

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court is the most important court in the world. However, very few citizens have the chance to watch the Supreme Court in action when historic lawsuits come before it. This is because the seating in the courtroom is limited. The Supreme Court will soon take up the health care bill and rule on its constitutionality. This monumental case affects every single American; yet only a select group will be able to attend the hearing.

Representative GERRY CONNOLLY has introduced legislation that I support to allow cameras in the Supreme Court. A single nonintrusive-type camera, controlled by the Court staff would allow for greater access in the decisions made by the nine jurists in black robes. I know cameras can be placed in a courtroom without disruption because I was one of the first judges in Texas to allow cameras to film criminal cases.

A lack of seating capacity is no reason to deny the American people the right to see Supreme Court proceedings. The American people deserve an all-access pass to watch the High Court rule on the law of the land.

And that's just the way it is.

SHINING LIGHT ON THE HUMAN RIGHTS SITUATION IN BELARUS

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give voice to a concern that I have heard raised from numerous constituents who originally hail from Belarus. Since 1994, President Lukashenko has abused his power and has actively worked to undermine the freedom of the Belarusian people.

Recently, the State Department released a report on the human rights situation in Belarus. Under this authoritarian regime, Belarusians have been subject to manipulated elections and oppression on the basis of political affiliation, ethnicity, and religious beliefs. Following the most recent election, security forces arrested political activists, presidential candidates, and journalists.

Mr. Speaker, it is unacceptable that this kind of oppression exists today in Europe, and I hope that more Americans will be made aware of the tyranny in Belarus. I thank the Belarusian-American Youth Association for bringing this issue to my attention. And I stand with my constituents in support of freedom for the Belarusian people in opposition to this oppressive regime.

ETERNAL VIGILANCE

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

There is so much going on these days, and we have to trust the United States, the Federal entities of the executive branch to keep us protected. That's why our hearing last week with the Attorney General of the United States, Eric Holder, before the Judiciary Committee of the House was very disturbing. We had Attorney General Holder before our committee back on May 3 of this year; and at that time, the Attorney General said, with regard to this horrible project, this undertaking called Fast and Furious, the Attorney General said he had only known about it "a few weeks." To most of us, "a few weeks" means about 3 weeks. However, in testifying under penalty of perjury last week, the Attorney General said in essence, Look, 3 weeks, 3 months—a few weeks is 3 months; there's not really any difference. When you have the highest-ranking person in the United States Department of Justice who plays so fast and loose while testifying under oath, who plays so fast and loose with the facts, it is quite disturbing, and it's time for a change.

Our Attorney General testified that there were a certain number of guns, 94,000 firearms, submitted for tracing and that 64,000 of those firearms were sourced to the United States. The further we get into that, the more inaccurate we find out those figures are; and of course we recall—and it's understandable that with a boss like the United States President who has previously said, 90, 95 percent of the guns seized at crime scenes in Mexico came from the United States, it's understandable that if the boss is making those kinds of glaring errors on numbers, then perhaps the head of the Department of Justice would make substantial mistakes in numbers.

But, fortunately, the Department of Justice is not the only source of information regarding those types of matters. The Congressional Research Service is a bipartisan group. They do an extraordinary job. I've gotten the impression that potentially the majority may be Democrat, but it doesn't matter to those folks. They do a very good job of researching thoroughly whatever project they're given.

And the information that we were able to get back from the Congressional Research Service indicates that there are maybe only 25 percent of the weapons that Mexico has seized that are capable of being traced back to their original source and that most of the weapons that Mexico seizes are never offered for the process of tracing because they know there's no way to trace them. So if only 25 percent of those that are seized in Mexico are asked to have tracing done, then it is very clear that not 95, not 90, not even 70 percent of the weapons seized can be traced to an American owner first.

□ 1950

We also know from the testimony and the information about this Fast and Furious project of the ATF Depart-

ment of Justice, because the ATF is a subsidiary of the Department of Justice, but we know that gun dealers were pushed into making sales to people they didn't believe should be sold the weapons; and our own Federal Government, our own Justice Department, urged them to go ahead and make the sales on behalf of their country anyway. Then some in this administration have the nerve to say this, too, was Bush's fault, and they point to programs in the Bush administration as being the source.

Andrew McCarthy, back November 8, had a great article in National Review Online, "Fast & Furious Was . . . Bush's Fault." He goes on to point out that Fast and Furious did not begin until 2009, months after the end of the Bush administration, and he also goes on to point out a number of things.

For example, Wide Receiver, which was a project under the Bush administration, involved what were considered controlled deliveries. As a former judge, we'd hear constantly about controlled deliveries where the government would have people—find out people were inquiring about making drug sales, and they would set up a delivery. There would be plenty of agents there to intervene as soon as the transaction had actually been made. The controlled delivery meant not only do you have people watching, you may even have some way to follow what is being transferred in that controlled delivery. That's what was anticipated with Wide Receiver, the project under the Bush administration.

