

they have jobs and a strong economy to come to. This legislation is a great first step in fulfilling our responsibilities to all veterans who have sacrificed much on behalf of this Nation. With that in mind, I was proud to support the passage of the VOW Act.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to recognize a Member of the minority party for 1 hour.

YUCCA MOUNTAIN

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

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I have prepared remarks today, but I want to talk about Yucca Mountain.

We've heard a lot of talk this week about the Presidential candidates and Yucca Mountain. America needs to realize that South Carolina, on the Savannah riverside, is currently holding all of the legacy weapons product material that came out of the Non-proliferation Treaty—plutonium, sitting in my State, in my district, that is slated to go, under past agreements, to Yucca Mountain. It's the right place.

America needs to bring Yucca Mountain back online. And let's take the legacy weapons products out of South Carolina and put them in a long-term storage facility.

A TEXAN LOOKS AT CURRENT EVENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, for going on a couple months now, we've been hearing the President say we need to pass his jobs bill—pass his jobs bill right away, right now, pass his jobs bill. And it was so ironic to have a President of the United States, who says he wants to work with the Members of Congress, but Members of Congress won't work with him, and in his purported "effort" to work with Members of Congress, he doesn't ask to sit down with Congress in a private meeting and talk about these issues. Oh, no, that would really show an intent to work with Congress, to sit down in a room where we can visit about the issues. That would be really working with Congress. Instead, what we have from the President of the United States is a demand.

Now, I'm not sure historically, Mr. Speaker, how many times a President of the United States has decided to just throw a little hissy fit and, I'm going to come talk to Congress. Well, we know that he was an instructor. He wasn't a professor, but an instructor.

You can be an instructor in a law school if you practice law on the side or a community organizer on the side, or whatever; and they'll let you come teach a course or two. So anybody who has been involved in a law school, you would think, even as a low instructor, would know that the Constitution makes very clear that the President of the United States has no right, no moral authority to demand to come speak in the House.

Now, the President would never give credit to the willingness of this Congress to vote unanimously to allow the President, after his little hissy fit, to come speak in the House, but we did. He demanded to come speak to the House. He has to have an invitation to do that. In social circles, if somebody demanded to come to someone's house—I demand an invitation to come lecture you in your house—most people would say forget it. But this House, controlled by Republican Members—the majority here, Republican, Democrat majority down in the Senate—we voted unanimously. There were no objections to inviting the President to come lecture us rather than sit down and try to work with us.

□ 1200

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOHMERT. I certainly will yield to my friend from Texas.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I just want to thank you for taking this time to speak on this subject. I think it's commendable that you would do that, and I think you're exactly right. I would encourage you to keep telling the truth as you know it.

And how proud we are of you in the Texas delegation and certainly in east Texas, where you represent that part of the State so well. So keep up the good work.

Mr. GOHMERT. Well, that's so unexpected and unnecessary, and it actually means a great deal. Thank you.

Somebody that's been here slugging it out longer than I would ever be able to handle, Mr. BARTON from Texas came as a young man, and he's been able to endure the slings and arrows through many, many years of being in the minority.

And we're back to dealing with a White House who wants, he says, to negotiate, to work with Congress, and does so by demanding to come talk to Congress, and comes.

Did we have a warm, friendly meeting here as the President stood here on the second level?

Well, actually we got lectured. We were lectured that we needed to pass the President's jobs bill right away, right away, 16, 17 times. We've just got to do it now.

During the speech, I don't recall the President ever saying, I really don't have a bill. I don't have a bill. And, in fact, if you want to sit down and work with me, you won't be able to because in the morning I'm getting on Air

Force One, funded by the taxpayers, and basically hit the campaign trail. And I'm going to be beating up on you guys in the House of Representatives for not being willing to negotiate with me, even though I'm not around. And, by the way, I'm not going to negotiate even if we sat down because you've got to take my bill completely, pass the whole thing. I'm not going to compromise on anything.

That was the message for a number of weeks. Take it; pass it as it is. Never mind the fact that he didn't have a bill when he hit the road and was condemning Congress for not passing his bill. That's just strange.

You would think if somebody really wants to work with Congress, really wants to do something for the people of America that are hurting—I've had four job fairs in east Texas, and I've gone to each one, and it breaks your heart. There are people in their fifties and sixties, there's a lot of young people, a bigger percentage of young people, but there were older people, tremendous experience, tremendous education and training, been laid off because of the bad economy.

