

would have a health care benefit, and if they retired at age 50, they could rely on that company providing them health care until they became eligible for Medicare, and then I guess it would become secondary to Medicare. But what a great benefit. But after all, when you work for a company—I guess a lot of people don't do that today, Madam Speaker. But if you spend 25 or 30 years, 5 days a week, 365 days a year being loyal to that company, you have earned it. It's not a gift. It's something that you have earned.

And when Medicare part D was passed, a lot of concern on the part of the Federal Government that these companies would just say, Well, okay, we'll just drop the coverage for our retirees and they can, when they get eligible agewise for Medicare, they'll just pick up their health care then.

Well, a tax break was given to these companies on that cost that they incurred in providing the health care benefit for their retirees, and indeed it did include prescription drugs for many of these companies. And all of a sudden with this new law, ObamaCare—ObamaCare, Patient Protection and Affordable Health Care Act—that tax break was taken away. I really didn't realize it. I'm on the Energy and Commerce Committee and very involved in all the markups and back-and-forth that went on for a year, but I wasn't aware of that provision. But in the aggregate, something like \$6 billion worth of tax advantage to incentivize these companies to continue to pay the health insurance for their retirees was taken away.

Well, they were required, the companies, as this was a cost to their bottom line, the SEC requirement was that they immediately let the SEC know, to make a filing to that effect. And what they did, they were literally threatened to be drug before the Energy and Commerce Committee with the threat of subpoena to come and prove they weren't lying.

Madam Speaker, my colleagues, and the American people, that is a pretty scary scenario, is it not? Is it not? It's unbelievable is what it is. But these companies submitted all the required documents that the committee demanded and then the committee realized that the companies were right and they were wrong. This indeed was an unintended consequence. And this bill is riddled with stories like that. It's been 3 months and we're finding something new like that almost every day.

Here's also what we got, as I refer you back to the easel. ObamaCare hurts all employers. Independent Mercer Survey on ObamaCare: 97 percent of employers responded that the legislative changes would cause premiums to rise. And indeed they have.

□ 2020

The survey also examined business' fears about the law's new employer mandate penalties. More than one in four employers, 26 percent, and nearly

two in five retailers, 39 percent, may not be in compliance with provisions requiring coverage of all employees working over 30 hours per week. And finally, of those, a majority, 59 percent, said they would consider changing their business practices so that fewer employees work 30 hours or more per week.

So what we're talking about, again, is that this bill, while it may get a few more people health insurance, it's going to cause so many more people to lose their jobs, to add to that 16 million. And, Madam Speaker, as I said earlier, these people, once they've been out of work a while, they want health insurance, but they also want a paycheck because they have to support their families. And they'll do everything they can to protect their health.

You know, they won't let them walk to school on a busy highway, and they'll make sure they're wearing their helmets when they get on their bicycles. But, you know, food is not free, clothes are not free, mortgage payments are not free.

So, again, this is why the American people said, you know, we're in a rut. We're in a ditch, and we think it's time for you to stop digging. You are making it worse. You are digging the hole deeper, borrowing all of this money and us being \$13 trillion in debt. You cannot spend your way out of debt. It's impossible. It can't be done. It's never been done. Let's get this country back on its feet and get people back to work, get that unemployment rate down to 6 percent again; and then we can do the things that we need to do.

Madam Speaker, I could talk about a number of Republican alternatives. WALLY HERGER, my good friend from California who is the ranking member of the Health Subcommittee on Ways and Means, just introduced a bill within the last couple of days that does all the things that we need to do. And I can assure you, Representative WALLY HERGER's bill is not 2,500 pages long. And that's a commonsense sort of thing.

I am going to mention one other thing to my colleagues, and then I'm going to wrap up this evening. I was so disappointed, and my physician colleagues were so disappointed, Madam Speaker, when the President did not follow through on his promise to do something about medical liability reform, so-called tort reform. We've tried to many times pass that in this Chamber under a Republican majority, but we couldn't get it through the Senate. I have given a lot of thought to that. And particularly when the CBO says that we could save \$54 billion over 10 years, I think it's probably closer to \$100 billion a year. I have seen many other studies that suggest that.

But I think that the bill that I am introducing right now—it's called MEDMAL Act of 2010. MEDMAL is an acronym. It stands for Meaningful End to Defensive Medicine and Aimless Lawsuits. Doctors all across this coun-

try are ordering all of these unnecessary tests. They're getting criticized for getting a CAT Scan on everybody that comes into an emergency room with a headache. But I'm telling you, they're doing it not to gin up their own revenues. They're doing it because they're scared to death that if that one in a million situation where the person has a brain tumor or an impending stroke is missed, they will be sued and not only lose all of their assets, they would lose their profession. We can't continue that way. And I would think Republicans and Democrats alike, if we could join hands can do something about that.

So I have introduced a bill, and, Madam Speaker, I think that it will really make a difference. And I will be talking about that a lot as we go through these remaining 6 months of the 111th Congress and trying to work my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to make sure it's something that's fair, that our trial attorneys who, for the most part, are great people and are very skilled in what they do, and they're representing their clients who have been injured maybe by some doctor or hospital practicing below the standard of care, they deserve their day in court. We don't take that away. That would not be right.