Unfortunately, there was an incident where Wide Receiver, apparently that project had a controlled delivery setup of weapons, the intent never ever to allow them to actually leave this country or to actually have the individuals involved get away with those weapons, but actually to have them have an interdiction, have them arrested. And also, one other thing, they had homing devices on the weapons. Well, unfortunately, everything went wrong. The homing devices were detected, they were removed, the controlled delivery went bad, and folks got away.

That is a far sight different from this administration deciding we're going to see that massive number, at least a couple of thousand weapons, are put in the hands of criminals who will likely take them across the border. They will certainly end up in the deaths of Mexicans, and there's a good chance will result in the deaths of Americans. Anyone in any administration who thinks such an idea is a good one needs to go from that administration. Anyone from any administration who allows something so insane to take place does not need to be in that administration. Anybody who has such lax control over his department that though those directly under him know about it, they leave him plausible deniability to come in and say: I didn't know anything about it. Maybe Lanny Breuer; yeah, apparently he knew all about. Yeah, I see

Lanny quite a bit, but I didn't know anything about it. Anybody that sets up a structure to allow themselves that kind of plausible deniability—so-called plausible—and would allow something that results in a foreseen death, much less hundreds of deaths, does not need to be head of that department.

Now, this should not be a partisan issue. Back when President Bush, George W. Bush was President, we had been told in our Judiciary Committee in the House by the Attorney General at that time that there were no known abuses of the national security letters. The national security letter powers bother me greatly. I'm extremely concerned about them. I've been very concerned about them, and we had the report from the Attorney General, no, there are no known abuses. Well, that is an awfully powerful weapon, but we were assured under the PATRIOT Act it is only allowable that those letters be used to gain information about foreign nationals—not American citizens—or people who are associated with known foreign terrorist organizations. It would never be used against American citizens. We were assured of that.

So some of us wanted to make sure that there were no abuses, no American citizens were being pursued internationally or nationally. We were assured they weren't. The Attorney General in July had testified before—this was, I guess, 2007; I believe it was July—that there were no known abuses by Federal agents of the national security letter where they demand information, documentation, all that's in the possession of the person to whom the letter is sent. It turns out, three days before the Attorney General testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee, there had been a report that was placed on his desk. The Attorney General's defense was: I never read it before I testified before the Senate, so I was certainly testifying honestly; I just didn't know. That was enough, though, to have people on both sides of the aisle, Republican and Democrat, House and Senate, agree we need to change something, and we got it changed within about six weeks.

This administration is so used to obfuscating, hiding the ball, preventing documentation that is requested from coming to light, this administration thinks that it can keep protecting people who need to go for the good of the country.

Then we find out there's emails in the documents that were provided by the Justice Department. There are emails indicating that, gee, maybe it would be a good idea if we could use Fast and Furious numbers to get more regulation. Sharyl Attkisson has an article—this was part of CBSnews.com—where she indicates:

ATF officials didn't intend to publicly disclose their own role in letting Mexican cartels obtain the weapons, but emails show they discussed using the sales, including sales encouraged by ATF, to justify a new

gun regulation called "Demand Letter 3". That would require some U.S. gun shops to report the sale of multiple rifles or "long guns." Demand Letter 3 was so named because it would be the third ATF program demanding gun dealers report tracing information.

On July 14, 2010 after ATF headquarters in Washington D.C. received an update on Fast and Furious, ATF Field Ops Assistant Director Mark Chait emailed Bill Newell, ATF's Phoenix Special Agent in Charge of Fast and Furious:

"Bill—can you see if these guns were all purchased from the same (licensed gun dealer) and at one time. We are looking at anecdotal cases to support a demand letter on long gun multiple sales. Thanks."

□ 2000

Amazing. The ATF, the Justice Department, creates this horrible program that would get people killed and then wants to use that as a basis for further regulation and further elimination of our Second Amendment rights to the United States Constitution. Unbelievable. They have Senator FEINSTEIN down the Hall when questioning Lanny Breuer, who apparently indications are was not truthful with regard to Fast and Furious, and Senator FEINSTEIN says, "We have very lax laws when it comes to guns. I think this, to some extent, influences the ATF and how they approach the problem as to whether they have political support or not. But I think these numbers are shocking. And I think when you know the numbers of deaths these guns have caused used by cartels against victims, it's literally up in the tens of thousands. So the question comes as what we can do, and I would really rather concentrate on the constructive rather than other things. And so the question comes, do you believe that if there were some form of registration when you purchase these firearms that that would make a difference?"

