

neighborhoods and other things like that so we can deal with the obesity problem, so we can deal with smoking cessation, and all the things that contribute to poor health and really increase the costs. When we look at communities and focus on community prevention, that's where we're going to reduce the cost of health care.

So, I wanted to just say a word about Medicare because I am so tired of hearing about \$500 billion taken out of—cut from Medicare. Now, that's a misinterpretation of what really happened. That \$500 billion comes from cutting waste, fraud, and abuse in part.

I was reading in an article in the paper just today that Medicare could probably save \$70 billion just in 1 year, in 2010, by really zeroing in on waste, fraud, and abuse and implementing some of the recommendations of the General Accountability Office—they could save \$70 billion in 1 year. Multiply that by ten, I think it comes up to \$700 billion, which is more than the \$500 billion that the Republicans keep saying we took out of Medicare.

We didn't. We made payments fairer, remember, by making the payments more equitable across the board. So we may have lowered some of the reimbursement rates for Medicare Advantage, but we were able to still keep some of the better, more effective Medicare Advantage programs in place.

We began to close the doughnut hole. We took some of that money to close the doughnut hole so that over the 10-year period there will be no time that a senior or a person with disability will have to pay the full cost of their medication.

We are providing preventive care with no copayments and an annual physical exam with no copayment. And in addition to all of that, with that \$500 billion, we extended the life of Medicare by 8 years.

So I just want to clear that up. We did not take \$500 billion out of Medicare. We used it to reinvest into Medicare, to make it stronger, to provide more services and more benefits for the beneficiaries.

Of course, health care reform will take an investment, but it will reduce costs over time. We'll reduce disparities, we'll have better end-of-life care with planning by individuals and their families, we'll have that community-based prevention, obesity prevention, smoking cessation and health policy and every policy that I talked about. And all of that will reduce the cost of health care.

I just want to close by just reading a few statements from some physicians. I'm a primary care physician, a family physician myself. And Medscape today published an article from a primary care round table. And I know the doctors who spoke here said many, many things. I just want to quote a sentence or two from several of them.

Charles P. Vega, M.D. At the end of his statement he says:

The Supreme Court decision breathes life into the health care reform movement at a

critical time, and we need to take advantage of this fortune, not only to implement the most important parts of the Affordable Care Act, but also to start building towards the next logical steps in health care reform, beginning with an efficient public option that emphasizes smart, quality care.

And Dr. Robert W. Morrow says:

And now we're in a regulatory space where the health of the public could take precedence over the profits of the commercial health plans. And why not?

Dr. Roy M. Poses, M.D., says of the Supreme Court ruling:

The news is not bad. We're probably, on balance, somewhat better off with some health care insurance reform than none. However, we're still a long way from meaningfully addressing concentration and abuse of power in health care. There will be no rest for the weary bloggers of the Health Care Renewal.

Another doctor, Dr. Li, says:

My take is that the plan is not as good as what's being touted by the left, but it's far better than what's being said by the right.

And Dr. Robert M. Centor says:

Clearly, upholding the individual mandate allows the U.S. to approach universal health care. Universal health care is such a worthy goal that we must applaud this victory.

Dr. Mark Williams says:

For me the Supreme Court ruling on the ACA implies at least a period of relative clarity and less uncertainty, despite much political rhetoric. In short, we now have some time for planning and innovation.

And he also says:

Healthcare is too precious to be considered a business or a marketplace commodity. Whatever system we choose must commit itself to the needs of the population and the global community, not simply to our own personal needs. It must be based on needs and not simply on service expansion.

And lastly, from my own American Academy of Family Practice, they say:

Having the mandate upheld is consistent with what has been AAFP policy for over 20 years. We have advocated for health care coverage for everyone and access to at least basic health services, including good primary care with prevention and chronic illness care. You can argue whether the mandate is the only means to get there, but at least in the analyses that I've seen, it was one of the best identified ways to get everyone covered.

And so, the American people, when you ask them about the different provisions of the law, an overwhelming majority really supports the provisions that we've been able to provide for them in health care reform.

□ 2000

Many physicians are touting the Supreme Court decision and the law. I think, if we can all forget about the political rhetoric of repeal and just work together to make sure that it's implemented in the best way possible, we will really be doing what the American people have sent us here to do.

