

THE CONTINUED THREAT OF TERRORISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BLACK). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF CORPORAL SEAN LEAHY IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, about a week or so ago, a good friend of mine from Indiana, Rex Early, who has been very active in not only political circles but in civic events for a long, long time, brought to my attention some extraordinary things that have been done by a young man who is in our military.

Corporal Sean Leahy graduated from Hamilton Southeastern High School in 2006 in Fishers, Indiana, and he is now a 23-year-old marine and squad leader with the 1st Platoon, Kilo Company. He recently completed his second tour of duty, initially having served with distinction in Iraq.

Sean was preparing to leave the Marine Corps to pursue a college degree; and when made aware that his unit would be sent to Afghanistan, instead of leaving to pursue college, he again decided to answer the call, and he reenlisted instead of going to college. He didn't have to risk his life again, but he wanted to be with his unit, and he promptly joined his brethren in preparation for their next deployment.

He was deployed to Sangin in the Helmand province of Afghanistan, an area where our troops have sustained heavy losses and heavy wounds in recent months. But Leahy and his good friend Matthew Bland served side by side with honor, guiding and protecting their platoon.

When called into duty, Corporal Leahy answered the call to action without any hesitation. And I think that's really amazing for a 23-year-old fellow who has a great college career ahead of him to pass that up to go back with his unit into a combat situation. When he was presented with the opportunity to pursue a calmer life here in the States after completing his tour in Iraq, he instead chose to stand shoulder to shoulder with his fellow Marines.

Madam Speaker, this kind of bravery and love for one's country is too often neglected, overshadowed by our chaotic news cycle and conjecture regarding the latest Hollywood gossip. The heroic actions of people like Corporal Leahy can often go unnoticed. But today I rise to give a heartfelt thank you to Corporal Leahy and to the many men and women like him in our armed services who have chosen to risk everything day after day to ensure our country's safety in the face of terror.

□ 1130

The words I have just spoken don't express enough the sentiment that most of us in America feel toward the people who are defending our freedoms.

Mr. Speaker, I have the distinct privilege of rising in honor of one of our fine fighting men who has recently returned from a tour in Afghanistan.

Cpl. Sean Leahy, who graduated from Hamilton Southeastern High School in 2006 in Fishers, Indiana, is a 23-year-old Marine and squad leader with the 1st Platoon, Kilo Company. He has recently completed his second tour of duty, initially having served with distinction in Iraq.

Sean was preparing to leave the Marine Corps to pursue a college degree, when he was made aware that his unit would be sent to Afghanistan. Instead of leaving to pursue college, he again decided to answer the call, reenlisted, and promptly joined his brethren in preparation for their next deployment.

He was deployed to Sangin in the Helmand province of Afghanistan, an area where our troops have sustained heavy losses in recent months. But Leahy, and his good friend Matthew Bland, served side-by-side with honor, guiding and protecting their platoon. When called into duty, Cpl. Leahy answered the call to action without hesitation.

When he was presented with the opportunity to pursue a calmer life here in the States after completing his tour in Iraq, he instead chose to stand shoulder to shoulder with his fellow Marines. Mr. Speaker, this kind of bravery and love for one's country is too often neglected, overshadowed by our chaotic news cycle and conjecture regarding the latest Hollywood gossip.

The heroic actions of people like Cpl. Leahy can often go unnoticed. But today, I rise to give a heartfelt thank you to Corporal Leahy and the many men and women like him in our Armed Services who have chosen to risk everything, day after day, to ensure our country's safety in the face of terror.

I would now like to proceed with the rest of my Special Order.

There was an article, Madam Speaker, in a number of our papers around the country after Osama bin Laden was killed. These articles kind of troubled me, not because we haven't been aggressive in going after Osama bin Laden for 10 years but because of the message these articles sent possibly to the terrorist leaders around the world. It indicated that the President wanted to reach out to the Muslim radicals now that Osama bin Laden has been killed, as if to say, "Let's solve this problem and not have any further conflict."

Now, that kind of rhetoric may sound good to many people in this country, but it troubles me because it may give the impression that we're trying to appease the terrorists in order to get them to stop their terrible, terrible terrorist activities around the world.

