

with our farm policy, our military policy, tax reform, health care. I would hope that in Congress we can return to the days where we actually had regular order and we discussed things like this in committee, that every bill wasn't a partisan vehicle, and when there was give and take and challenging one another in terms of ways it could be done better, and listening to a wide variety of opinions. And I say by all means allow a wide variety of opinions to come forward to talk about the future of the postal service. I think that's healthy. I welcome it. I've spent a lot of time talking to people on the Postal Rate Commission. I've talked to leadership in the management of the postal service, postal employees, people who are customers, and competitors of the postal service. I want to explore these issues.

I'm absolutely convinced that the interests that are involved with the postal service, broadly defined, including its unions and employees, understand that there is going to be more change taking place in the future. That there are some adjustments where there is probably more capacity than we need, there will be changes going forward. We want to be careful and selective about what we do. But I go back to my point about the impact it will have on rural and small town America. I want to be sure that the changes that we undertake don't make great difficulty for people who don't have the access that some of us who live in metropolitan areas have, people who are connected to the Internet and people who have ready access to other resources.

I think it is important that when people are talking about reducing the sixth day of service, that they think about the implications for individuals who depend on that. For many people who work and get packages that are important to them, being able to have them delivered on Saturday is important, and particularly when you look at holidays that go over weekends, the difficulty of delivery of things like medicine is not a trivial question. And the fact that the postal service is in a sense a partner with some of its private sector competitors, cutting back on that service, what it does with those competitor-partners and what it does with people who are marketing through the Internet, through the mail, this needs careful consideration.

It is interesting as people dive into the numbers behind the elimination of Saturday service. You're eliminating 17 percent of the postal capacity and it would only save 2, maybe 3 percent, and there would be costs associated with that. It is kind of interesting. I would like us to think about what it does to the business model, if you're going to eliminate 17 percent of the service and you save a couple percent in operation; particularly, as I mentioned, that we constrain what they charge and we have an artificial financial barrier with the 75-year pre-funding of health care.

I think it is important for us to respect what we've got, think about the alternatives, and have a discussion where the interests—whether they are direct mail, they are marketing, they are online shopping, they are people in terms of the pharmaceutical industry, senior citizens, rural and small town America—let's get in and talk about this, find out not by declaring war against postal employees, but working with them in a cooperative fashion to find out suggestions that they have in terms of moving forward, and looking at what this tremendous resource that we have, what the value is.

I'm in the State of Oregon, where now all of our ballots are done by direct mail. It is a way to improve efficiency and lower cost for local governments. Broader application of mail-in ballots would improve the security, the efficiency, and cost savings. We have barely scratched the surface of that.

There have been deep concerns, and I note that we had a somber observance today about the death of a couple of our employees, guards who were gunned down on this day in 1998. We've lived through eras where there were concerns about anthrax, about opportunities that some may be involved with bioterrorism. And there have been scares about pandemics. Well, it may well be in our future that there would be great value to having a network that reaches 150 million addresses six times a week with a skilled workforce that can turn that around in a matter of hours.

You don't have to stretch your imagination very far to think of acts of disease or terror where that network may well make a difference. We're finding oftentimes in communities that it's the postal worker who is alert to problems within a family or somebody that is missing and not showing up. They are eyes and ears that do not just volunteer projects but connect people. Let's think about the value of that network before we start to unravel it.

Mr. Speaker, I will conclude where I began. I think everybody whose is privileged to serve in this Chamber needs to think about how we do business differently. I think we need to be open to arguments, questions, evidence, to be able to squeeze more value out of the public dollar, to use the resources to protect the vitality and livability of our communities, and to build partnerships and relationships. And I welcome the discussion that we're having with the postal service in the media and here in Congress. But I would hope, Mr. Speaker, we could do it in a way that is thoughtful and broad-based. I would hope that we would be able to look at what the postal service has provided for 236 years. I would hope that we would think about the value of the workforce. It's not just over a half-million family wage jobs that makes a big difference, particularly in small town and rural America, but these are people who have a skill set and a distribution across the country which has other val-

ues, some of which I have just mentioned, and others we have not explored.