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

## REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6079, REPEAL OF OBAMACARE ACT

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112-587) on the resolution (H. Res. 724) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6079) to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and health care-related provisions in the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

### INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS AND BROKEN PROMISES

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.

These can be the best of times and the worst of times. There is still so much potential. This country has so much in the way of assets. It is interesting to hear my friends across the aisle talk about the wonders of ObamaCare, but I know this President has said before: if you make more than \$250,000, you won't ever have your taxes raised. I won't ever raise your taxes.

He has said it a lot of different ways. Yet, when I read his version of the American Jobs Act, which he, himself, pushed for, promulgated, demanded be passed, it actually raised taxes on everybody who made more than \$125,000. So he broke the promise there.

In ObamaCare, it's very clear that, if you make just above the poverty line and if you can't afford the kind of Cadillac insurance that is demanded that you purchase, you're going to get hammered with a tax, and it will ultimately be 2½ percent in extra income tax. He basically has pushed through a bill that makes war with those who can least afford to buy health insurance—adding a 2½ percent tax to the people who are the most vulnerable and hardworking folks. They're just trying to get by, and they're going to have to pay an extra 2½ percent in income tax?

Now, the enlightened Chief Justice explains through pages 11 through 15 of his opinion that it's actually not a tax, that it's clearly a penalty because, if you don't buy the insurance at the high level the government will dictate, then it will be necessary for you to pay an extra hunk of income tax—those who are the hardworking, least able to afford it. I don't see how anybody can say, It's great, and a happy day for you.

If you go through the rest of his opinion, of course he says the Commerce Clause doesn't make the ObamaCare bill constitutional; but then he gets around to saying, Well, regardless of what Congress called it—you know,

they called it a penalty—we'll just say it's a penalty for the purposes of jurisdiction so that it allows us to take up the case; but for purposes of whether or not it's constitutional, we'll call it what it is—a tax. It's one of the worst decisions this Chief Justice has ever made, and it's one of the worst I've ever read—poorly written by a man who should have known better.

But this administration has broken so many promises. It had negotiations with Egyptian leader Mubarak. We are certainly ready to throw him under the bus just as they have our allies, the Northern Alliance, that successfully fought and defeated the Taliban within a matter of months with our assistance but with less than 500 U.S. military in country. Now, after the President added troops and we had over 100,000 troops, this administration is ready to turn the country over to President Karzai and the Taliban. The Taliban has been on national television, saying, Hey, obviously, by virtue of the Obama administration's begging us to come to the table, promising they'll release some of our murdering thugs from confinement and that they'll buy us first-class offices in Qatar, well, gee, it's obvious to the world, they've said, that the United States has lost the war in Afghanistan.

Congratulations, President Barack Obama, for making it clear to the Taliban that you have lost the war for us.

Now we are advised the President has invited Egypt's Islamist leader to the United States. Past administrations have recognized the Muslim Brotherhood's end goal of a giant, worldwide caliphate where we all fall prey under sharia law and where we all have freedom, but that freedom is to only worship Allah and where we have justice but that justice is only under sharia; and this administration is embracing them wholeheartedly.

In this article of July 8, Sunday, from Business and Financial News, it headlines: "Obama Invites Egypt's Islamist Leader to U.S." It talks about how President Barack Obama has invited Egypt's newly elected Islamist President, Mohamed Morsi, to visit the United States in September.

It reads:

Washington, long weary of Islamists and an ally of ousted President Hosni Mubarak, shifted policy last year to open formal contacts with the Muslim Brotherhood, the group behind Morsi's win.

It reads:

Morsi formally resigned from the group after his victory, but nowhere is there an indication that Egypt's new President has disavowed the effort to make the United States, which they've called the Great Satan, subservient to sharia law.

In fact, as to the Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood's leader as posted yesterday in The Blaze:

Egypt's Muslim Brotherhood chairman, Muhammad Badi, also known as the group's "Supreme Guide"—this would be the Supreme Guide over the newly elected Egyptian leader—said last week that waging jihad

against Israel is an imperative for every Muslim. Middle East watcher Raymond Ibrahim, who scours the Arabic press and translates it to English for Western eyes, posted this revelation on his blog.

