

reporters, a response that I believe perfectly explains how our country should recognize God.

Quarterback Tebow said this: "If you're married and you really love your wife, is it good enough only to say to your wife 'I love her' the day you get married? Or should you tell her every single day when you wake up and every opportunity?"

"My relationship with Jesus Christ is the most important thing in my life. So any time I get the opportunity to tell Him that I love Him, or given the opportunity to shout Him out on national TV, I'm going to take that opportunity. And so I look at it as a relationship that I have with Him that I want to give Him the honor and the glory any time I have the opportunity."

Tim Tebow's brave comments are an excellent reminder that we need to look for every opportunity to thank the Lord for our blessings of liberty that He's bestowed upon this great country.

May God forgive this Nation of its sins, may He overlook the times we forget to thank Him for His gifts, may our people turn to Him for guidance and salvation, and may He continue to bless the United States of America.

#### EQUITY IN TAXATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WEBSTER). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, it's a sign of maturity to be able to retain two different but related concepts in your head at the same time. For instance, taxes should not be raised on the majority of working Americans while the economy is in this very difficult situation. But a little more can reasonably be paid by those who are extremely well off.

□ 1010

The simple fact is that our economy and our families cannot afford to take the economic hit that is poised to pull a hundred billion dollars out of the economy with the expiration of the 2 percent payroll tax holiday that's scheduled to expire this year.

There is currently a proposal that's being debated in the other body that I hope we'll have the opportunity to vote on here to be able to extend and expand the payroll tax cut and to pay for it.

Under this proposal, employees would receive a 50 percent additional cut in the payroll tax, cutting it essentially in half, and employers would have a reduction in the payroll tax that they pay on their employees up to the first \$5 million of payroll. This would help 98 percent of businesses but not give unnecessary giveaways to large and profitable organizations, and, most importantly, it would prevent the typical family from suffering a significant increase in their taxes while the economy is still fragile. This proposal

would give the average family \$1,500 a year extra to spend. You would think that people ought to be able to corollate those two concepts.

The way that this would be financed is a small surtax on not just rich, but superrich people. These are folks who make over a million dollars a year, and they would just pay the surtax on that amount that they earn over the million dollar threshold. It's far less than the 1 percent that we are hearing argued about. They would still pay lower Bush-era tax rates on the first million, and those that have extensive investment income, which most of them do, would still benefit from those lower rates.

Unfortunately, we find people here who are caught up in an ideology that trumps concern for the economy and the typical American family. It was this refusal to consider a balanced approach that is supported by the vast majority of the public that led to the collapse of the so-called supercommittee. Americans were and are ready for action that is bold, big, balanced and fair.

Now, we actually can start on the road of recovery just by going on autopilot. The default that is set up that will let the Bush-era tax cuts expire unless Congress does something and moving towards automatic sequestration will actually solve most of the deficit problem that we face just by doing nothing.

But we can do better than nothing. We can adjust. We can craft. We can focus it to get the most benefit. And we can start with a modest adjustment.

I hope my colleagues will not let the worship of the top one-tenth of a percent of the economic pyramid trump concerns for the rest of working families and the American economy.

#### HAMESH KHAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROOKS. Aslum Hamayun lives in Alabama's Fifth Congressional District. He is a father who loves and cares very much about his son, Hamesh Khan. At Mr. Hamayun's request, let me share with you and the American people the plight of Mr. Hamayun's son, Hamesh Khan.

Mr. Khan is an American citizen who, thanks to the Obama administration and the United States Government, has been wrongfully held for over a year and a half in Pakistan prisons without indictment for a specific crime or trial. This is Hamesh Khan's story.

Mr. Khan has lived in America since he was 10 years old. Mr. Khan earned a bachelor's and two master's degrees from Georgia Southern University. Following graduation, Mr. Khan worked for Citibank in Pakistan. In 2003, the Musharraf government appointed Mr. Khan to head Pakistan's Punjab Bank.

Unfortunately for Mr. Khan, the Musharraf government fell in April

2008. As seems to be so often the case in the world, a new government regime meant that appointees of the past regime risked trouble. In American citizen Hamesh Khan's case, the new Punjab government issued an arrest warrant on suspicion of corruption and corrupt practices. Let me emphasize that point, on suspicion of corruption and corrupt practices.

