

stressed by the demands of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Above all, General Casey has never wavered from his personal commitment to support the soldiers and families who are the heart and soul of the United States Army. He implemented the Army Family Covenant and the Army Community Covenant to expand and improve services and raise awareness about the unique challenges military families face.

Madam Speaker, during times of uncertainty and crisis, our Nation has been fortunate to have exceptional men and women who step forward and calmly lead. Such a man is General George W. Casey, Jr. He has been exemplary in his selfless service for our country through war, peace, and personal trial.

It is with profound admiration and deep respect that we pay tribute to General George W. Casey, Jr., for all he has done for the United States Army and this country. We thank General Casey, his wife, Sheila, and his two sons, Sean and Ryan, for their dedication and sacrifice on behalf of our soldiers, our Army, and our Nation.

As a personal aside, several years ago, I was on a plane that was grounded in Germany coming back from a codel in the Middle East, and here comes the Commander in Chief of the Army jogging up to the airfield just to say hello to the congressional delegation. He is a great man.

BUDGET COMPROMISE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, at the outset, let me associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman who just spoke on behalf of General Casey and thank General Casey, with him, for his service to the country.

Madam Speaker, in 1998, as a Republican Congress was struggling to compromise with a Democratic President on a budget bill, a Member of the House rose to speak to what he called the "perfectionist caucus," those Members who stood against compromise under any circumstances. Here is what he said:

"Now, my fine friends who are perfectionists, each in their own world where they are petty dictators, could write a perfect bill. It would be about 2,200 of their particular projects and their particular interests and their particular goodies, taking care of their particular States. But," this speaker said, "that is not the way life works in a free society. In a free society, where we are sharing power between the legislative and executive branch, compromise is precisely the outcome we should expect to get."

Those words were true then when Newt Gingrich, the Speaker of the House, said them, and they are still true today.

In the last election, Americans voted for shared responsibility. Without both

parties' willingness to compromise—to take less than 100 percent of what they want—there will be no solution to our most pressing problems, including our debt; there will be no action on our budget; and the government will be in danger of shutting down, which, in the midst of a fragile economic recovery, would be disastrous.

So the question is this, Madam Speaker: Who is willing to compromise and who is standing in the way?

□ 1020

Democrats are willing to cut and compromise. We believe that smart, targeted cuts are a part of the solution, and we have offered to meet Republicans more than halfway.

The Republican leadership initially proposed \$73 billion in spending cuts. Their conference rejected that proposal and demanded \$100 billion in cuts.

Democrats have offered \$51 billion, and signal a willingness to move toward the \$70 billion figure suggested by the Republican leadership, very near the Republicans' original goal, provided that we can agree on cuts that don't cripple our economic recovery and undermine our shared values.

Cutting 200,000 children from Head Start is not, I believe, a value we ought to support. Adversely affecting 9 million young people's ability to go to college and make us a more competitive society is not one of those values either. Substantially reducing our ability to participate in basic research which will grow our economy, create innovative ideas and spur invention is not one of our values.

In my view, H.R. 1 that passed this House did not represent America's values. Yes, we need to become fiscally disciplined, but we need to do it in a smart way that reflects our values.

Looking at those numbers, Americans are surely thinking there is clear room to come to an agreement and keep the world's largest enterprise, the United States Government, from being funded on a sporadic, uncertainty-creating 2-week or 3-week increment.

So why can't we?

Well, read the news. The New York Times March 28 said this: "Tea Party supporters are coming to the Capitol this week to rally Republicans to not compromise with Democrats on spending cuts." That's the perfectionist caucus wing.

Politico, on March 27, said this: "Harsh rhetoric Friday night suggests GOP leaders still fear a tea party rebellion." That's what Newt Gingrich was talking about with respect to the perfectionist caucus.

The Hill, on March 29 said, "Striking a deal with Democrats would set off a wave of revolt among the most conservative members of the caucus." That's the perfectionist caucus that Newt Gingrich was talking about that brought our government to a standstill and shut down our government in 1995 and early 1996.

We are in a dangerous place, I tell my friends, when compromise, which is es-

entially the job description of a legislator in a free society, is enough to spark revolt.

