

by the way, as the gentleman knows, all 11 of the 12 appropriations bills having passed. And while I was not sure of what was going to happen on the health care bill, we will achieve our objective of passing all 12 appropriations bills in a timely fashion.

I yield back.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

I think the gentleman, though, speaks to the point I'm trying to make. We are trying to get things right here, and spending billions of dollars for spending's sake is not the goal here, and I know he agrees with me on that, that we are trying to effect the most prudent expenditure of taxpayer dollars in these very difficult economic times.

As the gentleman knows, we voted on a PAYGO bill this week, and frankly, the spirit behind that PAYGO bill was to attempt to restrain the type of spending that we've seen this Congress conduct. In fact, this week, in one of the reports, one of the authors of an opinion column said, frankly, we are spending—the spending PAYGO bill that was passed this week was full of loopholes.

And again, we know that the PAYGO bill that was passed was that. It wasn't a holistic PAYGO bill. It wasn't something that, frankly, will do much to address the runaway spending. So we still sit here, Mr. Speaker, and want to have an open process so we can contribute to holding back the runaway spending in this town.

So I would say to the gentleman, just as he has said to me, we ought to be looking to try and open up this process again. We were not allowed to do so in the PAYGO debate and address the number one concern of this government right now, which is the runaway spending. We have not been allowed to do so in any of the appropriations bills, and if we are going to be here through the weekend, as the gentleman may suggest, why isn't it we couldn't take that time to debate the DOD bill in an open and full, transparent manner?

I yield.

Mr. HOYER. As I said, I think we'll have a rule similar to the ones that we have considered the previous 11 bills under.

Mr. CANTOR. I didn't hear the gentleman, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HOYER. I said, as I said, I believe we will be considering the defense bill under rules similar to those which have led to the passage of the other 11 bills.

I yield back.

Mr. CANTOR. I will say to the gentleman, obviously, with much disappointment, and I think really reflecting the disappointment on the part of the American people, that we should be having a much more robust debate on these issues. Certainly, if we are going to be addressing the issue of health care, and the gentleman says that his side is insistent on rushing back to the floor, insisting on some political deadline, then I don't understand why it is we couldn't have an

open debate on some of the other issues if we are going to be waiting around here until next Monday or Tuesday.

So, with that, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I yield back.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JULY 27, 2009

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. 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, July 28, 2009, for morning-hour debate.

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

There was no objection.

INCREASE PRESSURE ON HONDURAN COUP GOVERNMENT

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the de facto government in Honduras and President Zelaya should accept the San Jose Accord proposed by Costa Rican President Oscar Arias. The Arias proposal includes the return of President Zelaya, formation of a unity government, a general amnesty for political crimes by all parties, and moves forward the date of the upcoming elections.

The U.S. should impose tough sanctions on the de facto government that carried out the coup. The U.S. should suspend all MCC funds, cancel visas for members of the de facto government and their families, and freeze all their assets in the United States. President Zelaya must also accept the terms of the Arias proposal in order to restore democracy in Honduras and avoid greater conflict and bloodshed.

Not a single, solitary government in the world recognizes the coup government. It's time to end this stalemate and move forward. The Arias proposal puts the Honduran people first, treats all parties with respect, and offers a peaceful resolution. It's not too late for President Zelaya and Roberto Micheletti to accept it.

F-22 PRODUCTION

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

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, 2 days after the Senate voted to strip funding for an additional seven F-22 Raptors from the 2010 National Defense Authorization Act, it seems that critical information may have been withheld that could have influenced the outcome of this vote; an internal Pentagon oversight board report has

revealed that full rate production of the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter may be delayed.

Given that the need to transition to the F-35 was cited by several Senators who voted to terminate the F-22 program, it is indeed troubling that this information was held internally until after the F-22 vote earlier this week. If the Pentagon had been forthright with the facts, there is a very strong chance that the hearts and the minds of several Senators might have been changed and the funding for the additional F-22s may not have been stripped.

The news that the F-35 will again be delayed only further strengthens the argument for continued production of the world's only fifth-generation fighter in full-rate production, the F-22 Raptor.

I hope that as we move forward with negotiations between the House and the Senate on the future of the F-22 program, the Pentagon will make every effort possible to ensure that Congress is fully briefed on the facts and what they mean for the future of American air dominance.

JULY 24, 2009, THE FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE KITCHEN DEBATE

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

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, today, July 24, marks the 50th anniversary of an important incident in the history of the cold war, the famous Kitchen Debate in Moscow between then Vice President Richard Nixon and Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev.

At the informal debate in 1959, Mr. Khrushchev predicted wrongly that the Soviet Union would overtake America in economic prosperity. As Time Magazine reported, Vice President Nixon managed in a unique way to personify a national character proud of peaceful accomplishment, such as its way of life, confident of its power under threat.

Today, I pay tribute to President Nixon for his diplomacy and his years of service to the Nation, including at the Kitchen Debate 50 years ago today.

FOREIGN WORKERS AND U.S. AIRCRAFT

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, American taxpayers spend millions of dollars a year screening people who board an airplane. We check IDs and roll-on luggage. We check purses, pockets and computers, and we take off our shoes. We check everything that goes through the door. But the next attack on our country is probably not going to be because somebody is flying in an airplane. It will probably be because somebody has access to our airports and our airplanes who shouldn't.

