

something that even you should never tolerate, the censorship of a Member of Congress from telling his constituents what's really going on around here, especially when their health care is concerned."

OVER 5,000 NOW DEAD IN
AFGHANISTAN AND IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, five American soldiers have been killed in Afghanistan so far this week. That brings the death toll in July to 31, making this the deadliest month for our troops since the conflict in Afghanistan began.

We also passed another tragic milestone this week. According to official Department of Defense statistics, over 5,000 American troops have now died in Iraq and Afghanistan, combined.

Of course, the human tragedy is even greater than that, because the 5,000 figure doesn't include the number of wounded American troops or the casualties suffered by the troops of other nations. It also doesn't include Iraqi civilian casualties or the military family members whose lives have been devastated. The human tragedy is so great, you can't really calculate it. And of course you must add in the Afghanistan civilian casualties as well.

What has been the reaction of this, in this Congress to the catastrophe? Well, we have passed yet another supplemental funding bill to keep the fighting going. But the situation in Afghanistan is becoming more and more dangerous. The U.S. Command expects that roadside or suicide bombings against our troops will be 50 percent higher this year than last year. In the first week of June, alone, there were more than 400 attacks, the highest level since 2001. And the Pentagon has admitted that we are losing troops at an alarming rate.

I voted against the supplemental funding bill because 90 percent of it pays for the military-only approach that has been such a failure in Afghanistan. Less than 10 percent of the supplemental goes to pay for the non-military activities that can actually prevent extremism in Afghanistan. These include economic development, reconstruction, humanitarian aid, civil affairs, and diplomacy. Even National Security Advisor James Jones has said that nonmilitary approaches are vital and that they have always been lagging.

Well, it's time for them to stop lagging, Mr. Speaker. It's time to put those ideas front and center. We must also launch a new regional diplomatic surge that engages Afghanistan's neighbors in efforts to help the Afghan people and strengthen the central government's ability to deliver services and protect the citizens.

In addition to Afghanistan, we must also pay attention to other parts of the

world where extremists take advantage of poverty and lack of opportunity to recruit new members. In these areas, America must invest in basic human needs like jobs, like health, education, education especially for girls and women who are often completely shut out of the classroom.

□ 2015

This is what the people want. This is what they need from America, not more innovations, not more occupations. This is what will bring real hope for the people's future, and this is what will help to avoid adding extremists in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, by changing and by supporting smart power over other priorities and goals, we can give the people of Afghanistan help. We can help them build a stable and functioning state. We can save the lives of our troops, and we can go a long way toward defeating extremism and stopping those who threaten our security—oh, and it would save billions of dollars as well.

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.)

PROMOTE AVIATION THROUGH
RESPONSIBLE POLICY

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

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, good evening.

Since the Wright brothers left the ground for the first time at Kitty Hawk, aviation has fascinated our collective imagination, contributed to unprecedented interaction among people, and grown to become one of the most important industries in our Nation.

Whether it was aviators of the past, like Charles Lindbergh, Amelia Earhart, or those more recently, like Steve Fossett, who flew a solo, nonstop trip around the world that began and ended in Salina, Kansas, aviation has had a unique ability to capture our attention and to inspire us to achieve things which we once thought were impossible.

Advances in aviation technology and engineering have led to the development of larger, faster, more fuel-efficient planes that carry passengers and goods around the world. The ease of travel and shipment modern aviation allows has contributed to a worldwide economic growth and to new opportunities for leisure travel for far more people than ever before. In America, the aviation industry accounts for more than \$1 trillion in economic activity each year. Millions of Americans are employed by this critical industry that facilitates so many other economic transactions.

As a Kansan, I take special pride in the aviation industry, which has deep roots in our State. Pioneers in the industry, such as Glenn Stearman, Walter Beech, Clyde Cessna, Bill Lear, and Amelia Earhart, all have important connections to the Sunflower State. Many of these innovators helped establish Wichita as the "Air Capital of the World." Today, a who's who of aviation companies operates in the city of Wichita, including Boeing, Airbus, Bombardier, Cessna, Hawker Beechcraft, Spirit Aerosystems, and Raytheon.

In Kansas, the aviation industry accounts for 20 percent of the State's manufacturing employment, and it employs tens of thousands of Kansans. Engineers, machinists, mechanics, inspectors, scientists, and technicians are dedicated to producing the best aircraft in the world. These employees take great pride in what they do, and they deserve our support.

Yet the industry faces significant challenges. The recession has hit aviation hard, and many workers have lost their jobs. During the difficult times that we're in, Congress especially needs to be supportive of this critical component of America's manufacturing base. Efforts to demagogue about the use of private planes and business aviation by private corporations harm this industry. I was troubled in January, during the consideration of the TARP Reform and Accountability Act, that provisions to limit businesses from leasing or from using general aircraft for business purposes were almost included in the final legislation. Doing so would have lowered the national aviation production, and it would have hurt workers everywhere, especially in Kansas, where more than 54 percent of our country's aviation products are manufactured.

Congress must remember the importance of this industry, not only to our national economy but to so many local and regional economies within the country. It is in our collective interest to protect and to encourage growth in the general aviation community.

As a member of the Congressional Aviation Caucus, I work to inform and to educate Members of Congress about the importance of this industry to our Nation. Congress was right to, once again, reject the "user-fee" proposal that would have further harmed general aviation. User fees would have unfairly burdened the general aviation industry. Congress must continue to oppose unnecessary taxes or fees on general aviation. Those in Congress must also question and fight the impractical regulations, such as the Transportation Security Administration's large aircraft security proposal, which would apply to many of the planes owned by individuals and small companies.

