

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. MORAN of Kansas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. WHITFIELD addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

VACATING 5-MINUTE SPECIAL ORDER

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

There was no objection.

□ 1700

THE WEEK AT A GLANCE IN CONGRESS

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 as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it has been quite a week. We've heard friends across the aisle get up and talk about how we've "expanded civil rights in the military." And I appreciate the fact that friends believe they did a wonderfully noble thing for the military, just as they would probably think they did a wonderfully noble thing to expand civil rights in courts martial that occur in the military. But the fact is, under our United States Constitution, that so many people want to keep referring to when it's convenient, it anticipates that there will be different rights afforded in different areas, one of which is in our United States military.

The purpose of the military is not to be some socially engineered experiment. It is to do one thing, and that is to protect our homeland, protect our way of life. For that reason, the Constitution anticipated that Congress,

under its authority to create courts, could set up military commissions, could set up and pass the Uniform Code of Military Justice, which gave the military an entirely different type of structure when it comes to processing their rights and adjudicating different aspects of military life. Because to do otherwise, to give everyone in the military, as I was for 4 years, the same rights that are afforded in a civilian court means that you can destroy the function of the military because so often the military doesn't have time to do all of the same things a civilian court does. That's why the UCMJ was created, that's why it's constitutional, and that's why we needed some forum like that for our military.

It is always an honor to get to speak in this hallowed Hall, but hopefully we can cast some light on what it means to be in the military because, for example, if you are suspected and there is probable cause to believe that a military member has committed a crime, then it can be pursued as an article 15, nonjudicial punishment. And as we saw with the outrageous pursuit of an article 15 against three valiant servicemembers, they had the right to choose not to accept the nonjudicial punishment that could have forced them into restriction, extra duty, taken away pay, dropped them in rank. Instead of having that forced on them, they were afforded their right, under the UCMJ, to say I'm not going to accept this; I want to go to trial in a court martial. That's what occurred, and all three were acquitted—fortunately and appropriately. But that's one of the ways.

Another way is the commander, at different levels of command, can order a court martial be convened. A court will be convened, and a military judge is appointed. And if it is the commanding general of a facility, he can order a general court martial, the highest level court martial under the UCMJ. And at that general court martial, you can have a dishonorable discharge—and it depends on the crime as to how serious the punishment could be—but it could be as serious as a dishonorable discharge and even life in prison. So it's a very serious matter.

But whereas during the days when I was a prosecutor, an attorney, a judge, a chief justice, when there was a jury selection in a civil court, you randomly sent out notices and randomly brought people in, and then you went through a jury qualification with all of those and called out those who did not meet the requirements of the law to be a juror in a particular case. And then once the jury panel was qualified, they were brought before the parties of a particular case and they went through what we in Texas call voir dire, but most of the country calls voir dire—it's just the way we talk in Texas. But during voir dire, the attorneys have the opportunity to ask questions of the jury panel so that they can determine whether or not there are people who can be struck for cause, and to also

allow them to exercise what are called peremptory strikes so they can go through—and in Texas, you can have as many as 10 strikes in the right cases—to strike them for any reason as long as it was not prohibited by the Constitution, strike people for no reason.

In the military, if a commanding general convenes a court martial, it means he has signed off ordering that that servicemember be prosecuted. So he's the convening authority for the court martial. He has ordered that this person be prosecuted, so he is satisfied in his mind, he thinks this guy ought to be prosecuted, brought to justice. And then that same authority gets to pick the people who will be on the jury. And the attorney for the defendant in the military will have no rights to peremptory challenges as you would in the civilian court. They would have no right to try to determine who he would like to strike for peremptory reasons.

It's a very difficult process for a defendant or defense attorney. There are cases in which someone can get life in prison in the military and may only have five members handpicked by the commanding general to be on the jury. Now, why would that be allowed? That probably just really infuriates some who are so concerned about civil rights and they will say, well, that's not fair. But what they don't understand is, in the military, you can't go through all the processes that we have so luxuriously been bestowed with in the civilian sector and still be able to fight wars and protect us against all these enemies, foreign and domestic. There has to be a difference in the rights that are afforded those in the military and those in the civilian sector, or the military cannot function. If they are out on the battlefield, they don't have time to go through a full civil trial and afford all the civil rights because, if they did, they would lose every battle. You can't do that to them and expect them to defend us.

So there are different rights for those in the military than those in American society, and it has to be so to have the strongest military that mankind and the world and history has ever known and ever seen, and that is exactly what we have today.

