

makes it a little tougher, doesn't it, to use leverage against China when we owe them that much money. Growing up, I had Sunday school lessons about the Bible teaching whoever you borrow money from becomes your master, and we've done that because we can't control the spending.

So we need something that is a little out of the ordinary to bring this thing in, and what better method than the one that the constitutional founders, the drafters, put in there, approved, and the States ratified, and that is to say, you know what, it's time for an amendment convention.

We have usurped so much power from the States—and this latest health care debacle, the health care reform bill that was passed and signed into law now, has the potential to bankrupt States that were having a hard enough time as it is.

Well, those States have power under our Constitution, and as we know, up until the 17th amendment, when those in Washington—and this was apparently pushed by Woodrow Wilson. He liked the idea of the Federal Government running everything, and he would have been really proud of the health care bill because it was all about the GRE, the government running everything.

So this 17th amendment was an effective way of taking away any check or balances that the States were provided under the Constitution because, under the Constitution, the State legislatures selected the U.S. Senators. Most students were never taught that. But the founders felt like there had to be a way that the Federal Government could be prevented from just usurping all the power from the States and the people as the tenth amendment talks about, and this would be it, because you would never send a Senator up here from your State, if you're a State legislature, if he's going to add unfunded mandates to your responsibilities in the States and take away your power at the same time. There were Senators that were recalled.

So, from the day after the health care bill was passed here in the House, I've been talking about an Article V amendment convention that would allow the States to come together and propose amendments. Now, there's difference of opinion. I had a wonderful conversation with former Attorney General Ed Meese about this. He has some good ideas as well.

But we have got to do something. And I am not in favor of repealing the 17th amendment, have never been in favor of repealing the 17th amendment, but there are some wonderful ways of reining in the Federal Government, maybe giving the States the right to veto legislation. So, there are a number of things, and as we saw back when the States were gathering momentum to have an amendment convention, Congress got scared that that would really happen so they rushed in and voted to repeal prohibition, proposed

that of course as a constitutional amendment and it passed.

So maybe the States need to start that gathering storm, and we could get Congress to do what it needs and, that is, give the States some power like they originally had.

I appreciate so much my friend from Utah yielding.

JOBS

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. Mr. Speaker, interesting news came out Friday about jobs. There was a good Wall Street Journal article June 4. It talked about this wonderful news that we heard from Washington that last month the job total increased by 431,000. That is fantastic news, just wonderful. But there's a little problem in it. The U.S. Department of Labor released statistics saying, yes, there were 431,000 jobs created last month and that's fantastic and all, but unfortunately, 411,000 of them were temporary census worker jobs. Well, it's just hard to feel really good about the economy when out of 431,000 new jobs, according to the U.S. Department of Labor last month, 411,000 of them were government jobs. Not just government, temporary government jobs.

I've talked to some census workers. We had a job fair in my district in Marshall, Texas, at the East Texas Baptist University. They're very cooperative and helpful. We had one previously at Laterno University. Texas Workforce Commission does such a great job. We've partnered together with them and Laterno and Longview and many other partners to have a job fair previously. We've had one in Lufkin, partnered with Angelina College and the Texas Workforce Commission, and this one was in Marshall.

On one hand, anytime you throw a party and a lot of people show up, you're thrilled; this worked out great. But on a very human basis, you know that every one of the people that come seeking jobs have broken hearts. Most of them have families who need them to get jobs. So many of them, you know, long-time employees somewhere, and we have not done them any favors by the work that's been done here in Congress going back to failing to reform Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac which really put us to the brink of economic collapse. Complete failure to do that, to reform them.

Then in September, October of 2008, as a potential meltdown began, many people don't know but there were more homes sold in September of 2008 than in any month in the last 5 years before that. But of course, once the Secretary of Treasury went out and said unless Congress gives me \$700 billion, there's going to be a total meltdown, but give me \$700 billion in a slush fund and I'll

pay off my buddies on Wall Street and I'll get everything going good, and you know, basically inferring that—and I think he legitimately believed, if all the people that he had worked with and knew so well on Wall Street maintained their wealth, continued to get rich or richer, didn't go bankrupt, then it surely would be good for the rest of America.

Little did he know that that was not the case. We bailed out folks, and you know, it's interesting. It also said something about the morality in America because there was a time in America if you got greedy, a little hasty, and drove your cart off in a ditch and your neighbors helped you get your cart out of that ditch, then you felt a little guilty. It was a moral thing. You had a conscience and you felt guilty because your neighbors helped you get your cart out of the ditch, and they did not contribute at all in you getting it there. It was your own negligence, your own greed.

