

permanent jobs that will be created there.

So I ask the people that are watching here today and the American public to let Congress know, to let the President know that it's important to you that we create jobs in America. This project, when approved, would start the next day moving ground, employing people.

Let's do that. Let's get America back to work. Let's help create American jobs.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BERG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Nebraska for yielding.

Once again, President Obama has chosen to put politics over the American people by punting on the Keystone Pipeline decision until after his 2012 campaign.

The construction of the pipeline will create thousands of good-paying jobs, spur economic growth, and help break our national dependence on foreign oil. This pipeline has received bipartisan support. It will increase America's access to safe and secure energy supplies and would bring more than 1.2 million barrels of oil into U.S. markets each day. Its construction could create tens of thousands of new jobs, many of which could be seen in North Dakota. In fact, Bakken Field crude oil is expected to account for 25 percent of the pipeline's expanded capacity.

North Dakota is a national example of why we need a common sense, long-term energy plan. Our energy sector has created thousands of good, high-paying jobs. In fact, our state has the lowest unemployment in the nation. But this wasn't an accident. It was the result of common sense policy—a long-term energy plan called EMPOWER North Dakota that encouraged energy development, rather than putting up new regulatory barriers.

But instead of looking to North Dakota for solutions that could help our economy, create good jobs, and help American become energy independent, the Obama administration continues to create new roadblocks to expanding domestic energy production.

I strongly urge President Obama to look ahead for the next generation, not the next election, and expedite the approval of the Keystone expansion.

REINING IN SPENDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, there is so much going on these days. We have the responsibility of reining in spending, if we will just simply live up to it.

We know that our friends at the other end of the hall, the majority in the Senate, want to spend, want to tax more, not interested in making serious cuts.

It's rather amazing that this President could come into office and Speak-

er PELOSI and Leader REID could bump up the spending by \$1 trillion, and when it becomes apparent to the whole world, not just the U.S. but the whole world, that we've got to rein back in that extra trillion they began to spend, not only do they not want to cut that extra trillion that is bankrupting us, but they want to add taxes on Americans so that they can justify even more spending. It shouldn't work that way.

We're running a deficit. We have been for a number of years. And to have Speaker PELOSI take over this Chamber and take a \$160 billion deficit, which we shouldn't have run when the Republicans had the House in '06, and then parlay that into 10 times more deficit spending is just unfathomable. But it has happened, and it's got to stop. We owe that to future generations.

At the same time, we also know, and I think Joel Rosenberg, the author, referred to it in his book, "Inside the Revolution," that Osama bin Laden didn't just rejoice in the killing of 3,000 or so Americans on 9/11. He also actually said that one of the great things about 9/11, from Osama bin Laden's standpoint, was that they spent maybe half a million dollars in setting up and carrying out the 9/11 murders, but that also they were costing the United States billions and billions of dollars, and it may run into trillions of dollars.

But we have to defend ourselves. We have to keep with our commitment and our constitutional duty to provide for the common defense. So not only do we have the responsibility of trying to regain some maturity as a Congress in controlling our spending and not doing further damage to the economy by rewarding the, as the President called them, the "fat cats on Wall Street," those people that gave to his campaign by a 4:1 margin, the executives on Wall Street and their families, 4:1 Democrat over Republican, it's time to quit bailing out people who got themselves into those messes. We should never have done it for Wall Street. We should not have done it for the automakers.

If we had had a real payroll tax holiday—holiday, meaning you don't do something. I can't imagine having a school holiday and you only get 2 percent of the day off. I know kids that went to school with me, growing up, would never have considered a 2 percent holiday a real holiday.

The President's payroll tax holiday at 2 percent is going to go forward. We passed that out of the House, unless the Senate, down under HARRY REID, kills the bill and doesn't allow that payroll tax cut to continue.

□ 1540

But it's not a holiday. A real payroll tax holiday would have been to do what I proposed 3 years ago. Art Laffer said it would have been the best stimulus we could have done at the time, and that's the genius behind Ronald Reagan's economic policies in the early eighties. But that would have been to

say you earned the money, you're going to keep it for at least a couple months in your own paycheck, and then you decide which car manufacturer you want to bail out by deciding what car you're going to buy with the extra money you've gotten in your paycheck. That would have been a great thing to do.

Instead, we had a Presidential administration decide who they wanted to bail out, how they wanted to bail them out. We had a secret society set up by the President in the White House decide which dealers, how many dealers were going to have to be shut down, and we ended up having the unthinkable occur, a violation of the Constitution, and that is a Federal taking of property, a Federal order to take property without any due process, without any remuneration. People even had borrowed money to buy dealerships. They still owed the banks for the money they borrowed to pay for those dealerships.

