

thing—because if you remember when it was passed, and you were here, you both were here, they said, oh, well, let's just get it passed and then we are all going to find out what is in it. Some of our esteemed colleagues across the aisle had made that comment; and now when the American people are finding out what is in it, they don't like it. Things are changing. They are finding out what is in it, they don't like it, and they are rejecting it.

One of the reasons that those costs have gone up is the essential health benefits that have to be covered. For every American, there are 10 essential health benefits. My friend Cindy, she and her husband do not have children, and yet they are forced to purchase maternity coverage; they are forced to purchase pediatric coverage.

Now, these are wonderful things for families, young families, growing families; but they are not appropriate for every American. So what is lacking here in ObamaCare is choice, the ability to choose your plan. I am all for getting health care coverage for every American. I want every American to be able to have affordable health care coverage; but you can't do it by forcing individuals to buy something that they will never use, they will never need, paying a premium price, and costs out of pocket. I am sorry, it is just not affordable for American families.

□ 1645

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Reclaiming my time, as we draw to a close, I said earlier, 61 percent of the American people are opposed even today, 3½ years after passage of this law, and they can't even get on the Web site. They can't get signed up. Wait until they get signed up and find out what they are going to have to pay and the amount of the deductible. I guess I would call that sticker shock. I think instead of 61 percent, it will be 80 percent will be opposed to it.

I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Just one comment. I tried today for the sixth time to get signed up, and I couldn't. So I am going back Thursday for the seventh time.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Reclaiming my time as I close, I tried to get on today. I couldn't. I got the error message. I didn't even get put in the queue to make it a little softer. I got the error message and got kicked offline—and Monday is the last day. So I am going back to my office to try to get on once again. I am really feeling for the patients, the American people, the seniors who are in one heck of a mess because of this not well-thought-out, rushed bill that was totally partisan. You just can't do that in this Congress with a bill this important. We are talking about human lives here; life and death, and that is not the way to do it.

We will come back with a solution, and I hope we will do that in a bipartisan way. I love the American Health Care Reform Act. I am a cosponsor.

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

DON'T REPEAT NORTH KOREA MISTAKE WITH IRAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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, well, we got a notice: All House Member briefing: Iran, Wednesday, December 4, 9 a.m. The briefing team, right at the top of the list, Ambassador Wendy Sherman, Under Secretary of Political Affairs.

So that was thrilling. I recognize that name, Wendy Sherman, who is going to give the House a briefing in the morning at 9 a.m. on how good things have gone in the dealings with Iran.

As The Wall Street Journal article from November 20 points out, the Clinton administration's policy coordinator for North America, Wendy Sherman, is now the Obama administration's lead negotiator for the Iran nuclear talks.

In a 2001 New York Times op-ed, Ms. Sherman urged President Bush to cut a deal, writing that Kim Jong Il "appears ready to make landmark commitments because to ensure the survival of his regime, he has to improve the country's disastrous economy by reducing the burden of a vast missile program and opening the doors to trade."

Well, Ms. Sherman was wrong about that in her op-ed she wrote in 2001. Kim Jong Il needed to help his economy, she was right about that, but she thought it meant that he was ready to get rid of his ballistic missile program and open the doors more to trade. Well, certainly they were willing to open the doors to trade. But just as she had been wrong in 1994 when she helped the Clinton administration work out an amazing deal with North Korea, and to recap the highlights of that deal with North Korea, Korea was believed to be pursuing nuclear weapons so Ms. Sherman was the policy coordinator for North Korea involved in this process. She, Madeleine Albright and President Clinton thought, what a great thing, we will give you nuclear reactors, nuclear power plants, give you some fuel, and in return, you have to renounce nuclear weapons and you have to promise not to pursue nuclear weapons.

Wow. Oh, there was one other thing. The Clinton administration, Wendy Sherman, Madeleine Albright agreed to a provision which would have prevented them and did prevent them from inspecting the North Korean nuclear facilities for at least 5 or so years, which ended up being enough time for them to pursue their nuclear weapons. I mean for President Clinton, Madeleine Albright and Wendy Sherman kind of remind me of the repossession guy that Jeff Foxworthy talked

about coming to his house when he was poor telling him he hadn't made his payment in months and so he had to take his car, and Foxworthy begging him not to take the car, and he has to have it to make a living. He said the guy said I have to leave with the car or cash or a check, to which Foxworthy said he replied, "You'll take a check. Well, why didn't you say you will take a check. Sure, I can write you a check."

