

have provided a missile defense capability to the United States mainland from Europe that would have been available as early as 2013. All of our intelligence agencies are indicating that by 2015, Iran could have missile technology to reach the United States. That's why we needed that missile defense technology in 2013. They were going to have ICBM capability by 2015.

The International Atomic Energy Agency said just last week that Iran already has the capability to produce a nuclear weapon. So when we're talking about 2015, and they are going to have the ICBM capability to reach the United States, we are talking about a missile perhaps with a nuclear warhead. This administration scraps that plan and, instead, proposes a plan that will not be available until 2020.

So by all the information we have right now, this administration's action has a 5-year gap that has developed in the time period where the administration is accepting the capability by Iran without having the missile defense technology to protect the United States.

What else are we hearing from Iran? Today there was an announcement that Iran has a covert uranium enrichment facility. This should come as no surprise. This is a country that has continued to seek missile technology, nuclear technology and nuclear capability. We understand that Tehran is not just trying to do this for civilian purposes, that it actually represents a threat to the United States, and that's why people have been such advocates to ensure that this country has the appropriate missile defense technology to protect the country.

So the administration responds and says, It's not just 2020. We have capability in Alaska. That will be our backup plan. We can use our missiles in Alaska to protect the United States from Iran.

The problem with that is that this administration, through this House just this year, cut Alaska's missile defense capabilities by a third. So we would have had our AEGIS and THAAD capability, we would have had our European capability, and we would have had our Alaska capability, perhaps for multiple shots that could have occurred in order to protect this country from Iran's quest for an ICBM with it, as is now said by the IAEA, to have a nuclear capability. Instead, this administration says, We're taking Europe off the table. We are going to rely on what we have, and we're going to take our Alaska capability and cut it by a third.

It puts our country at risk. It puts our families at risk. The President should reverse this decision and should proceed with supporting our allies in NATO, supporting the Czech Republic and Poland, who have been there for us, and put the system in place, protecting the United States.

The President said that the system that he is doing is more cost effective. There is a classified report—I have an

unclassified version of it—an independent assessment of the proposed deployment of ballistic missile defense system in Europe. This report says that the most cost-effective plan was the one that he just scrapped. I will end with reading a letter that I sent to Secretary Gates, requesting that he make this independent assessment and study available. We hope that he releases it so we can have a robust debate on that.

MISSILE DEFENSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate being recognized for the privilege and the honor to address you here on the floor of the House of Representatives.

As we wrap up this congressional week and I listened to the gentleman from Ohio, the gentleman from Utah and the gentleman from Arizona talk about missile defense and our national security, what I have heard over this last hour is a technical, tactical, strategic explanation of why America has taken the positions that we have, the decisions that have been made in the previous administrations, and I think a clear and stark analysis of what apparently is a huge diplomatic mistake made by the President of the United States.

I would make the point that those who defend him seem to always revert back to a default position of, The President must have gotten something for it. They speculate that there must be a quid pro quo to pull the rug out from underneath the Eastern Europeans—in particular, the Poles and the Czechs—who in their headlines, as I believe Mr. FRANKS said—the headline in one of those papers said “Betrayed!” To betray the Poles and the Czechs, the United States of America, the integrity of our Nation and the confidence in our national security have been diminished in a way that probably can't ever be rebuilt.

But those who defend that decision will argue, Well, the President is a smart negotiator. He is a brilliant man. Therefore, we have to trust his knowledge and his judgment because he must know something that we don't. Yet I haven't heard one of these imaginative characters that can defend anything and advocate for anything come up with a single thing that would be worth doing what the President did. What could possibly be worth giving up the integrity and the credibility of the United States? What could possibly be something that could come out of any negotiations with Iran or Russia that could emerge as a plus on this side that would offset the loss of international credibility, the word of the United States and our commitment to our allies, let alone giving up the strategic position of being able to take out Ira-

nian missiles shortly after they leave the launching pad, instead of leaving this 5-year window, as Mr. TURNER just said?

If your President is so much smarter than you are that he must have gotten something accomplished behind the scenes that's so valuable that even you can't conceive of what it might have been, I don't know if you call that a rational thought or a religion. But, Mr. Speaker, we're in a situation here where the United States and the world is in a very, very dangerous place. This globe is a giant chessboard; it's a giant Monopoly game, and it's a giant Risk game that's going on. It's a giant poker game that's going on. And there are some poker players, chess players, Risk and Monopoly players out there that are really good and really smart, and they spend their time trying to figure out how to outmaneuver the United States. It has taken place ever since the dawn of the Soviet Union, and the Monopoly game here in the United States broke the Soviet Union, and they imploded.

Now we have Putin over there on the chessboard, at the poker table, and he is making moves on this global chessboard that seek to reconstruct what he can of the former Soviet Union. It's been in his interest to cause Iran to be a thorn in our side and for us to think that we could ask Putin to, well, be open and do us a favor and maybe he could talk real nice to the Iranians and they would stop their nuclear endeavor—after all of these years and these billions of dollars spent and the great diplomatic risks that they take?

These people are not going to just simply tip over their king and walk away from this chessboard. For the President to think that dialogue is diplomacy and that you can accomplish things just because you talk about it is an inherently left-wing, myopic European view, and it's something that I've heard from their mouths in the discussions that we have over in that part of the world.

We have with us Mr. BISHOP from Utah who has significant insight into that part of the world, the politics of Western Europe as well as geography of that part of the world—Iran, the Middle East, Eastern Europe and also Western Europe. I have asked the gentleman if he would stick around long enough to impart some of that broader view to explain the forces that are at play in this dynamic, the forces of Russia, the forces of Iran, the Islamic effort that's there, the Israeli position that's there, the threat that comes from Iran threatening to annihilate and wipe Israel off the face of the Earth.

And by the way, this move, in my view, brings it closer and closer that Israel likely will have no choice but to at least attempt to take out the nuclear capability of Iran. Their survival might very well be at stake. So this move that might look like its a move designed to pacify the Russians might

well end up being something that compels the Israelis to make a military strike. And it may well be a tool that, once removed, the missiles are in the Middle East, and this is a decision that is now made that moves us to the inevitability that there will be military action take place as a result of a pacifist action on the part of the President.