Again, a deadly program that would kill innocent people is put in place by the Justice Department's ATF, people are killed, and then people around this town want to use this horrible program's results to justify taking away Second Amendment rights. It's staggering. Staggering. It's bad enough that anybody would think this type of program, Fast and Furious, was a good idea, but then to turn around and use it to try to destroy Second Amendment rights under the Constitution is simply unconscionable.

Well, the Attorney General also, when asked about his testimony last week, he said, yes, he had ordered in February an Inspector General study, an inspection of the Fast and Furious program. It was pointed out to the Attorney General that in the big document dump that they had—and it was clearly a document dump intended to mask and hide anything therein. A good piece of evidence of that is the fact that 92 pages, at least, of the documents were Senator GRASSLEY's own request for information about Fast and Furious. Those were just duplicated

dozens and dozens and dozens of times, and that was part of the document dump just to hide what little bit of information was in there.

And yet despite all those documents produced and despite information that was inquired about at the hearing, the Attorney General does use government email, he does use private email, he does sign things, not one email of the Attorney General, not one letter, not one order of any kind by this Attorney General was part of that record.

If we have an Attorney General who believes in playing so fast and loose with the laws that it really is more about who you know in this administration rather than what the law says, it's time for another Attorney General. Nothing was produced. When I asked about his testimony that an IG inspection was ordered, our Attorney General indicated basically that he had such a great relationship with the Inspector General he could just pick up the phone and ask her to do an inspection, a study.

If that's the way this Attorney General operates, which he testified under oath that it was, we need a new Attorney General. Those kinds of things are so serious they require something signed.

And as far as being so chummy with the Inspector General, it also makes clear this is no way to run a Justice Department, because it makes clear that the Justice Department is run by a man who is so chummy with the one person that may be able to do an independent study that there really is no independent study done.

That also became clear, and DARRELL ISSA who has been pursuing this—and I'm thankful for it. He has been relentless. But the information has not been forthcoming. But from what information has been gleaned, we find out that this Inspector General, the very, very, very close chum of our Attorney General, had found out that there was a gun dealer who became so concerned about this egregious thing being done where he was being forced to sell guns to people to whom he did not want to sell guns, that he began recording conversations, things that were told him by Federal agents so that he would have some protection. When the Inspector General found out, she got the recorded conversations.

Now, a good Inspector General who is not extremely chummy with the person heading up the Department she is supposed to independently study and inspect would go forward, talk to witnesses and see if they said anything inconsistent in their statements to the Inspector General so that the Inspector General could determine if these people were being honest.

Instead, what this very close ally and chum of the person whose Department she is supposed to be inspecting, she apparently took the recorded statement, gave it to the Federal agent and said, hey, you better listen to this before you give any statements so you

can make sure your statements are consistent.

Inspectors General aren't supposed to do that. They're supposed to conduct a thorough, independent investigation. All the indications are that this Inspector General is, just as Attorney General Holder testified, so chummy, so close, that she doesn't need a written order. It works out better if we can just say, we just talked about it over the phone. And, in fact, wouldn't that be great, too, if we could do that here in Congress? Do you know what? We passed a law, but we just talked about it, and you don't get to find out what it is, but we'll come after you if you violate it.

You can't run a government that way. There needs to be documentation for decisions that are made so we know who made them. And that brings us to one of the more egregious factors in the poor management of the Justice Department. When the Attorney General was asked who it was by my friend, Judge POE from Texas, now in Congress, who it was that made the decision to go forward with Fast and Furious after 10 these many, many months, the Attorney General said he just really didn't know, and he didn't know if he was going to be able to find out.

Since we have an Attorney General that has no way of knowing who is making the decisions in his Department that are getting innocent people in the United States and Mexico killed, it's time to have an Attorney General who does.

□ 2010

We cannot survive as a country when the Federal Government plays so fast and loose with orders that mean the difference between people being killed and not killed.

It's time for a change. America deserves better. Mexico deserves better. And you can't help but wonder what kind of pressure was put on Mexico's government not to raise holy Cain about having all these illegal weapons forcibly sold that were going into Mexico. We had no intention—or this Justice Department had no intention of following them, no method of getting them back, no method of finding out where they were. And in fact, it appears the whole goal was to wait and see when they showed up at crime scenes—which normally meant somebody had been killed—then check the serial numbers against those the ATF had forcibly required the sale of, and if they matched, then we could blame American gun dealers. It's understandable a gun dealer in the U.S. could become concerned, that maybe he ought to start taping Federal agents giving him instructions. Things are not going well in this Justice Department.

One other area of concern—has been for some time—is the fact that there are organizations in the United States that are raising money and then funding terrorist organizations abroad.