Then it sets out this quote:

According to last Thursday's edition of Al Wafd, during his weekly sermon, "Muhammad Badi, the Muslim Brotherhood's Supreme Guide, confirmed the necessity for every Muslim to strive to save al-Quds—and that's Jerusalem—from the hands of the rapists—Israelis—and to cleanse Palestine from the clutches of the occupation, deeming this an individual duty for all Muslims."

More specifically, he "called on all Muslims to wage jihad with their money and their selves to free al-Quds"—or Jerusalem—the same, exact language one finds in al Qaeda's tracts.

□ 2010

The article goes on that earlier this year the Middle East Research Institute translated a sermon of bodies in which he called for "gradually establishing a global Islamic caliphate leading to 'mastership of the world.'"

"Mastership of the world" is what's in quotes.

It is interesting, because it hasn't been that long ago. This was posted by my friend Patrick Poole, July 5, 2012. It says, "Rewind—2010: Egypt's prez Morsi called for expulsion of U.S. ambassadors across Middle East." Patrick Poole says:

While doing a bit of filing in the office yesterday, I came across a September 2010 Reuters article of more recent interest.

You might recall that was the time when Terry Jones, in Florida, was threatening to burn a Koran on the 9/11 anniversary and had the whole Muslim world in an uproar—before he had even committed the act (which happened several months later).

In the mere contemplation of such an action by Terry Jones, the Muslim Brotherhood was calling on all Muslim countries to expel all U.S. Ambassadors. And who was making this call?

According to Reuters:

Mohammad Mursi, spokesman for Egypt's influential Muslim Brotherhood, said the organization was calling for pressure on all Muslim governments to expel U.S. Ambassadors.

Yes, this is what we want to encourage, this type of leader. We want to tell the world by this President's open arms at the White House—not with the ill treatment previously of Prime Minister Netanyahu—but with open arms, a member of the Muslim Brotherhood who never disclaimed the desire to make us subservient to shari'a law, bringing him to the White House.

As some of us travel around and speak to different people around the world, those who are truly fighting for freedom—and not the freedom the Muslim Brotherhood talks about, where it is freedom only to worship Allah; freedom truly to make choices about who one worships or whether one worships at all. They say when the United States invites someone and shows hospitality to people in the world, the rest of the world gets the message that the conduct of those individuals they are inviting and embracing and having

smiling pictures with, that their conduct is a good thing.

When this country's leaders embrace leaders of other countries, it tells the world this is what we think in America is the way to act, the way to be, the thing to do. That it is very deflating. Having talked to Iranian refugees in northern Iraq, they just get devastated when they see an American leader being so chummy with people they know embrace terrorism, that have no problem with terrorist activities to promote Islam spreading around the world.

This President should be far more careful about who he encourages and who he discourages, because the true friends of liberty around the world, who stood up to Syria's leader, they were not embraced by this President. There was no statement from this President of: Let's do for the protesters and the rebels in Syria what I demanded we did in Libya. There was nothing like that.

We've sent Secretary of State Clinton over to the Middle East. There have been statements that we don't like what you're doing, but nothing like what this White House did when they cut the legs out from Mubarak who at least tried to keep the peace with Israel to some extent and what he did in actually providing bombs and air cover to take out Qadhafi in Libya.

We knew at the time the Muslim Brotherhood will probably take over Egypt, that they have called us the great Satan. We knew in Libya that there were even al Qaeda who want to bring about this Nation's end violently, and yet this President embraced those al Qaeda rebels, along with the other rebels in Libya, dropped bombs, and provided air cover.

None of that has been done for Syria. It's a little bit strange because much of the world considers Syria's leader to be a mere puppet of the Iranian terrorist leaders. Certainly Russia, who has shown great hostility to some of the things we deem to be appropriate liberty, they embrace the actions of the Syrian leader.

Where was this President when there were true freedom seekers stepping up and being killed? Was he giving a pretty speech?

Another article that was in The Blaze, July 8, says:

The Jerusalem Post explains:

Washington, long wary of Islamists and a former ally of ousted President Hosni Mubarak, shifted policy last year to open formal contacts with the Muslim Brotherhood, the group behind Mursi's win.

