

from Kanawha County; Elizabeth Drewry, the first African American elected to the legislature from McDowell County, West Virginia; Elizabeth Kee, the first woman elected to Congress from Bluefield, West Virginia.

One West Virginian has given us a national holiday—Anna Jarvis, the founder of Mother's Day, from Grafton, West Virginia.

In the sciences, Dr. Harriet Jones broke down barriers to become the first licensed physician in West Virginia from Marshall County.

We have two women who reached the very pinnacle of their field. Novelist Pearl Buck, from Hillsboro, West Virginia, won the Nobel Prize for literature. In athletics, no one could forget West Virginia's own Mary Lou Retton when she made history by achieving her perfect 10s in 1984.

The stories of West Virginian women and all women must be told. That is why I support H.R. 863, the National Women's History Commission Act.

It is my privilege to talk about so many wonderful West Virginia women.

TRIMBLE TECH STUDENTS AT SXSU FESTIVAL

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to the tragic events that took place in Austin, Texas, on Thursday at the annual South by Southwest Festival.

A suspected drunk driver being chased by the Austin police slammed his car into the festival crowd. Two of those injured were in high school. Curtisha Davis—known as “Tish”—and Deandre Tatum—called “Dre”—students at Trimble Tech High School in my hometown of Fort Worth, Texas.

Curtisha is a senior and has broken bones and other injuries, and Deandre is in the intensive-care unit under a medically induced coma at the University Medical Center at Brackenridge.

Please continue to pray for the Trimble Tech family. It is a very close-knit family at Trimble Tech High School, known as the Bulldogs. I ask for the prayers of everyone.

There was a death involved in this particular tragedy, and I ask for prayers for all the families affected, including these two young people from my hometown, Curtisha and Deandre.

HONORING THE LIFE OF LES BOTELHO

(Ms. GABBARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, last week I was deeply saddened to hear the news of the passing of my friend and Hawaii island resident, Les Botelho. I share my heartfelt condolences with his family and his friends.

Les was a committed family man and also dedicated to serving his commu-

nity. He lived simply and led by example, always understanding the importance of servant leadership and giving back.

Les was a native of Laupahoehoe and graduated from Laupahoehoe High School and Hawaii Technical School. He worked for the County of Hawaii for many years, working his way up to administration before he retired.

Those of us who had the privilege of knowing Les knew we could always count on him. He was very often the first call that people made when they needed help with anything.

He was a mentor to so many and a great example for all to follow, as he always taught the next generation to become involved, to be a part of making a positive impact in our community, and to undertake the great responsibility of being leaders in our future.

Aloha nui, Les, we miss you very much. Mahalo for your lifelong commitment to serving Hawaii. Aloha.

GOVERNMENT BUREAUCRACY

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. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES), my new friend.

REMEMBERING RETIRED UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COLONEL ROBERT DARDEN “PETE” PETERSON

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor retired United States Air Force Colonel Robert Darden “Pete” Peterson who passed away on March 2.

Colonel Peterson was a member of America's Greatest Generation. He not only served our counsel selflessly during World War II, but also during the Korean war and the Vietnam war.

Colonel Robert Darden Peterson was born in Jonesboro, Arkansas, in 1923. After graduating from high school, Pete would go on to attend the University of Mississippi with a football scholarship.

After his first football season at Ole Miss, he enlisted in the United States Army Air Corps to aid the war effort in Europe. Colonel Peterson trained as a B-17 pilot and became an aircraft commander at age 20. During World War II, he was a member of the 8th Air Force and completed 28 combat missions.

After World War II, Pete briefly returned to civilian life only to be recalled to Active Duty in 1947. He would serve as assistant chief of directorate of combat operations during the Korean war and the Vietnam war.

He was responsible for all surveillance and control of the Strategic Air Command winged resources within Southeast Asia.

During 1967 and 1968, Colonel Peterson served as air operations planner for all tactical and support air activities

in the southern portion of North Vietnam and the Southeast Asia interdiction area. He remained a combat pilot, flying 19 combat missions in support operations in Vietnam.

In 1968, Colonel Peterson was assigned to the Pentagon as Air Force actions officer for programs pertaining to the Strategic Air Command.

In 1970, he was assigned to the Joint Chiefs of Staff Operational Directorate. Following his assignments in Washington, he accepted the post of deputy base commander at Dyess Air Force Base, a Strategic Air Command base in Abilene, Texas.

In 1976, Colonel Peterson retired from military service and lived most of his retirement years in Texas. During his 33 years of service to our country, he flew B-17s, B-36s, and B-52s and logged over 7,000 flying hours.

He was so trusted and experienced, that he was assigned to America's nuclear Air Force in the Strategic Air Command. As a pilot, he was one of the first in our country to fly with atomic weapons and hydrogen weapons.

