

days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PRIVILEGED REPORT ON RESOLUTION OF INQUIRY TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. WAXMAN, from the Committee on Energy and Commerce, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111-146) on the resolution (H. Res. 449) of inquiry requesting the President to provide certain documents in his possession to the House of Representatives relating to the Environmental Protection Agency's April proposed finding that greenhouse gas emissions are a danger to public health and welfare, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PRIVILEGED REPORT ON RESOLUTION OF INQUIRY TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. WAXMAN, from the Committee on Energy and Commerce, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111-147) on the resolution (H. Res. 462) requesting that the President transmit to the House of Representatives all information in his possession relating to specific communications with Chrysler LLC ("Chrysler"), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2346, SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2009

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until 11:59 p.m. on June 12, 2009, to file a conference report on H.R. 2346, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2009, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORT ON COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2010

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until 11:59 p.m. on June 12, 2009, to file a privileged report on a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, and Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1 of rule XXI, all points of order are reserved.

□ 1200

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. CANTOR. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland, the majority leader, for the purpose of announcing next week's schedule.

Mr. HOYER. I thank my friend for yielding.

On Monday, Madam Speaker, the House will meet at 12:30 p.m. for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business, with votes postponed until 6:30 p.m.

On Tuesday, the Former Members Association will have their annual meeting on the floor at 8:30 a.m. The House will then meet at 10:30 a.m. for morning-hour debate and 12 p.m. for legislative business. On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for legislative business. And on Friday, as is unusual, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business.

Madam Speaker, we will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. A complete list of suspension bills will be noted by the end of the day.

In addition, we will consider a conference report on H.R. 2346, the Supplemental Appropriations Act on the 2010 Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriation Act and the 2010 Homeland Security Appropriations Act. And I yield back.

Mr. CANTOR. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I would say to the gentleman that he has noticed two appropriations bills for next week: Commerce, Justice and Science; and the Homeland Security appropriations bills. Madam Speaker, I would ask the gentleman, does he expect the House, as is its custom, to consider these bills under an open rule? And I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

It certainly would be our intent to proceed with an open rule on the consideration of the Commerce, Justice and State bill—I guess it's Science now. The intent, of course, as the gentleman knows based upon our discussions, is that we will finish all 12 appropriation bills individually between now and the 30th of July. This will give the Senate and the House the opportunity to agree on a conference report on the 12 appropriation bills and hopefully enact those bills and send them to the President prior to the onset of the fiscal year October 1. If we do that, of course, it will be unusual, and it is an ambitious schedule. But because of that, it will be necessary for us to consider these bills in an effective, but also efficient, fashion and stay within

time constraints that will allow us to accomplish those 12 bills within that time frame. I am hopeful that as Mr. OBEY and Mr. LEWIS proceed and the subcommittee Chairs proceed, that we can agree on that occurring.

As the gentleman and I have discussed, we will see how the first bill goes, or the second or third, and hopefully they will go in that fashion. The only constraint that we want is to utilize the time so we can effect the objective of passing these bills by the August break so we will have time to finish them before the beginning of the fiscal year.

I would tell my friend that, in addition to that, there would be one, however, additional request that the chairman of the Appropriations Committee has made—with which I strongly agree and that I think is fair to all the Members and to the committee Chairs and subcommittee Chairs—and that is that there will be a requirement for preprinting an amendment. There will be no selection in the CJS bill of amendments, but there will be a requirement that they be preprinted and included in the RECORD.

If, however, I want to assure the gentleman, there is some problem with the RECORD reflecting an amendment that has been prefiled but doesn't make it in the RECORD, we would proceed as if that had been included in the printed RECORD.

Mr. CANTOR. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

As the gentleman knows, in 2005 this House did abide by a schedule such as the one that he proposes, and did so under an open rule on each bill.

I ask the gentleman if, given this preprinting requirement that we are proceeding under, if there is a need for a perfecting amendment that comes upon the adoption of an amendment, how is it that we will be necessarily guaranteeing Members' perfecting amendments the right to be heard? Will there be a UC granted for such a perfecting amendment? I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank my friend for yielding.

