

from the middle class to corporate elites and the very wealthy.

Now, it is true that they talk about reducing certain corporate tax expenditures, but only in vague terms, only to a small degree. It is basically a dramatic decline in corporate tax, in the revenue of the corporate income tax.

Now, finally on to the other. We have been told by our Republican colleagues on so many occasions that the worst thing we could do is increase taxes in the middle of a recession; yet the Republican proposals, all of them, involve a dramatic increase for working families going into effect this next year, namely by allowing the Making Work Pay Tax Credit, the so-called Obama tax cuts, \$800 for every working couple, \$400 for every working single, expire at the end of this year. I urge my colleagues to join with me in cosponsoring our colleague Scott Murphy's bill to extend this \$800/\$400 tax credit.

With all the talk of extending the Bush tax cuts, with all the talk for those who make more than a quarter million dollars a year, we should not forget that the Obama tax cuts expire at the end of this year, and for well more than half of all American families, the Obama tax cuts are more important than the Bush tax cuts.

Now, why is nobody even talking about extending the Obama tax cuts? Because no one with an income of over \$150,000 a year gets any of that benefit. So when we have a tax cut that is targeted at working families that is more important than the Bush tax cuts to over half of American families, we see this tax cut about to expire without any discussion from those who tell us that the worst possible thing would be to increase anyone's taxes in the middle of a recession. I do not want to hear about spending \$700 billion over the next 10 years to provide tax relief to the top 1 percent. I do not want to hear that from those who are talking about increasing taxes on more than half of America's working families. It is time to extend the Obama tax cut.

I look forward to working in a bipartisan way to provide tax relief to get this economy moving again and then to shift to fiscal austerity, but allowing the Obama tax cuts to expire and then cutting corporate income tax by one quarter is not the way to go.

ANOTHER DAY ON THE TEXAS BORDER

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, it was just another day on the Texas border on October 1, 2010. A young couple, David and Tiffany Hartley, were on Falcon Lake.

Falcon Lake is a massive lake that borders Mexico in the State of Texas, an international border. They were on their jet skis, and they traveled across the international line into Mexico.

They had gone to see an old mission that was partially submerged in Falcon Lake.

On their way back coming into the United States, they were being chased by three boats full, obviously, of drug cartel members—later we learned they were the Zeta drug cartels—firing automatic weapons at David and Tiffany Hartley. David was shot in the back of the head. Tiffany tries to help, but they were still shooting, so she flees.

She comes back into the United States, and one of the boats—get this, Mr. Speaker—follows her into the United States for over 3 miles until she got ashore and finally sought safety with some passerby that was standing there. Then this boat casually goes back into Mexico.

David Hartley was murdered on October 1, 5 weeks ago. The way the current runs in Falcon Lake, his body would have been into the American side in about 2 hours had not someone taken his body out of the water or cut the life preserver off of him or both. His body has never been found.

The Mexican Government quickly accused Tiffany Hartley of being the culprit—the audacity—just to not investigate this case. David Hartley's body has never been found. The perpetrators who murdered him and shot at Tiffany Hartley have never been prosecuted.

A detective by the name of Rolando Flores from Mexico was assigned to investigate this case. He apparently was the only person investigating this case. Soon after he started investigating it, his beheaded body turned up in front of a police station. Mexico quickly decided: We are not investigating the case. And, of course, they have not.

Mexico has an awful track record of solving homicides, not just homicides of Americans in Mexico, but of Mexican nationals who are murdered in the name of selling drugs across that border and bringing them into the United States. So this case has not been solved. I doubt it will ever be because of the ineptitude of the Mexican Government to preserve and defend and protect people in Mexico.

As Sheriff Sigi Gonzalez of Zapata County has said: This area is a trafficking area for drug cartels. The Zeta drug cartels have operational control of parts of that lake and bring drugs into the United States at night.

I went down to Falcon Lake along with Sheriff Gonzalez' people. We went up and down the lake in speed boats. Of course, before we were allowed to get on the boats, we had to make sure that the locals who were taking us there had automatic weapons and everybody was wearing a bulletproof vest. Then we flew up and down the international border of this massive lake, some 60 miles long, almost 8 miles wide.

Interesting to note, Mr. Speaker. The entire time we were on the lake either in a boat or flying over it, we saw no other boats on either side. No Americans are out on the lake. No Mexican

nationals are out on the lake. For 6 hours we toured that lake and we saw no one, and the reason is it is dangerous. People on both sides of the borders don't go on that lake because it is not under the operational control of either Mexico or the United States. It is under the operational control of the Zeta drug cartel. That is a very unfortunate situation.

This is one instance of many where there are places on the international border with the country of Mexico where neither country has operational control of the border, and it is time that we force them to do something about this nonsense that is taking place, the murder of Americans.

Since then, there have been other Americans murdered in Mexico. Have these been crimes solved? Of course those crimes have not been solved.

□ 1920

We were just hearing comments by the other side about being at war in Afghanistan and Iraq. It is true. We go to war and fight the battles in other countries, Afghanistan and Iraq, we defend the borders of other nations. Maybe it is time we come home and defend our own borders and protect our borders as well as defending borders in Afghanistan and Iraq, because it is the first duty of government to protect the people.

So what do we need? We need more boots on the ground. We need National Guard troops on the ground. We need more Air National Guard, Coast Guard, and we need the help of the Border Patrol to protect the dignity and sovereignty of the United States to keep the drug cartels from bringing that cancer into the United States, because it is the first duty of government to protect the people, and it is about time we protect all the citizens of this country.

And that's just the way it is.

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.)

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.)