Hamas is one specifically. And since this government continues to send money to the Palestinian Authority, which has now got an agreement with Hamas, our own government is in cahoots in funding terrorism. At some point the insanity has got to stop.

We know that this kind of thing has gone on by organizations in the United States because in November of 2008 the Bush administration obtained five convictions, 105 counts of funding terrorism. Most people refer to the litigation as the Holy Land Foundation trial. And there were over 200 named coconspirators with the Holy Land Foundation and the individuals named, and those coconspirators, many of them were implicated through evidence that was introduced at trial in the Holy Land Foundation trial.

Now, they were named coconspirators, but the others were not actually indicted. My understanding is that the Bush administration intended to try to get those first convictions—the first time the case was tried to a hung jury, an 11–1 split, as I understood it, for guilt. The second time they got the 105 counts of conviction against the five individuals. And their intent was, if they could get those prosecutions, get those judgments, get those findings of guilt, then it would proceed on with others of the 200-plus named coconspirators. And in fact, some of the named coconspirators, like CAIR, ISNA, had filed a motion with the Federal court in Dallas that ended up at the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals in New Orleans. They wanted their names struck from the pleadings, but the Fifth Circuit in essence said there is a *prima facie* case. There is sufficient evidence here to show that these named coconspirators were coconspirators and therefore, no, they're not going to have their names struck from the pleadings; they're part of the evidence. It's clear, or there is evidence to support their being coconspirators with the Holy Land Foundation. Some folks have been trying to get documentation from the Holy Land Foundation trial. We've gotten some, but there were a massive amount of documents that were turned over to the five defendants, the Holy Land Foundation people. And since we know beyond a reasonable doubt they were funding terrorism, there is not really any doubt in most thinking peoples' minds that those documents all found their way back to Hamas, the terrorists.

But this administration, led by Attorney General Eric Holder, has decided they're not going to prosecute any of those people. Even after the Fifth Circuit said there is *prima facie* evidence, there is sufficient evidence to go forward and to keep their names because they are coconspirators, according to the evidence produced, this administration has chosen to protect those individuals by not prosecuting them, much like this administration did in failing to prosecute the individuals involved in the new Black Panther

movement—who one African American involved in the civil rights movement of the sixties said was the worst case of voting rights abuses that he had ever seen. And yet this Attorney General, who could have gotten a judgment and prevented at least these two individuals from ever appearing at a voting place like this and intimidating voters, chose to water down the judgment with one so that he just didn't go back to that same voting place in the next election. And with the other, who was certainly, from the videotape, involved in violating people's civil rights, didn't even take the judgment against him. And then to turn around and refuse to prosecute people who there is sufficient evidence to show that they are funding terrorism is horrendous.

There is an article, December 7, "Holy Land Foundation Hamas Support Convictions Affirmed." And this is from Andrew McCarthy, who was the prosecutor in the first World Trade Center prosecution, 1993, when the attempt was made to blow up the World Trade Center the first time, successfully prosecuted. And at the time, America didn't realize we were in a war. We were in a war, but only one side knew that they were in a war, and that was the radical Islamists.

As Mr. McCarthy indicates, the U.S. Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit, upheld the convictions of five jihadists behind the Holy Land Foundation, the piggybank set up by the Brotherhood in the U.S. under the guise of charity to fund Hamas to the tune of tens of millions of dollars during the deadly Intifada. The three-judge panel's unanimous 170-page opinion recounts that Hamas was created by Brotherhood operatives—that's Muslim Brotherhood—in 1987 as the Brotherhood's "Palestinian branch." Thereafter, "the Muslim Brotherhood directed its worldwide chapters to establish so-called 'Palestinian committees' to support Hamas from abroad."

McCarthy continues:

In the U.S., the "Palestine Committee" was led by Mousa Abu Marzook (who for a time in the early nineties actually ran Hamas from his home in Virginia). The Palestine Committee created not only the Holy Land Foundation but a number of other Islamist entities in the U.S. The leaders of one of those entities, the Islamic Association for Palestine, subsequently created CAIR, the Council on American-Islamic Relations, which was cited as an unindicted coconspirator in the case.

Mr. McCarthy goes on to point out that documents recovered by the FBI at the home of a Brotherhood operative established the Brotherhood's overarching role in the Hamas support scheme, including bylaws showing the Brotherhood had directed the collection of donations for the Islamic Resistance Movement, which is Hamas.

□ 2020

Also recovered at the time was the internal memorandum in which the Brotherhood's American leadership asserted:

The Ikhwan [i.e., the Brotherhood] must understand that their work in America is a kind of grand jihad in eliminating and destroying the Western civilization from within and 'sabotaging' its miserable house by their hands and the hands of the believers, so that it is eliminated and God's religion is made victorious over all other religions.

