

operational plans developed by Federal agencies with responsibilities under the National Response Plan to address preparedness and deployment of dental resources.

This bill was drafted to ensure that Congress was not being prescriptive as to how the Department of Health and Human Services or the Department of Homeland Security should plan for medical emergencies. The bill provides these Departments increased flexibility to utilize additional professional expertise and capacity, if they feel it is appropriate. This is just common sense. The fact that today the Department of Homeland Security could not talk to a dental school where it is decided it would be an ideal place to stockpile materials like vaccines but could if it was a medical school is just absurd.

If these facilities can aid our national defense, or if dentists want to be included in our Nation's post-disaster response, the fact that the government felt constrained to include them is a gross oversight that this bill corrects. I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I would also like to include in the RECORD an exchange of letters between Chairman WAXMAN of my committee and Chairman OBERSTAR of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee that pertains to this legislation.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND  
INFRASTRUCTURE

Washington, DC, September 28, 2010.

Hon. HENRY A. WAXMAN,  
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce,  
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington,  
DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN WAXMAN: I write to you regarding H.R. 903, the "Dental Emergency Responder Act of 2009".

H.R. 903 contains provisions that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. I recognize and appreciate your desire to bring this legislation before the House in an expeditious manner and, accordingly, I will not seek a sequential referral of the bill. However, I agree to waive consideration of this bill with the mutual understanding that my decision to forgo a sequential referral of the bill does not waive, reduce, or otherwise affect the jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure over H.R. 903.

Further, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure reserves the right to seek the appointment of conferees during any House-Senate conference convened on this legislation on provisions of the bill that are within the Committee's jurisdiction. I ask for your commitment to support any request by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for the appointment of conferees on H.R. 903 or similar legislation.

Please place a copy of this letter and your response acknowledging the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure's jurisdictional interest in the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure in the House.

I look forward to working with you as we prepare to pass this important legislation.

Sincerely,

JAMES L. OBERSTAR,  
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,  
Washington, DC, September 28, 2010.

Hon. JAMES L. OBERSTAR,  
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and  
Infrastructure, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN OBERSTAR: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 903, the "Dental Emergency Responder Act." The Committee on Energy and Commerce recognizes that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure has a jurisdictional interest in H.R. 903, and I appreciate your effort to facilitate consideration of this bill.

I also concur with you that forgoing action on the bill does not in any way prejudice the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure with respect to its jurisdictional prerogatives on this bill or similar legislation in the future, and I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this legislation.

I will include our letters on H.R. 903 in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. Again, I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and I look forward to working with the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure as the bill moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

HENRY A. WAXMAN,  
Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 903, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 2250

#### 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.

#### POSSIBLE LEGISLATION FOR CONSIDERATION DURING LAME DUCK SESSION OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it is always an honor to be here. We have had quite a day of different suspension bills. It has been an interesting day all

the way around. Also I was honored to have a visit from the new president of Baylor University, a man named President Ken Starr. I think he will do a great deal of good for Baylor University. In fact, I am wearing a green and gold tie in his honor and in honor of the school where I got my law degree.

A lot has been going on. We haven't had time to take up the issue of extending the current tax rates for another year so businesses could be sure about what is going to be happening, so they could go ahead and make plans, go ahead and make those additional hires, take those folks off the unemployment rolls because they would finally know what the future holds in the way of taxes. But that was not to be. No, instead we have taken up 85, reduced by one, 84 suspension bills, all done today in a bipartisan manner. And it does bring to the fore the question as to why couldn't we do the same thing in a bipartisan way to help the economy?

We are hearing over and over from business people, there is so much uncertainty. If we are really going to have this massive tax increase come January 1, we have got to hunker down and get ready. We may have to let some more people go so we can pay the additional tax burden that the Federal Government is going to lay on us.

They made clear if we are going to pass what the well-respected on both sides of the aisle former chairman of Energy and Commerce, Mr. DINGELL, called not just a tax, but a great big tax, the crap-and-trade bill, if that is still looming out there, then that is a potential albatross around the neck of employers. They need to move forward. But Mr. DINGELL is exactly right; it is a great big tax. It is still looming out there. It is still a threat to be taken up in a lame duck session.