I have discussed this matter with the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and it is his view—and I share that view, certainly—that in that instance granting a unanimous consent would be appropriate. Obviously, if the circumstances change and such an amendment were necessary, I think the gentleman will find that the chairman is inclined—and I believe the subcommittee chairman will be inclined—to give unanimous consent to achieve that objective.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, I would say to the gentleman that the Speaker of the House has announced a goal of considering the cap-and-trade bill on the floor prior to the July 4 recess. I would ask the majority leader, does he expect the Speaker's goal to be met? And I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

We certainly hope so. The Speaker and I have both indicated, with respect to the energy bill, which seeks to not only address the conservation of our energy and making us energy independent, but also seeks to address the global warming challenge that confronts our globe, to pass that legislation in a timely fashion. It passed out of committee, as the gentleman knows, the week when we left for the Memorial Day break, so it has been pending now for at least 3 weeks.

It is our hope that we can move forward on this as early, perhaps, as the last week in June, which would be immediately before the July 4 break. Time and circumstances will dictate whether or not that is possible, but we certainly do hope to consider that in the near term.

In addition, as the gentleman undoubtedly knows, we also have under consideration the health care bill, which the President has made a very high priority and which we have made a very high priority. So that bill will also, we hope, be considered prior to the August break.

So those two bills are major pieces of legislation that we hope to consider, but I don't want to give an exact date on those because they are complicated pieces of legislation. We hope that we can reach agreement on—and we would like to reach agreement across the aisle as well—if not all facets, at least some facets of that bill. I'm sure your side has considerations that will help us perfect a bill. I think we will probably have some agreements, but, nevertheless, we hope to move forward together on both bills.

Mr. CANTOR. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I would like to ask a followup of the majority leader, specifically for the benefit of the Members who serve on the Ways and Means and the Agriculture Committees. Will we anticipate that those two committees will have an opportunity to hear and mark up the cap-and-trade bill? And I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I have discussed this matter with the chairmen of both committees. Certainly they will have the opportunity. Whether they will avail themselves of that opportunity I can't say at this point in time. What I mean by that is that there are clearly concerns that both committees have and have been expressed. But whether or not they're going to actually go to a markup of the bill or try to perfect it in other ways on the floor or in working with the Energy and Commerce Committee I don't think has been decided by either committee at this point in time.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, I now would like to point out to the gentleman, as all of us know, that our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan have spent the last 29 days waiting for this Congress to authorize the funding that they need to execute their mission to maintain not only

their own safety, but the safety of us here at home. We have heard reports since last night that the war funding bill and its provision and primary mission of funding the troops has now been somewhat eclipsed by provisions which have no relation to protecting and supporting our troops in the field. So I would ask the gentleman, could he confirm, number one, that \$108 billion—scored at \$5 billion by the Congressional Budget Office—whether that money for the IMF will be included in the troop funding bill? Number two, are the reports correct which have indicated that the provisions prohibiting the release of detainee photos has now been stripped from the measure that we will consider? And thirdly, could the gentleman confirm that the conference report coming to the House will now allow for the transfer of the Guantanamo detainees into the United States?

And I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As the gentleman recalls, we had a relatively robust discussion about this last week.

Let me, first of all, say that the principle purpose of this bill was, is, and will be on Tuesday the funding of our troops in the field, providing them with the resources necessary to complete successfully or pursue successfully the task that we've given them and to provide for their safety and well-being to the possible extent we can. So that was the intent, it is the intent, and will remain the intent.

Now, let me make a suggestion that providing for some of the poorest nations in the world to be more successful economically will not only be beneficial to our country and to the international economy generally, but also to the safety of our troops, very frankly. It is, obviously, in deep poverty and frustration from which many of the terrorists that we have seen have been recruited. To the extent we provide for the economies of these small, troubled countries, we may well be a safer world, not only economically better off, but from a security standpoint better off. So we perceive the IMF as an integral part of a process of seeking security.

I might say that the IMF, as I quoted last week, very strongly supported by Ronald Reagan, very strongly supported by both President Bushes, but particularly President Bush the First, where they said investing in the IMF was an investment in the well-being of the international community and our own country.