But our military was made promises earlier this year from the White House through the leadership here in Congress. They were promised that we're looking at changing the policy of Don't Ask, Don't Tell, which will allow those who practice homosexuality to do so openly and overtly. For most of the history of our Nation, the military has made sodomy a crime for which you could go to prison. So we've made a dramatic turn in more recent years so that people could feel comfortable that they are afforded all the civil rights.

We're moving to giving our military all the civil rights that we all have in the civilian sector, not realizing a military can't function like that, not realizing that the military has to have different rights, to some extent, in order

to function properly. Because those in the military and most who have served in the military—obviously not all—out of the millions and millions and millions—our colleagues across the aisle keep talking about 13,000—but of the millions and millions and millions who have served in our military, most understand that when you are in harm's way and you have people firing at you and you're hunkered down in a bunker or you're in a foxhole, you're in an untenable position and lives are at risk, that one of the strongest tendencies in the human body, the sexual urge, needs to be one that is not an issue. So whether it is those who cannot control their urges of heterosexuality or homosexuality, it absolutely should not be an issue when it comes to combat.

And because those in the military have been scared to death of what kind of transformative change the repeal of Don't Ask, Don't Tell would have, what it would mean, what it would do to their functioning, their ability to function as a military and protecting us, they ask, At least let us submit our opinions, let us give you our input. We're the ones out here willing to lay down our lives for you in Congress, for you in America, for you in the ACLU. We're the ones out here willing to lay down our lives for you, let us have some input, let us tell you how it is in the military because we're not sure you understand it has to be different in the military for the military to function.

And our White House and our majority leaders in Congress said, We hear you and we'll listen to you. We're going to do a study, and it's due December 1 of this year. And we will get your input because you're out there willing to lay down your lives for us, so we'll get your input and we'll have a study on exactly what kind of transformation this will make in the military. Will there have to be separate quarters for heterosexual males and homosexual males and heterosexual females and homosexual females? I mean, what is this going to look like in the military? What are we going to need to do in the way of facilities to accommodate the different types of sexual attraction?

It's going to be an interesting question, and I think it's very important to get that study. We need to know what it's going to do. How much is it going to cost our military in the way of time and transformation at the very time they're losing their lives in Afghanistan? We still lose some in Iraq. And what many people don't know and what broke my heart in peacetime was to attend funerals of military friends during peacetime, because people die even in peacetime in the military. What is it going to do to the military trying to adapt to another potential war?

What if Iran gets their nuclear weapons because all we're doing is playing footsie talking about sanctions at a time that Iran's centrifuges continue to spin, they're spinning, they're continuing to enrich uranium, they're get-

ting closer every day to not having the small amount they've got, but moving toward full enrichment and the full bomb that could take out Israel. And if you read the quotes from Ahmadinejad, he makes it very clear—even though reporters in America have been scared to ask him anything other than ridiculous questions and not get to his claims that he is going to destroy the “Great Satan” America—he has made clear that our way of life needs to be wiped off the planet, as does that in Israel. He has made it very clear. And in furtherance of that goal, he has made clear they're continuing to move toward nuclear weapons, and we are not going to stop them.

And we talk about sanctions. Now, China, to their credit, has been honest. They say, we don't want to go along with sanctions. I've been very concerned that China will come along and say, you know what? We'll agree to sanctions, just like Germany, France and Russia did against Iraq during the Oil-for-Food sanctions. And then we found out later after we went into Iraq that Germany, France and Russia had been cheating and had made billions and billions of dollars. They loved having the sanctions because it meant they had no competition because everyone else was observing the sanctions.

□ 1715

So, it is to China's credit that they have at least been honest enough to say they don't think the idea of sanctions is a good idea because, if they did and if China said, Okay. Okay. We'll do sanctions, and then they started cheating, not only have we not done anything with sanctions, but we've enriched people who wouldn't mind seeing us leave this Earth as the greatest Nation in history. So we need our military to be able to function as well as it is now.

We have heard testimonials from those who have said, I had a friend who couldn't stand to keep his homosexual feelings private. He had to go overt. He had to go public. He wanted everybody in the military to know. Yet, even though the vast majority of the military says that creates a real problem for us, our majority voted yesterday: Not only are we going to force you to have a different system than you've ever had before, but we don't care what you think.

Now, we've heard today that—let's see. I believe the term “political grandstanding” was used. The fact is I've been heartbroken for my friends in the military. People I know so well are heartbroken over what we've done. We've betrayed our promise to the military. When I say “we,” I mean this body. We are part of it. We have betrayed our promise to the military that we would hear them out.