Fearing politically motivated reprisals, Mr. Khan fled Pakistan for his home, America. Thereafter, Pakistan sought extradition of Mr. Khan pursuant to the arrest warrant for suspicion of corruption and corrupt practices.

Let me be clear on this point. Three parties are involved in this tragedy: a new Pakistani regime; President Obama and the United States Government; and Hamesh Khan, an American citizen.

The United States had to decide whom to support: Pakistan or an American citizen. The Obama administration chose Pakistan over its own American citizen. Mr. Speaker, it would be wonderful to know why the Obama administration made that decision.

In any event, on December 10, 2009, Mr. Khan was arrested by United States marshals in his office in Washington, D.C., and held without bond for 5 months. Remarkably, persons in Mr. Khan's position are barred from fully defending themselves at extradition hearings. For example, Mr. Khan was barred from presenting evidence to impeach the allegations against him. Mr. Khan fought extradition until it became clear that the severe evidentiary limitations made it impossible for him to defend himself.

On May 13, 2010, the United States Government forcefully handed Mr. Khan over to Pakistani authorities at John F. Kennedy Airport in New York. Mr. Khan was bound in handcuffs and leg chains. With the Obama administration's historic act, Hamesh Khan became the first American citizen ever extradited to Pakistan. The one concession the United States State Department received from the new Pakistani regime was a promise that Mr. Khan would be fairly treated under Pakistani law.

While anyone hearing this story can suspect political motivations for the prosecution of Mr. Khan by Pakistani authorities, I am not in a position to make a judgment on that issue. But I am in a position to make a judgment about our United States Government and its responsibility to protect American citizens.

Whether he is innocent or guilty of the charges by Pakistani authorities, Hamesh Khan has not been served justice. Under Pakistani law, after arrest for suspicion, Pakistan's National Accountability Bureau can hold a person for up to 3 months without bail. Within that 3 months, Pakistan's National Accountability Bureau must either indict a held person for specific crimes for trial or order his release; yet it is now

over 18 months since Hamesh Khan became the first American citizen extradited to Pakistan, and for those 18 months, Mr. Khan has been held without bail, without indictment, and without trial. Mr. Khan lives in a 6-foot by 6-foot prison cell in Pakistan.

I pray the American State Department did not anticipate that Mr. Khan would be held indefinitely without indictment or trial when they forcibly bound and shackled an American citizen and gave him to Pakistan.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I enter this statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD: It is time for America's State Department to use whatever influence is necessary and proper to cause Pakistan to treat Mr. Khan in accordance with Pakistan's own law and with international treaty obligations.

Justice cannot be served an American citizen in any other way.

#### WHO SAYS GOVERNMENT CAN'T CREATE JOBS?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Who says, Mr. Speaker, that government can't create jobs? The greatest need of the American people today is jobs, but the question before them is this: Who is responsible and how should jobs be created?

Democrats, Republicans, and Independents, liberals, moderates, and conservatives all agree that the private sector is the primary source of jobs. However, with 9 percent official unemployment—the reality is it's much higher—and 25 million Americans either unemployed or underemployed, it's self-evident that the private sector has not supplied enough jobs and either can not or will not create enough full-time jobs today to employ the 25 million people who need them.

□ 1020

So what do we do? Throw our hands up and say, "Nothing can be done," Congress?

Democrats generally believe in "priming the pump," through deficit spending if necessary, to create jobs and stimulate the economy in order to put the overall economy back on track during these times when the private sector has obviously failed us. In the past, many Republicans have generally agreed; but this current Tea Party-Republican Party, all of whom have government jobs and employ government staffs, doesn't agree and generally argues that the government can't create jobs. Really?