And so nowadays we've gotten to the point where AIG, Goldman Sachs, Wall Street, some of them at least—they let Lehman Brothers go because they were a competitor of Goldman Sachs—but anyway, they got greedy, extremely greedy, careless, and ran their cart into a ditch, and there was no way they were going to get out. They should have been forced to go into bankruptcy and reorganize like every other entity but they didn't.

America, most of us didn't like the idea. We didn't support it. We were totally against it, but nonetheless we were forced to get Goldman Sachs' cart out of the ditch. And what has happened since? Well, they've gotten in their cart, motorized it, and run over the rest of us.

So that didn't work out so well, and in January of 2009, when we heard that Timothy Geithner was going to be appointed to be Secretary of the Treasury, well, what we heard from folks down the other end of the hall was, well, we need to confirm him as Treasury Secretary because he worked with Paulson on the plan. To my way of thinking, this meant this guy should not get near the Treasury Department, but that's not what happened.

So we've continued to have the Federal Government continue to take over more and more authority, usurp more of individuals' moneys, their credit, the potential capital out there to create private jobs, just sucked it up in Washington, and in the meantime, the Federal Reserve apparently is printing lots of money. And so we're just doing all kinds of good things, and it is continuing to drive us toward a cliff.

And for anybody to stand up and try to make it sound like great news, 431,000 new jobs last month, that's the most in a number of years, it's fantastic, it's great, and not realize or not be forthcoming enough to point out that nearly all those jobs, the vast majority of them, were temporary census jobs is just not right, and it's not doing right by America.

So in this article, The Wall Street Journal points out some of the problems. This says, because the temporary workforce is more productive, the bureau is closing some offices earlier than planned. So it goes on to talk about the Census Bureau. Really tragic. That's the best we've got. That's the best we can offer to America.

I yield to my friend from Utah.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I appreciate the gentleman from Texas broaching this particular issue. Some people have asked me what is the Federal Government going to do about jobs. It's very clear the Federal Government has two options. One is you can actually create Federal jobs and fund them and run them and hire people for them, and the second is the Federal Government can create an environment that encourages the private sector to create jobs.

Indeed, at the beginning of the Great Depression in the 1930s, one of the problems that the country had was there were a great many people that had money that did not invest that money. They sat on the money because they were watching what the government would do and had a great deal of anxiety as to what the government would do, would it attack business or would it build a climate that was favorable to business.

In some respects, I think we have that same situation today where there are people out there with money that could invest and expand the economy but, indeed, are waiting and watching to see what the policies of this country will be with some level of anxiety as to what that policy actually would be.

If I can try and put this on a very personal level, I'm doing a history of my family and my father. My father, who was older when I was born, went 2 years at the depths of the Depression without a permanent job.

□ 2000

I have sometimes wondered what it would be like to be in that situation. Indeed, in the depths of the Depression, he was finally bailed out by collecting a job that was actually a government job. He got one of the New Deal-era jobs.

As much as he was grateful for that, he always warned me to be wary of those types of jobs created by the government, for he told me that a government that could create the job to give to you is also a government that can create and defund the job and take it away. Indeed, that is exactly what happened to him a few years later. The government decided to change courses, and that job was no longer there.

I thought it was very wise of him to recognize that those distinct possibilities were there and the Federal Government has two things we can do: one is create jobs, which is temporary at best; or one is create climate and an atmosphere that expands the private sector. I think I would at least argue at this point that that would be the wisest approach for this government to take.

Mr. GOHMERT. I really appreciate that point. Of course, it's the problem we have right now. When the Federal Government is moving toward a 1.3 to \$1.6 trillion deficit in 1 year, they are sucking the capital from every corner of the world, printing some, and there is not money for the private sector. We have had meetings with the Federal Reserve people, including Chairman Bernanke. We have had meetings with people in the OCC, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, and from the FDIC.

In the last couple of years we have had a number of meetings, and what we hear from people who are trying to borrow money to stay in business, people that have had lines of credit at their local bank for 20 years are now being told we are not going to continue your line of credit. And when they asked, have I ever been late, have I missed a payment, what is the problem?

Well, our banking regulators have told us that they are going to, you know, be all over our bank and we can't handle the pressure if we keep loaning you money, extending your line of credit.

We broached that subject with Chairman Bernanke, that some of the regulators are requiring more capital and more money in reserve than is required under the law, and they are putting pressure on the bank not to make loans that they made for years, and it's loans that make banks most of their money. If you don't allow them to loan money, then they are not going to make money, and they are going to go under.