And it's heartbreaking even more so because this Congress and this President have to take responsibility for continuing to put more and more laws, regulations, burdens on business that keep them from being able to retain jobs, keep them from being able to expand and create more jobs.

And when you hear from people who've lost their job, and they're not only brokenhearted, but they're upset because then they find out that this administration has done things like throw \$600 million at Solyndra, has spent millions of dollars, hundreds of millions of dollars, to create jobs. One giveaway program, seems like I read we spent \$8 million per job that was created. Different amounts resulting in a different number of jobs.

One of the things I've seen in talking to people in Texas who are involved in the education system is that when the President's so-called stimulus bill in January of 2009 was passed and it was done, rammed through like the ObamaCare bill was, it didn't have, it didn't seem, the full support of America. But it had a majority in the House, it had a majority in the Senate, and so it passed.

I like to think I'm objective enough that I certainly acknowledge it didn't start in January of '09 with President Obama. A good man, a smart man—he's not given credit for that—made a major mistake when President Bush trusted Hank Paulson. Paulson says, we're about to have a catastrophe, give me \$700 billion and I'll keep things on track, get things back on track.

We don't give \$700 billion to one man and say go fix things. You don't do that in America. That's not what the country was founded for. But it was done. And as I understand it, about \$250 billion of the \$700 billion is around the amount that Hank Paulson squandered

of the so-called stimulus or the bailout, TARP, whatever you want to call it.

Ironically, if one wishes to look at things from a political standpoint, it was pretty amazing because a Republican administration provided \$700 billion to mainly bail out people on Wall Street who had donated to Democrats 4-1 over Republicans. That's what's so amazing is to hear people constantly talk about these rotten Republicans on Wall Street, when the fact is they give to Democrats 4-1 over Republicans.

So, not only was it absolutely, in my mind, an immoral thing to do, to take people's hard-earned money and add it to money we borrowed from China and others to bail people out on Wall Street. That's not the America that was founded, that so much blood and treasure has been spent to establish.

Wall Street executives, I've got no problem, as long as they're playing by the rules, they're not cheating people, if they make \$100 million a year. I have no problem as long as they're playing fairly; but when they get greedy and end up being broke, I do think it's appropriate for them to do what Americans are supposed to do and what is set out in the Constitution to do, called bankruptcy.

And AIG, it sounds like they were making money in every department except the credit default swaps. Well, gee, that's what happens when you sell what is, in effect, insurance against a catastrophic event, which would be the failure of the mortgage-backed securities to have the value that was paid for them. You ensure against that. You take what amounts to premiums. You put no money in reserve to ensure against the event you took money to ensure against; and then are shocked some day when people want to make a claim under that insurance, and you've done nothing but take profit.

What a great business that was, selling insurance to ensure against mortgage-backed securities not having the value paid for them, and not having to set aside a dime of that in a reserve account so that if somebody ever makes a claim you've got to pay it back. Now, there had to be a fun business.

But, again, it was immoral, it was irresponsible, and they should have been under the rules of insurance. If you're going to sell insurance, you've got to ensure against the event you took money to pay off for if it ever happens. It didn't happen, so AIG should have been allowed to go through bankruptcy. If they had enough assets, and thought they might, they were certainly making a lot of money, if they had enough assets, they could reorganize, get creditors to agree and come up with a plan for reorganization. The law is very clear. At least it used to be before the auto bailout. But that's what should have happened.

□ 1210

Goldman Sachs, even though those were the dear, close friends of Hank

Paulson, the worst Secretary of the Treasury this country has ever had until we got Tim Geithner. Now it's a close call. I'm not sure who is worse. But he bailed out his buddies at Goldman Sachs. They should have been allowed to go through reorganization if they could, and, if not, then liquidation and bankruptcy. That is what the Constitution provides for. And it should have been allowed to happen. And I realize that if that had happened, then those massive donations that the Democratic Party and President Obama got from Wall Street wouldn't have come through for him. I realize that. But this is more than about political parties and more than about political donations. It's about the life and the existence of this country.

Nobody should be too big to fail. If you can get big enough that the failure of your company or your bank hurts a lot of people, then it's going to hurt a lot of people. But that is the problem when the government becomes a player. We start becoming the lending institution, we start becoming the player in insurance where we're going to be selling the insurance like we do flood insurance, and we're going to be guaranteeing all the home loans. Well, people have to be in the good graces of the Federal Government if they're going to be able to get what they want because the Federal Government becomes the player, selling the insurance, like flood insurance, or backing home mortgages, and then you have a catastrophe like we've witnessed for the last 3 years. It didn't have to happen, but it is what happens when a country moves toward being more socialistic, where the government runs everything, the GRE, government running everything. That is what ObamaCare was about, the GRE. That's what the President's stimulus bill in January of 2009 was about. We were told it was \$800 billion. It turned out to be maybe more like \$1 trillion. It was about the GRE, the government running everything.

