

Over the last decade, through the cooperation of a French citizen who had been exploring the forest and the Joint POW/MIA Accounting Command using DNA evidence and forensic identification tools, the remains of these heroes were identified.

On July 20, 2011, 67 years after their deaths, they were given the proper burial they had been denied as they were laid to rest in Arlington National Cemetery.

To these heroes, we say: Welcome home, and may you rest in peace.

While these soldiers were identified, we still have 72,000 American soldiers who are unaccounted for from World War II, and more than 83,000 from all wars who are missing in action.

Staff Sergeant Leroy Leist is one of those Americans. In 1944, his World War II bomber was shot down over the North Sea. His body, along with several of his fellow crewmembers, was never recovered. For more than a decade, Adrian Caldwell has worked tirelessly to locate her father's remains and bring them home. All of our fallen war heroes deserve a proper burial, and my office is working with Mrs. Caldwell to ensure that her father receives what he earned—the honor and gratitude from the country he served and gave his life to defend.

This repatriation reminds us that freedom is not free. We enjoy the liberty of a free Nation today because of men like these who answered freedom's call. And the way we honor their sacrifice is to remember them and call them by name.

The Greatest Generation is passing to their heavenly reward at a rate of over a thousand people a day. These are veterans who left their homes to fight in faraway places. These are families who supported those efforts. We cannot thank them enough before they are called home.

The other way we honor their sacrifice is to pass on the legacy of freedom that they died to defend. When I conduct town hall meetings around Mississippi, I ask a question: Do you believe your grandchildren will live a better life than you lived? For the first time in American history the answer to that question is no.

Sixty-seven years from now, and 167 years from now, successive generations will review the actions of our generation. Only history will record if we answered freedom's call.

AMERICAN DREAM SHATTERED BY NIGHTMARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. RANGEL. My colleagues, yesterday I was talking about the American Dream. But then again, I was thinking about how many people woke up this morning concerned about our national debt.

When you represent the type of district that I do, and many other Mem-

bers, they're concerned about can they get a job or can they keep the job they have. They're concerned about the bills and obligations that they have. They're concerned about whether they can keep their kids in school and whether they can keep food on the table, whether they can keep the dignity and pride and not have their dream shattered by this nightmare that their country owes \$14.3 trillion.

We're making a special appeal to Americans, Republicans and Democrats, not to allow our country to get caught in a position that we don't pay our bills. I suspect that a lot of my constituents would say: Well, how the heck did I get that bill? How do we owe \$14.3 trillion, and what did I have to do with it?

And I guess we have to say honestly: You didn't have much to do with it. You did not go into countries and get involved in three wars. You were not responsible for saying that the richest of Americans and corporations that are receiving large profits should have and continue to have preferential tax treatment.

Well, why are you telling me then that I have to pay the debt? If we all have to pitch in on this, what about the guys who will not be making a sacrifice?

Well, that's kind of difficult to explain to these people. But you tell them that there are people in the Congress who truly believe that they can address their problem by having a constitutional amendment.

□ 1110

I know it's a stretch, but that's what some of us have to deal with in the Congress. But you've heard some of them this morning say the only answer to our problem is to have a vote in the House of Representatives and persuade two-thirds of our Members that in the United States Constitution we will require a balanced budget.

Now, after we get two-thirds here—and we can't get two-thirds to agree to anything but, hey—then we have to get two-thirds from the Senate. And we only hold the Senate by one vote, but it's a commentary because after we do that, then we have to go out to the States and ask the State legislators to approve what we have done, at least two-thirds of the States. That's their answer to those people who had an American Dream.

It would seem to me that along the line they may ask: Who received the benefits of all of this debt? And I would suspect that a lot of the people that manufacture military equipment had a windfall. I would suspect that those people that were able to take jobs overseas, the profit-and-loss books look like they did pretty well. And the financial section, our committee voted for and it was approved by the President, \$789 billion to be given to the financial community. And God knows they say these are the people that can create the jobs.