In fact, the lame duck session, after the election in November, could be devastating to our economy, as if we haven't already done enough. We have got not only the crap-and-trade bill looming and being threatened as a potential lame duck session bill in which Members of Congress would be asked to vote who had already lost their jobs on election day, but we got other bills hanging out there that some have said they would like to see come up during a lame duck session.

One such bill is on the other side of the aisle affectionately known as "card check," which is really intriguing. Card check is quite a misnomer, because it would provide for the elimination of secret ballots in union elections, in deciding whether a group were to go union or not.

I was intrigued. In the last Congress we were voting on card check, and the majority leader of the House of Representatives, the Honorable STENY HOYER, came down this aisle right over here. And I was standing over there,

and I said, "Leader?" He turned around and said, "Yes?"

I said, "The rumor is you are going to vote against your party, and you are going to vote against card check." He said, "Well, the odds of that happening are infinitesimal." He has a great sense of humor.

I pointed out, "Well, it is just that everybody on the floor knows that if it were not for the secret ballot, John Murtha would have been elected majority leader." And he just laughs, "Oh, you are so funny." He moved on.

But the truth is, the Speaker of the House, she said she wanted John Murtha to be the majority leader. And we have already seen that this Speaker of the House is amazing at the wielding of power. She has been far more effective at the wielding of power, both with carrots and sticks, to get things done than our Speaker was my first 2 years here, in 2005–2006. She knows how to wield power.

She said she wanted John Murtha to be majority leader, and yet STENY HOYER of Maryland won the election. Why? Because there was a secret ballot, and the will of the Democratic Party here in the House was that STENY HOYER be the majority leader. So because of the secret ballot, because there had been no card check bill that had been rammed through to change the rules in the House of Representatives, here in the House of Representatives there was still a secret ballot.

Now, when I was growing up in Mount Pleasant, Texas, I went through public schools, and I am pretty sure most of my teachers I had voted in the Democratic primary, voted for Democratic candidates. And I had some wonderful teachers. They inspired me. They instilled in me that the secret ballot is such a foundational block of any society that wants to have free elections that to withdraw that would bring the whole political building down, would subject you to a tyranny.

So it is absolutely staggering that people who would come in here and be protected with secret ballots in their own party elections would not grant that same right. Actually, they don't have the power to grant the rights; those are given by God. But they have the power to prevent people from enjoying the rights that were bestowed on us through our Constitution and with the grace of almighty God.

We are endowed by our Creator with certain inalienable rights. Apparently the President left out the Creator. It is understandable. When you rely heavily on teleprompters, as our President does, it is understandable that sometimes you just read past things, and certainly the person who fills in his teleprompter with the information would not have left that important part of the Declaration of Independence out.

□ 2300

We are endowed by our Creator, because if it were otherwise, if we were endowed by the government with inalienable rights, then the government could certainly take them away anytime they wished.

Yet, we go back to the founding of this country, to the time when those people gathered together and gave us the foundation of what we have grown from and grown into as this fantastic Republic, the greatest country in the history of the world. As Tony Blair recently said and as another member of Parliament said this week: this is an extraordinary country like no other in history, and we have so much to be proud of.

I know there are those who have only recently been proud of America, but when you study its accurate and true history so thoroughly, there is so much to be proud of, and the Founders could see that. They had the vision. Proverbs tells us: Where there is no vision, the people perish. Yet those Founders had vision for the future. They stood firmly on eternal truths.

One example is Peter Muhlenberg. Now, since the 1950s, Lyndon Johnson had gotten a tag into the Internal Revenue Code, which for the first time since our country's inception said, If you're a terrible institution as designated by the Internal Revenue Code, you cannot get involved in politics.

That was new and different because, for over 170 years, it was the churches that were behind the most important movements, one of which was the Declaration of Independence. Before that, you had the Virginian Commonwealth laws that were put together. You later had the Northeast Ordinances. There was so much that the churches pushed forward.

Peter Muhlenberg was a minister, a Christian minister, and he had already talked to Washington. Washington had made him a colonel, unbeknownst to Muhlenberg's congregation there in Pennsylvania. He was preaching that Sunday, in his black ministerial robe, and he was preaching from Ecclesiastes 3: "There is a time to every purpose under Heaven." When he got down to verse 8, he recited the words in the last half of Ecclesiastes 3:8: "There is a time for war and a time for peace."

