

dictatorships overseas. A great man named Solzhenitsyn became the hero of so many of us when he exposed the Soviet Union's extensive gulag system. Is this really the kind of a United States we want to create in the name of fighting terrorism?

Some have argued that nothing in section 1021 explicitly mandates holding Americans without trial, but it employs vague language, radically expanding the detention authority to include anyone who has "substantially supported" certain terrorist groups or "associated forces." No one has defined what those terms mean. What is an "associated force"?

Sadly, too many of my colleagues are too willing to undermine our Constitution to support such outrageous legislation. One Senator even said about American citizens being picked up under this section of the NDAA, "When they say, 'I want my lawyer,' you tell them, 'Shut up. You don't get a lawyer.'" Is this acceptable in someone who has taken an oath to uphold the Constitution?

Mr. Speaker, of course I recognize how critical it is that we identify and apprehend those who are suspected of plotting attacks against Americans; but why do we have so little faith in our judicial system? Have we not tried in civilian court and won convictions of hundreds of individuals for terrorist or related activities? I fully support continuing to do so, but let us not abandon what is so unique and special about our system of government in the process.

I hope my colleagues will join my effort to overturn this shameful section, 1021, of the National Defense Authorization Act.

A NATION UNIFIED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Let me join with my colleagues to wish some of our distinguished Americans a happy birthday in this month, but more importantly, let me acknowledge and salute both Muhammad Ali and First Lady Michelle Obama in celebrating their birthdays this month.

I've listened to my colleagues speak about the question of job creation, and they're absolutely right. As Democrats, we've come back to do nothing but to ensure the passage of the payroll tax decrease for working Americans and, as well, to be able to provide for jobs for this country and our communities. My constituents have spoken loudly and clearly, so I have several points, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to make today. Some of them wind back to the culture and how we work together.

First of all, I'm hoping that as a member of the Judiciary Committee here in the House we'll have an opportunity to look seriously at the SOPA legislation and find a compromise. I've

worked on the issues of piracy from the time late-Chairman Henry Hyde served on that committee, and I am concerned about it. But in this new world of startups and technology that is beyond many times our comprehension, it is important to ensure that we do not falsely or inappropriately shut down sites or stop businesses from thriving. There must be a compromise. I am prepared to be at the table of discussion to save jobs.

The U.S. is losing high-tech jobs to Asia. In fact, the United States lost more than a quarter of its high-tech manufacturing jobs during the past decade as U.S.-based multinational companies placed a growing percentage of their R&D overseas. I am here to fight for that R&D to come back. I, frankly, believe those are the jobs of the 21st century and that it is time for us to fight for those jobs to come back.

Mr. Speaker, we can do many things together. That happens to be one, and I hope to encourage the high-tech industry and others to join me as we proceed with roundtable discussions to see how we can impact all of our communities, those communities that have unemployment at the highest levels. We know that there are jobs in the high-tech industry, not only in the famous Silicon Valley in California, but in places around the Nation. Houston, Texas, is looking with complete and great excitement at the potential of building our biotech and, of course, technology sectors more and more and more. Let's save those jobs.

I want to move to something that is quite contrary to what I've just mentioned, but the reason I started with something on which we could work together is because I'm concerned. In this element of political campaigns, this atmosphere, I have no challenge with the First Amendment and with those who are trying to encourage individuals to vote and to vote for them. But I rise today in the backdrop of the commemoration of Dr. King's birthday, which really speaks to all Americans' hearts.

No matter what your background, Dr. King spoke of peace, nonviolence, and harmony in this country. I love that. I am a product of that. I was educated by way of opportunities that had not been given to my parents. Yet we find candidates like Newt Gingrich who simply want to throw fuel on the fire of racial divide to develop sort of an explosiveness in this country that is unnecessary.

To suggest that President Obama is the "food stamp President" has underlying suggestions. To be able to say that the idea of substituting a New York janitor who makes \$37,000 and put a bunch of kids to work—the New York school district is predominantly minority, Latino and African American—is by its very words divisive and destructive. And to insinuate that poor communities and minority children have never seen people get up, go to work and work hard—come to my district

and see people getting up in the early morning hours, single parents working hard to create opportunities for their children.

Mr. Gingrich, I know you. You are better than that, and if not, America is better than that. I am incensed by your words.

Mr. PAUL, our colleague, another candidate who is running for President, has a series of newsletters that have already been appalling to those of us who cannot understand why racial divisiveness has to be at the core of Presidential politics. Now we understand that there is a comparison in these newsletters about 13-year-old African American boys: that they are wild and unmanageable. If you say that about our children, they will come to believe it.

I am literally appalled that our Presidential politics, Mr. Speaker, has to be grounded in racial divisiveness. Dr. King wants us as a Nation to be unified. I call upon the Presidential candidates to get out of the dungeon and to rise to your higher angels on behalf of the American people—speak of unity not divisiveness. Our troops fight for all of us, and for justice and equality for all.

JOBS FOR YOUNG AMERICANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, when I had the privilege of serving in this House for the first time in the 1980s, I joined with many of my colleagues in supporting the creation of the Martin Luther King, Junior holiday. I recall the time because we had twice before defeated the proposition based on fiscal concerns. I, in fact, had voted against it on one occasion and then had reflected further on it and thought that it perhaps was more important that we have a single holiday that celebrated the consensus that had been obtained on civil rights, the consensus in this country that we should take positive action to assure that all men and all women were recognized as being created equal and having opportunity in this society.

□ 1120

I thought this consensus on civil rights was embodied in the person of Dr. Martin Luther King and thought it was important for all Americans, young and old, to be able to reflect on that and to have a period of time for that reflection and that we could learn from the mistakes of the past and also the sacrifices of the past as we went forward.

Now, having said that, I must take exception to a characterization of the comments of one of our Presidential candidates, a former colleague and my friend, Newt Gingrich, when he was trying to make a very, very important point. Too often, those of us in government take credit for programs that