Come, let us reason together, Lyndon Johnson said. That is what we need to do. We face partisan opposition to any compromise on spending levels. Some Members' willingness to shut down the government unless they get their way on divisive social issues, even though the Republican pledge to America promised to, and I quote, "end the practice of packaging unpopular bills with 'must-pass' legislation to circumvent the will of the American people." In fact, Mitch Daniels, candidate for President, Governor of Indiana, said they ought to be considered separately. He is right.

Madam Speaker, the perfectionist caucus, unfortunately, seems to be alive and well. It just has a new name. Just listen to its own words.

One Republican Member said this: "If we can't defund health care reform in the spending bill, then we have just got to dig in." In other words, shut down government if you can't repeal the health care bill.

Is that an item for substantial, substantive debate? It is. But should we shut down the government while that debate is occurring? I say no.

Another said, "I think we have to have a fight. I think this is the moment." In other words, our way or no way. I don't think that's what the American people voted for.

Another said this: "I don't see any room for compromise."

Democracies cannot work that way. As Newt Gingrich said, we're elected from different constituencies by different people with different views, and they expect us to come here, all 435 of us, and all 100 in the Senate, and make reasonable compromises to move our government forward. Yes, to reduce the deficit we must do that, but let us do so in a way that honors our values and honors our democracy.

For the rest of us, Members of both parties who understand that legislating means compromise, it's time to find common ground and prevent government shutdown.

INSIGHTS FROM THE CONSTITUENT WORK WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BARLETTA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to share with my colleagues in the House what my neighbors at home shared with me during the past constituent work week. Throughout the week I heard from small business owners, local officials, university leaders, teachers, students, Rotarians, and a Purple Heart National Guardsman about the issues facing Pennsylvania's 11th Congressional District. Although the voices were different, the message was the same. We need to get our economy back on track.

Last week I spoke at the Rotary Club in my hometown of Hazleton about the debt crisis crippling our Nation. The Rotarians were engaged, attentive, and concerned about the spending habits of Washington.

Madam Speaker, I let them know that we have a debt crisis in this country, not because Washington taxes too little, but because Washington spends too much. For far too long, the Federal Government has overspent, overtaxed, and over-borrowed. That stops now.

If we are serious about our economic prosperity, we must cut wasteful spending in favor of investments proven to work. Last week I visited the SHINE 21st Century After-School Program at Panther Valley Elementary School in Nesquehoning. Located in 10 schools in Carbon and Schuylkill Counties, SHINE is a data-driven, rural education model designed to provide academic enrichment to at-risk students. I commend Jeanne Miller, Director of the SHINE Program, and Lehigh-Carbon Community College for partnering together to benefit pre-service teachers and, more importantly, some of our region's most deserving students. Like the D.C. Opportunity Scholarship Program, the SHINE model stands out as a program that works.

As a member of the House Committee on Education and the Workforce, I will continue to examine how education at all levels is preparing students for careers. I was privileged last week to welcome Chairman KLINE and the House Education and the Workforce Committee to Wilkes University in Wilkes-Barre for a field hearing on the role of higher education in job growth and development. Witnesses from Wilkes University, Empire Beauty School, Luzerne County Community College, and Lackawanna Junior College demonstrated firsthand how northeast Pennsylvania is taking strides to provide quality higher education.

Additionally, Chairman KLINE and I met with and read to a kindergarten class at Riverside Elementary East in Moosic. The reception we received from all of the students was unbelievable, and I couldn't be more appreciative of the students, teachers, and school administrators for putting such a fantastic visit together.

Also, last week I welcomed Chairman MICA, Subcommittee Chairman Shuster, and the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee to Scranton for a listening session on the future of our roads and infrastructure. The listening session helped me and other members of the committee gain a greater level of insight from local leaders with expertise and real world experience in transportation and infrastructure policy. During the listening session, we spoke about job creation, heard some examples of burdensome regulation, listened to ideas about cost-effective maintenance plans, and were briefed on public-private partnerships as new ways to build and repair Pennsylvania's roads and bridges.

