

fund that those people convicted of those dastardly crimes would be required to pay into.

That's the basis of the bill. Let's try to get a grip on this issue—hold people accountable, hold the trafficker accountable, hold the person that is the customer accountable, and then rescue the victim and treat her with the dignity that she deserves as a human being and get them out of that slavery that they have been trapped into. We will soon introduce that legislation in the House and in the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, this conduct that I have talked about I would hope would concern Americans. As I mentioned, I spent a lot of time at the courthouse in Houston, first as a prosecutor, 22 years as a criminal court judge, saw a lot of victims of crime, a lot of children, a lot of those cases, many of these cases, were crimes that were sexual assault.

Sexual assault cases are a unique type of case, Mr. Speaker. Sexual assault cases against minors have a dramatic impact on the minor. Sexual assault against minors that have been trafficked into slavery, I don't know of anything worse because of the repetition of the crime that is committed against that child.

These traffickers, when they commit these crimes, these assaults, on young women primarily, boys as well, or older adults who are still forced into prostitution, that is a sexual assault, it is a crime. When a person commits the crime of sexual assault against another, it is more than a physical crime. It is a crime where the perpetrator tries to steal the soul, the very life, the very heart of the victim, and sometimes, Mr. Speaker, they are successful.

That is why sexual assault is such a horrific crime, because it goes after the inner being of the victim. That's why it ought to bother us that that occurs. It ought to bother us that what's taking place in other parts of the world—whether it's in Europe, central South America, and in the United States—against children, it ought to make us mad so that we can do something about it and hold people accountable.

Congressman JIM COSTA and myself—a Democrat from California and I—started the Victims' Rights Caucus several years ago in 2005, bipartisan, to try to help victims of crime. We have a lot of Members on it—almost 100. We are focusing on this issue of minor sex trafficking victims in the United States, and in other countries, to try to get them rescued—to take them to shelters like Mario runs in Central America, the same type.

When Ms. HAHN and I were there at this shelter talking to these girls they were happy to see us—really happy to see Ms. HAHN. She just has that personality. You know, I'm kind of a grumpy old guy from Texas. They were pleased that somebody actually cared about them, and they made us things. I have a bracelet that a young girl made for me—Ms. HAHN has one too. They tied it

on our wrist. I get a lot of things. I have 10 grandkids. They make me things. I wear this bracelet for a lot of reasons. One, because a child gave it to me that had just horrible things happen to her in her life.

It is important for us—with all of the issues we've got to deal with here in Congress in the United States—that we get back to some basics about how other people in this country are treated. When they are not treated right we need to be upset about it. In this case, we need to hold people accountable for doing things to kids.

We can do that. We can make things better—treat victims like they're victims, hold criminals accountable, stop the demand for minor sex trafficking by putting those folks in jail, making them pay into a fund that goes to grants that will end up in the hands of shelters that try to help these kids, and some other things.

Awareness is very important. It has been said by a lot of people over the years that when we are judged, either as a Nation, Congress, country, we are not judged by the way we treat important folks, we are not going to be judged by the way we treat the rich, the famous, the powerful.

□ 1745

We are going to be judged by the way we treat the poor, the unfortunate, the elderly, children, and victims of human suffering.

I hope we are judged well.

I hope we see the American conscience raised to a level of: this is important. Children are important in this country, and those who have had bad things happen to them, we're going to be concerned about it and not just walk over, as the Good Book says, on the other side of the road and pass them by.

And that's just the way it is.

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

American Association of University Women (AAUW), American Bar Association (ABA), Americans Overseas Domestic Violence Crisis Center, Araminta Freedom Initiative, Attorney General of Texas Greg Abbott, Aware, Inc., Breaking Free, Coalition Against Trafficking in Women Child Justice, Inc., Child Welfare League of America, Children's Advocacy Institute-Sacramento, Children's Assessment Center-Houston, Children's Defense Fund, Children at Risk, Council on Church Financial Integrity.

County Welfare Directors Association of California, Courtney's House, Covenant House International, Crittenton Services for Children and Families, Division of Indian Work, Erik L. Bauer, Attorney at Law, WA, Empire State Coalition of Youth and Family Services, End Child Prostitution and Trafficking-USA Equality4Women, Equality Now, Florida Coalition Against Trafficking, Foster Family-based Treatment, Association Fraternal Order of Police, Futures Without Violence, Georgia Women For a Change, Inc., Girls for Gender Equity.