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

(Mr. SMITH of New Jersey addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. MORAN of Kansas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ADDRESSING THE CONCERNS OF AMERICA

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 such a pleasure and honor to be back here after our recess. Obviously there are matters of concern for all Americans. Obviously since we were here last, the voters have spoken, and spoken pretty loudly.

But there are a number of things that concern Americans. There have been significant Tea Party groups and organizers here talking. It looks like those folks have found out that Americans have voices, and they can be heard.

One of the great things I think that has been realized across America is once again it is being acknowledged that the people are the government. Every couple of years we have a hiring day to hire servants who will step up and do the will of the government, the people, as directed by the people.

Well, they have forgotten for a while that hiring day is Election Day, and you shouldn't go into it unless you are properly prepared, as any good employer would be, by reading the resumes, talking to the candidates, doing interviews and seeing who would be the best hire to be the public servant from that area, the employee. Boy, their voices were heard this year.

So it is quite reassuring. And I am pleased to work with folks across the aisle, I know we all are, to move forward with the things that the American people have once more said are very important.

If you go back to November of 2006, you find out the people really haven't changed their opinion much. They made it clear in November of 2006 that they were not going to tolerate the deficit spending that the Republican majority was doing. They didn't care who was in the majority. They still don't. They want the deficit spending to stop.

They wanted it to stop in November of 2006, so they made their voices clear and said, okay, Democrats, you have promised us that if we make you the majority, you have promised to end the

deficit spending, because the Republicans, my goodness, they have run \$100 billion, \$200 billion deficits in one year. It was outrageous. Who knew that within 4 years that a Democratic administration would be deficit spending done by Republicans on steroids, ten times the kind of deficit that was anticipated in one year. We can't continue as a country with that kind of spending going on. It has to be stopped.

But we were hearing in the last week the cry of people across America too about this lame duck session. Now, it is nice, we had some lovely votes tonight: The Copyright Cleanup, Clarification, and Corrections Act; recognizing the 50th anniversary of Ruby Bridges desegregating a previously all-white public elementary school—very worthwhile; and the third vote tonight, honoring the 30th anniversary of the Bayh-Dole Act, which it sounds like most people don't know what that was.

But, nonetheless, people are scared that it is going to get a lot more serious than that, because they made their voices heard in the election. We don't want people coming at us with that crap-and-trade bill and saying we are going to shove this down your throats like we did the health care bill. They didn't want the health care bill. They thought they made it clear, but they were not listened to.

They made it clear they don't want the elimination of what my wonderful elementary, junior high, and high school teachers, who nearly all of them were supporters of the Democratic Party, taught. All of those teachers made clear in my growing up that a very important foundation in any democratic republic like ours is the secret ballot. Now we still have this bill out there, the card check bill, that will eliminate secret ballots.

We can just think back in our own Chamber here to the race for majority leader between STENY HOYER and John Murtha, the late John Murtha. Speaker PELOSI, speaker-to-be PELOSI had made clear she wanted John Murtha to be her majority leader. They seemed to have worked closely on the issue of bashing President Bush over the military operations and trying to stop him at every turn. In return, he was named speaker-to-be by PELOSI as her choice to be majority leader.

Well, who in their right mind would go against someone who is clearly so adept at using political power as the gentlelady from San Francisco, if she knew who was going to go against her choice? But the fact is, like the Republican Caucus, the Democratic Caucus used a secret ballot, so the people in the Democratic Party after the November 2006 elections were free to choose the person they most wanted to be the majority leader, and that ended up being the gentleman from Maryland, Mr. HOYER.

Had a similar card check bill been shoved through this Congress to force the Democratic Party to have the secret ballot eliminated, then I think

you could anticipate that the late John Murtha would have been majority leader, and the will of the Democratic Members in this body would have been overwhelmed simply because such a primary component to a democracy was removed, the secret ballot.

We don't need to remove the secret ballot so that might will make right, instead of right standing on its own. The ballot has to be secret in any organization in which anyone wants it to be secret. Take Robert's Rules of Order, of the requirement to have a secret vote.

Of course, out here when we are doing the people's business, it can't be secret, because we are employees, we are servants, sent up here to do the people's will, so it shines up on the wall exactly how we vote when we vote.

But one of the things that people should have learned after this November election, including Senators that are up for election 2 years from now, is if you jam another one of these bills down somebody's throat, the people's throats across America, as you did health care, you will be looking for a place to retire or another job.

Now, one thing: If they do ram through the crap-and-trade bill as it passed through the House with 300 pages of amendments filed at 3-something a.m. in the morning, where we didn't have time to read them all, I was able to get to the point in the bill, I think it was around page 900-something, where there was a fund created in there to help pay people who lose their jobs as a result of that bill. Although we heard from people across the aisle no one would lose their jobs as a result of that bill, it turns out the people that actually wrote that bill, whatever special interest group it was, perhaps Wall Street, because they are going to be engorged with riches if that bill passes and more union jobs will be lost, it will be a disaster for working America.

□ 1930

But whoever wrote it realized there are going to be a lot of good Americans lose their jobs if that bill passes. And if you go over a little further, there was a fund that would pay for moving expenses if people lost their job as a result of that bill and they could move within the United States to a place to get a job. Unfortunately, it didn't help people move to China and India and Argentina and other places where the jobs really moved.

So the good news for those in the Senate perhaps helped by anybody in the House, if they try to ram that crap-and-trade bill through during this short lame-duck session then the good news is there is a provision in that bill that will help them with their moving expenses and perhaps to give them a subsidy until they find another job because there is no question there's going to be people lose their job as a result of that bill if they vote for it during this lame-duck session when the public has