

Let's get real before this White House's Wall Street advisors ask our Nation to take more Chinese and Mexican car imports while thousands upon thousands of Main Street Americans hit the unemployment lines.

Here is the plain, unvarnished truth. The world might be flat in America because our markets are wide open, but tax-and-trade terrain is mountainous across the world for our country, surely in Asia and in Europe, in managed markets, and even on our own continent where tariff and nontariff barriers keep out our products.

What sense does it make for our middle class to prop up companies hitting bottom from this financial crisis only to have more jobs outsourced, resulting in more unemployment here and more citizens expecting care from our government?

It is time for this administration to employ section 201 trade relief in order to get our beleaguered industry back on its feet.

And frankly, it is time for some truth.

GITMO

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. Mr. Speaker, the administration plans to close the state-of-the-art Guantanamo Bay detention facility by January. The problem is, they have no plan for what to do with the terrorist detainees. These are the people who have tried to kill Americans, and they want to keep up their sinful ways by trying to kill more Americans. These are people picked up off the battlefield, sometimes hiding between children and women's skirts in villages. They were not wearing uniforms. They were not state sponsored, but they were there for a reason, and that was to kill innocent people.

For example, they use women and children for two purposes: one, to hide behind as cover, and the other reason is to murder in the name of religion. That's why they're called terrorists. They try to inflict terror and fear in all peoples.

Some of these people have been waterboarded. They gave us vital information that saved American lives. Apparently, two plots were uncovered by waterboarding. One crime was to crash a plane into a Los Angeles skyscraper and another to blow up the Brooklyn Bridge.

I wonder if the would-be victims appreciated the waterboarding?

What are we supposed to do to get this information?

But some are now to be more concerned about the treatment of Gitmo detainees than they are about potential American victims. Maybe we don't have our priorities straight. And by the way, Mr. Speaker, I have been to Gitmo, and its facilities are better than many American jails where we keep Americans.

Let's look a little bit at history. General George Washington had a very different way of dealing with folks that were captured who weren't wearing uniforms. A British spy named Major John Andre, who was a buddy of Benedict Arnold, fell into these circumstances. After surveying West Point, Benedict Arnold met with Andre and gave him a sheaf of papers outlining the state of the garrison and the arrangements that had been made for its defense at West Point. Andre removed his uniform as a senior British officer, put on a plain coat, stuffed Arnold's secret instructions into his silk stockings, and set off for New York and his headquarters. Militiamen caught up with him on the road, however, found the papers from Arnold in his boots, and turned him over to George Washington, who had him hanged. Is that better than being waterboarded?

So what do we do with these terrorists if we close Gitmo? If we take hundreds of hard-core terrorists from an isolated island like Gitmo and put them in American prisons, we expose the nearby communities, inmates, law enforcement, prison guards, officials and their families to the possibility of payback, attacks aimed at breaking them out or retaliation against the community for holding them.

If they go to an American prison, they, in all likelihood, would eventually be released into the United States. That's not good news.

We don't want them brought to Texas, by the way, Mr. Speaker. We have enough problems from the Federal Government neglecting our southern border.

Last week, in the Judiciary Committee hearing, Attorney General Holder couldn't name one State that wants these outlaws sent to them. So what are we going to do?

Are we going to reopen Alcatraz and put them there? Who knows?

Do we bring them here and try them in our Federal courts?

Mr. Speaker, if we stop and take a look at why we have separate legal systems for our citizens and for military purposes, maybe the reasons will be crystal clear even to administration lawyers: The American domestic legal system wasn't built to deal with enemies in a war. Military courts have always handled combatants captured on the battlefield.

Nonuniformed enemies in a time of war do not have the same rights under the U.S. Constitution as American citizens, at least that's what we have always thought.

So what's next? Are our soldiers going to have to warn terrorists of their Miranda Rights?

Are the Army Rangers going to need a search warrant from a Federal judge to go into an al Qaeda hideout in Afghanistan?

Will the troops need to consult a Federal lawyer and get permission to shoot back when being shot at? Now, wouldn't that be helpful.

So what is the administration going to do with these terrorists?

They have set the date of January 22, 2010, to close down Gitmo. Let's hope the administration reevaluates its decisions regarding letting these terrorists go and keep them locked up.

And that's just the way it is.

HONORING STEWART WINSTEIN ON HIS 95TH BIRTHDAY

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

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Stewart Winstein, who turns 95 years young on May the 28th. Stewart is a giant of Rock Island County and one of the most respected leaders in my entire congressional district.

Stewart's contributions to the Quad Cities region are enough to fill up three biographies. He was the longest serving chairman in the history of the Rock Island County Metropolitan Airport Authority. In that position, he fostered unprecedented growth at the Quad City International Airport. He oversaw major expansion projects, as well as the increased security that resulted from the September 11 terrorist attacks. Through it all, Stewart was committed to providing the people of the Quad Cities with a safe, reliable, and very bustling airport. The thousands of people that fly in and out of the Quad City airport are fortunate to have had Stewart's leadership and his dedication.

From 1974 to 1978, Stewart served as president of the Rock Island County Welfare Information and Referral Services. And as if that didn't keep him busy enough, he was also public administrator, public guardian, and conservator during that time.

Amazingly, all the things I've named so far were just Stewart's extracurricular activities. His day job was being the best attorney in all of Rock Island County. Stewart is renowned for the law firm he founded with his two partners, Frank Wallace and Harrison Kavensky, nearly 50 years ago. Winstein, Kavensky & Wallace has withstood the test of time as a result of the tremendous leadership of Stewart and the outstanding service he has provided to all of his clients.

But it was in the arena of politics that I got to know Stewart so well. He is a fierce and articulate advocate of the Democratic Party and our principles. He worked tirelessly for local Democrats, including myself and my predecessor, Congressman Lane Evans. Stewart has hosted events for candidates from the White House to the courthouse at his home. He witnessed history as a delegate to the 1968 Democratic Convention in Chicago and attended several more in the years that followed. He served long stints as vice chairperson and treasurer of the Illinois State Democratic Central Committee.

To list Stewart's numerous accomplishments only tells half the story. Stewart is a great man. He always had tremendous love for family, especially his late wife, Dorothy. Dorothy was not just Stewart's wife, she was his very best friend.

I have had the honor and privilege of calling Stewart a longtime friend and trusted advisor for many years. Our community has benefited greatly from his generosity and his goodwill. To put it simply, the Quad Cities is a better place to live because of Stewart Winstein.

I would like to join Stewart's son, Arthur, his stepson, Max, and all of his family and friends in wishing him a very happy 95th birthday.

THE FAIR TAX

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

Mr. INGLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to ask my colleagues that may be supporters of the Fair Tax whether we have got some parallel idea that we have been, that I have been talking about on this House floor for a while now.

In the Fair Tax, what happens is you reduce taxes, income taxes, payroll taxes, those sorts of things, and you impose a tax on consumption. And the very good idea behind that is that you want to tax the things that you don't necessarily want to incentivize, and you want to free up from taxation those things that you do want to incentivize.

So right now, under our current Tax Code, savings and investing, investments are treated shabbily in the Tax Code. Consumption is treated pretty well, because if you are a business, you can deduct those things. And so the idea is to turn that around. That's one of the good arguments for the Fair Tax.

Now, of course, the downside of the Fair Tax is that it comes with a pretty substantial increase in the price of goods sold if they are new goods because it's a substantial consumption tax, perhaps 23 percent. Of course, Fair Tax proponents immediately point out that that wouldn't be the actual total increase in the price of a good because the income tax assumptions would come out of the pricing of that product; and so the dollar candy bar wouldn't be a \$1.23, it would be something less than a \$1.23 because the candy bar company would not have to pay income taxes, nor would the sugar company and all the components. Good arguments.

So I am wondering if it's the same thing as what I've been talking about with a revenue-neutral carbon tax, the same kind of deal, that what we are doing here is we are switching what you tax, swapping out one tax for another.

So in the concept that I have been describing here in a series of Special

Orders, what we would do is we would reduce taxes on payroll, and that's something we want more of, labor industry income, and we would impose a tax, essentially a consumption tax, on carbon dioxide.

□ 1945

The result would be that the things that would be incentivized would be payroll, which is again labor, industry work. The thing that would be disincentivized would be carbon emissions.

Now, the interesting thing is that it's sort of the son of fair tax, a much smaller impact than fair tax—what I'm talking about here when it comes to the dollar shock—because in the case of the fair tax, gasoline, presumably, would go up by a 23 percent sales tax. Natural gas would have a 23 percent sales tax. Electricity would have a 23 percent sales tax on it. Now, of course, some of that would be knocked down by the income tax assumptions coming out of the provisions of those products, but the result would be a switch in taxes in the fair taxes. It would be a big, old switch from income taxes and from those sorts of things—payroll tax—to a consumption tax. What I'm talking about is that it would be sort of a small version of that where you would take reduced payroll taxes and then would impose a tax on carbon dioxide, but the difference between the two is this:

In what I'm talking about, there would be an incentive to switch technologies, too. In the fair tax, you are talking about just hitting every new product sold with a 23 percent sales tax. In the case that I'm talking about, you would be just targeting one particular kind of product. The result would be that nuclear would be possible, that all kinds of new transportation fuels would be possible and that we would be breaking this addiction to oil, cleaning up the air and creating new jobs in this sort of son of fair tax, in this little, small version of a fair tax. That is the fair tax plus this very important technology shift.

That's what I'm after, Mr. Speaker, is that technology shift that can give us an expansion of this economy and be part of the means of our growing out of this recession. We did it in the '90s with the productivity we got out of the Internet and the PC. I think we can do it again now with energy. Energy security is our ticket out of this recession. Similar to the tech boom in the 1990s, this is our opportunity to grow the economy and to clean up the air, to create jobs and, by the way, to help balance the Federal budget, because that's what happened in the late '90s. The growth of the economy because of the productivity from the Internet and the PC gave us new revenues.

I think we can do the same thing in energy, but the start of it is getting the economics right, and if we do that, Mr. Speaker, I think we can help change the energy insecurity of the

United States into energy security. It all starts with economics and with free enterprise making it happen.

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.)

U.S. STRATEGY IN AFGHANISTAN

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. Mr. Speaker, just last week, the House approved a \$96.7 billion spending bill that provides funding for our military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. I joined many of my House colleagues in voting for this funding. Our men and women in uniform and troops in the field deserve the best training and equipment our Nation can provide.

While America's military personnel faithfully conduct their mission abroad, elected officials here in Washington should take seriously their responsibility to develop a viable, long-term strategy for these operations. I have always voiced my support for the United States military action to topple the Taliban in Afghanistan following the tragedy of September 11. Yet, nearly 8 years later, I am concerned that the United States has not articulated a clear strategy for victory or an end point to our efforts in that country.

Because of this concern, I join more than 70 Members of Congress in cosponsoring H.R. 2404, Congressman JIM MCGOVERN's legislation to require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to Congress outlining the exit strategy for the United States military forces in Afghanistan. Without focus and targeted objectives, adding more manpower to our efforts in Afghanistan could cause the United States to go the way of many great armies and leave our troops in never-ending, no-win situations.

Many world leaders have noted that military action in Afghanistan alone is not going to free us of terrorism. Colonel Douglas McGregor, a veteran of Vietnam, put it well when he recently wrote for the Armed Forces Journal: "When national military strategy fails to answer the question of purpose, method and end state, military power becomes an engine of destruction, not just for its intended enemies but for its supporting society and economy, too."

The United States continues to devote its blood and treasure in Afghanistan while the Afghan Government has yet to purge itself of many who are funneling support to the Taliban. Meanwhile, here at home, money and manpower are needed to address our Nation's serious economic concerns and to protect our citizens from the violence at our southern border with