Why would we rush in and pass the elimination of Don't Ask, Don't Tell right now? We told them we'd wait for the study, and people yesterday were

saying, Well, we're going to wait for the study. We're just going to pass it now that we're going to eliminate it, regardless of what they say, and then we'll get the study at the end of the year and use that.

Well, the headlines already hit the paper—last night and this morning. The military reads the news. Although, they can't complain about things that their Commander in Chief orders because that would be punishable by court-martial. They read the news. They know when they are about to be adversely affected, and they know when they've been made promises that haven't been kept by the very people sending them out to potentially lay down their lives, and they know the headlines in the papers all read that the House voted yesterday to repeal Don't Ask, Don't Tell.

Is it so much to ask in the military that you keep your sexual desires private so that we all concentrate on our military missions? Wouldn't that be a good idea?

You know, I've known people to be kicked out of the military for having affairs because it has adversely affected the morale and the well-being of the military. You can't put up with that. When it hurts its well-being and the morale of the military, it needs to be dealt with or you'll lose your military. We've had a policy since 1993 that President Clinton put in place, which said, Look. Just keep your sexual attractions private, and we welcome you to serve in the military; but our number one function in the military is to provide for the common defense, and anything that distracts from that is not appropriate.

We heard the civil libertarians, who were so proud last night, clapping and cheering over the fact that we've betrayed our promise to the military, clapping and rejoicing that the huge, vast majority of the military was begging them not to do this, but they wouldn't wait for the official report.

I still am heartbroken.

For the charge of political grandstanding on our side of the aisle, I come back to the question again:

Why was it so important to betray our promise to the military that we would wait and get their input on what was going to have such a profound effect on the way they protect us and on the way they live every day? Because it isn't like living in the civilian sector. I can assure you that.

Could it have been that the political left was getting upset that the majority had not done enough for them and their view and that, if they didn't rush and do something big to show them they really cared about the far left, they would not be there for them in the fall for November's election? Could it be that the majority wanted to stay in the majority and that they didn't want to lose such an important part of their base, albeit the far left end? Could that have been the reason that we had to

rush in here and pass this law yesterday and betray our promise to this Nation's military?

I am at a loss, particularly as we recess to go home for Memorial Day to pay tribute to those who have made the ultimate sacrifice for this Nation.

As John 15:13 said, "Greater love has no one than this, that he lay down his life for his friends." We are to pay tribute to them at the same time we've betrayed the promise we made to them, dramatically altering their future.

One other point. Then I have a friend from Minnesota here, and I want to yield to her.

On the very day after we betrayed our promise to the military and basically said, We don't care what you think. We're going to change your way of life, and we're going to change the way everything works in the military, particularly while we're in two battlefields, we took up today an amendment to H.R. 5116.

In that amendment, all it was asking was that our disabled veterans be given the same special consideration that minorities are given under this bill, those who are trying to get an education in a college or in a university. Most of us over here on this side did not think that was such an untenable position.

Our disabled vets, those who have lost part of their lives and their ability to function physically, we can't even give them the same consideration that a minority gets who attends a college or a university?

I figured it would be virtually unanimous. Yet the amendment failed. The majority brought down the amendment and said, You know what? Disabled veterans, on the day after we betrayed our promise to the military, we're not even going to give you the same status as a minority in America to help you further your education. We don't want you to have that special consideration.

So, if you listen to the beautiful prose that is spoken here on the floor, you would believe that every single Member of this House wants to do absolutely everything they can for our veterans, but if you look at what was done, we've betrayed our military, the promise we made to them. Then, the next day, we said, We don't consider you, disabled veterans, to be as important as minorities in America.

Why wouldn't they be? I am at a loss.

I yield to my friend from Minnesota.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank the gentleman from Texas, and I thank him for his statements in reviewing some of "the week that was."

That's really the theme of this hour that we have. We are talking about some of the events that have happened, a kind of "week in review," if you will, of the events of this week. I'm sure the gentleman will want to comment on some of these things as we go on, but we need to go through items that are very crucial and critical, not only to the future of the Nation but to what has happened, in particular, this week.

We saw this week that our country took a very historic line and broke it, and it was this:

We broke the \$13 trillion mark in debt for this country. This is real money, and all we have to do is know the comparison. Think of dollars in terms of time. A million seconds equals 11½ days. A billion seconds equals 32 years. A trillion seconds equals 32,000 years.