Colonel Peterson was a highly decorated officer. His military honors include the Distinguished Flying Cross, the Meritorious Service Medal, the Air Medal, the Bronze Star, and numerous other medals and awards that reflected his dedication to serving our country in the United States Air Force.

A review written by a commanding officer during Colonel Peterson's military career best sums up the way he lived his life at home and when on duty. The CO wrote:

Peterson requires a lot of his crew. However, he gives more than he demands of others.

Colonel Peterson passed away earlier this month and was laid to rest on March 7.

Our thoughts and prayers are with the family and friends of Colonel “Pete” Peterson. His survivors include 7 children, 15 grandchildren, 17 great-grandchildren, and numerous nieces and nephews.

He will be forever remembered as a patriot, a pilot, a soldier, a husband, a father, a grandfather, and as an American hero. We thank him and his family for their outstanding service and sacrifice to our country.

As I close, I ask everyone to continue praying for our country during these difficult times and for our military men and women who protect us from external threats and our first responders who protect us from internal threats right here at home.

God bless our military men and women, and God bless the United States of America.

Mr. GOHMERT. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED), my friend, such time as he may consume.

NO MORE WEEK

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me time to address the Chamber today.

I rise today to talk about the NO MORE campaign. NO MORE is the first

unifying symbol meant to express support for ending sexual assault and domestic violence, similar to the Pink Ribbon campaign for breast cancer.

Mr. Speaker, next week, March 17–21 is NO MORE week. This symbol will be active throughout social media, ad campaigns, and throughout our country, to highlight for men and women across the country to come together to stand up to end sexual violence by saying “No more.”

This proliferation is supported by organizations, such as the Avon Foundation for Women, Mary Kay, National Alliance to End Sexual Violence, National Network to End Domestic Violence, the YWCA, and Department of Justice’s Office on Violence Against Women.

Mr. Speaker, I come here today to say no more because of something very personal to me. Within the last year, my family experienced firsthand the issues of sexual assault.

My beautiful niece, 18 years old, was raped. We saw that event impact a young life—our family—in a way that I cannot express, Mr. Speaker.

□ 1145

I come here today to say, “No more.”

Last night, I had an opportunity to speak with my niece. I said: If you had an opportunity to address the country and to address the Chamber of the U.S. House of Representatives, what would you say? How would you answer the question “no more because”?

Essentially, what she said was: “No more because” there are no excuses.

No one can make an excuse as to why sexual assault is acceptable. No one should offer an excuse that a woman wanted it, that a woman asked for it.

Mr. Speaker, we need to change the culture in our country as we are afraid to talk about this issue. So many women have been impacted. Men across the country have not been taught how to deal with this issue in an open and honest fashion. March 17 to 21 is an opportunity for us as a nation to say, “No more.” We are going to come together in a national effort and say: Sexual violence is not acceptable; domestic violence is not acceptable. We are going to discuss it openly and amongst our country and fellow countrymen in a way that ultimately will lead to there being no more.

In having had to experience this firsthand for the last 12 months, I can tell you that it is time.

On behalf of my niece and my family, Mr. Speaker, I ask all Members and all people across the country to look at the NO MORE campaign and to look at this symbol and to discuss it with your sons, your daughters, your sisters, your brothers, your mothers, and your fathers and say: We can’t accept this any longer.

Then we end sexual violence once and for all, because now is the time to say, “No more.”

God bless my niece. God bless my family. God bless this great country.

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you for those stirring and important words.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING), my friend.

MACK PIERCE

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, a small but vibrant community called Nahunta, which is hidden off the beaten track in eastern North Carolina, sadly said good-bye last year to one of its most beloved residents. Mack Pierce, who lived and breathed Nahunta for 81 years, passed away on November 3.

Now, up here in Washington, D.C., the title “Pork King” might not be a compliment, but in Nahunta, Mack Pierce’s company wore the crown proudly. He founded the Nahunta Pork Center in 1975, and grew it into one of the largest pork retail displayers in the Nation. In the eastern portion of my congressional district, it is impossible to miss the enormous yellow signs up and down the interstate that declare the Nahunta Pork Center as the “Pork King,” a treasured title in one of the country’s largest pork-producing States.

Mack had a keen insight for business and an unwavering commitment to his family, his faith, and his community. Rather than taking his business to a larger city as it grew, Mack chose to build a successful, stable business that would bring employees and customers alike to his hometown of Nahunta. As a result, thanks to Mack, Nahunta is a household name in eastern North Carolina, and it is recognizable to its customers up and down the east coast. The Nahunta Pork Center has remained in the same location since it opened, and it has grown substantially as its customer base has increased. Throughout his life, Mack focused on providing the best product and outstanding service, and his hard work helped put Nahunta on the map. Business, though, was second to family and community.