And, in fact, you get a copy of the Fifth Circuit's opinion, there are a number of interesting things addressed by the Fifth Circuit with regard to the Holy Land Foundation. The Fifth Circuit said:

We are satisfied that independent evidence also established the existence of a joint venture or combination among the declarants and the defendants to support Hamas through the Holy Land Foundation and the zakat committees. For example, participants at the Philadelphia meeting discussed Hamas and its control of the zakat committees. The participants referenced the importance of the Holy Land Foundation in the Committee's goals, and they identified as "ours" various zakat committees to which Holy Land Foundation donated funds. The Government also introduced evidence of numerous financial transactions and personal contact between the defendants and Hamas leader Marzook, who was listed in the Elbarasse and Ashqar documents as chairman of the Palestine Committee. Marzook also had in his personal phone book the contact information for Baker, Elashi, El-Mezain and Elbarasse. Further, Hamas leader Mishal spoke at a meeting attended by Baker, Elashi, El-Mezain and Ashqar about supporting Hamas. According to Shorbagi, who was present, El-Mezain led a break-out group at that meeting to discuss the financial issue of raising money. Moreover, Shorbagi specifically testified from personal knowledge that the Holy Land Foundation was part of Hamas.

Well, the Fifth Circuit, talking about the Holy Land Foundation trial, said the evidence at issue was offered to show the defendant's connection to terrorists and his predisposition to terrorist activities.

It goes on to cite much of the evidence. And the Court says:

The evidence in this case does show a relationship between the defendants and Elbarasse and Ashqar, as well as their connections to Hamas leaders.

It goes on to say:

The record here showed the defendants' joint participation in a shared undertaking involving the Committee—that's the Palestine Committee—and the documents were properly admitted.

The Court goes on, makes numerous findings, discusses the law, but also says:

The defendants here "are wrong to suggest that it is necessary to know the precise identity of" the declarants in the Elbarasse and Ashqar documents.

They go on to conclude:

It's "inescapable" that the declarants were joint venturers with the defendants in support of Hamas through the Palestine Committee.

It goes on to cite some examples there. The Fifth Circuit did an excellent job of going through reciting the evidence, and they said this:

They were also consistent with security "guidelines" found among Holy Land Foundation's materials stored at Infocom, which

directed that there should be cover stories agreed upon to explain things like meetings and travel.

Now, if this group that worked through the Holy Land Foundation to send money to Hamas were perfectly innocent, then it seems interesting that the Foundation's policies and guidelines that were found in Virginia in a sub-basement which contained much of the Muslim Brotherhood's archives would say the following—and this is from a footnote on page 84 of the Fifth Circuit's decision. They said:

The document, which was labeled "The Foundation's Policies & Guidelines," included comprehensive policies for ensuring the secrecy of the organization's activity. For example, the policies directed that documents should be arranged at meetings so that they could be easily gotten rid of in an emergency; that measures should be taken before a meeting to be sure there is no hidden surveillance equipment; that an alert signal should be given if the location is monitored or if a member of the committee is followed; and that documents should be hidden when traveling and a pretext should be devised in case they are discovered in a search. The possession of such a document by a purportedly charitable organization was clearly suspicious.

And the Fifth Circuit there is a master of understatement.

It is amazing what was found in the documentation in Virginia, and that's after a couple were arrested as they went across the Chesapeake Bay Bridge, photographing construction columns of the bridge. And on further search of their home in Virginia, sub-basement, they found the Muslim Brotherhood archives that gave us so much information.

The trouble is, there were massive numbers of boxes of information. And as we understand it, much of that was provided to the defendants in the Holy Land Foundation trial.

I made the request of the Attorney General last week that, since those documents were provided to defendants who were convicted of funding terrorism, funneling money to Hamas, that surely the Justice Department would now allow Congress to see those boxes of documents. The Attorney General, once again, didn't know what was furnished. He would look into it.

We need an Attorney General that knows what's going on when there are organizations in America who are financing, by millions and millions of dollars, people who are conducting terrorism efforts around the world. Well, the Attorney General said he'd look into it. An official request was made at the hearing. And yet, we're waiting to hear from the Justice Department.

It just seems to make sense to me that if this Justice Department will provide documentation to people who are part of a terrorist network, then surely they'll provide it to Congress. But then again, that remains to be seen.

We had an article here from Fox News on December 7. It reports that SUSAN COLLINS, Senator SUSAN COLLINS, on Wednesday blasted the Defense

Department for classifying the Fort Hood massacre as workplace violence, and suggested political correctness is being placed above the security of the Nation's Armed Forces at home.