Then heaven help us, the FDIC insurance account will be hit more, and we will have to bail out more banks and what-not, all because we had some silly regulators who were concerned that a bank they were supervising might some day go under and it might look bad for their career advancement, and so they put too much heat on a local bank.

Now, there is greed, there is avarice that has gone on in some places; but most of that was in the investment banks, not in the local community banks, which were doing okay until "Chicken Little" Paulson started running around screaming the financial sky was falling. And the next month we went from selling more homes than any time in 5 years to selling no homes. We went from people buying cars to people not buying any cars, and it put us in a terrible funk.

It was all because this so-called financial genius that was chairman, and his protege is now running Treasury now, wasn't smart enough or educated enough in the ways of the world that when you go out and say we are going to have a depression, banks are going to fail one after another. When you create panic yourself, it is a self-fulfilling prophecy.

That's why, when they went out, and he talked, bless his heart, he talked President Bush into going out and joining ranks with him and getting on the

chicken little brigade, that the financial sky was falling and scared America. When you go out and the President and Secretary of the Treasury are saying that if they don't pass this particular bill, whatever, it wouldn't matter—if they don't pass this bill on Monday in the House, then the market is going to crash a lot worse than 1929.

It's a self-fulfilling prophecy. It fell 777 points; people panicked. Many Republicans got talked into voting for the bill and joining most of the Democrats that voted for the TARP bailout bill. It should have been ended long ago; it was a big mistake.

But, boy, everybody needs to feel good, though. Goldman Sachs had their biggest profit year in their history last year. So their jobs are secure; they are doing good.

But for the rest of America, there is a problem with capital; there is a problem with too little regulation over the investment banks, no reform over Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, none. It is not even in this so-called financial reform that's really a financial deform bill, because it has a systemic risk council that allowed the Federal Government, in complete abrogation of what my friends were talking about in the prior hour about the 10th Amendment, and the power reserved of the States and people, just a complete ignoring of all of that. They are going to pick and choose winners and losers.

Your company is too big too fail; we will never let it fail. So that means they can run in the red; they can run their competition out of business. They will be the last business standing in that particular area because our systemic risk council from Washington, their lofty Mount Zion realm, said we picked this one to be the systemic risk.

The government was never supposed to have that kind of power. This country never got to be the greatest country in the history of the world by having Washington pick and choose winners and losers, and that's what that financial deform bill does, and I hope that it doesn't come with many of the provisions that are in there now, but it looks like that's what is going to happen.

But, anyway, we're sucking the capital out, we are preventing the private sector from creating the jobs. And then they saw this health care bill, they saw it passed.

As our Speaker pointed out, we had to pass the bill so we could find out what's in it. Some of us actually read most of it, so we had a good idea what was coming and that's why we fought so hard against it.

There are going to be more jobs lost. There have already been jobs lost because of that bill. There's going to be more jobs lost.

When I hear people who didn't read the bill and didn't know what all it did, but they just took the word of people pushing it, they really believed when they said here on the floor, it's going to help the working poor. It's going to

help those hardworking folks that don't have enough money. If you read the bill, you find out that actually if you don't make enough money to buy as good a policy as the government is mandating, we know you are working poor, we know you are struggling.

If you had the money, you would buy better health insurance. But since you don't, we are going to pop you with another additional income tax. We are going to add a couple of percent to your income tax. Merry Christmas. You don't have enough money to buy the insurance, we tell you, bless your heart, you are working poor, you are going to be poorer because of this health care bill.

During the job fair last week, I was talking to an employer who was saying, you know, we have got a number of jobs that are entry level so they are making minimum wage, but it's a good entry-level place and we provide some good health insurance. So it's minimum wage, but we provide them health insurance. It's a great place for somebody young just starting out, get their foot in the door, get experience and be able to advance up from there.

Well, guess what, under the health care bill that was passed and signed into law this spring, he can't do that for people that make 133 percent or less of the poverty level. So those people who would go take that job because even though it's minimum wage, provides health insurance, bad news. Under the bill, they are going to have to go on to Medicaid, not Medicare, but Medicaid.

Now, some States have increased some of the reimbursement rates under Medicaid. Well, that's coming to an end real quick because of all the additional unfunded mandates on the States that's going to add billions to what they have to come up with. They are not going to be able to do that.

We already saw there was polling, New England Journal of Medicine and others, doctor polling that indicates 35 percent, some as much as 55 percent of the current physicians, when this kicks into law, will retire and quit practicing medicine. Oh, well, that's great, that's really going to be good for the working poor and how about the President's own words when he said on the day before the bill passed here, his own words: where as in the past you went to the doctor and you got five tests, now you will go to the doctor and you will get one test. Well, wasn't that good news?