But we also try to end this frivolous jackpot justice that exists today. And I think this bill will do that. So while I don't have too much time to talk about it tonight, Madam Speaker, I certainly do plan on sharing it with my colleagues maybe as we come back next week.

Well, let me thank you for your attention tonight. I thank my leadership for giving me the opportunity. I probably needed another hour to really go over everything that I wanted to talk about. But I think it's important for us to know that the American people are not done with this. As I said, it's not over until the American people win because that's why we're up here. We're up here to win for the American people, not for the special interests, not for ourselves. We're public servants, and we're obligated to continue to work to try to do what's right for the American people. And I think we can and will do that.

VACATING 5-MINUTE SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the 5-minute Special Order of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is vacated.

There was no objection.

TOPICS OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, I have appreciated my colleague's insights. Somebody who has spent his entire adult life working on the issues of health care and trying to be a healer and a helper certainly has a good idea about ways to fix our health care system. It's just a shame that in the health care bill that got crammed down everyone's throat here that my friend from Georgia as well as so many of the doctors here were not allowed any real meaningful input.

And it is interesting, as we think about the health care bill that was supposed to do so much, and you consider it in light of the Speaker's comments, that we need to pass the bill so we can find out what's in it. Well, we're beginning to find out more and more. Now, some of us read through the 1,000-page bill. We read through the 2,000-page bill, and when we got this one between 2,000 and 3,000 pages, frankly, I put off going through that.

I knew there wasn't going to be much sleep for a while while I was trying to get through that, and I think I got through about all but about 300 pages. It's tough sledding, though, of course when you are reading through a bill that references other sections and subsections and including other laws that unless you actually go look them up, then it's hard to really get a grasp. Since I have been a judge and dealt with law most of my adult life, sometimes you can pick up things others don't realize.

But it really is heartbreaking to realize as more and more people get into this new so-called health care bill just how much damage is being and will be done. You don't cut \$500 billion from Medicare and not end up having seniors that don't get the care they need. You don't end up increasing taxes by \$500 billion, like this did, and not hurt job creation in this country.

I heard a comment just today from someone who's not a Member of Congress, is an economist. He said, You can't love jobs and hate the people that create them. And that seems to be what we're dealing with. We've got a health care bill that punishes employers. If you dare try to provide health insurance for your employees, then you're going to actually end up paying more than you ever dreamed you would. If you don't pay for health care for your employees, if you have more than 50 employees, you're going to be paying \$2,000 per employee, and that's going to get pretty expensive. It's not going to help them one whit with their health insurance.

But we have done so much damage to jobs, it's just unbelievable. And I am getting more calls and emails into my office from people that are shocked because they thought once the ObamaCare bill went through, all of a sudden they would magically get health care like they never had before. Now what people are going to get for the next few years is a lot of extra taxes, \$500 billion in extra taxes, and

that's not going to be good for the economy.

□ 2030

But as we approach the end of the year, a number of economists have pointed out, things should start picking up the rest of the year if the government doesn't keep interfering and creating problems as it has been because the economy wants to improve itself if we will just let it. But especially the next 6 months, things should be improving because when we get to January 1, 2011, there are going to be the biggest tax increases in American history. January 1 of 2011, it's coming.

And we have seen over and over, you want to hurt the economy, then just have a big tax increase. Our friends across the aisle constantly enjoy saying it is tax cuts that got us into this problem. It is not; it is the spending that went out of control. When the Republicans had Congress from 1995 to 2000, it is the Congress that got a balanced budget. The President doesn't pass a budget. He proposes one. His wasn't used. The Congress came up with a balanced budget. And despite President Clinton kicking and screaming, he finally came along and signed off on the bill, and we had a balanced budget.

The problem came when we had a Republican President and Republican House and Senate. You had Republicans get giddy and start thinking, gee, maybe the Democrats are right and you can show compassion by throwing money at a problem. You can spoil a child by doing that if you are a parent. You can destroy people's desire to work.

I wish more could have benefited from the exchange program from which I learned so much in 1973. There were eight Americans that were allowed into the Soviet Union that summer on that program. At one point the eight of us were out at a collective farm about 30 miles from Kiev in Ukraine, and I was amazed because the fields looked terrible. I am from east Texas and there is a lot of farming and ranching. I have worked on a lot of farms. I could not believe how bad their fields were. They were just pitiful. It looked like nobody had been working out there. The sun was eating them up, and they weren't doing anything about it. The fields were overgrown with weeds. Anyway, all of the farmers in mid-morning were sitting in the shade. I spoke some Russian back then, and I put together some words and tried to nicely say in Russian, When do you work? And they laughed. One of the guys said, in Russian, I make the same number of rubles if I am here or I am out there in the field, so I am here.

Well, there is your lesson on communism. When you end up paying people the same thing if they are working and sweating and killing themselves to grow crops, or if they are sitting in the shade, laughing, cutting up with their friends, they are going to sit in the

shade and laugh and cut up with their friends. It is going to happen. That is why communism has never worked and it will never work.

The Pilgrims tried a form of it out of a Christian thought—if we bring everything in a common storehouse and share things. Even the New Testament Church at one time tried that, and it resulted in the Apostle Paul saying: Okay, new rule; you don't work, you don't eat. The Pilgrims had to do something similar, and they got to a really novel concept: How about if we just give everybody your own private property, it is yours to do with as you wish, but you eat what you grow. You have excess, you can trade it, barter, whatever, use it to buy other things. What a novel idea, giving people private property and letting them be rewarded by the sweat of their brow instead of rewarding their neighbor.