□ 2030

During a joint session of the Senate and House Homeland Security Committee on Wednesday, the main Republican referenced a letter from the Defense Department depicting the Fort Hood shootings as workplace violence. She criticized the Obama Administration for failing to identify the threat as radical Islam. Thirteen people were killed and dozens more were wounded at Fort Hood in 2009, and the number of alleged plots targeting the military has grown significantly since then.

Lawmakers said there have been 33 plots against the U.S. military since September 11, 2001, and 70 percent of those threats have been since mid-2009, during this administration.

Major Nidal Hasan, a former Army psychiatrist who is being held for the attacks, allegedly was inspired by radical U.S.-born cleric Anwar al-Awlaki, who was killed in a U.S. drone strike in Yemen in late September and who parenthetically was leading a prayer session of Capitol Hill Muslim staffers just years before here in our Capitol complex.

Continuing with the article, the two men exchanged as many as 20 emails, according to U.S. officials, and Awlaki declared Hasan a hero. Chairman of the Senate Homeland Security Committee, Connecticut Independent Senator JOE LIEBERMAN, said the military has become a direct target of violent Islamic extremism within the United States. Senator LIEBERMAN's words: "The stark reality is that the American servicemember is increasingly in the terrorist scope and not just overseas in a traditional war setting," Lieberman told Fox News before the start of Wednesday hearings.

In June, two men allegedly plotted to attack a Seattle, Washington, military installation using guns and grenades. In July, Army Private Nasar Abdo was accused of planning a second attack at Fort Hood.

With regard to Private Nasar Abdo, it's worth noting that we have people who have been banned now from briefing our justice officials, intelligence officials, State Department officials on the threat of radical Islam. There was even a memo put together provided in this administration which by name pointed to Army Private Nasar Abdo and said this guy has been in uniform on Al-Jazeera basically saying he's going to do what Major Hasan did at Fort Hood. He's going to do it at Fort Hood.

This administration is so interested in protecting radical Islam and not offending radical Islam that that memo was trash-canned, never went anywhere. And the only way this private was stopped was not by our intelligence community, not by our Justice

Department, not by our State Department, and not with all of the information they could have. It was stopped by a gun dealer who just believed something was wrong, and he notified law enforcement.

Now we know from the 9/11 Commission, I mean, we've known since the Commission came out with their report, there are hundreds of mentions of things like "jihad," "Islam," not that there is any war on Islam. There is not. Thank God that the vast majority of Muslims know that we're not at war with them and they are not at war with us. But it is insanity not to protect ourselves and educate ourselves on that small group, that small percentage—it's a large group—of radical Islamists who have declared war on us.

Now this administration, though originally after 9/11 the Bush administration, the independent 9/11 Commission that was appointed, came out saying this is a result of radical Islam. Now the Justice Department, the intelligence community, the new lexicon will not allow the usage in training of words like "Islam," "jihad," the very things that led to over 3,000 Americans being killed and brought about wars that killed thousands more.

The war goes on; but as one individual who is fighting for us said, this administration is making us blind ourselves so we cannot see the people we are fighting.

There was a conference at Langley, CIA headquarters, that was canceled by this administration. Why? Because CAIR complained to the White House, and the report is that that's how the conference was stopped. CAIR complained to the administration, and they stopped it; and now the administration has gone through and come out with a new methodology of selecting people who will be allowed to brief our intelligence officials, will be allowed to brief our justice officials, will be allowed to brief our military; and they will not be allowed to use terms like "radical Islam," that those are, in this administration's mind, hateful terminology rather than helping us classify and figure out who it is that is on our side and who it is that is against us.

There's even a report out that this administration now in the last week is going to create a new category on the terrorist watch list which would be called "former military detainees." If that ended up being true, makes you wonder why they'd create a new category now. Are they about to release military detainees and so when they come into the country, or they're in our country trying to fly, we'll know who it is trying to kill us here?

This administration has blinded the people that are trying to fight the war against radical Islam, which is at war with us. We've seen to it that it looks like a procedure in both Libya and in Egypt are going to likely result in radical Islamists controlling those countries. The Middle East has become a powder keg far more so than it ever

has. And if you go back and look at the President's speech, back I believe it was in May, recently looked at a transcript where our own President said Israel is going to have to defend itself by itself.

Now, thankfully, as we saw when Prime Minister Netanyahu spoke here in this body, we had both sides of the aisle repeatedly stand in support of the things Prime Minister Netanyahu was saying.

Israel has been our friend; they've been our ally. Muslims are allowed to worship Islam in Israel just as Muslims are allowed to do here in the U.S. It would be nice if Christians were allowed to worship in Muslim countries, but their definition of freedom does not allow people to freely worship whom they wish. It only allows them the freedom to worship under Islam.

Even in Afghanistan, the last Christian church has now closed. The kind of freedom that American lives and treasure brought to Afghanistan now means you can't have an open Christian church in Afghanistan.

Then we find out this administration was indirectly negotiating with terrorists, with the Taliban, with regard to Afghanistan about a year and a half ago. There were a few of us that met with leaders of the Northern Alliance a year and a half or so ago, and they're the first ones that told us your administration is indirectly meeting and negotiating with terrorists, with the Taliban, the people we fought with you to defeat.

□ 2040

After we defeated them in 3 or 4 months, then we started putting in tens of thousands of soldiers—military—into Afghanistan. We went from being embedded to being occupiers, and we oversaw the creation of a constitution in Afghanistan that says sharia law will reign, which means there will be no Christian churches in Afghanistan when true sharia law is in charge.

One of the things that was found in the archives of the Muslim Brotherhood is a 10-year goal that began in 2005. For one thing, anybody who raises any issue about the small, tiny percentage of Muslims who are at war with us, the radical Islamists, is to be called an "Islamaphobe." That term originated with the Organization of the Islamic Conference, composed of 57 states. They're the ones who came up with that. They came up with the notion of branding anyone an Islamaphobe who says anything negative about radical Islam's trying to destroy America.

So any time people see the term Islamaphobe or Islamaphobia, they should know exactly where it originated. It originated with the OIC, the 57 states of the OIC, which are also helping fund through other entities and individuals courses at some of our Nation's formerly best schools that have shown they're for sale, that their souls are for sale, in that if someone will

give them enough money, then they will put on seminars and put on classes that will also call people Islamaphobes and talk about Islamaphobia—about anyone who raises any issue about radical Islam's trying to destroy our way of life.

The goal mentioned from 2005 is part of a 10-year goal, by 2015, to have subverted our U.S. Constitution to sharia law; and the method for doing that—we've been seeing it take place—is to subvert America's First Amendment rights to sharia.

One of the ways that that is being effectuated is when some nut burns a Koran in Florida, then people get killed in some riot in Afghanistan. Then even fine, upstanding Americans say, See, we probably need a law that prohibits the burning of a Koran, that prohibits saying anything bad about the Koran or radical Islam because that's going to get Americans killed. So let's have a law banning people from saying anything negative or from burning a Koran.

Never mind the fact that, in our country's history, we find out it's not against the Constitution to burn an American flag, that it's not against the Constitution to burn a Bible, that it's not against the Constitution to take a cross, symbolizing that thing on which Jesus was crucified, and put it in a beaker of urine. In fact, the Federal Government will even give money to have that done. But if anybody says anything negative about the Koran, let's make that a crime.

There are well-intentioned people in this Capitol who are thinking maybe we need a law like that; and when people push that kind of law, they are moving to subvert our United States First Amendment rights under the Constitution to sharia law. Once that happens, then that goal can be checked off of the goals that were established by the Muslim Brotherhood in 2005. They're hoping to get that done by 2015.

A great way to do that is to brand people like me or people in the Justice Department or trainers who would teach people about the ideas of radical Islam as Islamaphobes and continue to have courses they fund to encourage laws to prevent Islamaphobia so that they have laws that prevent anybody from saying anything negative about sharia.

Never mind, even on a television program today, an atheist called Christianity a hate religion. He said it's hateful, basically, in effect, because Jesus, he said, created a hell and that that's why we shouldn't admire Christmas. Well, some of us know that Jesus was not likely born in December, but more likely in the springtime, when shepherds are on the hills.

But to declare what our Founders knew would be an important core building block of this country, when they knew that the best things that ever happened to this country would come as a result of the reliance on the

teachings of Jesus and the teachings in the Bible, you had comments like George Washington in his resignation, saying—and I'll close with this:

He prayed that Americans would follow the teaching of the Divine Author of our blessed religion without a humble limitation of whose example in these things we can never hope to be a happy Nation.

He was right.

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

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3630, MIDDLE CLASS TAX RELIEF AND JOB CREATION ACT OF 2011

Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules (during the Special Order of Mr. GOHMERT), submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112-328) on the resolution (H. Res. 491) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3630) to provide incentives for the creation of jobs, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS HOUR: JOBS FOR AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I almost don't know where to start. Let me, first of all, indicate my privilege to be yielded the hour as the representative of the minority leader and also to indicate my privilege to discuss some of the issues of the Congressional Black Caucus, which has been a leader, along with our chairman, EMANUEL CLEAVER, and our officers and those of us who have worked on these issues, on the question of jobs for America.

I almost don't know where to start. First of all, let me say happy holidays to my colleagues and, in this season of giving and joy, acknowledge how special a time it is for families to come together.

