To list Stewart's numerous accomplishments only tells half the story. Stewart is a great man. He always had tremendous love for family, especially his late wife, Dorothy. Dorothy was not just Stewart's wife, she was his very best friend.

I have had the honor and privilege of calling Stewart a longtime friend and trusted advisor for many years. Our community has benefited greatly from his generosity and his goodwill. To put it simply, the Quad Cities is a better place to live because of Stewart Winstein.

I would like to join Stewart's son, Arthur, his stepson, Max, and all of his family and friends in wishing him a very happy 95th birthday.

THE FAIR TAX

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

Mr. INGLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to ask my colleagues that may be supporters of the Fair Tax whether we have got some parallel idea that we have been, that I have been talking about on this House floor for a while now.

In the Fair Tax, what happens is you reduce taxes, income taxes, payroll taxes, those sorts of things, and you impose a tax on consumption. And the very good idea behind that is that you want to tax the things that you don't necessarily want to incentivize, and you want to free up from taxation those things that you do want to incentivize.

So right now, under our current Tax Code, savings and investing, investments are treated shabbily in the Tax Code. Consumption is treated pretty well, because if you are a business, you can deduct those things. And so the idea is to turn that around. That's one of the good arguments for the Fair Tax.

Now, of course, the downside of the Fair Tax is that it comes with a pretty substantial increase in the price of goods sold if they are new goods because it's a substantial consumption tax, perhaps 23 percent. Of course, Fair Tax proponents immediately point out that that wouldn't be the actual total increase in the price of a good because the income tax assumptions would come out of the pricing of that product; and so the dollar candy bar wouldn't be a $1.23, it would be something less than a $1.23 because the candy bar company would not have to pay income taxes, nor would the sugar company and all the components. Good arguments.

So I am wondering if it's the same thing as what I've been talking about with a revenue-neutral carbon tax, the same kind of deal, that what we are doing here is we are switching what you tax, swapping out one tax for another.

So in the concept that I have been describing here in a series of Special Orders, what we would do is we would reduce taxes on payroll, and that's something we want more of, labor industry income, and we would impose a tax, essentially a consumption tax, on carbon dioxide.

□ 1945

The result would be that the things that would be incentivized would be payroll, which is again labor, industry work. The thing that would be disincentivized would be carbon emissions.

Now, the interesting thing is that it's sort of the son of fair tax, a much smaller impact than fair tax—what I'm talking about here when it comes to the dollar shock—because in the case of the fair tax, gasoline, presumably, would go up by a 23 percent sales tax. Natural gas would have a 23 percent sales tax. Electricity would have a 23 percent sales tax on it. Now, of course, some of that would be knocked down by the income tax assumptions coming out of the provisions of those products, but the result would be a switch in taxes in the fair taxes. It would be a big, old switch from income taxes and from those sorts of things—payroll tax—to a consumption tax. What I'm talking about is that it would be sort of a small version of that where you would take reduced payroll taxes and then would impose a tax on carbon dioxide, but the difference between the two is this:

In what I'm talking about, there would be an incentive to switch technologies, too. In the fair tax, you are talking about just hitting every new product sold with a 23 percent sales tax. In the case that I'm talking about, you would be just targeting one particular kind of product. The result would be that nuclear would be possible, that all kinds of new transportation fuels would be possible and that we would be breaking this addiction to oil, cleaning up the air and creating new jobs in this sort of son of fair tax, in this little, small version of a fair tax. That is the fair tax plus this very important technology shift.

That's what I'm after, Mr. Speaker, is that technology shift that can give us an expansion of this economy and be part of the means of our growing out of this recession. We did it in the '90s with the productivity we got out of the Internet and the PC. I think we can do it again now with energy. Energy security is our ticket out of this recession. Similar to the tech boom in the 1990s, this is our opportunity to grow the economy and to clean up the air, to create jobs and, by the way, to help balance the Federal budget, because that's what happened in the late '90s. The growth of the economy because of the productivity from the Internet and the PC gave us new revenues.

I think we can do the same thing in energy, but the start of it is getting the economics right, and if we do that, Mr. Speaker, I think we can help change the energy insecurity of the United States into energy security. It all starts with economics and with free enterprise making it happen.

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.)

U.S. STRATEGY IN AFGHANISTAN

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. Mr. Speaker, just last week, the House approved a $96.7 billion spending bill that provides funding for our military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. I joined many of my House colleagues in voting for this funding. Our men and women in uniform and troops in the field deserve the best training and equipment our Nation can provide.

While America's military personnel faithfully conduct their mission abroad, elected officials here in Washington should take seriously their responsibility to develop a viable, long-term strategy for these operations. I have always voiced my support for the United States military action to topple the Taliban in Afghanistan following the tragedy of September 11. Yet, nearly 8 years later, I am concerned that the United States has not articulated a clear strategy for victory or an end point to our efforts in that country.

Because of this concern, I join more than 70 Members of Congress in cosponsoring H.R. 2404, Congressman JIM MCGOVERN's legislation to require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to Congress outlining the exit strategy for the United States military forces in Afghanistan. Without focus and targeted objectives, adding more manpower to our efforts in Afghanistan could cause the United States to go the way of many great armies and leave our troops in never-ending, no-win situations.

Many world leaders have noted that military action in Afghanistan alone is not going to free us of terrorism. Colonel Douglas McGregor, a veteran of Vietnam, put it well when he recently wrote for the Armed Forces Journal: ''When national military strategy fails to answer the question of purpose, method and end state, military power becomes an engine of destruction, not just for its intended enemies but for its supporting society and economy, too.''

