

haven't even put a single jobs bill on the House floor. Instead of creating jobs, they are slashing them. The GOP spending plan eliminates 700,000 jobs and stifles economic growth. Rather than moving the Nation forward, they are forcing America backward.

And this week is no different. Republicans are making things worse for American families as they continue their assault on the middle class. They want to completely abolish four programs designed to help homeowners keep their houses and avoid foreclosure. Republicans have no interest in making these programs work better for the American people. By offering nothing in their place, the GOP is simply abandoning hardworking homeowners who are underwater and struggling to find jobs to pay the bills.

Now, we all know that government foreclosure programs are not perfect. But why are we completely dismantling programs that have helped thousands of Americans stay in their homes? Though not perfect, why are we targeting the victims of the foreclosure and financial crises instead of helping them by fixing these programs?

There's a lot that we can do better without giving up on people like Francisco. Francisco is from Duarte in my district. After a year, he was underwater, and, at the height of the recession, he tried to modify his home loan. He visited his servicer and was pushed back and forth between customer representatives. After 2 years of fighting for help, he only had four pieces of mail from the lender to show for it. He was eventually denied the modification, and he can't even appeal the decision. And though we should be doing more to help him, the Republican plan of doing nothing means that he is completely out of luck.

Commonsense improvements can be made to make the government foreclosure program better, ones that could provide relief to Francisco. Take the Home Affordable Modification Program, or HAMP. Simple fixes like having a case manager assigned to each case will allow for better communication between the customer and the bank. If a customer is denied a loan modification, it would be more effective to appeal the decision instead of having to reapply all over again. And we can do more to provide incentives for banks to complete modifications and ensure that servicers complete due diligence before denying modifications.

These are reasonable solutions that servicers have been slow to adopt, if at all. And if we don't make changes to these programs and instead just throw them away, what will struggling homeowners be left with? They will be left to the banks whose bad policies caused this financial crisis in the first place. They will be left with unstable communities strewn with abandoned homes, and they will be left without a home and no one to turn to for help.

It sounds like Republicans would rather return to old policies that we

know don't work rather than trying to fix the policies we know that can work. Struggling Americans deserve better than that.

NO-FLY ZONE: A CHALLENGE TO THE WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

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

Mr. PAUL. The important question being asked today with regards to foreign policy is should the United States impose a no-fly zone over Libya? There are leaders on both sides of the Capitol and leaders in both parties who are now advising this as well as individuals in the administration. It is my opinion that we should not. It would be foolish, it would have a downside, and we should think very, very carefully before we go expanding the wars that we're already involved in. We're in two major wars with Iraq and Afghanistan, and that involves Pakistan and Yemen already.

So to go into Libya now and impose a no-fly zone—we have to remember, a no-fly zone is an act of war. What moral right do we have to participate in war activity against Libya? Libya hasn't done anything to the United States. They're not a threat to our national security. There's been no aggression. There's no constitutional authority for a President to willy-nilly go and start placing no-fly zones over countries around the world.

We tried this in the 1990s and did it for 8 or 9 years. We had a no-fly zone, along with sanctions and blockades, around Iraq. Finally, it ended up with war. And the wars were based on lies. And then when that happened they said, yes, but it was well worth it because we got rid of a bad guy. But we also lost close to 4,500 American military people, 30-some thousand suffered severe injuries and hundreds of thousands are applying now for disability because we went to war when we shouldn't have gone to war.

To expand this war now makes no sense whatsoever. It's against international law. It challenges the War Powers Resolution. For that reason, we should stop and think. Congress should act. I'm preparing to introduce a resolution next week that it is the sense of Congress that the executive branch can't do this without approval from the Congress.

□ 1020

Why should we do this? Do you think it will cost some money? Yes, it is going to cost a ton of money. Innocent people will be killed. You can't just all of a sudden turn a switch and say don't fly over Libya; you have to bomb a lot of anti-aircraft sites and a lot of military establishments, so the war is on.

From my viewpoint, this is the kind of thing that has been going on too long. It contributes significantly to our bankruptcy, and we are now spending approximately \$1 trillion a year main-

taining our empire around the world. We are in the process of remaking all the borders and leadership in the Middle East and Central Asia, and now in North Africa we're getting involved. We have invested \$70 billion trying to prop up a dictator in Egypt, and look at how that ended up. Now we are hustling around to find out who the next dictator is.

So if we get involved, I'm not sure they even know who to bomb and which one and who is going to come out on top. That is an internal matter. It is a civil war that is going on. We can cheer for one side or the other, but that is not a justification to place the burden on the American people, both militarily and individually, as well as monetarily. Some would say yes, that sounds good, I agree, and as long as we get approval from the U.N. and NATO, it will be okay. But, you know, that is just really a cop-out. What army and air force and technology does the U.N. have, and what does NATO have? You get a resolution at the U.N. that says let's take out this bad guy and do these things, or NATO does it. They are all of our airplanes and all our money. And no matter what, anything and everything that goes wrong, the United States will be blamed for it. There is enough resentment against us already for pretending that we can tell every other country how to live.

The best way to look at this, I believe, is how would we as a people and how would we as a Congress respond if we were a weaker nation and there was a stronger nation, if they came and imposed a no-fly zone over us or had sanctions against us or had a blockade. We wouldn't accept that. That would unify us. So I don't buy into this thing that this is the only humanitarian thing we can do, expand the war.

If we want to do something for humanity, we need a new foreign policy. We need a foreign policy that isn't built on militarism; it's built on more cooperation and more trade and not picking our dictators.

Look at what happened after we picked a dictator for Iran. Sure, it lasted for 25 years or so. But eventually it radicalized the Islamists and they had a revolution, and we came out on the short end of that. So I think it is time that we reassess this and think about a policy that makes a lot more sense. Economically, we need to do it.

NUCLEAR WASTE AT YUCCA MOUNTAIN: OVER MY DEAD BODY

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

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have been in Congress now for 12 years. The very first speech I made on the floor of the House was why nuclear waste should not be stored at Yucca Mountain, Nevada. I cannot believe 12 years from when I first made that speech, I am back in the well of the House talking about why Nevada should not be