Mursi's success at the polls mirrors the rising influence of Islamists in countries across the Middle East and North Africa in the wake of revolts and protests against autocratic rulers who have led the region for decades.

But the Obama administration has invited Egypt's new Islamist leader, Mohammed Mursi, to visit the United States in September, according to an

Egyptian official, clearly reflecting Washington's changing view of Islamists and the Muslim Brotherhood.

Here is another article, posted April 26 of this year, from *The Blaze*. It is entitled, "Want to Know Just How Close the Muslim Brotherhood is to the Obama Administration?" It says:

On Wednesday evening, GBTV unveiled a powerful documentary, "Rumors of War III," exposing how radical Islamists, including the Muslim Brotherhood, are infiltrating American Government at its highest levels. Above is a video clip from the program outlining some of the key players involved.

It goes on:

Arif Alikahn, Former Department of Homeland Security Assistant Secretary for Policy Development; Now a Distinguished Visiting Professor of DHS and Counterterrorism at the National Defense University, Alikahn also served as Deputy Mayor for Public Safety for the City of Los Angeles, where he reportedly derailed the LAPD's efforts to monitor the city's Muslim community—particularly its radical mosques and madrassas where certain 9/11 hijackers were said to have received support. He is affiliated with MPAC, which has called the terrorist group Hezbollah a "liberation movement."

It goes on to establish some of the ties of this administration with members of the Muslim Brotherhood.

It was intriguing to me, when I asked our own Secretary of Homeland Security, Janet Napolitano, how many members of the Muslim Brotherhood were on her countering violent terrorism—violent extremism—sorry. She can't use the word "terrorism." She couldn't tell me whether 10 were Muslim Brotherhood or not. She didn't know.

Some of these things for some of us bring back memories of occurrences back from the late seventies when our own President Jimmy Carter, who has to be encouraged by this President's administration—because many people have said they thought he had the worst Presidency in history and did so much damage to international affairs—when you look at what this administration has done.

□ 2020

I mean, to the extent that an African from West Africa, elderly gentleman, but full of wisdom, wanted to meet me and visit when I was there a couple of years ago.

He said, we were very excited that you elected a black man as your President, but we have seen America appear to grow weaker and weaker in the eyes of most people. He asked that I come back and convey—and I have on more than one occasion—that you must not allow the United States to grow weak. Those of us who are Christian in foreign countries rely on the United States' strength to keep us somewhat safe.

If you let the world think that the United States is weak, or become weak, then many of us have no hope of being safe in this life. This country has to stand strong, and we have seen it grow weaker and weaker in the eyes of the world.

There's an article that's reprinted July 9, today, in *Human Events*, which was originally by Robert Spencer back February 14 of this year. He said:

Last week the Egyptian government announced that it intends to put 19 Americans on trial for fomenting antigovernment protests, a charge they deny. Protests from the Obama administration have so far been futile, met with sneers of contempt.

If you're of a certain age, this should sound familiar. On November 4, 1979, Iranian thugs stormed the U.S. Embassy in Tehran and took 52 Americans hostage. Jimmy Carter's government wrung its hands in futility for the next 14 months, until finally the Islamist Republic released the hostages January 20, 1981, the day Ronald Reagan took office as President of the United States.

The bitter irony in all that was that Carter had betrayed the Shah of Iran, a longtime U.S. ally, and thereby paved the way for the ascent to power of the Ayatollah Khomeini and the Iranian mullahocracy that has ruled Iran ever since. Rather than feel gratitude toward Carter, however, Khomeini viewed his abandonment of the Shah as a sign of weakness and pressed forward with his jihad against the Great Satan.

Iran has been hostile towards the United States since then, including gleeful predictions of our Nation's imminent demise. Just days ago, Iran's Supreme Leader, the Ayatollah Khamenei, declared to an enthusiastic Tehran crowd, that "in light of the realization of the divine promise by almighty God, the Zionists and the Great Satan (America) will soon be defeated. Allah's promises will be delivered, and Islam will be victorious."

The original Ayatollah Khomeini, not Khamenei, was said by Jimmy Carter to be a man, a fellow man of faith. Well, he has a different kind of faith, and we have soldiers still dying today because the United States of America allowed some Iranian thugs, terrorists, to commit an act of war by attacking an American embassy, taking Americans hostage, and did nothing to defend our territory.

I was at Fort Benning at the time. We were put on alert. Nobody wanted to go to Iran, but everybody expected, surely we will do something to show these Islamist jihadists, these thugs, that you cannot commit an act of war against the United States and not pay a price. Because as the United States Government, we have a duty to provide for the common defense. We have a duty to protect American property.

When American property is attacked, and under everybody's interpretation of international, an embassy is that country's own property, we let it go without anything but weak-kneed responses, and we are paying the price today. But we see this President who thinks a wonderful speech—and he's good at them, he reads them so well and throwing in constant apologies to people who want to destroy us and see us wiped off the map—will somehow engender love and devotion from people who want to destroy us.

It doesn't work that way internationally. We have a duty to protect this Constitution, and we are not doing so in embracing enemies of this country who still have not disclaimed the pledge, the effort to see this country overthrown.

There was a time when Presidents would view people who have made such claims and pledges or been part of terrorist organizations, we would not embrace such individuals, because we know the harm it does to our allies.

One article from a guy named Michael D. Evans says:

Carter viewed Khomeini as a religious holy man in a grassroots revolution, rather than a founding father of modern terrorism who introduced the Islamofascist ideology we are fighting today in the world war on terrorism.

As Henry Kissinger said, "Carter has managed the extraordinary feat of having, at one and the same time, the worst relations with our allies, the worst relations with our adversaries, and the most serious upheavals in the developing world since the end of the Second World War."

That was then, and now we have another President doing the very same thing.

There was an article from *The New York Times* back in June of 2001:

Prime Minister Ariel Sharon of Israel will meet with President Bush at the White House next week, the second time the two have held face-to-face discussions since Mr. Sharon's election.

In contrast, Yasir Arafat, the Palestinian leader, has not been invited to Washington by the Bush administration, and officials made clear today that they had no plans to do so in the near future. So far the administration has kept Mr. Arafat at arm's length, a stark difference from President Clinton, who brought the Palestinian leader to the White House more than any other foreign leader.

Those messages are not missed by allies and enemies alike around the world.

There is another article, this is from *The New York Times*, posted today:

In his first major speech last month, Mohamed Morsi, the new Egyptian president, pledged to seek the release of a notorious Egyptian terrorist from a North Carolina prison. Not long before that, a member of a designated terrorist organization, Gamaa al-Islamiyya—who also happens to be a recently elected member of the Egyptian Parliament—was welcomed to Washington as part of an official delegation sponsored by the State Department.

"Obama administration officials made no public comment on Mr. Morsi's promise and struggled to explain why the Egyptian Parliament member, Hani Nour Eldin, got a visa"—since after all he was a member of a designated terrorist organization. But he got not only a visa, he got entrance into our most secure administration dwellings.

The article says that the administration cited privacy rules, "declining to say whether he had been granted a waiver from the ban on such visitors or whether his affiliation simply escaped notice."

Pressed by reporters after the visa quickly became a congressional controversy, a State Department spokeswoman, Victoria J. Nuland, said Mr. Eldin had been judged to pose no threat to the United States.

□ 2030

"It's a new day in Egypt," she added.

"It's a new day in a lot of countries across the Middle East and North Africa."

And I might add, it was a new day in Iran when the Ayatollah Khomeini took over and President Carter welcomed him as a fellow man of faith.

This article from the Times goes on:

For the Obama administration, as it navigates the tumultuous effects of the Arab spring, it's a complicated day as well. Long-held assumptions about who is a friend of the United States and who is not have been upset, leaving Americans confused.

Well, it's leaving not only Americans confused; it's leaving our allies confused. We have people around the world who have fought with us, they have fought for us, and this administration has turned its back on them. You can go to the country of Afghanistan and some terrible killings have once again occurred. We know that Pakistan, according to the people I've talked to traveling around Afghanistan, Pakistan is basically the biggest source of supplies, reinforcement, or help to the Taliban. And what do we do? We have our Secretary of State apologize to the country who kept our country's biggest enemy, the mastermind behind the killing of more Americans than any other attack in our history on our soil, and they protected him. And they kept him protected. And we are supposed to apologize to Pakistan? Well, this administration did.