When it comes to key American industries, aviation is at the top of the list. I encourage my colleagues to join me in pledging to do all we can to promote aviation through responsible policy.

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

(Mr. SALAZAR addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE PUBLIC'S OPTION

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

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, the American Medical Association has given a ringing endorsement of H.R. 3200, America's Affordable Health Choices Act. This legislation contains a strong public insurance option which would guarantee that quality, affordable health care is available to all Americans.

The AMA has not always been on board with health care reform. Many of us remember their opposition to President Clinton's efforts. Yet the AMA and the millions of doctors it represents now realize that the status quo system is broken. They understand the urgency of the problem, and they recognize that the pending bill is a major part of the solution.

The AMA's strong voice joins the chorus of Americans who want this Congress to pass a health care reform bill that includes a public option. Nearly three-quarters of all Americans want the option to participate in a government-administered health insurance plan that competes on a level playing field with private insurers. Popular support for the public option is not a partisan issue. Seventy-one percent of independent voters support the public option, and so do half of all Republican voters.

Americans want this bill. They want the public option, and they want us to act now.

Americans understand the critical role the public option plays in slowing skyrocketing health care costs. A government-administered plan can provide quality insurance at a low cost, leading by example to make the health care market more efficient.

Efficiency will save families money. If we fail to act, the cost of health care for the average family of four will rise by \$1,800 annually for years to come. The public option is not just important for families. It's also key to putting our Nation's economy on the road to a full and sustainable recovery. If we don't contain health care costs, then our Nation's budget deficit will continue to spiral out of control.

Let us be very clear. The public option is not an attempt to drive private insurers out of business. Some State governments already offer their employees a choice between public and private health insurance, and private insurers have fared just fine.

A public option is critical to containing the health care costs that weigh so heavily on our Nation's fami-

lies and on our Nation's economy. The public option does what a good private policy should do. It promotes primary care. It caps out-of-pocket spending so that a family medical crisis no longer means a family financial crisis. It establishes shared accountability between doctors, patients and the insurer. It institutes new payment structures to promote critical reforms. It will ensure that patients are able to get the medically effective treatments their doctors recommend. In short, it provides high-quality care at an affordable price.

Just like private plans, the public option will be financially self-sustaining, receiving no special government funding beyond a loan to get it off the ground. The public plan will be bound by exactly the same rules that regulate private insurers. In other words, the public plan will compete on a level playing field with private insurers.

Some powerful industries have spoken out against the public option. They prefer the status quo where decisions about treatment a patient receives are determined according to a company's bottom line rather than according to what a patient needs.

On the side of meaningful reform, the most important voice of all is calling for the inclusion of a public option. That loud chorus is the voice of the American people. Now is the time to listen to them. Now is the time for health reform with a strong public option.

DEMOCRAT CENSORSHIP OF GOP VIEWS OF HEALTH CARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, when I served in this House the first time around, the Cold War was still ongoing, and there was a term that often appeared in the press. It was called Samizdat, S-a-m-i-z-d-a-t. That word was used to describe communications which conveyed the opinions of people disfavored by an oppressive regime. It was the personally published commentary among peoples who felt they were oppressed in Communist countries. Why? Because their opinions were not allowed to be expressed in the official press.

Today, we have a situation in this House in which Mr. HERGER, Mr. LAMAR SMITH, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BONNER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. OLSON, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mr. PRICE thus far have been refused by the majority permission to express their points of view with respect to one of the most critical issues facing our country, that of reforming our health care system.

One of the most distinguished Members of this body, a member of the Ways and Means Committee, Congress-

man KEVIN BRADY from Texas, in working with the Republican economic staff of the Joint Economic Committee, came up with this chart, outlining what we believe to be the bureaucratic nightmare contained in the majority's proposal for health care.

Now, the majority disagrees with our interpretation of the facts, and that's part of politics. That's part of this body, but the majority has now said we will not allow you in the minority to use any official communications mechanisms to share your views of the impact of this legislation on your constituents.

Now, why does this seem strange?

Well, it just happens that, in 1993, we were faced with what later became known as HillaryCare, an attempt by the Clinton administration to take over health care by the Federal Government. At that time, Republicans also came up with a flowchart that showed the bureaucratic morass that would result from that proposal. I have with me a copy of the permission from the franking commission at that time that this be allowed. The only difference I can see between the two charts is that one is in black and white and that one is in color.

What has happened in the interim? Well, HillaryCare was defeated. The President said we can't stand to defeat his particular proposal, that they somehow have all of the answers.

Now, some people may say, "Well, what is it that the franking commission is supposed to do? What are your rules?" The rules have been established essentially to make sure that Members do not abuse the right of communication by turning their publications into campaign pieces, so we limit the number of pictures one can have there, the number of references that can be made to the Member, himself or herself.

To give you an example of what we on the Republican side have approved, I have a newsletter that has gone out by one of the Members on the Democratic side in which the claim was made that the stimulus package has helped create and save 3.5 million Americans jobs. I think that's absurd; I think that is a point of argument, but I don't believe that we ought to stop a Member of Congress from the Democratic side from making that assertion to his constituents.

I have another one with me that was approved in which a Democratic Member has claimed that 3.5 million jobs nationwide have been created—215,000 jobs in New York and 7,200 jobs in her particular district.

Then I have a copy of a letter that was approved last year from the Speaker, herself, in which she says that the New Direction Congress—that's how she defines it—also fought to increase compensation for our troops in the face of opposition from the Bush administration. It then goes on to criticize the President even though he signed it.

We disagree with the characterizations that were in Speaker PELOSI's