Yet we had an administration that said close them. It's amazing. As I understand, most of those that were ordered closed were Republican, which started feeding into the belief that we had crony capitalism going on. If you were friends of the President, you were going to do well. If you weren't, you could lose your business without any remuneration, without any due process.

Now we have an administration that is in office in the executive branch. They've filled the positions in the Justice Department, in the top positions in the intelligence department, the State Department. They're running things from the executive branch. And they know, they've read the 9/11 Commission report, I certainly hope they have. It's interesting if we look back and see what the 9/11 Commission said. It was a very bipartisan report. Some things I didn't terribly agree with. But I knew that the people who wrote the report were doing the very best they could and doing the best to the best of their beliefs. And they had to account for how 9/11 came about, how we had 3,000-plus people killed, the worst attack on American soil on our history, how that came about.

They did the study. They found out all of the people that were involved were crying out, "Allah akbar." They were people who believed that their religion required them or encouraged them to kill innocent people, and that somehow they would be rewarded in paradise for killing innocent people. They have taken their religion, this small percentage of Islamists, and they actually believe that there is a God entity out there that will reward the devastation and killing of innocent people.

So the 9/11 Commission did a very candid report, and when you take a look at the things in that report and compare them to what this administration has done in the last 3 years to whitewash that part of history, to completely distort what really happened on

9/11, to blind, as one of our officers has said, to blind our own law enforcement, intelligence, justice people so they cannot see the enemy who has declared war on us, blind those that we have called upon to risk their lives to protect us, blind them from really seeing the risks and really being able to predict what will happen, it is staggering.

We've got the blind leading the blind.

I don't think it's any better depicted than in just a numerical analysis from the 9/11 Commission. I have a poster here. And of course as this writing says, the terminology is important in defining our goals as well as removing roadblocks in the hearts and minds. The 9/11 Commission identifies Islamist terrorism as the threat. The Muslim Public Affairs Council recommends that the U.S. government find other terminology.

The OIC, the organization of all of the Islamic states, all 57 Islamic states in the world, that organization came up with a term called Islamaphobia, the word Islamaphobe, so that if anybody bothers to do the research and find out that there is a small percentage of Muslims who are radicals and who believe the Koran directs them to destroy Israel, to destroy the United States, then let's label them Islamaphobe, even though they make very clear, like I have repeatedly, that we have Muslim patriots in America, we have Muslim business people who have done great good. The vast majority of Muslims are peace-loving people.

Nonetheless, people like me who would bother to point out this small percentage that want to destroy our way of life and are doing everything they can to get in a position to do that, we're Islamaphobes. That directive is straight from this OIC, this organization of Islamic nations, all 57 States.

That's been the directive. Scare people, intimidate people so that they will not speak the truth. It's unbelievable. Because if the OIC really wanted to help themselves, they could show the world that they were about peace, not about hatred, not about killing innocent people, by encouraging people to recognize it is only a small percentage of Islamists who believe that they need to destroy Israel and to destroy the United States.

But instead, they try to intimidate, try their name-calling. Amazingly, though, they have been very effective with this administration. If this administration had thoughts of clearly speaking truth, then they would not hesitate to call a shovel a shovel, to call things just as they are.

But instead, this administration has blinded those in the State Department, in the intelligence department, in the Justice Department so that they don't really understand the enemy, cannot understand the enemy, until the enemy, those who've declared war on us, can be accurately identified.

So you read in the 9/11 Commission report—there are three times that violent extremism is referred to in the

9/11 Commission report. But that has to be considered in light of the other things in the 9/11 Commission report because also in the 9/11 Commission report, there are 39 references to the enemy.

Well, for those of us who have been in military service, there was never a question. The enemy were those who wanted to destroy us, to kill us. And it's very easy to understand when a group calling themselves Islamists, calling themselves jihadists, want to kill everybody who does not believe as they do, they're the enemy. Not that difficult to understand.

□ 1550

But in this administration, these are bad words because, in the 9/11 Commission Report, 126 times the word "jihad" is used. Well, under this administration, you've got the FBI Counterterrorism Lexicon. Those are the words to train our FBI. They're used to train our intelligence. They're used to train law enforcement.

One of the things the Federal Government also does is train local law enforcement. So many local law enforcement make the journey here. Federal law enforcement as well as local and State law enforcement make the journey to Washington, D.C. They make the journey to Federal facilities to have Federal officers instruct them and teach them about different issues that are threats to our country. So it's important that people be properly educated about the threat.