And when our soldiers, our military suffered attacks from a certain area there adjoining Pakistan, and apparently in Pakistan, they finally responded to protect themselves, and we have to apologize for people dying who were in the area where attacks were emanating against our own soldiers. We have to apologize to a country who is supplying and funding the Taliban that's killing American soldiers.

Yeah, it's confusing to Americans and it's confusing to our allies. And that's why, when a handful of us were in Afghanistan in April, we were a little surprised that this administration did not want us to meet with our Northern Alliance friends, among them General Dostum. Instead, this administration prefers to address them as war criminals. Yeah, they fight tough. They defeated the Taliban. They fight like the Taliban. And they have no interest in losing because they know it means they lose their lives, they lose their homes, they lose their country. So they fight viciously.

And we were able to take out the Taliban initially with a few hundred soldiers. Less than 500 Americans. We had intelligence. We had special ops. We provided air cover, provided some weapons. And the Taliban was routed. We had a hundred thousand or so military into Afghanistan. We've become occupiers. Occupiers don't do well in that part of the world. Yet this administration continually throws our allies under the bus, thinking if we just embrace our enemies, if we make a great speech, maybe if I read from the teleprompters effectively enough, then they'll see how wonderful I am and America is and they'll come fall and

embrace us and just want to provide us nothing but love and affection.

It's an unrealistic view of the world. And yes, I'm a Christian and I believe everyone should be free to worship or not worship as they please. But that is not the case in Egypt right now. It's not the case in Libya right now. It's not the case in Afghanistan right now. It's not the case anywhere in any country where sharia is the law. We want Muslims, we want atheists to be free to worship, not worship. This is America. But any group, whether atheists or any other religion in the world that attempts to force us to comply with their religious laws, should not be tolerated.

Some say you've got a bunch of xenophobes and Islamaphobes. It's interesting that the term Islamaphobe basically was generated by the Organization of Islamic Council, the OIC, that has 50 States—no, wait. They've got 57 States and we've got 50; or we've got 57 and they've got 50. I get confused. Somebody on CNN said, Well, the only reason the President said the U.S. had 57 States is he was tired. So maybe I'm just tired. I can't remember who has 57, who has 50. Some people don't understand sarcasm either.

But the OIC promulgated that term and they've given millions and millions and millions of dollars to universities in America, including some Ivy League schools. They're not Islamaphobes. They have sold their soul for money. Sure, if you will give us millions, you bet you—hundreds of thousands even—we'll teach a course on Islamaphobia. We'll denigrate other religions. We'll denigrate the Founders. We'll denigrate those who would lay down their lives for this country's freedom, and we'll call them Islamaphobes.

Well, there's no Islamaphobia here. That's why I told the security detail at the American Embassy in Afghanistan's capital, when I was told I was not going to be able to go meet our allies at the Massoud residence, our friend Massoud knows something about sacrifice. His brother possibly could have united Afghanistan, but was assassinated a day or so before 9/11 because the Taliban knew that he might be able to unite the country. And if the United States figured out this is where the attack emanated, training emanated from, then they may come. So they assassinated my friend's brother.

General Dostum, who led that gallant charge uphill against the Taliban in the face of RPGs and bullets flying, offered to take me on horseback to reenact that internationally famous battle uphill against all odds. What courage on our behalf and on behalf of people who want freedom in Afghanistan. I was certainly willing—I have grown up riding horses—until the interpreter told me, You do understand, they don't have leather saddles. They're all wood. That kind of changed my desire to do that.

But General Dostum, Massoud, these great Northern Alliance leaders that fought for us, who lost friends and fam-

ily fighting with us and for us, have been thrown under the bus. But as I told the head of the security detail there, I was going to meet our friends at the Massoud residence. And after I was told we couldn't go, I let them know that I had talked to my friend Mr. Massoud and that they were sending secured vehicles to pick me up and at least two or three other Members of Congress that would go. And when I was told that would not be secure, we couldn't do that, I made clear that they would have to take me down before I got to the gate of the Embassy compound, because I was going, and that I would do that after our next meeting with our soldiers—American soldiers. After the meeting, I was told, We've arranged security for you to go to the meeting so you don't have to ride with the Massoud security folks.

