

accomplished student of criminal justice, he was a testament to his own words, and a shining light to all whom he encountered.

I join the Maryland State Police family and all those with whom he served in grieving the loss of Trooper Brown. He exemplified the best in our communities and, having spoken with his family, I know he was a wonderful son, brother and soon-to-be husband. His death is a tragic reminder of the perils our law enforcement officers face every day, and the bravery they show to ensure our safety.

I honor the life and memory of Trooper First Class Brown, and our thought and prayers are with his family and friends.

YOUNG MEN ENLIGHTENING YOUNGER MEN  
ABOUT OUR ORGANIZATION

Welcome,

My name is Wesley Brown and I am the founder of Young Men Enlightening Younger Men (YMEYM). In September, 2007, my friends and family and I came together to show the young men in the community that there is a bigger and brighter future ahead of them with unlimited possibilities. YMEYM meets together as a group at least once a month to take a field trip somewhere outside of our community and spend time bonding and mentoring. Between field trips, the mentors stay in touch with the young men and encourage them to stay in school, do the best they can in school and in extracurricular activities, respect themselves and each other, and to talk out any conflicts instead of resorting to violence.

All of the mentors have committed much of their personal time and finances during this formation period. YMEYM's meeting location was my residence, where we would sit back and talk about whatever was on the boys' mind. Our goal is to listen and understand their problems and issues. Then we talk together to reach positive solutions to solve the problems. This way, the young men can think before they act, which sometimes results in unjustified punishment.

So, what we created is more than a mentoring program, a tutoring program, or a community service program. This is now a brotherhood of more than 20 young males with distinct personalities and different goals in life who are coming together to be a part of something positive. After researching some of these issues, we found that the majority of today's young men just want to be a part of something and that is why gang violence in the neighborhood is growing so rapidly.

The school system requires that students have a 2.0 GPA in order to play sports. What happens to those who try, but who just don't make it because of poor school systems or a lack of support from home? Where does he go? Who can he turn to? We believe that if a young man is trying to make himself a better man and a productive member of society, then we are PROUD of him—and we tell our young men that. We are proud of them and are here to push them to reach their full potential.

As a young man myself, some may wonder why I am trying so hard to reach these young men, as if I am their parent. Well, I believe that if the community is not encouraging our youth to stand tall and become someone special, what makes us think that the outside world will? After they are exposed to the world outside of their immediate community, reality hits them. They must be prepared and they must be shown the importance of responsibility and accountability and then they will go far in life.

During these teenage stages is when young men develop different characteristics which will continue to live within him during his entire adult life. Too often young men underestimate their own capabilities and greatness. It is our responsibility to step up to the plate and make a positive change. One young man at a time.

WESLEY BROWN,  
Founder Young Men  
Enlightening Younger  
Men, Inc.

### SPECIAL ORDERS

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

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

(Mr. POE of Texas 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 (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

### THE OFFICE OF CONGRESSIONAL ETHICS AND THE DIGNITY OF THE HOUSE

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

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, recent press reports indicate that the House leadership is considering a rules change which would diminish the scope and authority of the Office of Congressional Ethics, or OCE. This is an apparent response to the OCE's decision to forward information gathered during its investigation of the PMA Group to the Justice Department, bypassing the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct in the process. The narrative seems to be that this is just another example of the OCE's succumbing to mission creep or of its growing beyond its intended purpose.

In the interest of full disclosure, I voted against the creation of the OCE in 2007. I felt at the time that the House should be able to establish appropriate standards and to police its behavior through the Standards Committee. I still believe that we should be able to do so, but this controversy over the OCE has effectively shown that, when it comes to removing the cloud that hangs over this body relating to earmarks and to campaign contributions, this body is unwilling, through the Standards Committee, to take the necessary action to uphold the dignity of the institution.

After an investigation lasting more than a year, during which some 200,000 pages of documentation were accumulated, the OCE concluded "there is evidence that some of the commercial entities seeking earmarks from Members of Congress believe that a political donation to the Member has an impact on the Member's decision to author an earmark for that donor."

