

as we do. Those nations include Russia, China and Iran. They need to be engaged.

Smart security also recognizes that al Qaeda and other extremist groups have the ability to shift gears and set up shop in other places around the world, probably in the poorest places they can find.

That's why smart security supports investments in the development of impoverished nations, to give people the hope and the opportunity they need to reject violence and hatred in the first place. And because we need to keep the extremists away from weapons of mass destruction, smart security calls for vigorous inspection regimes and a renewed commitment to nuclear non-proliferation.

In this session of Congress, Madam Speaker, I have introduced House Resolution 363, the "Smart Security Platform for the 21st Century." It is the blueprint we need to defeat extremism in Afghanistan and elsewhere in the world. Madam Speaker, the strategy I have described is tough. It is pragmatic. It will protect the lives of our brave troops, and it will keep our Nation safe.

As the administration conducts its review of the situation in Afghanistan, I urge them to choose this strategy because it is the winning strategy.

HALLOWEEN HEALTH CARE

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, somewhere in the deep, dark, moldy caverns of this Capitol building, known only to the very few, the taxacrats are very busy writing their Halloween health care bill. They want to shove it through Congress before Halloween. How appropriate a date for that nightmare.

The Senate took another step today toward Halloween health care. The Senate Finance Committee passed something they called a "concept" bill. It's not really a bill, it's just a concept, an idea. That means the bill is not really actually written. But they passed it out of the Senate Finance Committee anyway.

Now, they're supposed to merge it together with the trillion dollar Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee health care bill. That's the HELP bill. The Senate passed that earlier this year. So in the secret caverns of the Capitol, the health-care-crats are going to merge the two Senate bills to come up with the final Halloween health care bill.

Here is the problem with all the bills so far: The government decides our health care. All the power and all the control goes to the Federal Government. It lets the government decide what procedures doctors may perform on their patients. If some new medicine comes along, it won't be covered. You

have to go into the government-run plan to get new medicines. And you have to pay a big fine if you don't buy insurance when you're young and healthy. I'm sure the youth of America will like that new change in health care. Plus, businesses that cannot afford to have health care for their employees will also get stuck with an 8.5 percent tax. Of course, that will put some businesses out of business. In other words, tax them out of business.

The bills are so vague that illegals probably are covered in all of the bills as well. Also these bills tax good insurance plans like the ones that many union members have. If someone pays more to get better insurance, the government is going to make them pay for having that better insurance with higher taxes. And millions of people are still not covered in the bills. Now wasn't that supposed to be the reason for all of this reform? We are turning the health of America over to the government, and these bills still won't cover everyone.

And even when they still don't cover millions of people, government health care is just too expensive. America cannot afford it. Government-run health care is going to cost the taxpayers at least another trillion dollars at the very least. And where are we going to get the money? We don't have the money.

Now the taxacrats are trying to tell us that putting everyone in a new government-run health care system won't cost the taxpayers any money. Well, they are wrong. That would be the first time in history a government-run program like this health care bill costs less than it was supposed to be.

If you liked your health care when you had to pay for it, Madam Speaker, you will really like it when it's free.

There's more. Government health care is going to cut half a billion dollars out of Medicare to help pay for this Halloween health care bill. Of course, that scares our seniors. And another thing that's odd: Every single one of these bills don't go into effect until the year 2013. Now why is that? But the new taxes take effect in 2010. That's right. American taxpayers pay 3 years of new taxes on plans that don't take effect for 3 more years. Now isn't that lovely.

So what's the big rush to pass all this? You'd think they're trying to hide something. And I wonder what that could be? If this is such a great deal, why is there deception surrounding this health care bill? Why not have openness before we vote on it? Let's have floor amendments. Let's have lively floor debate on it. Let's take our time. After all, the bills don't take effect for 3 more years. And maybe we'll have time for everyone in the House and the Senate to read these bills. Now there's a thought.