President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, we are reminded by Michael Hiltzik in his new book "The New Deal: A Modern History," reveals a different truth, which is the source of the following information:

FDR was sworn into office on March 4, 1933. He came up with the idea himself of a Civilian Conservation Corps on

March 13, the first jobs program of the New Deal. He presented his idea to a White House aide, Raymond Moley, on March 14—an idea that he had just come up with the night before. The idea was to put platoons of young unemployed men to work in the forests and the national parks. That very afternoon, a memo and a skeleton bill went out to the four Secretaries who would be involved in implementing his CCC plan—Frances Perkins, Labor; Henry A. Wallace, Agriculture; Harold L. Ickes, Interior; and George H. Dern, War—the first interdisciplinary agency of the New Deal.

The next day, on March 15, the four Secretaries returned a joint response proposing a wider relief program, encompassing not only a Civilian Conservation Corps, but a public works program and a grants-in-aid to States and municipalities for relief. On March 21, FDR sent a message to Congress involving, among other things, his idea of a CCC. In his message, he observed "more important . . . than the material gains will be the moral and spiritual value of such work . . . We can take a vast army of these unemployed out to healthful surroundings."

Congress debated and passed the Civilian Conservation Corps program in 8 days, on March 29. By early April, the CCC was open for business. The first registrant was 19-year-old Fiore Rizzo of New York, who arrived on April 7 in a cab with three of his friends at an Army recruiting station in downtown Manhattan. Rizzo belonged to a family of 13, whose father had not worked in 3 years.

So how did these government-created jobs work out?

The average enrollee signed up at the age of 18½, stayed for 9 months—6 months was the minimum tour, 2 years the maximum—and gained up to 30 pounds during his term, thanks to three square meals a day served up by the Army quartermasters as fuel for daily labor.

The program ramped up quickly. By July, there were 1,300 camps housing 275,000 enrollees, already working vigorously on projects that would rank among the most notable legacies of the New Deal. Before the CCC ended and with the coming of war mobilization in 1942, the CCC built 125,000 miles of roads, 46,000 bridges, more than 300,000 dams to check erosion, planted more than 3 billion trees, and strung 89,000 miles of telephone wire.

The camps instilled in many of these young men the concept of an American identity. No doubt the comradeship was fostered by a shared resentment of the camps' martial regimen, the rising with the bugler's call, the mandate to keep their bunks and footlockers in order, and the heeding of senior officers without discussion. Mr. Speaker, I can only imagine that, today, these Army quartermasters would demand that our young men pull up their pants. The Army, too, found the experience valuable. As War Secretary George Dern

confided to Frances Perkins a year into the program, his officer corps had had to learn "to govern men by leadership, explanation and diplomacy rather than discipline. The knowledge is priceless."

The CCC would serve as a model for national service programs of a later era, such as the Peace Corps, AmeriCorps and VISTA.

"There was pride in the work," one former boy still recalls 60 years later. "We built something, and I knew I helped . . . It was something you could take pride in, and there wasn't a lot of pride available in those days."

Among the New Deal programs, the CCC would inspire almost universal affection, even more so than Social Security.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government can create jobs.

#### RON SMITH, A VOICE OF REASON FOR MARYLAND AND AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) for 2 minutes.

Mr. BARTLETT. On November 18 Ron Smith, a respected and beloved Baltimore-area radio talk show host on WBAL, as well as a columnist for the Baltimore Sun, announced his retirement after 26 years because of his diagnosis of inoperable pancreatic cancer and impending death.

I ask all of my colleagues to join me, along with thousands of loyal listeners and readers who have expressed their deep appreciation and admiration for Ron Smith. Ron unflinchingly contributed a voice of reason with unmatched candor while providing a forum for civil and vigorous debate about politics and policy that is sorely needed everywhere in America.

I feel privileged to have been a guest a number of times on Ron's show on WBAL. It was always equally a pleasure and a challenge to meet Ron's high standards. Ron is a true conservative in the classical and historical meaning of the term. With equal enthusiasm and utmost respect, Ron asked tough questions of guests and callers and dissected the arguments of liberal elites, Democrats and Republicans, and others who call themselves conservative.

From a vast knowledge of both history and government, Ron Smith shared, and we in Maryland were most privileged to benefit from, his succinct and persuasive dialogue and dedication to liberty and reason.

Thank you, Ron. Godspeed.

#### STOP OUTSOURCING SECURITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) for 5 minutes.