This is what comes when you go to—let me call it the Neville Chamberlain School of Diplomacy or capitulation, for remember when he returned from Munich waving a letter saying that he had achieved “peace in our time.” Well, that peace in our time didn’t last long. I was thinking about the situation of how it was that Hitler actually negotiated with the Russians for a while and that ended up with Poland being divided and a global war as a result.

I would be happy to yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Utah. I am interested in your perspective on this global chess, poker, Monopoly, Risk game that’s taking place.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I appreciate the gentleman from Iowa spending some time talking. We had the opportunity earlier this year of traveling to Germany together to meet with the chancellor, the foreign minister, the economics minister, the interior minister, several of those to talk about it. I recognize that I’m not putting myself here as an expert in this particular area because sometimes it is a matter of perspective.

I know at one time when I was over in Germany meeting with our fellow parliamentarians, who are members of the Bundestag, that I was amazed as we started talking about the impact of the Helsinki Accords on the ultimate destruction of the Soviet Union and the falling of the Communist empire. They seemed to have a greater emphasis on the significance of the Helsinki Accords than I have ever heard any political scientist in the United States putting on it.

So sometimes there is that perspective that is somewhat different. But in dealing specifically with how we should resolve and go forward, specifically with Russia which is rejuvenated, there are a couple of things to keep in mind. I’m not sure quite how you play with them all, but there are a couple of things to keep in mind. The first one to keep in mind is, the Russians have not played nice with their neighbors who used to be part of the empire. So the Ukrainians, they clearly cut the oil and gas and threatened the economic security and independence of the Ukrainians at a time when it was not the most convenient, and it created more political instability in the Ukraine, as if that was a part of an overall goal.

Shortly after that, there was the invasion of Georgia, another former republic of the USSR that is now an independent nation. Certainly, the consequences of that have yet to be actually played out in the international

arena. But what the Russians did cannot be considered as a nice neighborly approach to any type of situation.

I would also put into that milieu of understanding some concepts of what is going on internally in Russia. The Russians have traditionally liked having scapegoats for internal problems. One of the problems that the Russians are facing right now is one of demographics. They are losing population. They have a massive amount of land to control without a population that is growing or an economy that is growing to handle that. And one of the elements that historically has happened within the Russian mind-set is to try to find some scapegoat for that particular approach. I think we have got to keep that in the back of our minds as we are dealing with how we actually move forward in relation to the Russians and everywhere else.

It is, indeed, correct, as the gentleman from Iowa said, that if the Russians had been helping us to pressure the Iranians in a nonviolent embargo approach, that we would be further along in that effort to try to pressure the Iranians to use only a peaceful nuclear program, rather than what we, I think justifiably, suspect for all kinds of concepts that would be going there. We would not have Mr. Morgenthau from New York City, who can never be considered a right-wing radical Republican, talking in newspaper and magazine articles about the interconnect between Iran and Venezuela and how some of the money that was supposed to be stopped in the embargo has been able to be laundered through Venezuela and the connection between this. Eight times Chavez has visited Iran. Iran is now putting money into Chavez’ efforts. So I see the future of the problem when we look at the Iranians on the east, Venezuela on the south of our country, the North Koreans on our west coast and realize that we are living in some very perilous times.

I happened to be in Germany when Ronald Reagan was talking about putting the missiles in Germany. It was heavily contested at the time. The Soviet Union was violently opposed to it, and there were a lot of pacifists within Europe who said that putting missiles in there was the worst thing we could possibly do; it will escalate the conflicts; it will escalate the violence. And what we found out in looking at history is it did just the opposite. It worked in actually bringing about a longer term peace as well as, ultimately, the end of a reign of terror of communism and allowed people who had never been free to finally become free.

That is why I am so worried about our decision, after our Polish and Czech allies went out on a limb politically to allow us to have some kind of missile defense system that would protect Europe and the eastern coast of the United States before the Iranians could develop anything offensively, to stop that prior to that, saying that we

will now come up with a program that won’t work until 5 years after the Iranians would probably be effective. I worry about what the result is, and I worry that we, as a country, have not learned the lessons from history, from the past, because we seem to be making what I consider to be mistakes as we deal with these rogue nations.

□ 1330

And mistakes as we deal with our allies in Europe, insulting them, putting them in difficult positions, and then yanking the rug out from under them, as well as putting ourselves at some kind of military disadvantage as to the defense of this country against other countries that significantly are malevolent in their attitudes towards the United States, it’s a very cumbersome and difficult situation as we look at how that chess game is being played.

I think the demographics of what is taking place in Russia should not be overlooked. They have decisions that have to be made, and they don’t have a lot of very good choices before them right now. They will be looking for choices which kind of deflect the inability of their interior policy that is not working.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Briefly reclaiming my time, a question forms in my mind, and I’d like to take advantage, Mr. Speaker, of the expertise which I will assign to the gentleman from Utah in his understanding of history. And I’m looking back upon those events in the 1980s and this event that’s coming up for the 20th anniversary this November 9, the fall of the Berlin Wall.

When I watched that happen on television, I saw literally the Iron Curtain crashing down. Every time a hammer blow landed, every time they hit it with a chisel, every time they knocked another chink or pulled a section of the wall down, that was the Iron Curtain being deconstructed. Demolition of the Iron Curtain that took place began on November 9 of 1989.

Now, at that moment the pundits in the news media didn’t understand what was taking place. They didn’t see that as the Iron Curtain. They saw it as the family reunification plan. And therein lies the large flaw that took place on the part of the liberals. They didn’t understand the dynamic that had taken place. But Ronald Reagan understood it at that moment. I’m not convinced that his immediate successor understood it to the depth that Ronald Reagan did.

But this question has always lingered in me. I thought that it proved to the world that free markets and free enterprise and freedom would always prevail over communism, socialism, despotism, totalitarianism of any kind because of the dynamics that come from the creativity and the productivity and the freedom that comes from the human spirit and the checks and balances that exist in the marketplace.

Yet I didn’t hear them capitulating in their argument. They just suspended

their arguments for a little while. And then front-and-center, full-blown, proud, global Communists disappeared.

