only a boon for our community but for our Nation.

Just this month, FIU received an $11 million grant benefiting the south Florida community and transportation. It was also featured on NBC's Today show as they began operating the Aquarius Reef Base. I believe in the future of FIU and have no doubt that it will continue to build on its past achievements in order to reach greater heights. In closing, I would like to thank all Hispanic-Serving Institutions across the Nation.

EVENTS OF THE WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, today was a big day for the people of the United States of America. Some of us had tried to warn our friends across the aisle that back 3½ years ago, when ObamaCare was being passed, that there would be dire consequences. It would not just hurt the economy but it would hurt people's health.

We were assured, No, we've got to do this bill that most people hadn't read. A precious few had read. I had read it. Some said, we have to pass it so we can find out what was in it, which was diametrically opposed to what the Founders wanted to see done. Though Thomas Jefferson was not at the Constitutional Convention, he did write later that he approved of the work. But if he had one thing that he could add, it would be the requirement that no bill could be passed until it had been on file for a year.

If ObamaCare had been on file for a year, I really don't have any question that it would never have passed. Because whether Members of Congress read it or not, people across America would have read it and would have found out what was in it, would have realized that if they like their insurance policy, they are likely going to lose it. If they like their doctor, they are likely going to lose their doctor. People would have figured out that the consequences that are now being borne out would be coming down the road.

There were union leaders that just couldn't rush fast enough down to the White House to express their support for a bill that they clearly did not read. They relied on representations that turned out to be totally untrue. But we were trying to get across to union leaders, to Americans that this is a bad bill for union members. If they like their insurance—which most did—they would not likely keep it.

We were told, This has to be done for the 30 million or so that don't have any insurance. And now today, we see people losing their insurance right and left that they liked, losing doctors they liked.

A doctor in my hometown had told me about having done a surgery just recently. He helped a woman, and he said, you know, it was one of the best jobs I have ever done. Just a tiny minimal loss of blood. It was done in 61 minutes. They have to keep track of those things. And because of his many years of experience, it paid off, and a patient got great help.

But because so many parts of ObamaCare have been going into place, he got a call the very next day from a Federal bureaucrat who called from clear across the country to tell him that he was reviewing the information about the surgery the day before and that the average time for that surgery was around 3 hours and that, you know, 61 minutes was just way too fast, that he was way below the average. And normally, they lose three pints of blood, and he didn't hardly lose any. Therefore, they were going to have to dramatically dock the compensation only down to about 40 percent. He was told how he could change the record and get full compensation. But this is an honest and honorable doctor, and he was not about to do that. But what it did result in is, he has given his notice. He is giving up his practice. And because of the government's heavy-handedness, after this year, patients will not be having the benefit of his incredible experience, expertise, and training because this is where government control of health care goes.

You run off doctors who care more about their patients than they do the government. And they're not going to stand for this kind of intrusion by some bureaucrat that didn't have any idea what good surgery was, telling him he couldn't be compensated because he did what, in effect, was too good of a job.

These stories are being born out across the country. When the government starts taking over health care more and more, it is a disaster. And, of course, the government gets to know everyone's most personal secrets of their own physical body.

I would have thought that over the years, since Roe V. Wade and so many friends across the aisle were screaming about privacy rights, that surely, they would not want either Democratic or Republican bureaucrats or elected officials knowing every detail of their private bedroom lives. And now we find that Democrats, without a single Republican vote, passed a bill that is going to give the Federal Government full power to know every detail of what goes on in someone's bedroom. I mean, I would have thought that this was something that Republicans and Democrats could have come together on. I'm greatly appreciative of the Democrats that voted with us today. And I know there's one reason they would have voted with us today, and that is that they have been home.

I love August because most of the people here spend that time as they should. And they hear from people in their districts and across the country, letting them know what's a proper thing to do and what's not a proper thing to do. And who's suffering for what decisions of Congress.

I love it when we come back in September, and Members of Congress have been hearing from people across the country, especially in their districts. It's a great thing. It seems like we get a lot more things done that really are good for America. And today was one of those things. Every Republican standing together and some Democrats because everyone who voted for this continuing resolution—they had stuff in there I was not in favor of. But to bring help to the American people who are already hearing—we've had personal stories about people being told, well, that after the first of the year they're not going to be able to get their pacemaker, they're not going to be able to get the medical device they needed, they're not going to be able to get the back surgery they need. They're already hearing these things from health care providers that because of ObamaCare kicking in the first of the year, they will no longer be able because they're just too old. So we're going to throw them out to pasture and not let them have the health care they need for a good quality of life and for the long life that they should be entitled to. This was a good vote today. And I appreciate our Republican leaders for managing things to the point where we can be here today and do that.

