

Today, the Internet runs smoothly and networks balance your email, music downloads, and streaming video because the Internet runs without government interference or regulation. Yet, net neutrality would destroy this model of service that consumers have come to expect and that already works—and works well.

Madam Speaker, in this case, The Washington Post got it right. Implementing net neutrality will stifle the very technological growth we need to continue to stay competitive in the global marketplace, and it needs to be defeated.

WORKING TO END HUNGER IN AMERICA

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize my colleague and fellow Hunger Caucus co-Chair, Congressman John Boozman of Arkansas, for his leadership in the fight to end hunger. On Monday, Congressman BOOZMAN hosted a hunger relief and nutrition roundtable to address hunger in his district, an issue that affects one in seven Arkansas residents.

Joined by Dr. Janey Thornton, deputy under secretary of Agriculture for Food, Nutrition and Consumer Services, this forum brought together local antihunger leaders to coordinate efforts and discuss innovative ways to eliminate hunger in Arkansas' Third Congressional District. Today, more American than ever struggle to put food on their tables. Hunger is getting worse here in America, and we should do more to combat it. I encourage my colleagues to follow Congressman BOOZMAN's example and host forums to address the problem of hunger in their congressional districts. We owe it to our constituents to come together and to put an end to hunger in America once and for all.

I would like to insert into the RECORD the following article from The Morning News:

[From the Morning News]

LACK OF TRANSPORTATION WORSENS HUNGER, EXPERTS SAY

(By Doug Thompson)

ROGERS.—A full food bank does a hungry person no good if it's miles away and he cannot drive there, hunger experts agreed.

Janey Thornton, deputy undersecretary for Food, Nutrition and Consumer Services for the U.S. Department of Agriculture, met Monday with directors of local food relief agencies and charities along with 3rd District Rep. John Boozman, R-Rogers. At least 50 people attended the forum at the Center for Nonprofits in Rogers.

"Do you have problems with 'food deserts?'" Thornton asked soon after the question and answer portion began. "There are large areas across the country where people don't have a big chain store nearby for a variety of reasons." Attendees replied that poor people, particularly the elderly, lack transportation. They go to convenience

stores that sell a few groceries. That's a trend nationwide, Thornton said.

"There's little or no fresh fruits and vegetables," at these small stores, Thornton said. "They're also a whole lot more expensive. Milk and other basics can cost two times the amount that you'd find at a chain store."

"Transportation is a huge, huge problem among seniors," said Marge Wolf, director of the Northwest Arkansas Food Bank in Bethel Heights. Wolf added that a lack of basic cooking skills has also become a problem.

"Since the recession began, we're having more and more people who don't know how to cook," Wolf said. "We have food at the bank where, if we give it to someone, they do not know how to cook it."

That is a national trend also, Thornton said. Many could buy food that was at least partly prepared, requiring only heating or some simple preparation to eat when they were employed, she said. "There are some food banks across the country that are installing kitchens to give basic cooking lessons," she said.

It would also help if more people learned to garden, Thornton added. This skill is of great value to the poor, she said. Her home state of Kentucky has a program where seniors show students how to plant gardens in the spring, then tend the gardens while students are away during the summer. The food is harvested in the fall and served in school cafeterias, she said.

□ 1530

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. KILROY). 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.

WE, THE SUBJECTS

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. Madam Speaker, the United States Constitution starts out with the words "We the People." It's right there at the beginning, written large so folks don't miss it. It means that we are a self-governing people. It means that the Constitution is an agreement between the people and the government. It's not an outline of what the government will give people. It's designed to keep government in a box, to keep it under control. Its purpose is to limit what government can do to the people, not the other way around. The Constitution does not live. It does not breathe. It's not an evolving document with constant change of its true meaning. It says the things it says in plain, simple language.

A current Supreme Court Justice told me recently that the Constitution means what five of the nine Justices says it means. Well, that elitist statement may be true as a practical matter, but the writers of the Constitution never wanted five Justices in a dark, damp, secret room to make the Constitution mean what the Judges wanted it to mean. It seems many of the Supreme Court opinions are so twisted

with outcome-based decisions that they are the result of the ebb and flow of political and social opinion. The Constitution is not some elusive ideal that changes with time but was written to prevent government, or Judges, from making it mean different things at different times or different things depending on who is in charge, whether it be Judges, Congress, or even Presidents.

There are simple rules for adding to or taking away from the Constitution. There is a high threshold on that process for good reason. The people have to agree to change the Constitution by the complicated amendment process. The Constitution is a self-governing people's agreement with our government, an agreement that says to government that government must stay within these limits or the government violates its contract with the people by disregarding its duty to stay within those bounds of the Constitution.

Now the question to be asked is: Is our government out of control?

As the Constitution is the framework, the Declaration of Independence is our Nation's heart. The Declaration of Independence gave us the justification for establishing this new Nation. The Constitution is the foundation of this new Nation. The Declaration proclaims that our rights come from the Almighty God. They are inalienable. That means our rights cannot be stolen from us by government. We must make sure government recognizes our individual rights. Government can't change what our God-given rights are, and government doesn't give people rights. Government has no rights. Government has power, power that comes from the people because we give our government that power.

Even though it's seldom taught in our Nation's Ivy League law schools, rights are from the Almighty, not from government. If rights are from government, then government can take them away at its whim. Millions of Americans over the centuries have shed blood and even died to put government power in its box, in its place. We are to control government. Government was not established in this country to run roughshod over the people.

There seems to me, now, to be an attack on individual rights by our own government. America's founding as a Nation put an end to the centuries-long notion of "might and power make right." Today, some in this country want to forget about that. Our Founding Fathers called these elites princelings—elite power-grabbers who want to be able to tell us how to live and run our own lives. Some are at the levers of government right now. Might and power does not make right.

Some want government to have the power to control every aspect of our lives. Those that urge a government takeover of health care are a prime example. Government should not have the power over our health, who our doctors are, or what medical procedures are allowed. Government should