The United States continues to devote its blood and treasure in Afghanistan while the Afghan Government has yet to purge itself of many who are funneling support to the Taliban. Meanwhile, here at home, money and manpower are needed to address our Nation's serious economic concerns and to protect our citizens from the violence at our southern border with

Mexico where drug wars are growing more dangerous every day. Given the problem our Nation faces at home, we need to make wise decisions about how we spend our money and military resources abroad.

Andrew Basevich is a West Point graduate, a retired Army colonel, a Vietnam and Gulf War veteran, a professor, and a military historian. Mr. Speaker, he is also the father of a son who gave his life in Iraq in 2007. In an article he wrote for the American Conservative, titled ''To Die for a Mystique: The Lessons our Leaders didn't Learn from the Vietnam War,'' I quote Mr. Basevich: ''Americans today profess to 'support the troops,' but that support is a mile wide and an inch deep. It rarely translates into serious or sustained public concern about whether those same troops are being used wisely and well. With the long war already this Nation's second most expensive conflict, trailing only to World War II, and with the Federal Government projecting trillion-dollar deficits for years to come, how much can we afford, and where is the money coming from? The President who vows to 'change the way Washington works' has not yet exhibited the imagination needed to conceive of an alternative to the project that his predecessor began.''

Mr. Speaker, again, that is from the father of a son who died in 2007 for this country. It is essential that the President work with his military commanders and with the Congress to develop the best strategy for achieving our goals and for wrapping up our military commitment in Afghanistan. I hope that many of my colleagues in both parties will join me in cosponsoring Congressman MCGOVERN's legislation, H.R. 2404.

Before closing, I ask God to please bless our men and women in uniform. I ask God to please bless the families of our men and women in uniform. I ask God, in his loving arms, to hold the families who have given a child, a child who has died for freedom in Afghanistan and Iraq. I close three times by asking God: Please, please, please, God. Continue to bless America.

THE STEAMROLLER OF SOCIALISM

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this week, the Energy and Commerce Committee will take up a bill that will put a huge tax on every single family in America—rich, poor and in between. It's going to hurt the people who can afford this tax the least—the poor, the retirees who are on a limited income. It has been estimated that this tax is going to increase the tax burden on every single family by over $3,000. Most families in this country can't afford to pay an extra $3,000 in taxes. Not only that, it is going to raise the cost of every single good and service in America. Food is going to go up. Medicine is going to go up. Health care insurance is going to go up. Everything in this country will go up because it's an attack on the energy producers and on the energy consumers in America.

We have got to stop it. The American people need to understand what this is all about. It's not about cleaning up the environment. It's about creating more revenue for the Federal Government to grow a bigger Federal Government, a bigger socialistic government. We are taxing too much. We are spending too much. We are borrowing too much.

What this will do is it will steal our grandchildren's future. It is immoral. The people who are promoting this should be ashamed of themselves. We've got to stop it, and the American people need to stand up and say ''no'' to this tax-and-trade. I call it tax-and-cap. A lot of people on our side call it cap-and-tax. It's about taxing. It's about more revenue for the Federal Government. It's about just taking money from people who cannot afford to give money to the Federal Government. It's about promoting an agenda that FDR followed during the Great Depression that extended deep into the recession and depression during that time. That is exactly what I believe is going to happen to our economy if we go down this road.

We have a steamroller of socialism being driven by NANCY PELOSI and by HARRY REID, and it's being fueled by the administration and Barack Obama. The American people need to put a stop sign and speed bumps in the path of this steamroller. We see the federalization and the nationalization of the financial services industry. We see car dealerships being closed by this administration. That's unconstitutional. It has never been done in the history of this Nation, and we need to stop it.

We see this administration and the Congress wanting to socialize health care, making a Washington-based health care system that is going to take away patients' choices. It's going to increase the cost of all health care. It's going to destroy the quality of health care in America. We've got to stop it, and it's up to the American people to do so by contacting their Members of Congress and saying ''no.'' We have to develop a grassfire of grassroots support all over this country to say ''no'' to this steamroller of socialism.

Former U.S. Senator Everett Dirksen at one time said, when he feels the heat, he sees the light. The American people need to put the heat on Members of Congress in the House and the Senate and say ''no'' to a Washington-based health care system. Say ''yes'' to a patient-based health care system that the Republicans and, in fact, in our office are generating. We need to change the health care financing system, but it needs to be patient-based, not Washington-based. It needs to be based on choice by patients where decisions are made within the doctor-patient relationship, not made by some bureaucrat in Washington, DC.

So we have got to put a stop to this. We are stealing our children's future. We are going to destroy what this country was built upon. This country was built upon a free market system, and we are taking over the free market system here in Washington and are making it all socialized, all Washington-based. So it's up to the American people to say ''no.'' I encourage you to contact your Congressman, your Senator and say ''no'' to this cap-and-trade bill. Say ''no'' to socialized medicine and what is being promoted by the Democratic majority. Say ''no'' to this socialization of all of our market system.

We've got a picture of exactly where we're going. All we've got to do is look in Venezuela. We are going down the same track that Venezuela is going down. We see the end results, too. We've got a clear picture of that. All we have to do is look at East Berlin during the time that the wall was there under Communist rule. All we have to do is look at Cuba today, and we see where this country is headed if we don't put a stop to it.

It's up to the American people. So please, folks out there, say ''no'' to this steamroller of socialism and ''yes'' to a free market solution to all of these problems so that we can build a stronger economy. We have to leave dollars in the hands of small businesses to create jobs and to buy inventory. That's what, as Republicans, we are proposing. So, please, American people. Say ''no'' to this steamroller of socialism.

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

(Mr. MCHENRY 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 Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana 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.)

CBC FOCUS ON HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE) is recognized for 60