

to help all Haitians, many building upon decades of commitment to that island nation. Churches of every denomination and members of all faiths worked together in acts of charity. As the Gospel tells us to do, they fed the hungry, gave water to the thirsty, sent shelter to strangers, provided clothing to the suddenly destitute, offered comfort and medical care, and, in the saddest charity of all, some helped to bury the dead. In addition to the efforts of the churches, synagogues, mosques, and other places of prayer, the Lions, the Masons, and the Daughters of the American Revolution all pulled out the stops to reach across the ocean.

Mr. Speaker, the military support, the people of faith, and the civilian first responders are not three groups; they are all one community. These groups are interwoven threads that came together to weave a safety net of volunteers, food, comfort, and shelter for the suffering in Haiti. I am proud of their efforts as they've worked to support the needs in Haiti. I am proud to represent such an amazing tapestry of generosity and talent in the 2nd District of North Carolina. And I was proud to support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, let me say tonight to all Americans: I thank them for their help to these people in their hour of need.

#### THE ADMINISTRATION'S ENERGY-KILLING POLICIES

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. Mr. Speaker, the administration's new budget proposal will strangle small business. But there's one small business the new budget is targeting with both barrels: the small, independent mom-and-pop oil and gas producers.

Getting energy out of the ground is a tough business, and it's expensive. These wildcatters hire a lot of people and risk a lot of their own money to find oil and natural gas. Banks don't lend money to these people for risky propositions; so a group of investors has to come together and risk their own money to drill in an oil or gas well, and the Federal Government gives incentives for taking this risk with a tax writeoff for part of their drilling expenses, because, frankly, America needs this energy.

The removal of the tax deduction plus new taxes on all energy producers will be in the billions. But removal of tax deductions especially hurts small businesses that take the risk. Ninety percent of the wells drilled, owned, and operated in this country are independent small operators. Let me repeat. Ninety percent of the wells drilled, owned, and operated in this country are independent small operators. They're called the "wildcatters."

These independent operators go out and hire other businesses to drill oil

wells. They hire geologists to help find the right place to drill for oil and natural gas. Backhoe drivers clear the drilling areas. Truck drivers haul equipment and make deliveries. The food service industry feeds the independent crews. And these taxes threaten the whole infrastructure that supports the independent oil and gas industry.

According to the Texas Alliance of Energy Producers, 88 percent of natural gas in Texas comes from small independent operators. These wildcatters represent the independent spirit of this Nation that has made us the greatest country in the world, the small businesses that are the backbone of this country.

If we stop the tax incentives, this in essence puts a new tax on these independents. It will kill off these small businesses, decrease discovery of new oil and natural gas in our Nation, and it will choke off the infrastructure that promotes and provides most of America's natural gas. Now, my question is, why would the administration intentionally put people, including many blue collar workers, out of business and out of work?

These new taxes are punishing the little guy, and when they go after the little guys, they're going to have to stop the drilling. There will also be fewer refineries.

Natural gas is the clean burning transition fuel of the future, and you have to drill a hole in the ground to get it. Natural gas will be the bridge until we have something else to transition to. We can't switch to an all-illusionary green energy resource that doesn't yet exist overnight. But we have 100 to 150 years of proven natural gas reserves in just our own country. You have to drill for it. It's in the ground. Some of it's underwater. But it's a clean-energy fuel.

How can the administration justify subsidizing a green technology that doesn't even exist but they won't let the small oil and gas independents deduct a part of their risk drilling for natural gas?

Nearly 60 percent of our oil comes from other countries all over the world, and most of those countries don't like us. If we kill off the independent oil and gas industry in America, what are we going to do? Try to import more oil?

I probably represent more refineries than any other Member of Congress. If this legislation passes, it will cost southeast Texas billions of dollars in new taxes. It will hammer the refinery industry and put thousands out of work.

Now, why would the administration target America's energy producers? Why would we want to send more money to countries in the Middle East? Why would we want to send more money to Hugo Chavez? Wouldn't that money be better spent on American energy provided by American companies who offer jobs here in America?

So what are we going to do right now if we drastically reduce America's energy production, if we cut our ability to deliver natural gas? Are we going to just sit at home and freeze in the dark?

Most places, except in big cities, there is no public transportation. How are people supposed to get to work? Where I represent in southeast Texas, people drive to work. Their vehicle sometimes is their car—it's called a pickup truck.

The energy-killing policies are proposed by the administration this year, not 10 years from now, but it's in the next budget. It will kill off American jobs. It will kill off productivity. It will make America more vulnerable to our enemies, and it will send money, American money, overseas, and it will continue to make us dependent on foreign countries for our oil. It's not a good idea to destroy America's energy industry. The government should not tax our energy industry out of business.

And that's just the way it is.

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.)

#### INTERROGATION TACTICS

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, earlier today we heard some pretty imaginative accusations from my Republican colleagues when they were talking about an amendment I offered to the Intelligence Authorization Act. While my amendment is being removed from the manager's amendment up in the Rules Committee, I want to take this opportunity to clear up a few things.

When President Obama took office last year, one of his first Executive orders was to extend the Army field manual's guidelines on interrogation tactics. Those guidelines prohibit interrogators in all Federal agencies from using brutal interrogations in any circumstance. That is the law today.

So to get the facts straight, brutal interrogations are illegal right now. But this Executive order doesn't completely solve the problem. The President can't include criminal penalties in Executive orders, and current U.S. law doesn't outline what constitutes a brutal interrogation.

