

been polluted with Chicago style politics and their brains have turned to mush.

This morning, I had a lengthy teleconference concerning this issue with the Executive Vice President of the Indiana State Medical Association, James G. McIntire, J.D. Apparently ISMA has not taken any position yet. I have also written a letter to the President of the AMA, a copy is enclosed, advising my opposition and intent to resign as a member.

Please keep up the good fight. Best personal regards to you.

Sincerely,

NED P. MASBAUM, M.D.

CARMEL, IN,
July 22, 2009.

J. JAMES ROHACK, M.D.
President, American Medical Association,
Chicago, IL.

DEAR DR. ROHACK: Your announcement of the AMA's backing of nationalizing health care was shocking to say the least. It was my mistaken belief that the AMA always opposed socialized medicine since it does not work anywhere in the world. It was also my belief that the organization backed Health Savings Accounts as a truly free enterprise American way to solve the economic problems of our current system. Why would the AMA sell out it's own members and the American public?

If you and the AMA do not reverse your current position immediately, you can say goodbye to me as a member of over 40 years.

Sincerely,

NED P. MASBAUM, M.D.

On Tuesday, the Congressional Budget Office director told Senator BAUCUS that his plan to cut \$123 billion from Medicare Advantage—the program that gives almost one-fourth of seniors private health-insurance options—will result in lower benefits and some 2.7 million people losing this coverage.

Last week Mr. BAUCUS ordered Medicare regulators to investigate and likely punish Humana Inc. for trying to educate enrollees in its Advantage plans about precisely this fact.

Jonathan Blum, acting director of a regulatory office in the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, CMS, said that a mailer Humana sent its customers was “misleading and confusing to beneficiaries, who may believe that it represents official communication about the Medicare Advantage program.”

Mr. Blum has also banned all Advantage contractors from telling their customers what Mr. Elmendorf has just told Congress. Mr. Blum happens to be a former senior aide to Mr. BAUCUS and a health adviser on the Obama transition team.

So, for the record, CBO's Director Elmendorf says that cuts to Medicare Advantage “could lead many plans to limit the benefits they offer, raise their premiums, or withdraw from the program.”

Providing of accurate information by Medicare Advantage plans to its enrollees is not prohibited by applicable Federal rules and regulations.

AFGHAN ASSESSMENT

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

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, in 2007, the Commander in Chief, President George W. Bush, relied on his military commander on the

ground to give him an assessment as to what it would take to turn around what was then a very bad situation in Iraq. General Petraeus made his case before the House and Senate Armed Services Committees, and he was given the resources that he requested. The surge in Iraq provided the necessary level of security that ultimately allowed the political process there to move forward.

Similarly, General Stanley McChrystal has been charged by the Commander in Chief, President Barack Obama, to give an assessment of what it will take to win in Afghanistan and achieve the objectives that the President had committed to earlier this year.

I believe General McChrystal's report was politically sanitized and General McChrystal needs to appear before the House and Senate Armed Services Committees to give an honest assessment of what is going on in Afghanistan.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

AMERICAN POSITION AGAINST TERRORISM

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

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I stood on this floor about 3 years

ago and called upon the United States to clearly define its position toward what is now the world's largest state sponsor of terrorism, the Islamic Republic of Iran.

I then called upon the IAEA to refer Iran to the Security Council because I believed then that what Western intelligence has long suspected about Iran and what it seems that President Obama is now just beginning to realize, Iran is systematically and relentlessly pursuing the development of nuclear weapons.

Today's revelation that they have a second uranium facility at Qom should remove all doubt in any reasonable person's mind about their inevitable intentions. Yet today's announcement at the G-20 summit by the leaders of Britain, France and the United States reveal that Iran has been covertly operating and developing a new underground uranium enrichment facility at Qom.

It is disgracefully ironic that today's announcement comes only a week after announcing our abandonment of the European missile defense site which could have protected the homeland of the United States against Iranian long-range missiles, and only one day after President Obama chaired a United Nations Security Council specifically addressing the need to halt the spread of nuclear weapons throughout the world. Unbelievably, the resolution passed by the Security Council, under President Obama's leadership, omitted any mention whatsoever of either North Korea or Iran.

But regardless of the Security Council's failure to explicitly address the real and present danger that the peace-loving world faces because of Iran's nuclear ambitions, the fact is that Iran has already disregarded three previous rounds of Security Council sanctions and has continued to aggressively pursue a nuclear weapons capability, including building this underground facility and testing the long-range ballistic missiles that could be used to deliver a nuclear payload.

□ 1215

We have reached a crossroads with Iran, Mr. Speaker, that will result in one of two outcomes: either Iran transforms the geopolitical landscape by becoming a nuclear power that proliferates nuclear and missile technology to terrorists throughout the world and then threatens the very existence of countries like Israel; or, by the world's inaction, we place the tiny country of Israel in the unavoidable position of having to act unilaterally with military force to protect themselves and humanity from the threat a nuclear Iran would represent to the entire civilized world. We must not place Israel in that position, Mr. Speaker.

President Obama's announcement today also offered no assurance and, in fact, was a weaker statement than the statement given by Prime Minister Brown and President Sarkozy, who

rightly said that we live in the real world, not the virtual world, and that the real world requires leaders to make decisions to act.

With its languishing economy and literally centuries' worth of natural gas reserves, Iran's claim that it seeks nuclear capability solely for peaceful purposes is ridiculous beyond my ability to express.