□ 2040

We had a good meeting. It was great to see them. They have trouble understanding why this administration has forsaken them, our allies. I don't hear anybody here calling this administration Islamaphobes because they have thrown our Muslim friends under the bus. But they are the enemy of our enemy, the Taliban. And this administration, this President, has made clear to this corrupt regime over there that, look, we're going to be out on this day certain; you'll be on your own for the military.

Well, now, they're negotiating some kind of deal where we may provide some help. But Karzai, for all the things he is, he is not totally stupid. He is not a stupid man. And he knows if all our soldiers are gone, and with all the support that Pakistan has given the Taliban, then the Taliban is going to be there. They will be as vicious as they have in the past, and he'd better make some peace with the Taliban. That's why they've been allowed such freedom in the Afghan capital to the point that the Taliban leader would tell and proclaim, yes, we all can see because the U.S., because the Obama administration is begging them to come negotiate and we'll buy them things, we'll release their thugs that have killed Americans, killed innocents, but we'll release them, we'll do whatever. You just come talk to us.

It's obvious to the world that we've lost. This administration is sending dangerous signals to our allies that you cannot trust this country as an ally of this country. You'd better watch your back. So when this administration says, we've got your back, you better be wearing something that will stop a knife because it could be forthcoming. As President Mubarak found, as the Northern Alliance found, as freedom lovers in Iran have found, as freedom desirers at Camp Ashraf have found, and as some of our allies in Israel have found, this administration is the first American administration to vote with Israel's enemies a couple of years ago when we voted with Israel's

enemies to require them to disclose their weaponry.

So it's confusing to people around the world. Should we take a chance on being a friend to America because a year or two later they may embrace our enemies and throw us under the bus?

I do believe in the teachings of Jesus. I do believe in the teachings and have been there where they say it's pretty certain this is where Jesus delivered the Sermon on the Mount and told us who it was who was blessed. So some say, well, shouldn't our government turn the other cheek? Blessed are those who mourn. Shouldn't we be the peacemakers? Yes, we should be the peacemakers. But as a government, we have a different obligation. Ours is to protect our people. We are to protect those who live in America, who have trusted us to be their public servants so that they can live out the beatitudes if they choose, so that they can live out and follow the teachings of whatever religious leader they choose. But they can't do that unless we keep them safe.

I'm reading a book that I started yesterday called "The Harbinger." It indicates God withdrew His hand from our protection on 9/11. There are interesting things in that book. It's time we look at the signs and we understand from world history that you don't turn on your allies and embrace your enemies and expect to save your country. You convince others who might be tempted to be your allies not to be. You teach your enemies that you are weak in the same way individuals on a school playground do not convince a bully that they are strong when they start giving gifts to the bully and try to buy the bully's kindness and respect because what it buys is not respect, it is contempt. And that is the way this country is now viewed around the world.

If you are evil in the world, just as Romans 13 points out, if you do evil, you should be afraid because this government does not have the sword in vain. We owe a duty to freedom-loving people around the world not to become weak but to protect freedom here so others can enjoy freedom other places knowing that the United States of America does not embrace and fall in love with terrorists or terrorist organizations or leaders of terrorist groups. We fight them, and we embrace those who love peace, not terrorism; and we make the world and this country safer in so doing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will include in the RECORD a letter. This is Act for America. I brought this up before, but because we have rules that don't allow things that include too many pages, we had to revisit the issue because there are so many thousands and thousands of signatures. It can be found at this Web site for Act for America. This is a petition and a letter sent to the Honorable JOSEPH LIEBERMAN, the Honorable PATRICK LEAHY, the Honorable DIANNE FEINSTEIN, the Honorable PETER KING,

the Honorable LAMAR SMITH, and the Honorable MIKE ROGERS. It's signed online by thousands and thousands of verified signatures, and those can be found from Act for America, Pensacola, Florida.

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

ACT! FOR AMERICA,  
Pensacola, FL, July 9, 2012.