We heard with the President's stimulus bill in 2009, January, that if we did not pass the President's stimulus bill—the President told us, he made very clear, if you don't pass this bill, I'm warning you, unemployment could go as high as 8½ percent. Well, 2½ years later, that 8½ percent looks pretty doggone good. That would have been nice. But it got up to 10, and we're back at 9.1 for months now.

The numbers are bad, but what is worse is all those people that cannot find jobs, and the biggest reason is because we have a government that thinks it is the answer when it's the problem. It's not the answer. When the government becomes the player and tries to be the player and referee, it doesn't work. When the government is so busy being a player as well as referee, it can't do its referee job very well, and so you have people like Bernie Madoff who get away for years with bilking people out of billions of dollars—life savings. That should never

have happened. If the Federal Government were more interested in being the referee and making sure people played fair, Madoff couldn't have gotten away with it for that long.

When the government wants to run health care as we do with Medicare and Medicaid, it becomes the problem, not the solution. And now we have seniors who are scared to death because they see what's happening. The President gets his bill, ObamaCare health bill, passed, and it has a provision for \$500 billion to be cut from Medicare. And then AARP, after supporting that bill that cut \$500 billion from Medicare, has the unmitigated gall to encourage people that are sending AARP money to notify their Congressman that we don't want any cuts to Medicare. Well, I've gotten those petitions. And my response is that if you're part of AARP and you don't want cuts to Medicare, then I'm so glad you're now off the AARP team and you now support what I do. Because AARP sold the seniors down the road.

Why would they do that? Well, let's look. Gee, they made, I believe it was in 2008, one big health insurance company made around \$92 million clear profit and another \$112 million or so profit, and then you have AARP that made over \$400 million in clear profit from the sale of their supplemental insurance. I had a proposal that would have given seniors a choice: you can stay on Medicare, or you can choose to have us buy you private insurance that covers everything. You won't need any supplemental insurance; it will cover everything, but it will have a high deductible. Thirty-five hundred dollars was the proposal, but I'm not married to that. If there were another figure that would end up being better from an accounting standpoint in the long run, you can do that. But the proposal was \$3,500. And then for that, we will put the \$3,500 cash in the seniors' health care account for each of those 30 million or so homes that have people on Medicare, Medicaid. So then you have a debit card coded to only pay for health care, and the senior for the first time since the sixties will finally be in control of their own health care, making their own decisions, and we get the government out of the way of making decisions—oh, no, you can't have that medication; oh, no, you can't see that doctor; oh, no, you can't have that treatment. And what we're seeing are the early stages of what ultimately happens when the government controls health care. It's lists, and lists mean rationing.

I've heard from people that live in Canada and England. The father of one man from Canada needed a heart bypass operation. They put him on the bypass list, and 2 years later he had not gotten his bypass, and so he died. If he had been in the United States, he would probably still be alive today. One secretary in my district told me about her mother getting breast cancer. But she had to get on a list in

order to get the mammogram, had to get on a list to get the treatment, get on a list to have therapy, and get on a list for surgery, all those things that came with it. And as a result of all those lists, she said, "my mother died because she was in England. I was found to have cancer, I had immediate treatment." She's a secretary. She got treatment. She got the surgery and treatment. And she says, "I'm alive because I was in the United States. My mother died because she was in England."

Well, unfortunately, there are people who love people but think that by the government running health care—which will inevitably lead to rationing of health care—that somehow that's a better thing. Our health care system needs work. It needs to be fixed. But the thing we should be doing is not having the government become the ultimate, the biggest player and referee in health care. We need to get the government out of being the player and get them back into the business of being the referee.

At the same time, we need to get the health insurance companies out of the business of being health managers and back in the business of selling insurance. And you do that, if we can move forward, with health savings accounts. The young people of today in their twenties and thirties start putting away money in their own health savings account, let that build—there shouldn't be any limits on how much you can put in, but it ought to be a requirement you can never take it out. You can give it to your kids, give it to charities for a health savings account for those who can't provide it themselves, but once it becomes health savings account cash, that's where it stays until it's spent on health care.