But where did they go is the question? Did they go back and lick their wounds and change their ideology and come back as free enterprise capitalists? I don't remember their doing that. But I wonder if the gentleman from Utah has any thoughts on what happened to those front-and-center Communists from 1989. Where are they? Some have passed away but some are still with us. What are they doing today and what do they believe in, and how does this fit into the equation?

I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I appreciate the gentleman from Iowa offering me this opportunity to tell you flat-out that I don't know what they have done or where they are going.

I do know that what we have found is for the United States to be effective, we had to be strong and secure and make sure that our self interests could be protected.

I just finished a book about the Civil War and about Lincoln as the Commander in Chief and his approach to it. He was much more intellectual about his view of the war than we are. He understood that time and resources are weapons just as much as individuals are or soldiers are in using war. And to be honest, the problem he had with the Union generals through most of the war was they didn't catch the concept of time and resources as an integral part in making decisions. He got it. And he was very much vilified at the time because he insisted on an approach which ultimately said the only way we can win is if we are forceful and strong and insist on this.

If Lincoln had simply backed off and said, What we're going to do is we're going to negotiate a peace with the South, there would have been a lot of people that would have said, Yeah, I am tired of the war; let's negotiate a peace with the South. And a lot of people in the North would have said, Yeah, let them go; we don't want to be part of them anyway.

But what Lincoln clearly understood from the geography of the situation and the future is that the Civil War would have been the first war between the States, not the only war. It would have been the first of many wars in the States as the North and South then battled over economic issues, transportation in the Ohio Valley, use of the Port of New Orleans, frontier land in the West. He clearly got what the future would be.

I think President Reagan, when he decided to stand tough and he was highly criticized for it, got what the future would be. He did not want to see a world where there was nuclear proliferation, but he understood that America had to be tough in order to get to that point.

I worry that we have somehow lost those lessons of history, and we don't realize that for the United States to

move forward, we have to ensure that we are perfectly capable of defending ourselves. That's why I'm worried. The decision that we made to take the missiles, not implement the missiles in Poland and the radar system in Czechoslovakia, does not make us more secure. The idea of trying to cut our ground-based missile defense does not make us more secure. And where is this overall vision that we are trying to go? Where is this concept that we have to have security first before we can therefore start to negotiate other items around the world?

I'm concerned with our enemies, especially Venezuela, who are clearly malevolent in their approach to us, spreading that document throughout the rest of Latin South America. At the same time, the Iranians are very bellicose, to say the least. And North Korea, who knows what you want to do with him. Those are the concerns. Those are concerns.

I appreciate the opportunity of speaking with the gentleman from Iowa. I know when we had the chance of going to Germany, he was very forceful in presenting an American approach, and he was willing to ask the tough and difficult questions when the rest of us were trying to be reticent here, not in an obnoxious way, by any means, but in a way of saying somebody's got to play the devil's advocate and say, What does this really mean, and where will we go in the long term?

And I appreciate his efforts in that. And I know, if you'll excuse me at this time, that he will also go through that in this period of time that he has on the floor. And, Mr. Speaker, he will do what he always does. He asks the right questions in a way that you can't avoid trying to find a good answer to those questions.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, I very much appreciate the diplomatic gentleman from Utah for his contribution to the knowledge base and the decisionmaking process that we do here in this Congress. And I would suggest that he's a little overly humble when he says he doesn't know the answer to what happened to those Communists. When I think about the discussion that we've heard about Ukraine, Georgia, Iran, Venezuela, North Korea, South America, Mr. Speaker, all of these areas are discussed in a book written by Colonel Robert Chandler called "Shadow World." It's 500-and-some pages long. And Mr. Chandler takes the situation of the world at the end of the Cold War, and that would be at the implosion of the Soviet Union, and he begins to identify the leading personalities in the world, those leaders and those ideologies within the countries that are, let me say, Communist interests, hardcore Communist interests.

And he takes the person around the globe to every populated continent and talks about the core politics of each of those countries, including these countries that have been mentioned by Mr.

BISHOP of Utah and especially Venezuela and North Korea and some of the other countries in South America, also Putin in Russia and how things unfolded and Gorbachev's position as well.

It is a very, very educational compilation of what happened after almost 20 years ago when the Berlin Wall went down, the Iron Curtain came crashing down, and the people who were holding up that part of the world, the left side of the world, those on the east side of the Berlin Wall, who had a managed economy, who had the central planning that set up 5-year plans for the collective farms, those that told everyone else when to go to work, what raw materials to deliver. And if you remember, Ronald Reagan and some of the others made the joke that, well, people in the Soviet Union pretended to work and the Soviet Union pretended to pay them. But eventually that house of economic cards collapsed.

A question was before us as a Nation, and that question was, while the Soviet Union was developing a missile capability to eclipse our own capability here, such a devastating force of ICBMs that there was nothing the United States could do to survive such an attack, that mutually assured destruction was going down the path of a destruction that would be so bad in this country that civilization itself may not survive.

The question that was before us was articulated best by the former Ambassador to the United Nations, Jeane Kirkpatrick, who, as she stepped down from that position in the early 1980s, said this contest that's going on, this Cold War, is the equivalent of playing chess and Monopoly on the same board, and the only question is will the United States of America bankrupt the Soviet Union economically before the Soviet Union checkmates the United States militarily? That was the most succinct example of what was taking place in that Cold War in the 1980s.

We know how it played out now. We look back on that, and almost 20 years ago the Soviet Union could no longer hold their economics together. They couldn't keep their military out even in places like East Germany. So they opened up the border with Hungary. People flowed around through Austria and Hungary. And at a certain point, there wasn't any merit in guarding the Wall anymore because people were streaming around the end. And so they went over the top and began to sit up on top of the wall with hammers and chisels and saws and anything they could get their hands on. And, yes, some broke bottle of champagne, and there was family reunification.

But it was the Iron Curtain crashing down nearly 20 years ago that should have been a lesson for the whole world that free enterprise always defeats a managed economy, because no matter

how many smart people you put in positions of power, they can't micro-manage an economy that is a combination of everybody's individual productive and economic activity every day.

