

hadn't been necessary in the first place. Because the best way to support the men and women of the United States military, I believe, would be not to send them to fight in unnecessary wars in the first place.

The tragedy is all the more poignant, Mr. Speaker, because these injuries are being sustained in conflicts that are doing little or nothing to advance our national security interests. I can't help but think how many military families would have been spared the struggle if we had taken a SMART security approach to fighting terrorism or if we had doubled down on humanitarian aid rather than resorting to aggression, invasion, and occupation.

But as fiercely as I am in opposition to these two wars, I will never turn my back on the men and women who have been asked to fight them. In fact, the more skeptical you are about Iraq and Afghanistan, the greater you should be in your obligation to our troops on the front lines. There's one big solution to the strain on our veterans health care system and family caregivers, and that would be to reverse the disastrous policy that is creating more wounded combat veterans every single day.

So, Mr. Speaker, I can think of no better way to honor our soldiers than to end these wars and to bring all of them home—and bring them home now.

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

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

#### LADIES IN WHITE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Ladies in White are a group of wives, mothers, sisters, and daughters of Cuban political prisoners. The group came together after the arrests of 75 Cuban dissidents in April 2003. Seventy-five Cuban political prisoners who, 7 years ago, joined the thousands of others who are imprisoned in Cuba because of their political beliefs or for "crimes" that are only "crimes" in a country brutally oppressed by a totalitarian regime of gangsters, by gangsters, and for gangsters. Because that is what the Castro brothers are—gangsters.

Fidel Castro has been a gangster since he was a juvenile delinquent. He became a Communist to give ideological clothing to his gangsterism. Raul Castro came to gangsterism via Marxism-Leninism, after his brother sent him as an almost illiterate adolescent to then-Czechoslovakia, where he received a rigorous indoctrination in Marxism-Leninism. So the brothers ar-

rived at gangsterism via separate paths, but they are both experienced and ruthless practitioners of the most violent and brutal forms of gangsterism.

The Ladies in White experience the tactics of the Castros' gangsterism every single day. The Castros' state security apparatus pays and trains thugs to strike fear in the hearts of all Cubans in order to keep the regime in power. The thugs, the plainclothes terrorists of the Castros' regime, harass, intimidate, insult, spit upon, and engage in violence against the unarmed dissidents and other independent civil society members in Cuba. These spectacles are known as "acts of repudiation." The international press refers to the plainclothes thugs of the Castros' state security apparatus as "civilian government supporters," but that doesn't change their true nature. No, they're not "plainclothes government supporters." They're plainclothes thugs of Cuban state security.

On recent Sundays, the Ladies in White have gone to church, as every Sunday, to pray for their family members who are political prisoners, and the thugs have become more violent. Protected by uniformed state security agents, the plainclothes thugs have spat upon and committed acts of violence against Laura Pollan, Bertha Soler, Reina Tamayo, Julia Esther Nunez, Asuncion Carrillo, Loida Valdez, Laura Maria Labrada, and the other Ladies in White.

I hereby submit for the RECORD the names of 96 Ladies in White who have been actively demanding the release of Cuban political prisoners in recent months.

1. Martha Díaz Rondón
2. Regla Vaillant Planas
3. Mildre Noemí Sánchez Infante
4. Ercilia Correoso Pérez
5. Maritza Castro Martínez
6. Blanca Hernández Moya
7. Lilia Castañer Hernández
8. Ivonne Malleza Galano
9. Deysi Lázara Suárez Martínez
10. Odalys Sanabria Rodríguez
11. Caridad Caballero Batista
12. Zoila Hernández Díaz
13. Gertrudis Ojeda Suárez
14. Niurkis Rivero Despaigne
15. Mercedes Fresneda Castillo
16. Sara Martha Fonseca Acevedo
17. Ismari Salomón Carcasés
18. Tania Montoya Vázquez
19. Yolanda Martínez Guerra
20. Guadalupe Varela Mora
21. Zayli Figueroa Acosta
22. Odalys Zurman González
23. Bárbara Couyedo Riego
24. Miriam Espinosa del Valle
25. Doraida Pérez Paceiro
26. Iris Tamara Pérez Aguilera
27. Mayra Morejón Hernández
28. Mari Blanca Avila Espósito
29. Petra Serafina Díaz Castillo
30. Rosario Morales La Rosa
31. Sonia Garro Alfonso
32. Maylisis Abrahantes Muñoz
33. Juana Gómez Riego
34. Yudermis Fonseca Rondón
35. Crispina Xiomara Duquesne Suárez
36. Dorales Alvarez Soto
37. Ana Iris Vega Rodríguez
38. Lázara M. Caballero Betancourt