Some of us know that's not a good idea. In some cases, there are tests that are given, purely from doctors practicing defensive medicine because of lawsuits that are threatened and that they worry about. But on the other hand, there are doctors who conduct tests because they know there is something there. They know there is something there. And one test doesn't show up, well, let's try this, because I know there's something there.

That's what was the case with my mother in 1976. It took them 6 days to

find her brain tumor. Our local doctor, one of the local doctors where I grew up, had told my dad that if she gets much worse you may just end up needing to commit her. Well, it was very tough for a woman as brilliant as my late mother to think that she was going crazy. But that's what the local doctor thought because he was a general practitioner; he didn't have the expertise of terrific experts.

But after 5 or 6 days of testing, they found she had a little brain tumor. She wasn't going crazy; she had a little brain tumor that was causing her problems. Because they found it when they did, we got to keep my mother for 15 more years.

So I would kind of have hated for my mother to have had one test, like that's some kind of good news. That means she may well have been committed to an insane asylum on the recommendation of a general practitioner.

But if you look at what the health care bill does, it pushes people more and more to general practitioners and thank God for them. Some of my closest friends are general practitioners. They do an incredible job. They have to know so much about so many different areas of medicine. Then they are able to figure out, ah, you have got that problem, let's get you over to the specialist. Then the specialist can home in for their whole career on a specific problem. Under this health care bill, that's not going to be the case.

But I got off on this from the job situation. Well, you don't have to worry about your health care; we are going to fix it to where we cut \$500 billion out of Medicare. You don't think that's going to help pay or that's going to be funded partially by what the President promised? In the past, you go to the doctor and get five tests and now you go and get one test. Okay.

Then how about the \$500 billion in new taxes? Well, I have talked to employers. Last week, we were not in session. I talked to employers that say, there is so much being stacked on top of my head, and I can't get my line of credit extended. You know, there is no sense in me continuing this. This is nuts. I am not hiring.

Then because of the provision in the bill, in the health care bill, which starts popping a tax above a certain level of employees, lots of employers that I have talked to are going to start making sure they don't go over that. They could use more people, but they are not going to go over the limit because they don't want to start paying that \$2,000 per employee tax that you get popped with once you have too many employees.

You know, and it—I just wonder, do we not notice what kinds of incentives we are putting in place? We are putting incentives in place to hire fewer people. We are eliminating capital, making it, that would have made it easier for the private sector to hire people than for Congress and for the Federal Government.

But these Census jobs, as this headline in The Wall Street Journal says, Census jobs end all too soon, and they will, and it's going to be tough when they do, 411,000 temporary workers hired last month by the Census. We are going in the wrong direction.

□ 2015

This is not a good thing. We are doing more damage. And even before Republicans lost the majority in 2006, there were so many of us that were pleading, Look, we're in a hole. It's time to stop digging. And in November of 2006, because Republicans had the audacity to run up a \$100 billion, \$200 billion deficit in 1 year, it was outrageous, and Democrats rightfully won the majority because Republicans had not been as conscientious about making sure we didn't run this government into a ditch ourselves. And with the promise that their majority would see there were no more deficits, we would get this country on track, we would stop the craziness that the Republicans had in this deficit spending, we now find this year a projection of a \$1.3 to \$1.6 trillion deficit in 1 year. It's just hard to get my mind around—not that I have much of a mind to get around anything, but that is such an extraordinary amount of money to be in the hole in 1 year.

I read an article somewhere where around the world people are starting to say, Well, one thing we know for sure, since the United States is willing to run up over a \$1 trillion deficit in 1 year, then clearly they're not serious about paying their debts. Well, some people can't remember what happens when a government spends so much money that it doesn't have that no one will loan them money again. And we've also forgotten a lesson from history of what happens if you try to print your way out of debt by printing money. Germany tried that, and it just created such runaway inflation—remember the cartoons, the wheelbarrow full of money to go buy a loaf of bread? Well, we're printing money at record rates. We are running a deficit at never even comprehended rates.

For those who can remember, basically, the Soviet leader had to stand up and say—this was basically the essence—We can't borrow enough money anymore to stay in business. We can't print enough money to stay in business. We're out of business. States are each on their own now.

Well, there are some in this country that think that might be a good idea. But this Nation got to be the greatest in history because we were together as a Nation, all 50 States, fussing and disagreeing among ourselves as family, but never before in history have we come so close to voluntarily going over a cliff. I mean, World War II, record amounts of money were being spent. We were fighting for our very lives, for liberty and for freedom.

