

I have some of the bills that we passed today. One of those was that we had the time to vote after debate on regulating insects, roaches, fungus, and rats in the United States. Oh, such an important piece of legislation that the House of Representatives debated and voted on.

But while we had the time to vote on these important issues of regulating the rats and roaches and fungi in the United States, we didn't take the time to protect the American people from those people throughout the world who want to kill us, who want to do harm to us and our families. And not to America only, but to all freedom countries throughout the world.

Because we didn't have time to work on the Protect America Act, a bill that does exactly what it says, Mr. Speaker, it protects America. It protects America from terrorists. And one of those ways is being able to eavesdrop into conversations when one terrorist overseas talks to another terrorist overseas, amending the FISA, the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance, Act. But, oh, we didn't have time to do that.

Mr. Speaker, it troubles me because has the House of Representatives, without firing a shot, raised the "white flag of surrender" to those people who wish to do us harm? The head of the National Intelligence Service has told us that 50 percent of the intelligence that they attained is through FISA. And yet we have cut off that resource by failing to vote on that, failing debate on that. But yet we had time to talk about roaches, rats, and fungi.

Mr. Speaker, this ought not to be. Under FISA, we have been able to prevent crimes from being occurred against the United States. One of those was the bombing of the Brooklyn Bridge, another was the bombing of Fort Dix in New Jersey. Those were prevented because of FISA, because we had the intelligence, because we had the eavesdropping, the legal eavesdropping capability.

Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives has not done a service to the people of the United States by failing to debate this issue and at least have an argument, a lively debate, and then vote on it to protect the United States. The people of the United States deserve better from us. Our job is to protect America through legislation. And, Mr. Speaker, I think we have not done that today because we are off doing other things.

So I hope that I am proven wrong by history that this did not hurt the United States down the road for failing to act on this important legislation. And it's important that the House come back as soon as possible and deal with the issue of protecting America first and making sure that we know what they're saying throughout the world when they want to do us harm, because the people we fight, the war we fight against are people who will do anything to get their way and their radical beliefs including killing chil-

dren and women and the innocents and car bombs and anyone else that gets in their way.

And there is probably joy throughout the terrorist cells in the world that the United States Congress did not do its duty today.

And, Mr. Speaker, that's just the way it is.

THE MILITARY FREEDOM ACT

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to follow my friend, a former judge also, from Texas, Mr. POE; and he nailed it on the head. And I tell you, following up on that is another travesty going on this week, and that's why I just filed a bill in the last 15 minutes called the Military Freedom Act.

We are endowed by our creator with liberty. But like any inheritance, we only get to keep it if we are willing to fight for it. That is precisely why so many of our uniformed military members have laid down their lives. And the plain fact is that there is no more important purpose for the Federal Government than to provide for the common defense.

In order to do that, there's got to be a military. But we have all of the rights of freedom of speech. Even those rights have limits, such as when you can't yell "fire" in a crowded theater. There is, however, no right to trespass, there is no right to obstruct lawful ingress and egress into a military recruiter's office. The City of Berkeley, California, chose not to protect the Marines' lawful right to ingress and egress. They instead chose to aid and abet lawbreakers by encouraging them and passing an ordinance to make it easier to violate the Marines' rights.

The restricting of funding that is proposed and put forward in the bill I have just filed has been done previously in matters such as the speed limits of States or to encourage States to limit drinking and driving. So it's nothing new.

It has been deemed appropriate to encourage political entities in areas in which the Federal Government has a vested interest, and it has no more vested interest than what we have in providing for the common defense.

But Berkeley and any other city has the right to rule over its own city as they wish, and they're welcome to do that. But the Federal Government should not reward a city that chooses to obstruct and prevent the obtaining of military members who provide the very freedoms and the umbrella of freedom under which that city acts. They have a right to use freedom of speech, but they have no right to take United States taxpayers' dollars to aid and abet hurting our military readiness.

We took an oath in this body, in this room, to defend this Nation against all enemies, foreign and domestic; and

those who prevent the United States from attaining military members are not the Nation's friends. Though such a city may deserve punishment, all we are trying to do with this bill is just not reward them for hurting our national defense.

Other city leaders, such as those in San Francisco, Toledo, Ohio, like the mayor there, have snubbed or restricted our military. They need to be aware that when they begin to prevent the military from having enough troops to protect us and being militarily ready, they should not expect Federal subsidies to assist them.

It is true that the actions addressed in the Military Freedom Act are mainly actions or omissions by community leaders and not all of their citizens. We understand that. There are good citizens in each of those towns. But the choice of the citizens is either to replace the hurtful leaders or bear the consequences or move. The old adage is democracy ensures the people are governed no better than they deserve. Therefore, those cities either deserve to have better leaders who don't hurt our national defense, or they deserve not to have funds to award their harmful conduct.

Cities like Berkeley should take stock of how many of their very own first responders in the business in their cities of saving lives were trained in the military.

I would remind you also, and I remember vividly because I was about to go on active duty about the time Vietnam was ended, our heroes came back from Vietnam and were spit on. Some of the hippies that did the spitting cut their hair, got into positions in cities and have found, figuratively, new, effective ways of spitting on our military.

But everyone should understand, Mr. Speaker, this is not taking away money for expressing free speech. It's simply not rewarding the obstruction of providing for the common defense. Since it will cost additional money to overcome the obstruction to our military readiness, the Military Freedom Act takes money from the appropriate place to do that.

This is the ultimate PAYGO bill for military readiness and national security.

In any event, I hope and I encourage the leaders, the majority leaders, the Democratic majority leaders of this body to bring this bill to a vote and let the cities know that we don't reward those who prevent our providing for the common defense.

□ 1630

PAY ATTENTION AMERICA

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the American people mostly don't pay