If there were an opportunity to volunteer, Mack was first in line. For over 70 years, he was a member of the Nahunta Friends Meeting, where he served in many capacities. At his church, Mack served as an elder and as a finance committee member. He sang in the choir, taught Sunday school, and mentored young folks at the church. In the community, Mack was a founding member of the Nahunta Fire Department. He served as a trustee at the nearby Mount Olive College, and he sat on the board of directors of the BB&T Bank. At home, he and his wife, Jean, spent 61 wonderful years together. They had two sons, Larry and Freddie, and four grandchildren. Mack cherished his role as a husband, as a father, and as a grandfather.

In his lifetime, Mack Pierce enriched the community of Nahunta in too many ways to count, and he will be greatly missed.

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, there are many great Americans. There are some who are ex-

ceptional, and it is always a pleasure to hear about a life well lived, someone who will meet his Maker and who will hear the words “well done, good and faithful servant.”

We have some who do a rather sloppy job with the duties they are given. It specifically brings to mind, Mr. Speaker, the National Journal Daily. It has got a picture of my friend Justin AmashK on the front with the words—in big letters—“Drunken Karaoke with Justin Amash.” Yet, when you read the story, it is very clear that Justin Amash didn’t have anything to drink. It was not a drunken karaoke event.

As my friend Mr. Amash puts it in a letter that many of us have signed:

The story concerned a fundraiser for Representative Thomas Massie, which was held earlier this week. The fundraiser was hosted by a number of Virginia Young Republicans at an Irish pub in Clarendon. One of your reporters who regularly covers House Republicans attended the event. As you reported, Representative Amash spoke as a guest at the event. He introduced Representative Massie, and talked briefly to a crowd of young people about public policy and principles that many Republicans share.

After the event officially ended—not part of the event—Representative Amash stuck around to take pictures with fans in the crowd as a courtesy to the Young Republican hosts, and there were some who stayed for the usual Tuesday night karaoke. Representative Amash did not participate in any karaoke singing or drinking.

That is even noted in the article. That is why it was such a surprise that the National Journal would have as the headline—front page, top story—“Drunken Karaoke with Justin Amash.” That is libelist. That is outrageous, and particularly—I did some checking—it turns out that the National Journal has a contract with the House of Representatives to provide everybody a copy of the print version for \$617,000 per year.

With that kind of sleazy title, I think it is time to relook at that contract. I mean, we all know the National Journal’s ratings of conservatives. JUSTIN AMASH usually gets rated by the National Journal as one of the more liberal when he is, if not the most conservative, one of the most conservative. So we have known that National Journal reporting in some areas has been very suspect, but that is just as sleazy as it gets. A front-page, top-story apology to JUSTIN AMASH is owed by the National Journal. That is the least they can do.

Since we are part of the government here in Congress, it is important to note when things go well, and it is important to note when things don’t go well and when there are problems.

There was a major story yesterday afternoon. The Daily Caller reports “Health and Human Services Official Resigns, Pens a Must-Read Rebuke of Federal Bureaucracy.” It is an article posted by Caroline May, and its original publication is in AAAS news.sciencemag.org by Jocelyn Kaiser.

This story from The Daily Caller reports:

A Health and Human Services official has resigned after dealing with the frustration of the “profoundly dysfunctional” Federal bureaucracy which left him “offended as an American taxpayer.”

In a resignation letter obtained by ScienceInsider, David Wright, Director of the Office of Research Integrity, ORI, which oversees and monitors possible research misconduct, offers a scathing rebuke of the unwieldy and inefficient bureaucracy that he dealt with for the 2 years he served in that position.

In his letter to Assistant Secretary for Health Howard Koh, Wright explains that the 35 percent of his job that was spent working with science investigators in his department “has been one of the greatest pleasures of my long career.” The majority of his duties, however, represented his worst job ever. “The rest of my role as ORI Director has been the very worst job I have ever had, and it occupies up to 65 percent of my time. That part of the job is spent navigating the remarkably dysfunctional HHS bureaucracy to secure resources and to, yes, get permission for ORI to serve the research community. I knew coming into this job about the bureaucratic limitations of the Federal Government, but I had no idea how stifling it would be.”

I want to add parenthetically here that he is talking about the remarkably dysfunctional Health and Human Services Department that wants to make your decisions for you about your health care. They want to tell you and have told millions and millions of Americans that your health insurance is no good even though most Americans liked the insurance they had and wanted to keep it and were promised by the President and so many friends across the aisle, if they liked it, they could keep it. It turns out that was absolutely not true.

The HHS, the Health and Human Services Department, in being as bureaucratic, as negligent, and as dysfunctional as they are, is what every Democrat in this body and in the Senate and without a single Republican vote wanted to shove in control of every American’s health care. Now we are finding out just how disastrous that was.

This article about Director Wright goes on to read:

According to Wright, activities that in his capacity as an academic administrator took a day or two, took weeks and months in the Federal Government. He recalled an instance in which he could not get approval for a \$35 cost to have cassette tapes converted to CDs. He eventually was able to get them converted in 20 minutes for free by a university. In another instance, he “urgently needed to fill a vacancy,” but was told there was a secret priority list. Sixteen months later, he wrote, the position was still unfilled.