Give Way to Freedom, Harris County, TX Sheriff Adrian Garcia, Heartland Girls Ranch, Human Rights Project for Girls, Illinois Victims.org, Innocents at Risk, International Association of Chiefs of Police,

International Initiative to End Child Labor, Jesse Duplantis Ministries, Jewish Women International, Junior League of Seattle, Lakewood Church, Lauren's Kids, Lutheran Social Services of New England MaleSurvivor.

Maryland Human Trafficking Taskforce, Men Can Stop Rape, Minnesota Alliance on Crime, Minnesota Indian Women's Resource Center, Minnesota Indian Women's Sexual Assault Coalition, Multnomah County, OR Department of Community Justice, Nancy O'Malley, District Attorney, Alameda County, CA, National Alliance to End Sexual Violence (NAESV), National Association for Children's Behavioral Health, National Association of Council for Children, National Association of County Human Services Administrators, National Association of Police Organizations, Inc., National CASA Association, National Center for Housing and Child Welfare.

National Children's Alliance, National Coalition Against Domestic Violence, National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, National District Attorneys Association, National Domestic Violence Hotline, National Network to End Domestic Violence (NNEDV), National Network for Youth (NN4Y), National Organization for Victim Assistance (NOVA), National Organization of Women, National Task Force to End Sexual and Domestic Violence, New Media Company, New York State Anti-Trafficking Coalition NOMI Network, PACE Center for Girls.

People Against Violent Crime, Perhaps Kids Meeting Kids Can Make a Difference, Pierce County, WA Coalition Against Trafficking, PROTECT, Sanctuary for Families, Saving Innocence, Sensibilities Prevention Services, Sex Trafficking Survivors United, Shared Hope International, Sheriff Marlin Gusman, Sheriff of New Orleans Sheriff Thomas Dart, Cook County Illinois Sheriff Southeast King County, WA Coalition Against Trafficking, State Senator Jeanne Kohl-Welles, Washington District 36.

State Senator Sandra L. Pappas, Minnesota District 48 and President of Senate, Street Grace, Susan D. Reed, District Attorney, Bexar County, TX, Texas Association Against Sexual Assault (TAASA), Texas CASA, The Advocates for Human Rights, The Center for Children & Youth Justice The Demand Project, The Family Partnership, The Freedom Center of New Orleans, The National Crittenton Foundation, The NYC Association of Runaway, Homeless, and Street-Involved Youth Organizations.

The Protection Project, The Women's Center of Tarrant County, The Women's Foundation of Minnesota, To Love Children Educational Foundation International, Inc., Washington Engage, Witness Justice, World Hope International, World Vision International, YouthCare youthSpark/A Future. Not A Past.

BUDGET AUTONOMY FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AMIDST THREAT OF GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MASSIE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) for 30 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Last week, the Nation's Capital—the District of Columbia—was in great grief and pain as we lost 12 employees at the Washington Navy Yard on Monday. I want to thank Members who

have expressed their condolences when they've seen me here.

Tuesday, I was on this floor for a moment of silence with four Members of Congress who had served in the Navy even though this is actually a naval installation which houses, largely, Federal civilian employees of the Naval Sea Systems Command. Sunday, I was at a memorial service for the 12 with the President and other Members of Congress and a large group of friends and families of the 12. Yesterday, I attended the funeral of Arthur Lee Daniels, a most sobering and sad funeral of a man who supported his wife and children and who was much beloved by them. He was the breadwinner, and now he is gone.

All during that week, however Mr. Speaker, there was another cloud hanging over this city that I could not forget, that, strange as it may seem, the shutdown threat facing the Federal Government was also facing the District of Columbia. We are talking about a local budget and a budget that, by rights, should not be in the Congress at all. September 30 is the end of the fiscal year. That is Monday—4 days away. The prospect of a government shutdown increases as each day passes. All that we hear here are permutations on the conditions that have now been put on the congressional resolution for keeping the government open, so I cannot assume that there will not be a shutdown, at least, for a short period of time. Considering the shutdown of 1995, anyone who reads history or who was here then, I think, would not want that to happen again.

The cost of a shutdown to the Nation's Capital according to the figures from 2011—the cost of a shutdown threat, because the government has not shut down in recent years, but there were three possible shutdowns in 2011. The cost of a shutdown was \$131,000 to the District of Columbia and 3,000 staff hours. That's money and time that should be spent on running a big city.