Many people think that, and as a Christian I don't seek to ram my beliefs into someone else, but as a Christian if you care you would like for people to understand what is at risk. But I hear Christians here on the floor who have spoken up and said, You know, Jesus said, as you have done to the least of these, my children, you have done to me. He said we are to help the widows and orphans. He said we are to help the less fortunate. I was naked and you clothed me. I was hungry and you fed me. Where is that compassion in here? What they misunderstand is that Jesus never said go thee therefor, use and abuse your taxing authority, take somebody else's money, and do your charitable work. He meant for you to do it with your own money, your own effort, not go take from somebody else and legalize your stealing from somebody else so you give to your favorite charity. That is not what he intended. He knew in an orderly society you would have need of government. You would need courts. That is why Romans 13 talks about the role of government. If you do evil, be afraid, because the government is supposed to be fair. But fairness is not taking in a form of legalized stealing, taking somebody else's money to give to your favorite charity.

That is why after Zacchaeus met Jesus, the first thing he did was go and cut taxes. Fact is he even created a 4 to 1 rebate for those from whom he improperly took tax money. But you don't hear that kind of talk a whole lot here; you hear you guys are heartless and uncaring.

When you think about eagles or birds, it seems so mean and uncaring for a mother to shove that bird out of the nest and force them to learn to fly. It seems mean. It seems uncaring. But unless they do that, they are never going to learn to fly. There are people who could fly in this country, figuratively speaking, and yet the government keeps pushing just enough money into their hands to keep them subsisting and just enough money to keep them beholden to the big master here

in Washington. It is as if there are people here in this city who want people across America to see us in Congress as the big master. And you are the slave. You are the servant. We want you beholden to us. That's not what this Nation was founded on.

This Nation was founded on the ideas, and you read them and hear them if you study history—I had wonderful history teachers, and it breaks my heart to hear people who don't understand where we came from and the basis for this country. But it was not to lure people into subsistence and dependence on the government. That was never the purpose. It was to inspire people. It was to give them liberty and freedom and say you can be anything you want to be. And some of us were blessed to have parents who loved us and would say that: you can be anything you want to be.

□ 2040

And now today, unfortunately, surveys are showing, indicating 70 percent of American adults, first time in our history, are saying we don't believe our children are going to have the opportunities and liberties, the life as good as we have had it. That is tragic. And that is why some of us ran for Congress, because we are going to do everything in our power to prevent that from happening, so our children can have an even better life, better liberty, better freedoms than we had. It can still happen, but it cannot happen when this government is determined to make people completely reliant on it.

One of the things that drove me to run for Congress, to leave the judicial bench, was I knew judges were not supposed to legislate, and I didn't. Sometimes I didn't like the laws I had to follow, but if we were going to have a rule of law in this country, judges have to follow the laws, and I did. But it was seeing how many examples over and over presented themselves that had indications that government lured these people away from their God-given potential and into ruts from which they could not extricate themselves, with no hope of getting out unless they committed a crime. That's the way it would look to them. How did we get so far afield from the foundation of this Nation that inspired people to reach their heights?

And I understand, I mean we're all affected by how we're raised and the people that had an impact on our lives. And I am sure there are those in America who, if they came from a broken home, there are even people who have been given everything with a silver spoon who would seem to have come from nothing and yet had the best schools all the way up, had the greatest things. And I can understand if somebody has been given everything their whole life that they've ever wanted that they would think, Well, we need to do that for other people because, look at me, I've reached the top and, you know, I had everything given

to me. I never really had a real job, never really had to work to earn things for myself. Everything was given to me, so let's just give everything to everybody else.

Unfortunately, we come back to the quote I read earlier, "You can't love jobs and hate the people who create them." It doesn't work. And jobs are not created for very long by government without hurting the private sector, meaning eventually the government takes over everything, provides the jobs. And there's no better example of where that goes than we had in the Soviet Union.

Eventually, just like the Pilgrims, just like the New Testament church, people in leadership realize we've made a mess. Now, the question is: Can we get back on track? It was one of the Caesars that realized providing bread and circuses had made the people lazy, they were unproductive, and it was destroying the Roman Empire. And he tried to do away with bread and circuses to push people, as the mother eagle does, push the baby out of the nest so it will be forced to fly.

Unfortunately, when you have made them dependent for so long, for too long, they don't fly. They start rioting in the streets. They don't reach their potential. They start destroying what others have and what others have created for themselves, and you eventually destroy the society. They had to reinstate the bread and circuses, and they knew there was no way to avoid the eventual end because people had become too dependent on government.

Phil Gramm used to say, when you got one more in the wagon than pulling the wagon, the wagon's going to stop. We've gone from 39 percent of U.S. adults not paying income tax now approaching 50 percent. And when we get over 50 percent, if those people that do not pay any taxes all vote, then we're done for, because you'll have people picking the leaders, just as has been predicted thousands of years ago, you will have people selecting the leaders based on how much they will be promised from the public treasury, and the public treasury will go broke. And then you are put to the situation that the Soviet Union had. You can't print it fast enough to get out of debt. You can't borrow enough to sustain you any longer, so you have to announce this country is out of business. We're done. And that's where this country is going.

