

felt over large distances, creating significant economic and humanitarian consequences.

As with any abrupt change in the Earth's system, a cascade of other transformations will likely follow, each building upon and exacerbating the others. We could see a shift in ecosystems, the collapse of permafrost in the Arctic, and an extensive species loss. Each of these changes would trigger massive implications for the natural systems and society as a whole.

So what does all this mean? It means we must act now. As President Obama said in his State of the Union address: If you want to debate the science of climate change, feel free to do so, but you will be pretty lonely.

Today America's business leaders, the Pentagon, the majority of Americans, the scientific community, and nations around the world recognize that we cannot wait to act.

We saw evidence of this last year when more than 40,000 negotiators from 196 countries descended on the French capital for the Paris Climate Summit. The Summit provided the world with an effective global framework for addressing climate change, but our work is far from over.

It is time to recognize that the consequences of inaction are far too great. If my colleagues are willing to put political ideologies aside and recognize that acting on climate change is not just in our planet's interest, but in the interest of humanity, we may still have a fighting chance.

Albert Einstein once said: "The world, as we have created it, is a process of our thinking. It cannot be changed without changing our thinking."

Now is the time for Congress to change our thinking and address the reality of climate change.

ARMY SERGEANT RODDIE EDMONDS OF KNOXVILLE, TENNESSEE

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

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the word hero is used way too lightly these days, but an extraordinary man from my district was a true hero of legendary proportions.

During World War II, Army Sergeant Roddie Edmonds of Knoxville, Tennessee, was captured at the Battle of the Bulge by the Nazis and sent to a POW camp. When the war was nearing an end, the camp's commander ordered all of the Jewish prisoners to report for what they knew was certain death.

As the highest ranking American in the camp, Sergeant Edmonds called on all 1,000 servicemen imprisoned there to step forward.

The German commander explained: They cannot all be Jews.

Sergeant Edmonds responded, with a pistol at his head: We are all Jews here.

The German commander backed down.

Sergeant Edmonds has now been designated Righteous Among the Nations, Israel's highest award for non-Jews. He is the first American serviceman to receive this honor.

Much has been written about the Greatest Generation, Mr. Speaker. It is because of people like Sergeant Edmonds. His son was given this great award on behalf of his father at the Israeli Embassy last week.

I am introducing a bill requesting that Sergeant Edmonds be awarded a Medal of Honor posthumously.

Director Steven Spielberg has purchased the rights to Sergeant Edmonds' story, and I hope a movie about his life will come out in the near future. The story of his valor should be made known to all Americans.

FEDERAL AIR MARSHAL SERVICE

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I want to go in a different direction at this point and mention another topic.

A couple of months ago, in interviews both by National Public Radio and CBS News, I described the air marshal program as possibly the most needless, useless, wasteful program in the entire Federal Government.

Shortly thereafter, the Los Angeles Times published an editorial entitled "It's Time to Ground America's Air Marshals" and said, "Duncan has a point."

The editorial pointed out that there is no data showing marshals successfully put down in-flight threats and added: "In fact, passengers are apparently more likely to stop troublemakers on board than armed marshals." The Times said that air marshals are a placebo the country should stop taking.

I became concerned a few years ago about this when I read in USA Today that more air marshals had been arrested than arrests by air marshals. At that point, the Service was costing \$200 million per arrest.

I was able to get the Appropriations Committee to start reducing their funding from a high of \$966 million, after they had been given big increases each year, to \$790 million this fiscal year.

Having airport screeners and simply locking aircraft doors have done much more good than the many, many billions we have spent just so air marshals can fly back and forth, back and forth, back and forth, usually in first class. This money is money that could and should be spent on much more cost-effective security measures.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, The Wall Street Journal, a few months after 9/11, when they noticed that almost every department and agency in the Federal Government was sending up requests for more money based on security, said a wise legislative policy to follow would be that, from now on, if any legislation came to the Congress with the word "security" attached, it should be given twice the scrutiny and four times the weight.

Unfortunately, we have wasted many, many billions on different programs in this country just because they had the word security attached. We need to take the advice of The Wall Street Journal and give those bills much more scrutiny.

□ 1030

CANCER IMMUNOTHERAPY

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

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, last month President Obama came to this Chamber to speak, inter alia, of a moonshot to cure cancer under the leadership of Vice President BIDEN. This week the President announced specific plans to invest \$1 billion to fund that moonshot.