And last but not least, before we make changes, I think we ought to be sure that we know that they are going to get what is advertised because, despite all of the rhetoric, we have the lowest cost, most efficient postal service in the world, moving 40 percent of the traffic, doing it very cost effectively, despite the fact that Congress, in its wisdom, has tied the hands of the postal service, dictated rates, told them what they could close or not close, and changes course repeatedly.

□ 2120

I would hope we could do a better job working with our partners there and the people who depend on it to make this part of an area where we figure out how to do business differently, because I think there are opportunities not only to save money but to take advantage of this resource. I think it ought to be done thoughtfully, I think it ought to be done soon, and I appreciate the opportunity to discuss it here this evening.

I yield back the balance of my time.

#### THE MUSLIM BROTHERHOOD INQUIRY

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, there's been a great deal of wailing and gnashing of teeth, it seems lately, in response to a letter that five of us signed to five different inspectors general, five different departments of the U.S. Government. Despite the effort to distract, despite the wild accusations that have come about five separate letters that were quite factual, set out things that were footnoted, documented as true, we were simply asking inspectors general of the different departments if they would investigate about potential Muslim Brotherhood effects within those departments.

I have been amazed. Out of five letters to five different departments, each one of them different, each one of them dealing with facts that were in each particular department, we have been met with this frenzy from some quarters, including some of the mainstream media, to demonize people that are just simply asking questions. Actually, we used to have a mainstream media that would ask questions.

Also, when you look at the fact that in 1995, the defendants charged with involvement in the 1993 first World Trade Center bombing were tried, and as the prosecutor, the Federal prosecutor in that case, a brilliant guy named Andrew McCarthy has set out in one of his articles, we proved, we introduced evidence and proved beyond a reasonable doubt that the intention of these people, these radical Islamist groups, was to bring down this country.

As Andy has properly asked, since we proved beyond a reasonable doubt to a great group of jurors in New York about the effort of these radical Islamists, Islamic jihadists, to bring down America, what's happened since 1995 that all of a sudden this administration says, oh, no, forget what was proved beyond a reasonable doubt to New Yorkers in 1995 and been upheld, you can't believe that? Don't look at the factual evidence behind the curtain, for heaven's sake; just look at what we're telling you, and we're telling you there is no Muslim Brotherhood involvement in America, and there's no Muslim Brotherhood effect or influence in this administration.

But that is deeply troubling because we know from the Holy Land Foundation trial in Dallas, that was well tried in 2008, and convictions on over 100 different charges, and they established, they named defendants, proved beyond a reasonable doubt about the charges of their support for terrorism, and they also named numerous parties as co-conspirators in support of terrorism, and the Justice Department was involved in that, the Attorney General's Office was involved, and they proved beyond a reasonable doubt that there were Muslim Brotherhood groups who were supporting terrorism in America. At least they proved beyond a reasonable doubt the defendants were involved in supporting terrorism, and then basically—it might be deemed or called a preponderance of the evidence—that others who were not indicted, but were named, such as CAIR and ISNA, the Islamic Society of North America, in that case, the evidence was produced to establish that the Islamic Society of North America is the largest Muslim Brotherhood front group in America.

And some of us who simply signed a letter asking questions? Look, how about doing an investigation to see what the influence of the Muslim Brotherhood is in this administration? Because previously, including through the prosecution in November of 2008 of the largest terrorism support allegations in American history, it was established the Muslim Brotherhood is alive and well and having influence in America.

Yet, the Islamic Society of North America's President, Imam Magid, has been a guest at the White House, and, in fact, if someone, I guess because they regularly don't do their homework, were to check, as I have in the past, I don't know if it's still there, there were a couple of times I checked in the past couple of years, but if you were to check with the White House Web site, you would find that the number two person in the National Security Administration, the Deputy National Security Adviser, Denis McDonough, was giving a speech to a group called ADAMS—I'm sure John Adams appreciated the reference—but ADAMS, the All Dulles Area Muslim Society, and there is the transcript of

his speech. I don't know if it's still up. Like I said, it's on the White House Web site. And Denis McDonough, the number two guy, the deputy national security adviser, thanks President Imam Magid, the president of ISNA, the named co-conspirator for supporting terrorism, for the wonderful prayers he gave at the Iftar celebration in the White House the August before, Iftar being the celebration that concludes Ramadan.

