

□ 1956

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. YODER, SCOTT of South Carolina, and POE of Texas changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 376, Consideration of PATRIOT Act Extension, had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to cast my floor vote on rollcall vote 376.

Had I been present for the votes, I would have voted “nay” for rollcall vote 376.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained for personal reasons, and missed a recorded vote for S. 990, the PATRIOT Sunsets Extension Act of 2011. If present, I would have recorded my vote as “nay” for rollcall vote 376.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 376, I was away from the Capital region attending the Civil Rights Freedom Riders’ 50th Anniversary Celebration. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

#### APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO UNITED STATES GROUP OF THE NATO PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BROOKS). Pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 1928a, clause 10 of rule I, and the order of the House of January 5, 2011, the Chair announces the Speaker’s appointment of the following Member of the House to the United States Group of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly:

Mr. LARSON, Connecticut

#### FAREWELL, TOM McAVOY

(Mr. GARDNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, times have been hard for the newspaper business; but this week, the Pueblo Chieftain experienced an especially tough loss—the retirement of its editorial research director, Tom McAvoy.

Tom is a native of Pueblo, Colorado. He graduated from Central High School in 1964 and from CSU-Pueblo. After receiving a master’s degree in journalism from Ohio State University in 1969, he spent a year working in the AP’s Denver bureau until he accepted a teaching position at his alma mater back in Pueblo, Colorado.

During the summers, he worked part time in the Chieftain’s newsroom; and in 1977, the position became full time. When Tom began his career, these were the days of Woodward and Bernstein, Hunter S. Thompson, and Gloria Steinem. Investigative reporting and gonzo journalism just don’t exist like that anymore. These were also the

days before emails and cell phones, and stories were literally filed over the wires. Tom is, without a doubt, what one would consider “old school.”

In 1983, Tom took over as the political beat reporter for the Chieftain, working out of its Denver bureau for the next 21 years. He covered the State capitol, three Governors; and he remembers what the Colorado legislature was like before term limits.

I’ve had the opportunity to work with Tom not only at the State capitol in Denver, Colorado, but at the Chieftain. He knows a great deal and cares a great deal about Colorado, south-eastern Colorado, and the water law that has made Colorado the great State that it is today. Not only am I going to miss Tom McAvoy, but I know the people of Pueblo and the people of south-eastern Colorado will as well.

Tom, thank you for your service to the people, and I look forward to working with you because I know, in retirement, you’re still not going away.

□ 2000

#### MEMORIAL DAY: REMEMBERING OUR WAR HEROES

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Veterans Day is the day we honor our veterans who go overseas and they return. Memorial Day is the day we honor our soldiers, our sailors, our airmen who go overseas and they don’t return. Monday is Memorial Day, and all Americans should give homage and honor, praise and prayers for those that served and gave up their lives for the rest of us. They gave their youth for our future.

Not far from where we are today, right down The Mall, is the newest memorial on The Mall; it’s the World War II Memorial. It’s a massive memorial to those World War II—the “Greatest Generation”—veterans that served. On the back wall there it looks like a bronze plate. And if you get closer, Mr. Speaker, you notice that it’s not a bronze plate at all, but there are thousands of stars; 400,000 stars on the World War II Memorial, and each one of those represents a young American that went overseas in the great World War II and did not return; 400,000 Americans. Those are just a few that have served and given their lives.

Patriotism is a good thing. This Memorial Day we praise those who served, and we praise the families of those who served.

And that’s just the way it is.

#### PAYING TRIBUTE TO RUSSELL SKINNER

(Mr. BRADY of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Our postman is retiring this weekend. Normally that

wouldn’t be national news, but this is no ordinary man. Russell Skinner has been serving our community and our neighborhood for more than 30 years. He’s more than that; he’s an entrepreneur. He has his own flooring company. You’ll see him on evenings and weekends working to try to provide not just good service to his customers, but to take care of his family as well. He runs a Christian gospel singing group. You will see him in our local churches around the region bringing God’s songs and music across our region.

Russell Skinner loves his country, he loves our soldiers, he loves his family, and he loves his God. And he is just part of the American dream, living it, working it, fighting it. Russell Skinner will be missed in our community. He is what’s great about America.

#### THE PATRIOT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it’s my honor to be recognized to address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives and this great deliberative body that we have, and especially immediately in the aftermath of this historic vote that has just gone up on the Patriot Act.