My friends across the aisle in 2005 and 2006 who complained bitterly about deficit spending were right. We should not have been deficit spending. It's a big reason that our friends across the aisle won the majority. But in the 4 years since, nearly 4 years, we have gone, in one case, a \$160 billion budget to a \$1.6 trillion budget. They said the right things. I thought they believed them. You've got to stop deficit spending. Yet here after the majority shifted, we have found ourselves with 10 times the deficit that we were beat up for, properly, 4 or 5 years ago. The defi-

cits have to stop. We are destroying this country.

You look back at what President Reagan did, had a great economist, Art Laffer. And he had said you need a 30 percent tax cut. If you will cut taxes 30 percent, you will see this economy explode. Unfortunately, that 30 percent tax cut was put in place over a 3-year period. In 1981, there was only like a 1½ percent tax cut; in 1982, a 10 percent tax cut; in 1983 about a 20 percent tax cut. So just as Laffer predicted, when he got so troubled when he heard that it was going to be phased in over 3 years, he said 1981 and 1982 are going to be disastrous, 1983, when the full tax cut comes through, it will be terrific. And that's what happened, and that's how President Reagan got a second term.

The big tax cuts came through. The problem was deficit spending did not stop. And it's carried on even today, with that brief interim. When the serious Republicans took the majority, 1995 to 2000, they balanced the budget. But we've got to get back to that or those 70 percent of American adults who think their kids will not have it as good as they did, they will end up being right.

Now, look at some of the judgment that is being utilized these days. You have people that say they believe in the law, and yet you had a Federal judge say you can't act arbitrarily and capriciously and just ban all offshore drilling even among people who are doing everything right.

You know, I betcha if the Federal Government had said we are going to have a moratorium on our dear friends, the big Democratic contributors from a company called British Petroleum, if we just have a moratorium on British Petroleum offshore rigs, there would have been a basis, because we knew, it appears at least, that they cut some corners. And the more you find out, the more you realize they kind of felt like somebody here in Washington had their back.

They were working with this administration, with the Democratic majority, particularly in the Senate, to pass a number of bills that most people think were not a good idea. But the TARP bill, British Petroleum supported that. The stimulus bill. Most people think, you know, oh, these big oil companies, they are all Republican. Well, if you look, just like Wall Street, Wall Street gives about four to one to Democrats over Republicans. And with British Petroleum, they were working so closely with the administration and with Democrats in the majority, as one article talks about, Senator KERRY communicating with, working with British Petroleum to try to pass the crap-and-trade bill at the very time that the Deepwater Horizon blew out.

□ 2050

It is beginning to appear that British Petroleum used a cheap way of drilling in such deep water. It shouldn't have

been used in such deep water. That is what is beginning to emerge, it appears may be the case, and that it seems like there was almost an attitude that we don't have to worry; we're big buddies with the White House and with the majority. They've got our backs; we can cut corners.

We find out Minerals Management Service sent out their two-man unionized father-and-son team to be the last team of offshore inspectors that inspected the Deepwater Horizon. There's certainly plenty of anecdotal stories about how the inspections were not occurring as they should and there were gifts changing hands, all kinds of problems.

We find out that a lady who was in the Clinton administration that actually signed the notices about the deepwater leases, offshore leases, back in '99 and '98, that pulled the price adjustment language, which has now apparently cost our country billions of dollars from its Treasury where they should have gone to big companies like British Petroleum. It turns out that lady went to work for British Petroleum for 8 years, from 2001 until 2009; and then in June of 2009 she came back to work for Minerals Management Service, even though we heard from the Deputy Secretary of the Interior, oh, yeah, we've recused her from areas where she may have a conflict. Give me a break. From British Petroleum?

No wonder they thought somebody here in Washington, their Democratic majority friends, the White House, had their back, so they could go cheaply, they could cut corners and make extra profit because they were in with the powers that be here in Washington. They were in. They were in favor of the crap-and-trade bill. They had supported TARP. They had supported the stimulus. And this administration loved having a big oil company that supported them on this stuff so that they could tout that.

So, sure, BP thought they had their back covered. And it was only when, after a number of weeks when it became very clear that the American public was furious, appropriately, at British Petroleum, that the administration realized they needed to throw them under the bus, and so they finally did. But what better thing to do, if you're going to hurt one of your friends by throwing them under the bus, then just hurt all the oil companies so that they're all hurt equally, except, of course, the one we heard on television that may be George Soros' biggest individual investment, over \$900 million to drill offshore Brazil. We loaned them \$2 billion from this country even though we won't drill our own stuff and have a moratorium.

In this article about the deepwater drilling ban and the Federal judge, Feldman, that lifted it, this article, and this was from Bloomberg, indicates that Judge Feldman granted a preliminary injunction halting the moratorium and immediately prohibited the

U.S. from enforcing the ban. Government lawyers told Feldman the ban was based on findings in a U.S. report following the sinking of the Deepwater Horizon rig off the Louisiana coast in April.

But then Judge Feldman, after he reviewed that, said: "The court is unable to divine or fathom a relationship between the findings and the immense scope of the moratorium." The quote continues: "The blanket moratorium, with no parameters, seems to assume that because one rig failed and although no one yet fully knows why, all companies and rigs drilling new wells over 500 feet also universally present an imminent danger."