As you indicate, the \$108 billion scores at \$5 billion because it's a loan guarantee; it's not a giveaway. We believe that the IMF is a very important part of it, and in answer to your question, the IMF will, in fact, be a part—as I think the gentleman probably knows—of the conference report that will be filed perhaps later tonight.

With respect to your second question regarding—well, I guess your third

question because your first was about the security of the troops—the third question of Guantanamo, let me, first of all, read a letter, a paragraph of a letter dated June 11 to Mr. OBEY and Mr. INOUE, the Senate chairman of the Appropriations Committee, from President Obama.

□ 1215

He says, On May 13 I announced I would resist the release of additional detainee photos because I did not believe it would add any additional benefit to our understanding of what happened in the past and that the most direct consequences of releasing them would be to further inflame anti-American opinion and put our troops in greater danger. Earlier today the Second Circuit granted the government's motion that will stay the earlier court order to release the detainees' photos, and we will now move forward with a petition to the Supreme Court to appeal the case.

He goes on to say, I deeply appreciate all you have done to help with the effort to secure funding for the troops, and I assure you that I will continue to take every legal and administrative remedy available to me to ensure that the DOD detainee photographs are not released. Should a legislative solution prove necessary, I am committed to working with the Congress to enact legislation that achieves the objectives we share.

With respect, lastly, Mr. Whip, to the detainees, as you know, one detainee was, in fact, transferred to the United States, to New York, for the purposes of trial. That is not unusual. As the gentleman knows, many terrorists have been tried in the New York District Court in which this trial will occur. In addition to that, four Uyghurs have been ordered released by the court because the court concluded there was no proof of terrorist activity by the Uyghurs. They've been released to Bermuda.

One Iraqi detainee, Mr. Sadkhan, was returned to Iraq. One Chadian detainee was returned to Chad. And Mr. Ghailani, to whom I have referred to earlier, has been transferred to New York City, where there is a standing indictment against him. He'll be tried for his role in the 1998 attacks in Tanzania and Kenya in which the father and brother of one of my constituents, Edith Bartley, were killed, Julian and Jay Bartley. So I, for one, am pleased that this gentleman, and I use that term loosely, unfortunately, but this individual will be tried and brought to justice.

All four Biscoe conspirators have been found guilty and are serving out sentence in the U.S. supermax prison. It has been agreed under the language, as I understand it, that has been adopted that detainees would be brought to the United States for no other purpose than prosecution.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

And, Madam Speaker, I would respond by going back to the gentleman's

original statement concerning the principal purpose of the war funding bill, and that he said, if I could paraphrase, the intent of the bill is to fund our troops. So I am at somewhat of a loss to understand why we have taken 29 days. We've already had one strong bipartisan vote in this House with nearly unanimity on our side of the aisle to provide the necessary funding for our troops, so I'm at somewhat of a loss to understand why the delay.

The gentleman speaks of the urgent need for us, as U.S. taxpayers, to fund a global bailout, and the gentleman said that there is indication that somehow if we address the issue of poverty that we will then be lessening the number of terrorists. I don't know, Madam Speaker, if all of us would agree with that or not. No question, reducing poverty is a laudable goal, but we are also in the business here in Washington of setting priorities. Priority one should be the funding of our troops and to secure this country and its citizens. And thank God we have our men and women in uniform there. They should be our priority in executing in terms of advocating for the safety and fighting for the security of this country.

So I am still, to use the gentleman's word from last week, confounded as to why it is we cannot have the IMF funding go through regular order in this House. As you know, reports have indicated that actions have been taken by this administration, especially Secretary Geithner, to cast a vote in favor of increasing access to money and credit for the member nations of the IMF. That is done without congressional approval. And we're talking here specifically about the special drawing rights of nations at the IMF. We have also found out that the nation of Iran will have the ability to access funding of over a billion dollars through this process. To me, that calls for congressional oversight and action. It doesn't warrant delaying this bill. It doesn't warrant putting on the backs of our troops the funding of nations, frankly, that are providing support for the destruction of our efforts and endangering our troops on the ground in Iraq and in the region.