That is when Muhlenberg took off his black ministerial robe, as he is depicted doing in the statue here in the Capitol. Underneath, he had on a Revolutionary officer's uniform, including the saber. He had been carrying that saber around, wearing that and the uniform underneath his robe. Then he said, in essence: "Ladies and gentlemen, now is the time for war," because they believed they were endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, and those were things worth fighting for.

When you read those Founders' letters and their diaries and journals,

when you read their speeches and their writings, you find out they knew they were on to something that would be something new, a new order of things, a new order of the ages. That's why the great seal has "Novus Ordo Seclorum" at the bottom, underneath the one side. In fact, it's on the back of everyone's dollar bills. This was a new order of the ages, a new order of things—not a new world order. This was a new order of the ages, a new order of things where people would get to govern themselves. For so long, this country has borne out the old adage that democracy ensures people are governed no better than they deserve.

That was one of the hardest things for me to come to grips with in the 1990s. As a Nation, like it or not, we had what we deserved as a Nation. In fact, in every election, from the beginning of this country, whether we have liked it or not, regardless of which party has been in power, we have gotten what we deserved.

I do not seek to ever use my position to force my religious beliefs on others; but when I was a judge, I was required to discern whether or not the people who claimed disqualifications had legitimate disqualifications from jury duty. I was struck over and over because I had Christians who would come up and say, I cannot sit on jury duty. I'm disqualified because I'm a Christian.

I would explain to them, I'm not seeking to change your religious beliefs, but I need to find out exactly whether or not you're disqualified for religious reasons or whether this is just a personal preference. So I would have to inquire, Does this mean you believe what is in the Old and New Testaments?

Well, Of course, I would be told.

Well, does that mean you believe it to be true when Jesus said, in Matthew, if you say "rock eye" to your brother, you'll answer to the courts?

Now, the verse was mainly about answering to the Father in Heaven for what's in your heart, but Jesus knew that, in an orderly society, there would have to be some form of government which would hold people accountable.

They would say, generally, Yes, I believe that.

You know, over in Romans 13, it makes it clear that, if you believe the Romans is supposed to be part of the New Testament and if you said you're a Christian, do you believe that Romans is and that Romans 13 is valid as part of your belief system?

They would normally say, Well, yes, of course.

Well, then, you have to believe that in Romans 13 God has basically ordained any government for good or bad and that in Romans 13:4 it points out: "If you do evil, be afraid," because God does not give the sword to the government in vain.

The government is God's minister to avenge evil, to reward good deeds, and of course, in our Constitution, it is to provide for the common defense. But I would ask the people who would come forward as Christians if those were their beliefs, if they believed those things in Romans, so I could try to make the judgment as to whether or not they were disqualified as jurors.

The response was normally, Of course.

I was in a position to point out, Then if you understand our history, you believe, then you understand, as a called juror, you've been given the sword. If you believe Romans 13, then when you're called for jury duty, that sword has been placed in your hand, and you're expected to come forth and administer and to make sure that people who have not done evil don't get punished and to make sure that those who have done evil are to be afraid, because they will be punished as they, as the jurors called forward, are the government.

In fact, the Founders believed that the people would be the government and that every so often there would be a day in which the people, as the government, would come forward. They would say, We are going to hire new folks to carry out our will. We the people, as the government, will hire people to do what we tell them for the next 1, 2, 4, 6 years. Over the years, we've been told even still that the most widespread religion in America which people in polling data indicate is Christianity.

□ 2310

If they believe the Founders and they truly believe the Old and New Testament, they have to understand they're the government. They have been given—in fact, we all as American citizens have been given—the source.

Now, all of those in this body are hired public servants. We get hired every other year. The government, we the people, the government have the right to fire us every other year. And as the government, if you truly believe the responsibility is to carry out your duties as the government in the most effective and efficient manner possible, well, that would require coming out on hiring and firing day to see that the best people got elected, because when people stay home, they get what they deserve on hiring day. When people come out and vote, they get what they deserve on hiring and firing day. And when people don't bother to educate themselves on who all has applied to be the public servant to get hired on hiring day, then they're not carrying out their duties as a proper government.

When people know that they would be a better candidate and be a better public servant, then it's their obligation under our founding documents, under the concepts on which this Na-

tion was based, to step forward and run for office or to help others as they run for office, if they know they would be the best person to fill the job of public servant. But we have forgotten what role who plays. The people are the government. We're the public servants. And all too often that gets forgotten.

