

terrorist threat that we face, all of us share in that end.

But I would say to the gentleman that somehow there have been statements made by the Speaker and others indicating a certain preconceived bias, like a belief that perhaps the CIA or others have somehow misled us.

I do think the gentleman is correct in saying that we need to focus on what kind of practices occurred, but I also think that in an ongoing manner, to ensure compliance with the law, we need to understand if there is some type of preconceived bias, as was indicated in some of the public statements that may have been made today. And I do think that the gentleman would agree, openness and an indication of a predisposition prior to the revelation now of who knew what when may be somehow shaping the bias in these discussions.

I share with the gentleman the notion, we need to follow the law. But if there is somehow a belief—and I'd ask the gentleman whether he shares this belief—that somehow the CIA or others have intentionally misled this body, because that seems to be some concern that has been raised today.

I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I have no idea of that. I don't have a belief of that nature because I have no basis on which to base such a belief. I certainly hope that's not the case. I don't draw that conclusion.

What I say to the gentleman, once again, is that to a degree, that is a distraction. It is not irrelevant, but it is a distraction from the central point. I will tell my friend that I think there is far too much discussion about what was said as opposed to what was done.

The truth commission I think has a responsibility—or whatever we call a commission that would look at this issue—not so much for what was done but to ensure that what we do going forward is legal, consistent with our values, consistent with our morals, and consistent, as the gentleman points out, with protecting our Nation and our people.

In my view, we have a responsibility to do all of those. In my view, we can do all of those. They are not inconsistent with one another. And that is what I think we ought to be looking at as we look at what happened so that what happens in the future—because certainly this Nation is going to be under threat now and in the future. I think it's very important. I frankly think that upholding our values is consistent with also protecting our security.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

I remain concerned. And I think it is shared by my colleagues on this side of the aisle that if it is the intent of the Speaker and the majority leader to pursue a truth commission surrounding the investigation of terrorists and the interrogation tactics employed, that we do know what interaction this body had, the Members of this body and its

committees had, in the oversight of the tactics that were employed. Because if we are all concerned about following the law, which we should be first and foremost here, and if there was acquiescence, if there was knowledge on the part of this body, but yet now allegations made suggesting that certain tactics were used and were against the law, that raises serious questions about the ability for this body going forward to properly exercise its oversight authority so we do uphold the law.

That would be our concern over here, Madam Speaker, that we make sure that there is a full vetting of what transpired so that we don't repeat the type of mistakes perhaps or we don't repeat the omission of action, if you will, on the part of this body.

With that, Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

HR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 1 p.m. tomorrow, and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning-hour debate, and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday, May 19, 2009, for morning-hour debate and noon for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has agreed to without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title;

H. Con. Res. 80. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for an event to celebrate the birthday of King Kamehameha.

HELP FOR NEW JERSEY SENIORS AND VETERANS

(Mr. ADLER of New Jersey asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ADLER of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I rise today to call attention to the struggles of our seniors and our veterans. These are tough economic times. Many New Jersey families, seniors and veterans are struggling to make ends meet. That's why I'm pleased to know that seniors and disabled veterans are receiving a \$250 economic recovery payment this month. We have to make sure our seniors and our veterans receive the benefits and relief they need and so richly deserve.

When I reviewed the first draft of the economic recovery package, I realized that retired seniors and disabled vet-

erans were completely excluded from receiving any tax rebate. I worked quickly to fix this oversight, introducing the Safeguarding America's Seniors and Veterans Act which was included in the final recovery package enacted into law. Fortunately, New Jersey seniors and disabled veterans will now be receiving \$250 in tax relief this month.

During these tough economic times, we must ensure that we take care of our seniors and our veterans, those who have made our country so great and kept us safe and free. These \$250 checks have already started arriving in homes in Burlington and Ocean Counties and in Cherry Hill and are making a great difference in the lives of our seniors.

I'm happy to be part of this process.

CONGRATULATING LAUREN ZUMBACH

(Mrs. BIGGERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BIGGERT. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and congratulate a remarkable young woman from my district, Lauren Zumbach, who was just announced as a 2009 Presidential Scholar.

The Presidential Scholar program annually recognizes 141 of the Nation's most exemplary high school seniors who have demonstrated outstanding academic performance as well as exemplary leadership, citizenship and community service. Lauren embodies all of these traits.

A poised and confident young woman, Lauren is a leader both in and out of the classroom. As a student athlete at Hinsdale Central High School, Lauren has been a straight A student while contributing to her championship cross-country team.

Her accomplishments do not end there. Outside of the classroom, Lauren has organized work days to improve local forest preserves. She has worked to instruct area children about safe online behavior. And just last fall, Lauren was the impetus behind Trot for the Troops, a 5K race that raised money for the Illinois chapter of Operation Homefront.

In a few weeks, Lauren will graduate from Hinsdale Central High School, and I congratulate her on receiving the 2009 Presidential Scholar award.

□ 1645

THE MEDIA SHOULD HOLD OBAMA ACCOUNTABLE

(Mr. SMITH of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, last week, the Obama administration increased its budget deficit projection to more than \$1.8 trillion and then promptly blamed the deficit on former President Bush. Most of the national

media have blindly accepted this false charge despite facts to the contrary. President Obama did not inherit the current budget which spends too much, taxes too much, and borrows too much. But he did vote for last year's budget as Senator. President Obama didn't inherit the \$787 billion so-called "stimulus package," he authored it. President Obama didn't inherit out-of-control government spending. He has presided over it.

At some point the national media needs to hold the current administration accountable for its own spending and the ballooning deficit which will increase inflation and slow economic growth.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 Maryland (Mr. HOYER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. HOYER 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. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

AMERICA'S TREASURY IS BARE

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

Mr. PAUL. Madam Speaker, today we passed the supplemental bill. And I'm deeply disappointed about that. I was disappointed also that I wasn't able to get any time to enter into the debate because the time was rather limited and it was a closed rule. But I did want to make a couple of comments and the concerns that I have had about this supplemental.

When the President sent the supplemental over, it was \$84.9 billion. And there were some of us that were hoping that we wouldn't be funding the war through supplementals, but it looks like that hasn't changed, the process would continue, even though there were some that believed there would be a change in the way we funded these wars. When that bill came to the House, there was a lot of expression about concern about spending too much money. But by the time it got to the floor, it was \$96.7 billion. And things were added, for instance, \$2 billion for the flu epidemic that didn't occur, but still, we are going to spend \$2 billion trying to figure out whether we are ever going to have an epidemic.

It was very disappointing that even though it was a closed rule, the minority had one chance to do something about it and maybe reduce some of the spending. But lo and behold, when that amendment was offered, it was offered to increase the spending by \$2.9 billion. There was a lot of expression of the outcry about this spending and the deficits we have and the deficits exploding and the Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid underfunded, and we are in the midst of a crisis. But it doesn't seem to bother anybody about spending. But the truth is, the Treasury is bare. The Treasury is empty. And yet we continue to spend all this money.

So where do they think they are going to get this money? Well, we can't tax the people any more. The people are broke. And yet still we resort to more borrowing and more printing of money which will not last forever. It will eventually come to an end. And I think that is what we are witnessing.

This process bothers me a whole lot that we come to the floor with the supplementals. We rush them through. We talk about this excessive spending. And lo and behold, when we finally vote, we get a total of 60 people who would say, Enough is enough. And besides, what are we doing? Where are we spending this money? I thought we were supposed to, with this change in administration, that we would be fighting less wars. But no. The war in Iraq continues. We expand the war in Afghanistan. We spread the war into Pakistan. And we always have on the table the potential danger of Iran.

So when will it ever end? We can't even define the enemy. Who exactly is the enemy over there? Is it the al Qaeda? The Taliban? Is it the Government of Pakistan? If you can't define the enemy, how do you know when the war is over? If we are in war, which we are, how can this be anything other than war? When was this war declared? Oh, well, we got this authority 5 or 10 years ago. Who knows when? Perpetual war. This is what we are involved with. Perpetual spending. And then we say, well, we have to do that to be safe. That is what is preposterous. It is the very policy that makes us unsafe. We pursue this policy, and the more we do, the less safe we are. There is a big argument now about whether we are safer now with the new administration or is it making us less safe?

The truth is the policies of the last 10, 15, 20 years have made us less safe. And as long as we occupy countries, as long as we kill other people and civilians are being killed, we are going to build enemies. And as long as we are known throughout the world that we torture people, we will incite people to hate us and want to come here to kill us. So we aren't more safe. We are less safe by this foreign policy. And some day we have to wise up, change our ways and not be the policeman of the world, not to pretend that we can be the nation builder of the world, swear off and make sure we don't torture, be-

cause you don't get worthwhile information from torture. All it does is incite people against us. And the occupations can never be of any benefit to us.

What about the financial calamity that is coming? I'm afraid this is the way this will end, through another financial crisis much bigger than the one we currently have, because you can't create \$2 trillion of new money every year and expect this system to continue.

The Soviet system collapsed because they couldn't afford it. Their economic system was a total failure. We did not have to fight the Soviets. Even though they were a nuclear power, they collapsed and disintegrated. And that is what we have to be concerned about, because we cannot continue to finance this system and pursue a policy which endangers us.

So if we care about the American people and care about our liberties and care about our Constitution, we ought to look seriously at our foreign policy and not continue to pursue the supplemental appropriations where we continue to spend money that we don't have.

H.R. 1924, TRIBAL LAW AND ORDER ACT OF 2009

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Dakota (Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to discuss H.R. 1924, the Tribal Law and Order Act of 2009. I was proud to reintroduce this legislation designed to address the serious deficiencies and systemic flaws within the Federal agencies charged with providing law enforcement and justice programs in Indian country.

As the at-large Member of Congress for South Dakota, I am proud to represent nine sovereign Native nations. The Federal Government has a unique relationship with the 562 federally recognized tribes. This government-to-government relationship is established in the U.S. Constitution, recognized through hundreds of treaties, and reaffirmed through executive orders, judicial decisions and congressional action.

Law enforcement is one of the Federal Government's responsibilities to federally recognized tribes. Yet on many counts, we are failing to meet that obligation. In April, Oglala Sioux Tribe president, Theresa Two Bulls, testified at the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies' oversight hearing on law enforcement issues in Indian country. President Two Bulls discussed the law enforcement crisis on the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation in southwestern South Dakota. She explained how large, land-based reservations struggle to maintain the level of officers needed to protect tribal members.