So I have a question to the gentleman of why it is so important that we go ahead and fund a global bailout when the primary mission is to fund our troops.

And I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

The gentleman articulates a number of premises that I reject, I don't agree with. Nobody is putting anything on the back of the troops. The gentleman has been in this body for some period of time, and he knows that from time to time the other body adds amendments to bills and it is incumbent upon us to consider those amendments. As the gentleman knows, when we passed the bill through the House, it did not have the IMF funding in the bill. The Senate added it to the bill. It was a subject of

the conference report. The President of the United States has asked for the IMF funding. We happen to agree with the President of the United States that the IMF funding is appropriate funding and does, in fact, as I will restate for the gentleman, we believe, add a security component to the troop funding that is the primary purpose of this bill.

Secondly, I reject your premise that somehow this money is going to go to people who are going to harm us. In fact, of course, as I told you last week, the last time Iran, which you mentioned, received money was when Ronald Reagan was President of the United States in 1984. There is no expectation, in my opinion, that Iran, while it may be eligible technically, is going to get any money, as it has not for the last quarter of a century.

I would reiterate what I said last week in quoting Ronald Reagan, no individual who wanted to give aid and comfort to the enemy. Very forthright in his confrontation of communism and despotism. He said, "I have an unbreakable commitment to increase funding for the IMF." As I cited to you, he said that on September 7, 1983. He went on to say, "The IMF is the linchpin of the international financial system."

The gentleman and his side of the aisle continue, in my opinion, to misrepresent what is intended by that funding. The President of the United States, whether it was Ronald Reagan, George Bush the First, George Bush the Second, or any other President, that goes to an international meeting with 19 of the other large industrial nations in the world and they sit down together and attempt to try to bring the global economy back to vibrancy and agree that, in part, what is needed is some assistance to the poorest nations in this world who are themselves being dragged down and, in the process, adversely affecting the global markets generally agree to make a substantial commitment of loan guarantees available. As the gentleman knows, the United States has about a 20 percent vote on this, and this is about a 20 percent contribution that the President has agreed to. The other 19 nations agreed to come up with 80 percent of these dollars. All of them agreed that this is in the best interest of restoring our global economy and, I suggest to you as well, stabilizing the security situation that confronts the international community.

President Bush said—and this is the last quote I'll give. You may be tired of hearing these quotes, but your side of the aisle has been making a great hue and cry as if IMF is some specious, dangerous pursuit. This is not a bailout. This is an assistance to people to try to grow back and be positive, contributing members of the international global marketplace.

George Bush said this: "The IMF and World Bank, given their central role in the world economy, are key to helping all of us through this situation by pro-

viding a combination of policy advice and financial assistance." George Bush said that on September 25, 1990, a time of economic stress internationally for the same reason that President Obama and the 19 other industrialized nations of the world agreed that this was an appropriate step to take.

I would hope the gentleman would urge his party to support this, consistent with the principles of Ronald Reagan and George Bush.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, I think, as the gentleman knows, we are probably going to have to leave this topic and agree to disagree. It is very concerning, given the new times we are in, and, frankly, the facts and information have come forward about the special drawing rights about the fact and knowledge that we have at this point knowing U.S. taxpayer dollars will help facilitate countries like Iran, Venezuela, Burma, and others to access more money to do what it is that they think is in their interest and certainly not in the interest of the U.S.

But I would like to turn the gentleman's attention back to his statement about the intention of this bill and the primary purpose of the war funding bill, which, again, to loosely paraphrase, was to provide for troop safety and security, and that's the underlying purpose. The gentleman indicated that the President has already taken the same position that most of us, I believe, in this House have taken so far as these photos are concerned and the release of the photos of the detainees. So I am again at somewhat of a loss to understand why it is that even if the White House and the President himself have sided with what I think the majority of the American people feel as well as the Members of this House, why it is that we are doing the opposite in the text of the report that we will be voting on.

