

and Saudi Arabia have now become our bankers. If lawmakers in this body were serious about the debt and about the deficit issues that Americans are increasingly worried about, Congress would have an honest conversation and would do something about it.

In June of 2006, they stood in the same place, and spoke about the introduction of a bill called the SAFE Commission Act. They explained that the country is having trouble. It's a bipartisan commission, and it puts every spending program on. It comes back and requires—it requires, Mr. Speaker—that Congress vote up or down. In a bipartisan manner, Congressman COOPER and I have had this bill in now for 3 years.

I have little faith that this Congress will act through regular order and will tackle this enormous, growing problem. It will take this approach: Instead of dealing with these issues, Congress will ignore them.

In closing, it reminds me of the Simon and Garfunkel song, which they sang in Central Park, called "The Boxer." It says: Man hears what he wants to hear, and disregards the rest. I would change the words to say: Congress hears only what it wants to hear, and disregards the rest.

Therefore, this Congress is allowing Uncle Sam to go broke. It is time for us to deal with it in a bipartisan way for the good of our children, for the good of our grandchildren and for the good of everyone who lives in this country.

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

(Mr. DEFAZIO 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 Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MORAN of Kansas 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 North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MCHENRY 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 Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

MOVING GUANTANAMO DETAINEES TO U.S. SOIL AND CONGRESSIONAL TRANSPARENCY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-

uary 6, 2009, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I thank the Speaker for the recognition.

Yesterday was a very interesting day in an open hearing in the Intelligence Committee. It's something that doesn't happen very often. We had the opportunity to hear from a small business person from Standish, Michigan—Dave Munson. The hearing was about congressional notification.

When is it the requirement of the executive branch, of the President and of the executive agencies, to fully brief Congress in a timely manner on the actions that they are taking?

The law is fairly clear. Congress needs to be fully and currently informed of intelligence matters.

So why would David Munson, a small business man from a small town in northern Michigan, be testifying in front of the Intelligence Committee?

David Munson is asking that this Congress, that the Michigan legislature, that the city council in Standish, and that the citizens of Standish, Michigan be fully and completely informed and be on a timely basis informed on what this administration's policies are for moving Guantanamo prisoners to the United States.

On January 22, the President made a statement that he now is finding is very, very difficult to finish. He promised that, within 12 months, the prison in Guantanamo would be closed and that the Gitmo detainees would be moved somewhere else, either overseas or perhaps to the United States. Many of us who have been working on this issue for years recognized how ill-advised the President's statement could be.

President Bush had said that he wanted Guantanamo closed, and as he started taking a look at how he would make it happen, he found out it was very, very difficult to do. He diminished the number of detainees in Gitmo, but he wasn't able to close it completely. President Obama, really with no analysis, said he would close it in 12 months. He has now found out how difficult that is.

Other countries don't want to take these detainees. They don't want to take them into their countries. We don't want them in the United States. As soon as they move from Cuba to the United States, they get a whole new set of legal rights and legal authorities. So why would we want to do that for some of the most dangerous people in the world? Yet the President seems committed to moving these people to the United States.

One of the sites that he is supposedly investigating, or that the Department of Defense and the Department of Justice are considering, is a closed corrections facility in Standish, Michigan. The Department of Defense has been there. Mr. Munson believes that some of the elected officials in the commu-

nity are having ongoing discussions with the Department of Defense about moving these detainees, these prisoners, to the State of Michigan even though the community is opposed.

Just like most of Michigan, this is a community that is hurting. We've got a 15.3 percent unemployment rate—the highest unemployment rate in the country, so we need an economic stimulus; but what the people of that community have said is we don't need an al Qaeda stimulus in our community. If the President is considering moving these prisoners to Michigan, what they do want is transparency. They would like to know exactly what the status of the negotiations is.

Are there negotiations actually taking place? If there are, then they'd like to know: What's the impact on our community going to be? They'd like to have a better understanding.

As Mr. Munson said yesterday, exactly who are these individuals we're considering moving into our community? What are their backgrounds? Why are they being held in Gitmo? Why have we detained them for years? He would also like to know, as would other people in the community, if we've held these people in Gitmo for a number of years, what have we learned while we have held these people in detention? What kinds of risks and challenges might they pose to the people who are guarding them and to the community where they are housed? What has been our experience in holding al Qaeda and radical jihadists in prisons around the world? Have there been attempted prison breaks? Have there been attempted prison entries where people outside have targeted the communities where these facilities are held?

These are the kinds of questions that the people in Standish, Michigan and the people of Michigan want answers to. The people in Standish have asked for that information. The Michigan legislature has asked for transparency. I have asked for transparency as the ranking member of the Intelligence Committee, but consistently, Secretary Gates and the Obama administration have replied with stone silence. They are totally unwilling to share any information with elected officials or with the citizens of Standish about what their plans and intentions may or may not be.

For an administration that said we are going to be transparent, to have a hearing in the Intelligence Committee where we're saying we want to talk about transparency and about what some would say is a lack of transparency by the previous administration and now by this administration and about keeping Congress fully and completely informed on a timely basis, it was the perfect hearing in which to have that discussion.

What David Munson clearly articulated is that people in Michigan and people in Standish are concerned, and they want answers. This administration has been unwilling to keep the