I would like to put into the RECORD a few things that were said prior to World War II that I would like, if the President were paying attention, to listen to, because there's an old saying, "Those who don't profit from history are destined to make the same mistakes."

The first quote is from Lord Chamberlain, who was the Prime Minister of England prior to World War II:

"This morning, I had another talk with the German Chancellor, Herr Hit-

ler, and here is the paper which bears his name upon it as well as mine. We regard the agreement signed last night, and the Anglo-German Naval Agreement, as symbolic of the desire of our two peoples never to go to war with one another again."

That was a speech that he made at Heston Airport on the 30th of September, 1938. It was part of the "Peace for Our Time" approach that Lord Chamberlain was taking.

He said, later on in a letter that he sent to his wife in December of 1939:

"I stick to the view I have always held that Hitler missed the bus in September 1938. He could have dealt France and ourselves a terrible, perhaps a mortal, blow then. The opportunity will not recur."

He was trying to say that the reason he signed that agreement with Hitler was because they weren't prepared for war and so he decided to give the Sudetenland to Hitler without any kind of a conflict. The thing that bothers me about that is what he said to the Czechoslovakian people:

"When we were convinced, as we became convinced, that nothing any longer would keep the Sudetenland within the Czechoslovakian State, we urged the Czech Government as strongly as we could to agree to the cession of territory, and to agree promptly. The Czech Government," because of the pressure that was brought upon them, "through the wisdom and courage of President Benes, accepted the advice of the French Government and ourselves. It was a hard decision for anyone who loved his country to take, but to accuse us of having by that advice betrayed the Czechoslovakian State is simply preposterous."

But, in fact, it was a terrible decision that was made by Lord Chamberlain, because what happened was, because of the appearance of weakness by going to Munich and signing a peace agreement on Hitler's terms, giving the Sudetenland, which was part of the Czechoslovakian Republic, to Hitler, it was the green light, because he suspected and felt that the free countries of the world were afraid of him and would back down in any case that might arise. As a result, World War II started and 50 to 60 million people were killed.

It is very important that we realize today, as they did after Lord Chamberlain made this terrible mistake, that we should not in any way give the appearance of appeasing the radical Islamists, because they may think because we got rid of Osama bin Laden, we don't have the intestinal fortitude to keep after them to destroy them so that they can never be a threat to the free world again.

I think it's important that we remember what Winston Churchill, who was an outcast in the British Parliament at the time, what he said for years and years and years. Quoting Churchill:

"The era of procrastination, of half-measures, of soothing and baffling expedients, of delays, is coming to its close. In its place we are entering a period of consequences."

He was predicting that World War II was going to start, and this was as far back as 1936.

He went on to say later on:

"People say we ought not to allow ourselves to be drawn into a theoretical antagonism between Nazism and democracy; but the antagonism is here now. It is this very conflict of spiritual and moral ideas"—that's what we're facing right now, spiritual and moral ideas of the radicals—"which gives the free countries a great part of their strength."

Winston Churchill, who was vilified, was absolutely correct. They should have prepared for war. They should have let Herr Hitler know that there was going to be no giving of any quarter to him, and it might have prevented World War II and maybe saved 40, 50, 60 million lives.

Winston Churchill went on to say after the war was about to begin in the House of Commons in 1938:

"Britain and France had to choose between war and dishonor. They chose dishonor, and now they will have war." And they did have war.

Churchill also said:

"And do not suppose that this is the end. This is only the beginning of the reckoning."

I hope our government realizes that this is not the end of the war with the terrorists. This is still going on. Although bin Laden has been killed, there's still a lot of terrorists out there that believe we're weak and that we're not going to follow through and that they can prevail in the long run. We need to send a message like Churchill did prior to what Lord Chamberlain did by going to Munich that we're going to be tough and we're going to follow through. I think the President needs to send that message very loud and clear, instead of reaching out, now that bin Laden is gone, and saying to the terrorist world, "Now that bin Laden's gone, your leader's gone, we ought to sit down and work this thing out." That is a sign of weakness. And I hope the President when he makes this speech makes absolutely clear to the terrorists that we're willing to do whatever it takes to protect America and the free world.