□ 1220

Leave it to your children when you die. Leave it to other charities that have people who need health care, and it could go in their health savings accounts.

Once we do that, for the kids in their twenties and thirties, indications are, by the time they're 65, 70 years old, not only will they not want Medicare, they won't need it because they'll have enough money in their accounts that they can do whatever they want to and have whatever health care they need. But it's not the end-all solution. We don't have free market forces at work in health care. It's why costs keep going up. That's one of the reasons.

Another reason is the tremendous advances that have been made in medicine that are now slowing down without the great people who have been attracted to health care—brilliant doctors and nurses. People in the health care industry are so smart, but we're already seeing the quality of people applying not at the level it once was. Why should it when this government intervenes and prevents people from being compensated properly?

But until we get free market forces at work in health care, we're not going to fix health care, and you cannot have competition in health care as long as we have our existing system in which nobody knows what anything costs:

You ask, What does an MRI cost? Well, it all depends, you're told.

What does a room with a single bed in your hospital cost? Well, it all depends. We can't really say.

You have Blue Cross. You have this and that. You have Medicaid. You have Medicare. Are you paying cash?

It all depends. You can't fix health care when there's no competition.

Growing up in Mount Pleasant, Texas, it was no secret that we went between two and, actually, eventually three different doctors' offices. We loved the doctors. They were great doctors. My mother passed away at 91, and my dad is still alive. I recall, growing up, we'd go to one doctor when I thought we were going to this other doctor:

Well, they raised their prices, and they're both great doctors.

Well, yeah, they are. I love them both.

So we would go. When one would raise his price, we'd go back to the other doctor. You can't do that now. You don't know what a doctor charges. I've talked to doctors who would love to tell people what they charge, but it all depends whether it's Medicare, Medicaid, what insurance.

Then the most unfair cut of all is, if you come in and if you're too poor to have insurance and if you're not eligible for Medicare or Medicaid, then they're going to sit down with you and work out a payment plan for an amount that is normally many times more than the insurance companies would ever have agreed to pay. Well, that's not right. If somebody comes in with cash, they ought to be able to get it cheaper than Blue Cross or cheaper than other methods of payment. They're coming in with cash. In a good scenario, that's the way it would be.

If everyone had a health savings account that covered the high amount of the deductible, of their catastrophic insurance, that's the way it would be because you would call up the doctor or the hospital and say, I need to come in. How much do you charge? Under a bill I've proposed, they'd have to tell you. You could find it online. It would have to be posted. "This is how much we charge." They'd have to know before they'd come. Then you could get competition. You've got your debit card coded to only cover health care, and so you then care about how much things cost. You can't find a whole lot of people who care how much health care costs anymore because they're not paying it. What does it matter if the cost goes up 10 times?

Then you've got seniors, many of whom are AARP members. They're paying their dues, and they've got their supplemental insurance. How tragic that AARP didn't mind the \$500

billion cut to Medicare. Gee, let's think about that. If there's a massive cut to Medicare and if AARP sells supplemental insurance to cover what Medicare doesn't, I wonder if maybe they might think they would sell more insurance. Maybe that's why they would support a bill that cut Medicare by \$500 billion.

The games that have been played around this town really need to stop. We've gotten this country in trouble, but they're not going to stop with the President spending every day traveling around the country, demonizing Congress for not passing his bill, his law, when he doesn't even know what's in his bill. I do. I read the whole thing. I'm told there may not be anybody else in the House or Senate who has read every page of the President's bill like I did. Well, if the President would read it—he's obviously a smart enough man—he would see that a lot of his claims do not have the merit he thinks they do—or whoever is putting those words in his teleprompter thinks they do.

On education, we have the stimulus bill. We were told it was going to create so many jobs, that it was going to build bridges and fix bridges. It didn't do those things. So now, 2½ years later, the President makes the same speeches. That's got to be good for the speechwriters because they could go back and take the same speeches that the President gave in January of 2009:

You need to pass this bill. You've got to pass this bill right now, right away. Then it will build bridges; it will fix these bridges; it will hire people, get school teachers back and law enforcement.

Those were all said in January of '09. I'm wondering if we shouldn't go back and compare those speeches and see if they haven't just cut some of those speeches and pasted them. Hey, it worked. They got Congress in January of '09 to pass the massive stimulus bill.