I am sure Members must be saying, Well, what is it that the District of Columbia did to make the Congress want its budget to come to the Congress? Because that's anathema to most Members of Congress. I think most Members of Congress would almost rather repeat the Revolution of our forefathers rather than see one's local budget here before Members who know nothing of it and have nothing to do with it and don't have a dime in it. This is a matter of history and anachronism that nobody should be proud of.

We are talking about a local budget of \$8 billion in local money, and there is not anything about the D.C. budget that has summoned it to the Congress. It comes because it has always come. It's on automatic pilot, despite a budget autonomy referendum that has been overwhelmingly passed in the city, despite my budget autonomy bill, despite my statehood bill; but we are only talking about the local budget now, about local budget autonomy.

So, my friends, I can say there is nothing about the D.C. budget that causes it to be here. On the contrary, the District of Columbia has a \$1.5 billion reserve. It puts money in its reserves every year—in good times and bad times. That is one of the largest reserves in the United States today. Most jurisdictions would be proud to have any reserve at all these days. So far from there being something about the D.C. budget, there ought to be a resolution on this floor that commends the District of Columbia for how it has handled its local budget. Its budget was submitted here, on time. The budget was in such good shape that it was easily approved by both appropriations committees. There it sits in the House and Senate, along with Federal appropriations—although the District budget alone among them is not a Federal appropriation. It is a local budget.

So in this matter that ties the city up in the Congress, there is no budget issue. Indeed, the appropriators have never interfered or tried to change the local budget. There is no way they could do so. A local budget is put together with great delicacy after local subcommittee hearings and other hearings and negotiations between the council and the Mayor, with trimmings here and additions there. No one would dare touch it. In my more than 20 years in Congress—and most of my time has been spent in the minority—no one on either side of the aisle has attempted to get into the innards of the District budget.

I have every confidence in the District budget because the District of Columbia has something that no other jurisdiction in the United States has. It has an independent chief financial officer who serves on a 5-year term and who cannot be fired by the Mayor or city council except for cause, and you know what "cause" means. He is independent. You can't spend money unless he passes off on it. The money isn't available unless he says so. Of course, there is the same kind of discretion that your own local jurisdictions have to spend money, but it's not nearly the kind of discretion you're used to. Indeed, no political figure—no other mayor or council or local legislature—has a chief financial officer who gets the final say on budgetary matters.

You see, there is nothing that any Member could raise about the budget. If anything, the District budget is subject to a kind of scrutiny that no Member's local budget is. There are Members in this body whose local or state budgets are balanced only by straws and fluff. Ours is a balanced budget that has had the sanction not only of a Mayor and a city council, but of a chief financial officer.

So, you say, there must be some good motive here. After all, who would want to bring a big, complicated city to its knees for nothing. The answer, my friends, is: no one. There is no one in this body or in the other body who has called for or made a statement that

would lead you to believe that she is for the present predicament of the District of Columbia's, allowing the city to close down if the Federal Government shuts down.

Nor is this one of the usual ideological or philosophical differences between the two sides where Democrats and Republicans have deep differences on matters like their budgets or health care or the rest—not this one. No one complains about the budget and how it is put together. No ideological or philosophical differences have been raised; and if there were some, I think there would have been no hesitation in raising them.

So there is nothing in D.C.'s local budget for any Member of this House. There is nothing in a threat of a shutdown for any Member of the House. There is nothing in a shutdown, itself, and here I am referring to a local government shutdown. Part of the reason it goes on is that most Members don't pay attention to any local jurisdiction, even one right in their faces—the Nation's Capital's budget. That's not what they've been sent here to do. Most don't even know about it. I'm sure they don't care about it.

So this historic anomaly, doing great damage to the city, continues. Worse, this matter with our local budget here now, facing the great Nation's Capital with a shutdown, violates every principle of federalism. My colleagues on the other side stand on federalism, it would appear, above all other matters; and I should think they would be the first to want the local budget out of the hands of the "big foot" Federal Government. On my side of the aisle, there are deep feelings about local control as well.

Put yourself in my position. How would any Member of this House feel or react if its local money had to pass any eyes in this Chamber who had nothing to do with raising that local money? I don't have the words to say what you would say in that circumstance. If this government were founded on any principle, it was founded on the principle of federalism, and if there is any meaning to federalism, it begins with money: no taxation without representation.

You, Members of the House and Senate, elected by your constituents, don't get to say what my constituents do with their own money. That's a basic principle of American federalism.