It is now open knowledge that for years North Korea gave false overtures that it would engage in negotiations over its nuclear program while holding every deliberate intention to continue its covert development of its nuclear program. We are lying to ourselves and to the world that similar overtures, if made from Iran, will be any less disingenuous. And the implications for our children and our future generations are profoundly significant, Mr. Speaker.

The world must act. As one former Israeli Ambassador put it, "The game is over." Iran is no longer progressing but has now reached the endgame of diplomatic relations.

Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of every sanction and diplomatic effort possible to prevent Iran from gaining nuclear capabilities. However, ultimately I am convinced the only two things that will stop Iran from becoming a nuclear armed nation and proliferating nuclear terrorism globally in the future will either be a direct military intervention from America or other nations, or the absolute conviction in the minds of the Iranian regime that that will occur if their march toward gaining nuclear weapons continues.

The world must act, Mr. Speaker. For the sake of freedom and for all that free people love, Iran must not be allowed to progress one step further in its pursuit of nuclear weapons.

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

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

IRAN: A CLEAR AND PRESENT THREAT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, President Obama's decision to scrap a long-range, European-based missile defense shield was not only met with concern among our European allies, but more importantly has sounded alarms here at home where the President's action will leave the Nation vulnerable to Iranian long-range missile attack.

Three years ago, in response to growing threats from Iran, the U.S. developed plans to install a missile defense

system in Eastern Europe to protect Europe and the United States from potential long-range missile attack. Under the program, 10 interceptor missiles would be located in Poland and a radar station would be built in the Czech Republic by 2013. The European-based missile defense system would add an additional layer of defense to the continental United States, which already has a small network of interceptors on the west coast.

The European-based missile defense shield was endorsed by our NATO allies, who called it a "substantial contribution to their collective security." Now, the Obama administration has taken the unusual and highly questionable position of canceling the planned European-based missile defense system in favor of a scaled-back program that will not be ready until 2020.

The threat represented by Iran is real and growing. Last February, Iran launched a satellite, demonstrating substantial progress toward achieving a reliable long-range missile program. A month later, the head of the U.S. European Command testified before the House Armed Services Committee that Iran would be able to deploy an intercontinental ballistic missile, an ICBM, capable of reaching all of Europe and parts of the United States by the year 2015.

The President stated his decision was based upon reduced threats from Iran and greater cost efficiency of his alternative defense system—and anyone watching the news knows that there is no diminished threat from Iran. However, a July 2008 classified report produced by the Institute for Defense Analyses concluded that the European-based missile defense system that the administration now wants to cancel would, in fact, be the most cost effective. I have called on the administration to declassify this report so that all of the facts can be known and we can have a robust debate.

Moscow has made no secret of its opposition to the European-based missile defense system and has repeatedly called for its elimination. Furthermore, European leaders have heard from Russian leaders. The Russians have continually shown that they have no intention of pressing Iran to drop its nuclear and missile programs. For its part, Iran also shows no willingness to be deterred by Russia. Yet, the administration, in courting Moscow assistance in halting Iran's nuclear missile ambitions, has effectively chosen to surrender America's bargaining position with its shelving of the proposed missile defense system.

While the Obama administration's decision to reverse course on European missile defense is being met with smiles in Moscow, Americans have real reason to be concerned. By the administration's own admission, its alternative missile defense system will not be able to be fully capable until 2020, with intelligence indicating Iran will have ICBM capability by 2015. This

means the United States could be vulnerable to Iranian missile attack 5 years before the administration gets its new missile defense system ready.

Not only is Iran near its goal of launching ICBMs, reportedly, it has already the ability to construct a nuclear bomb. Last Thursday, a group of experts at the International Atomic Energy Agency stated, in a report obtained by the Associated Press, that Iran is already capable of building a nuclear bomb and is on the way to developing a missile system capable of carrying an atomic warhead.

Remarkably, in the face of Iran's blatant actions to develop a nuclear weapons program, the administration continues to pursue a course of unilateral disarmament. Earlier this year, the President cut funding for missile interceptors to be based in Alaska as part of the ongoing construction of a homeland missile defense system, reducing the number of interceptors by one-third. I opposed that move and offered an amendment in the House to restore the funding. Unfortunately, the President's cuts were sustained by a Democrat majority of the House.

The administration's record on missile defense at a time when both North Korea and Iran are seeking nuclear weapons capable of reaching the United States is troubling. This year, the administration has cut missile defense by \$1.2 billion, reducing by one-third our intended west coast shield which would protect us from North Korea's advancements and has stopped a European-based system intended to protect the U.S. from Iranian missile threats. In the face of known threats, this administration needs to rededicate itself to defense of the United States' mainland.

It is now my honor to recognize our ranking member of the House Armed Services Committee, BUCK MCKEON, who represents California's 25th District, was elected in 1991, has been a leader in ensuring the United States has adequate defense, both that our troops have adequate equipment in their conflicts but also in ensuring that the United States has adequate defense systems.

With that, I would like to recognize Representative MCKEON.

Mr. MCKEON. Thank you, MIKE. And thank you for holding this Special Order.

I think you have done an outstanding job of getting out to the American people the problem with cutting our missile defense system at a time of war. I have been here a little bit longer than you. I came in 1992. In 1992, we had 18 Army divisions. We are down to 12 now. Actually, in 1998, we were down to 10. We've built it back up in the last 10 years. We had 24 fighter wings; we now have 12. We had 546 Navy ships; we now have 283. Do you detect a trend?

Historically, we have cut our defenses after a war. We did that after World War I, so that when World War II came along, we were training with wooden dummy rifles and it took us a