Halloween health care is just a nightmare. And the people I represent in southeast Texas don't want the government controlling their health care. But

Halloween health care looms in the dark shadows of these hallowed halls. Where the trolls roam at night, the bureaucrats write their health care bill, while the taxpayers continue to ask, "trick or treat?" And that's just the way it is.

THREAT OF TERRORISM

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Eight years ago, the U.S. entered Afghanistan. Now 8 years later, 791 American deaths and billions of dollars later, we must ask, what have we gained? Has our 8 years in Afghanistan made us safer? And will 8 more years make us safer still?

As we speak, the administration is reviewing the best strategy to achieve one primary objective: To protect Americans from another terrorist attack. We agree on the objective. We differ on the strategy.

As we move to define our strategy, the question we must continue to ask ourselves is: how do we keep Americans safe from a terrorist attack? Recent events suggest that we need to broaden our focus and think bigger than Afghanistan. After all, we are battling not simply against terrorists in Afghanistan but against terrorism, which we are learning has many fronts, extending from Afghanistan to Pakistan to Somalia, Yemen, Uzbekistan and even our own backyard.

Over the past 2 weeks, five men have been arrested for plotting terror attacks in our country. One man lived in New York for more than a decade and was planning to detonate a bomb there on the anniversary of September 11.

Thomas Friedman argued in his recent New York Times column that the most active front in this war against terrorism is "not Afghanistan, but the 'virtual Afghanistan,' the loose network of thousands of jihadist Web sites, mosques and prayer groups that recruit, inspire and train young Muslims to kill."

The young Jordanian who was recently arrested for attempting to blow up a building in Dallas was caught after declaring war on the U.S. on jihadist Web sites.

We must broaden our focus. Jihadist networks are also gaining ground in unstable states such as Somalia and Yemen. Recently, a source at a U.S. defense agency stated, We know that south Asia is no longer al Qaeda's primary base. They are looking for a hide-out in other parts of the world and continue to expand their organization.

We must broaden our focus. Two weeks ago, a major Uzbek terrorist with links to the Taliban and al Qaeda was killed in south Pakistan. The man killed was the leader of the Islamic Movement of Uzbekistan, a group whose goal was to set up an Islamist state there and ultimately throughout central Asia.

We must broaden our focus because the jihad has no borders, and thus our security policy must have no borders. James Traub recently likened jihadism to Communism without Russia, explaining that “its success or failure is measured in ideological rather than territorial terms.” That is the threat we face, a threat based not on borders but on beliefs.

Which brings us back to our initial question: how can we best keep Americans safe from an ideological and borderless threat? We have sunk billions of dollars into Afghanistan, but at some point we must prioritize our spending. The reality is we have limited resources, measured both in lives and tax dollars, and we must expend those resources carefully and pragmatically.

“The problems of this world are deeper, more involved, and more stubborn than many of us realize,” said George Keenan, scholar and diplomat, in a 1949 speech to the Academy of Political Science. “It is imperative,” he continued “that we economize with our limited resources and that we apply them where we feel that we will do the most good.”

If pouring a large portion of our precious resources into Afghanistan will keep Americans safe from another terrorist attack, then it is an unquestionable investment we must make. But the reality that we are battling a worldwide network of jihadists might require us to step back and reassess our priorities.

If we are ever to achieve our objective of keeping America safe, we must, as Mr. Keenan suggests, apply our limited resources where they will do the most good. Where that exactly is, we have yet to determine. But we must be careful of basing our strategy on borders, when the enemy we are fighting is borderless.

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 addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE STIMULUS LABEL MUST BE SHUNNED

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I was reading the Roll Call newspaper today, and on the front page it says, “New Economic Plan Weighed, But ‘Stimulus’ Label Shunned.” It says, “Democrats are scrambling to define a new plan to boost the economy as unemployment hurtles toward double digits, after months of insisting that talk of another stimulus package was premature.”