Some don't remember. There were Germans that came ashore. One American citizen was with them, and of

course they were captured. They were going to commit war crimes here in the United States. They were captured, tried—by military commission, by the way—but under the rules of law, you can hang on to them as long as there's a war going on. That's a whole other issue, but it's a way in which we're not learning from history. We're thinking that when people are at war with you, you can treat them better than our own soldiers are being treated in courts martial, give them more rights than our own soldiers have.

It's because people don't understand the Constitution. They don't understand the Constitution embraces the congressionally passed Uniform Code of Military Justice that embraces, as the Supreme Court pronounced, the Military Commission Act of 2006, as amended last year. Of course, the amendment mainly required us to quit calling them "enemy combatants" and now, under the new law last year, we call them "unprivileged alien enemy belligerents," not "combatants."

We're not learning the lessons of history. And when nations fail to do that, it becomes clear, eventually, that they are well on their way to the dustbin of history. We don't have to do that. This country could last 200 more years, 400 more years, but we have to learn the lessons and the mistakes of the past and grow and learn from them. We haven't done that.

We are not going to see private sector jobs created as long as the Federal Government is sucking up all the money, sucking up all the capital. There's not much left to loan. And the private sector can do so much more creating jobs than the Federal Government does because obviously—you know, the Federal Government itself is a giant Ponzi scheme. You know, adding 411,000 workers in 1 month, you can't keep doing that and still pay for it. The Ponzi scheme known as the Soviet Union went out of business. That's what will happen to us as well.

So, anyway, one of the things that we have failed to learn from history—I wanted to talk about jobs a little bit and then spend the remaining time talking about another area in which people just don't seem to be learning here in Washington from history. It's not hard to find. It's more accessible than it has ever been in the history of mankind. We've got the Internet. You can find all kinds of credible information. You want to go back and read John Quincy Adams' incredible closing arguments that went on for over 2 days in the Amistad case? You can get it. You want to read Ben Franklin's entire speech before the Constitutional Convention, 1787, where he said, If a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it possible an empire can rise without His—the Lord's—aid? He said, We are told in the sacred writing that unless the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it. And he said, I also firmly believe that without His—God's—concurring aid, we shall

succeed in this political building no better than the builders of Babel. We shall be confounded by our local partial interests, and we, ourselves, shall become a byword down through the ages. He went on. But you can find that whole speech, you can find all that material. You can find the lessons that have been learned through history.

If you don't have a Bible and you wonder what was the most quoted book here in the House of Representatives for the first 100-plus years of our history, it may have been 150 years, the most quoted book here on the House floor was the Bible. I have one right here, the most quoted book in the House of Representatives for most of its history. If you wanted a bill to be passed, then you better find some wisdom in Scripture and share it with people so they understand.

Well, we had something last week. It was called by some a "peace flotilla," but it was quite clear that there was a lot more to it than that, that this was a contrived plan. This was an effort to embarrass Israel, because the proponents knew that Israel would have to defend itself, there was no question about that. They have been hit with so many thousands of rockets from the Gaza Strip, they had to eventually defend themselves. And lest we forget, the Gaza Strip was controlled as part of Israel until Israel's leaders thought, You know what? It's not part of any treaty. It's not part of any demand, but what if we gave the Gaza Strip to the Palestinians? What if we just gave that unilaterally, not asking anything in return? I mean, what an incredible show of good faith that would be. That would surely provoke our adversaries into realizing we do want peace, so let's give away the Gaza Strip.

Now, they hadn't learned a whole lot from the fact that you could give away a part of what was part of Israel at the time, controlled by Israel, give that to southern Lebanon and they will know that we are really interested in peace and things should really go well, continuing not to get the message that every time it seems that Israel gives away land, even going back to its early inception centuries and centuries and centuries before there was Muhammad, there was Islam, Israel, if they gave away land, it was normally used as a staging area later to attack them because they had given away something that was under their control.

And I wondered about the mentality—do you guys not get it? You give away land. You get attacked from it every time you seem to give it away—until I made a couple of trips over and you begin to realize the mentality: after years and years of suicide bombs, family members just having coffee at this restaurant, alive one minute, laughing with kids, with their children, dead the next minute; a suicide bomber walking down into an area of school children so he can blow himself up and kill children; when you see and you understand there have been so

many rockets flying into Israel and you find out the mentality apparently for so many Israelis has been, Look, we just want to be left alone. We just want to be left alone. We will give you land, unilaterally give it away, not demand, just please leave us alone.

I was reminded of the routine Bill Cosby talked about where—and I think out of the first six albums I ever had, three of them were Bill Cosby. He had a way of taking life and helping you to look at yourself and laugh. But he talked about as a parent, the youngest one screaming and hollering, and he said, Hey, stop. And the little girl screams, Well, I want this. And the other kids saying, It's ours. It's ours. And he says, I don't care. Let her have it. You've got to stop the screaming. She's got a lot of my stuff, too. Just let her have it so she will quit screaming.