Of course, Peter Muhlenberg, Peter Muhlenberg's brother Frederick, there are stories that he was not very pleased that his brother Peter had recruited from his church, because he recruited from the church. He got people there in his congregation to join the Army with him and recruited from the town, and they all came to the Army together. And there were stories Frederick wasn't that pleased with what Peter did from the pulpit.

There were other stories that when Frederick's church was burned down, that he did likewise. He recruited. He joined the revolutionary forces and helped defeat the British, and, in fact, the Christian minister named Frederick Muhlenberg was the first Speaker of the House of Representatives.

We also know that behind the abolitionist movement was the churches. There were many right-thinking people, but the primary groups were the churches; because when they really studied New Testament principle, they worried and feared that how could God continue to bless America when we're putting our brothers and sisters in chains and bondage, and they fought it. And Abraham Lincoln, so troubled by that battle, and, in fact, after he was defeated for a second term in the House of Representatives in 1848, new person took office early 1849, stories were that he did not plan to ever run again.

But stories that John Quincy Adams had told and sermons basically that John Quincy Adams preached just down the hall on the evils of slavery and pleading with his colleagues to end the blight against America called slavery, those fell not on deaf ears but on a young freshman's ears, Abraham Lincoln, between the time he was sworn in in early 1847 to the time his successor was sworn in in early 1849.

1850 brought about the compromise of 1850. Other States were going to be coming in. They were going to be allowed to have slavery. This ate away at Lincoln because he knew, and those sermons John Quincy Adams preached on the floor of the House just ate away at him. We could not continue to go forward without stopping this terrible sin called slavery in America. He knew that was no way to treat brothers and sisters.

And eventually he got back into politics, ran again as we know. Of course, got defeated by Stephen Douglas for the Senate but later elected in 1860 to be President. There's some historians who say that when Lincoln's son died, he believed it was God blaming him; because he knew when he got elected

President that was ordained by God so that he could bring an end to slavery, and he waited too long to do that. There's always different versions of different historians, but that is one version of history, that Lincoln blamed himself when his son died, that he should have immediately sought to end slavery. But as the States started seceding from the Union, he felt, Okay, I will hold the Union together, and then I will end slavery.

But he carried a heavy heart as President of the United States, as a Christian, and his second inaugural address that's inscribed on the north inside wall of the Lincoln Memorial is so profound, and it is an intellectual giant dealing with theology and this issue of how could a just God allow so much injustice and so much hate and war. And he goes through, deals with the issue, and ultimately says we have to proclaim God is righteous all together.

We have an extraordinary history. Who was it that inspired Dr. Martin Luther King, Junior, to push for civil rights for everyone? Some people think, well, all he did was make sure that African Americans were treated like others, like everybody else, that he fought for minorities. But the truth is his theology as a Christian minister was so deep, he understood that in bringing about a society where people were judged by the content of their character, rather than the color of their skin, that he was also freeing Anglos who were Christians, many for the first time, to treat people the way a Christian brother and sister is supposed to treat another Christian brother and sister.

But that was in the 1960s, and the change of the law in the 1950s for the first time in our history saying churches could not be involved in politics had a profound effect. And then in the early 1960s, 1963, we have the Supreme Court say, you know, we're not real sure. We don't think that you should be having prayers in public schools.

And yet, it was Ben Franklin that broke the logjam after 5 weeks in the Constitutional Convention of 1787 by being recognized. He was 80 at the time. He was 2 or 3 years away from meeting his Maker. He was suffering apparently from gout, had to have help getting in and out of Independence Hall for the Constitutional Convention, but he got recognized. And he pointed out they'd been meeting for nearly 5 weeks and had accomplished basically nothing.

How does it happen, sir, he said, that we have not once thought of applying to the Father of lights to illuminate our understanding? In the beginning contest with Great Britain, when we were sensible of danger, we had daily prayer in this room. Our prayers, sir, were heard and they were graciously answered.

Franklin went on, and then he came to the point, we're told, that a sparrow

cannot fall to the ground without His notice. Is it possible an empire could rise without His aid?

□ 2320

We've been assured in the sacred writing that unless the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it. "Firmly believe this," Franklin said. Then he said, "I also firmly believe that without his concurring aid, we shall succeed in our political building no better than the builders of Babel." And he knew. This 80-year-old man in pain and suffering had a mind and wit as sharp as ever, though his body was deteriorating.