Now, if the Senators just straight down that hall, if the Senators at the other end of the hall had to go back and listen to town halls and had to listen to their constituents the way Members of the House do, then there's no question in my mind they would have been rushing down here to work with us to say, How can we stop this disaster that is creating so much harm to people's health across America that it's only just going to multiply exponentially come January?

But because of the 17th Amendment and because State legislatures no longer select the Senators, as the Founders had established, Senators get elected at large. And there's a lot of benefit to having people accountable to all the voters in the State. But there was also benefit when the State legislatures selected the Senators because that was the Founders' check and balance to make sure Senators did not just totally take away the powers that the Constitution gave to the States and the people under the 10th Amendment.

Everything that is not specifically enumerated as a Federal power or prohibited to the States and the people was reserved to the States and the people under the 10th Amendment. That meant that before the Federal Government started getting its heavyhanded hands all over education, that local governments and local school boards could make decisions on what their schools needed.

But Congress got involved. We had set up a multibillion dollar department

to start sucking off money that could be going for students across America to fund bureaucrats and bigger, nicer buildings and offices and more and more cubicles for bureaucrats so that we would spend more money on bureaucrats that we used to spend on the students.

□ 1245

And it also meant that school boards across the country would have to spend more and more money on bureaucrats and administrators, other people in the school system that were not actually involved in teaching.

Madam Speaker, I would challenge people to go look at their own school board and get a report from their own school board. What percentage of our school districts' employees, in 1978, before the Department of Education really kicked in, what percentage of our school districts' employees were teachers that worked directly with the students? And what is that number now? Because the numbers I've seen seem to indicate most school districts have ended up now about half of their employees are actually helping the students.

This is what happens when government bureaucrats get involved. This is what happens when the Federal Government ceases to be the referee that they were designed to be, and, like, in health care, they become a player, they become the coach and the referee, all three.

We have a bad enough problem when we're just trying to referee; but when the Federal Government becomes the coach and the player and the referee, especially in the area of health care, it means less care for individuals.

Like ObamaCare. Oh, it was going to mean a lot more jobs, if you want to work for the IRS and go after people's personal lives and their insurance. And it's bad enough when they come after you demanding more tax money, but now they were going to come after you for your health care. That's the last thing we need.

Hiring all—millions and millions of dollars for navigators. They weren't going to provide one iota of health care for anyone. And I'm not sure they even were required to graduate from high school.

And all of that money that could be spent on health care will now be, if we do not, if the Senate does not agree, if they hold this good bill up, if the Senate shuts down the government, which I hope and pray they won't, but all of this money will end up going for bureaucrats instead of going for health care, as it could be going.

So it's a big day for the people of America who have already been told that come January 1 they will not get the health care they need. It's a big day for those who've been being told this year that their health insurance costs are going to skyrocket because of ObamaCare.

Some States like New York, apparently, theirs were so high they might come down a little bit, but most Americans were going to see, or are seeing, their health care costs skyrocket.

We have had reforms in the Republican Party; and those who say otherwise are either totally ignorant, intentionally so, or they're lying, because the Republicans have many great policies.

And most of us actually thought President Obama had a good idea when he said, let's see this debated about health care. Even on CNN. Let's get it out there, where the American people can see who is for what.

Well, the President didn't live up to that because if he had, they would have seen union leaders not helping their union members. They would have seen the big pharmaceuticals getting a special deal in there. They would have seen plaintiffs' lawyers getting special treatment.

They would have seen AARP getting special treatment, though their members were going to get hurt. They would have seen all these special deals from the groups that stood with the President on this health care bill.

And I have a feeling the President would not—feel pretty strongly he would never have won a second term if the American people had seen all the negotiations that were involved in passing this disaster or, as one Democrat called it, train wreck, Democratic Senator.

It is a train wreck. But the trouble is it is an ongoing train wreck that will continue to hurt passengers who were put into this ObamaCare system for many years to come.

And that's not even talking about the economy, those who have gone from full-time to part-time, those who have lost their health insurance when they had very good health insurance. Employers that I've heard from have said, we are so upset. Under ObamaCare, we cannot afford to keep insurance.

One owner had said, Look, I've always paid 100 percent of my employees' health insurance. And now, because of ObamaCare, this bill that Congress forced on us is making me stop. So I'll give them, you know, an allowance; but because of the way costs have gone up, it may not cover things.