Then think of that in terms of money and what debt will mean for the new generation that is coming up. All of us are a part of the debt-paying generation. All of us have to pay for this out-of-control spending, but it is in particular those who are born today, who are between the ages of 5 and 30, who are now the debt-paying generation. Just with the stimulus bill alone, \$787 billion, which we didn't have, we had to go and borrow it from foreign countries in order to spend that money. With debt service, that bill will cost us over \$1 trillion. This is the cost of that bill to the debt-paying generation.

Those who are between the ages of 5 and 30 will spend, presumably, 45 years in the workforce. For every month the debt-paying generation is in the workforce, one will effectively have to go out and buy a full-sized iPod and give it over to the Federal Government. The next month, one will have to go out and buy another full-sized iPod and give it over to the Federal Government. That is the real cost for the debt-paying generation's lives, those who are between the ages of 5 and 30. For 45 years, they will have to effectively buy the price of a full-sized iPod for their portion of paying off just that one debt obligation that has been accrued by this body.

This week, we broke the \$13 trillion mark. No one's hands are clean on this deal. Republicans spent too much money. This red line on the chart shows the excess debt that was accrued under Republican leadership. This blue line shows the excess debt that was accrued under Democrat leadership. It's by a 2:1 ratio, so it's both parties that have been part of the problem. Yet, under the recent leadership of the Democrat Party, we have seen literally debt fall off a cliff of fiscal sanity.

I have another figure that came out this week as well that I'd like to share, and it's on who is getting paid and on what has happened to pay scales in the United States. No one thought it could get this out of whack, but this is how stunning the statistic is.

If we look at those who are government workers, Federal employees, and if you take comparable professions in the private sector versus those of government employees, government employees, on average, make more than private employees in 83 percent of all professions. So, whether it's white collar or blue collar or management or professional or highly skilled or low skilled, it doesn't matter. In 83 percent of all professions, it's the government worker who is making more than the person in the private sector.

Well, is that so bad?

Well, consider it's the private sector that creates the revenue to pay for the government workers. Not only do the government workers make more; they make substantially more than their counterparts in the private sector—on average, 20 percent more in wages—but that isn't the whole package. When you combine the wages with the benefits package, which would be health care and retirement benefits, the government employees are making double what their counterparts are making in the private sector.

So, if you take someone, let's say, who is a janitor who is working for the government, the person is making, on average, double what a janitor is making in the private sector. If a person is a cook or if a person is a copy editor, on average, they are making double what people are making in the private sector. If you're working in the private sector at the exact same job, you're making about \$60,000 a year versus \$120,000 a year if you're a government employee.

So, today, this body was offered the opportunity to freeze the increase in wages for government employees. This body decided to take a pass. They didn't even want to freeze the increase, the next increase, in wages for the only sector in this economy that is making double what people in the private sector are making.

We also offered an opportunity for people in this body to freeze the wages of Members of Congress in 2011 and thereafter. Again, this body took a pass. Recently, on a Web site called YouCut, 500,000 American people voted and said this is the number one issue they would like Congress to address—freezing the salary of government employees.

Did this body listen? Well, not the majority party.

Those who are in the Republican Party voted almost uniformly to freeze the wages. In fact, I think it was uniform. One hundred percent of Republicans voted to freeze the wages of government employees and to freeze the salaries of Members of Congress. That didn't happen on the Democrat side of the aisle. Perhaps that could be because, as we have seen, it is the Democrats, unfortunately, who have been wild with taxpayer money, spending it at a rate of over double the excess rate that Republicans have spent. That's just one of the issues that has happened this week.

□ 1730

We also were watching the tragedy of the administration's late-to-the-dance response to the tragedy of the Deepwater Horizon explosion in the Gulf of Mexico with BP. Where was the competence from the Federal Government and from the Obama administration when we needed them most, when all of this oil has been gushing into the Gulf and destroying the shoreline of the Gulf of Mexico, destroying the way of

life and fishing opportunities and rich tourism opportunities for those who live on the Gulf Coast? Where was the competence from our government when we needed it most?

We haven't seen competence in the government's hands-off policy with this disaster. We needed to ask the question on day one, what did the Obama administration do about the Coast Guard? What did they ask the Coast Guard to do to intervene? On day one, they weren't there. What did the administration do on day one with the booms that could have been put out in the ocean in order to quarantine off, if you will, this oil as it surged to the surface? Nowhere to be found.

The administration, they were hands off. They didn't do anything. Where were the boats that could have been commandeered by the government to be sent into this region to deal with that oil plume as it was coming up in the water and destroying marine life? Nowhere to be found. Why? The administration was hands off on this policy. They were missing in action.

Where was the emergency plan to deal with an oil rig explosion? There wasn't one. We found out to our horror there was no plan A, much less any plan B to deal with an emergency of this magnitude. And still the oil flows.