As I've talked to educators around Texas, I found something that was deeply saddening and a bit maddening. There was some very limited amount of the trillion dollars in the President's so-called "stimulus bill" in January of '09 that went to hire teachers. I've met young people who were hired as teachers, and I'm thrilled when young people are able to get jobs. It's a good thing. Then I've talked to different educators who have said, It's so tragic. The stimulus money ran out, so we had to let teachers go. If you don't keep paying the stimulus money, then we don't get to keep those same teachers.

That ought to tell us something. The stimulus money was not stimulus. If it had been stimulus, it would have stimulated things to the point that those teachers who were hired 2½ years ago would have stimulated enough in the economy that they would have been able to keep those jobs; but the stimulus bill in January of '09 was not nor was the stimulus bill in January of '08 under President Bush. They did not

work. They don't work. That's not the way to stimulate.

So then what really breaks my heart is when I find out people my age, who are in their fifties, and people in their forties who have been teaching for 20, 25, 30 years—and because they do and because of the payment structure in education, they make a little more and a little more as they go along. Lo and behold, the Federal Government comes in and says, Here's a bunch of stimulus money, not that much in the scheme of a trillion, but we'll give you a little bit to hire some new teachers. They hire new, young teachers. They're working for cheaper than the older, experienced, well-trained teachers.

So what happens when the stimulus money that didn't stimulate anything runs out? It's rather tragic. People who have families, who have committed their lives to education, have lost their jobs.

□ 1230

I've heard from those people. Good teachers, good educators. But when they look at it, jeez, if this stimulus has allowed us to hire these young, new teachers, these experienced teachers that have a heart for the students, well trained, well educated, they're costing a little more, let's let them go. How tragic that this body would pass a bill under Speaker PELOSI intending to help education; and as a result of the misguided attempt to help education, we have driven out many of our best, most experienced, most caring teachers.

I have talked to young people who have gotten a job. They don't intend to stay teachers all that long. They're hoping they can find something else. So you have people who committed their lives to education losing their jobs because of a stimulus bill that wasn't for young teachers who don't plan to stay teachers. They don't like teaching; they want to do something else.

This body needs to get back to the original purpose of the Constitution. The purpose of the Constitution was to have a limited government, and that government would be a referee. It would make sure people and businesses in America played fair. It would not guarantee equal results, but it would guarantee opportunity to be fair and equal. It was a long way from doing that until the wonderful works that were accomplished by the efforts of Martin Luther King, Jr.

So we were on track, more equality of opportunity; but now it's as if some people think, no, Dr. King wanted equal results. No, he didn't. He wanted people judged by the content of their character, not the color of their skin.

We made great, tremendous strides, but when a government wants to guarantee equal outcomes instead of equal opportunity, it becomes a tyrannical government. It becomes the player and not the referee.

The other thing we're supposed to do is provide for the common defense, and

that means not checking in our brain before we come to work every day. That means in every executive agency charged with providing for defense, you don't suddenly declare that the only people who can advise us about that tiny percent of radical Islamists, tiny percentage of the overall Muslim population, the only ones that can advise us about those radicals are people that really understand that mentality.

We want people from the Muslim Brotherhood who want to take over the county, take over the world, have a united caliphate under sharia law to be the ones to advise us on how we deal with radical Islam, although this administration has now made it extremely clear, Attorney General Holder has made it clear, Secretary Napolitano has made clear, we really don't want to offend those who want to kill us and destroy our way of life by referring to them as radical Islamists.

Let's call them violent extremists. But when you look at what they've said, and you look at what they've done and want to do, it's because of their sick beliefs in what being a Muslim means.

An even further tragedy is the fact that we have allowed people with organizations who have supported terrorism to be advisers to this administration, to this Justice Department, to this intelligence community, to this Department of State. We've got foxes in the hen house.

We don't need to pass the President's so-called jobs bill. This will do more to drive up the cost of oil and gas because this President doesn't understand that the four pages of deductions that he repeals in here will put independent oil and gas producers out of business.

He doesn't understand that 94 percent of the oil and gas wells that are drilled on the land in the continental U.S. are drilled by independent oil and gas producers. He doesn't understand that when you eliminate their ability to raise capital, those wells will no longer be drilled. The major oil companies that the President demonizes and says he's going after will not only not drill all of those wells and produce all of the oil and gas; they can produce the exact same amount and make massive amounts more in profit.

So the one thing the President says he wants to do that's page 151 through 154 of his bill has the exact opposite effect. It will increase revenues, profits, for major oil companies because it will drive out the independent oil and gas producers, not to mention the millions of jobs that we'll lose by doing that.

