

Article 239 of the Honduran Constitution states: "The citizen who has already held executive power"—that would be the President—"may not be President or designee. Anyone who violates this provision or proposes its reform and supports those who do directly or indirectly, must immediately cease the discharge of their duties, and shall be disqualified for 10 years from the exercise of any public function."

Those are pretty simple words. It sounds like the Constitution prevents Zelaya from trying to hijack the government.

The self-governing people of Honduras set forth in their Constitution that a tyrant could not abuse the process and become a dictator. They set rock solid term limits to one term for President. These good people legally removed Manuel Zelaya, the man who would be dictator, a tyrant, and a special friend of Hugo Chavez of Venezuela. Now that's special.

Here's how the people acted legally. After several attempts by legal means to prevent Zelaya from staying in power, the Office of Public Prosecutor filed a criminal complaint. The charges were treason, abuse of authority and usurpation of power in violation of the Honduran Constitution. The Supreme Court of Honduras agreed with the charges and issued an arrest warrant for the armed forces to arrest Manuel Zelaya. So Zelaya was legally arrested. And because he violated the Constitution, he was exiled from the country.

We should be applauding the people of Honduras for following their rule of law. In America, we honor the rule of law. We believe in self-determination and constitutional limits on government power, but we picked the wrong side in this case. We took the side of the tyrant versus the people of Honduras.

Now why would we do that? We cut off foreign aid to Honduras. We have refused to recognize the interim government that followed the rule of law. This is a Honduran Government that is doing everything despite America's interference to make sure that their elections take place as scheduled, to make sure their democracy survives according to the Constitution.

In the meantime, Zelaya, who was exiled, has slipped back into the country. He's holed up in the Brazilian Embassy. He's being funded by guess who? The Communist dictator, Hugo Chavez. Zelaya's thugs are targeting select groups with violent acts, including attacks on Christians. Zelaya is attempting to create chaos, but the popular will does not exist to return this would-be dictator to power. The people want their free elections to take place as scheduled.

One of our Senate colleagues, Senator DEMINT of South Carolina, recently returned from Honduras. He said that the only person he found in Honduras interested in putting Zelaya back in power was guess who? The American ambassador.

Mr. Speaker, it is a moral imperative that we back the rule of law, that we honor the decision of the democratically elected institutions of Honduras, that we support the elections in November, and that we recognize the new government, whoever wins the race.

Why do we, as a Nation, say we believe in self-determination but deny self-determination to Honduras? Why do we say we believe in a constitutional government but bash the nation of Honduras for following their own Constitution? Why do we support the likes of a deposed ruler like Zelaya? And how is it any of our business to determine who should be President of Honduras anyway?

Honduras has been an ally of the United States, yet appears to be another example of how we treat our allies worse than we treat our enemies. We are on the wrong side of things when we stand by the bandit dictator Hugo Chavez and his buddy, Manuel Zelaya.

And that's just the way it is.

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

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

LET AMERICA'S HUMANITARIAN VALUES SHINE IN AFGHANISTAN

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, Afghanistan appears to be headed for a runoff election in the next few weeks. The United States must insist and we must expect that a credible, democratic Afghan government emerges from this political process because so very much is at stake. A democratically elected government in Kabul that has the trust of the Afghan people is necessary because it's our best weapon in the fight against violent extremism in Afghanistan.

Such a government, a stable, honest government, would stabilize the country. It would encourage Afghanistan's neighbors to engage in a regional diplomatic effort. And it would be the strong partner America needs to deliver humanitarian and economic aid to the Afghan people. Afghanistan desperately needs this aid. It has seen two foreign invasions in the last three decades and years of political turmoil.

Afghanistan is also very, very poor. By some measures, it is just about the poorest country in the world. The United Nations issued its annual Human Development Index earlier this month, Mr. Speaker, and it ranks the countries of the world on criteria such as life expectancy, literacy, school enrollment and gross domestic product. Afghanistan ranked 181st out of 182 countries—next to the last.

That's why the United States must put far more emphasis on economic de-

velopment, reconstruction, humanitarian aid and improved governance if we are to succeed in Afghanistan. To do this, we must redouble our efforts to bring a "civilian surge" of aid workers to Afghanistan. In fact, President Obama announced this initiative 7 months ago with a great deal of fanfare, but the results so far have been disappointing.

An adviser to General McChrystal, our commander in Afghanistan, told *The New York Times* last week that "our entire system of delivering aid is broken and very little of the aid is getting to the Afghan people." Another adviser said that the effort has been a "nightmare" and that "vast amounts of aid money have been wasted."

One of the reasons for this problem, Mr. Speaker, is the violence in the country. The aid workers who are on the ground now in Afghanistan are brave and truly dedicated. But some of them are understandably reluctant to leave the relative safety of Kabul and venture out into the countryside.

There are several ways to improve this situation. Some American military personnel could be directed to protect the aid workers. The United States could step up its efforts to train the Afghan army and police so that they can provide local protection. The White House must also provide better benchmarks for measuring the progress of our civilian effort.

We must prove that we are doing a better job of delivering American humanitarian aid, and this can be accomplished with three extremely important goals: it would improve the lives of the Afghan people and give them a reason to reject violence. It would demonstrate that America offers the Afghan people a better future than the extremists offer them, and it would help to remove the impression that the American Army is an occupying army.

Mr. Speaker, if we want to succeed in Afghanistan, we must let America's humanitarian values shine through. That's the best way to help build a stable Afghanistan that can't be used by the Taliban or other extremists to threaten our security, their security, and the peace of our world.

□ 1200

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.)

TAKE A LESSON FROM PRESIDENT RONALD REAGAN

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the Obama administration, led by its Council of Economic Advisors, indicated that if we spent \$1 trillion with