Well, that is what the North Koreans did. Oh, you mean in return for new, sophisticated nuclear power plants and fuel, you will take just a promise from us that we won't pursue nuclear weapons? Well, why didn't you say that. Sure, we will promise anything you want in return for nuclear weapon fuel and nuclear power plants that we can use for our own benefit. Sure, we will make those promises. Any other promises you want?

I mean, how gullible does an administration have to be to believe that a promise from a rogue regime is worth basing the future safety of your citizens upon? Well, we don't have an answer to how gullible you have to be because this administration is now doing the same thing. It wasn't enough that Wendy Sherman was wrong in 1994 and wrong in 2001 in her op-ed; now she is the lead negotiator with Iran, and she is going to brief Members of the House here tomorrow.

How gullible are we? There is no requirement that we have to be as gullible as this administration. I mean, sure maybe you believe an administration when they say if you like your insurance, you can keep it. Maybe you believe that administration when they say if you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor, period. Maybe the House is gullible enough, or maybe the majority at one time was gullible enough to believe that, and did. In fact, people in this room actually repeated those promises, making them themselves. But how many times do you have to be shown that people making the promises are wrong before you get skeptical?

Now on top of all of the broken promises about ObamaCare, we have an administration promising us that we can trust Iran, that we have made a great deal. They have made us some promises, just like North Korea did, and we know we can trust them because the only thing at stake is the existence of the nation of Israel and the existence of the United States without nuclear weapons going off in it. That is all that is at stake. Or perhaps an EMP caused by a nuclear weapon that is shot off from an intercontinental ballistic missile. It doesn't even have to be that accurate. If it goes off near the middle of the United States, certain range of elevation, then it will fry most every computer chip, and we are going to be in trouble. Grocery stores cannot operate appropriately without their computer systems. Wal-Mart. There are all kinds of places that won't be able to

operate appropriately. Most everybody's cars now rely on computer chips. Our military is very reliant on computer chips. Yet this administration says now Iran is somebody we can trust.

I keep coming back to what some allied leaders said back in September in the Middle East: Do you guys not realize that you are now helping the people that attacked you, the organizations that attacked you on 9/11? That make up the Taliban, Muslim Brotherhood background; al Qaeda, Muslim Brotherhood background. I mean, what do you not realize that allows you to now help the people you are at war with or supposed to be at war with? I say the word "war," and of course this administration has made clear, we are not at war with anybody. According to this administration, we are trying to counter violent extremism, but we don't talk about terrorism. We don't talk about radical Islam. We have stripped that from our training manuals because it may offend and does offend radical Islamists that want to destroy us and kill us. So we don't want to do anything that might offend the people who want to kill us. You know, there was a time in this country when if another group declared war on us, then we fought them. We weren't going to let them win that war against us.

This administration thinks you can make a great deal with Iran just like the Clinton administration did with North Korea and stop their nuclear proliferation right in its tracks. I would humbly submit, Mr. Speaker, it will be just as effective, less so, than the deal with North Korea was.

Iran has been crippled by sanctions, but sanctions were not going to stop Iran from developing nuclear weapons. They have consulted with, they have learned from North Korea how you game the system. All you have to do is enter into talks with a Democratic administration like the Clinton administration or the Obama administration, and they will cut you a deal. They will even help you get nuclear material. All you have to do is write them a check, and on that check say we promise not to pursue nuclear weapons. Heck, the United States under the Clinton administration, they have shown they will even agree not to inspect your nuclear facility, which will allow you to finish your nuclear weapons.

Well, Israel understands what a tremendous mistake this is because they are too close. Their existence rides on not making a mistake of the calamitous nature that this will be, and this is.

So it is amazing, though. You know, people stood up and made America all kinds of promises about ObamaCare, and it turns out, at the time promises were made about ObamaCare, they had already had the discussion and knew that people wouldn't be able to keep their insurance if they wanted it, and knew they wouldn't be able to keep their doctor if they wanted it. So what

did they do? They said, we have a Presidential election coming up and it won't sound good to use words like "if you like your doctor, there is a chance you might can keep your doctor." That won't sell good in the election. "If you like your insurance, there is a chance you might can keep your insurance," that won't sell, so we have to go out and tell what is not true so we can win the next election.

How about that Benghazi? Let's keep that under wraps. We know it was an attack by an al Qaeda-affiliated group. Of course, there might have been some concerns that they used the very weapons that this administration supplied to the al Qaeda-infused rebels that may have been turned on our State Department personnel, our Ambassador, and they didn't send anybody to help them. They did not send anybody to help them.

□ 1700

We had planes, we had personnel that could have gotten to Benghazi and at least saved the last two of the four, could have saved Dave Ubben's leg, could have saved a lot of damage, could have saved a lot of the classified material being out there for a month or so for anybody who wanted to get it. It could have saved all of that, but no one was sent.