Hon. LOUIE GOHMERT,  
Rayburn House Office Building,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GOHMERT: Attached, please find an ACT! for America Open Letter to targeted members of the U.S. Congress. The letter has been signed by over 21,000 Americans—all of whom are very concerned with ongoing actions by the FBI related to the language of the agency's counterterrorism training materials.

ACT! for America shares the concerns of some Members of Congress, yourself included, that the ongoing purge of counterterrorism training materials used by the FBI as well as state and local law enforcement is a danger to our nation. Further, we see these actions as a continuation of concerted efforts to manipulate, if not altogether eliminate, a clear definition of the threat that radical Islam poses to our nation.

We hope this letter will serve as a useful token of the concern the American people have for this issue as well. It also may be found on our website: <http://www.actforamerica.com/index.php/fbi-petition>.

Thank you very much for all of your efforts in the United States Congress. The 240,000 members of ACT! for America stand with you every step of the way.

With warm regards,

LISA PIRANEO,  
Director of Government Relations,  
ACT! for America.

Enclosure.

ACT! FOR AMERICA,  
Pensacola, FL.

PLEASE PUT AN IMMEDIATE STOP TO PLANNED CHANGES IN THE FBI'S COUNTERTERRORISM TRAINING POLICIES

Hon. JOSEPH I. LIEBERMAN,  
Chair, Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee.

Hon. PATRICK LEAHY,  
Chair, Senate Judiciary Committee.

Hon. DIANNE FEINSTEIN,  
Chair, Senate Select Intelligence Committee.

Hon. PETER KING,  
Chair, House Homeland Security Committee.

Hon. LAMAR SMITH,  
Chair, House Judiciary Committee.

Hon. MIKE ROGERS,  
Chair, House Permanent Select Intelligence Committee.

DEAR CHAIRMEN LIEBERMAN, KING, LEAHY, SMITH, FEINSTEIN AND ROGERS: We write to you today in strong opposition to proposed changes to FBI counterterrorism training materials.

We share the concern of many sitting Members of Congress that the ongoing purge of counterterrorism training materials used by the FBI and state and local law enforcement puts our nation at great peril. It is critically important to the safety of our nation and its citizens that our law enforcement officials are permitted to accurately define the threat, and based on that definition, put in place sound policies to protect our nation and its citizens. Law enforcement officials are the front line of counterterrorism, and they must have accurate training materials that cannot be modified at the whim of one or two Members of Congress, or outside consultants whose identities are kept secret from congressional oversight.

Whitewashing of law enforcement counterterrorism materials appears to be an informal implementation of U.N. Resolution 1618 (the "The Istanbul Process"). This resolution includes language that seeks to bypass the U.S. Constitution by laying the groundwork for criminalizing any action or speech against a religion, using protection against "incitement to violence" as the rationale. The State Department has vowed to aid the Istanbul Process, and this is completely unacceptable. This resolution and the policies it supports are completely prohibited by the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution and must be rejected by the United States. Political correctness must not trump constitutional rights, nor hamper our country's ability to protect itself by muzzling law enforcement.

We strongly encourage you to hold hearings on this issue and, further, to do all that you can to put an immediate halt to any changes in law enforcement counterterrorism policies before they have been fully vetted through congressional oversight. Your committees share jurisdiction over these matters.

Please know that the American public is becoming more educated about the threats posed to our nation by those who support and/or perform acts of terrorism in the name of political/radical Islam. We are looking to our elected officials to enact sound policies that will protect us, as they swore to do when they took their oaths of office.

Sincerely,

This petition signed by 21,195 verified signators. For a full list of signators please send your request to: ACT! For America, PO Box 12765, Pensacola, FL 32591.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. COBLE (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of travel delays due to weather.

Mr. CULBERSON (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of a family obligation.

Mr. DESJARLAIS (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of flight delays.

#### SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 3238. An act to designate the Department of Veterans Affairs community based outpatient clinic in Mansfield, Ohio, as the David F. Winder Department of Veterans Affairs Community Based Outpatient Clinic, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by Speaker pro tempore, Mr. THORNBERRY, on Friday, June 29, 2012:

H.R. 4348. An act to authorize funds for Federal-aid highways, highway safety programs, and transit programs, and for other purposes.