Also we saw this week the travesty of 1,000 soldiers now dead in Afghanistan. This is a horrible, chilling thought to see this happen, and we mourn their loss and we weep for their families and thank them for their service to our country.

Then, finally, today more news came out from the White House. We saw this week that back in February Representative JOE SESTAK of this body said he was offered a job by someone in the administration in order not to run against Senator SPECTER in the primary in Pennsylvania.

Today, after three months, the White House said it was former President Bill Clinton who as an intermediary offered Mr. SESTAK a job to stop running for political office in the primary in Pennsylvania against Senator SPECTER. Why? Because apparently President Obama backed Senator SPECTER for that political office. The only problem is that this activity is illegal to do under the United States Code, whether a job was offered either directly or indirectly by the administration.

When President Obama was asked yesterday in his press conference, the President refused to answer the reporter when he asked the question, Major Garrett. Instead, the President said the White House would issue a formal response.

Well, the American people need answers to this very serious question that was asked by Major Garrett: Who authorized former President Clinton to make this offer to Mr. SESTAK? We don't know. The White House won't tell us. Who on the President's staff was involved in any of these discussions? We don't know. The White House

won't tell us. What was offered to Mr. SESTAK? We don't know. The White House won't tell us. Who was present when the offer was made? We don't know. The White House won't tell us. And what was the reply? We don't know. The White House won't tell us.

Did President Obama discuss this job for leaving the political race when he met with President Clinton this week at the White House? We don't know. The White House won't tell us.

This is a very serious charge, and for three months the media has failed to press President Obama for an answer, much less press him for details. Now that Mr. SESTAK has won the primary over Mr. SPECTER, this issue looms large, and it demands an answer from the White House.

Double standards are wrong when it comes to equal application of the law. The law should not apply just one way for Republicans and another way for Democrats. We need to get to the bottom of this very serious issue, no matter which political party is in the White House.

Mr. GOHMERT. Reclaiming my time, the White House has stonewalled, as the gentlelady has pointed out. But it has been also intriguing to me that you have a former admiral in the United States Navy who brought this up, and he has refused to give full details and make sure that the full truth about all of this was known himself.

I am deeply intrigued by that, because I understand that our colleague was a graduate in 1974 of the Naval Academy of the United States, and the academies have an honor code. And when I was in school at Texas A&M, we had an honor code as well. Aggies do not lie, cheat, or steal, or tolerate those who do.

The Naval Academy's honor code that is supposed to be kept by Naval Academy students and graduates says, "They stand for that which is right, they tell the truth, and ensure that the full truth is known." That is part of the honor code for midshipmen for the Naval Academy.

So I am looking forward to both the White House and our colleague stepping up and giving the full truth, so we can get this behind us and move on, for heaven's sake. It shouldn't have gone on this long without having a complete answer. There is no purpose to that.

We also heard this week from our colleagues how proud they were that they successfully passed within the last couple or three hours what is called the "doc fix," because doctors were going to be cut 20 percent in their reimbursement under Medicare.

I have seen documentation that makes clear that for some doctors, some treatment, when you cut them any more than they are already, they lose substantial amounts of money. So why would they even undergo to help someone with a physical problem on Medicare, particularly Medicaid that pays even less, when they are receiving less compensation than it costs them

just to conduct the activity with the patient?

What has not been talked about here on the floor by those who are so proud that they passed the "doc fix" and did not cut the doctors 20 percent more this year was that, originally, there was supposed to be a fix in the reimbursement to physicians that would last at least 3½ years, and then at the end it would begin being cut 20 percent again.

Well, what was inserted and actually came to the floor was a fix for not 3½ years, but 19 months, and at the end of the 19 months, instead of going back to a 20 percent cut again, it moved and advanced to a 33 percent cut.

Even though we had colleagues across the aisle so proud that they helped our doctors continue to be able to see patients, it turns out that not just the AMA—I don't really trust their endorsements after seeing what they did on the health care fiasco that would cut care to seniors by \$500 billion and would dramatically change their professions forever—but looking further, every physician organization that weighed in said this is a disaster. Don't pass this.

Yet it was passed anyway, and the majority stands up after it passes it and basically says, "You're welcome." You're welcome? They haven't really said thank you, because they were begging them not to pass it.

That is kind of what we have seen with the military as well. When we get into this area of special rights, as we have heard people clamor around the country for special rights in the military and special constitutional rights for those who are trying to kill and destroy us, if you go back, and I know everybody hasn't been fortunate enough to have a legal education. I am very blessed with a legal education at Baylor University. Serving in the Army for 4 years, you learn probably more than you ever wanted to.