That's playing out across the country. People are not hiring people as they should. They're not sure how much they're going to be out of pocket because of ObamaCare.

So there are plenty of alternatives. I had a bill that I think was, like, 28 pages, that Newt Gingrich sent some folks, experts to sit down with me and brainstorm, put together good ideas. MIKE BURGESS, TOM PRICE, there's lots of great health care ideas. And I think that if the American people could see us do what the President promised, and debate that, where they can see, we've got lots of great alternatives.

But one of them that needs to be in every bill, whatever ends up being the law, if we can totally get this repealed, we need to have truth in the cost of health care so that when someone asks a hospital administrator, what does a room cost for one night, single room, one bed, they can actually tell you without saying, well, it depends. Is it Medicare or Medicaid, Blue Cross? What insurance?

Or if it's cash, there ought to be a price; it ought to be posted. People ought to know what it is because if people could pay the actual price that a lot of insurance pay, they wouldn't want the insurance getting between them and the doctor and telling them what procedure and what doctor, or the government getting between them.

If they could pay what Medicare pays, then a lot of people would have the money to do it themselves.

But people get a bill, like I did for my daughter, $12,000 for two MRIs. Well, it didn't cost but a matter of hundreds of dollars, not $12,000.

There ought to be truth in advertising in the cost of health care, just like ophthalmologists do now on LASIK surgery. That's why the price kept coming down.

And there were times when my parents say, we're going to another doctor here in our small town, said the other one went up on price. I remember being told specifically: and this doctor's as good as that one.

When was the last time anybody changed doctors because the doctor was costing too much?

Nobody knows what doctors are costing, and that needs to be part of the reform. And ObamaCare does not even touch that issue. It just gets a heavy-handed government between patients and their doctors. And I want to see the day when patients and doctors make their decisions, not the government, not insurance companies. And we could do that with some of our proposals.

So I know there are people that know I've not cheered my leadership very often. But today was a big day. Today was an important day, not for Republicans, not for Democrats, but for the people of America who have already been finding out how much damage ObamaCare is doing.

And, hopefully, Senators down the Hall will—now that it's headed down to the Senate—now Senators will start hearing and having to listen to Americans who are suffering health-wise, health care-wise, and economically because of that terrible bill.

It is also an important week. A number of things have happened.

Oh, and there's an article here, ''Home Depot Alters Insurance for Part-timers.'' A lot of people have gone from full-time to part-time so they wouldn't have to be—the employers would not have to pay the heavy-handed ObamaCare insurance costs. Home Depot. There are just so many of these stories.

Let's see. There's a report posted by Rob Bluey on September 18, front page, ObamaCare. This says, here's a sampling of where America stands on

ObamaCare: 68 percent are concerned about the impact of their personal health care under ObamaCare; 57 percent oppose ObamaCare; 52 percent believe ObamaCare will result in their health care costs increasing.

And from people I've talked to, they don't just believe it. They've already seen it start to have that effect; 51 percent want Congress to cut funding for ObamaCare.

As it says here, labor unions have sought relief from it. Democrats have called it a train wreck, and the Washington political class is getting exemptions or special treatment.

Well, if we can't get it repealed, everybody ought to be under it, including the President, whose name is normally used to identify the bill.

Another thing happened this week, in the last week, that was certainly worth noting, and that was the sentencing of a criminal defendant who went in to the Family Research Center and began to shoot. There's an article here from WND, there's a quote, has a quote:

> There's a paradigm shift in America where if you are an outspoken, open Christian, you are now being labeled as not only a hatemonger, but also a potential threat to U.S. security.

And that was a quote from retired General Jerry Boykin with the FRC. He was, in part, referring to documents influenced by the Southern Poverty Law Center, or SPLC, that identified the Founding Fathers as the kind of radicals that we should be watching out for today.

So it is rather amazing that the very Constitution that we celebrate this week was founded by people who are now being called extremists. The most free country in the world now has people calling the Founders, those who gave us our Constitution, as being radical extremists that need to be stopped. The irony is actually sickening.

The article goes on, though, talking about Boykin. He was, in part, referring to documents by the Southern Poverty Law Center. Boykin's full list of accomplishments in service to his country is too long to detail, but it includes serving as an original member of the U.S. Army's Delta Force, commanding all the Army's Green Berets, and doing stints at the CIA and as deputy Under Secretary of Intelligence at the Department of Defense.

And now he's found himself facing an adversary here in his homeland, one that is also capable of bloodshed, and that is the radical left.