He ultimately moved that we would begin each day with prayer, led by a local minister. And from then until now, today when we start, we have a minister start with prayer. So it was staggering, in the 1960s, that the Supreme Court, as they continue to do, say, Yeah, we don't think prayer is appropriate. Well, thank goodness I had a great legal education at Baylor University, and we learned about the Constitution. We learned about the Constitution's history, and it doesn't take much digging to find exactly where it came from.

One of the things that the Founders pointed out was that "we don't trust government." The people, as the government, in this new creation, this Republic, "if we can keep it," as Franklin said, was going to rely on people being diligent and coming to the polls on election day, on hiring day, and making sure they hired good people to carry out the will of the government, the people. And over the years, we've lost that.

Of course they wanted, not just one legislative body, a huge House of Representatives, big for that time. And then also, that was not enough, not some just elite or social elite in another body like, a House of Lords. They wanted a group they would call the Senate, and they would have the power to nix anything that the guys in the House of Representatives did. That's what the Founders thought: We want to make it as hard as we possibly can to pass laws because when it's too easy, then you have tyranny. And that's what we've seen a great deal of lately.

We saw with the automobile bailout an auto task force. We had all these czars. We have an auto task force, unelected, unaccountable—certainly to Congress. They wouldn't tell us what went on. They wouldn't give anybody any information about the conversations that took place, who said what. And yet they come out with a bankruptcy plan that turned the bankruptcy laws upside down.

I mean, the law is supposed to mean something. There are businesses and individuals that have had to file bankruptcy, and they were forced to always play by the rules. And yet here were

these automakers who got to just thumb their noses at the law. Why? Because the safeguards that were put in place by the Founders were just ignored. Well, there were checks and balances. You can't just have a czar or some task force that's unaccountable, just ignore laws and come forth with a bankruptcy plan that doesn't allow for any motions. It doesn't allow for any other alternative plans, does not allow the secured creditors to be treated as secured creditors but instead, flips them upside down so the secured creditors are treated as unsecured and the unsecured union is treated as secured.

Nobody could get away with turning the law upside down like that. We have too many other checks and balances, we thought. But not here in Washington now, we don't. And that's why this body and the Senate allowed a terribly illegal bankruptcy plan to go forward. It wasn't hard apparently to find a bankruptcy judge that would welcome the chance to avoid ever having to have months and months or years of hearings. He would just simply sign off on that because, as we know, bankruptcy judges are subject to reappointment on a regular basis. And we also know many bankruptcy judges want to be district judges and other things. So it apparently wasn't too hard to find a bankruptcy judge to sign that order, giving it color of law. This body should have struck it down. We had the power. We turned our heads. There was one hope left. That was the Supreme Court, another wonderful check and balance put in place by the Founders. Ruth Bader Ginsburg, to her credit, put a 24-hour hold on the deal that was born out of these private, secret meetings unaccountable, unelected people were having when they turned the law and the Constitution upside down.

There were takings of dealerships born out of these private, secret seedy discussions. They took property rights away from these people. Some of them still owe money at the bank today, yet their dealerships were taken away. Their security was taken away. The banks that had loaned money to buy dealerships were harmed when the dealer's dealership was taken away by this anarchy group.

But the Supreme Court let the 24 hours go, and an illegal, unconstitutional bankruptcy plan went through unimpeded. And lots of people suffered. I understand their claims, the claims being made currently, it sounds like, to me, legitimately by dealers who had a Federal taking without due process and without remuneration. It sounds like they're doing the right thing. And yet we've heard from people on the other side about how terrible the economy was that the Democrats inherited from President Bush.

When if you go back to January 3, 2007, that was the day that the Democratic majority took over the Senate

and the Congress. We can just visit that day. January 3, 2007, the Dow Jones closed at 12,474.52. The GDP for the fourth quarter of 2006, we found out after election day, had grown 3 percent higher than in the third quarter. The unemployment rate was 4.5 percent. Bush's economic policies had led to 40 straight months of job creation, more jobs than were being lost. January 3, 2007, was also the day that BARNEY FRANK took over as chairman of the House Financial Services Committee and CHRIS DODD, as Senator, took over the Senate Banking Committee as chairman.

Over and over, the Bush administration had asked Congress to stop Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, to rein it in, and to Republicans' dismay and dishonor, it was not done. It should have been. And certainly the Democratic friends across the aisle were objecting. The man who became chairman, BARNEY FRANK, was objecting. Of course we've seen the speech where he said, No, they were fine, in essence. They were fine. They were not fine. They were in big trouble, and nothing was done. It should have been.