I do want to start on some of the comments of my friend and colleague from Texas. I am delighted to have him acknowledge that we cannot condemn one faith as it relates to the harm that terrorists desire to do against us. It's important to also note that there are some distortions in the comments about terrorism and in the President's position and the administration's position.

I think it is important to acknowledge that the war against those who will do us harm is not about points; it's not about partisanship; it's not about one-upmanship; it's not about what one administration has done better than the other.

I am very grateful to the men and women in our intelligence community

and to the men and women in the United States military and to those who are engaged in homeland security that we have not had a terrorist act of the proportion of 9/11 on our soil since 9/11. There are no doubts of the many threats that have been interjected and stopped, and it's important for my colleagues to understand that.

I am a senior member on the Homeland Security Committee. Tragically, I was appointed to the select Committee on Homeland Security and traveled with one or two Senators, people in the other body, to Ground Zero. When I arrived, it was early enough that one of the rescue missions was continuing. One could see the smoke billowing out of the ashes; and as we visited the board that still had loved ones about whom people were asking, Have you seen my father or my son?, it was a potent message for those of us who are committed to securing the homeland.

□ 2050

The chairperson for a period was a member of the Congressional Black Caucus, Chairman THOMPSON. He serves now as the ranking member of the committee. He has always chosen to be bipartisan. And over the last week, we joined in a bipartisan hearing with the Senate, Senator LIEBERMAN in the other body, Senator COLLINS, and the chairperson now, Chairman KING, on the question of the potential danger of our military and military bases. In that hearing, no one quarrelled with the responsibility to identify those who would go against our military on domestic soil or how we would address the question.

But it is important to note that I stand here and refuse and reject the labeling of one faith as a faith of terror. I have been in so many different mosques and among so many different groups of Muslims who practice Islam who have rejected those horrible acts.

One cannot challenge the pathway that President Obama has taken or not view it as a pathway that has saved lives. In particular, there is documentation that the last administration, after a period of time, indicated that they didn't know where Osama bin Laden was. It was not their focus. They knew that the country was safe, but they were not looking for Osama bin Laden. Frankly, in the period of time of President Obama's tenure, he has gotten the imam in Yemen, the American citizen imam that was in Yemen who was a part of the inspiration of Major Hasan, who perpetrated the terrorist acts in Fort Hood in my State, the State of Texas. We have intervened in several terrorist threats and attacks, the Times Square bomber. If my recollection serves me well, I think, also, the Christmas Day bombing; that might have been a little bit before that.

We have, in essence, taken out a number of high-target threats to America's security. We have, in fact, with the intellect and genius and with the

order of the President of the United States, President Barack Obama, in a very dangerous mission, the Navy SEALs secured and brought to his end Osama bin Laden. A very dangerous mission, a very controversial mission, but there had to be a Commander in Chief that ordered it. So I take issue with the comment that this President has not been vigilant in protecting the homeland.

Any number of us who serve on Homeland Security know that we can always be better and can always work on issues to, in fact, secure—more than secure. But as a member of the Homeland Security Committee, I've watched as our Border Patrol has surged to 18,000. As we have utilized resources on the border, the numbers of those coming across the border illegally have dropped. As we try to be constructive in arguing for comprehensive immigration reform, I have seen a number of responses that would cause me to disagree that this administration has not been vigilant.

And even today, as we are speaking to the President of Iraq, arguments are being made to ensure the evenhandedness of Iraq's behavior and their treatment of individuals in Iraq, dealing with those who are at Camp Ashraf, but, more importantly, our ongoing relationship with Iraq and our ongoing relationship with a very vital region where there are allies like the King of Jordan, allies that we've been friends with, that it is important that we maintain a certain type of demeanor. And, clearly, suggesting that a two-State solution is not viable or the Palestinian people are not real, they're made up, is an outrageous position to take for any public political person that would rise and ascend to leadership, whether it is in the Congress or in the Presidency of the United States. I could not, not just respond to charges of inadequacy by this administration.

I have served on the Foreign Affairs Committee, I was privileged to have served, and, likewise, being a member of the Homeland Security Committee and serving as the ranking member on Transportation Security and fighting to enhance security measures, more personnel, better training, responsiveness to those who are patted down and go through aviation security, making it fair but yet making it responsive to the nuances and new ideas of terrorists who want to do us harm. Mr. Speaker, it's important that we acknowledge fairness, balance, and that we continue to pray every day for our men and women who are on the front lines, for our intelligence community, for those who are thinking every moment, under this administration, successfully, on addressing that question.

I am here, however, to raise the question of our concerns of the American people that are outside the circle of homeland security and address the day-to-day needs of those who are fighting against poverty, losing their quality of life.