But, anyway, terrorists, people who are part of a group who have said they are at war with this Nation, they are not entitled to the same rights under the Constitution that we are. Just like people in the military are not entitled to the same rights as people in the civilian sector, people at war with this country, going back to the Quirin case in 1942, they were called enemy combatants. If they abided by the Geneva Convention, if they wore a uniform, if they abided by the rules of law, then they were entitled to be treated as prisoners of war under the Geneva Convention.

We treat the enemy combatants who are not entitled to anything under the Geneva Convention better than the Geneva Convention affords them. And throughout the history of mankind, for people who have studied war, and if you are an officer in the military you have been required to study military history, you know that if a nation was a civilized nation and they captured people who were at war with them,

part of a group or a country who said they were at war, then you held them until their friends or country said, we are no longer at war.

At that point, and it may be 10 or 20 years down the line, but at that point, when the friends finally admitted we are no longer at war, then you would release those enemy combatants and let them return home on the promise not to be at war anymore.

And if they were suspected or there was probable cause to believe they had committed a war crime, then you didn't even release them to go back home, even if they served 20 years in a POW camp. You tried them before a military commission for war crimes. And, again, the Constitution of the United States anticipated that in those situations, when they were tried, it would be before a military commission, and the Constitution specifically gives the Congress the power to set up military commissions to do that.

But because people don't realize our way of life is at risk, and the Constitution, drafted by our Founders, who realized you have to have a different set of rights for those at war against you, they have pushed and said no, no, no; let's give these extra rights and treat these enemy combatants as extra special. That is why in the Military Commissions Act of 2006, which has been upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court, they were referred to as enemy combatants, going back to the Quirin case of 1942.

Well, once our friends across the aisle took the majority, they could not live with this horrible language of calling these people that want to kill us, destroy our way of life, destroy our families, our children, everything we hold dear, they didn't like them being called enemy combatants. It sounded offensive. So an amendment to the Military Commissions Act of 2006 was passed calling it the Military Commissions Act of 2009 in which we struck the language "enemy combatant."

It is no longer appropriate under the law of this Congress to call someone an enemy combatant who wants to kill us and destroy our way of life. Now we call them, and the term is quoted, "unprivileged alien enemy belligerent," hoping that will be less offensive to those who want to kill us, destroy us, wipe out our families and take all we have.

Mrs. BACHMANN. If the gentleman will yield, just recently the President made an announcement on the nuclear strategy document that he will also change the language and no longer allow the use of the term "extreme radicalism" in the document as well. Now we are applying terms of political correctness to our military documents and to our documents for our national security.

We can go ahead and change all the terms we want, but that doesn't make any difference to the people who mean to destroy our country and to kill our people. They still have the same in-

tent. And it seems that the first rule of war is to know your enemy and appreciate what their purpose is.

I think the thing that shocked me the most in this Chamber was when we took a vote, the last vote of the week before we left town, and it was unbelievable, because it expanded the civil rights of terrorists.

If you recall, those who interrogate like, let's say the underwear bomber on Christmas Day, when he was taken off the plane and interrogators sat down with that underwear bomber to find out everything he knew, and, of course, we found out it was less than an hour he was subjected to interrogation.

Well, the bill that was passed in this Chamber would put a 15-year jail sentence on our interrogators, our good guy interrogators, if they were found to treat an alleged terrorist either inhumanely, cruelly or in a demeaning fashion.

□ 1745

Now, the one thing we know is that our Attorney General is now giving taxpayer subsidized attorneys to these terrorists after they try to kill us, which they don't necessarily have the right to. They're given Miranda warnings. The privileges and immunities under the Constitution reserved to a U.S. citizen are given to terrorists, they're given a taxpayer subsidized lawyer, and so how often do we think it will be that these taxpayer subsidized lawyers, under this new bill, will raise the issue that the interrogator was maybe demeaning his client? Try 100 percent of the time. And so, won't that have a chilling effect on our interrogators when they're trying to pull information out of these terrorists? Maybe information like, do you have a computer? How are you financed? Are there any other guys like you out there? Are there any more coming behind? Maybe information like that that would help us to keep our people safe.

This is the unbelievable action of the current Democrat majority that is not keeping our people safe, and, in fact, as the gentleman from Texas said, is working to enhance the civil rights, not of freedom-loving, God-fearing, patriotic Americans but of terrorists who seek only the destruction of the United States and to destroy the lives of the American people.

