

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, dotting 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

its promise of no more war supplementals for Iraq and Afghanistan. The President has gone back on every promise that he made during the campaign. He has already asked for a supplemental this year, says it was a carryover from last year, but that won't happen again. However, before the ink was dry on the amended full committee report of this bill, the chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, Congressman MURTHA, publicly stated that another supplemental is necessary to fund the troops because of the low fiscal year 2010 Defense allocation.

So the promise was that all of the money for the war was going to be here and we wouldn't have to do more supplementals. That isn't going to happen.

This bill also avoids making hard fiscal choices about spending abroad while we face a financial crisis here. This is not the way we should be going. We should be funding our friends and our allies. We should be helping Israel which is the only true democracy in the Middle East and who stands by us year after year, day after day. But funding things like abortion and international family planning is not the way to go.

WASHINGTON IS OUT OF CONTROL

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, America has been the light of liberty and a beacon of hope to the world for centuries, truly centuries. We are the greatest Nation the world has ever known. We have provided more hope and more opportunity and more liberty and more freedom for more individuals than any nation in the history of mankind.

But today, July 9, 2009, folks in my district and folks across this land are not just concerned; they are fearful. They are afraid that the very Nation that they know and love and that has been the greatest Nation in the history of the world is slipping away from them—in so many ways, so many ways.

Mr. Speaker, we all just got back to Washington from a week many of us spent at home over the July 4 break, and I heard people come up to me and tell me that they were concerned and worried and fearful about the amount of spending and the amount of borrowing and the amount of taxing coming out of Washington. They say Washington is out of control. Mr. Speaker, they are right. They are absolutely right. The deficit this year, \$1.8 trillion; four times the largest previous deficit. Four times.

Borrowing. We are borrowing 50 cents of every single dollar we are spending. Mr. Speaker, it is out of control. Taxing, raising taxes on every single American. I don't care what the President tells you, Mr. Speaker, it is not

true. They are raising taxes on every single American.

Now the solution, one of the solutions, is to allow this deliberative body, this greatest deliberative body in the history of the world the opportunity to allow the Representatives in this body to work their will, to say I believe I am going to represent my constituents in this way and offer this amendment on this bill and thereby allow the House to make a decision.

We are in appropriations season, Mr. Speaker. It is a time when we decide how to spend Americans' hard-earned money, the money that they send to Washington. During that season in the past, the House has allowed appropriations bills to come to the floor under what is called an open rule which means that everybody gets the opportunity to amend the appropriations bill. They get the opportunity to offer an amendment in the House, and the House gets to vote on the amendment.

There have been amendments offered on recent bills that have not been allowed. In fact, this is the most repressive majority in the history of the Republic if you use the number of closed rules, not allowing amendments to come to the floor.

This, Mr. Speaker, this is the most repressive majority ever in the history of this Republic.

An amendment that was offered but not allowed to the bill we voted on today would have prohibited funding for any new international organization for the purposes that would tax American energy companies from abroad. The only conclusion I can draw is that the Speaker and the Democrats in charge want American energy companies to be taxed by foreign governments.

An amendment that wasn't allowed would have reduced the spending 15 percent on this bill to 2009 levels, a savings of \$17 billion. That amendment, Mr. Speaker, was not allowed. I can only assume that the Speaker and the Democrats in charge want to increase spending by \$17 billion over 2009 levels.

An amendment that wasn't allowed, an amendment to prevent U.S. funds from being used to pay the legal expenses of United Nations employees who have been charged with malfeasance, not allowed. Mr. Speaker, I can only conclude that the Speaker of the House and the Democrats in charge want the American taxpayers to pay the legal expenses for United Nations employees who are charged with malfeasance.

Mr. Speaker, an amendment that wasn't allowed would have prohibited assistance to members of foreign terrorist organizations. Mr. Speaker, the only thing I am left to conclude and the American people are left to conclude is that this Speaker and the Democrats in charge want the American taxpayer to provide assistance to members of foreign terrorist organizations.

Mr. Speaker, this isn't the way the House is supposed to be run. It is not

the way that the House has been run for the last 233 years. It is not the way that the American people learned about democracy, that their Representatives would be allowed to represent them actively and aggressively so that people had the opportunity to represent their constituents equally with every other Member.

Mr. Speaker, right now in this Chamber we have tyranny from the majority, tyranny that is not allowing the voice of the people to be heard. Mr. Speaker, I demand that this Chamber, that these Members of this House of Representatives make certain that the rules are appropriately followed and end the tyranny of the majority in this Chamber now.

DEMOCRATS ABUSE RULES PROCESS

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to follow up on what my friend from Georgia was saying, about tyranny in this House. We were promised the most open government in the Nation's history. That's what we were promised.

There is the Speaker's Web site that even talks about how open it is going to be. Well, it isn't. And as a result, the Nation is being punished because some of the things that our friends across the aisle said before they were elected to the majority to control this city and this country were true.

□ 2045

You do better when you have open government and open amendments and can debate these ideas. But that's not what we've gotten. Oh, no. We've had an abuse of the rule process. Why? Because they can.

I was asked, as I was around the district this last week, Why do you let them get away with all these things that are going on? And I said, Well, you're not following what's going on. Every time we make a privileged motion, we try to enforce the rules, it's tabled every time, so it's not going anywhere. So no one is held to account for abuses. Why? Because they can—and they didn't want an open government.

You know, the founding of this country tells so much. Those guys were so brilliant. They were so much better read than most of the people in this body now. They knew what government led to. They knew what the abuse of power led to. And so they weren't content to have one body elected, they said, let's have two. And not only should we have two bodies, let's make them at odds with each other. We need friction so that there is not this abuse.

And not only that, we don't want to do like we've seen some parliaments do where they elect their executive. No, no, no. We want the people to elect an executive, and then he will be at