The gentlelady from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I was in my office, Congresswoman, and I could not help but both agree and hear you.

I wanted to come just to applaud you for, first of all, restoring and educating this House on the issues of federalism, local control, and also of reintroducing them to Washington, D.C., which gained local control and gained the right to elect its local officials. Also—maybe most people don't know—it has an operational budget that is balanced and that, in actuality, could continue to run its services for its people, as the Congresswoman has indicated, but for

the pass-through that is required here in the House of Representatives.

□ 1800

I simply wanted to come and applaud you and say a government shutdown is for naught. It is not good for anyone, and it is shameful that it is tied to the defunding of ObamaCare when the millions of Washingtonians, who are here, who dutifully provide for this House and this Senate and all of those who come in and out of Washington, D.C., the millions of tourists, the international guests, that we would dare tell them, without a vote, without a voice, in terms of the voting voice, to say not only are we shutting down the government that is going to hurt all of America, we're going to shut you down and you're in local control with your own monies, ready to run, ready to help, ready to provide for the safety and security of the comings and goings of those who work in the Federal Government in the House of Representatives.

So I could not miss the opportunity to again reinforce my commitment to the legitimacy of Washington, its right to a voting representative in both the House and the Senate, and, as well, the fact that you make a very potent argument, because in many of our jurisdictions, city government may still be operating. Of course, many people will be hurt—Social Security, the military, veterans, the soldiers' families who don't get a paycheck. What the Congresswoman is saying, and I want to add to that, insult to injury coming from this shutdown is the fact that a whole city would not be able to operate the Nation's Capital where people are now heading to by airplane for whatever visits they may have—tourists, international guests.

I just met with an international leader today. They will all be coming to a city that will literally be shut down because my Republican friends want to defund ObamaCare and don't have the respect to give you the waiver, the position that you have asked for to make sure that Washington, D.C., runs.

I thank you for alarming us. I hope that as we enter into our discussions tomorrow that we will raise this issue and that those of good common sense will come to their senses not only for the people of the District of Columbia in hearing your plea, but they'll come to their senses for the American people and keep this government running.

Ms. NORTON. I thank the gentlelady from Texas, who, in her generosity, has come down to speak from the point of view of another Member who isn't facing this in her own jurisdiction but understands what we are facing from the Federal Government and how it must indeed be. I thank you very much for your generosity and for those very insightful statements about our predicament.

Indeed, before I recognized the gentlelady, I was speaking about federalism. Essentially, our forefathers

and foremothers distrusted Federal power. Nothing is more alien to Federal power than a local budget. I can't imagine that they would have abided that under any circumstances for the District of Columbia or any other city. This country is, in many ways, State and local-oriented, not Federal oriented. We need the Federal Government, we can't do without it; but as to our principles, we set up a Republic that separated local and State matters from Federal matters, and of those matters none is more salient than matters affecting the purse.

The District does not regard itself as a hostage. We are not a hostage to this fight. If that were the case, we would try to negotiate our way out of it or give up. But we're not a part of this fight. When you're a hostage, somebody would say something about you or they would want something and they're using you to get it, but they're not. No one has claimed the District of Columbia as some link to the disputes that are going on here between the administration and Congress.

We face a no-exit, no-way-out proposition because there's nothing we could, ourselves, do. There's nothing for us to give. There's no concession for us to make that would free us. We've got to depend upon the goodwill of the Speaker of the House of the majority, leader of the House of the majority, majority leader of the Senate and the minority leader of the Senate, their leadership, this leadership, and, of course, of our own minority leadership and the Members of the House and the Senate.

I cannot believe they do not identify with me as I stand here trying to get recognition for my city to spend its own money. I believe if they put themselves in my place, there would be enough generosity in this body to agree that wherever we stand on the dispute before us, the District of Columbia is not a part of it and should not be dragged into it.

This is a big, complicated city. It's run well. Its budget and reserves show that. The Federal Government, unlike the Nation's Capital, does not deliver direct services. That's what big cities and small towns do. A Federal shutdown will have its effects throughout the country because we've got almost 3 million Federal workers, and they will feel it first and foremost; and some of the services that the American people regard as essential, but which are not considered essential by the Office of Personnel Management, some of those services will not be available. But those are not like the services that many of you who live in the District of Columbia, Members of Congress, depend upon from the District of Columbia, like picking up your trash and garbage, for example. Even that would be stopped.