If we look back, we will find that Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, they weren't sitting dormant on the side. Oh, no. They were actively involved in politics. And if you look at the period, as Open Secrets did, from 1989 to 2008 to find out who gained the most in political contributions during that period from Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac as they sought to try to entrench their futures, well the second-highest amount of contributions from Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac went to a Senator named Barack Obama.

□ 2330

Things changed, didn't they? And now we have the book come out from Mr. Woodward. Who is to know exactly what is absolute truth and what is affected by unartful memory?

As a judge, we would hear well-meaning witnesses all try to give their version of what they saw with their own eyes, and it was amazing. Eye-witnesses so often varied on details that occurred.

But Mr. Woodward has a book out. I was deeply saddened to see what he had said about President Obama's discussion with Secretary Gates, that he could either endorse the President's idea of 25 percent fewer new troops going to Afghanistan, 25 percent fewer than the military had asked for in McChrystal's report, or the President could go with what he described to Gates as a "hope for the best" plan of 10,000 trainers, under which Afghanistan would almost certainly be lost to the Taliban.

Woodward quotes President Obama as saying, Can you support this? And then he is quoted as saying, Because if the answer is no, I understand it, and I

will be happy it just authorize another 10,000 troops and we can continue to go as we are and train the Afghan national force and just hope for the best.

Woodward's comment was "hope for the best." The condescending words hung in the air. Well, there were accounts, reports that supposedly, possibly, that McChrystal had originally orally said, We probably need 80,000 troops in Afghanistan to have as much effect as the surge in Iraq had had and to get things under control.

I am not sure if those were true, but one account was that the President, or the White House, had asked, Let's cut that down from 80 to 40 because that's more reasonable, something more doable.

But nonetheless, the request was in writing for 40,000. And the report made very clear that time was of the essence. And if we delay doing this, the whole outcome of Afghanistan could hinge within the next 12 months. And it was shocking to wait for 90 days. Thirty days, nothing happened. The President said he had been busy, been running around congratulating people all over the country. Kind of like in here. We don't have time to help the economy by assuring people and businesses we will keep the same tax rate for at least the next year or so. Oh, no. We had to do 84 suspension bills on various things today. No time to help the economy, though, by assuring businesses and people their taxes will not have the biggest increase in American history, which looms as of January 1.

But anyway, 30,000 troops were authorized. And it's a shame if that ends up being true, that President Obama told Gates, either go along with the 30,000, 25 percent less than McChrystal said were absolutely essential to having a chance, the best chance to defeat the Taliban, and to win in Afghanistan.

But the trouble is, my friend, DANA ROHRBACHER, had let me know this past summer that there were some members of the northern alliance that we called upon, some call them warlords, tribal groups, who we had allied ourselves with when we first went into Afghanistan. We let them do most of the fighting, and they were able to defeat the Taliban. We provided weaponry and consultants, trainers, and they were able to defeat the Taliban.

But then, as Afghanistan languished, the Taliban has made a resurgence. And there were stories that these people with the northern alliance, these leaders had heard that the United States was indirectly negotiating with Pakistan and with Karzai, as the leader of Afghanistan, and indirectly with the Taliban, basically, if you'll just let us out next summer and not make a fuss, you can have the country. You guys can work it out. That was what the northern alliance people were hearing.

And what I didn't know until we met with a number of those leaders, these

are brave warriors. These are brave fighters. But they were concerned for themselves and more so for their families and for those who looked to them for leadership, because what I didn't know was that after they had defeated the Taliban to help us, we demanded that they disarm and basically said, you know, you can count on us. You know, the Taliban's been defeated. You can disarm now. That's the only way to peace. And don't worry, we are around to make sure that the Taliban won't be back. They won't be bothering you. You defeated them. We are here. We will see that nothing bad happens.

So they disarmed. And they said they really did. They trusted the United States, their ally.

And now, the Taliban making this resurgence, because McChrystal didn't get the soldiers he asked for, and although the President said that is the war, that's where Bush is messing up, he didn't make that the central war. This President has not done any better and, instead, has announced to our enemies, not in so many words, but it's something any enemy would get. When you say we're going to pull out next summer, it tells the enemy, if you can just hang on until next year, then you win.