Again, parenthetically as to this article about HHS dysfunctionality, it is important to note that these people who took 16 months and still didn’t fill a position because they had a secret priority list are the same ones who are going to have a list as to who can get what surgery at what age. Some people bristled when Sarah Palin called it a “death panel,” but they are going to decide who can get a pacemaker, at what age, and who cannot. So, as I had

to do a couple of times, they are not going to have to actually sign an order sentencing somebody to death, but it is basically not that different. When you say someone who must have a pacemaker in order to live can’t have it, you might as well be signing a death penalty order.

□ 1200

This is an organization that cannot get their act together—not to build a Web site, not to protect people’s most personal information, not to even get a \$35 authorization to convert cassettes to CD. If they can’t do that, do you really want them deciding whether you get a pacemaker or not? Whether you get a bypass surgery you need or not?

A conversation with somebody in my district who came from Canada keeps coming back to me. He told me about his father, in the Canadian glorious health care system that everybody got shoved under, where the government controlled who got pacemakers, who got surgery, who got what, needed bypass surgery, and was on a list. Two years later, he didn’t get it. And he died because he hadn’t had bypass surgery.

I said, Well, that is amazing. I didn’t know it took 2 years. What was the problem? He said, They kept moving people on the list in front of him. I said, My understanding is it is a crime in Canada to give anything of value to get someone to move you up the list. He said, That’s right, but there is a panel that moves people up the list as they feel appropriate. They didn’t move my father up the list. He didn’t get bypass surgery for 2 years. And so he died.

If someone, unknown of whether he has insurance or not, were to go into a hospital here in Washington or in my hometown in Tyler, Texas, or Longview, or basically anywhere, and he is immediately found to need a bypass, they are going in and doing the bypass. But not in Canada. Not in England. And not here in the United States, once the group that shoved ObamaCare down the throats of the American people have their way and this bureaucracy with secret priority lists gets to tell you what you get or don’t get in the way of health care.

I just cannot imagine thinking Americans wanting the government, and particularly Health and Human Services, making those kind of decisions.

We found out this week, when my friend TOM PRICE asked how many people have paid for their health insurance, they couldn’t tell us. Secretary Sebelius doesn’t know. Can’t know.

Do you think they are going to know when you, Mr. Speaker, need bypass surgery? They won’t.

Some will say, Well, in Congress they probably get special treatment. They have no idea. We won’t get special treatment. We will end up like the people in Canada, going on a list.

I read an article sometime back about England. They have got a new

target, it said. They were trying to adjust down the amount of time it took to get surgery or treatment or whatever a doctor prescribed after it was prescribed. They knew it wouldn’t be done overnight, but if everybody pitched in, everybody worked hard, they thought they might get the delay in getting the surgery or treatment you needed down to a 10-month wait. If everybody worked hard, eventually they could get it down to 10 months.

I thought, Good grief. And you want to do that to America? You don’t have to wait 10 months for a mammogram or surgery or a biopsy, if it’s needed.

These people that keep saying, You Republicans have no alternatives. We have all kinds of alternatives.

What I keep encouraging our conference and the RSC to do—and I am hoping one of our groups here is going to do it—is start having informal hearings and bring in witnesses so that we do what President Obama promised when he was a senator. If I am President, he promised us, we are going to have debate over health care. We are going to do it on C-SPAN. We want the whole country to see who is standing up for whom.

That is what I want. That is what we need. Let America see who stands for them and who stands for the big, bloated, secret priority-listed bureaucracies like Health and Human Services.

This article goes on about HHS. David Wright, who has now resigned, said:

On another occasion I asked your deputy why you didn’t conduct an evaluation by the Op Division of the immediate office administrative services to try to improve them. She responded that that had been tried a few years ago and the results were so negative that no further evaluations have been conducted.

David Wright closed by saying he plans to publish his daily log to further shed light on his work. He said:

As for the rest, I’m offended as an American taxpayer that the Federal bureaucracy—at least the part I’ve labored in—is so profoundly dysfunctional. I’m hardly the first person to have made that discovery, but I’m saddened by the fact that there is so little discussion, much less outrage, regarding the problem. To promote healthy and productive discussion, I intend to publish a version of the daily log I’ve kept as ORI Director in order to share my experience and observations with my colleagues in government and with members of the regulated research community.

These people at HHS, who couldn’t find their rear end with both hands, are going to tell you what you can have done to your body?

I have heard friends across the aisle for so many years now talk about how they want the government out of our bedroom. Are you kidding me? With ObamaCare, they are in your bedroom, they are in your nightstand, they are in your bathroom, your kitchen cabinet. They are everywhere in your house and outside your house you try to go. This puts them in charge of your most personal private matters.

