speaker, the costs are too great. We don't have a defined mission in Afghanistan. We do not have a development plan. Our endless military presence will only serve to fuel anti-Americanism throughout the region. But it continues to go on.

So what's the cost here at home? As we experience one of the worst economic recessions in our Nation's history, every taxpayer dollar becomes more valuable. Today the majority in the House decided that funding an endless occupation of two countries is more important than education, health care, and renewable energy right here at home.

For my State of California, the war in Afghanistan has already cost us \$21 billion. That means 2.6 million new Head Start places for children that need to go to school. It means 9 million individuals could have been provided with health care, 38.7 million homes could have been provided with renewable electricity.

We make choices every day on the House floor. Today that choice reflects a decision to keep our troops in Iraq

until the end of 2011 and in Afghanistan indefinitely. This vote does not invest in SMART Security. It does not take us into the 21st century, because for every dollar in the supplemental dedicated for smart humanitarian investment, \$8 will be spent on the military. And it keeps going on.

I want to say we either change the way we meet our obligations and have a different way of coming together with nations that we don't agree with or we're going to be in a lot of trouble as human beings.

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.)

TROUBLES IN THE AUTO INDUSTRY ARE NOT JUST A MICHIGAN PROBLEM; TODAY WE SEE THEY ARE AN AMERICAN PROBLEM

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I represent a district in southeast Michigan. We are a part of the very heart and soul of our domestic auto industry, an industry that has served our country very well. It's built the weapons that America needed in times of war when our freedom itself was at risk. It's provided millions of Americans an opportunity for a good job with good benefits and a secure retirement.

We all understand that the American auto industry has fallen on very, very hard times. Those of us in southeast Michigan understand it well. It's not a new development. We are painfully aware of it. We've dealt with plant closings and thousands of jobs lost. We've dealt with families torn apart, home foreclosures, and communities devastated. And we've endured massive new unfunded Federal mandates placed upon our industry, which have made it very difficult to compete. We've watched as Federal and State incentives have been offered to foreign competitors to come into our home market on equal terms, even though similar access to foreign markets has not been offered to our domestic companies. We've seen this government negligent in not formulating a manufacturing policy that protects vital American interests and good-paying American jobs. And for years we never asked for help.

But when Wall Street melted down last year, our problems were made even worse because 80 percent of the people who are going to buy an automobile require credit and not enough credit was available, and, of course, auto sales have just fallen through the floor. And when the auto companies came to Cap-

itol Hill to ask for similar assistance that's been given to the Wall Street banks, those whose actions made their problems even worse, the auto industry was treated with disdain and their pleas for help were rejected by this Congress, which seemed indifferent to the problem and to the desire to protect American jobs.

This was a Michigan problem we were told, not an American problem. We tried to remind our colleagues of everything that this industry has meant to our great Nation, and again we received indifference and we were told, Just let them go into bankruptcy.

We were told that these companies needed to shed their legacy costs. Well, guess what. Legacy costs have names. They are people. And we're told that this has to be done because these foreign competitors who were given free access to our market do not have such legacy costs. Or imports which are built by low-wage workers overseas do not have these legacy costs. We are told we need to drive American wages down to match Third World competitors in order to compete.

Well, today we see that this is not just a Michigan problem anymore; today it is an American problem. Today Chrysler is in bankruptcy court, exactly what many in this Congress advocated for. And today Chrysler filed a list of 789 dealerships whose franchise agreements it is asking the bankruptcy court to sever. That means the closure of 789 dealerships in communities all across our great Nation.

These businesses represent not just a place to buy a car, but they represent community leaders, the sponsors of the Little League teams or the chairman of the Rotary. In many cases the biggest job provider in the town. The average dealer in this Nation, Madam Speaker, employs over 50 people. So this move means the loss of over 40,000 more jobs. Now 789 communities across this Nation will feel the pain of a contracting domestic auto industry. The pain of a business shutting down, the pain of jobs lost, the pain of families who will be devastated.

And tomorrow that pain will only get worse as General Motors is also set to release a list of dealers it hopes to shed and a list that will be much, much larger than 789 dealers.

Madam Speaker, this list was submitted as a part of that bankruptcy filing, a bankruptcy that many Members were advocating for when they believed it was just a Michigan problem. And now we see Members lamenting the fact that dealerships in their districts are closing. And they fail to realize that if this bankruptcy had happened last December, when they voted against bridge loans for the auto industry, it would have included every Chrysler dealer, because a disorderly bankruptcy would have led to the liquidation of Chrysler. So some Members got what they advocated for, Chrysler in bankruptcy, which today has led to the loss of 40,000 jobs. And tomorrow it will get worse.