And I would say to the gentleman, Commander Ray Odierno, General Odierno, Commander of the Multi-national Forces in Iraq, someone that I'm sure the gentleman has had occasion to meet and I as well, who we know is a very respected and serious leader of our troops, he said just a few weeks ago, I strongly believe the release of these photos will endanger the lives of U.S. soldiers, airmen, marines, sailors, and civilians, as well as the lives of our Iraqi partners. Certain operating units are at particular risk of harm from release of the photos. And he went on to describe those particular risks that are specific.

The gentleman, I think, can agree with me it is not in the interest of securing the safety of our troops for us to remain silent or for us not to take congressional action ensuring that nothing occurs for us to possibly harm our troops in this bill. That is why I ask the gentleman again, how have we sat here and delayed consideration of the bill because now we had to ensure inclusion in the bill the stripping of the

provision which provides the safety of our troops?

And I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Maybe one of the answers is we have less enthusiasm on this side of the aisle for interposing in cases that the court is considering. I was called back on a Sunday by your side of the aisle many years ago to do exactly that. It ended up having no effect.

There are a lot of people on my side of the aisle who believe that the objective that is being sought, which the President of the United States and, to this extent, General Odierno agrees with the Commander in Chief that these photos ought not to be released, as I pointed out to you in the paragraph that I read from the President's letter. In fact, the court has stayed the release of those pending a review by the Supreme Court of the United States. This matter is under consideration. There was general concern about obviating FOIA, the Freedom of Information Act, generally as opposed to specifically. But the President has made it very clear, the Commander in Chief, and obviously General Odierno agrees with the Commander in Chief on this issue, that he is going to take such steps as are necessary to ensure that these photos are not released, to the extent that he and General Odierno both agree that the release of those pictures may, in fact, have an adverse effect on the safety of our troops. So what I simply respond to the gentleman is that the President of the United States and General Odierno are both in an agreement and the President of the United States is taking action to effect that agreement.

□ 1230

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman, Madam Speaker.

I would simply point to the vote taken yesterday in the House on the motion to instruct conferees, 267 Members of this House support the inclusion of the language barring release of the photos. So I am at a loss to understand the thinking behind this action when we bring this report to the floor that strips that language.

Not only the majority, by far the Members of this House on both sides of the aisle said that they think that language is important. The American people do. It is counterintuitive to think at all that Congress should not take action to secure the safety of our troops and stop the release of those photos.

Lastly, Madam Speaker, I would just say to the gentleman, we have been somewhat dismayed again about the clouding of the issues and the underlying principle of this bill, which is to fund our troops and provide for their safety, and we've seen this process delayed over unrelated items. It is unfortunate. And I'm hopeful that our troops are not getting the wrong message, that somehow their safety, secu-

rity and the funding of their efforts doesn't come first.

I would just lastly like to ask the gentleman: How is it that when we left the House and we had the broad bipartisan support of the provisions which fenced off the money so that we would not endanger the citizens and the communities of the targeted facilities that the detainees from Guantanamo would come to that we took that fencing off of the money to preclude the funding of shipping terrorists here, to now say that we're going to be safer, it is a better policy for us to try and achieve the rights and protect the rights of the terrorists at the potential expense of endangering U.S. citizens?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. As the gentleman knows, there's no money in here for transferring. The \$80 million that was requested was not included in the House; was not included in the Senate; it's still not included. The bill prohibits current detainees from being released in the continental United States, Alaska, Hawaii or D.C., as the gentleman knows. It prohibits current detainees from being transferred to the current United States, Alaska, Hawaii or D.C., except to be prosecuted and only after Congress receives a plan detailing: risks involved and a plan for mitigating such risk; cost of the transfer; legal rationale and court demands; and a copy of the notification provided to the Governor of the receiving State 14 days before a transfer with a certification by the Attorney General that the individual poses little or no security risk.

In addition, the bill provides current detainees cannot be transferred or released to another country unless the President submits to Congress 15 days prior to such transfer: the name of the individual and the country the individual will be transferred to; an assessment of risks posed and actions taken to mitigate such risks; and the terms of the transfer agreement with the other country, including any financial assistance.

Lastly, it requires the President to submit a report to Congress describing the disposition of each current detainee before the facility can be closed.