So we know the President of the largest, according to evidence in the Holy Land Foundation, the largest Muslim Brotherhood front trial, the president gets invited to the White House to do prayers for their Iftar celebration. And we also know Denis McDonough thanked Imam Magid for the wonderful introduction there at the All Dulles Area Muslim Society.

So it's a little troubling not only that this influence is there, but then when five Members of Congress raise a question, how about an investigation to see what this influence is? Because we know minds are changing, although the evidence has not changed that was introduced in 1995 and 2008.

Our good friend down the Hall, Senator MCCAIN, chastised us. Yet, if you believe quotes, and sometimes you can't, but he was quoted as saying at the beginning of the trouble in Egypt that he was, and he used the word, according to the article, unalterably opposed to any support for the Muslim Brotherhood.

□ 2130

Well, if that was the word then, the word now is altered unalterability because it appears that he sees no problem with what's going forward. If he does, then my apologies if he now objects to any assistance to the Muslim Brotherhood. But it's my impression that he didn't have a problem with this administration's help to Egypt now.

So when we see the things that have gone on—the things that have been introduced and proven in court and the Fifth Circuit saying, no, you cannot strike those names from the pleading because there's sufficient evidence to establish that they were supporting terrorism, so, no, you can't strike those named co-conspirators from the pleadings—and somehow five Members of Congress are the bad guys for saying let's investigate.

What influence has this group had—and I know from back in my questioning of the Secretary of Homeland Security last October, when I was asking if it was true that there were some members of the Muslim Brotherhood who were part of her Countering Violent Extremism Working Group that advises Homeland Security on how to deal with what some of us would call "radical Islamic jihad," but which Homeland Security now calls "violent extremism"—apparently not wanting to offend people who are wanting to commit radical Islamic jihad on our country. But I asked her in that hear-

ing in October last year about that, and she points out that actually she has another individual in charge of the Countering Violent Extremism Working Group, so she doesn't really know if they have Muslim Brotherhood members as a part of that.

I asked her this question: All right. Are you aware that the president of ISNA, Imam Magid, is a member of that working group. Correct?

Secretary Napolitano: I can't answer that that is an accurate statement.

So she doesn't know whether the president of what's been established in court as the largest Muslim Brotherhood front group in America is part of her advisory group at Homeland Security.

Of course it was interesting in our hearing last week, she also indicated that there had not been a terrorist that had been allowed into the White House with the Egyptian recent group, when we had been reading in the paper that there had—of course, that may not be a good source because they were mainstream papers—but we had been reading that there was a member of a known terrorist group that was allowed into the White House and that he used that platform to lobby for the release of the blind sheik who had assisted in planning the 1993 World Trade Center bombing.

So I thought it might be helpful, Mr. Speaker, tonight to just touch base regarding the timeline that Investors Business Daily sponsored. It was an editorial. It was dated July 19, 2012, posted at 6:46 p.m. eastern time. And it can be found at investors.com, Mr. Speaker. But it's entitled, "How Obama Engineered Mideast Radicalization." And then it goes through, and after preliminary paragraphs, it just sets out a timeline for things that have happened.

I hope my friends, who have been so quick to condemn and ridicule, and even people who are on committees who should know about these things and should know about the evidence in the Holy Land Foundation trial where Muslim Brotherhood ties were established, and they should know about the proof in 1995 at the World Trade Center first trial of the defendants that did that. I would think they would be welcoming, since there are many people who are not aware of what the evidence was in those. They would welcome input from someone as well versed as the prosecutor from the 1995 World Trade Center trial.