Yet under this administration—forget what the 9/11 Commission Report saw as the real threat—there are 29 times that "violent extremism" can be found in the FBI Counterterrorism Lexicon and nine times that it can be found in the National Intelligence Strategy from 2009, which lays out our strategy as to how we're going to face and defeat the enemy that has declared war on us, that wants to destroy us.

There are 39 times that the 9/11 Commission Report referred to "enemy." Yet the FBI Counterterrorism Lexicon and National Intelligence Strategy from this administration thinks the word "enemy" may, perhaps, hurt the feelings of those who want to kill us. Because they want to kill us, let's not hurt their feelings by calling them the "enemy."

We had an actual bill that changed the Military Commission Act of 2006, done in 2009 under Speaker PELOSI and Leader REID, and that was probably some of the thinking behind changing it. They were afraid the term "enemy combatant" might offend those who want to cut off our heads, blow us up, nuke us. They didn't want to offend them; but here again, the word "enemy" is hard to replace, so they left the word "enemy" in there but softened it up. Instead of calling them "enemy combatants," they changed the wording of the Military Commission Act so that it's now "unprivileged alien enemy belligerent."

Hopefully, by softening the language, those who want to cut off our heads and nuke our Nation will feel better about those they want to kill and destroy.

The 9/11 Commission Report refers 126 times to "jihad." Clearly, that's what we're facing—jihadists who want to commit jihad, which is a holy war, the way these people see it, against those of us they see as infidels. As Khalid Sheikh Mohammed references in his own pleading in the 9/11 case, they reference a provision in the Koran that says they're justified in killing those who would combine any entity with Allah, because Allah gives no permission to combine him.

So, if anyone thinks that there is a Holy Trinity, which are the words that start off the Treaty of Paris, 1783, with Great Britain—you can find it over at the State Department. The first words are in big, bold type: "In the name of the most holy and undivided Trinity"—that's how our treaty started that recognized this country. Well, according to those Islamic jihadists, who are at holy war with us, that document, itself, is a declaration that we are infidels and need to be destroyed. Yet, under this administration, the FBI is not being taught what "jihad" means. It's eliminated from the Lexicon. It's eliminated from the National Intelligence Strategy in this administration.

Even the word "Muslim" is found 145 times in the 9/11 report because you could not do an assessment of the 9/11 attack without discussing Muslim and Islam. Yes, it's only a small, tiny percentage of Muslims who believe this way—thank God for that—but let's don't kid ourselves that they believe that they were holy Muslims who came and killed 3,000-plus people on 9/11.

Not only has this administration whitewashed—completely eliminated—the word "Muslim" from our Lexicon and from our Strategy, but also the word "Islam," which is mentioned 322 times in the 9/11 Commission Report by these bipartisan people, who were concerned like we all were after 9/11 that we might lose this country—that people might nuke us, that they might destroy Washington, New York, Chicago, an area down near Houston where 70 percent of our oil is refined. There are places we were afraid we would get hit—and we would not have energy; we would not have a government; we would not have commerce; our seats of commerce.

That's when the 9/11 Commission Report came out, because they knew they had to be honest and candid in their assessment. Whether we agree or disagree with their findings, they were working in the best of good faith in trying to make their assessment. That's why they used these terms as many times as they did—322 times. It's not Islam. It's not the 1.5 billion people who proclaim Islam is their religion, their way of life. It's a small percentage.

But how can we expect to defeat the enemy that has declared war on us unless we recognize who it is?

There are a number of other references.

The Muslim Brotherhood is a national organization that is working toward an international caliphate. In the Holy Land Foundation trial, tried down in Dallas, there were 105 counts. They were found guilty, five defendants. It was about the Muslim Brotherhood and the Holy Land Foundation and the Palestine Committees that were raising money and were certainly giving some to some charities. They could point to those and say, Look, we gave money to charity—but they were also funneling money to Hamas. They were funneling money to terrorism. That's against our law.

There are 65 times that "religious" is used in the 9/11 Commission Report because these Islamic jihadist nutcases considered themselves religious in what they were doing in killing so many innocent people.

There are 36 times "al Qaeda" is referenced in the 9/11 Commission Report—but in the FBI Counterterrorism Lexicon, zero; in the National Intelligence Strategy, one time.

"Sharia law" was referenced twice in the 9/11 Commission Report. It's not even mentioned in the new Lexicon or the Strategy.

How can we win a war declared by others upon us unless we can recognize our enemy?

This administration has done—not everything—but it has done so much that it can blind us so we can't see our enemy. There is nothing more vivid than to see the complete eradication of the terminology that would allow our people to recognize their enemy.

There's not even a reference to "Hamas." Hamas is a terrorist organization. We've recognized them as a terrorist organization. They're responsible for killing innocent people. Yet, in the new Lexicon, we're not even telling people who are being trained to defend us about Hamas.