Just don’t call the as-yet-unwritten new proposal “stimulus.”

Shakespeare said a rose by any other name would smell as sweet. They’re talking about another stimulus bill. And everybody in this country knows that the \$787 billion stimulus, and with interest it’s over \$1 trillion, did not work.

The President said that unemployment would not go over 8 percent. It’s over 9.5 percent right now. And the Democrats are scared to death it’s going to go to 10 percent, so they are coming up with another plan, stimulus, to get the economy moving so there won’t be any more unemployment. It won’t work. It won’t work just taking government money and throwing it at the problem. It creates more deficits, it’s going to cause more inflation down the road, and it’s going to cost higher taxes, but it’s not going to create jobs.

The thing that creates jobs is giving Americans more disposable income in their paychecks. The thing that creates jobs is for businessmen and industry people to have more money so they can buy more equipment and more plants so they can produce more products that people can buy. And then the employees, because they have more money because their taxes have been lowered, can buy it. That’s what Ronald Reagan knew.

□ 2000

Ronald Reagan cut taxes when he came in. We were in a very bad economic time back in the early eighties. A lot of people don’t remember that, but they were very bad coming out of the Carter administration. So he came in and they said, You’ve got to raise taxes. You’ve got to throw money at it. And he said he thought we ought to do just the opposite. We ought to give people some of their money back by lowering taxes. We ought to give business and industry some of their money back so they can invest more, and that would create a rising tide that would raise all boats. And you know what? It did. And it created the longest period of economic expansion in the history of this country.

Now, today the President wants to solve the problem by taking taxpayers’ money, raising taxes, coming out with new programs that are spending billions of dollars and then throwing money at it. It will not work. If they come up with another stimulus package and they throw all of this money at it that we don’t have, we will have to print more and we will have inflation because of it, and that will raise taxes. Then the unemployment rate will continue to rise because people won’t have disposable income to spend. And many of them will be losing their jobs because businesspeople will be cutting back and laying people off or going offshore.

The fact of the matter is raising taxes right now, throwing more taxpayers’ money that we don’t have at the problem, will not solve it. The thing that will solve it, if I were talking to the President—and I hope maybe

someday he will be listening—is, Mr. President, cut taxes on the individual, cut taxes on business and industry. Give us more disposable income and people will buy products. And when they buy products, we will create products. And when we create products, we will create jobs. That is the answer. Ronald Reagan knew it, but President Obama doesn’t, but maybe he will get the message before long.

Where we are heading right now is toward a socialist economy, a government-run socialist economy like the Europeans are doing. It hasn’t worked there; it won’t work here.

Mr. Obama, Mr. President—if I were talking to him, I hope he will listen—cut taxes. Do what Ronald Reagan did and you will solve the problem.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

SAY “YES” TO INTEGRITY IN THE NFL, “NO” TO RUSH LIMBAUGH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, this is the value of democracy: differences of opinion. And, frankly, I believe that this government, this majority is on the right track. We were in an emergency, a recession that has continued for a period of months. Even as we watch Wall Street bounce back, we know the pain of Americans who have suffered the loss of jobs.

It is important to note that history is at our back; for if FDR had not been aggressive and taken risks to invest in programs that generated jobs, maybe not the type of focus of the 21st century but the WPA, who put our grandfathers and some grandmothers to work, allowed young men who were able to come back from World War II to be able to have an opportunity to then grow a capitalistic society, the boom of the 1950s, when those young men and young women married and created families and built homes.

And so it is important to have the facts. And I would say to you that the jobs data which we are collecting says that jobs have been created, important jobs. Thousands and thousands of teachers have been able to be retained to educate our children. We have had a number of others in various agencies that we have been able to keep, and those jobs then generate into the private sector.

I am often well aware that there are different economic perspectives, but Paul Krugman has a note, not necessarily the full article that I hope to associate myself with, but it says,