So this is from Investors Business Daily, an editorial. It says:

The Obama record: After angry Egyptians pelted her motorcade with shoes chanting "Leave!," Secretary of State Clinton insisted the U.S. wasn't there to take sides. Too late.

"I want to be clear that the United States is not in the business, in Egypt, of choosing winners and losers, even if we could, which of course we cannot," Hillary Clinton intoned earlier this week.

Of course, the administration could, and it did, picking and even colluding with the Muslim Brotherhood. And one of its

hardliners, Mohammed Morsif, now sits in the presidential palace, where he refused to shake unveiled Clinton's hand.

This administration favored Islamists over secularists and helped them overthrow Hosni Mubarak, the reliable U.S. ally who had outlawed the terrorist Brotherhood and honored the peace pact with Israel for three decades. The Brotherhood, in contrast, has backed Hamas and called for the destruction of Israel.

Now the administration is dealing with the consequences of its misguided king-making. Officials fear the new regime could invite al Qaeda, now run by an Egyptian exile, back into Egypt and open up a front with Israel along the Sinai. Result: more terrorists and higher gas prices.

In fact, it was Hillary's own Department that helped train Brotherhood leaders for the Egyptian elections. Behind the scenes, she and the White House made a calculated decision and took step-by-step actions to effectively sell out Israel and U.S. interests in the Mideast to the Islamists.

The untold story of the "Arab Spring" is that the Obama administration secretly helped bring Islamofascists to power. Consider this timeline:

2009: The Brotherhood's spiritual leader—Sheik Yusuf Qaradawi—writes an open letter to Obama arguing terrorism is a direct response to U.S. foreign policy.

2009: Obama travels to Cairo to deliver apologetic speech to Muslims and infuriates the Mubarak regime by inviting banned Brotherhood leaders to attend. Obama deliberately snubs Mubarak, who was neither present nor mentioned. He also snubs Israel during Mideast trip.

2009: Obama appoints a Brotherhood-tied Islamist—Rashad Hussain—as U.S. envoy to the Organization of the Islamic Conference, which supports the Brotherhood.

The Organization of Islamic Conference, by the way, the OIC, it isn't in the article, but it is composed of 57 states. Fifty-seven Muslim states make up the OIC, and that's what is being referred to there.

2010: State Department lifts visa ban on Tariq Ramadan, suspected terrorist and Egyptian-born grandson of Brotherhood founder Hassan al-Banna.

2010: Hussein meets with Ramadan at American-sponsored conference attended by U.S. and Brotherhood officials.

2010: Hussein meets with the Brotherhood's grand mufti in Egypt.

2010: Obama meets one-on-one with Egypt's foreign minister, Ahmed Aboul Gheit, who later remarks on Nile TV: "The American President told me in confidence that he is a Muslim."

2010: The Brotherhood's supreme guide calls for jihad against the U.S.

2011: Qaradawi calls for "days of rage" against Mubarak and other pro-Western regimes throughout Mideast.

□ 2140

2011: Riots erupt in Cairo's Tahrir Square. Crowds organized by the Brotherhood demand Mubarak's ouster, storm buildings.

2011: The White House fails to back longtime ally Mubarak, who flees Cairo.

2011: White House sends intelligence czar, James Clapper, to Capitol Hill to whitewash the Brotherhood's extremism. Clapper testifies the group is moderate, "largely secular."

2011: Qaradawi, exiled from Egypt for 30 years, is given a hero's welcome in Tahrir Square, where he raises the banner of jihad.

2011: Through his State Department office, William Taylor—Clinton's special coordinator for Middle East transitions and a long-

time associate of Brotherhood apologists—gives Brotherhood and other Egyptian Islamists special training to prepare for the post-Mubarak elections.

2011: The Brotherhood wins control of Egyptian Parliament, vows to tear up Egypt's 30-year peace treaty with Israel and reestablishes ties with Hamas, Hezbollah.

2011: Obama gives Mideast speech demanding Israel relinquish land to Palestinians, while still refusing to visit Israel.