Now, when I came to Congress 6½ years ago, I was concerned that there was not enough natural gas to continue to produce electricity with it, even though it is the most clean-burning thing that we've got. It would be wonderful, I thought, if you could do that. We just don't have enough because you've also got to have natural gas. It's a feedstock that you have to have in order to produce so many of the

plastics, so many of the goods that are now so important to all Americans and to health care and to transportation. So if you're using natural gas to produce electricity, provide energy, then it's going to drive up those costs.

Well, then science and necessity being the mother of invention, we hone our ability to horizontally drill. Hydraulic fracking allows us to get gas that we couldn't get otherwise. And now, depending on who you believe, we've got 100, 300 years of natural gas. Some of us have been told that possibly the largest deposit of natural gas just may be off the west coast of Florida, and nobody's allowed to drill there.

We find out that the Marcellus shale up in the Northeast is producing jobs for people, unless our friends across the aisle are successful in killing those efforts to drill for that gas, Haynesville shale down in Louisiana, east Texas where I am; Barnett shale, north, northwest Texas. These other gas finds are so extraordinary I now fully support my Democrat friend, DAN BOREN's, efforts to encourage people to convert cars to natural gas, to encourage manufacturers to produce cars that will run on natural gas. It will be cheaper than gasoline.

Some people identify greatly with the tea parties. I think they've been demonized, the people I see at those tea parties, all races, all ages, but they seem to have one thing in common: They're all paying income tax. And we're down to about 50 percent of the country that's doing that. People that come out at the tea parties, that's the one commonality: They pay taxes, they pay income tax and, as a result of that, they'd like to see less government.

□ 1240

So some have been surprised that I would support something that's not free market totally because I'm a free market kind of guy. But the overriding concern for this body, the oath that we take should be to make sure that we provide for the common defense. We have been sending trillions of dollars overseas when so much of that money finds its way into the hands of those who hate us, want to destroy our way of life. They don't think that people should have freedom to choose because if you give freedom to choose they think, their religious beliefs are, you'll slip into degradation, and then you'll be part of a Nation that needs to be destroyed.

Well, it happens. When you give people freedom of choice, just as I believe God did to start with, some are going to choose to do wrong. It's going to happen. We're all going to make mistakes, and some will do so intentionally. That's when you need a government to enforce rules of fair play to make sure that we provide for the common defense so that people can freely practice peaceful religious beliefs.

But we've been sending all that money year after year, growing more and more dependent on overseas oil.

When President Carter created this new monstrosity, a couple of them, one called the Department of Education and another called the Department of Energy, and every year the Department of Energy has existed, its goal has been to reduce the dependency on foreign oil. And every year they fail at their job more than they did the year before. Every year. No matter how many billions, hundreds of billions of dollars they throw at alternative energy rather than letting the free market play, it's not working.

But the reason I would support encouraging people to convert cars to natural gas, I'd like to buy a car from a factory in the United States that runs off natural gas. We do need infrastructure where you can pull up to a gas station and get natural gas instead of gasoline. But I support it because if we do that, I now see we could be 100 percent energy independent. It would save the lives of our most treasured possessions in this country, the American people, the men and women who give their lives for their country, when we have funded terrorism, not intentionally, but by paying people who hate our own country for their oil when we could get off of it. And if we get on natural gas for 100 years, there's going to be time to develop—and I know some people think it's not possible, I really do think we could eventually come up, somebody will, with a way to hold electricity. Some laugh at that. The late Ted Kennedy laughed about having a strategic defense shield of rockets, that's Star Wars. And lo and behold, it's happening. Well, until President Obama reneged on our agreement with Poland that cost so many their political lives in Poland, supported the missile defense that would stand between us and Iranian missiles, and we turned our backs on them, stabbed them in the back.

Well, we're at risk, and it's time to quit sending money to countries that hate us. As I have often said, you don't have to pay people to hate you; they'll do it for free. You don't have to pay them. And yet we keep sending money to people who hate our guts, and it doesn't cause them to like us. It causes them to not only hate us but to have total contempt because of how stupid we are—that we know that they hate us and we still keep giving them money. Bullies on a playground who demand lunch money from another student don't develop admiration, love, and respect for students who give them their lunch money. They still hate them. They still don't think anything of them. That's not the way to deal with bullies. The way to deal with bullies is to make sure that if you have to band together as a government, as an educational administration, and just decide we're not going to let bullies prevail, then you do that. You can do that in schools. You can do it in the world by having a government that is strong enough militarily that what it says, it can back up.