Boykin is the executive vice president of the Family Research Council, or FRC, which is dedicated to ''a culture in which human life is valued, families flourish, and religious liberty thrives'' and seeks to ''advance faith, family and freedom in public policy and the culture from a Christian world view.''

On August 15, 2012, heavily armed homosexual activist, Floyd Lee Corkins, II walked into Washington offices of the FRC and began shooting with the intention of killing ''as many people as I could.'' Corkins admitted he picked the FRC offices that are here in Washington because the organization was listed as an ''anti-gay'' hate group by the SPLC on its Web site.

The article says, Corkins, a former volunteer at an LGBT community center, pleaded guilty to terrorism and will learn his fate Thursday when he will be sentenced in Federal Court in Washington, D.C.

We now know he was sentenced to 25 years.

Boykin said:

> I think the SPLC should be taken to task by the media and public opinion for the reckless nature of what they're doing.

□ 1300

Personally, I think it's worth noting that the Southern Poverty Law Center arose out of racial hatred and bigotry, those things that were addressed by Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., a true American hero, who advocated for peace, who advocated for love of Christ Jesus, as an ordained Christian minister. That was the way to win the day.

And now, all these years later after the death of that great American hero, Martin Luther King, they've somehow morphed into an organization that is so busy calling other people and groups hateful, they don't see all of the hate that they are spreading and spewing around this country.

Back to the article:

> The general called the map capricious and noted it had no definition of a hate group.

It's talking about a hate map that the SPLC had created.

> More importantly, we think what they're doing is absolutely reckless, particularly given they put us in the same category as groups like the Ku Klux Klan and the skinheads.
>
> Pressure has to be put on the SPLC to stop this because, Boykin said, ''It is reckless behavior that has, at least in this case, incited someone to want to kill people who don't believe what they believe and stand for.''

People may remember that he came in to the FRC and he had sacks of Chick-fil-A sandwiches, which was also to be considered hateful by the SPLC.

I think it's worth noting that if you go back to the 1964 speech by a man who was considered to be an extremely liberal Democrat, Hubert Humphrey, you go back to 1960 speeches by a man that some considered to be very liberal, John F. Kennedy, and you will find that they talked about the home and the parents and a mother and father and a good home and how we ought to be nurturing homes.

Humphrey's speech was really rather amazing to the 1964 Democratic Convention. Though he was considered a liberal, he made very clear that we were doing great damage as we break down the traditional family home. I wonder how he'd be labeled today by the SPLC for the speech he gave in 1964.

But the article says:

> Corkins managed to shoot and injure just one person, thanks to the heroics of building manager Leo Johnson, who stopped the attack. A video shows Corkins entered the building and approached Johnson, then leaned over to place his backpack on the floor. When he straightened up, Corkins pointed a semiautomatic handgun directly at Johnson and fired. Despite being wounded in the arm, Johnson was able to subdue Corkins after a brief struggle. Boykin said, ''Leo is doing very well after a series of surgeries, and in over a year of recovery time, he is doing very, very well.''

Anyway, it points out:

> The general is also a pastor and wanted to emphasize, ''It's important to remember that, regardless of where America is today, the original roots of America were founded in Judeo-Christian beliefs.'' He observed the Declaration of Independence was signed by men of Christian faith, but today, the vestiges of that heritage are being squeezed out of our society.
>
> People who cling to those values are being forced to go underground for fear of being ridiculed, for fear of even being attacked and maybe even killed, as was evidenced here. It's a sad commentary on the state of our society.

It is a sad commentary on our society. We were founded on Judeo-Christian values.

Look at the speeches that were given during the Constitutional Convention. The fact that the Constitution itself was dated in the year of our Lord, 1787, I wonder what Lord they were talking about. The Founders knew. They knew.

Hopefully, we can get back to the place where, though people in America may practice whatever religion or no religion they believe or want to, the values are those that we were founded on.

It was amazing to me how in the first draft of the Declaration of Independence Thomas Jefferson could put one of the longest grievances listed as talking about slavery and condemning King George forever in allowing it in America. They knew it was wrong. The values they had, they knew slavery was wrong; but out of convenience, it was allowed. And it did such great damage to this country because it damaged people that were in it.

And the great speeches of John Quincy Adams just down the hall after he ran for the House of Representatives and got elected after he was President. He was the only person to ever be a Representative after he was President. But he wanted to end slavery, and he believed that was what God was calling him to do and what God wanted America to do.

That's what Abraham Lincoln believed. He believed, by 1860, God had called him to bring an end to slavery. And he was influenced by the speeches down the hall by John Quincy Adams. And it has been an honor for me to be in the church and worship God in the church where an incredible human being worshipped, came close to God, named Frederick Douglass, who had such a profound effect on Abraham Lincoln, as well, and made a material change in this country for the better.