I bet if they had just only imposed a moratorium on this administration's former dear friend and the majority, particularly in the Senate, British Petroleum, then that moratorium probably would have held, because there are, seem to be, indications they were cutting corners.

Judge Feldman said this, also: "The court cannot substitute its judgment for that of the agency, but the agency must, quote, cogently explain why it has exercised its discretion in a given manner." Judge Feldman then says "it has not done so" and that it must be "immediately prohibited" in order to avoid "irreparable harm."

And then what seemed to be offensive even more so from this administration was announcing that there would be an appeal even before the opinion was read. It's as if this administration really and truly does not care about the law. We saw that with the auto task force. Their bankruptcy laws say there have to be time for alternative plans for reorganization, secured creditors take the first, unsecured creditors take last and least. Those laws were turned, just thrown out by an auto task force meeting in the White House, appointed by the President, without any confirmation from the Senate, without any input from Congress.

We couldn't even find out what was discussed in those meetings. They just threw aside the bankruptcy law, threw aside the Constitution that says before you can take property there must be due process, threw all those laws to the side, completely dismembered the Constitution and the bankruptcy laws and found a bankruptcy judge. Perhaps since they have to be reappointed, it's not a lifetime, this bankruptcy judge was hoping to be reappointed as a bankruptcy judge, perhaps he was hoping for a lifetime appointment, but the judge signed off on it. Clearly illegal.

The Supreme Court should have stopped it but apparently the administration scared enough of the Supreme Court judges that if they held up this bankruptcy plan and the sale to an Italian, an inferior car company, then all people in the car business would lose their jobs, and they used scare tactics and got even the Supreme Court to overtly walk away from the Constitution and ignore it. And this is the kind

of thing we see now. They won't even read the opinion of the judge to see if it makes sense, just simply announces we're going to appeal.

But then again, what would you expect from an administration that didn't have the decency to call the Governor of Arizona and say, you know what, Governor, we owe you an apology. We are so sorry. We should have been doing our job as a Federal Government. We should not have allowed 75 percent of gang members who are violent in this country to be here illegally. We shouldn't have allowed illegals to destroy wilderness area national parks and put people at life and liberty at risk, property at risk. We shouldn't have allowed that to happen to Arizona. We should have done our job, and we're sorry.

Oh, no, that didn't happen. Instead, the Secretary of State was sent to Ecuador to tell Ecuador, since I guess the administration thinks we owe Ecuador more than we do one of the 50 States, of the U.S. citizens, we owe more to Ecuador apparently, so they were told about the lawsuit that would be forthcoming against Arizona's law from people who announced without ever reading the law that it was a terrible thing, it was racist, it was profiling; and they had not even read the law.

□ 2100

You know, it's scary. It's really scary what's going on around here when the law doesn't matter. I never thought I would see a time in our country's history like this when the law just didn't matter.

"We're in power."

I really enjoy Bill O'Reilly's show on Fox, but I heard him say the other night, What's wrong with the President's bringing in a company CEO and having the Attorney General there, who has already announced he is investigating them? He wants to charge them with a crime, and have him sitting there for no other reason, obviously, than to intimidate the CEO of British Petroleum and to get them to fork up a \$20 billion fund. There is a reason that one man in this country is not supposed to have that kind of authority to extort money.

Bill O'Reilly said, oh, he thought it was fine. In fact, he would even go in with a machine gun and force them to give up that kind of money. I hope and pray he got carried away when he made that comment and that he really doesn't believe that, because what that would be saying is, when someone does something as hideous as what British Petroleum has done here—taking lives, wounding, injuring people, destroying landscape, destroying vast areas—it's okay if you become a criminal if they have been so very negligent.

It's not okay to let someone's negligence force you into becoming a criminal. We've got to be above those things, and we've got to follow the law. There are laws that say you cannot abuse your office by threatening prosecution unless someone does something financially that you direct.

Anyway, these are just amazing times when smart, people, with wisdom on most occasions, are letting that go to the wind as a result of some heinous negligence—and maybe at some point we'll find out—some criminally negligent activity, as we've seen from British Petroleum.

We owe it to Arizona and the people of the United States to enforce the borders. There are people coming into this country who want to destroy our way of life.

I talked to a retired FBI agent who said that one of the things they are looking at are terrorist cells overseas which have figured out how to game our system. It appears they would have young women who would become pregnant. They would get them into the United States to have a baby, and they wouldn't even have to pay anything for the baby. Then the babies would return back where they could be raised and coddled as future terrorists. Then one day 20, 30 years down the road, they could be sent in to help destroy our way of life because they would have figured out how stupid we've been in this country to allow our enemies to game our system, to hurt our economy, to get set up in a position to destroy our way of life. Yet we won't do anything about it. We'll even sue a State that tries to do something about it.

We have a national park down on the Arizona-Mexico border that now has signs posted to warn American citizens not to go into the area because it is being used by people illegally there. You know, it's kind of like those spaces in roads where a city just doesn't want to spend the money to fix a hole or a bump. So, instead of fixing the problem, they'll just stick up a sign, saying, "Bump." That's what we're doing. We have got a problem. People are putting life and limb and sacred fortunes at risk, and all we're doing is putting up a sign saying that this is a dangerous area and that you probably don't want to come over here.