And I thought about Bill Cosby's comment because I get that impression, you know, the Israelis were so tired of the death and the suicide bombs and rockets and grenades, they said, Look, we'll just give you land if you will leave us alone. Let us live in peace.

So I understand better the mentality that says, Here, we will unilaterally give away land that actually makes it harder for us to protect ourselves, because they're thinking that that will bring about acts of kindness on the other side, not realizing when you're dealing with people who, because of religious zealotry, have made clear that they want to see your nation wiped completely off the map, they're not really going to get all touchy-feely over some gift that you make. That's what has happened with Gaza. They acted out of such wonderful intentions, Let's give this land to the Palestinians.

And after you've seen what was there—there were greenhouses. There were ways that people could make a living there, and there were ways that people could produce their own food there. Instead, once they gave the land away, the greenhouses were destroyed. So many were plundered, just acts of violence. Well, it was the Israelis, so destroy it. These were ways they could have lived and eaten and made a good living, and they destroyed it.

□ 2030

So, hopefully, people in Israel are beginning to understand you've got to defend yourself and that acts of peacefulness are not going to be met with acts of peace in response. They are going to be met with flotillas, with Kazan rockets, and with death in your own country.

Because the idea is not to get a strip of land here at Gaza; it is not to get a strip of land here in the northern part of Israel; it is not to get the Golan Heights. You know, it is not to get the West Bank and to enlarge that. No, not at all. It is to wipe Israel off the map.

It's interesting how and it grieves me much, actually, to know that there are well-educated people who have gone

through life thinking that the Israelis, the Jewish people, had no history prior to the Palestinians in that area, that their history was more in Germany and in Poland and in America. America didn't even have any idea that Israel existed, other than the Native Americans.

A tragic thing happened here just recently. For the first time in United States history, the United States decided to ignore thousands of years of lessons and to demand, with Israel's enemies, that they let the world know exactly what weaponry they have, what nuclear weaponry they have. Let everybody know exactly what you've got. It was well-intentioned, I'm sure, on the part of this administration, but what a disastrous mistake.

I thought about Hezekiah, King of Israel, long before the days of Mohammad, when Israel was a nation in the land where they now are. King Hezekiah was the son of Ahaz.

For a little history, Ahaz, as King of Israel, had seen the northern kingdom make an alliance with Assyria, and it made a very powerful alliance in military. They were marching toward Jerusalem, and it appeared there was no way they could be stopped. And that's when, according to scripture, God told Isaiah to go find Ahaz at the cistern and tell him, I'm not going to let that alliance take Jerusalem. Isaiah did that, and they did not take Jerusalem. Ahaz changed his ways, and Israel was blessed centuries before there was Mohammad. They were greatly blessed.

Then his son Hezekiah came along, and things went well for much of his reign. You know, there were ups and down, as any nation has. There were ups and downs in Hezekiah's private life.

Following the tradition that for most of this nation's history was a reading and quoting from the Bible as the most quoted book here on the House floor, 2 Kings 20:14—and I'm skipping a lot:

Then Isaiah, the prophet, came to King Hezekiah and said to him, What did these men say, and from where have they come to you? Hezekiah, who was king, said, They have come from a far country, from Babylon.

Isaiah said, What have they seen in your house?

Hezekiah answered, They have seen all that is in my house. There is nothing among my treasures that I have not shown them.

You know, Isaiah knew that was absolutely stupid to bring in people who would like to see his country destroyed and gone, who would like to have his treasure that he had built and created and to show them everything he had.

I mean, it's like saying for people who play poker, "I am such a benevolent poker player. Let me show you my cards. I'll take two cards, and I'll show you what they are, and now here is my five. Okay. Who wants to bet?" You don't do that.

It would be like playing chess and saying, "Now, I want to be benevolent,

and so I'm going to tell you you're tempted to move here. If do you that, I'm going to move here, here, and here, and it will be checkmate." You can't do that. That lesson should have been learned repeatedly, and it was not.

Isaiah foretold to Hezekiah, continuing on in verse 16:

Hear the word of the Lord: Behold, the days are coming when all that is in your house and that all that your fathers have laid up in store to this day shall be carried to Babylon. Nothing shall be left, says the Lord.

I don't care whose history it is. If you fail to learn from history, you're asking for disaster. To borrow a line from Proverbs, which was later the title of a movie: You're going to inherit the wind.