Well, I don't know whether any economist agrees with that, but they have enjoyed these tax cuts for decades, and we now are at the highest unemployment that we've ever been. And it would seem to me that those who have, through the benefits of all of our taxpayers, received this windfall, that it's not asking too much to ask them to invest in their country, to invest in jobs, to not look at how much profit they can make overseas but how many lives can they have to get a decent salary, to be able to join the union, to be able to pay their bills, and at the same time be able to go back to work.

This answer that everyone makes a sacrifice, it's not talking about the private sector that made the money. I don't even know why "sacrifice" is even used in any dialogue. What we're basically saying is that we have to cut spending. Well, everyone would agree to that. But these people that are receiving benefits from their government are the ones that will be making the sacrifice. And as we cut the benefits—whether we're talking about education benefits, health care benefits, supplements to pensions, or sometimes the only funds that they have in retirement, Social Security; whether we're talking about checks for the disabled who cannot work—now they want to cut those programs and the people that provide the service. So that means that they will be increasing the number of people that are unemployed.

It just doesn't make sense that we have unemployment compensation and other things for people to have disposable income, but we cut \$4 trillion from those people that are trying to survive.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for allowing me to address the House.

DO THE RIGHT THING FOR AMERICA: BALANCE THE BUDGET

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, there's no question this Congress for many years has had a problem with spending.

The Democratic Congress developed a bigger and bigger appetite for spending for 40 years, as it held the majority for years and years.

Then Republicans took the House in 1995, and they forced a balanced budget on President Clinton. They had friction between the President and the Congress, and that allowed this country to have a balanced budget.

Who would have ever thought—I certainly wouldn't. I know I have got some Democratic friends who would have thought it, but I wouldn't—but when we got a Republican President and we had Republican majorities in the House and Senate, we began to spend again. There wasn't the friction there to hold spending down, and Republicans, I would submit, lost their way and began spending too much money.

My first year in Congress, in 2005 and 2006, we shouldn't have spent the

money we did. And I can recall being here on the floor and having Democratic friends beating us up, rightfully so, because in 2006 we spent \$160 billion more than we had coming in. We didn't have to do that. We shouldn't have done that.

I would never have dreamed that 5 short years later that with the Democratic majority the spending would have exploded once they had no friction between a Democratic President and a Democratic Congress, and that we would go from the \$160 billion in deficit spending in 2006 that Republicans got beat up for to \$1.6 trillion in deficit spending—10 times more—and people still thinking that's somehow okay.

It wasn't okay for Republicans to overspend by \$160 billion, and it's not okay for this Democratic Senate and President to continue to push to spend \$1.6 trillion more than the \$2.2 trillion we supposedly will have coming in.

Now we're told today we're going to have a vote on a Republican bill. A little surprising to some of us Republicans. We passed a bill, Cut, Cap, and Balance. It wasn't what I wanted. I liked the balanced budget amendment with a percentage of GDP cap on spending to help rein Congress in, and that was negotiable on the percentage. But it also had \$111 billion out of \$1.6 trillion that would have been cut from spending. That just wasn't enough. But the balanced budget amendment, if it had been passed and become part of the law, was enough of a game changer it was worth voting for.

Then the Senate sits back and says, We're not going to go for that. We're not going to pass anything, so pass something else. And now our leadership has heard the call of Leader REID down the hall and is going to bring another bill.

And I know the intentions of both sides of the aisle want the best for the country. I get that. I understand that. We have different ideas on how that can be done. And I know that there are people in my party that want to keep beating up on me because I can't vote for a bill that only cuts \$1 trillion out of \$15 trillion to \$16 trillion that will be deficit spending over the next 10 years. Because it's easy to do the math: We cut \$1 trillion out of \$15 trillion, \$16 trillion over the next 10 years, and if we can keep doing that, and there are no assurances we can, every 10 years cut another trillion, then when I have my 207th birthday, we can celebrate that year a balanced budget, and we will have only added \$120 trillion to the \$14.3 trillion deficit now. I can't vote for that.

Politically we're told, this is the political thing to do. You've got to do the political thing. If you don't vote for the Boehner bill, you're voting for Obama. That's not true. If the Senate will pass anything—anything—then we could drive this to a conference committee and get a compromise. The Senate has to pass something.

Well, think about this scenario very quickly: We pass this, say, hypothetically. The Senate says, Oh, well, you pushed us to the edge of the cliff; we didn't want to vote for this. Then they pass it just like we did, and the President says, I was going to veto but we're on the edge of the cliff. A 100 percent Republican bill; they wouldn't compromise. And now they say, Well, gee, Republicans inherited the economy.

It's not right practically; it's not right politically. Let's do the right thing for America.

THE SOMALIA CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, the Horn of Africa is currently suffering from the worst drought in 60 years, one of the worst humanitarian crises in recent memory. For both moral and national security reasons, it demands a strong, clear, sustained response from this institution.

Last week, famine was declared in parts of southern Somalia. This means acute malnutrition rates among children now exceed 30 percent, that more than two people per 10,000 die every day, and that people are not able to access food or other basic necessities.

□ 1120

One out of every five households in famine-declared areas have no food at all. The malnutrition rates in Somalia are currently the highest in the world. In the last few months, tens of thousands of Somalis, the majority of them children, have died as a result of causes related to malnutrition. In some of the most affected areas, an estimated 310,000 children are acutely malnourished.

The worst may be yet to come. Eight million people are in need of assistance in Ethiopia and Kenya. Unless the global community and humanitarian agencies intervene now, it's predicted that the entire south of Somalia will face famine within the next 2 months.

Nearly a thousand people are arriving daily at overcrowded refugee camps in Kenya and Ethiopia. Many have journeyed for weeks to get there. According to Josette Sheeran, executive director of the U.N. World Food Program, the roads to these camps "are becoming roads of death. Over half the women I talked to had to leave children to die or had children die. In the Horn of Africa, we could lose a generation." And the troubles do not end there. Sexual violence against women in these already overcrowded refugee camps is on the rise.

This crisis didn't happen overnight. The eastern Horn of Africa is prone to chronic food insecurity. What is more, below-average rainfall in late 2010 and the spring of 2011 anticipated drought conditions, which have been dramati-

cally worsened by the fact Somalia has not had a central government since 1991. Drought conditions have also progressively worsened throughout the year in Ethiopia and Kenya.

To address the ongoing crisis, Secretary Clinton recently announced that the United States would provide another \$28 million in aid for people in Somalia and for Somali refugees in Kenya, in addition to the over \$431 million in food and nonfood emergency assistance already provided for the region this year.

It's a good start. But we need to ensure that the appropriate U.S. funds are available to address this crisis this year and that Congress provides enough funding to maintain our ability to really address these crises. It is a matter of life and death for the most vulnerable people in the world.

We do this not just out of moral responsibility, although that should be compelling enough. It is also because our national security interests need to be represented to maintain the capability to combat food insecurity in the Horn of Africa and other critical regions around the world. It's about our national security. Anti-hunger programs can help this crisis and strengthen international diplomacy. Yet, unfortunately, we have seen the money for international food aid cut back severely. When we fight hunger and poverty, we undercut the recruiting base of those who would threaten us—the terrorists who would threaten us.

Let me conclude by saying we know what we can do to help. We have the ability to alleviate hunger and suffering of millions in the Horn of Africa. We know that doing so is the right thing to do. It makes us safer in the long run. We lack the political will to do the right thing. I urge my colleagues, support funding for these critical programs in the coming budget for the millions of suffering in Somalia, Kenya and Ethiopia, for the humanitarian crisis of the future, for the continued safety and the security of the United States.

BROWN CHAPEL A.M.E. CHURCH 145TH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SEWELL. I rise today to recognize the 145th anniversary of Brown Chapel African Methodist Episcopal Church in Selma, Alabama. For 145 years, Brown Chapel has been a pillar in the Selma community, and she stands today as a powerful symbol of the civil rights movement for the major role that this church played in the events that led to the adoption of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

One hundred forty-five years ago, just 2 years after the Emancipation Proclamation, freed slaves began worshipping, first in private homes, and