It is time to repeal ObamaCare. It is time to have an alternative that some of us have brought to the front.

One of the things we need to do is not make sure everybody has high cost insurance. It is to make sure everybody has accessible, affordable health care.

When you combine all the money the Federal Government and the State governments spend providing Medicare and Medicaid and you divide it by the number of households in America that have someone on Medicare or Medicaid, which my office tried to do back in 2009 and 2010, it was tough getting the information on how much we are spending on all this. People could only give you an estimate. The same people that want to run your life and tell you what you can have in health care can't even tell you what they are doing.

But the best estimates we can get from these government sources and the best estimates from the Census Bureau—because they couldn't give us an exact number—indicates that back 4 years ago we were spending about \$20,000 to \$30,000 per household for people that had somebody on Medicare and Medicaid. It was most likely closer to the \$30,000 number.

That is what inspired me. I told Newt Gingrich about it, and he said, You have got to get that in bill form and get it scored. It may change the whole debate in Congress about health care. This is nearly a year before ObamaCare was passed.

So we got it in bill form, and it included giving seniors the option for the first time since the sixties to really control their own health care. Because we would buy them not bronze or some other kind of health insurance, we would buy them the best Cadillac insurance you can get. We wouldn't require that they had to have maternity care, because there are not that many 80- and 90-year-old people that need the maternity care that this administration is forcing.

It would give them Cadillac insurance for what they did need, and give them a high deductible. At this point, we might say the deductible would be \$5,000, \$7,000, or something like that. Whatever the amount the high deductible was, my bill, my proposal, was we are better off giving every senior on Medicare or Medicaid cash in a health savings account with a debit card that is coded so it will only pay for purely health care items, and you empower a senior to get what they need—to go to the doctor or health care provider they want to go to and not need some bureaucratic fool in HHS to tell you whether or not you can see this person.

We have got to get power back into the hands of our seniors and into the hands of the poor. They are entitled to be able to choose who they want to go to, I would think.

Let's empower people and quit punishing people simply because they are middle class and they have got a job and they are paying taxes. Let them have the same opportunities as those they are paying for.

What is going on is outrageous. And just when we think it wouldn't get much worse, we have this article in Power Line, "Bill Henck: Inside the IRS," by Scott Johnson. He notes:

As noted at the top, William Henck has worked inside the IRS office . . .

And that is the IRS office. How is the IRS linked to a discussion about health care? They are going to enforce ObamaCare. We have got the IRS, as if they don't have enough power now, is going to be in charge of enforcing health care.

Most of the Republicans I know want to eliminate the IRS. Some want to go to a fair tax. I would like to have a flat tax. I think it is time to have that debate and go to whichever wins the debate and gets rid of the IRS.

My brilliant friend—and I am surprised he let's me call him his friend, but he is a brilliant man—Arthur Laffer, the genius behind turning the devastating economy around under President Carter, I talked to Arthur about this and I said, I would like to go to a flat tax—I know a lot of people want to go to a fair tax—so we can get rid of the IRS, but somebody is going to have to enforce it. How would we do that if there were no IRS? Arthur says, I have got it all spelled out. I have got it written out.

I am hoping some of my colleagues here will meet with Arthur and let him give them the one, two, threes.

He said, You don't need an IRS. He said, The big mistake with the IRS is that the Federal Government set up an entity that not only gets to pick and choose whom they audit, they get to enforce what they find and what they do.

So they can pick either at random or intentionally and maliciously. Even though that violates the law—we have seen it happen already—they can pick who they want to audit, whose life they want to make miserable. And then if they don't comply with what they find and what they order, even though it may be very wrong, then they are capable or have the authority to take everything they have.

That is why my brilliant friend, Arthur Laffer, says, You set up a very small auditing entity, but you cannot give them the power to enforce their audits. That is too much power for one government agency.

□ 1215

So you have a very small auditing agency and, as Arthur said, you don't allow them to ever pick who they want to audit. Every audit is selected at random, so they don't get to pick on people they dislike. They only audit whatever person or entity randomly is selected by the system. And if they were to do otherwise, they would break the law and be subject to punishment themselves.

These days, now, if somebody calls the IRS out, then they are normally going to get hit up with an audit and be treated maliciously by the IRS.

So this article goes on. It says:

I have been an attorney in the IRS Office of Chief Counsel for over 26 years. Over a number of years, I have attempted, largely unsuccessfully, to alert the public to abuse within the IRS. One of my kids suggested I contact a blog, and Power Line has graciously agreed to publish this account.

I do not personally know whether the IRS has targeted conservative groups or individuals, but I do know that the environment within the agency, the IRS, is ripe for such activity, and there is nothing to prevent it from occurring.

As stated in more detail below, I have personally witnessed improper giveaways of billions of dollars to taxpayers with inside access at the agency, bullying of elderly taxpayers, the coverup of managerial embezzlement and misappropriation of thousands of dollars in government funds, and a retaliatory audit.