You can't do that. This great country of ours can't now turn on Israel and demand of Israel to make the disastrous, disastrous mistake that Hezekiah did. Sure, we'll bring you in. We'll show you everything we've got. We're demanding that now, with Israel's enemies, that they've got to show everything they've got to those who want to see them gone. And to people like Ahmadinejad who has pledged that Israel will be wiped off the map? You're going to let them know every defense—everything that Israel has?

What kind of naivete is running the place? I know it's well-intentioned. Just like the health care bill, it's well-intentioned; but as a result, people are going to be put on lists like they have been in England, like they have been in Canada, and they're going to die, waiting for their treatments, for their tests. Here we are, well-intentioned, refusing to learn the clear lessons of history.

So what did we see last week? Well, actually, we can go back to May 25, 2010. Israel became aware that there was a Free Gaza flotilla, so they advised Turkey and other governments, whose nationals Israel knew were going to participate, that Israel could not allow the self-styled humanitarian mission to breach its defensive and able blockade of Gaza.

Now, it would be like, after 9/11, people who would like to see this country wiped off the map, the United States. Ahmadinejad has made that clear, that Israel is the little Satan and that the U.S. is the big Satan. He wants to see us gone. It would be like a group of peace-loving people saying, "We're coming onto an airplane, and we're not going to let you check us. We're not going to go through your metal detectors. We're coming, and there are lots of us. By the way, we also have metal poles and knives, and we will shoot you, too, when you try to stop us. We're going to get on those planes, whether you want it or not, because we're going to style ourselves the Free America flotilla—airtilla. We're going to be 'Airtilla the Hun.' We're going to bring people into the airports. We're going to overwhelm the security, and we're going to get on those airplanes without being checked."

This is what is being done to Israel after thousands and thousands and thousands of rockets have been launched from the Gaza Strip into Israel, killing Israelis, maiming children. I mean, Israel couldn't let that go on.

So, sure, we'll let the humanitarian aid through. They made that clear. But they made clear back as early as May 25 that they were not going to allow anybody to breach the naval blockade.

So, apparently, the nations that Israel warned did not take it to heart. In fact, one flotilla participant said on May 28 that this mission is not about delivering humanitarian supplies; it's about breaking Israel's siege on 1.5 million Palestinians, and that's the truth.

By the way, en route, the Arab news channel Al Jazeera exalted jihadist martyrdom and sang Palestinian intifada songs. On May 29, Hamas consents to broadcast on its state-controlled television in Gaza an interview with a leading Gaza professor, calling on flotilla passengers to engage in martyrdom with the people of Gaza.

On May 30, despite repeated warnings from Israel defense forces, the six vessels continued their voyage toward the security zone. Aboard one of the ships, one person told Turkish television, "We will definitely resist, and we will not allow the Israelis to enter here." Another said, "If Israel wants to board this ship, it will meet strong resistance." Israel's mistake was not taking those quotes to heart, not taking them literally.

On May 31, 2010, Israeli Navy personnel warned all six flotilla ships that they are about to enter restricted waters. Again, Israel offers to collect humanitarian aid and have it delivered to the Gaza Strip by the United Nations, but the ships again refuse to comply. Aboard one of the ships, it is announced, "We are going to resist, and resistance will win." Militants on the ship begin yelling, "Intifada, intifada."

Well, we know what happened from there. Some don't. Some haven't watched. I mean, they've watched mainstream America and they haven't seen the Israelis being beaten with metal pipes, they haven't seen the Israelis being stabbed, they haven't seen Israeli soldiers shot and thrown overboard.

How would we react in America if people decided to peacefully overwhelm security at our airports, to get on airplanes for benevolent causes, who then stabbed or beat security agents at our airports? We wouldn't put up with that. Well, I don't know. Maybe this administration would; hard to say. But we know from history that's a big mistake.

What really breaks my heart is some of us have been seeing this stuff coming, and I wanted this to be a very bipartisan effort. So, for some months, I've been trying to get a pro-Israel group on board, I've been trying to get friends across the aisle on board with a resolution that would make very clear

that we support Israel's defending itself, whatever needs to be done, and if nothing else has worked, that the military means are supported by this Nation.

Instead, this administration has been snubbing Israel. He snubbed their Prime Minister previously when he came to Washington. He walked off. "I'm going to go have dinner with my family. Why don't you just stay here in the White House for the night so you can come around and do what I've demanded, and you can let me know when you get ready to do what I've demanded." Prime Minister Netanyahu appropriately didn't stay. He went to the Embassy. He didn't need to be blackmailed into anything.