Who would be affected, therefore? Well, clearly the 600,000 plus—actually, it's close to 625,000 residents now because the District has been gaining

population at a rate of about 1,000 a month. That speaks to how well the city is doing. That's how attractive the city is to people moving to this area. It clearly serves, first and foremost, its own citizens; but the District of Columbia is the Nation's Capital and serves private businesses. It serves Federal officials, visitors, Federal buildings, and foreign embassies. The circle is very broad of those who will feel any shutdown of the District of Columbia.

Moreover, our finances, which have been doing so well, could be very negatively affected. The city has financing agreements of various kinds, such as a master equipment lease, for example. Like every city, it leases a wide variety of equipment, like some traffic lights and automobiles and public safety vehicles, and it has certificates of participation on some of its buildings, like its command center for public safety. All of those could face a default if a payment is due while a shutdown occurs. Of course, if that occurs, if they miss a payment, then, of course, under the terms of these agreements, the bondholders must be notified, and that would drive up the city's costs.

Is there a Member that even knows this? Surely there are Members who would care that this unintended effect would lead to such serious results.

Wall Street already penalizes the District because its budget has to come here at all. When your budget is not final when it is passed by your local officials, it has to come to a body like the Congress of the United States, even at its most stable, the fact of dual sanctions to approve a budget costs the city on Wall Street, not withstanding its handsome reserves.

I'm not asking the Congress to do the unprecedented. Eighteen years ago when the government shut down—and it was shut down for a week—I went to Speaker Gingrich and asked him not to allow the District to shut down again. There were partial shutdowns, but each time a CR came. He included the District in the CR, and I'm asking for that relief, as well, from the House. It was a House and Senate in Republican hands and an administration in Democratic hands—it was also a polarized time—yet the District of Columbia was kept open.

There are remedies. We are included in the pending congressional resolution because, thanks to the appropriators for the last 10 years, if there is a congressional resolution or, for that matter, a bill, the District of Columbia can spend its local funds at next year's levels. That's not a big favor to the District of Columbia because, remember, we are not a Federal agency, which can only spend at the present year levels. But it was an important thing to do because it had calamitous effects, when the District could not move ahead with its own appropriations as planned and with contracts and with schools and with the many different operations that were affected, when you couldn't

spend at the next year's level which you had approved and had been approved by your chief financial officer.

So I've had three bills. One was to amend the CR so that if it turns out to last until December 15 or if it turns out to be a week from now, whatever it is, the District would not have to lurch from CR to CR in short-term CRs. We've asked that the District be permitted to spend its funds for the 2014 fiscal year.

Then I also have an independent bill that would allow the same remedy—not part of the CR—that the leadership could bring to the floor simply to allow the District to spend for the 2014 fiscal year, same terms, nothing changed, exactly what is now in the appropriation that is pending, except that it could now go forward for the next fiscal year.

Then I have a permanent no-shutdown bill.

What makes all of this so ironic is that pending, as I speak, is bicameral, bipartisan support for preventing government shutdowns.

This summer, the Oversight and Government Reform Committee and the Senate Appropriations Committee approved larger bills that contained provisions that would permanently authorize the District government to remain open and spend its local funds. The President's fiscal year 2013 budget contains the same authorization, and the appropriators in the House have acknowledged the harm done to the District by these shutdowns and asked the authorizers to proceed.

□ 1815

As we move closer to the government shutdown, the need to free the District's budget from the grasp of a dispute that shows no sign of ending has become more clear. These continuing resolutions, and the preparations for shutdown are having a punitive effect on the Nation's Capital.

The Nation's Capital is an innocent party to this Federal dispute. Only legislation like the three bills I have just named or my budget or autonomy legislation would keep the Nation's Capital from being embroiled in Federal fights. I ask Members to consider what I have said here this evening and to free the city from disputes I don't think you mean us to be a part of.

I thank the Speaker and yield back the balance of my time.

COUNCIL ON AMERICAN-ISLAMIC RELATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. VALADAO). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, there has been some interesting news come out. The Council on American-Islamic Relations is changing its name. There was an article in the American Thinker on September 23. This article points out that an explosive story posted Sun-

day by Charles Johnson at The Daily Caller reveals that:

CAIR has apparently been laundering money obtained from Middle East donors in violation of Federal law. While it publicly presents itself as a single organization, CAIR has, in fact, created a multitude of 501(c)(3) organizations and a 501(c)(4), CAIR Action Network. By moving donations around, CAIR may have evaded taxes and has avoided disclosure of its foreign funding sources required by the Foreign Agent Registration Act.