But let me say in the final analysis, many Republicans, including the former Secretary of State, Colin Powell, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, adviser to a number of Republican Presidents, said on a news program almost a year ago now that he believed that Guantanamo ought to be closed; he believed it should have been closed yesterday when he was speaking. That was a year ago. The President of the United States has indicated he thinks Guantanamo ought to be closed. There is disagreement on that. I understand that. But if it's going to be closed, a plan has to be effected for the purpose of dealing with those who are at Guantanamo, and the President is working on such a plan. The Congress in both bodies made a determina-

tion until we have such plan, we're not going to take action to facilitate that. That's what I think the conference agreement sets forth, and I think it sets forth protections that can give the American people a confidence level.

Let me say something additional to the gentleman. I'm older than the gentleman. When I was a child, approximately 4 or 5 years of age, I was living in Mexia, Texas. My father, born in Denmark, served in the U.S. Army. He was in his forties and wasn't sent overseas. He was the finance officer at a POW camp in Mexia, Texas. Mexia, Texas is a town of about 7,500 people—apparently then and now. I asked somebody about it just recently. There were 4,000 Nazi troops in a POW camp in Mexia, Texas. They were kept there. They were not necessarily terrorists. We need to take special precautions.

But in the pursuance of the policies enunciated by the President of the United States when he ran for office, when he was substantially elected by the American people, he told them exactly what he thought ought to be done. He is pursuing what he said to the American people he would do. He is doing it in my opinion in a thoughtful way that will protect the American public and will bring to justice those who have committed international crimes. I think that is something that we are trying to work through.

I want to reiterate. The gentleman has now mentioned so many times that we have allowed the funding of the troops to get caught up with other issues. Surely the gentleman, I know, does not mean, because he's been here long enough to know, that when the House and the Senate and the Presidency were in the hands of his party, the funding of the troops got tied up from time to time with other issues. That's the nature of the legislative process. But I'm hopeful that the gentleman, because he's so focused on getting this money to the troops quickly, will urge all of his colleagues on Tuesday to join with us in voting to fund the troops.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman and his plea for support in his bill, knowing good and well that this bill did not go out of this House without some support from Republicans that were necessary for its passage in its original form.

I would just say to the gentleman and thank him for his description of the POW camp in Texas. But here we are dealing with individuals who are not necessarily soldiers of war, they're enemy combatants, an entirely different set of circumstances that we have today.

Mr. HOYER. Will my friend yield on that question?

Mr. CANTOR. I will yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

He and I are probably two of the strongest supporters in this body. Those POWs were part of a regime that killed 6 million people. I remind him,

and the gentleman doesn't need reminding of that, but these were not simply soldiers of a regime that was pursuing a war that you and I might view in a different way.

Mr. CANTOR. Reclaiming my time, I would just say to the gentleman, as he does know, there were applicable provisions at law which govern the treatment of soldiers at war and there is a much less definitive, more nebulous environment in which we are to look towards enemy combatants, which is my point. Because with the trial of enemy combatants on U.S. soil, we are confronting, as the gentleman knows, cases of first impression at every turn, and we are confronting uncertainty as to the disposition of these cases which brings up potential harm for U.S. citizens.

I would just go back to the gentleman's plea that he would like to see us support this bill. If the primary purpose is to maintain, promote the security and safety of our troops and provide them with funding, it is a reach for me to understand how allowing for a release of photos, how allowing for the transfer of enemy combatants—terrorists—to U.S. soil furthers that end.

So I would say in closing, Madam Speaker, if the gentleman is satisfied with deferring to the White House and deferring to this President on the very core purpose of securing this country at all levels and doesn't feel the Congress should take affirmative action, then I believe his support of this bill is well put. But it is certainly the opinion of many of us in this House as indicated by votes as late as yesterday that we can do better, that we can take action to secure our troops, get them the money they need and get rid of the unrelated items in this bill.

Mr. HOYER. I simply want to observe, as I pointed out in the five or six points I made, particularly that current detainees cannot be transferred or released to another country without notice to us, nor can they be released here in the United States without further action. So that the gentleman's premise is, I think, not correct, that this President has the authority to, or the intent to release people at this time in the United States before or after trial.