I realize, you know, we're all victims of the environment in which we grew up, and if you grew up in an environment, say, for example, Chicago, where you're used to snubbing folks—you do that in France, and it's no big deal. So it's understandable that would be brought to the White House.

□ 2045

But the trouble is, when you're the most powerful executive in the world, and you snub a friend, there are international implications. Things like that have been known to start wars and cost thousands and thousands of lives. Activity like that has consequences, and the world has been watching while we snubbed our ally, who has more of the same rights in their nation that we have in this one than any nation in the Middle East. And we're snubbing them? And we're trying to force them to do what they did in giving away land to southern Lebanon, giving away the Gaza Strip, not defending itself, now demanding that they show all of their weaponry? That has consequences. It can start wars.

And the reason that I've been working behind the scenes for so long trying to get people on both sides of the aisle, and I've got plenty of this side of the aisle support, and I have a few Jewish friends on the other side of the aisle that are supportive, but it wasn't enough. But now I agree with some other friends that said, you can't keep this private; you've got to put the pressure on publicly. And hopefully, Mr. Speaker, people would contact their Members of Congress and let them know that they need to get on board with the resolution that says Israel can defend itself.

Sanctions, what a lovely thing to talk about. And when you have years and years and years to work with, whether it's South Africa or somewhere, that's one thing. But when you've got centrifuges spinning, and the IAEA already tells us that Iran has probably enough enriched uranium for two nuclear weapons, and the centrifuges are still spinning, and we're still trying to talk to other nations in the world about getting on board with our sanctions, Israel is more at risk every day.

And not only have we not gotten other nations to get on board with sanctions; Russia has cut a deal. They're going to provide them their best anti-aircraft weaponry as 300 is coming to Iran. And the days are growing and building. And we're putting all the wrong pressure on our dear ally.

And some know in this body that I've been pushing, all three terms I've been here, what I title the U.N. Voting Accountability Act. One of these days I'm going to get it to the floor for a vote. I got it as an amendment. We had over 100 votes on it. That was back in 2005. I'm hoping to get it the floor as a bill at some point to bring about sanity to our foreign assistance policy.

But it basically says this: Hey, these nations around the world, you're sovereign nations. You can do whatever you want as long as it doesn't hurt us, because we'll protect ourselves. But any nation that votes against the United States position more than half the time in the U.N. won't get any financial assistance from us in the subsequent year. March 31 every year a report comes out about who voted which way on all the contested votes. You look at those, you see who voted against our position more than half the time and you just say, fine; that's your position. We are not going to keep paying people to hate us. We have found we can get people to hate us for free. And we don't have to get taxpayers to keep paying taxes to pay people to hate us when they'll do it for free.

We're paying Israel's enemies about as much as we're supporting Israel with. It's a big mistake.

One thought I had that would be a clear image to the world, and I appreciate the few friends across the aisle that have said they have supported the idea, and that is, we need an image, a visual image going to the rest of the world so they know, there may be a little bickering with our friend, our close ally Israel. But when people saw both sides of this aisle standing and applauding Prime Minister Netanyahu in a joint session, then they would get the picture; hey, we may fuss among ourselves, but we will defend them.

There are still some historians that believe that it was Secretary of State Acheson saying basically that Korea was beyond our sphere of influence, which led, and apparently Korea was already massing forces. But you can't help but wonder if once they heard that that's beyond our sphere of influence, we won't come to South Korea's aid, that's when the Korean War started. You start wars, oftentimes, when the strongest friend snubs their ally, then enemies of that ally think they can act against that ally without the strong supporter stepping forward.

And we need to let the world know that Israel is still our friend. They still vote with us more than way over 90 percent of the rest of the people in the U.N., and a friend like that is a friend we ought to support. And you won't get peace until you show you're willing to

stand up against the bad guys. And then the bad guys understand that and you have peace for a while.

But, Mr. Speaker, I see my time has expired, so I appreciate your indulgence tonight.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and the balance of the week on account of a death in the family.

Ms. RICHARDSON (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of primary election in the district.

Mr. CARTER (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of travel delays.

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 Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WEINER, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today, June 9, 10, and 11.

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today, June 9, 10, 11, 14, and 15.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, today, June 9, 10, 11, 14, and 15.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, today, June 9, 10, 11, 14, and 15.

Mr. LATTA, for 5 minutes, June 9.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes, June 10.

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. 5330. An act to amend the Antitrust Criminal Penalty Enhancement and Reform Act of 2004 to extend the operation of such Act, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House reports that on May 28, 2010 she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 5128. To designate the United States Department of the Interior Building in Washington, District of Columbia, as the "Stewart Lee Udall Department of the Interior Building".

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House reports that on June 1, 2010 she