This information was forwarded to the Standards Committee, which agreed with the conclusion drawn by the OCE. The Standards Committee summarized the OCE's findings as follows: "There is a widespread perception among corporations and lobbyists that campaign contributions provided enhanced access to Members or a greater chance of obtaining earmarks."

Then, quite inexplicably, the Standards Committee dropped the matter, stating that to address the problem is "not within the jurisdiction of the committee." Let me state that again. The Standards Committee said that it lacks the authority to establish a standard that will address what they conclude is a widespread perception of a link between earmarks and campaign contributions. This defies reason.

At the beginning of the 110th Congress, the House adopted rules requiring Members of Congress to certify that they have no "financial interest" in an earmark's being sponsored. "Financial interest" has been defined by the Standards Committee to include a direct or a foreseeable effect on the pecuniary interest for the Member or his or her spouse. The relevant section of the House Ethics Manual then states, "Campaign contributions do not necessarily constitute financial interest."

How can the Standards Committee lack the authority to set standards or to interpret rules? This is particularly confusing when one considers that the Standards Committee can address the issue by simply amending the interpretation of "financial interest" it has already promulgated in the House Ethics Manual.

One need not read very far into the Standards Committee's summary of the OCE's PMA investigation before realizing that Members, through their campaign committees, derive significant benefit from the "widespread perception" of a link between earmarks and campaign contributions. To pretend that this benefit does not constitute "financial interest" is no longer a viable option. We are no longer acting in ignorance. The "wink-wink-nod-nod" game, which we have all known to exist with regard to earmarks and campaign contributions, is now well documented, and the Standards Committee's definition of "financial interest" needs to be updated to reflect these findings.

So where do we go from here?

We can shoot the messenger, as press reports indicate many Members are inclined to do, but the problem with this approach is that the message about the link between earmarks and campaign

contributions has already been delivered.

What we do with the OCE at this point is very much beside the point. It's little more than a sideshow. We need to concern ourselves with the dignity of the House. That is our collective responsibility. It does not fall outside of our jurisdiction.

As I have said many times before, Mr. Speaker, the PMA cloud that hangs over this body rains on Democrats and Republicans alike. We are in this swamp together, but we can't grab a shovel while we are covering our eyes and plugging our ears.

#### IMMEDIATE NEEDS FUNDING FOR FEMA

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

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring the voices of my constituents in Jefferson County, Wisconsin, to the floor of the people's House.

In 2008, homes along the northern shore of Lake Koshkonong and within the surrounding community were absolutely devastated by a record-setting flood. This was a 500-year flood event. It is the same one that ravaged much of the upper Midwest and, in particular, Wisconsin and Iowa.

During that storm, I knew that the damage was going to be devastating and that many of the houses in our community would be beyond repair. What I didn't know was that, almost 2 years after the floods, the agency upon which they relied would be leaving these hardworking Americans behind. You see, in February of this year, FEMA instituted what it calls "immediate needs funding." Basically, they are freezing already approved funds to folks in Wisconsin and in other disaster areas across the country.

A couple of weekends ago, I had the chance to visit with property owners from my district, of whom I have the privilege of representing, who have been affected. They are survivors of the 2008 floods. I wanted to hear their stories. Many brought photos and letters. They brought their own unique stories. They brought their anger and their frustrations.

I met with Gene and Marie Harris at their home on Lamp Road, one of the most extensively damaged neighborhoods in this flood. The damage was so extensive that their house was absolutely uninhabitable and has been since the flood. They showed me photos of before, during, and after, and we talked about the tangle of bureaucratic red tape that they waded through in order to get approved for the FEMA dollars. They were approved for the FEMA money, but they haven't received a penny because of the funding freeze. When I asked Marie to recall what they had gone through back in June of 2008, not surprisingly, she welled up with tears.

Mr. Speaker, our hearts go out to the victims of the recent floods and of natural disasters. Yet I fear we suffer from that old adage, "Out of sight, out of mind." Once the cameras are packed away and the news crews leave for the next breaking story, what happens to the victims and survivors of these natural disasters? Will the families in Tennessee or in Arkansas suffer the same fate as Wisconsinites and Iowans? Will they see their funding from FEMA freeze even after it has been approved?

One would hope that the system of emergency response would keep on plugging away, assisting the families in need across this country, but we have seen that system completely break down. This is unacceptable.

It has been 2 years since their homes were devastated, and my neighbors are still living in temporary housing, and they are enduring financial chaos. One man is homeless. Another family is on the verge of bankruptcy because of the situation that FEMA has left them in.

I know this is wrong. My constituents know this is wrong. The Federal Government has to do better.

□ 1815

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.)

#### ENERGY INDEPENDENCE

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, this Nation has sent millions of good jobs to other countries over the last 30 or 40 years because of environmental rules, regulations, and red tape. This has hurt millions of poor and lower-income and working people by destroying jobs and driving up prices on everything.

The BP oil spill in the Gulf is a terrible thing, and we need to do all we reasonably can to see that something like this does not happen again. However, some extremists want us to stop offshore oil production entirely. Talk about wrecking our economy. Talk about killing countless numbers of jobs. And all this at a time when our unemployment is far too high and underemployment is even higher.

John Engler, the former Governor of Michigan, wrote a column 5 days ago in the Washington Times under the headline, "Drilling Moratorium is a Jobs Moratorium." Governor Engler wrote, "Our country cannot afford to use this accident as an excuse for an overbroad moratorium that stops progress to the detriment of our economic and national security. We do not need to choose between energy security and environmental safety. We need to continue to strive for both."

Charles Krauthammer, the TV commentator and columnist, is respected even by people with whom he disagrees as one of the smartest men in this city. He recently wrote a column asking why we were drilling in 5,000 feet of water in the first place. He wrote, "Environmental chic has driven us out there. Environmentalists have succeeded in rendering the Pacific and nearly all the Atlantic Coast off limits to oil production. And, of course, in the safest of all places, on land, we've had a 30-year ban on drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge."

Mr. Krauthammer is right. For many years, we have tried to allow drilling on about 2,000 or 3,000 acres of the Arctic Wildlife Refuge. ANWR is 19.8 million acres, some 35 times the size of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park. The Smokies get over 9 million visitors a year, and people think it is huge. They cannot humanly comprehend how big ANWR is, yet it is home to only a couple hundred people in the village of Kaktovik and gets a couple of hundred visitors each year. Yet radical environmentalists, who almost always come from very wealthy or upper-income families, oppose oil production almost everywhere. They want gas to double or triple in cost so people will drive less. They can't relate to people who cannot afford gas that costs \$7 or \$8 or \$10 a gallon like it does in some other countries.

Not only would shooting the cost of gas way up cause the loss of huge numbers of jobs, it would put the final nail in the coffins of many small towns and rural areas. People in rural areas generally have to drive longer distances to get to their jobs. Already, two-thirds of the counties in the U.S. are losing population. Yet, once again, radical environmentalists see nothing wrong with this. Most of them are city people, anyway. They probably think it would be good if everyone was forced to live in 25 or 30 urban areas, with the rest of the country left totally empty and people could be bused to a national park or wilderness area every couple of months, under government supervision, of course, so they would not harm the land.

Everyone pays lip service to energy independence, but we already had 84 percent of our U.S. oil off limits even before the President imposed this latest moratorium. Environmental radicals will say they, too, want energy independence. But, then, environmental groups oppose drilling for oil, cutting any trees, digging for any coal, or producing any natural gas because of the pipelines and the refineries. And, heaven forbid, they certainly don't want more nuclear power.

The opposition varies from group to group and geographic location, but the environmentalists are always there to fight any kind of energy production except for solar and wind. But then some oppose the windmills, too. And solar energy, despite mega billions in government subsidies over the last 30