You don't do that when you make contractual agreements, as we did with Mubarak. And I'm not a President Mubarak fan. I was not a Qadhafi fan. But this administration had agreements with both of those people. They turned their backs on them, and now it appears we have radical Islamists that are taking over in those countries, and they will hate us more than Qadhafi did because at least Qadhafi was afraid of us.

And then, we had a hearing yesterday in the Judiciary Committee. Secretary Napolitano came here. It has not made the mainstream media. They'll probably never touch it, but it ought to rock people's lives when they see what's going on with this administration. You can't use the word radical Islam—that might offend the people that want to kill us—when the fact is if we address radical Islam, we will protect the moderate, the vast majority of Muslims who are moderate who want to live in peace. If the radicals take over, they could be the first ones they go after. As well as liberal reporters, they'll take them out. Gays, they'll take them out.

You would think people for gay rights would be on the side of those of us who want to go after radical Islam. But instead, it seems to be strange bedfellows in combining against those who want to support and defend the Constitution of the United States.

So we do some digging, a couple of sleepless nights doing research, and we find out the Homeland Security Department has people in its midst who are advising it. We find out, there's an article about it, it can be found on the Internet, we find out that there was a seminar by two of the leading experts on radical Islam that was going to be given to law enforcement. And CAIR—a named coconspirator supporting terrorism, named as a coconspirator in the Holy Land Foundation trial that should have been prosecuted, but this administration says they're friends, we're not going after them—CAIR complains to the White House, to this administration, and they cancel the briefing. And the word we're reading is that, gee, apparently they're rewriting the rules so that people in our intelligence of this administration, people in Homeland Security, people in the Justice Department, people in the White House, can only be briefed. They are rewriting the rules, and what we are told they'll end up saying is, you can't do the briefing if you're part of the government. So if you're in the government and you're not Muslim and don't have sympathies for radical Islam, then you'll be prevented from briefing others despite the fact that you may have spent your whole adult life studying this terrorism since 1979, when we saw it first come after us in Iran after President Carter proclaimed this "man of peace," Ayatollah Khomeini, was coming in, and he has done more to create hatred, to create violence, than any leader I'm aware of in the last 50 years.

□ 1250

President Carter thought he'd be a man of peace. Wrong. He wasn't. Nor is the present Khamenei. Nor is Ahmadinejad. And then you find out the president of ISNA, the Islamic Society of North America, who has ready access to the White House, within the inner sanctum of the State Department.

When the President gave his speech to try to upstage Netanyahu the day before Netanyahu was coming from Israel to the United States and ultimately to address this body, the president of ISNA, a named coconspirator in the Holy Land Foundation trial, 105 counts of conviction in which the named coconspirators should have been pursued after those initial convictions, he's advising the President on his speech about Israel. He's giving remarks on how the President is doing. He's got the President's ear. He's got the State Department's ear. He's got National Security's ear. In fact, we see from the Deputy National Security Advisor's own transcript of his own remarks that were on the White House Web site, the Deputy National Security Advisor commends the president of this named coconspirator to fund terrorism for leading prayers for the Iftar celebration last year at the White House.

We haven't seen anybody in this mainstream media that wants to talk about the fact that al-Awlaki, who this administration killed with a drone just not that long ago, was leading prayers for Muslim staffers on Capitol Hill.

Foxes are in the hen house. And they're given more and more authority.

We found out yesterday that it was Homeland Security that gave a secret security clearance to Mohamed Elibiary, from all accounts, a very nice gentleman. But if you read his writings, he thinks the world of the Muslim philosopher on whom Osama bin Laden relied so heavily for being barbaric, for killing innocents. The man that is part of the inner circle and now has been elevated to the National Homeland Security Advisory Council of the Secretary of Homeland Security thinks that he was a man of peace. He was executed in the sixties, but his writings fully supported what Osama bin Laden was doing. They support what radical Islam is doing. And that's why they constantly point to his writings from the fifties and sixties.

We also find—and I have got a flyer in my materials here—that Mohamed Elibiary was one of the featured speakers for the tribute to a man of vision, the Ayatollah Khomeini, just recent years ago. He's been given a secret security clearance. I find out 2 days ago he's also working with the ACLU to attack from the outside, to demand materials that will tell them about the sources and methods of how we try to get some intelligence on the people that want to destroy and kill us and ruin our way of life and create a one-world caliphate for some dictator like

the Ayatollah Khomeini or Khamenei over there now in Iran. And we're giving people like that access.