Quoting Johnson, "Under IRS regulations, an organization may have 501(c)(3) and 501(c)(4) related entities, but they must maintain a wall between the two; this is accomplished by establishing separate bank accounts, board of directors, bookkeeping, and payroll. CAIR, though, had none of these."

Johnson cites David Reaboi, vice president for strategic communications at Frank Gaffney's Center for Security Policy, "Plentiful legal evidence, acquired in the course of a lawsuit—plus CAIR's own official filing documents to the Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs (DCRA) and IRS—make clear that CAIR has engaged in a thinly-disguised money laundering operation. In addition to violating its 501(c)(3) regulations, CAIR's undisclosed and hidden foreign donations amount to violation of the Foreign Agent Registration Act as well."

Guidestar reveals nine state chapters, a property holding company in California, a main office in Washington, D.C., and the CAIR Foundation. Many of these chapters have little income. The Iowa chapter—yes, there is one—has none. The Foundation was de-listed in 2011 because it failed to file the requisite IRS form 990 tax returns for the three prior years. However, in June, WND reported that while Tea Party organizations were being sandbagged by IRS, the agency quietly restored the CAIR Foundation's non-profit status following a meeting with White House officials.

Well, the article, though, points out that CAIR is changing its name. And it should also be noted that this comes on the heels of an inspector general report last week that was made public that established that the FBI had not properly followed its own directives, that it had told FBI offices that they were not to have non-investigative relations with CAIR as part of their so-called community outreach program because of the evidence that was introduced in the Holy Land Foundation trial in 2007-2008.

It should be noted that the judge in the U.S. District Court in the Holy Land Foundation trial—in which there were over 100 counts of funding terrorism, basically, that were found to have been violated, criminal violations—found that when CAIR, ISNA moved to have their name struck—there was one other name, I believe—they had been listed as unindicted co-conspirators. And they wanted to have their names removed. And the court there at the District Court refused to remove their names. So they appealed to the U.S. Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals. The U.S. Fifth Circuit Court group of judges ruled that there was plenty of evidence to support CAIR, ISNA, their names being part of the suit because the evidence was sufficient to show they were the largest Muslim Brotherhood front organizations in America.

So it is interesting when the article points out that they got their IRS non-profit status returned after they had visited with White House officials.

Which reminds me of back 2 years ago. There was a law enforcement seminar at Langley out at the CIA headquarters. And CAIR, though—at the time, the FBI was not supposed to have any relationship with them. The White House certainly had plenty of relationships with them. And they made calls to the administration, and they got these seminars eliminated out at Langley because they objected to people being taught about what radical Islam believed, what it wanted to accomplish.

And they actually got people delisted from being able to teach. One of whom, Steve Coughlin, spent many years studying radical Islam. And he used to brief our military commanders. And it was located at the Pentagon. Studied radical Islam. And then all of a sudden, because CAIR makes a phone call or two to the administration, now a man that knows a tremendous amount about radical Islam is no longer able to teach people about the dangers of radical Islam. That went well in line with CAIR's complaints that the FBI training material needed to be purged because there were things in there that they found offensive. And so things were eliminated.

Well, when MICHELE BACHMANN, TRENT FRANKS, myself, and a couple of others sent five separate letters to five different departments—the Department of State, Homeland Security, intelligence—one was to the Department of Justice. And in each letter, it set out specific facts indicating that there was at least some Muslim Brotherhood influence in that department. So the inquiry was not requesting an indictment, just an investigation about the extent of Muslim Brotherhood influence in that particular department.

The Department of Justice response indicated they had an ongoing investigation at that time, and it was with regard to the impropriety of FBI offices dealing with CAIR, despite the FBI's new policy to the contrary, since there was evidence they were a large Muslim Brotherhood front organization.

But nonetheless, some FBI offices continued to have their so-called outreach programs. One found that they had brought a couple of CAIR officials in to help teach about Islam and Muslim activities. And the relationship went on.

I asked the former FBI director why it took so long since the FBI had been gathering that information about CAIR's relationship to the Muslim Brotherhood, why it took so many years after they started gathering evidence about them to sever that partnership relationship for community outreach.

So there's no question there's Muslim Brotherhood influence in this administration. The Egyptians have pointed that out for a long time. And