How do we expect to win a war like that, not one of our making, not one we want but one declared on us, unless we are willing to recognize those who are at war with us and to recognize their motivation?

These folks are extremely predictable if you understand their mind-set, if you understand how they take provisions from the Koran and twist them and what they believe with them. Unless you can study that and understand that, you can never say, as General Patton did after he defeated Rommel and stood up looking over the devastation that his tankers had caused—and he used a little colorful language—"I read your book."

However, nowadays we're preventing our law enforcement, our intelligence, our State Department from reading the book—those who have put books together and studied books—of those who are trying to create a way to wipe out

the Little Satan, Israel; Zionism—and the Great Satan, the United States of America.

□ 1600

We in this body and those at the other end of this Hall in the Senate took an oath; and unless an oath means nothing, we have a duty to perform. I have come to know very personally some with whom I hardly ever agree on political issues on the other side of the aisle, but I've come to know their hearts, and we have gotten to be good friends. And I know people on both sides of the aisle here who, with all their heart, want to live up to their oath and do the right thing.

But no matter which side of the aisle we're on—or if we don't even care about aisles—it is critical that historically for a nation to survive, it must recognize those who have sworn the destruction of that nation and are doing everything they can to gather the means to do that.

We have a Private Abdo. This is a young man, Private Abdo, who did an interview on al-Jazeera. He was seen on al-Jazeera. We have people in our administration's intelligence and Justice who see him on al-Jazeera, basically laying out—and of course this news program was done in Arabic. It was not done in English. If you listen to the program on YouTube, you can hear some of the things that Private Abdo said.

But he made clear, Hey, I'm a Muslim. I cannot deploy. The same things that Major Hasan said before he went and killed 13 of our military at Fort Hood and another, which was the unborn child of one of our pregnant servicemembers. He made clear, just like Private Abdo, I can't both deploy and be a Muslim. I will have to go kill Americans. I can do that without violating my religion, at least in their beliefs. But I cannot be deployed into a Muslim country because of the risk I might kill a Muslim without that person that I kill meeting one of the requirements to be allowed to be killed and, therefore, that would send me basically to hell. So I can't do that. But it's okay to kill Americans.

This Justice Department ought to be getting these words back in its lexicon. Our intelligence should get them back in their lexicon so that when you have a private go on al-Jazeera and say these things, that our intelligence and our Justice Department are allowed to put that in a memo and say, This guy has sworn that he cannot go to a Muslim country; and, therefore, he's better off killing our own soldiers than he is being deployed.

We need to recognize when people are saying they're going to have to kill us. But instead, even though he was seen on al-Jazeera and it was clear he was setting things up, just like Major Hasan did, the only reason that people were not killed by the bombs he was wanting to create and he was buying material to produce was because a

local gun dealer got suspicious and reported him, not because the intelligence or Justice Department acted on seeing this private putting himself in Major Hasan's same pattern.

If I could see that other poster. We've got another soldier in uniform who has been on al-Jazeera. And yet now, because of the changed lexicon, people are not able to properly pursue this kind of problem so that one of our own soldiers starts defaming our own military and using the OIC term that Islamophobia is evident within the military. The overwhelming sentiment was that Islamophobia was present in the U.S. military.

It's time that this administration wake up; and if it's not willing to wake up, this Congress must wake it up. That's why the Founders created three separate branches and created two Houses within this branch so that they hoped that there would be adequate responses to threats, they hoped that it would be difficult to pass laws that would hurt the country. Their hope was that they were setting up a system that would protect itself. But until we take the blinders off, those who are sworn to protect us, we're in some big trouble. Or as folks at Fort Benning, where I served for 4 years, used to say, We'll be in some deep kimchi.

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

CONGRESS: DON'T TREAD ON D.C.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. HARTZLER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I rise to speak about a possible set of events that will, I think, astound the American people. Most, by now, would agree that a shutdown of the government is a very bad idea. A shutdown of the government is a worse idea for the American people. But if you want to hear the worst of the worst, by far, it is shutting down a local government which is not involved in your national fight. That is what could happen as the first session of the 112th Congress closes out and leaves its signature on American history.

The District of Columbia's local budget, raised in the city, a budget larger than the budget of some States—thanks to the taxpayers of the city—nevertheless, has to be approved by the Congress. It was approved by the District of Columbia months ago, even approved by the Financial Services appropriations subcommittee months ago. But here it sits because most of the appropriations have not been approved by the Congress of the United States.

No wonder District of Columbia residents have informed our office that they will be here tomorrow to speak for themselves because, Madam Speaker, taxation without representation is