I have also heard credible accounts of, among other things, further improper giveaways, blatant sexual harassment, and anti-Semitism. All of these have been swept under the rug.

Parenthetically, in this article, where this person, this attorney in the Office of Chief Counsel for over 26 years, points out, anti-Semitism in the IRS? We are seeing it grow.

I mean, when I heard, as a child, in history class, about the Holocaust, and I read that Eisenhower required that people in the community be required to come help clean up these horrid concentration camps where gas ovens and other ways were used to torture and kill Jews, I thought, for Eisenhower to order that, that is a little rough, you know, for these people to have to come out and clean that up. I mean, nobody will ever deny there was a Holocaust. There is too much information about it.

Now we have people denying there is a Holocaust, and as I understand it, there are five main Jewish groups that support Israel, and all of them are being mistreated by the IRS, and they don't want anybody to talk about it because they don't want to get targeted any more than they already have.

Then we see, from an attorney in the Office of the Chief Counsel, or general counsel, for 26 years, he says, I have seen the anti-Semitism within the IRS. So I hope my Jewish friends on the other side of the aisle, my Jewish friends across the country that have not been involved in politics, will wake up and help us clean up the mess in the Federal Government by speaking up about the prejudice and the bias that they have had to live with.

This article goes on:

A number of years ago, a manager in my office, there in the Chief Counsel's Office, the IRS, was embezzling thousands of dollars in travel funds. His actions were common knowledge, but other managers, including a currently high-ranking executive in the Office of Chief Counsel, did not report him.

I did report his conduct to the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration, but they did not investigate the matter for a considerable length of time. After I complained to my local Congressman's office, the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration finally forwarded the matter to the Office of Chief Counsel to be handled internally.

Eventually, the Office of Chief Counsel made the manager pay the money back, but took no other disciplinary action, even though others who committed the same type of scheme were punished severely.

The manager in question has led a charmed life. Several years after this episode he decided to retire, but was starting a new job at a different city 2 months before he was eligible to retire.

He could have retired early and taken annual leave for 2 months before retiring. However, he did not want to take annual leave because Federal employees can cash out annual leave when they retire.

Rather than have him burn at least \$20,000 in annual leave, the IRS transferred him back to the new city, but did not give him any work, allowing him to work at his new job while still receiving a government paycheck.

I obtained an email from this manager in which he admitted that he had no work, that the IRS was not planning to give him any work in the new city, and that he was working on matters related to his new job while at the IRS.

I forwarded this email to the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration, TIGTA, but of course was ignored by both TIGTA and the Office of Chief Counsel.

TIGTA has a well-deserved reputation for protecting IRS managers. In fact, a TIGTA agent once stated that “We don’t investigate IRS managers.”

At the same time, the manager was embezzling travel funds. I was working on a case involving what I call the Elmer’s Glue scam. Tax shelter operators misused synthetic fuel credit.

And for those who don’t know what that means, that is part of the green economy that this administration wants us all to participate in. The bottom line is, it gives them more control over our personal lives. That is what the movement is about.

But nonetheless, there are some that are dedicated to it that really believe in it. But the people at the top, they know it is all about more government controlling people’s lives.

But anyway, he says:

Tax shelter operators misused a synthetic fuel credit by spraying watered down household glue on marketable coal, degrading the coal, but producing huge tax credits for investors. This was costing the Treasury at least \$3 billion a year. The IRS turned a blind eye toward this activity and harassed those of us in the agency who were trying to stop it.

Since I had witnessed TIGTA help cover up embezzlement, I decided to go to the press about the Elmer’s Glue scam. The Wall Street Journal published a story about it, but the scam continued.

As a result of complaining about TIGTA’s inaction regarding embezzlement that is within the IRS, and speaking out about the Elmer’s Glue scam, my wife and I were subjected to a retaliatory IRS audit.

After an experienced revenue agent from Fairfax spent an entire day auditing our tax returns, he stated that they were clean. Soon thereafter, he called me and apologetically stated that his “special projects” manager had ordered him to return to Richmond and keep digging into our returns. He stated that his regular manager would not have ordered this.

In parentheses David Wright says:

I believe that because in 26 years at the IRS, I have never heard of an agent being sent back to continue a straightforward indi-

vidual return that had been judged to be clean.

So David Wright says:

I contacted The Washington Post, gave them my privacy waiver to discuss our tax returns with the Service. When the Post presented that waiver to the Service, they quickly dropped our audit.

Now, I happen to know many IRS agents who are decent, good, hard-working, honorable people. They are the kind of people I would want working in an auditing agency like Arthur Laffer has talked about because I know they would be fair, they are honest.