Madam Speaker, the challenges we face in our district are great, but they are not unique. My friends and neighbors in Pennsylvania's 11th Congressional District are hardworking people, and I will continue to bring their voices to Washington throughout the 112th Congress.

Finally, Madam Speaker, in closing, I would like to note that we're all here today, free to talk and debate, because of the brave men and women serving in our Armed Forces. I was humbled and honored this week to attend the Purple Heart medal presentation in Hazleton to Pennsylvania Army National Guard Sergeant First Class John Leonard.

Sergeant Leonard was injured in an IED explosion in Iraq in February. It is men and women like Sergeant Leonard who make me proud to be standing freely in this House Chamber today.

□ 1030

KOREA-U.S. FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maine (Mr. MICHAUD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MICHAUD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak in opposition to the Korea Free Trade Agreement.

The Korea FTA is fundamentally flawed. As everyone knows, it is the same NAFTA-style agreement that hasn't worked for 17 years. This agreement will further undermine U.S. manufacturing and ship more American jobs overseas. But there are things the American people don't know about this trade deal, things that the administration hopes that they will not find out.

The administration will say that this agreement is key to increasing U.S. exports. But what they don't say is that it also increases Korea's imports, too, which will expand our trade deficit by hundreds of millions of dollars each year and cost us 159,000 American jobs.

It will also result in more under-priced goods from China being transhipped through Korea and being dumped in the United States.

The administration will say that this trade deal is important for U.S. national security. But what they don't say and talk about is the potential for it to benefit North Korea through the Kaesong Industrial Complex.

And the administration will say that they fixed the auto provisions and opened up Korea's market to all U.S. companies. But what they don't mention is the fact that they only fixed the auto provisions on paper, not in reality, and this is still a bad deal for the United States companies here in the U.S.

They don't tell the American people that this free trade agreement does nothing to stop Korea's currency manipulation. But the Treasury Department actually identified Korea as a currency manipulator in their report this February.

I have come to the floor today to make sure the American people are

aware of how bad this trade deal is for the United States and how good this FTA is for China, Kim Jong Il, and South Korea.

I would urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to oppose this flawed NAFTA-style trade deal.

H.R. 910, THE "DIRTY AIR ACT"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Madam Speaker, I rise to speak out against the GOP energy agenda and H.R. 910, the Dirty Air Act.

While consumers around the Nation, including my district of the Virgin Islands, are struggling to make ends meet amidst the rising cost of energy, our colleagues across the aisle are shamelessly using scare tactics to cripple EPA's regulatory authority and gut the Clean Air Act.

H.R. 910, the Energy Tax Prevention Act, or more appropriately, the Dirty Air Act, will reverse generations of scientific advancement and does nothing to protect the everyday American. In fact, the legislation outright denies the science that clearly demonstrates that greenhouse gases are injurious to health and that they accelerate global warming. This is science that the Congress has paid for.

The Academy of Sciences, a committee of many of the world's leading climate scientists and others, make the indisputable health link that these gases are injurious to our health. So I want to speak out against that agenda. As the President has recently said, we have got to work together to secure America's energy future.

The only ones who benefit from this legislation will be those who already benefit, Wall Street oil speculators and Big Oil allies here in Congress. This is nothing more than polluted politics. The American people deserve better. Let's save American jobs, invest in the green economy, and ensure a clean, not a dirty, future for the children of tomorrow.

Madam Speaker, I rise to speak out against the GOP energy agenda and H.R. 910, the Dirty Air Act. While consumers around the Nation, including my district of the Virgin Islands, are struggling to make ends meet amidst the rising cost of energy, our colleagues across the aisle are shamelessly using scare tactics to cripple EPA's regulatory authority and gut the Clean Air Act.

H.R. 910, the Energy Tax Prevention Act or more appropriately, the "Dirty Air Act" will reverse generations of scientific advancement and does nothing to protect the everyday American.

In fact the legislation outright denies the science that clearly demonstrates that greenhouse gases are injurious to health and that they accelerate global warming. This is science that this Congress paid for. The Academy of Science, a committee of many of the world's leading climate scientists and others make the indisputable health link, not the EPA