Having said that, I would say, the gentleman continues to talk about the add-ons, but I will tell the gentleman, as the gentleman knows, over 80 percent of this bill deals with the funding and security of our troops and the prosecution of the effort to defeat terrorism. Over 80 percent of this bill. It is in that context that I would hope the gentleman would see his way clear to urging his colleagues to join with us in passing this needed legislation.

Mr. CANTOR. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for his suggestion and counsel, and I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JUNE 15, 2009

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning-hour debate, and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday June 16, 2009, for morning-hour debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. KILROY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Wanda Evans, one of his secretaries.

COMMENDING SOUTH ORANGETOWN SCHOOLS SUPERINTENDENT KEN MITCHELL

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

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commend South Orangetown Schools Superintendent Ken Mitchell in Rockland County in my district for his quick reaction and his bravery as he singlehandedly prevented what could have been a terrible tragedy in South Orangetown Middle School.

According to reports, a man came into the school, stormed past security and demanded at gunpoint that Mr. Mitchell make changes to a letter on swine flu. He certainly picked the wrong person to threaten when he took on Mr. Mitchell, a former hockey player and coach. The 55-year-old superintendent was able to tackle him and disarm him before police were able to break into the locked office to apprehend the suspect.

Thankfully, no one was hurt.

Why someone would enter a school with a gun is something I will never understand. It's disturbing to even fathom what could lead someone to choose to do that. However, it is heartening to realize that someone like Ken Mitchell is standing in their way.

The dedication shown by Mr. Mitchell to the children should be an example to all. Our Nation has witnessed too many deaths of our children in their schools. The people of the South Orangetown school system and the community as a whole owe him a huge debt of gratitude.

Hero is an overused word in today's world, but I can think of fewer situations which more warrant that word than protecting children in their classrooms. Ken Mitchell is truly a hero.

VIETNAM MUST RESPECT THE RULE OF LAW

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

Mr. CAO. Madam Speaker, although we live in the 21st century, many people today are still deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law by governments that lack the rule of law. One such government is the Socialist Republic of Vietnam.

About 10 years ago, the Vietnamese Ministry of Labor, War Invalids, and Social Affairs directly oversaw and operated two state-owned labor companies that were involved in the largest human trafficking case ever prosecuted by the U.S. Department of Justice. The case thoroughly documented the exploitation and abusive conditions faced by more than 230 workers at the Daewoosa factory in American Samoa. These victims were beaten, starved, sexually harassed and threatened with deportation. The High Court of American Samoa subsequently found these state-owned labor agencies liable for the atrocities and made them pay \$3.5 million to the victims. Almost 10 years after the ruling, Vietnam still refuses to acknowledge its part in these atrocities and pay.

Madam Speaker, I ask that the U.S. Congress demand that the Vietnamese government pay the damages and respect the rule of law.

□ 1245

CONTINUING BONUSES FOR BANKERS

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, since January, the American people have endured another loss of \$1.33 trillion of their wealth, having already faced the worst drop in wealth since 1951 in the prior quarter. Yet despite being at the root of our economy's tailspin, Wall Street continues to issue huge bonuses.

For example, Merrill Lynch has issued \$4 billion in bonuses to the very bankers and financiers who created this mess that are now nested over at the Bank of America. This is yet another sign that America needs to rein in the false money wizards and reward those who create real wealth in our society, starting with hardworking Americans.

So let me ask the question, when will Wall Street's profits translate into a better life for everyone else? With wealth declining and unemployment rising, America should not be hollowed out by Wall Street. Rather, Wall Street's business should translate into a better way of life for the American Republic. We have wandered far from that mark.

AMERICANS' NET WORTH SHRINKS \$1.33 TRILLION IN 1Q

(By Jeannine Aversa)

WASHINGTON.—American households lost \$1.33 trillion of their wealth in the first three months of the year as the recession took a bite out of stock portfolios and dragged down home prices.

The Federal Reserve reported Thursday that household net worth fell to \$50.38 trillion in the January-March quarter, the lowest level since the third quarter of 2004. The