These are the kind of people that complained to me when the Secretary of the Treasury was given to Tim Geithner, even though he had signed, 4 years in a row, under oath, under penalty of perjury, that he would pay the tax on the funds the International Monetary Fund were paying him if they would not deduct the money he was supposed to pay, so he swore he would pay it personally. And then he blamed it on TurboTax, and he paid it back after he was appointed Secretary of the Treasury.

But there were IRS agents, honest, honorable, decent IRS agents all over the country who were outraged that Timothy Geithner was appointed to the Secretary of the Treasury, to be the boss of people, these people, these front-line workers in the IRS, who made it very clear, if they ever even underpaid, so they had to pay additional taxes at the end of the year, they would be fired.

And here was a guy who didn’t pay his taxes for 4 years, not until he got appointed to be Secretary of the Treasury, that was put in charge of all of these very honest, upright, decent people who happen to work at an agency that includes some who are incredibly corrupt and who protect the corruption as David Wright is pointing out.

Well, David Wright goes on and says:

Within the past few years, the IRS has used a “cadre” to pursue a particular type of case. I was assigned one of those cases that was in Tax Court. I believed we should concede the case in question because our legal position was incorrect. As a result, I was called a quitter and a coward, was threatened with retaliation and, in fact, suffered retaliation.

The cadre—he says I hate that term, but that is what they call themselves, pushed cases with an obvious legal defect. Taxpayers were denigrated in writing as “upper class twits.” And one cadre member stated that, despite the weakness in our legal position, the taxpayers in these cases were typically elderly, and could be forced into settling their cases.

I stated my ethical concerns to management, and they were answered with a short non-response and did not even bother to ask for the name of the cadre member who stated that we could bully elderly taxpayers into settling their cases.

He adds, the Tax Court ultimately rejected the Service’s position regarding that legal issue.

I mean, it ought to scare Americans profoundly that the IRS that is going to be in charge of enforcing the health care law thinks it is okay, at least

some think it is okay, to bully elderly because they are elderly and they will get scared and they will pay the government rather than have the government come down on them. So even though they don’t owe it, we can scare them into paying money because they are elderly.

I mean, Americans ought to be up in arms over this kind of abuse. And to think that a majority in Congress in 2010 wanted this same government controlling everybody’s health care?

Americans need to wake up. This is a danger to their life and their liberty.

He goes on and points out more abuses that shock the conscience. It is outrageous what the IRS—I am sorry—some in the IRS have been able to get away with, this same government that a majority in 2010 trusted with every American’s health care.

□ 1230

We have a story this week from Breitbart. Robert Wilde reports that there are emails now that reveal the Obama administration shut down the World War II Memorial, knowing the World War II veterans were coming.

One email that they cite from a government official says:

While I understand that these memorials have remained accessible to the public during past shutdowns (I’d imagine with the Mall being so open, it’d probably be more manpower-intensive to try to completely close them), I wanted to do my due diligence and make 100 percent sure that people could visit the outdoor memorials on the National Mall in the event of a shutdown.

I can say, from having been out there on October 1 and having pulled one of the two barricades aside so that our World War II veterans could go through the open-air memorial dedicated to them and to their friends that died serving with them—and I saw that, wow, they have shut down an open-air, open-sidewalk, walk-through, roll-through in your wheelchair memorial.

It has cost them money to bring in all these barricades, and I have been there at all hours of the day and night, to the Lincoln Memorial, to the World War II Memorial; and most of the time, it is hard to see a park employee out there, but eventually, if you look hard enough, you will see one or two out there.

The day after the gentleman from Mississippi, Steve Palazzo, and I picked those barricades up and moved them back after I cut the yellow tape, the next day, I counted them—16 Park Service police—many of them on mounted horses that you never see out there, out there to try to intimidate World War II veterans from being able to go through for the one time they were in Washington in their lives to see those places that listed where they fought and where friends died.

As one man with tears told me—he pointed to the islands in the Pacific that were listed, the names of his friends who fought with him and died on each of those islands, and this administration, which wants to control

everybody's health care, wanted to deprive those World War II veterans—knowingly deprive them of just this one chance to roll through in a wheelchair and see what was dedicated to them. It is tragic, what is going on. It is time Americans awoke.

Ben Franklin is credited with saying, in essence, those who are willing to give up liberty for security deserve neither. We are seeing that. Americans have given up so much liberty over and over, saying: well, at least it is going to keep me safer.

At what point do you say enough giving the Federal Government power? We want our liberty that the Founders established in the Constitution, that war after war was fought to provide, that the Declaration acknowledged were rights that were endowed by our Creator.

Some ask: Well, if these rights are endowed by our Creator to life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness, why doesn't everybody in the world have them?

It is real easy. God, the Creator, gave us freedom of choice. We are free to choose things that would do us harm and free to choose the right way that would lead to life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness.

We happen to have been blessed by either being born here or have come to a Nation where we had those liberties, where they were fought for, where the things that were taught in church, that were spoken of in the Bible—the Bible is the most quoted book in the history of this Chamber, especially in the first 150 years, and especially by those who fought against slavery, saying: How can we expect God to continue blessing America when we are putting our brothers and sisters in chains and bondage?