39. Marlenis Guerra Martín
40. Nerys Castillo Moreno
41. Tania Maceda Guerra
42. Caridad Sarduy Fernández
43. Raquel Castillo Urquiza
44. Sandra Guerra Pérez
45. María Elena Fernández
46. Yaneris Pérez Rey
47. Roxaida Ramírez Matos
48. Dulce Avalo Díaz
50. Ariela Riviaux Castillo
51. Evelia Hernández Ravelo
52. Georgina Noa Monte
53. Belinda Barzaga Lugo
54. Marioris Moreno Noa
55. Xiomara Duquesne Suárez
56. Mirtha Gómez Colás
57. Madeline Lazara Betancourt
58. Yaquelin Cutiño
59. Gladis Lugo Expósito
60. Dulce Maria Quintana
61. Suyoanis Tapia Mayeta
62. Leonor Reynord Borges
63. Leydi Coca Quesada
64. Noely Camila Araujo Molina
65. Yordanka Peña López
66. Yeni Palenzuela Izquierdo
67. Ana Aguililla
68. Laura Inés Pollan Toledo
69. Bertha Soler Fernández
70. Melba Santana Ariz
71. Reyna Luisa Tamayo Danger
72. Belkis Cantillo Ramírez
73. Alejandrina García de la Rivas
74. Julia Núñez Pacheco
75. Nélida Borrego Aragón
76. Reyna Maria Ortiz Tamayo
77. Milka Maria Peña Martínez
78. Ana Belkis Ferrer García
79. Loida Valdés González
80. Lidia Esther Lima Valdés
81. Magaly Broche de la Cruz
82. Isabel Sánchez Altarriba
83. Yamilé Velázquez Batista
84. Sonia Alvarez Campillo
85. Asunción Carrillo Hernández
86. Irene Viera Filloy
87. Bárbara Rojo Arias
88. Iraida Soledad Rivas Verdecia
89. Amada Evelia Hernández Ravel
90. Catalina Cano
91. Elsa González Padrón
92. Belkis Barzaga Lugo
93. Gisela Delgado Sablón
94. Noelia Pedraza Jiménez
95. Nancy Sánchez Altarriba
96. Mercedes Acosta antiago de Cuba

I also submit for the RECORD a letter sent today by representatives of the Ladies in White outside of Cuba, Blanca Reyes Castanon and Yolanda Huerga, asking international leaders for support in the Ladies in White's struggle for human rights and liberty.

MARCH 27, 2010.

DEAR SIR, We write you as the Representatives of the Ladies in White in Europe and the United States, to seek your urgent attention for the current plight of Cuba's political prisoners and their families.

The Ladies in White are members of independent civil society and the group was born spontaneously, seven years ago, as a result of the arrest of 75 members of the peaceful opposition by the Cuban regime during the Black Spring of 2003. Wives, mothers, sisters, and daughters of these prisoners only ask for the right to see their unjustly jailed relatives freed.

By this means we seek to ask, that as a representative of a democratic nation where human rights and freedom of speech are respected, that you attempt, and within your ability, interest yourself personally and seek the attention of those individuals and institutions that you see fit, to defend these

women, and their relatives, so that all hostility that they suffer in the streets of Havana and in all of Cuba cease, both physically and verbally, for defending their right to freedom.

We thank you for your time and cooperation, and we trust in your invaluable help, at the same time that we insist that the current situation is extremely delicate and dangerous.

Respectfully,

BLANCA REYES CASTAÑÓN,  
*Representatives in Europe.*

YOLANDA HUERGA,  
*Representative in the United States.*

This last Sunday, the day before yesterday, the Ladies in White were surrounded and subjected to 7 hours of insults and acts of violence by the plainclothes thugs of the Castros' state security apparatus. Surrounded and subjected to nightmarish, abominable insults and grotesque sexual gestures, as well as loud, constant screams and chants of communist slogans and violence for 7 hours, the day before yesterday, subjected to the well-planned tactics which are part of the training of the plainclothes state security agents of the Castros' gangster regime.