Let's see. This is an article from Fox News, authored by Joshua Rhett Miller. Anyway, in quoting from the article:

"Roughly 3,500 acres of the Buenos Aires National Wildlife Refuge—about 3 percent of the 118,000-acre park—have been closed since October 6, 2006, when U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service officials acknowledged a marked increase in violence along a tract of land that extends north from the border for roughly three-quarters of a mile. Federal officials say they have no plans to reopen the area."

We've just got to let the illegal, violent people have that property, and U.S. citizens can't use it. It has been closed.

The article reads, "Elsewhere, at Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument, which shares a 32-mile stretch of the border with Mexico, visitors are warned on a federally run Web site that some areas are not accessible by anyone.

"Due to our proximity to the international boundary with Mexico, some areas near the border are closed for construction and visitor safety concerns," the Web site reads.

We're not going to fix the bump in the road. We're just going to put up a sign that says, "Bump." Well, why don't you spend the money that's being spent on the sign to stop the problem? Instead, States like Arizona are driven to try to protect themselves.

Now, we have got an area down there, a wilderness area in this park, the Organ Pipe Cactus National Park, with a 32-mile stretch. It is wilderness area, so you can't even drive a vehicle. Border Patrol can't drive a vehicle into that area. A helicopter can't land in that area. Border Patrol is not allowed to adequately do their job there. How crazy is that? It's because we've got massive numbers of illegals—some violent, as we've found out—coming in there, doing damage and putting our Nation at risk. Instead, we declare it off limits to our own people. You can't keep a country going when you have that little regard for the country's future safety and current safety.

It's interesting, too. Under U.S. law, the Border Patrol can go onto private land along the U.S. border with Mexico or Canada. It can go in up to 25 miles away from the border to do their jobs except in this national park area. They're not allowed to go in to do their job there.

That's why I've prepared a bill that would direct the Secretary of the Interior or Border Patrol—and this is the way it works in this country, in this government. The law is we have to have a study done to see what would be an appropriate amount of land before we would be allowed to transfer it. This bill would require that a study be completed to determine the buffer area needed to allow for border protection and for environmental protection on lands administered by the Department of the Interior along the border of Arizona and Mexico. Then they'd have to come back very quickly. I put in 6 months. They want to have 2 years normally. We haven't got that kind of time. They'd come back and tell us how much would be appropriate to convey over, away from the park, so that we could adequately control our border. It's the only thing that makes sense in that regard, and I'm hoping that many of my colleagues will sign onto that bill.

Another thing we've done here is we, today, passed a bill making tougher sanctions regarding Iran. They are tougher sanctions, and that's a good thing. The trouble is it has taken so long to get sanctions in place and the centrifuges in Iran have been spinning for so long that, according to the IAEA, they have enough nuclear material to make two bombs now.

Well, let's think about that.

I have a resolution here, and I'm hoping, Madam Speaker, that we will have people who will get on board. I think

I've got around 50 cosponsors, but there is no reason that most of the Congress should not be sponsoring this bill, so I would submit the following, and this is from the bill that has been crafted and that I am proposing.

□ 2110

The whereases are as follows:

Whereas, with the dawn of modern Zionism, the national liberation movement of the Jewish people some 150 years ago, the Jewish people determined to return to their homeland in the Land of Israel from the lands of their dispersion;

Whereas, in 1922, the League of Nations mandated that the Jewish people were the legal sovereigns over the Land of Israel and that legal mandate has never been superceded;

Whereas, in the aftermath of the Nazi-led Holocaust from 1933 to 1945, in which the Germans and their collaborators murdered 6 million Jewish people in a premeditated act of genocide, the international community recognized that the Jewish State, built by Jewish pioneers, must gain its independence from Great Britain;

Whereas, the United States was the first Nation to recognize Israel's independence in 1948, and the State of Israel has since proven herself to be a faithful ally of the United States in the Middle East;

Whereas, the United States and Israel have a special friendship based on shared values, and together share the common goal of peace and security in the Middle East;

Whereas, on October 20, 2009, President Barack Obama rightly noted that the United States-Israel relationship is a "bond that is much more than a strategic alliance";

Whereas, the national security of the United States, Israel, and allies in the Middle East face a clear and present danger from the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran seeking nuclear weapons and the ballistic missile capability to deliver them;

Whereas, Israel would face an existential threat from a nuclear weapons-armed Iran;

Whereas, President Barack Obama had been firm and clear in declaring United States opposition to a nuclear-armed Iran, stating on November 7, 2008, "Let me state—repeat what I stated during the course of the campaign. Iran's development of a nuclear weapon, I believe, is unacceptable."

If I might interject here, this bill was drafted to be extremely bipartisan to show that people on both sides of the aisle have the same concerns. We've just got to get people signed on as cosponsors so that we can get this to the floor for a vote.