As a scientist and as the manager of large scientific projects, I am naturally inclined to be skeptical of such bold claims from politicians. President Nixon famously launched the same war on cancer in 1971. Tragically, we continue to wage that war today.

More recently, Andrew von Eschenbach, the director of the National Cancer Institute under President Bush, set the goal of eliminating suffering and death from cancer by 2015. We all know, unfortunately, that that goal was never met.

So why is this cancer moonshot any different? Is this a moment like 1961 when President Kennedy stood before a joint session of Congress and announced his goal of sending a man to the Moon by the end of the decade and succeeded? Or is this a moment like 1971 when President Nixon declared war on cancer and failed?

I believe that President Obama's cancer initiative will succeed, and the reason that it will succeed is brutally simple: Science, basic science and technology that exists today and did not exist 45 years ago; technology that was generated by decades of curiosity-driven federally funded research paid for by the United States taxpayer.

There are many decades of federally supported basic scientific advances that will allow the Obama-Biden cancer moonshot to succeed: The ability to fully genome sequence individual cancers, the ability to manipulate the genome and produce animal models to study and to test the basic mechanisms of cancer, and immunotherapy treatment, which was named Science magazine's breakthrough of the year in 2013 and has been capturing so many headlines around the world.

Immunotherapy is an ingenious and revolutionary treatment that uses the body's own immune system to fight cancer. Since time immemorial, there have been stories of miraculous remissions of cancer when patients with apparently incurable cancers have experienced spontaneous and often complete remissions. These were often attributed to an act of God or perhaps the moral character of the patient.

We now understand that for most, if not all, of these remissions that they happen when the body's immune system, which has evolved over millions of years of combat with foreign viral and bacterial invaders, finally understands that cancer is an enemy and has all the horsepower that it needs to attack and to clean it up. Immunotherapy now gives us the scientific understanding of how to mass produce those miracles.

This would never have been discovered without decades of sustained Federal investment in R&D, and although the breakthroughs in immunotherapy rest upon a large pyramid of federally funded research, there are two parallel threads of federally funded research that directly led to this breakthrough.

One was pioneered by Jim Allison, then of UC Berkeley, and Arlene Sharpe of Harvard Medical School. The other was pioneered by Lieping Chen of the Mayo Clinic, all three labs using Federal funds to study how the immune system is controlled and how it knows to kill foreign cells but not its own cells. This was a fascinating scientific question, but not one which was obviously relevant to cancer.

All three labs were sponsored by basic science peer-reviewed grants from the National Institutes of Health, which I mention, Mr. Speaker, because of the way that peer review seems to be coming under attack by members of your party. In the 1990s these groups were all working on what became known as immune checkpoints, which are regulatory pathways to turn down the immune system to prevent it from attacking its own body.

Even once this basic discovery was made, the established pharmaceutical companies would not touch it, but in 1999 Medarex, a small biotech in Princeton, New Jersey, funded by the National Institutes of Health, took on the project. Ten years later, only after Medarex was well on the way to showing that their cancer immunotherapy approach worked in humans, it was purchased by Bristol-Myers Squibb for \$2.4 billion. Now there are many drug companies developing checkpoint inhibitor drugs to treat cancer as well as other immune system-related treatments for cancer.

So, as I mentioned before, the Obama-Biden cancer moonshot will likely succeed because of the technology and basic science that was generated by decades of curiosity-driven scientific research funded by the United States Government.

Mr. Speaker, I am the representative of U.S. citizens, but one who does not share your party's monomania about small government or a desire to keep our government small and indebted simply to provide low tax rates for wealthy donors because Americans know that small government does not accomplish great things, like sending a man to the Moon or curing cancer.

The following is a complete text of my remarks:

Mr. Speaker, last month, President Obama came to this chamber to speak, *inter alia*, of

a "moonshot" to cure cancer, under the leadership of Vice President BIDEN. This week the President announced specific plans to invest one billion dollars to fund that "moonshot." As a scientist, and as the manager of large scientific projects, I am naturally inclined to be skeptical of such bold claims from politicians. President Richard Nixon famously launched the same "war on cancer" in 1971. Tragically, we continue to wage that war today. More recently, Andrew von Eschenbach, the director of the National Cancer Institute under President Bush, set the goal of "eliminating suffering and death from cancer by 2015." We all know, unfortunately, that goal was not met. So why is this "cancer moonshot" any different?