It is amazing that with all the hatred that's being spewed toward Christians,

I'm shocked that in my lifetime that we have seen the lessons of anti-Semitism and the hatred toward Jews start coming back, even in this country. When I read about what happened in the concentration camps during World War II, I couldn't believe it. And I just knew we would never allow that kind of hatred to raise its ugly head again. And yet not only in some hate-filled countries in the Middle East is it resurfacing, it's resurfacing here in America.

There were five of us Republicans in the House that signed letters to five different Departments. We set out facts in those letters. We said:

> There's indications that there was Muslim Brotherhood influence within your Department or Agency. Since your job is to investigate issues in your Agency or Department, we would ask you to investigate the extent of Muslim Brotherhood influence in your Department.

One such letter was sent to the Department of Homeland Security. One was sent to the Department of State. Even Senator MCCAIN got all up in arms. It was obvious he'd not even read the letter before he started condemning those that signed it. So I hope that at some point he'll read our letters.

Then we hear in the news this week, stories from the Washington Times and Washington Free Beacon written by Adam Kredo, dated September 18:

> A senior Muslim Brotherhood official, who until recently had been employed by the William J. Clinton Foundation, was arrested in Cairo on Tuesday and charged with inciting violence. Gehad el-Haddad served as one of the Muslim Brotherhood's top communications officials until Egyptian security forces seized him as part of a wider crackdown on officials loyal to ousted former President Mohamed Morsi.
>
> Before emerging as a top Brotherhood official and adviser to Morsi, el-Haddad served for 5 years as a top official at the Clinton Foundation, a nonprofit group founded by former President Bill Clinton.

This article goes on to say:

> El-Haddad gained a reputation for pushing the Muslim Brotherhood's Islamist agenda in the foreign press, where he was often quoted defending the Brotherhood's crackdown on civil liberties in Egypt. He was raised in a family of prominent Muslim Brotherhood supporters and became the public face of the Islamist organization soon after leaving his post at the Clinton Foundation. However, much of his official work with the Brotherhood took place while he was still claiming to be employed by the Clinton Foundation.

The article goes on to say:

> El-Haddad's arrest sparked outrage among Brotherhood supporters, scores of whom have taken to the streets to protest in the weeks since Morsi was removed from office and seized by the Egyptian military.

I want to inject in here that, as the article points out, it was scores—a score being 20 people—scores of people came to the streets. As I and some of my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, were in the Middle East in the last few weeks, I was surprised to keep seeing on CNN talk about the thousands of Morsi supporters and Muslim Brotherhood supporters who had come to the streets and, according to CNN, just want their country back. But they kept failing to report about the glorious stand that millions and millions and millions and millions of Egyptians took to get their country back because they did not want radical Islam running Egypt.

And as even some of our own officials privately said, we're not exactly sure how many millions of Egyptians came to the streets to protest Morsi and demand his ouster, but it was certainly millions more than the 13 million he claimed had voted for him.

This was not a coup, and those across America that only listen or watch the mainstream media, like the newspaper editor in Henderson, Texas, they don't know. They thought that was a coup because they haven't had the benefit of watching and getting information from the reality of what has happened in Egypt, because this was not a coup.

They can talk to the Coptic Christian Pope of Egypt in Cairo, as I have, and have him explain that, Look, I am a Christian, and I am telling you I was part of the demonstration. I was gratified to have so many moderate Muslims join hands figuratively and literally with us and with me and say we don't want radical Islam running Egypt. This President has violated our constitution repeatedly. He's making life horrible for people of Christian or Jewish or moderate Muslim faith, and we want him out. And the Egyptian Pope will tell you this was not a coup. This was millions more Egyptians rising up and saying very clearly, Morsi has to go.

I didn't know until I did my own research and consulted the experts that even though the United States gave advice to Egypt about their constitution, we did not emphasize the importance of having an impeachment process to have an orderly government.

So Egypt's constitution that Morsi was continuing to violate, according to the masses, the millions of people there, had no provision to remove him. They had no choice except to move out in peace, as they did, and demand Morsi's removal.

The violence, when you get down to accurate reporting, has been stirred by the Muslim Brotherhood. And just as CNN reported, they want their country back. And they're willing to burn churches, to kill Christians, to tell Christians to either repent and give up your belief in Christ or we will cut your head off and be proud of it and show the video. You either repent and repudiate Christianity or we'll kill you.