Those individuals laid the groundwork—the foundation for us to have this life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness. We owe them to leave it to the next generation.

Poll after poll say this is probably the first time in American history that a generation will leave a country less free, with less opportunity to their children.

That is why I ran for Congress. I want to do everything I can to keep that from happening.

I was taught as a Boy Scout—especially as an Eagle Scout—we were never to leave a place worse off than we found it; and if we don't turn this thing around, we will be the generation that does that. God help us and God forgive us if we do. We simply cannot do that.

When we have people who have stepped forward, as these in the IRS and Health and Human Services have, to say: Warning, red flag, red light, stop. There is too much abuse here. Demand your freedom back. Quit turning it over to Federal agencies.

When those people are rising up and saying wake up, America, we had better wake up. When we have a President who said, over and over as a Senator,

that we cannot allow a President to usurp more and more power away from Congress, it showed us that he knew right from wrong in this government.

Now, the same President is, by executive order, changing the law repeatedly, and it is time this House rose up and said: we are not funding one single part of the executive branch that usurps power that is not afforded it in the Constitution.

We have the power to do that. Why? Because the Founders put it in the Constitution, and just like our Creator endowed us with certain inalienable rights, just like some parents have plenty to endow to their children when they die, the children don't enjoy those benefits if they won't claim them and be willing to fight for them.

There are always people—evil people who want to take away those benefits, take away those rights; so no matter what someone inherits, if they don't accept it, claim it, and be willing to fight for it, they will not keep those benefits.

We owe the next generation what we were given and better, and until we start holding the executive branch accountable—at least those in it that are not complying with the law, that are violating the law—we are destined to be that evil, narcissistic, self-serving generation that leaves the country worse off than we found it.

Mr. Speaker, I hope and pray that enough of us will arise to prevent that from happening.

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

AID TO PAKISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, for 2 months, public attention has been riveted on Ukraine. Today, I suggest it is harmful to our security to just focus on Ukraine and ignore the battle against radical Islam and the ensuing threat of China that is far more dangerous to us than which direction Crimea goes.

Yesterday, Secretary of State John Kerry requested that Congress approve aid to Pakistan. That is foreign aid to Pakistan. The administration is requesting \$881.8 million for aid to Pakistan. The Congress and the American people should pay attention to this request.

Since 9/11, the United States has given Pakistan over \$25 billion, with over \$17 billion of that going to the Pakistani security services, services that target and kill American soldiers through helping those elements in that part of the world that kill American soldiers and terrorize civilian populations.

Our generosity has only emboldened Pakistan's military clique—that clique that actually rules the country, that

clique that gave refuge to Osama bin Laden.

Most importantly, Pakistan has not been acting as our friend—not just that clique, but the government itself of Pakistan; and we don't need to be supplementing the countries and supporting the countries and giving aid to the countries that are hostile to America's interests and hateful of our way of life.

It is a charade to believe that our aid is buying Pakistan's cooperation in hunting down terrorists, as Secretary Kerry stated yesterday. Frankly, that is wishful thinking, but that is not facing the reality of what we confront in South Asia.

A Pakistani commission reported on the bin Laden raid—the raid that brought bin Laden, the murderer of so many Americans, to justice—and the Pakistani commission points out negative developments in U.S.-Pakistan relations in recent years, and it is, in their view, “a growing American threat” to Pakistani interests.

These are not the sentiments of a regime that wants to work with us. These are not the sentiments of friends.

Remember, when our SEAL teams went to get Osama bin Laden, the Pakistani Government took the wreckage of one of our helicopters—a stealth helicopter, cutting-edge technology that was used in that raid—and gave it to the Communist Chinese.

Of course, the Pakistanis call the Chinese their all-weather friend, and we are supposedly just their fair-weather friend; yet we should be giving, according to this administration, over \$881 million more in aid, on top of the billions that we have already given the Pakistanis.

Indeed, a study by the Pew Research Center's Global Attitudes Project found that 81 percent of those surveyed in Pakistan were favorable to Communist China—Communist China—which represses its own Muslim population, murders Christians, and is a dictatorship of a clique—of a crony capitalist clique that controls that country.

When 81 percent of those surveyed in Pakistan are favorable to that country, while only 11 percent are favorable to the United States, should we be spending money that we are borrowing from China, in order to give money to a country that likes China more than it likes the United States, and we end up giving money to the country and to the people that don't like us?

Well, no. We should cut off our aid to Pakistan because it is not an ally, and any money we send to them only strengthens their ability to act against us and against our friends in Afghanistan and elsewhere.

We cannot buy the friendship of the people of Pakistan, nor can we buy the friendship of the Government of Pakistan. These are people who feel that their core interests and their values go totally against what we believe in and who we are, as a country.