The invisible hand, as Adam Smith famously described, and actually didn't, about how free enterprise works with providing the incentives and managing the supply. So it works like this: If the grocery store runs out of bread, the store owner understands he has to have more bread or otherwise people will go someplace else to shop. And if there's a cheaper, better bread at the neighboring store, that store owner is not going to sell his bread. So that's how bakeries get started, how grocery stores grow and shrink, how chain stores begin, how manufacturing begins.

Our control, our managed economy is this: Free enterprise drives our economy. And the buy, sell, trade, make-gain culture that we have that's part of what made America great, one of the central pillars of American exceptionalism is free enterprise. When we have that working for us in this country, Americans are more productive than anybody else in the world.

Our job here in this Congress, Mr. Speaker, is to get government out of the way and to provide the kind of tax and regulatory structure as minimally as we can so that the result is the individuals in this country will see our average annual productivity go up. And if people are rewarded for their productivity, they will produce more. If you tax them and punish them and regulate them, they will produce less. So in places like the Soviet Union, the former Soviet Union, they just simply suppressed the productivity by taking away the rewards.

I can give you a simple example that stands out in a very stark way. And that is Communist China, a country of more than a billion people, about the same geographical area of the United States, having trouble in a lot of ways competing in the technological and educational side of this. But some years ago, they decided they were going to let their farmers, who are less controlled now than they were, be able to get engaged in the honey business without having government interference. So, in other words, government doesn't appoint themselves a few thousand beekeepers and have them deliver all that honey for a set price. They let them compete on the open market.

And what has happened? China almost immediately began exporting honey and competing against the honey here in the United States because they had some people that could be beekeepers. That's like a little microcosm of free enterprise that sprung up out of China because they took the regulations away, took their managed economy away and let people produce all they could produce and sell all they could sell and keep a significant share of the profits.

Well, here in this country, we've had that as a tradition across the breadth of this economy, and it's diminished significantly, Mr. Speaker.

So the vitality of free enterprise brings about the best in us, the highest productivity, the most innovativeness in us. It gives us an incentive to extend each of our educations. It gives the inventors an incentive to invent. It gives the people that are producing and doing the experiments on pharmaceuticals an incentive to produce better medicine. And those who invent better surgery techniques get to cash a bigger check.

□ 1345

Well, even though they are humanitarians driven by a desire to do good in their work, when you really need to reach back for that extra adrenaline when it gets late at night when the rest of the world is tired, or maybe you don't feel very good because you are exhausted, that extra incentive of profit makes a difference and a reward for it in a society that appreciates it.

Around the globe, there is a line of scrimmage between freedom and the suppression from freedom. So when the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) humbly said he didn't know the answer, I think perhaps he didn't know the answer that I wanted him to give—that will happen—but he understands very thoroughly how the rearrangement that took place after the fall of the Berlin Wall at the end of the Cold War, some countries and philosophies lined up on the side of the freedom. Those countries are among those countries where we already had the holes dug to place the missile defense shield, Poland, Czechoslovakia.

Mr. Speaker, have you failed to notice that the people who have achieved their freedom most recently love it and adhere to it the most? The Poles love their freedom. The Romanians love their freedom. And the Czechs love their freedom. They remember what it is like to live under the boot heel of the Soviet Union. They remember clearly within their own families the fear of the occupation that took place before, in many cases World War II, and certainly during and after it.

I recall in a trip over to that part of the world with Mr. BISHOP a conversation with a man about my age whose father's first military operation he was engaged in was Auschwitz, not at Auschwitz to liberate Auschwitz, but at Auschwitz fighting for the Russians. Those things don't pop up easily in our history books, but this broad global concept of who is on what side of this line of scrimmage, who is on the side of freedom and who is on the side of suppressing freedom, we need to understand this.

These forces know instinctively what is at play out here on the globe. And so we wonder, what is the chess board that Putin is playing on? The Monopoly board that Putin is playing on? He is not about advancing freedom; he is

about diminishing freedom. The freedom in the Soviet Union, I should say Russia, and some of our satellite states, has diminished since Putin stepped into control.

We met with significant leading personalities in Russia, and I am going to avoid saying their names because I don't need to turn more heat up on them; but you would recognize many if not all of them, Mr. Speaker, and they told us that there really no longer exists a free press in Russia, not a newspaper that they can count on that has any influence that is free to print what it wants to print. There is not a free legislature in Russia any longer either. They are the people who are controlled by Putin, and they don't have free markets. We know that the Mob has taken over a lot of that economy, and there is a payoff that goes on inside of all of that.

So a Russia that had an opportunity to take a step up after the implosion of the Soviet Union now is stepping into the darkness of the left again, moving towards a communist state, taking away the freedom of its people and their ability to effectively have freedom of speech and freedom of assembly and freedom of the press and freedom of their economy. Those things have been significantly diminished under Putin, and they understand that and they see that.

The leaders of freedom in Russia today would have believed that the Russian people would have stepped up by now and gone to the streets and taken their country back. It has not happened. I would encourage that they do so, that they take their country back. We thought it was happening during the days of Yeltsin when he climbed up on the tank. Good things happened there, but we should not forget that we are the vanguards of freedom here in the United States of America for the world. We are the inspiration for the world.

And when it looks like the model for our diplomacy is simply capitulation to Russia, under the belief that our community organizer in chief somehow is a master of foreign policy, well, he is the manager of foreign policy and he is the Commander in Chief of our military, and certainly I stand with our military, and I want to help coach him on the foreign policy a little bit.

I don't know why the press has not been more critical of the President's foreign policy. This huge plunder of just announcing that he is going to pull the missiles out of Poland and Czechoslovakia, take that shield away, and almost at the same time you notice that the information was leaked out about the nuclear capabilities of Iran, which we have just heard in the previous hour, Iran developing the capability, that they have the capability to develop a bomb now and they are in the process we know of developing the capability to deliver it.

And it doesn't take very much of a missile to drop one into Israel, and it

only takes one weapon dropped into Israel to annihilate the entire country. And they have said that is what they intend to do.

We look at the President of the United States, his foreign policy experience seems to have, before he became the Commander in Chief and the chief architect of our foreign policy, his foreign policy experience comes to this: having been raised in part in Indonesia at a young age which would give him some sense of the culture but probably no sense of the global, military, cultural dynamics, but raised at least in part in Indonesia.