And lest we forget, the Taliban was behind the training and the planning of 9/11 and the killing of 3,000 Americans. How quickly we have forgotten. Have you forgotten? Have we forgotten?

They killed 3,000 people, and now we are going to let them—we are going to walk away from Afghanistan and let them have a stronghold there. And the northern alliance knows what that means. It means that they and their families are dead. Our allies will be dead.

It isn't hard to figure out, if you're out there in the world, and United States representatives say, you can trust us, be our ally, you'd want to say, well, no, no thank you very much. I have seen what you have done to your allies. I have seen what your best friend, Israel, has had happen to them and the pressure you have put on them not to defend themselves, to give away part of their country; to keep giving away unilaterally, when there is nothing being brought to the bargaining table by the other side. Yeah, we have seen what you have done to your allies.

We saw how you voted to demand Israel show off their weaponry, just like Hezekiah did as king of Israel when he showed the weaponry to Babylonian leaders. And for that, Isaiah said, in essence, you fool. Because you have done this you will lose it all.

You don't show your enemies all of your defenses. You don't do that. And you don't make your friends do that either. You don't make your friends give away their ability to conventionally defend themselves like we have been putting pressure on Israel to do.

And now, with Afghanistan. I don't know what the answers are. But I would have hoped that from Vietnam we learned, not that we couldn't win, because we find out from the true history, Vietnam was winnable, but we didn't have the will. Washington could have decided to win the Vietnam war whenever it got ready, but, instead, we kept sending people over there piecemeal to die.

The message ought to be clear. If you are going to send American men and women into harm's way, you send with them everything they need to win, and you don't tie their hands behind them. You let them fight.

And the rules of engagement in Afghanistan are causing losses of life because we are so tying our own hands that it puts our people at risk.

□ 2340

Is there any wonder people are hesitant to be our allies? The Northern Alliance could tell them, watch out. I hope and pray that the Northern Alliance leaders were wrong, that our administration here is not indirectly sending messages to the Taliban: If you just hang in there, you guys can divide things up. Because it does mean our allies in Afghanistan will be dead.

It is rather hard to hear people in this administration say that the Republican Party has no leaders when they took one of my ideas. And I did tell them, I don't care who gets the credit. But that was back in January of 2009—actually, November of 2008, when I pushed forward the tax holiday idea. It is a great idea. People would leave the money in their own checks.

I emailed the idea to Newt Gingrich. He fired back: This is brilliant. I will push it.

I don't get a lot of emails saying something I proposed is brilliant. Art Laffer had said more recently that would have been the best thing to do, a tax holiday.

The trouble is the majority right now believes that the money being earned by people doesn't belong to them, it belongs to us, and we will decide what of this government's money they get to keep. That is not way it is supposed to work.

And we have been told we are supposed to be for something. We have got all kinds of fantastic plans, but the majority has a choke hold on CBO so that they will come forward; if the President needs a CBO score to be under \$900 billion, they get it under there and then conveniently find out later on that they missed it by a quarter of a trillion dollars. If the administration needs a scoring to be done in the time that the rest of us are told by CBO they can't score something in that amount of time or with what little is given, if this administration or this majority wants it, they get it done. I don't see how that is bipartisan.

When you look at over 700 bills that they have scored and you find just barely over 100 Republican bills, including what Newt Gingrich had told me: You have got to get your health care bill scored. It could change the debate. It ought to have a good score. Well, CBO has shut out that possibility, as if they were the most partisan of all partisans, because they know by preventing alternative bills from getting scored, then they prevent a viable alternative from being debated here on the floor. Shame on CBO.

There have been some great ideas, and they are so basic. Do you want to get the economy going? Let people keep their own money. You wouldn't have needed an automobile bailout if you had let people keep their own money for 2 or 3 months.

People say: You guys on this side of the aisle are only out to help the rich. I am not. We are not. But what we want to do is focus tax relief only to the limited people who are paying the taxes, and we have the unmitigated gall to think that we should not engage in class warfare. That is divisive. Or maybe I should say divisive, derisive, dismissive. Tax relief should go to those who are paying taxes, pure and simple. And it is not a tax rebate if people didn't put any "bait" in in the first place.

Art Laffer also says, as an economist that helped Reagan get the cart out of the ditch for this country: Quit buying all this stuff. Start selling off things. Yet every month that goes by, this government buys more and more lands, which takes the land off of the tax rolls for the local government and the schools. We do so much damage taking away tax dollars from schools, and we take away areas where we have got natural resources that could be mined or produced.