People want to believe promises that are made by their own government, especially when it pertains to something as important as their own health, their own health care, or the defense of their Nation when it is at risk. Well, it is at risk. There are people who are at war with us. They have been at war with us since 1979. We didn't really fully appreciate it until 2001 on 9/11.

And now we have an administration that has completely failed to realize that the people who declared war on us in 1979, who want shari'a law to govern the world, who want a worldwide caliphate over which the 12th imam will rule the world—some of them believe Jesus will come and fight at his side—this administration does not understand they have never given up on their goals.

Thank God that most Muslims do not believe the radical Islamist approach to Islam. I am grateful. But it is crazy not to realize that there are radical Islamists that want to destroy our way of life.

As the Obama administration was bragging over their great deal with Iran, we got word yesterday that Iran announces—this is an article from the Washington Free Beacon—a second nuclear reactor. And the leader, Rouhani, says, "Our enrichment will never stop." So much for this administration's misplaced belief in Iran honesty.

These leaders are at war with us. They want to destroy us. They want to destroy Israel. How can we get someone in this administration to take notice?

Mr. Speaker, I have the answer. It is when people in the United States Sen-

ate and enough people here in the House say, Mr. President, you can't do this kind of damage. We know it is innocent. We know you think this is the way to go. But we know you can't trust Iran, you can't trust the Ayatollah Khamenei, you could not trust the Ayatollah Khomeini, you could not trust Ahmadinejad. Just because they have got a different President, they have still got the different leader.

By the way, we didn't used to call the Ayatollah Khomeini the "supreme leader," just like U.S. leaders didn't used to call Hitler "mein fuhrer." He was not entitled to that title. He was an evil man. I personally don't think it is appropriate for any United States leader to call someone who hates Israel and hates America and wants them wiped off the map and thinks that the 12th imam is coming and will one day rule over the area in which Israel is, the area in which the United States is, that we should not be calling that man "supreme leader." It is the same thing as calling him "mein fuhrer." You don't do it. This administration has not learned that lesson.

So Iran announced that they are still not going to comply with what the Obama administration says they have agreed to do, yet this administration is still sending the former Clinton North Korean policy director, a former Democrat who was advising President Bush in an op-ed to cut a deal with Kim Jong Il, that he really wants to make a deal, kind of like North Korea did in 1994. She was wrong in 1994. She was wrong in 2001. She is wrong now about Iran.

We are told that those who refuse to learn from history are destined to repeat it. When there is enough arrogance that anyone, any leader thinks that they are smarter, wiser, and better than anyone who has gone before, therefore, they can make a better deal with corrupt and evil people like no one else has made, then their name goes down in history just as Neville Chamberlain's has. He waived his peace agreement, which he agreed to give away part of Europe to his fuhrer thinking it meant peace in his time. What it meant was his ignorance and naivete was going to cost millions of people their lives.

History is there for people who are willing to study and learn from it. I shutter for the people in Israel. I shutter for people in the United States that think we are invulnerable. The only way the United States could possibly stay invulnerable for a while longer is if its leaders realized we are vulnerable and we have to stay prepared, we have to stay vigilant, and we have to stay on the lookout for people that want to destroy our country. Yet they would rather make a deal with the lying cutthroats who lead Iran than they would sit down and work out an agreement with Republicans in the House of Representatives.

We were willing the night of the shutdown. We were willing the day before the shutdown. We compromised

three different times, and HARRY REID refused to even allow negotiators to be appointed. We appointed ours. People say Republicans shut down the House, shut down the government. We didn't do that. HARRY REID did that. He refused to even negotiate. It was his way completely.

He asked a question when the press was there. Not many of them reported on how ridiculous the question was. But he asked the question of, basically, what right do they, the House of Representatives, have to say what government programs get funded and which do not?

Well, I asked that exact question to four constitutional experts that testified before our Judiciary Committee today. One clearly was a defender of the Obama administration, yet all four of the witnesses—brilliant, constitutional scholars, even though we have our disagreements. These were brilliant people, and every one of them had the same answer for HARRY REID's question. The answer is the United States Constitution, article I, section 8. It gave Congress control of the purse strings, and it gave the House a little more control than the Senate. The Senate has got to go along with whatever legislation is going to become law.

But he asked the question, and I put this question to our experts: Suppose you were in a town hall meeting with constituents back in a congressional district and an elementary schoolchild asked the question, What right does the House of Representatives have to decide which government programs get funded and which do not? They unhesitatingly said the answer is our Constitution, article I, section 8. They all agreed. They all knew immediately.