They burned churches. They killed Christians. They killed moderate Muslims. I think it's to the military's credit, they heard the millions more Egyptians who rose up than Morsi claimed voted for him and demanded the ouster since there was no impeachment mechanism, and now they have an interim government with a roadmap toward having a fair election. But they're not going to let the radical Islamists take over that country.

□ 1315

We need to be applauding that because they know, when they stand up to radical Islamists—just like other places in the world—it means death to some of them. Because radical Islamists believe they get virgins, they get paradise if they kill what they think are infidels in the process of pursuing their goal.

Thomas Jefferson could not believe that there was a religion in the world anywhere, as well read as he was, that believed you could get to paradise by killing innocent people—and especially not innocent women and children for heaven's sake. So he got his own version of the Koran, an English translation.

Thank God most Muslims do not believe in the radicalized Islam, but it's time to recognize this is a threat. The Muslim Brotherhood around the world wants to build toward one thing, and that is a permanent global caliphate where all of us either repudiate our faith, or lack of faith, and become radical Islamists like they are. We cannot allow that to happen.

Our five letters that our group of five in the House wrote were pretty benign, actually, pointing out that, look, there is influence, let's find out what the influence is.

I might also mention from the article here that I was quoting from that El-Haddad, who was arrested as the radical Muslim Brotherhood spokesman in Egypt, he left the Clinton Foundation in August of 2012, 2 months after Morsi assumed the Egyptian Presidency. But it says:

> The Clinton Climate Initiative taught Haddad about managing an NGO and the role that civil society takes between the state and private sector, lessons he is applying to the Renaissance Project.

But Haddad had told the Independent that he applied the knowledge he learned at the Clinton Foundation to his work for the Renaissance Project—the Muslim Brothers:

> He was appointed a ''senior adviser and media spokesman'' to the Muslim Brotherhood in January 2013 and served in that role until his arrest. He regularly defended the Brotherhood's authoritarian crackdown on civil society, even running damage control in December 2012 when Morsi supporters attacked women and children.

That's the kind of outrage that the people of Egypt stood up against. The article says also:

> When widespread democratic protests broke out on June 30, El-Haddad referred to the demonstrators as violent thugs in an interview with the Free Beacon.

Nobody I know knows for sure—it would be the Clinton Foundation, the Clinton family, somebody knows—who hired this Muslim Brotherhood advocate to work for the Clinton Foundation and allowed him to continue his work for the Muslim Brotherhood while he was working for the Clinton Foundation.

We know that a man named Al-Amoudi helped with some of the Muslim hirings and placement in the Clinton administration. But we haven't been able to find out who it was that placed Huma Weiner, or Huma Abedin Weiner, in the position with then-First Lady Hillary Clinton to become her close advisor over the years, especially when she became Secretary of State. Of course we also know that Ms. Abedin Weiner was part of a Journal that was founded and run by a guy that Osama bin Laden said had a material effect on him being radicalized.

So it's interesting. There's a lot of questions here about how much influence the Muslim Brotherhood had. In fact, how could this administration end up being so supportive of a Muslim Brotherhood member who said, well, he gave up his Muslim Brotherhood membership. Well, the Muslim Brotherhood makes clear, you don't have to have a card to be part of the Muslim Brotherhood, you just have to believe what they do, and clearly Morsi did. And he violated the constitution routinely, according to widespread reports.

So the 13 million he said voted for him, there are allegations of fraud, but that was clearly overshadowed by the millions and millions more in the largest demonstrations in the history of the world as the Egyptian people rose up and said, we don't have an impeachment provision in our constitution, so all we can do when a radical like Morsi takes over our country then is demand the military have him step down until we can elect a truly democratic leader who will follow the constitution.

I know there were friends who told me, we think Morsi is a really good guy because he's really actually going to bring peace; he's helping bring peace in the Sinai. But when you actually go over there and do your own research, you find out that now the Sinai has been more weaponized with real military weapons than just about anyplace on Earth. And it is a major threat to Israel. So those who thought maybe he's a real help to Israel, they have no idea.

In meeting with General Al-Sissi, he makes clear, I don't want to be president. I'll step down from the military. But the people of Egypt made clear to us in the military they want a democracy, and this man totally violated the constitution. When I asked him point blank—since I had heard from a former CIA agent that he said he knew that Morsi had been trying to contract to have a hit placed on General Al-Sissi—I asked him directly if he had evidence of Morsi trying to have him killed as head of the military, he dodged the question, but finally admitted, yes, they had evidence of Morsi trying to have Al-Sissi killed.

I mean, if we had a President—and thank God we don't have a President like this—who was trying to have other members of the government, including at the Pentagon, having them knocked off, we wouldn't stand for that. Well, the people of Egypt, they didn't even know about the contract he was trying to take out—according to what these people who say they have knowledge, what they say—but they knew that they had a president who was acting outside the constitution, and he had to go.

I want to go back to the influence that some of us are aware that the Muslim Brotherhood has on this administration. And we can say that because we know in the Holy Land Foundation trial in U.S. District Court, ample evidence was produced to show that CAIR, the Council of American Islamic Relations, and ISNA, the Islamic Society of North America, were two of the largest front organizations for the Muslim Brotherhood. When CAIR and ISNA, these groups tried to have their name removed as, not indicted, but as named co-conspirators to support terrorism, the District Court said no, there's plenty of evidence there to support your staying a named co-conspirator. So they appealed it to the Fifth Circuit. The U.S. Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals made clear the evidence is quite profound: Yes, these guys are front groups for the Muslim Brotherhood.

We know CAIR has had all kinds of influence in this administration. But when I was questioning Secretary Napolitano on October 26, 2011, I asked her about this. I was asking her if she was familiar with a man named Elibiary from Texas—nice guy, I've met him. I said:

''But let me ask you, Mohamed Elibiary is—was a member of the working group''—talking about the Countering Violent Extremism Working Group. ''You promoted him, and it said there—I've got articles here that say you swore him in as a member now of your, let's see, the Homeland Security Advisory Group. He's apparently been given a secret clearance. Do you know Mr. Elibiary?'' Secretary Napolitano said yes.

Further in the question I said:

''This is critical: Secretary, were you aware that a week ago today, from his home computer, he accessed the SLIC database''—a classified database—''got information off and has been shopping a story to national media on Islamophobia directed by the Governor of Texas and the security folks there in Texas? Were you aware of that?'' She said no.

I said: ''I'm telling you it happened. Do we need to appoint somebody, or will you have that investigated yourself, and if so, by whom?''

''Well, since I don't know the facts,'' she said, ''I'll have to look into the facts.''

I said: ''So you'll be the one to make that call?''

She said: ''We'll have somebody, and it'll be myself or someone.''

On July 20, 2012, I asked the same person, Secretary Napolitano, about the same thing, and she said:

''I found out that the statements that have been made in that regard''—talking about him accessing the classified database—''are false. They are misleading, and objectionable. And I think they are wrong.''

I went on and I said: ''But are you saying before this Congress, right now, as Secretary of Homeland Security, that it is a lie that Mohamed Elibiary downloaded material from a classified Web site using the secret security clearance you gave him? Are you saying that's a lie?''

She said: ''I'm saying that isn't accurate. That is correct.''

I went on down and said: ''So you're saying that the State and local intelligence community of interest database is not classified?

She said: ''I'm saying that he, as far as I know, did not download classified documents.''

That's all real interesting. Oh, and I asked her if Elibiary's status on the Homeland Security Advisory Council had changed. She said no.

I said: ''And this administration seems to have a hard time recognizing members of terrorist groups who are allowed into the White House—you're aware of that happening, aren't you?''

She said: ''Absolutely not.''

And by the time she testified before the Senate, not long after that, she had found out that they had allowed a member of a known terrorist organization to go into the White House. So these are the kind of things that give us great concern.

It's my understanding that not only has Mr. Elibiary still been there, but he has had his security still there—it may have been increased, I'm not sure—but is now even more important as an advisor.

Then we got this from Judicial Watch. Judicial Watch had made a demand to know about the investigation into Mr. Elibiary. And the response back from the U.S. Department of Homeland Security—now that Secretary Napolitano is no longer there—and I am quoting from their letter to Sean Dunagan from Judicial Watch, September 16:

> We conducted a comprehensive search of files within DHS Enterprise Correspondence Tracking System for records that would be responsive to your request. Unfortunately, we were unable to locate or identify any responsive records.

They have no records of any investigation into the facts that were presented before Secretary Napolitano.

I talked to the head of the Department of Public Safety, Steven McCraw, in Texas before I asked our questions. He had told me that, even though she said the next day she didn't know anything about that episode of him allegedly downloading documents from a classified source, and Steve McCraw said I just talked to her chief of staff since you and I last talked. He said he had totally briefed the Secretary on the situation with Elibiary. She was fully aware of it. Then she came in and testified before us the next day she didn't know anything about it.