A President who has once traveled to Kenya, and once traveled to Pakistan. I don't know quite how that happened, but it was announced. And beyond that, the foreign policy experience for our Commander in Chief and the chief architect of our foreign policy seems to be a trip to Germany to give a speech during the campaign. That is not anything that has ever happened before that I know of during a Presidential campaign, but it looked at the time like he wanted to be President of Europe, the United States, and the world.

In any case, very, very limited on foreign policy experience. And the lessons of history, the lessons so well drilled into us by Neville Chamberlain's School of Appeasement when Chamberlain came back from the trip to Munich and waved the letter in his hand, the letter that Hitler had signed, and he said: I have guaranteed peace in our time.

That was the image of Chamberlain getting off the plane from Munich. And what happened? Within weeks the Nazis invaded Poland. They carved it up with the Russians, and we were off and running in a global war that cost tens of millions of lives. They remember that in that part of the world. They are afraid of being brought back into another war. The Poles remember being run over by the Nazis and the Russians, and then occupied by the Russians for all of these years up until 1990 or so.

This is a very sensitive situation that is going on. When the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) mentioned the Ukraine and Georgia, the importance of the sovereign state of Georgia should not be diminished.

We should understand that this chess game that I have talked about, the central square on the chess board for Putin is Georgia. That is the nexus through which the energy flows, the energy that is produced in gas and oil wells east of Georgia, east of the Caspian Sea, roughly 1.2 million barrels of oil going through Georgia by pipeline on a daily basis, 1.2 million, a train that has constant tankers of crude oil being hauled through the nation of Georgia on their destinations to the tanker ships and the Black Sea, and the natural gas that flows in pipelines through Georgia to other places in Europe.

Georgia is the nexus. Think, Mr. Speaker, of an hourglass, and on one

side of that hourglass is a lot of the production of oil and natural gas that is east of the Caspian Sea, flowing through this nexus of Georgia with pipelines, rail lines, and coming out the other side at the Black Sea and going on to land-based places around Western Europe.

Think of the Russians shutting off the natural gas to Germany a year ago January. Think what that meant when they did that. And to have the Germans take the position that it really didn't affect their foreign policy toward Russia because they only got 30 percent of their natural gas from Russia.

Can you imagine if Hugo Chavez had 30 percent of the natural gas coming into the United States and he turned the valve down and shut off our gas in January? Our furnaces would have gone dark on us, and our houses would have gone cold. If that had happened, what would we do? Would we accept that? If we didn't have the power to do something about it, would we capitulate to the demands of Hugo Chavez?

My answer, I think we would say yes. I think if we didn't have the power or another alternative, we would have to negotiate.

I am going to suggest that the Germans are negotiating with the Russians because they can't do a confrontation, and Putin knows it. That's why he shut the energy off that was flowing through Georgia for 4 days. He sent a message to Europe that he can do that anytime he pleases. When he shut the gas off that was flowing through into Germany, that said clearly that Putin can do that anytime he pleases.

So if someone controls your energy and they can shut the valve down anytime they please, you end up being a little nicer to those folks unless you produce another alternative. Well, the alternative that is being produced is building a new pipeline around to the North Sea. And where does it come from? Russia. That puts them in more control. My answer would be: I don't want any of that; let's develop our own energy sources and not be dependent upon those energy sources that are coming from Russia. But that has been Putin's strength. When energy prices went up, he found himself sitting on a lot of cash. That is unusual for a country whose energy falters; but because Russia has a lot of energy, they have had a significant advantage.

But, Mr. Speaker, we should remember when the Berlin Wall went down in 1989 and the Soviet Union imploded within the next couple of years that the people that were Communists, Socialists, Marxists, Maoists, they didn't go away. They didn't look at the model of this dynamic vigor of the United States economy that is driven by our people and decide they wanted to be more like us. Some did; not many.

Most of them went underground for a little while and then tried to get back in power. The former Communists are

there seated in the legislatures across that part of Europe today. In small numbers, and in some cases they don't get to call themselves Communists because that has been stained by the history of it, but they still believe the same thing. They still want to manage. They still believe that their elitist mind-set can tell the rest of us what to do. They want to take away the freedom of individuals to make their own choices economically and militarily and politically and culturally. And, in fact, persecute the churches while they are at it.

We need to understand Communists haven't changed. They might have taken on different names. They might have declared themselves Social Democrats or to be Progressives. They might just be the Democratic Socialists of America that are supporting Progressives in this Congress, but they are the same people with the same ideology.

And us freedom-loving people, I should say we freedom-loving people, need to understand that there are basic principles of Americanism, and free enterprise is one of them. And those who undermine free enterprise are undergoing anti-American activities because they are undermining our vitality and our freedom and are taking away our ability to take this Nation up to another level of our destiny.

That is part of this equation that is taking place here as the President of the United States—whom I happen to have this portrait of. I think it is a flattering one actually and well done as far as the artwork is concerned. The President of the United States brings an ideology to the task of community organizer in chief. With a limited foreign policy experience of having traveled, lived shortly in Indonesia and traveled to Pakistan and I understand to Kenya, and beyond that his trip to Germany to give his speech there with the Autobahn Bismarcks—I think that is the victory monument or the triumph monument that's there in Berlin—with that in the backdrop, not the Vandenberg Gate which he tried to do, that is not a lot of foreign policy experience to be playing on this global chessboard with the world's number one economy, the world's number one military, and with the destiny of the world hanging in the balance if you make a mistake.

□ 1400

No one has a crystal ball, but this is a very high-risk endeavor taken on by our Commander in Chief. And those who are experts on the military side of this, it's not quite universal, but there has been a broad criticism that has been made. And I have no idea. My imagination cannot tell me what he could possibly have gotten for capitulating on the missiles in Poland and Czechoslovakia.

And so, Madam Speaker, that brings me to the subject matter that has, I will say, riveted the American people over the last couple of weeks, and that

is the issue of ACORN, ACORN being the place where the President got his start in politics, where Barack Obama first engaged in community organizing, and his community organizing being part of—the most high profile that he did was Project Vote, the get-out-the-vote effort. And Project Vote that he worked for is a very close, indistinguishable-from affiliate of ACORN.