But the Ladies in White continue to stand tall. Like the political prisoners who they defend, the Ladies in White represent the true Cuba. They embody the decency, patriotism, and love of the real Cuba—not the grotesque, perverted hatred, envy, and perfidy of the Castros and their gangster regime.

This evening, my thoughts and prayers of limitless admiration and solidarity are with Cuba's Damas de Blanco—the Ladies in White.

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

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois 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 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 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 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 SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman 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 Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN 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 California (Mr. BILBRAY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

#### FINANCIAL REFORM

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, as we watch the Senate move on legislation yet again toward a cloture vote on Senator DODD's legislation, I think it is worth noting some of the concerns that many of us have and that many economists have with the Dodd-Frank approach on the legislation. I begin with focusing on a past occurrence, the rescue of investment bank Bear Stearns in the spring of 2008.

The Federal Government has committed trillions of taxpayer dollars to institutions like Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, AIG, Citigroup, and Bank of America out of fear that the demise of any of these too-big-to-fail institutions would trigger a systemic crisis and collapse of the global financial system. For my own part, I'd make the observation that I thought—I voted against those bailouts with the presumption that if we move to enhance bankruptcy, it would be preferable to setting up a system which would bring the moral hazard and the eventual evolution into a system where the Federal Government was guaranteeing institutions that were too big to fail.

But that is currently the concern I have about this legislation, even though the public has rejected this approach to financial regulation, the bailouts that we have seen, and abhor bailouts of financial institutions. If you have a town hall meeting, I guarantee you, you will sense the rejection of the Dodd-Frank approach.

□ 1815

Still, this approach, endorsed by the administration, would guarantee the bailout authority remains a powerful tool in the government's arsenal. Now, the President is hoping to use the tactic employed in the health care debate by dismissing legitimate concerns with rhetoric but not with facts. And I would take the comments he made in New York where he said, "What is not legitimate is to suggest that we're enabling or encouraging future taxpayer bailouts, as some have claimed. That may make for a good sound bite, but it's not factually accurate." Well, actually it is accurate.

And let us look at the bailout fund in the House-passed bill. On the House side, H.R. 4173, subsection 1609(o), it provides authority for the government to borrow up to \$200 billion that can be used by the government for its bailout actions.

In the Senate bill, Senate bill 3217, subsection 210(n), it creates a special \$50 billion fund to resolve big financial institutions, to resolve those institutions when they've failed. Behind that fund is the ability to issue government debt—in other words, to issue taxpayer obligations. It is no wonder why our colleague on the other side of the aisle from California (Mr. SHERMAN) recently said of the Dodd bill, "There are serious problems with the Dodd bill. The Dodd bill has unlimited executive bailout authority. That's something Wall Street desperately wants but doesn't dare ask for. The bill contains permanent, unlimited bailout authority," as my colleague on the other side of the aisle mentioned, and I agree with his assessment.

There is another piece of this in the broad expansion of open bank assistance authority granted to the FDIC. The House bill, section 1109, provides the FDIC authority to "avoid or mitigate adverse effects on systemic economic conditions or financial stability by guaranteeing obligations of solvent" financial institutions. The FDIC's guarantees can be up to \$500 billion and may be expanded an additional \$500 billion with permission from Congress. That is \$500 billion in potential taxpayer liabilities to solvent companies.

This is not the death panel that Chairman FRANK so often claimed. This is not an "enhanced bankruptcy process" or an "expedited bankruptcy" that the administration wants people to believe. It is, in fact, a codification of the current ad hoc approach to bailouts. As Mr. SHERMAN has noted in the past, this amounts to TARP on steroids.

We are handing over the keys to the Treasury to unelected bureaucrats. If TARP was any indicator, regulators will always err on the side of doling out too many Federal dollars under the guise of preventing a systemic shock. If the letter of the law allows for them to guarantee \$500 billion of debt for solvent companies, they will do just that.