And parenthetically, we know that the administration has now said if we'll just give him another term, then the next 4 years he will go see Israel.

Back to the article:

2011: Justice Department pulls plug on further prosecution of U.S.-based Brotherhood front groups identified as collaborators in conspiracy to funnel millions to Hamas.

2011: In a shocking first, the State Department formalizes ties with Egypt's Brotherhood, letting diplomats deal directly with Brotherhood party officials in Cairo.

April 2012: The administration quietly releases \$1.5 billion in foreign aid to the new Egyptian regime.

June 2012: Morsi wins presidency amid widespread reports of electoral fraud and voter intimidation by gun-toting Brotherhood thugs, including blockades of entire streets to prevent Christians from going to the polls. The Obama administration turns a blind eye, recognizes Morsi as victor.

June 2012: In a victory speech, Morsi vows to instate shari'ah law, turning Egypt into an Islamic theocracy, and also promises to free jailed terrorists. He also demands Obama free World Trade Center terrorist and Brotherhood leader, Omar Abdel-Rahman, aka the Blind Sheik, from U.S. prison.

June 2012: State grants visa to banned Egyptian terrorists who joins a delegation of Brotherhood officials from Egypt. They're all invited to the White House to meet with Obama's deputy national security adviser, who listens to their demands for the release of the blind sheik.

By the way, in the hearing last week, when I asked our Secretary of Homeland Security about that incident, widely reported, even the mainstream media was reporting it, that a member of a known terrorist organization was given access to the White House, she indicated that it just wasn't true, apparently, not knowing the news that was happening just across town from her Department.

In any event, back to the article:

July 2012: Obama invites Morsi to visit the White House this September.

The Muslim Brotherhood's sudden ascendancy in the Mideast didn't happen organically. It was helped along by a U.S. President sympathetic to its interests over those of Israel and his own country.

Now, that's the Investor's Business Daily editorial from July 19 of 2012.

I was shocked to previously find out that it was not until 2009 that our FBI sent a letter saying they were suspending their relationship, one place it referred, I believe the word "partner" with CAIR, CAIR being a named co-defendant related to Muslim Brotherhood activity and related to support for terrorism abroad.

It referred to the convictions in the 2008 Holy Land Foundation trial and the evidence that was introduced at the trial, but what shocked me is that

they waited till after a conviction, when the Justice Department was the one that was gathering this evidence. They'd been gathering it for years.

And I was amazed that they seemed surprised—or whether or not they were surprised, they didn't do anything to sever ties with CAIR, which seems to be, with the ACLU, the most influential in getting this administration to purge its training documents for the people that are supposed to protect us, of anything that might be considered offensive to someone who was a Muslim Brotherhood member or Islamist.

Now, I've visited with Muslims abroad. A man named Massoud, whose brother was assassinated just within 36 hours of 9/11, I consider him a friend. He knows about sacrifice.

The State Department said they simply could not spare the security to get me and anyone else to a meeting with our Muslim friends who have fought with Americans, buried their loved ones like Americans have from fighting in Afghanistan, these are our friends. And I told our State Department, that's fine; I talked to Massoud, and he's sending a security vehicle, and I am certainly willing to put my life in his hands because I trust him. He's a Muslim friend.

I told them I was going, after we finished meeting with our troops. And after we met with our troops, I was advised, we've arranged for an American security vehicle to take you, and we have contacted Mr. Massoud to let him know we would get you to the meeting.

We should never be afraid of Muslims, but we should be afraid of Muslim extremists that want to take over our country and destroy our way of life. It is critical that our intelligence, our Justice Department, those who are supposed to be protecting us, even in the White House, that they know the difference between our Muslim friends and those who want to subvert the democracy in America.

I make no apologies for that. I can't. I took an oath to defend this Constitution. I can't apologize for loving America enough that I will recognize those who are Muslim friends and those who are not.

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

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today between 1 and 5 p.m. on account of attending a memorial service for her former chief of staff.

Mr. REYES (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of medical reasons.

#### 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 the Speaker: