

This was not Seth's first deployment in the global war on terror. He enlisted with the Marines at age 17 and was serving his Nation in Iraq at age 18. Even at such a young age, Seth embraced the challenge of the Marine Corps and took pride in serving his country. His service and his sacrifice will never be forgotten.

Lance Corporal Sharp leaves behind his fiancée and lifelong sweetheart, Katie McMahon; his father and his stepmother, Rick and Tiffany Sharp of Adairsville, Georgia; his mother, Angela Preston of Alligator Point, Florida; as well as many other close relatives and friends spread out all across the country.

Mr. Speaker, my prayers go out to his family, and my most heartfelt gratitude goes out to Lance Corporal Seth Sharp for his selfless sacrifice for this Nation. I ask all Members to please join me in honoring the distinguished memory of Lance Corporal Seth Sharp.

CLEAN ENERGY AND THE GREAT LAKES REGION

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, hundreds and hundreds of Americans will gather in Massena, New York, to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the fourth seacoast of our country, stretching all the way from Duluth, Minnesota, all the way out to the Atlantic Ocean, and for communities such as Toledo and Port Clinton and Sandusky in my own congressional district, the Saint Lawrence Seaway waterborne corridor is our gateway to the Atlantic and the world beyond.

The seaway is the linchpin in our efforts to create sophisticated, modern, multimodal distribution hubs that can skirt the congestion in coastal ports in our country. The seaway, our corridor that we share with the Canadians, is the vital link of commerce between our Nation's heartland and world markets. Therefore, investments in the seaway are not only investments in our economic future for the Great Lakes States but for the Nation.

As the United States Congress considers clean energy legislation and a national power generation policy, it is important that that policy remediate a major national energy inequity that must be included in any reform bill.

Power costs are just horrendous in the Great Lakes States, in fact, double and triple the rates of our western and southern brethren and southeastern brethren in our country. And when you think about those regions having had the luxury of Federal power support for nearly 75 years—and they have enjoyed those power supports—they were really a product of a Nation that believed in growing to the west and the south. And we made it happen.

But our Great Lakes region, along with some northeastern States, are the

only parts of our country without equal access to Federal benefit for electric power generation and transmission, thus denying competitive rates to our residential, commercial, and industrial consumers.

The high costs of power just in my district here in northern Ohio—at 14 to 18 cents a kilowatt hour—is a serious factor contributing to job loss. In fact, the Midwest is put at a competitive disadvantage with the entire rest of the country, not because we have fewer resources or less skilled workers, but because Federal subsidies encourage development in western and southern areas, but not in ours.

The House version of the energy bill includes a provision members of the Great Lakes States worked very hard to incorporate. It begins the process of leveling the energy playing field for these Great Lakes States and creating the startup of Federal energy parity.

The Great Lakes region is home to 116 million people that account for well over a third of our Nation's gross domestic product, and we've long endured these serious competitive disadvantages because of the absence of Federal power parity.

This provision aims to level the playing field with all other regions of the country—the South, the West, the Southeast, the Tennessee Valley Authority—that have benefited for over 75 years from Federal power assistance to develop their economies.

These regions borrow at very favorable Federal funds rates and also receive significant energy infrastructure investments annually, with the Western Power Authority alone receiving over \$228 million just in the last year.

In the recovery bill passed earlier this year, there was an additional \$6.5 billion just for Bonneville Power Authority and the Western Area Power Authority, along with \$10 million for added infrastructure and administration.

For infrastructure, for renewable power generation, really, these Federal supports provide a huge strategic advantage. The language we're offering would propose a similar \$3.5 billion borrowing authority to create jobs through the development of clean energy platforms, and if we don't do this in our region, those green energy jobs are going to flow to the other parts of the country.

This provision would allow a Federal instrumentality such as the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation to undertake these green energy development activities across Great Lakes communities. And as the energy bill moves to the Senate, Members of this body must continue to demand equal treatment from the Federal Government for all regions of our Nation.

Our region's track record is commendable. It speaks for itself. We're among the three top solar centers in the hemisphere. We have massive biofuels industries, the first solar plant at a U.S. National Guard base, estab-

lishment of clean energy incubators at many of our advanced universities, and an expanding roster of startup green companies that are pursuing exciting opportunities in solar, wind, and other green power sectors.

The Great Lakes deserve to be a part of the solution to clean energy in our country, but in order to do this, we need to have that Federal energy power parity with the other regions of the country that have now developed as a result of what the Midwest and Northeast did for them over three-quarters of a century ago.

A true revolution in green energy can only be ushered in in a balanced way when the Great Lakes have the same instrumentalities that ushered in generations of western and southern growth.

ARE WE REDISTRIBUTING THE WEALTH?

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

Mr. INGLIS. Today, the Obama administration has floated an idea that really is rather shocking and is quite different than what I thought we were going to do with the TARP money that's coming back to us. In fact, last week I had two town meetings where I talked to folks in South Carolina's Fourth District about how it is that the \$350 billion of TARP I is now coming back to us, the taxpayers of the United States. In fact, \$70 billion has been repaid.

We're earning interest ranging from 5 to 9 percent on that. And the last reports we had, it's totaling \$4.5 billion that's paid back to us in interest. So you have the principal return of about \$70 billion. We have interest coming back to us in the form of the magnitude of somewhere around \$4.5 billion.

Today's story indicates that really it's a larger amount of interest; it's \$6.5 billion.

Now, what the Obama administration is talking about doing—and this truly is shocking, Mr. Speaker—is that that money would not come back to pay down the deficit from whence cometh the \$350 billion that we spent on TARP but, rather, they would divert this money to troubled homeowners.

There are two problems with this, Mr. Speaker. One is a real constitutional question, which is: What gives? The administration gets to decide, not Congress. The administration gets to decide, the Executive gets to decide about how to redistribute this money so that they can basically take it and use it for the Treasury purposes to do something else besides pay back to the deficit or pay back to the Federal Treasury? I don't think so, Mr. Speaker. It's a constitutional problem with that. That's the first objection.

The second is: Is this administration absolutely intent on redistributing

wealth? Isn't that what they're doing here? This money is America's money that we invested in trying to save our banking system from collapse, putting \$350 billion in TARP I into this effort to stop the collapse of our banking system.

When that money is paid back, it should come to all of us, all American taxpayers. We invested it; we should get it back. This is what I was telling in town meetings last week is that we're going to get this money back. And we've got a shot at getting back TARP I, maybe even at a profit.

But now the Obama administration is talking about redistributing that money, not giving it back to all the taxpayers; rather, doting on constituencies that they find favorable or that they are favorable to. So they pick up on a sympathetic case, which is maybe troubled homeowners, and they decide that we'll just slough the money to them rather than pay it back to the Treasury and have it enjoyed by all the taxpayers who invested the \$350 billion to the banking system.

So I ask you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, there's a constitutional objection here that we really should be concerned about as a Congress, and then there's this real question about how far will this administration go in attempting to redistribute wealth.

This money belongs to all of the American people. This money we pledged together to try to rescue the banking system. As it comes back, paid back to us, it should be paid back to all of us, not just to troubled homeowners, not just to sympathetic cases but, rather, to all American taxpayers.

So I urge my colleagues to join with me in watching the constitutional question here and watching the redistribution of wealth, which we must object to, Mr. Speaker.

AGREEMENT ON NUCLEAR ARMS CONTROL

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. I rise today to congratulate President Obama on reaching an agreement on nuclear arms control with Russian President Medvedev. This agreement will cut American and Russian nuclear arsenals by at least one quarter. This represents a critical step towards more substantial arms control, as well as a milestone in confronting our nuclear legacy.

I, like most Americans, was born in the nuclear age. The 1945 bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki marked its beginning, establishing an uncertain peace in a war-weary world.

□ 2030

But with the global proliferation of nuclear weapons, the threat of catastrophe grew ever closer. Confrontations in Berlin, in Cuba and the Middle East

were one miscalculation away from disaster. But rather than learning from these close calls and taking dramatic steps to reduce our stockpiles of nuclear arms, we built more, and so did the Soviet Union.

Our arms control efforts were limited at best, and at worst they collapsed under the pressure of pursuing a global containment strategy against the Soviet Union. Today, the United States and Russia each deploy over 2,000 nuclear warheads. Although both countries exercise extreme care in managing these weapons, only one mistake in judgment could be fatal. That risk has grown as seven other countries have joined the so-called nuclear club over the past half century.

Our nuclear warheads are also expensive to maintain and draw badly needed funding away from other priorities. As former President Eisenhower said, "Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired, signifies in the final sense a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and are not clothed."

For this reason I stand here today not only to congratulate President Obama on his progress in Moscow, but also to urge him to take further steps toward reducing the global stockpile of nuclear weapons. Like President Obama, I recognize that we live in a world in which threats to peace are no longer confined to the traditional great powers.

I echo President Obama's sentiment that in this "strange turn of history, the threat of global nuclear war has gone down, but the risk of nuclear attack has gone up."

Rogue states and terrorist organizations are dedicated to acquiring nuclear weapons. We must be vigilant in controlling these weapons and making sure that they do not fall into the wrong hands. A nuclear arms treaty with Russia to replace the expiring START treaty is a good place to start. We should also ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty which aims to limit the proliferation of nuclear weapons around the world.

We must confront the terrible legacy of the Cold War. We must recognize that although this legacy belongs to another generation, it is now our responsibility to enact change. We must stop wasting money on the excesses of the Cold War and start thinking about improving the present. We must show the world that we are committed to reducing this nuclear threat. We must do everything we can to ensure that nuclear weapons are never used again.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

TROUBLING INCREASES IN STATE-FOREIGN OPERATIONS APPROPRIATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, the vote that I took this afternoon on H.R. 3081 was one of the toughest votes that I have had to take in this House since I have been here in my 4½ years. The problem with the bill and with the decision that had to be made is because the bill contained funding for aid to Israel, our best friend in the world.

I have always been and will continue to be an extremely strong supporter of Israel. Israel has always been a good friend to the United States, and the people of this country and the people of Israel share the same values. However, the bill had so many flaws that it made it very difficult for a pro-life fiscal conservative such as myself to vote for the bill despite my very strong support for Israel.

The bill, when emergency supplemental funds were not taken into account, was still 32 percent more than the regular fiscal year 2009 appropriations. I am taking the liberty of using some of the figures from my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE), which were also presented today on the floor in terms of explaining the bill that we voted on this afternoon.

We are facing a fiscal crisis in this country. This administration and this Congress, led by Speaker PELOSI, are spending this country into a terrible, terrible situation. We are mortgaging our children and grandchildren's future with excess spending; and it has to stop somewhere.

Had this bill merely contained the funding for Israel, it would have been very easy for me to have supported it, although I was quite concerned that the bill reduced the funding for Israel by 7.2 percent below last year's funding level and 23.3 percent below the request. But, as I said earlier, the total bill had an increase of 33.8 percent compared to last year.

One of the most troubling increases in this bill was a 20 percent increase to the United Nations Population Fund and a 19 percent increase to International Family Planning. The United Nations Population Fund aids China's one-child policy, coercive abortion, and sterilization. International Family Planning goes to organizations that promote and provide abortion services through International Planned Parenthood Federation and Marie Stokes International.

In addition, the Democrats had rejected four cost-cutting Republican amendments that had been presented which could have made this bill a lot more palatable to the 97 Republicans who voted against it.

Another problem with the bill is that there was a false assumption that the Obama administration will live up to