I want alternative energy sources, and it would be easy. Instead of having the crap-and-trade bill that does so much more damage to the economy, heck, just start drilling what we have, making sure it is done safely. And that does not mean as it was being done when Deepwater Horizon blew up, where the part of MMS that was allowed to unionize was the offshore inspectors.

And when I asked the question, "What kinds of checks and balances do you have to make sure those offshore inspectors who are unionized and had a union contract to limit what they could be required to do, what kind of checks and balances do you have to make sure that they do the right thing?" they said, "Oh, the checks and balances? That is that we send them out in pairs so they are watching each other, and they will report each other if they don't do exactly what they are supposed to."

Yet the last two people who were sent as offshore inspectors, unionized,

to inspect the Deepwater Horizon were a father-and-son team. That is this administration and the union's idea of a good check and balance.

We have apparently hundreds of billions, and now it is estimated even over \$1 trillion, of Americans' money in foreign banks that was earned overseas, and it has been left there, and this government will never have a chance to tax that at all. So here we are in economic crisis.

This was proposed in September of 2008 by some leading economists here: Instead of a TARP giveaway slush fund, don't get the government involved in the socialist action of buying into business, buying into Wall Street, engorging Goldman Sachs and AIG. Let them go through reorganization like everybody else does.

But what you could do is say, okay, for you American people, companies that have money in foreign banks that has never come into American banks, here is the deal. You come in and purchase things that will get the economy going.

And we could direct that. There will be no tax consequences, no penalties. So you, with private money, can get things going. And then, of course, once that money is here, it does get the economy going; and, once it is in this country, then it is taxable for the future. Or we could start selling off some of the land. You know, we have got to start thinking outside the box.

One of the great things that happened under Abraham Lincoln was the Morrill Act. The Morrill Act allowed universities to be started with land grants. We have people on welfare. And I know there are some that just don't want to work, but there are some that do. How about if, instead of the welfare, we give them an alternative: We will give you so many acres that can provide land where you can live off of it and make a living. And we will give you seed money to start, but you have to sign an agreement you will never accept welfare again. How about that? We have got plenty of land.

How about using the energy sources we have and taking 25 or even 50 percent of the royalty and designating that to go for research for alternative energy sources, so that it happens without the government taxing and destroying the American economy?

And, how about dropping the corporate tax down to 15 percent, 2 percentage points below China? I am told by CEOs that have moved manufacturing industries to China that if we lowered our corporate tax rate to 17, 15, 12 percent, they would be building new plants back in the United States. Those jobs would return. We need to do that.

□ 2350

We need to do that.

We need a zero baseline budget, no automatic increases. I have that bill. I

filed it each of the three times that I have been here, each of the three terms.

I have got a U.N. voting accountability bill that simply says any nation, since they are sovereign they can do what they want to in the U.N., how they vote. They can applaud Ahmadinejad's crazy speeches, but for any country that votes against our position in the U.N. more than half the time, they get no financial assistance from the United States of any kind in the subsequent year. It is their choice. I said it before: you don't have to pay people to hate you. They will do it for free.

There are so many things we could do to get out of the economic malaise we are in. We need a balanced budget amendment. That would help.

I honestly believe we have got to pass a bill on Social Security that would shore it up. And, no, we didn't do it my first 2 years.

I proposed it to some of our leaders back then, our leading thinkers. They said it was a bad idea, but I still say it is a good idea, and that is for the first time since the inception of Social Security, you require Social Security tax money to go into the Social Security trust fund, real money in there to draw real interest. We could create instruments that would not create risk, that would allow us to draw interest without affecting the bond markets. There are so many things we can do.

We have been blessed so richly. I have said this before, but, Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude with it tonight, because people have been frustrated, I have been frustrated.

But the message is clear. John Adams wrote to Abigail after the signing of the Declaration of Independence. He was so excited, and he talked about the celebrations, and he finished his letter with this:

You will think me transported with enthusiasm, but I am not. I am well aware of the toil and blood and treasure it will cost us to maintain this Declaration and to support and defend these States. Yet through all the gloom I can see the rays of ravishing light and glory. I can see that the end is more than worth all the means, and that posterity will triumph in that day's transaction, even though we should rue it, which I trust in God we shall not.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PALLONE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MCGOVERN, for 5 minutes, today.