But going back to the resolution:

Whereas, on October 26, 2005, at a conference in Tehran called "World Without Zionism," Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad stated, "God willing, with the force of God behind it, we shall soon experience a world without the United States and Zionism";

Whereas, The New York Times reported that during his October 26, 2005, speech, President Ahmadinejad called for “this occupying regime—Israel—to be wiped off the map”;

Whereas, on April 14, 2006, Iranian President Ahmadinejad said, “Like it or not, the Zionist regime, Israel, is heading toward annihilation”;

Whereas, on June 2, 2008, Iranian President Ahmadinejad said, “I must announce that the Zionist regime—Israel—with a 60-year record of genocide, plunder, invasion, and betrayal, is about to die and will soon be erased from the geographical scene”;

Whereas, on June 2, 2008, Iranian President Ahmadinejad said, “Today, the time for the fall of the satanic power of the United States has come, and the countdown to annihilation of the emperor of power and wealth has started”;

Whereas, on May 20, 2009, Iran successfully tested a surface-to-surface long-range missile with an approximate range of 1,200 miles—which, by the way, if it were on a ship off the Texas coast could get it up to the middle of the country, 300 miles up, and which if exploded, as well-known among those who have looked at the issue, would create an electromagnetic pulse, an EMP, which some experts have told us will fry every computer chip in the country, and indications are even Wal-Mart would not be able to sell a product. Electricity would not be generated. It just is important to note what 1,200 miles means.

Whereas, Iran continues its pursuit of nuclear weapons;

Whereas, Iran has been caught building three secret nuclear facilities since 2002;

Whereas, Iran continues its support of international terrorism, has ordered its proxy Hezbollah to carry out catastrophic acts of international terrorism such as the bombing of the Jewish AMIA Center in Buenos Aires, Argentina, in 1994, and could give a nuclear weapon to a terrorist organization in the future;

Whereas, Iran has refused to provide the International Atomic Energy Agency with full transparency and access to its nuclear program;

Whereas, United Nations Security Council Resolution 1803 states that according to the International Atomic Energy Agency, “Iran has not established full and sustained suspension of all enrichment-related and reprocessing activities and heavy water-related projects as set out in Resolution 1696 (2006), 1737 (2006), and 1747 (2007), nor resumed its cooperation with the IAEA under the Additional Protocol, nor taken the other steps required by the IAEA Board of Governors, nor complied with the provisions of Security Council Resolution 1696 from 2006, 1737 from 2006, and 1747 from 2007 . . .”;

Whereas, at July 2009’s G-8 Summit in Italy, Iran was given a September 2009 deadline to start negotiations over its nuclear programs, and Iran offered

a 5-page document lamenting the “ungodly ways of thinking prevailing in global relations,” and included various subjects but left out any mention of Iran’s own nuclear program, which was the true issue in question;

Whereas, the United States has been fully committed to finding a peaceful resolution to the Iranian nuclear threat, and has made boundless efforts seeking such a resolution and to determine if such a resolution is even possible;

And, whereas, the United States does not want or seek war with Iran, but it will continue to keep all options open to prevent Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons;

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the House of Representatives:

Condemns the government—number one, condemns the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran for its threats of “annihilating” the United States and the State of Israel, for its continued support of international terrorism, and for its incitement of genocide of the Israeli people;

Two, supports using all means of persuading the Government of Iran to stop building and acquiring nuclear weapons;

Three, reaffirms the United States’ bond with Israel and pledges to continue to work with the Government of Israel and the people of Israel to ensure that their sovereign nation continues to receive critical economic and military assistance, including missile defense capabilities needed to address the threat of Iran; and

Four, expresses support for Israel’s right to use all means necessary to confront and eliminate nuclear threats posed by Iran, defend Israeli sovereignty, and protect the lives and safety of the Israeli people, including the use of military force if no other peaceful solution can be found within a reasonable time.

□ 2120

Now, that’s what we should have passed today instead of sanctions because the sanctions have not been productive, the centrifuges continue to turn, and Ahmadinejad continues to make threats.

Another thing that’s been going on is the snubbery of Israel by this administration and the incredibly hurtful vote with Israel’s enemies to force them to open up and reveal their most powerful defenses, similar to what Hezekiah did back 2,000 years before there was a Mohammed—back, unfortunately, as Helen Thomas never had anybody kind enough to teach her the truth, the historic truth. Thousands of years before Mohammed, Hezekiah was in Israel—well, I guess not quite 2,000 years. But after he showed the Babylonians his treasure and all his defenses, Isaiah came and said, Because of this, everything they have seen will be taken away.

You don’t show your enemies all of your defenses, your strongest defenses

because they’ll figure out a way to defeat them. And because this administration has been rather rude to Prime Minister Netanyahu—there’s a letter that I’m hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that Members will join in signing, bipartisan, Speaker PELOSI and Leader REID. The letter simply, bipartisan in nature, says: “This letter is to simply state the obvious need for the Prime Minister of our dear friend Israel to address a joint session of Congress. He has been here in Washington on numerous occasions but has not addressed a joint session of Congress since 1996.

“In our Nation’s history, we have invited over 100 leaders from 50 different countries to speak before joint sessions of Congress. At this time, with the enemies of America and Israel looking for weaknesses in our close relationship, we can show them that Israel is our friend and will be our friend, and we want to hear from its leader, Prime Minister Netanyahu.

“With the magnitude of international events and tensions swirling in recent years and the threat of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East, it is desperately important that we show the world the importance of our relationship with Israel by inviting Prime Minister Netanyahu to come address this body. The sooner we extend such an invitation, the more stabilizing it will be. We, the undersigned, urge you to extend the invitation to Prime Minister Netanyahu to speak to a joint session of Congress as soon as possible.”

