

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

those services, I am able to take the floor and pay tribute to Mr. James Hadley, a businessman, a banker, community advocate, a civic and church leader, and a friend to all of those who knew him.

For most of his adult life, James Hadley spent it building financial and business enterprises in low, moderate income, and disadvantaged communities. And Jim worked with many, many programs and projects, business ventures, and financial institutions.

And while he worked with many throughout the City of Chicago, I believe that that which gave him the greatest sense of pride and accomplishment was the work that he did with the Community Bank of Lawndale, where he, Cecil Butler, Diane Glenn, Reverend Shelvin Hall, and others pioneered the development of a community-owned bank, which has changed its name and is now named the Covenant Bank, and is under the leadership of Pastor Bill Winston of the Living Word Christian Center.

James Hadley and I both grew up in Arkansas not very far from each other, I in a little town Parkdale, and he in another town, Warren. And I really didn't know him at that time. But as fate would have it, we both migrated to Chicago. And as I got to know Jim, he became a role model for me. He was seriously committed to every endeavor to which he was a part of. He was loyal to whatever he was engaged in. He was a great family man, dedicated to his family, had a comprehensive approach to life, and was just a pleasure to know, to be around, and to work with.

As a matter of fact, I commend James Hadley for a life well lived, take note of his many contributions, and thank him for helping to make the world a better place in which to live.

As a matter of fact, he served on the board of many not-for-profits, the hospital board, Mount Sinai Hospital, was an active member of the Carter Temple CME church, worked with the Boy Scouts, worked with the male initiative in his church, and was simply known as a good man to all of those who knew him.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I extend condolences to his wife Gloria, his daughter, and all of the James Hadley family, and trust that there will be others who will come along like him, who was willing to give of himself continuously for the benefit of others.

James Hadley, he lived a good life. Well done.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### HEALTH CARE SUMMIT

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

Mr. BURGESS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Well, we have had quite a day here in Washington, D.C., in your Nation's capital. The 6½ hour health care summit that was held down at the Blair House right adjacent to the White House has mercifully concluded. And as the saying goes up in Washington, everything's been said, everyone has said it, so it was time to go home. But for those who haven't had quite enough discussion about health care today, maybe we can spend just a little while longer talking about some of the things that we heard today and some of the things that we maybe perhaps didn't hear today.

One of the things that I do want to stress, we heard several times in the past several weeks that the Republicans don't have ideas. In fact, that was one of the admonitions of the President on starting this summit was that the Republicans didn't have ideas, and he wanted to in fact show the country that the Republicans were devoid of ideas. But nothing could be further from the truth. If anything, we saw today abundant Republican ideas. Some may say there are too many Republican ideas, too many to fit in one room.

I wanted to spend a few minutes tonight talking about some of those ideas on our side. I have a Web site, Mr. Speaker, that is devoted entirely to health care policy. It is from the Congressional Health Care Caucus. The Web address is [www.healthcaucus.org](http://www.healthcaucus.org).

And under the Health Caucus Web site, under the Issues tab, I think it is the second heading, is a Prescription for Health Care Reform. Anyone is free to go to that site and click on the Prescription for Health Care Reform, follow the links, and they will be taken to a one-page description of nine different bullet points on health care reform.

In fact, there is even a little segment to record comments if someone would like to leave their ideas or their thoughts on the paper. Or if someone thinks of other things that might in fact be included, we welcome those comments on the Web site.

I am just going to briefly go through this list, and then I have got some other observations that I want to make on the summit that occurred today. And we will be joined from time to time by other Members of Congress, and I want to give them an opportunity to speak. But under the Prescription for Health Care Reform, certainly everything I heard this summer was, we don't want a 1,000-page bill. People really didn't want a 2,000-page bill after we came back and revamped it after the summertime. But what did people want Congress to do on health care?

There are people who have legitimate concerns that the system is not functioning in an optimum fashion. We do have great health care here in America, but there are distributional issues. The employer-sponsored insurance system does work well for the 60 to 70 percent of the population that is therein covered, but in fact there are problems for people who are outside the employer-sponsored insurance system, and there are certainly problems that all of us face with the advancing cost and complexity of health care.

So just running down the list, insurance reform that would include limitations on insurance companies excluding people for preexisting conditions, and guaranteeing access to insurance. Now, one of the fundamental differences on the Republican and Democratic approach to this is that the Democrats want to have, and the President wants to have, a mandate. That is, you are required to buy a product, an insurance product.

It is interesting because during the campaign in 2008, President Obama, when he was a presidential candidate, actually moved away from mandates. Candidate Hillary Clinton during her candidacy was in favor of mandates. Barack Obama was less enthusiastic about mandates. He did feel that there should be a mandate for children. We don't hear much discussion about that anymore. In fact, I don't think I heard that during the 6½ hours of debate today.

□ 2030

But mandates really have no place in a free society. There's some argument as to whether or not it would even be constitutional for the Federal Government to require someone to purchase an insurance product that they might