Mr. GOHMERT. I'm concerned, my friend keeps using the term "terrorist," and I'm worried that she may not realize that that might offend somebody that wants to kill her.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Thank God, if I could just reclaim my time, that we are standing in the well of the United States House of Representatives, one bastion left for free speech, at least I hope so for the time being.

Mr. GOHMERT. Well, as long as you don't say that somebody lied, then we're okay.

But I know that there are people who are concerned that if we are just nice enough to those folks who want to kill

us and destroy our way of life, that they'll come around and see how wonderful and nice they are. Unfortunately, they don't realize, to those who want to destroy our way of life and kill us, it appears to be weakness; and a weakness to them means we are worthy to be destroyed because we have no business being on the planet. But I know there are still those that say let's help those, do everything we can for them. And I come back to this article. There's a former CIA operative, Wayne Simmons, terrorist analyst, who was amazed at the medical treatment that was provided to those who want to kill and destroy us.

Having been to Guantanamo a couple of times myself, seeing the extraordinary court set-up that was ready to start trying terrorists back over a year ago when the President, the Commander-in-Chief, put the stop on it, they were about to go to trial and the first five to go to trial had already said they were going to plead guilty. But once they were told they were coming to New York and were going to get a civilian trial, well, obviously they made clear, well, we're going to be proud of what we did but we're not going to plead guilty. We're looking forward to that wonderful format in New York.

Again, for those who are worried that, you know, if we would just treat these folks nicely, they'll love us instead of wanting to destroy our way of life, well, I would give them humbly the example of Abdullah Massoud. Abdullah Massoud, a/k/a Said Mohammed Ali Shah, was released from Guantanamo. But because, during his attempts to destroy American lives, he had lost his leg below his knee, well, we fitted him with a prosthesis that cost between 50 and \$75,000. So those who were worried about if we just are nicer to these folks, well, we were nice to Mr. Massoud, gave him a prosthesis to help him, even though he lost his leg in trying to kill us. Well, we tried to help him and did and gave him that wonderful prosthesis, American ingenuity at its best, creating a prosthesis like that that would help him walk, help him be a participant in society.

So knowing that he would surely have to love us after we had helped restore his leg that he lost trying to be violent against us, he was released. And he, according to Pakistani officials, directed a homicide attack that killed 31 people in Pakistan, and then 2 months later, when he was about to be captured by Pakistani forces, he blew himself up, including the \$75,000 prosthesis. Apparently, it didn't mean a whole lot, how nice we were to him in Guantanamo.

On my first trip to Guantanamo, it was interesting. At one point there were a couple of us that were in one of the detention areas. We had been warned, now, when we go through this door, do not talk because you won't be able to hear their interaction between each other if they know a voice that

they're not familiar with is somewhere around here.

And so we listened. There was laughing. I didn't understand what they were saying, kidding around, a lot of banter back and forth between the different units where they were being held. And as we stood at the end of the hallway, someone with us said something that was heard by those on that hallway, and immediately, the banter, the cheerfulness turned into, "Help, I'm being tortured. Help." And we were treated to cries for help. They didn't realize that we had been hearing them kidding around, laughing and joking with each other until they heard that a new voice was on the floor. And we were told, that's because they know that there are different groups that come, Amnesty International, different ones that come to check on them, and so that's why as soon as they hear a voice that they don't hear every day, they want to make sure that they get lots of sympathy. It's what they're trained to do. It was just amazing to observe that firsthand. It was really interesting and amazing.

But also, we know that no one who is a guard is allowed to assault or even speak in a negative way toward anyone being held at Guantanamo. The only assaults now for some years that have gone on at Guantanamo occur when the inmates there figure out new and exciting ways to throw urine or feces on our guards. There's been only one guard that reacted hostilely by yelling an insult, a verbal insult at the one who threw feces on him. And he was punished for that, what was deemed to be, by our military, overreaction. Though he did not strike, he spoke angrily and insultingly and, therefore, he was punished.

You might wonder, Mr. Speaker, what happens to those that keep throwing urine and feces? Well, in a normal prison, and I've been through many of those, if you will not quit assaulting the guards, then ultimately you're put in an isolation cell where you can't possibly do it anymore. But because of all the complaints about what a horrible place Guantanamo is, though the people there are treated better than most any maximum security prison I've ever seen or heard about, we don't put them in isolation because Amnesty International, some of these groups, would just go nuts. And so they say it's easier just to punish them by taking away a couple of their hours that they're allowed to watch movies each day. And if it's bad enough, they may take some of their time away of the hours that they're allowed to be outdoors. That's their punishment—losing some movie time. In view of some of the movies out now, they're not missing that much. But that's how they're punished for throwing urine or feces on our guards.