So I have asked that the chairman of the Judiciary Committee make that testimony available to our dear friend, the Senate majority leader down the hall, so he won't have to ask that question to reporters who are not familiar with the answer. We can get it to him straight from some of the greatest constitutional minds on both sides of any aisle, and he will understand it is the Constitution that gives us the right to have a say.

For HARRY REID to shut down the government by saying you are either going to give us every dime that we demand or the government will be shut down is really outrageous. They shut the government down. We even gave them an out.

There is a wise Chinese saying that says, it is good to give your adversary a graceful way to exit. We gave the Senate majority Democrats a graceful way to exit by saying, Look, you don't want to completely defund ObamaCare; we get it. We think that is the best idea for America. Here is a compromise. Let's just suspend the whole bill for a year.

HARRY REID could have taken that and said, We don't want to do this, but the Republicans in the House are making us hold off on all of ObamaCare for

a year. Gosh, golly gee, we didn't want to, but they are making us.

That was a graceful way that they could have exited. But they were so determined to shut the government down that, when we came back with another compromise passed out of this body, we said, How about if we do this? The President acted unconstitutionally. That became very clear in our hearing. For the President to say he wasn't going to enforce the business mandate in ObamaCare is unconstitutional. Not only is it unconstitutional, the President is directly violating his oath of office. He is required to faithfully defend the laws, see that the laws are carried out, and he announced he wasn't going to do it for a year. He doesn't have that kind of luxury.

Even in a spirit of extreme compromise, I didn't vote for it. I thought we shouldn't be compromising against ourselves. But a majority in here voted to send the bill, and we sent it down to HARRY REID and the Senate that said the President has decided to suspend the business mandate for a year. If businesses deserve a mandate for a year, let's do it for every individual in the country for a year. That gave HARRY REID another out. He was so determined to shut down the government, he wouldn't even bring that to a vote.

Then our final ultimate compromise in compromising against ourselves, without any Senate offer of compromise whatsoever, was to say here are our negotiators we are appointing. We voted for it. We sent the list of negotiators; you appoint yours. We will probably have a deal by 8 a.m., and we will not even have to have a real shutdown. But HARRY REID was determined to have a shutdown, and so he got a shutdown. Now there is no graceful escape because we have got to repeal ObamaCare. That is very clear, and I hope that we do that.

I see my friend from California. Actually, he is a very dear friend. We have been in some interesting situations worldwide as we stand up for our country and for the people of the United States of America, for truth, justice, and the American way. As my time is about to expire, let me say that I didn't vote for the patent bill in the Judiciary Committee. I have some real concerns about it, as I did the last one that I voted against.

□ 1715

I still believe in my heart we should not have changed 200 years of patent law from the first to invent being right, changing it to the first to file being right. I think the law was appropriate the way it was. We needed to make some reforms, but I think we made a glaring error.

Many people came to this floor and said we have got to pass that bill to deal with the issue of patent trolls, and now we have another bill that we are told will likely come to the floor tomorrow that this time it will really

deal with patent trolls. There are some things in there that I like, and I am glad we are trying to deal with them, to help people that need to be helped.

You know, where a bank is utilizing a procedure that they paid for, they are not infringing on anybody's patents intentionally, and so to hold up people, you know, a small community bank that doesn't have a million bucks to spend on patent litigation, when they are innocent stakeholders, it just seems grossly unfair.

There are things we ought to do. But I am very concerned that we ought to be spending more time, let America help us get this bill right, and I am still hoping that we will wait, get more input so that we don't mess up the patent system any more than we already have.

My time is expired, or is about to, so I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from improper personal references toward the President.

THE CONGRESS THAT KILLED THE PATENT SYSTEM

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, let me thank my good friend, Mr. GOHMERT, for that heartfelt expression.

Yeah, there are problems at whatever area of government we look at. There are ways that we can improve it, but there are also problems in government that can be used as an excuse, as a cover for a power grab by very special interest groups in our country to change the law in the name of dealing with a serious problem.

Then what comes out of it has something to do with the interest of that special interest, rather than curing the problem. That is what is going on today when we deal, when we hear all of this talk about the patent system.

We must all ask ourselves: Do we want to be known as the Congress that killed the U.S. patent system which has served the American people well for 225 years?

Let's note that there are very powerful interests in this country. Mr. GOHMERT and I have been fighting them on a number of fronts. We call them globalists because what they are interested in is making sure that our economy and our rules and our rights are based in a global system that eventually will be run by the United Nations or whoever.

We have got multinational corporations trying to break down things like the patent law that have been unique to the United States and granted the American people many more rights than are granted to the people of other countries.

So, once again, we are talking about reforming the patent system. After 20