When the enemies of Israel were to see both sides of the aisle standing and applauding the Prime Minister of Israel, the message could not be more clear, but we need to send that message. It needs to be clear. It needs to be unequivocal. People need to know that we support our friend, and there is not a great deal of distance between our two countries. We’re close friends.

And if I might inquire how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MINNICK). The gentleman has about 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GOHMERT. Well, in closing, let me just refer to this little Bible my aunt says my uncle received going into World War II from the Federal Government when he went in the Army. It has a metal plate on it. It says: “May the Lord be with you.” And I realize this will be the last couple of minutes we’re in session this week. So these are the words of Franklin D. Roosevelt on the flyleaf:

“The White House, Washington. As Commander in Chief, I take pleasure in commending the reading of the Bible to all who serve in the Armed Forces of the United States. Throughout the centuries, men of many faiths and diverse origins have found in the Sacred Book words of wisdom, counsel and inspiration. It is a fountain of strength and now, as always, an aid in attaining the highest aspirations of the human soul.”

Franklin Roosevelt had a good idea there. And I will commend that, Mr. Speaker.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. DAHLKEMPER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. TOWNS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FORTENBERRY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, July 1.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, July 1.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, June 28, 29, 30, and July 1.

Ms. FOX, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MACK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FORTENBERRY, for 5 minutes, today.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 3962. An act to provide a physician payment update, to provide pension funding relief, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The Speaker announced her signature to enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1660. An act to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act to reduce the emissions of formaldehyde from composite wood products, and for other purposes.

S. 2865. An act to reauthorize the Congressional Award Act (2 U.S.C. 801 et seq.), and for other purposes.

S.J. Res. 32. Joint resolution recognizing the 60th anniversary of the outbreak of the Korean War and reaffirming the United States-Korea alliance.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 25, 2010, at 4 p.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Speaker-Authorized Official Travel during the second quarter of 2010 pursuant to Public Law 95-384 are as follows:

(AMENDED) REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, JENNIFER M. STEWART, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 29 AND MAY 4, 2010

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Jennifer M. Stewart	4/30	5/1	Qatar		390.00		8,578.00				8,968.00
	5/1	5/2	Afghanistan		78.00						78.00
	5/2	5/3	Pakistan		721.00						721.00
Committee total											9,767.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. JOHN A. BOEHNER, June 10, 2010.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO QATAR, AFGHANISTAN, AND GERMANY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAY 6 AND MAY 10, 2010

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Nancy Pelosi	5/7	5/8	Qatar		227.00		(3)				227.00
Hon. Susan Davis	5/7	5/8	Qatar		341.00		(3)				341.00
Hon. Donna Edwards	5/7	5/8	Qatar		341.00		(3)				341.00
Hon. Niki Tsongas	5/7	5/8	Qatar		341.00		(3)				341.00
Hon. Madeleine Bordallo	5/7	5/8	Qatar		341.00		(3)				341.00
Hon. Wilson Livingood	5/7	5/8	Qatar		280.00		(3)				280.00
Wyndee Parker	5/7	5/8	Qatar		291.00		(3)				291.00
Bridget Fallon	5/7	5/9	Qatar		682.00		(3)				682.00
Kate Knudson	5/7	5/9	Qatar		682.00		(3)				682.00
Brendan Daly	5/7	5/8	Qatar		277.31		(3)				277.31
Debra Wada	5/7	5/8	Qatar		341.00		(3)				341.00
Hon. Nancy Pelosi	5/8	5/9	Afghanistan				(3)				
Hon. Susan Davis	5/8	5/9	Afghanistan		28.00		(3)				28.00
Hon. Donna Edwards	5/8	5/9	Afghanistan		28.00		(3)				28.00
Hon. Niki Tsongas	5/8	5/9	Afghanistan				(3)				
Hon. Madeleine Bordallo	5/8	5/9	Afghanistan		28.00		(3)				28.00
Hon. Wilson Livingood	5/8	5/9	Afghanistan				(3)				
Wyndee Parker	5/8	5/9	Afghanistan		10.00		(3)				10.00
Brendan Daly	5/8	5/9	Afghanistan				(3)				
Debra Wada	5/8	5/9	Afghanistan				(3)				
Hon. Nancy Pelosi	5/9	5/10	Germany		87.00		(3)				87.00
Hon. Susan Davis	5/9	5/10	Germany		177.25		(3)				177.25
Hon. Donna Edwards	5/9	5/10	Germany		177.25		(3)				177.25
Hon. Niki Tsongas	5/9	5/10	Germany		177.25		(3)				177.25
Hon. Madeleine Bordallo	5/9	5/10	Germany		177.25		(3)				177.25
Hon. Wilson Livingood	5/9	5/10	Germany		116.25		(3)				116.25
Wyndee Parker	5/9	5/10	Germany		96.87		(3)				96.87
Bridget Fallon	5/9	5/10	Germany		230.50		3908.00				1,138.50
Kate Knudson	5/9	5/10	Germany		230.50		3908.00				1,138.50
Brendan Daly	5/9	5/10	Germany		53.25		(3)				53.25
Debra Wada	5/9	5/10	Germany		85.25		(3)				85.25
Committee total											7,662.93

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Military air transportation.

HON. NANCY PELOSI, Speaker of the House, June 10, 2010.