And then I find out this week—and it's written; it's now on the Internet and you can read the story—that the same man used his security clearance and is allowed to access security databases from his home computer; and he accesses a security database called the State and Local Intelligence Community database, called SLIC for short, and he pulled off some material that said on it "For Official Use Only," and then was shopping that to mainstream media in this country to try to condemn people in Texas for being concerned, under Governor Perry, as being Islamaphobes.

Then we find that the OIC that has been so powerful—57 states—that actually in 2007 they said that the most fearful terrorism that exists—and these are their words—is Islamaphobia. They created the term "Islamaphobia." They're donating hundreds of thousands and millions to some of our best educational institutions to go after people who are concerned not about Islam, not about the 95, 99 percent, whatever it is of Muslims who are peace-loving, but if you want to go after the 1 percent that wants to kill us and make this country into a caliphate under sharia law, you're an Islamaphobe. And they're paying millions and millions to develop that terminology.

So the mainstream media will buy into it and come after anybody that says, Look, there is a common thread

that runs through those people who want to destroy our way of life, that want to take our young men and women in this country, radicalize them and have them help them destroy the greatest, most free country in the history of mankind. And this administration is bringing some of those foxes into the hen house.

So not only does this administration give a man who admires the inspiration for Osama bin Laden, who is a featured speaker for the tribute to Ayatollah Khomeini, he's given secret security clearance and now is using that as a political weapon not just to go after people concerned about radical Islam, but also to go after an opponent of this President politically.

It's time to wake up. It's time to be a referee, not a player. It's time to let the free market system drive the economy, create jobs, while we do what we're supposed to do—provide for the common defense.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL

REVISIONS TO THE AGGREGATES AND ALLOCATIONS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2012 BUDGET RESOLUTION FOR H.R. 2576

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 305 of H. Con. Res. 34, the

House-passed budget resolution for fiscal year 2012, deemed to be in force by H. Res. 287, I hereby submit for printing in the Congressional Record revisions to the budget allocations and aggregates set forth pursuant to the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2012. Aggregate levels of budget authority, outlays, and revenue are revised and the allocation to the House Committee on Ways and Means is also revised, for fiscal year 2012 and the period of fiscal year 2012 through 2021.

The revision is provided for H.R. 2576, legislation amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the calculation of modified adjusted gross income for purposes of determining eligibility for certain healthcare-related programs. Corresponding tables are attached.

This revision represents an adjustment for the purposes of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended. For the purposes of the Budget Act, these revised aggregates and allocations are to be considered as aggregates and allocations included in the budget resolution.

Section 305 of the budget resolution allows the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget to revise the allocations of spending authority provided to the Committee on Ways and Means for legislation that decreases revenue. The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the allocations and aggregates of this concurrent resolution if such measure would not increase the deficit over fiscal years 2012 through 2021.

H.R. 2576 decreases the deficit over this period by \$14.6 billion and is hence eligible for these adjustments are.

The table that follows indicates what these adjustments are.

BUDGET AGGREGATES

[On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year	
	2012	2012–2021
Current Aggregates:		
Budget Authority	2,858,503	(1)
Outlays	2,947,662	(1)
Revenues	1,890,365	30,285,754
Changes for the United States—Colombia, Panama, Korea Free Trade Agreement Implementation Acts (H.R.3078, H.R. 3079, H.R. 3080):		
Budget Authority	0	(1)
Outlays	0	(1)
Revenues	0	-7,100
Revised Aggregates:		
Budget Authority	2,858,503	(1)
Outlays	2,947,662	(1)
Revenues	1,890,365	30,278,654

¹ Not applicable because annual appropriations Acts for fiscal years 2013 through 2021 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION—AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS FOR RESOLUTION CHANGES

[Fiscal years, in millions of dollars]

House Committee on Ways and Means	2012		2012–2021 Total	
	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays
Current Allocation	1,030,960	1,031,280	13,171,553	13,172,135
Changes for a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the calculation of adjusted gross income for purposes of determining eligibility for certain healthcare-related programs. (H.R.2576)	0	0	-21,700	-21,770
Revised Allocation	1,030,960	1,031,280	13,149,853	13,150,435

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, October 31, 2011, at 1 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

3617. A letter from the Secretary, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Foreign Futures and Options Contracts on a Non-Narrow-Based Security Index; Commission Certification Procedures (RIN: 3038-

AC54) received September 27, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3618. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Isopyrazam; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0906; FRL-8874-6] received October 6, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3619. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental