

specifically provided to take care of those who would kill Americans on the battlefield? For what reason are we doing this?

Why, Mr. President? Why, Mr. President? Why?

TRY THE TERRORISTS IN GUANTANAMO, NOT NEW YORK CITY

(Mr. GOHMERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, to follow up on my friend from California, he is exactly right. There is no good reason for bringing the most dangerous terrorists and terrorist organizers to the most densely populated area in our country. Those of us who have logistically been involved in setting up trials know that every bailiff, every guard, every person involved in the justice system will be at risk, as will their families.

So we know that every President brings their own kinds of experience to the office. This President does not have justice experience. He doesn't have military experience. He doesn't have foreign affairs experience. He doesn't have domestic affairs experience. He doesn't have community organizing experience, and that will be invaluable in organizing the communities in New York to get them off the island after the terrorists move in during the trial.

COSTS SOAR IN PELOSI'S TAKEOVER BILL

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, the nonpartisan, independent experts at the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, CMS, released their analysis of the Pelosi takeover. I would like to say it was shocking, but I already had my suspicions that the government takeover of health care was going to cost much more than claimed. The independent report this weekend exposes the truth and the real cost.

The report shows that the Pelosi takeover will increase health care costs by \$289 billion. This discredits all the assertions we have heard about how a 2,000-page bill, the \$1.3 trillion health care bill, will somehow lower costs. This health care takeover will violate this administration's promise to "bend the cost curve." It will add more than a dime to the deficit and kill jobs.

There are better alternatives that Congress should consider, like H.R. 3400, that will lower health care costs for families and small businesses while creating jobs.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism. Mass murderers should be tried at

Guantanamo Bay, not in New York City.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

SENDING MORE TROOPS IS NOT THE ANSWER

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, Matthew Hoh, a former Marine captain, recently resigned his job as U.S. Government reconstruction official in Afghanistan. In his letter of resignation, he criticized the American strategy in Afghanistan. He said the presence of large numbers of U.S. troops is making the insurgency stronger because it makes the Afghan people see America as an occupying power, a power that must be opposed.

Now, before anybody accuses Captain Hoh of being a long-haired hippie peacenik, keep in mind that he fought with distinction in Iraq before serving in Afghanistan. He believes in the American military. He supports it with all his heart.

□ 1930

In fact, he says that "no nation has ever known a more dedicated military as the U.S. Armed Forces. The performance of our troops," he says, "is unmatched."

But he also, Madam Speaker, believes that no military force has ever been given such a complex mission as the U.S. military has received in Afghanistan.

Captain Hoh is right. Our troops have been given an impossible job, and now we are seeing the tragic results. Over 1,000 American troops have been wounded in battle in just the past 3 months. That accounts for one-fourth of all the casualties we've taken since the war began in October 2001.

Think about it. The war has been going on for 97 months in Afghanistan, and one-fourth of all the casualties have been suffered in just the last 3 months.

Things have gotten so bad, Madam Speaker, in fact, that the casualty rate in Afghanistan is now actually higher than the casualty rate for American troops at the height of the violence in Iraq. And the spike in the casualty rate occurred after the administration sent 21,000 more troops to Afghanistan in the hope that there is a military solution to the problem.

But relying on military power alone has not done the job, and escalating the war now by sending in tens of thousands more troops won't solve the problem either.

That's why I am calling on President Obama to change our mission in Af-

ghanistan. I have urged him to devote most of our efforts on humanitarian aid, diplomacy, and economic development. These are the elements of "SMART Security." They'll do a much better job of stabilizing Afghanistan than a heavy military footprint.

Without this change in strategy, our troops are likely to face worse, not better, situations. The enemy is learning how to use IEDs more efficiently. Lieutenant Thomas Metz, the director of the Pentagon's effort to reduce IED casualties, has acknowledged that sending more troops to Afghanistan will likely mean more IED deaths and injuries, which include spinal cord damage, traumatic brain injuries, and amputations.

So I urge the administration to move in a new and a different direction for the sake of our country and for the sake of America's troops and their families. And I urge every Member of the House to listen to the words of Matthew Hoh, who wrote the following to a State Department official:

"I trust you understand the sacrifices made by so many thousands of military families whose homes bear the fractures, upheavals, and scars of multiple deployments. Thousands of our men and women have returned home with wounds, some that will never heal. The dead return only in bodily form to be received by families who must be assured that their dead have sacrificed for a purpose worthy of futures lost."

Madam Speaker, the casualty rate in Afghanistan is unacceptable. Continuing the same policies that put our brave troops at risk is unthinkable. That's why it's time to put SMART Security to work in a place where military power alone just isn't the answer.

THE TRIAL OF KHALID SHEIKH MOHAMMED

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. Madam Speaker, the 9/11 terrorist Khalid Sheikh Mohammed and four of his terrorist buddies are getting a trip to New York City to be tried in Federal court for their crimes against America.

Some of the other terrorists, however, are being tried in military courts. So why are we trying Mohammed in Federal court in the United States? Why aren't we treating them all alike, treating them all the same? Is it different strokes for different folks? It appears to be so. So why are these five special individuals being treated this way and brought to the United States for trial?

Military tribunals throughout history have always been used to try captured enemies on the battlefield. They have different rules and standards for evidence and interrogation, and the military courts make allowances for these basic differences. And tribunals