Byron Burris of WFFA in Dallas reports that the San Antonio Aerospace facility in Texas has hired 767 foreign airplane mechanics over the past 2 years without a real background check. These mechanics come from 45 countries, including Vietnam, Ethiopia, Egypt, Venezuela, Nicaragua, Cuba, Jordan, China and Sudan. These people work on American airplanes.

The State Department says it does a "criminal" background check, but reports indicate those checks are of poor quality and sometimes are left up to a third party.

We are ignoring the obvious when it comes to airline safety. Foreign workers with shady or unknown backgrounds should not have access to American aircraft.

And that's just the way it is.

□ 1515

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, just a moment ago I heard the minority whip profess interest in working with the Democrats to reform the health care system. Yet, I'm sad to say that the minority whip, the minority leader have been part of an effort to deal with fear and misrepresentation, attacking bipartisan legislation that would have done precisely that, reform the health care system.

Sadly, Mr. Speaker, there are some here who simply are not expressing the sense of urgency that most of us feel from the American people, a sense of urgency about fixing a broken health care system that costs too much, that produces wildly uneven results, and leaves too many outside the system of coverage, and others, with health insurance, at risk. We cannot continue along this path. Americans are not getting the help they need, even if they have insurance coverage. I was, I must say, disappointed, to say the very least, to see the attack on bipartisan legislation that we have worked on to help reform the health care system.

In a statement from the minority leader, and with the whip, and Mr. McCOTTER, there is an allegation that somehow there is legislation in the

health care draft that may place senior citizens in situations where they feel pressured to sign end-of-life directives that they would not otherwise sign that may start us down a "treacherous path towards government-encouraged euthanasia if enacted into law."

Well, Mr. Speaker, nothing could be further from the truth. Had the minority leader, and his whip, and the conference Chair bothered to check how that legislation came to be enacted into our health care legislation, they would have found out that it was work of a bipartisan group of Ways and Means Committee members. There were Republicans cosponsoring it along with Democrats. We had spirited discussion dealing with the fact that too often senior citizens and their families are not given the information they need to be able to cope with the most serious situation any of us will ever face as we have a loved one move into the end of his or her life.

We discussed how Medicare would pay for tests to hook people up, to poke them, to run them through machines, to have them on ventilators, to do all sorts of things; but it will not pay a health care professional to sit down with that patient, with that family, and let them know what they expect, answer their questions, help them know what their choices are. We had examples of committee members talk about their loved ones, and I would say, Republican committee members talk about how their loved ones didn't get that type of help at the end of life and actually were subjected to things that they thought were not in the best interests of their loved one. If they had a choice, they wouldn't have done it over again, and it didn't prolong their life, it actually made them less comfortable.

We're seeking to change that, to be able to adjust Medicare so that it speaks to the needs of American seniors and their families, that they're given the attention they need to prepare for this difficult period of time. There's nothing in this legislation that would force people to have consultations. There's nothing that would force them to sign advance directives. It's not going to choose a health care professional by the government and force it on them.

It's the type of sad, inflammatory rhetoric that suggests that people aren't serious about health care reform, not serious about meeting the needs of American families, but, rather, they're playing political games. Mr. Speaker, I can't tell you how disappointed I was to see this type of reaction to a carefully crafted piece of legislation that we've been working on for more than 6 months that is bipartisan and that speaks to the needs of American families.

The American public, especially our senior citizens, deserve our best efforts to meet their needs, not treat them like political footballs. I hope the Republican leadership will reconsider,

and that we'll be able to enact provisions like this to help our senior citizens.

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.)

THE BEST PRODUCT FOR AMERICA

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, back in November, Hank Paulson, the Secretary of the Treasury, and President Bush came to Congress in a rush that the financial sky was going to fall out if we did not pass the TARP bill, the financial bailout for Wall Street. Now, we were told that if we didn't do it, that stock portfolios and savings of Americans all over the country would decrease, maybe as much as 30 or 40 percent. Well, in that spirit of panic that frequently happens in this town, we did pass TARP. And what happened to your IRA back home? What happened to your savings account? What happened to your stock portfolio? Unless you're extremely lucky and unusual, your assets dropped by 30 or 40 percent. So much for the \$700 billion bailout.

And then in January, President Obama, using the same panic tactic, came to us and said, we have got to pass a second stimulus program. Keep in mind we had already passed one under President Bush in May of 2008. But we had to pass, in a hurry, something big, something dramatic, \$790 billion for a stimulus program. Why? Because the unemployment rate was 8 percent. But this would give us immediate results, President Obama promised. And so that was passed by Congress.

And yet, now, unemployment is approaching 10 percent, and in States like Michigan, as high as 15 percent; 2½ million Americans have become unemployed since the passage of the stimulus program. And now we have the same Washington-knows-best experts telling us that we have to pass major health care reform by next week, August 1.

Now, I want you to think about this. This is 17 percent of the economy, and we would put it in the hands of the Federal Government. It would set up a scheme where there would be a health care czar that would run and stipulate insurance policies all over the country; and in order to sell insurance in the United States of America, you would have to go through this bureaucracy and enter into an exchange. And there, inside this closed circle defined by the Federal Government, you would compete against a government option