I realize that some in this body, some around the country, want to help the terrorists and they believe if we'll just be nice to them, everything will work out fine. That's not the case. It is absolutely not the case.

It is religious zealotry. And I thank God that it is only a very small percentage of Islamic believers who believe in this type of violent jihad. The vast majority of Islamic believers don't believe jihad means the violent physical event that these jihadist extremists that we've come to know and see kill people do. So, thank goodness for that.

But for those jihadist extremists who believe, as Ahmadinejad said, that he can usher in the coming of the Mahdi, the Grand Mahdi that will rule over the caliphate, that he can usher that in by using nuclear weapons to blow us up, Israel up, this is serious. He believes it to his core, even though some of the American interviewers were either scared to ask, Why do you want to blow us up and destroy us? And do you really believe that you'll bring about the return of the Mahdi to rule the world if you use nuclear weapons? Nobody had the nerve to ask those.

That's what he has said repeatedly. And as the lesson should have been learned from Hitler, when you have a nut that's claiming he's going to kill people and destroy countries and destroy societies and commit genocide, and he achieves the weaponry to do that, you'd better take him seriously. But we haven't done that.

It's been a very interesting week. Earlier I was mentioning the bill, H.R. 5116, the COMPETES Act, it's called. This would have amended section 702, persons with disabilities, to include veterans with disabilities in achieving the same type of special consideration. That's all it says, special consideration that other groups designated as minorities under this do. How unfortunate, the same week we betray our promise to our military.

Well, as we anticipate heading home this weekend, which I do each weekend, and we think about Memorial Day and those who have laid down their lives for us, having attended the funeral of Sergeant Kenneth B. May, Jr., 26 years old, of Kilgore, Texas, in the last 10 days, our hearts and our tributes go out to those who served this Nation. May they forgive us for what we've done to them this week.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. BORDALLO (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of official business in the district.

Mr. JONES (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of addressing a high school graduation.

Mr. LATTA (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today after 11:35 a.m. on account of attending his daughter's high school graduation.

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 Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) to

revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOLT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WATSON, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. WHITFIELD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCCAUL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. BACHMANN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GOHMERT, for 5 minutes, today.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House reports that on May 27, 2010 she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.R. 5139. To provide for the International Organizations Immunities Act to be extended to the Office of the High Representative in Bosnia and Herzegovina and the International Civilian Office in Kosovo.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 282, 111th Congress, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until Tuesday, June 8, 2010, at 2 p.m.

OATH FOR ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

Under clause 13 of rule XXIII, the following Members executed the oath for access to classified information:

Neil Abercrombie*, Gary L. Ackerman, Robert B. Aderholt, John H. Adler, W. Todd Akin, Rodney Alexander, Jason Altmire, Robert E. Andrews, Michael A. Arcuri, Steve Austria, Joe Baca, Michele Bachmann, Spencer Bachus, Brian Baird, Tammy Baldwin, J. Gresham Barrett, John Barrow, Roscoe G. Bartlett, Joe Barton, Melissa L. Bean, Xavier Becerra, Shelley Berkley, Howard L. Berman, Marion Berry, Judy Biggert, Brian P. Bilbray, Gus M. Bilirakis, Rob Bishop, Sanford D. Bishop, Jr., Timothy H. Bishop, Marsha Blackburn, Earl Blumenauer, Roy Blunt, John A. Boccieri, John A. Boehner, Jo Bonner, Mary Bono Mack, John Boozman, Madeleine Z. Bordallo, Dan Boren, Leonard L. Boswell, Rick Boucher, Charles W. Boustany, Jr., Allen Boyd, Bruce L. Braley, Kevin Brady, Robert A. Brady, Bobby Bright, Paul C. Broun, Corrine Brown, Ginny Brown-Waite, Henry E. Brown, Jr., Vern Buchanan, Michael C. Burgess, Dan Burton, G.K. Butterfield, Steve Buyer, Ken Calvert, Dave Camp, John Campbell, Eric Cantor, Anh "Joseph" Cao, Shelley Moore Capito, Lois Capps, Michael E. Capuano, Dennis A. Cardoza, Russ Carnahan, Christopher P. Carney, André Carson, John R. Carter, Bill Cassidy, Michael N. Castle, Kathy Castor, Jason Chaffetz, Ben Chandler, Travis W. Childers, Judy Chu, Donna M. Christensen, Yvette D. Clarke, Wm. Lacy Clay, Emanuel