My amendment would have expanded upon the President's Executive order to clearly define what constitutes a cruel, inhuman, or degrading interrogation so that it is unmistakable what kinds of techniques are unacceptable. It also creates criminal penalties for those who use those kinds of interrogations. And to be clear, I didn't invent

this concept myself. The amendment was based on the Army field manual definition of acceptable and unacceptable interrogation tactics, which, as Senator JOHN MCCAIN has said, is effective 99.9 percent of the time. One of the most important things to remember about these kinds of interrogations is that they simply don't work.

Brutal interrogations are not an effective tool to collect information, and what's worse, they actually may produce unreliable information. As former CIA official Bob Baer has said, "What happens when you torture people is they figure out what you want to hear and they tell you that."

An endless string of studies have shown us that when people's minds or bodies are subjected to the kind of trauma these brutal interrogations entail, their brains don't function properly. For example, during training exercises, American special operative soldiers have had difficulty remembering information after they'd been put through food or sleep deprivation.

Why are the Republicans defending a tactic we know doesn't work? Interrogations like those hurt our reputation abroad. The world was horrified when they saw what American soldiers were doing at Abu Ghraib. As former Secretary of State Colin Powell has said, "People are now starting to question whether we're following our own high standards."

Brutality like that hurts our credibility and undercuts our reputation in the global community.

I'm a veteran. I wear my Vietnam pin well and proudly. I served in the Navy. I'm passionate about protecting this country and keeping our soldiers safe. More than anything, this amendment was designed to protect them.

Several soldiers have done a far better job than I can in explaining why we need laws like this. Retired Colonel Stuart Herrington said that cruelty in interrogations "endangers our soldiers on the battlefield by encouraging reciprocity." The golden rule, if you will.

Retired admiral John Huston has said, "Getting our interrogation policies back on track will preserve our standing to fight for humane treatment of American soldiers who are captured."

I couldn't agree more. Without clear laws that define acceptable and unacceptable interrogation practices, including criminal consequences for violating those laws, we are putting more Americans at risk of being treated with the same brutality.

Just last week the two former Justice Department attorneys who crafted the legal justification for the use of brutal interrogations got off scot free. The Justice Department absolved them of their wrongdoing and only said they had "exercised poor judgment" and hadn't broken the law. They took advantage of a gap in our current law and provided legal cover for abuse during interrogations. My amendment would have ensured this kind of legal maneuvering never happens again.

As the President said when he issued his Executive order last year, "We are willing to observe core standards of conduct not just when it's easy, but also when it's hard."

□ 2015

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.)

#### 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today actually in celebration of the recognition of the 100th anniversary of a great, value-laden, principle-driven organization, the Boy Scouts of America. It was 100 years ago this month that led to the formal organization of the Boy Scouts of America. And that came from an event actually that happened across the sea, in London.

A businessman from Chicago, William D. Boyce, was traveling there, and on a foggy night was lost, and was guided by the selfless act of a young man who stopped to not just offer directions, but take the businessman, lead him where he needed to be. And at the end of that journey, Mr. Boyce offered to pay the man, pay the young lad for that selfless service, that kind act. And the response was, "Sir, I am a Scout. We do good turns, and not for pay."

That led to Mr. Boyce returning and partnering with individuals in this country, and ultimately within the next year led to the forming of the Boy Scouts of America that has served this country and served the youth of this country for 100 years.

Scouting was described by its earlier founder, Lord Baden-Powell, when he founded Scouting in England, as a game with a purpose. It certainly is. That purpose is value-driven. And those values are lasting to this day 100 years later in the United States of America as citizenship, and leadership, and service, and character that builds lives.

The Boy Scouts of America today through the Cub, the Boy Scouting, the Venture program, the Scouting program serves both boys and girls. The Scout promise that is recited every week throughout this country at troop meetings includes those three parts of duty to God and duty to country, duty to self, and duty to others.

Prior to coming to this Chamber 14 months ago, I served for 30 years as a Scoutmaster. And in that time I saw that Scouting made a difference in the

lives of kids, kids from all walks of life, kids that came from intact families and very challenged circumstances. I saw how Scouting made a difference in terms of putting them on the path for successful careers to become community leaders, to actually become life savers, and had Scouts that applied their skills that they had learned to save lives. And as patriots and serving their country as members of our Armed Services, as firefighters, EMTs, and as becoming loving spouses and parents themselves.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise to talk about, additionally, the oldest existing, continuously registered, non-merged Boy Scout Council in America: The Chief Cornplanter Council based in Warren County, Pennsylvania. It was founded in July 1913.

In this 100th year of the establishment of Scouting, it is a pleasure to point out to my colleagues that the Chief Cornplanter Council was the 17th council to receive a charter from the Boy Scouts of America. But the first 16 have either disbanded or merged with other councils. So it holds onto the distinction as the oldest.

Originally chartered as the Warren County Council, the group was renamed Chief Cornplanter Council in 1954 to honor a local Seneca chief. The council office in Warren has a museum that features historical items, including a photo of five Scouts from 1914 with their badges sewn to their sleeves and their hats that remind us more of a World War I doughboy.

In 3 years, the Cornplanter Council will celebrate 100 years of continuous scouting in an area that is dedicated to Scouting and its ideals. Local Scout executive Kevin Bonner said the area serves 60 percent of all Cub Scout-age youth, while the national average is about 20 percent. At any given time they have about 1,000 youth involved in their program.

I commend this council for its longevity, its service to Scouting, and the difference that it, as well as other Scouting programs across this Nation, make in the lives of our future leaders.

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

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

#### TRIBUTE TO JAMES HADLEY

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. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a dear friend of mine, and a friend of many of those who knew him, who passed away a few days ago, and whose visitation services are being held even at this moment as I speak. While I was not able to be at