Is this a moment like 1961, when President Kennedy stood before a joint session of Congress and announced his goal of putting a man on the moon by the end of the decade—and succeeded? Or a moment like 1971 when President Nixon declared War on Cancer and failed?

I believe that President Obama's cancer initiative will succeed. And the reason it will succeed is brutally simple: science. Basic science and technology that exists today, and did not exist 45 years ago. Technology that was generated by decades of curiosity-driven scientific research—paid for by the United States Taxpayer. There are many decades of federally-supported basic scientific advances that will allow the Obama-Biden cancer moonshot succeed: the ability to fully genome sequence individual cancers, the ability to manipulate the genome to produce animal models to study and test the basic mechanisms of cancer, and immunotherapy treatment, which was named *Science Magazine's* breakthrough of the year in 2013, and which has been capturing so many headlines around the world. Immunotherapy is an ingenious and revolutionary treatment that uses the body's own immune system to fight cancer.

Since time immemorial, there have been stories of "miraculous remissions" of cancer, where patients with apparently incurable cancers have experienced spontaneous and often complete remissions. These were often attributed to an act of God, or perhaps the moral character of the patient.

We now understand that most, if not all, of these remissions happen when the body's immune system, which has evolved over millennia of combat with foreign viral and bacterial invaders, finally understands the cancer as an enemy, and has all of the horsepower it needs to attack it and to clean it up. And immunotherapy now gives us the scientific understanding of how to mass produce those miracles. But this would never have been discovered without decades of sustained federal investments in R&D.

Although the breakthroughs of immunotherapy rest on a pyramid of largely taxpayer-funded research, there are two parallel threads of federally funded research that directly led to this breakthrough. One was pioneered by Jim Allison, then of UC Berkeley, and Arlene Sharpe, of Harvard Medical School. The other was pioneered by Lieping Chen of the Mayo Clinic. All three labs were using federal funds to study how the immune system is controlled, how it knows to kill foreign cells but not its own cells. This was a fascinating scientific question, but not one that was obviously relevant to cancer. All three labs are supported by basic-science from the

National Institutes of Health peer-reviewed grants. Which I mention, Mr. Speaker, because of the way that peer review is coming under attack by members of your party.

In the 1990s, they were all working on what have come to be known as immunological checkpoints, which are regulatory pathways that turn down the immune system to prevent it from attacking its own body.

Even once this basic discovery was made, the established pharmaceutical companies would not touch it. But in 1999, Medarex, a small biotech in Princeton, NJ, funded by the National Institutes of Health, took on the project. Ten years later, only after Medarex was well on the way to showing that their cancer immunotherapy approach worked in humans, it was purchased by Bristol-Myers Squibb for 2.4 billion dollars. There are now many drug companies developing checkpoint inhibitor drugs to treat cancer, as well as other immune-system-related treatments for cancer.

So as I mentioned before, the Obama-Biden cancer moonshot will likely succeed, because of the technology and basic science that was generated by decades of curiosity-driven scientific research—funded by the United States Government. Or, funded by big government, Mr. Speaker, as your colleagues like to say. Funded by a big government, directed by a vast, unelected, overpaid, lazy, wasteful federal bureaucracy. A bureaucracy that will save millions of American lives. I often hear my colleagues on the other side of the aisle claim we don't need to make federal investments in R&D, because if it's worth doing, the private sector will do it. Immunotherapy is a perfect example of why that logic doesn't work.

The private sector took over, but not until researchers spent decades and millions of taxpayer dollars elucidating the basic science and proving this method could work.

I also hear my colleagues cherry picking studies that they can't make sense of and label them as wasteful spending, then trumpeting their success in cutting "wasteful" government spending. When the truth is those "wasteful" programs often lead to breakthroughs like immunotherapy. The cancer moonshot being led by Vice President BIDEN is likely to succeed, but only because of sustained investments in federal funding for research and development. As we work in the coming months to develop a budget, I hope my colleagues will keep this in mind. I am the representative of U.S. citizens, Mr. Speaker, but one that does not share your party's monomania about "small government", or a desire to keep government small and indebted simply to provide low tax rates for its wealthy donors. Because Americans know that small government does not accomplish great things, like sending a man to the moon, or curing cancer.

CELEBRATING RELIGIOUS LIBERTY AND CONSTRICTING INDIVIDUAL FREEDOMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee). The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, as I come to the floor this morning, I want to express appreciation for our 64th annual National Prayer Breakfast that takes place tomorrow. I think this is such a wonderful gathering that we