Then she had the nerve to say it never happened. Yet there was one reporter, Patrick Poole, that did an article about it happening. He had the source in the mainstream media who had told him about Elibiary shopping those documents to him. And it was a fact. They knew exactly where Elibiary accessed the classified database, they knew what computer he used. Yet Homeland Security, with the Secretary at the top, being totally unable to find what the Department of Public Safety knew and had found in Texas.

□ 1330

Mr. Speaker, we are in trouble when Homeland Security says they did an investigation and there's no documentation whatsoever of any investigation being done; and not only do they deal with the problem that was clearly a problem, they promote the individual.

It comes back to the letters—and I think we need answers again—that make clear that, yes, there is Muslim Brotherhood influence through this administration, and we need to know the extent.

We have also this week an executive summary of the FBI interactions with the Council on American Islamic Relations from their inspector general when he only looked into five specific incidences where the new policy—after it was proven that CARE was a Muslim Brotherhood front organization—where the FBI totally disregarded the new policy three out of the five times that they investigated—and that's only the five they investigated—and continued to have a chummy relationship with this Muslim Brotherhood front organization.

I have not yet reviewed the classified report; but, for example, October 2010, the New Haven FBI field office, the FBI office co-coordinated a diversity training workshop with a local Muslim organization, and two of the six trainers selected for this cultural sensitivity training were local CARE officials.

At some point, we have to learn that there are people who want to do away with our Constitution and do away with our form of government and substitute their own caliphate therefor. Some want to do it peacefully; some in the organization want to do it violently.

But it is an outrage for people who want to eliminate our Constitution and have their own sharia law to be allowed to be in the higher places in this government—at least that's what the Egyptians were reporting. For those news outlets that try to claim that by my reporting what happened in Egypt when the Egyptian people rose up by the millions and by showing the pictures of banners, like the one that had an American flag on one half with a green checkmark they like America and on the other side our President with a red X, they try to blame me for stirring up the Egyptian people.

I just want people in America to understand what is really going on; and, unfortunately, enough people have not gotten the picture. It is time to wake up, America. It is time to embrace the values that helped us get rid of slavery, that helped us become the greatest Nation in the world, in the history of the world, to re-embrace the values and to deal with anybody that wants to see those thrown asunder.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

MICHAEL SCAPARROTTI

(Mr. STIVERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a true American hero from Logan, Ohio, General Michael Scaparrotti, who is being promoted to a four star general today in a ceremony at Whipple Field Joint Base Myer in Henderson, Virginia. He is only the 223rd four star general in the history of the United States Army.

Prior to rising to the rank of general, General Scaparrotti has served as director of the joint staff at the Pentagon, second in command of U.S. forces in Afghanistan from July of 2011 to June of 2012, and he is now commander of all U.S. forces in South Korea.

Throughout his career, General Scaparrotti has rightfully earned a number of awards and decorations, including the Defense Superior Service Medal, the Legion of Merit with three oak leaf clusters, the Bronze Star Medal with an oak leaf cluster, the Meritorious Service Medal with four oak leaf clusters, and many more.

As a Nation, we are fortunate to have leaders and patriots like General Scaparrotti defending this country.

I am truly honored for this privilege to recognize General Scaparrotti, and I ask all the Members of Congress to join me in thanking him for his service and congratulating him on his promotion.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. FATTAH (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of official business.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of attending to family obligations.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of attending the funeral of a family member.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, September 23, 2013, at 11 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3039. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Prometryn; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0590; FRL-9395-4] received September 10, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3040. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Polyurethane-type Polymers; Tolerance Exemption [EPA-HQ-OPP-2013-0284; FRL-9397-6] received September 10, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3041. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Pyraclostrobin; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0549; FRL-9395-5] received August 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3042. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revision of Air Quality Implementation Plan; California; Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District; Stationary Source Permits [EPA-R09-OAR-2013-0064; FRL-9813-9] received August 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3043. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Placer County Air Pollution Control District [EPA-R09-OAR-2012-0790; FRL-9842-4] received August 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3044. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Placer, Santa Barbara and Ventura County Air Pollution Control Districts [EPA-R09-OAR-2013-0453; FRL-9835-4] received August 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3045. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-157, ''Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Support Act of 2013''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3046. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Dispute Resolution Pilot Program for Public Assistant Appeals [Docket ID: FEMA-2013-0015] (RIN: 1660-AA79) received September 3, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3047. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulation, Cumberland River, Mile 157.0 to 159.0; Ashland City, TN [USCG-2013-0718] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received September 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3048. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Regulated Navigation Areas, Security Zones: Dignitary Arrival/Departure and United Nations