So ACORN in Chicago has always had a broad and deep connection. It has always been very active there. From the early days when ACORN originated in Arkansas and emerged across the rest of the country, ACORN has had a very solid presence in Chicago. And the President of the United States might, in his most candid moments, confess that he wouldn't be very likely to be the President of the United States if it hadn't been for ACORN, ACORN's ability to register voters and get out the vote and bring about the kind of leverage within the inner city that allows ACORN to influence votes at the inner city level.

Now, ACORN is a corporation, and its structure is something that seems to be a little bit mysterious. It has been often reported that they're a 501(c)(3); that's not for profit. That means they can't engage in partisan political activities. And we have seen as a report from the Government Reform Committee that ACORN has up to 361 affiliates; in fact, they list 361 affiliates in their report. Some of those may not be active affiliates, and there may be some affiliates that didn't get picked up in the report done by the Government Reform Committee. But ACORN has turned into a spiderweb of this conglomeration of affiliates.

So when I speak of ACORN, Madam Speaker, I'm speaking of ACORN and all other affiliates, think 361 corporations, a third or more of them being 501(c)(3) not for profits, some 527 organizations, and some 501(c)(4) organizations, and other corporate structures, organizations that share, in many cases, interlocking boards of directors and an interlocking mission that reaches out and has become a vacuum that sucks up taxpayer dollars in many of the States and from the Federal Government.

They have received over 53 million Federal tax dollars since 1994, and I think that's a small piece of it until we examine all of the affiliates. Many of the States have contributed to ACORN in one way or another by reentering into contractual agreements with them; ACORN and ACORN Housing, for example, essentially in the business of brokering low-income housing.

So these are some of the things that ACORN has done. They've contributed to the toxic mortgage situation that brought about the economic meltdown just a year ago, and they've done so by shaking down lenders, by demanding contributions from lenders. What large major investment bank has not written at least one fat check to ACORN?

Madam Speaker, I'm going to suggest that they have shaken down many of

the banks that have been bailed out. And we should take a look and see which banks received TARP funds and look there and see which banks also contributed money to ACORN. And we need to bring all of the finances together of the private corporations that are part of this funding for ACORN as well as government. It's not enough just to audit what government sent to ACORN. It's important that we go to the private corporations as well and see what has happened.

But we know that ACORN has gone in and intimidated lenders. Lenders have written checks in order to, let me call it, "influence" ACORN to stop demonstrating in their banks so that they can actually do business. We know that ACORN personnel, including Maude Talbot—her first name actually escapes me, but Talbot is the last name, the head of ACORN in Chicago who has claimed Obama as her own—have bragged about going in to intimidate lenders in their offices and talked of other circumstances about shoving the lender's desk over against the wall, surrounding the loan officer, screaming and yelling and chanting at him until such time as he would get tired of that behavior and commit to loaning certain amounts of money into these areas in their neighborhoods. That's a shakedown, Madam Speaker. ACORN was involved in that.

And we know while they were shaking down lenders, they also were here in Washington, D.C., convincing this Congress that we should pass legislation to lower the standards of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac on their secondary lending market. And when that happened, it lowered the standards that undermine the foundation of requiring credit for loans. And when that happened, it laid the foundation, in fact, it eroded the foundation for credibility and credit and it began the downward spiral of the mortgage lending crisis. And at the core of that, as you look through it, you will see ACORN there over and over again shaking down lenders, coming to Congress, undermining the underwriting requirements that Fannie and Freddie required in order for them to purchase these bundles of mortgage-backed securities that were being created by individual bad loans in bad neighborhoods that were promoted by ACORN, who was getting checks from the lending institutions and getting agreements from the lending institutions to provide blocks of money that would be loaned into neighborhoods that ended up being bad loans.

ACORN is at the core of the financial meltdown. And by the way, the President of the United States was at the core of ACORN as a lot of the genesis of this was being generated; headed up Project Vote, later on hired ACORN to work for him to get out the vote during the Presidential campaign. So the President of the United States started out with ACORN. He trained their trainers. He represented them in court

to undermine, by the way, the integrity of the ballot box, in my view. And that's a Motor Voter issue, which we would disagree with philosophically. Headed up Project Vote.

The actions of ACORN in Chicago have been tied together integrally with the President of the United States all the way through. And here we are now with ACORN helping to, on film, apparently facilitate child pornography and being willing to work with and advocate for what to do with illegal immigrant children brought into prostitution rings in five cities in the United States at a minimum, that being Baltimore; Washington, D.C.; Brooklyn, New York; San Bernardino, California; and San Diego.

Madam Speaker, that was appalling to this Congress. It finally got us to the point of revulsion where we could finally vote to shut off funding going to ACORN and their affiliates. And that vote was a vote of 345-75 here on the floor of the House of Representatives. Just the day before, I didn't think it was possible, but the American people saw the character and the culture of ACORN in that film, those five films that took place inside those five cities, and we understand there are more that have not been released yet. And what happens? Finally, some of us that have been calling for investigations are starting to get a little bit of movement.

But what needs to happen, Madam Speaker, is an all-out full court press on ACORN and all of their affiliates. We need to have the Department of Defense unleash their investigators to trace down, through all the activities of ACORN and all of their affiliates, and work in cooperation with IRS investigations of ACORN and all their affiliates, track every dollar that comes into the affiliates and every dollar that goes out. The commingling of funds, the transfer of funds, we need to have the Department of Justice go back down into the embezzlement that took place of nearly \$1 million out of ACORN by the brother of the founder of ACORN, covered up by the founder of ACORN.

Brothers do that, I understand. One of them commits a crime and apparently the other one covered up the crime, which is a crime itself. And then they misappropriated funds that were pension funds in order to backfill the hole that was created in their accounting by the embezzlement of Dale Rathke, all of this covered up by his brother, Wade Rathke. And they covered it up and held it away from the functioning board of directors of ACORN at the time.

We have ACORN producing over 400,000 fraudulent voter registrations, complicit in the beginning, and part and parcel of the mortgage lending crisis, embezzlement/coverup by its top officers, and now we have ACORN helping to facilitate child prostitution rings and setting up houses of ill repute and helping to facilitate loans to

do that, and advocating that the, let me just say, pimp and the prostitute not claim all of the 13 or 14 presumably illegal children that they were going to bring in from El Salvador into Baltimore, but just to claim three of them so it wouldn't raise the levels of suspicion. And then they could qualify for the earned income tax credit and the child tax credit, child tax credit up to three children, \$1,000 a year per child, and then the earned income tax credit, which would probably add another \$3,000 to that, most likely, given the advice that they gave, to game the taxpayer for a check for a cumulative of about \$6,000, and just as a matter of fact and a matter of course.

ACORN would help with the income tax filings. They would help with gaming the taxpayer. They would help with a loan for the house of ill repute, and they would turn a blind eye, at a minimum, to illegal immigration. This is Baltimore. But in San Diego, they advocated to help with that. We have friends in Mexico. You have to trust us. We'll get this done for you. Unbelievable. No conscience.

We saw the culture of it. But all the parts that we've been talking about up to the part of the prostitution, people would deny it. We had defenders over here on this side of the aisle, but now they can't deny it because once you transpose the image of facilitating child prostitution as a matter of culture within the corrupt criminal enterprise of ACORN and their affiliates, once you expose that, none of the rest of this is unbelievable. It's entirely plausible, and it is, in fact, entirely real.

ACORN has created now a closed, contained economy within itself where its tentacles reach out and suck in and draw down Federal money, State money, contribution money, shakedown money from banks and other lending institutions and corporations to keep ACORN off their back, do the shakedown endeavor. And once that money gets drawn in, then it becomes something that gets commingled. And as it's commingled, then it goes out to further their political enterprise, corrupting the election process in the United States. And if there is anything that I am aggressive on defending, it is the integrity of the ballot box, and they have assaulted the integrity of the ballot box.

The President of the United States grew up in ACORN. He hired ACORN. He worked for ACORN. He hired ACORN. He is a player and a coach. He wore their jersey and now he is the equivalent of the owner. And he had set them up to do the census, and twice now the Census Bureau has announced that they aren't going to use ACORN to help with the census. Why would anybody think ACORN can count people better than they can get people registered to vote? Four hundred thousand fraudulent registration forms. Can't we imagine that ACORN would pay a commission for everybody that the census workers could count?

And if they paid people on commission, they would just simply fill out forms and expand the numbers, or count people two, three, four, five, six times. Even if they set up expectations and not a quota, the result ends up being the same, even though it's not as stark a violation of the law. You can't have American people counted by people that can't even handle a voter registration form with an expectation that it has an even even chance of being a legitimate voter registration form.

Madam Speaker, when they take your vote, when they undermine the integrity of the ballot box, that's more important itself than the Constitution, because even though the Constitution guarantees the rights that we have, the only thing that guarantees the Constitution itself is a legitimate election process. If the American people lose their faith in a legitimate election process, the whole thing comes crashing down.

If we don't believe that our vote counts, we can't accept the decisions of government. I mean, think what would happen if we elected a President of the United States, or Members of Congress, United States Senators, Governors of the States, and the American people believed that they were not the elected President, Governor, or Congressman, but they were simply those that happened to be on the side that was gaming the system.

□ 1415

We wouldn't accept their decisions either. If we don't accept the decisions that are made by government, then the progress of civilization comes to a halt and digresses, and we fall into the depths of a totalitarian state eventually as well.

Legitimate elections are the underpinnings of our Constitution, and the guarantees in the Constitution can't be sustained if we lose our faith in the election process. The worst thing that can happen in this country from a policy standpoint would be to see the integrity of our ballot box further eroded by organizations like ACORN. So this is very important. It is very important that the President of the United States stands up and takes a position on ACORN.

Did you notice he was really quiet about some things? He was quiet about Van Jones. Van Jones, the former Green Jobs czar, quit on a Friday night. I guess it was a Saturday morning, at 12:01 a.m. on a Saturday morning. Curiously, the President had nothing to say about Van Jones. Curiously, the press had no questions for the President on Van Jones, and he is a self-alleged Communist. Yet Van Jones drifted from the scene because he became too toxic.

There was a little incident up in Massachusetts of a professor from Harvard who was trying to break into his own house and who had a police officer called to his location. The President

saw fit to engage himself in that and to hold a beer summit between Professor Gates and Officer Crowley.

Now we've had the United States Senate vote to un-fund ACORN. We've had the House of Representatives vote to un-fund ACORN. We have the Treasury Department starting an investigation. At least it's implicit in their press release that's coming out. We have the Justice Department looking to see if they've written any checks to ACORN but not investigating ACORN and their affiliates thoroughly. We have a number of ranking members of full committees on this Hill who are doing what they can with the resources they have.

We don't have a single full committee Chair who has announced investigations and hearings into ACORN at this point. We've got Congress doing a slow walk right now on ACORN. We have the President of the United States, who could get himself injected into a lot of different discussions but who has not yet really made much of a peep regarding ACORN.

Now, if the Senate says un-fund ACORN and if the House says un-fund ACORN, why can't the President say un-fund ACORN? That's what I'd like to know.

If the President of the United States would step forward and say to this Congress, Investigate at my request, and I'll turn over all the resources of the entire executive branch of government to drill down through ACORN and all of their affiliates, and will chase every dollar, every director and every employee who has committed an illegal activity and will prosecute them to the fullest extent of the law and will bring about perp walks and prison time for people who are breaking the law, it would happen—it would happen overnight. But he has not. He sat in his ivory tower, and alluded a little bit to the inappropriate actions that might have taken place and about how we should, maybe, get to the bottom of it. They are not yet serious, Mr. Speaker.

They are not going to be serious until the American people make it the highest priority that they have. It's hard to make it the highest priority when you're watching your health care on the chopping block in the United States Senate, when you've watched our national security be diminished significantly by pulling the missile defense shield plan from Poland and Czechoslovakia, when you're not keeping faith with the people who have most recently achieved their freedom—that's the Eastern Europeans—and when you're putting the United States at risk and are empowering Ahmadinejad and empowering Putin and are setting up a tone of going wobbly at a time when we need to be the strongest.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate your indulgence.

I yield back the balance of my time.

CORRECTION TO THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 24, 2009 AT PAGE H9946

DIVISION B—CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2010

Division B provides continuing appropriations for all agencies and activities that would be covered by the regular fiscal year 2010 appropriations bills, until enactment of the applicable regular appropriations bill, or until October 31, 2009, whichever occurs first.

DAVID R. OBEY,
DEBBIE WASSERMAN
SCHULTZ,
MICHAEL HONDA,
BETTY MCCOLLUM,
TIM RYAN,
C.A. RUPPERSBERGER,
CIRO RODRIGUEZ,

Managers on the Part of the House.

BEN NELSON,
DANIEL K. INOUE,
MARK PRYOR,
JON TESTER,
LISA MURKOWSKI,
THAD COCHRAN,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. JONES (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. CULBERSON (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of an illness.

Mr. HILL (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of a death in the family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KAGEN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. NYE, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. DEFazio, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POE of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes, September 29.

Mr. INGLIS, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1599. An act to amend title 36, United States Code, to include in the Federal charter of the Reserve Officers Association leadership positions newly added in its constitution and bylaws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, September 29, 2009, at 12:30 p.m., for morning-hour debate.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for speaker-authorized official travel during the first quarter and second quarter of 2009 pursuant to Public Law 95-384 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO GERMANY, SWITZERLAND, UKRAINE, KAZAKHSTAN, MONGOLIA, CHINA, AND CANADA, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 31 AND AUG. 13, 2009

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. John A. Boehner	8/1	8/3	Germany		980.00		(3)				980.00
Hon. Jo Bonner	8/1	8/3	Germany		980.00		(3)				980.00
Hon. Dan Boren	8/1	8/3	Germany		980.00		(3)				980.00
Hon. Dave Camp	8/1	8/3	Germany		980.00		(3)				980.00
Hon. Tom Latham	8/1	8/3	Germany		980.00		(3)				980.00
Hon. Greg Walden	8/1	8/3	Germany		980.00		(3)				980.00
Paula Nowakowski	8/1	8/3	Germany		980.00		(3)				980.00
Amy Lozupone	8/1	8/3	Germany		980.00		(3)				980.00
Danielle Maurer	8/1	8/3	Germany		980.00		(3)				980.00
Jennifer Stewart	8/1	8/3	Germany		980.00		(3)				980.00
Hon. John A. Boehner	8/3	8/6	Switzerland		1,410.00		(3)				1,410.00
Hon. Jo Bonner	8/3	8/6	Switzerland		1,410.00		(3)				1,410.00
Hon. Dan Boren	8/3	8/6	Switzerland		1,410.00		(3)				1,410.00
Hon. Dave Camp	8/3	8/6	Switzerland		1,410.00		(3)				1,410.00
Hon. Tom Latham	8/3	8/6	Switzerland		1,410.00		(3)				1,410.00
Hon. Greg Walden	8/3	8/6	Switzerland		1,410.00		(3)				1,410.00
Paula Nowakowski	8/3	8/6	Switzerland		1,410.00		(3)				1,410.00
Amy Lozupone	8/3	8/6	Switzerland		1,410.00		(3)				1,410.00
Danielle Maurer	8/3	8/6	Switzerland		1,410.00		(3)				1,410.00
Jennifer Stewart	8/3	8/6	Switzerland		1,410.00		(3)				1,410.00
Hon. John A. Boehner	8/6	8/8	Ukraine		1,058.00		(3)				1,058.00
Hon. Jo Bonner	8/6	8/8	Ukraine		1,058.00		(3)				1,058.00
Hon. Dan Boren	8/6	8/8	Ukraine		1,058.00		(3)				1,058.00
Hon. Dave Camp	8/6	8/8	Ukraine		1,058.00		(3)				1,058.00
Hon. Tom Latham	8/6	8/8	Ukraine		1,058.00		(3)				1,058.00
Hon. Greg Walden	8/6	8/8	Ukraine		1,058.00		(3)				1,058.00
Paula Nowakowski	8/6	8/8	Ukraine		988.00		(3)				988.00
Amy Lozupone	8/6	8/8	Ukraine		988.00		(3)				988.00
Danielle Maurer	8/6	8/8	Ukraine		918.00		(3)				918.00
Jennifer Stewart	8/6	8/8	Ukraine		918.00		(3)				918.00
Hon. John A. Boehner	8/8	8/9	Kazakhstan		413.00		(3)				413.00
Hon. Jo Bonner	8/8	8/9	Kazakhstan		413.00		(3)				413.00
Hon. Dan Boren	8/8	8/9	Kazakhstan		413.00		(3)				413.00
Hon. Dave Camp	8/8	8/9	Kazakhstan		413.00		(3)				413.00
Hon. Tom Latham	8/8	8/9	Kazakhstan		413.00		(3)				413.00
Hon. Greg Walden	8/8	8/9	Kazakhstan		413.00		(3)				413.00
Paula Nowakowski	8/8	8/9	Kazakhstan		366.00		(3)				366.00
Amy Lozupone	8/8	8/9	Kazakhstan		366.00		(3)				366.00
Danielle Maurer	8/8	8/9	Kazakhstan		366.00		(3)				366.00
Jennifer Stewart	8/8	8/9	Kazakhstan		366.00		(3)				366.00
Hon. John A. Boehner	8/9	8/10	Mongolia		235.00		(3)				235.00
Hon. Jo Bonner	8/9	8/10	Mongolia		235.00		(3)				235.00
Hon. Dan Boren	8/9	8/10	Mongolia		235.00		(3)				235.00
Hon. Dave Camp	8/9	8/10	Mongolia		235.00		(3)				235.00
Hon. Tom Latham	8/9	8/10	Mongolia		235.00		(3)				235.00
Hon. Greg Walden	8/9	8/10	Mongolia		235.00		(3)				235.00
Paula Nowakowski	8/9	8/10	Mongolia		216.00		(3)				216.00
Amy Lozupone	8/9	8/10	Mongolia		205.00		(3)				205.00
Danielle Maurer	8/9	8/10	Mongolia		205.00		(3)				205.00