As Churchill went on to say, "This is only the beginning of the reckoning. This is only the first sip, the first foretaste of a bitter cup which will be proffered to us year by year unless by a supreme recovery of moral health and martial vigor, we arise again and take our stand for freedom as in the olden time." That was in October of 1938.

We're in a war against terrorism. It's something that hasn't been seen since the 12th century when the radical Islamists tried to take over western Europe. A lot of people don't remember that. But they did. And there's always

those radicals who want to foist upon the rest of the world their religious beliefs and the way they think the world should be run. We have to when they rise up again and again and again as they will throughout history, I'm sure that there will always be radical Islamists who will want to make sure the rest of the world believes the way they do as far as their religious beliefs are concerned. Whether it's now, or whether it was in the 12th century, or whether it's going to be in the future, the free world has to be resolute of purpose and make absolutely sure that the message is sent loud and clear that we are willing to do whatever it takes to defeat the terrorists. That means doing whatever it takes to get information from their leaders to make sure that we find the terrorists in whatever hole they've dug themselves in to protect themselves.

I'm very happy we got Osama bin Laden. I think it's a great step forward in the quest for peace. But the war is not over. It's going to go on for some time, until the terrorists know that there's no possibility of winning, and the threat to our homeland from terrorism, the threat to the free world from terrorism, goes on.

I would like to end, if I could, to say to the President—I know I can't talk to him because he's not here—but if I were talking to the President, I would say: Mr. President, when you make this speech, allegedly to reach out to the Arab world, make it absolutely clear that we're going to do whatever it takes to defeat the terrorists as long as it takes.

With that, Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1140

TROUBLES ON THE U.S.-MEXICO BORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, I want to identify with the comments of my friend from Indiana. Well said. Great thoughts.

We have wonderful friends in this world, as a Nation. But we need to recognize who are our friends and who are our enemies and who are the places, the countries, the peoples that intend us harm, who are the people that are willing to assist us in encouraging and allowing for freedom to spread around the world.

We should be well aware that there are people across our border in Mexico who are not Mexicans, people who would like to see this Nation fail as such an important keeper of the peace.

We know that Hezbollah has been setting up camp across the U.S. border in Mexico; that they have been working with drug cartels in Mexico, and it appears we see some of the signs of

that in the ways that people are murdered, the way the crime business has developed.

We know that people coming across our border into this country, a significant percentage at least, are other than Mexican. OTM, they're classified. So many of them from the Middle East, many who are taught to try to appear as Hispanic and come across and try to avoid indicating anything that would give away the fact that they are coming here, not for jobs, but to set up to try to do us harm.

So when you are aware that there is so much violence on the border, Americans being murdered down on both sides of the border, we have two lakes between Texas and Mexico, Lake Falcon and Lake Amistad, together about 85 miles of international border that should be patrolled by the United States Coast Guard. But this administration doesn't wish to see the Coast Guard there.

Visiting with the Texas Governor a few weeks ago, he had made clear, please help me in urging the administration to allocate some Coast Guard resources to these lakes, where the drug cartels are bringing dangerous people, bringing drugs, bringing mayhem across into the U.S. Texas is committing money, resources, manpower on the lake, but it's a Federal job.

And what we've seen with this administration, when a State does too good a job or tries too well to do the job the Federal Government is not doing in order to protect its State, this administration decides to sue them.

We've seen also recently that if there is plenty of evidence to support that people or groups are funding terrorism in the world, and it is radical Islamists that are doing that, then this administration wants to embrace the groups that we have evidence are funding terrorism, rather than confront them and stop them. It's an interesting time we live in.

I do want to follow up on the President's comments. Here Texas has suffered the loss of around 2.3 million acres burned in the last decade or so. Other Presidents, other administrations, and even this administration, have recognized that when 177,000 acres, 300, 400, 500,000 acres have been destroyed, that is certainly worthy of declaring a disaster area in order to provide Federal support.

Texas is a donor State. We always put much more into the Federal Government from Texas than Texas ever gets back. We're proud to be such an important, vital part of the United States.

It does follow that when there is such a compelling disaster as the wildfires in Texas, 2.3 million acres destroyed, that it would be nice to have the support of the President. But just as this administration snubbed all the contributions that Houston provided to the shuttle program, and refused to allow a shuttle to be on display permanently in the NASA Space Center in