As we have debated this and worked with an amendment process and negotiations that took place in the Senate, we got down to the last minutes here. And I presume final passage of the Patriot Act is now on its way to the President’s desk to be signed tonight so that there’s not a window of vulnerability with regard to the intelligence that we can gather against our enemies that are evermore coming into the United States and plotting against us globally.

This is an issue that emerged when we saw our vulnerabilities in the immediate aftermath of September 11. And as that was dealt with here in this Congress—and I will say that of pieces of legislation that have been passed in a relative emergency situation, the Patriot Act among them stands out as something that came together with—it was clearly a bipartisan effort to put the Patriot Act language together; it was done so with the information that we had at the time. Some of that information was gathered in a hasty fashion—the smoke was certainly rolling up out of Ground Zero in New York while the Patriot Act was passed here in the House of Representatives.

It was also passed with the idea that it had sunsets on it so it required reauthorization so that Congress would come back and have oversight over the authority that was granted in the Patriot Act to do surveillance. For example, roving wire taps. Clear back in the 1980s it was understood with cell phones that when investigators were investigating organized crime, for example, the Mob had it figured out

where they could pick up a cell phone, use it for a while, dispose of it, go grab another cell phone, use it for a while and dispose of it. The old wiretap laws that would allow for a judge to grant a warrant to tap a land line at, say, a residence or a business of the suspected mobster were archaic in the 1980s because of cell phone emergence, and so Congress acted and provided for the roving wiretap for investigations domestically. But it didn't cover the investigations that had to do with non-citizens and terrorist activities, and so that's something that the Patriot Act addressed.

As I look at the components of the Patriot Act one after another, it comes down to this: That the constitutional protections that are there for the individuals that are being investigated are equal to or greater than those protections for American citizens in domestic investigations unrelated to terrorist charges. So the roving wiretap is a piece that was a natural, that had to be part of the Patriot Act, and it is. And we also have the FISA courts, the special courts that evaluate the investigations and yield a judgment as to whether they're in compliance. The national security letters, of which there have only been about 300 requested national security letters—yes, there is a confidentiality that's attached to that. If a Federal agent goes into an entity and issues a national security letter, first of all, that's reported later on to the court, and the individual or the company that's required to produce that information is bound by confidentiality for obvious reasons. If Osama bin Laden or Zarqawi or any of the plotting terrorists were planning against the United States, the subject of the investigation, they would be tipped off. They would be tipped off on the national security letter request, which means the investigation would be blown up by that lack of confidentiality, the lone wolf piece of this.

So there is piece after piece of the Patriot Act that has stood up very well. And one of the people that has stood up on this issue that understands this very thoroughly, and one of the people who is on the Select Committee on Intelligence—which will prevent her from talking about some of the things that are confidential because of the deep intelligence knowledge that goes on in a secure room in this Capitol—is my friend from Minnesota whom I would like to yield to, MICHELE BACHMANN.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank the gentleman from Iowa for yielding.

This is a very important issue and a very important vote that we have just taken here in the House Chamber. It is dealing with the Patriot Act. We have had calls, we have had requests on our Facebook, Twitter, and in our emails urging a "no" vote tonight on the Patriot Act. I cast a "yes" vote on this act. The Patriot Act did pass. This is why. This is an authorization for the next several years in three areas. One

is the lone wolf exception. We have a new war, a new enemy, new tactics. The lone wolf is one actor acting alone. And if we get a tip, it may be at the last minute, and we've got to go in for national security reasons and find that actor. That is an appropriate use of gaining this intelligence and information.

Number two, roving wiretaps. We have changed from the days of telephones being wired into the walls; now we use a cell phone. A lot of modern terrorists will buy a thousand "go" phones. They'll make one call, use a cell phone, throw it away like it's a disposable phone, pick up another cell phone, make another call. So we have to have the ability to be able to go to whichever phone a potential alleged terrorist may be using.

Now the third exception is the business records section; this is section 215. This is the section that most people have the greatest worries about. They worry about the infringement of Fourth Amendment rights. I worry about that too. I spent all week this week going to Members who I felt would oppose the Patriot Act. I went to people who are national voices who oppose the Patriot Act to find out what their concerns were, because I'm a lawyer. I genuinely am concerned about making sure that we never cross the line as a Federal Government.

□ 2010

Why? Because I think government is too big. I think we intervene too much in people's lives. I certainly don't want to give the government the unfettered right to go in and access my personal private records. This is what I know to be true about section 215 and why I could vote for it.

Number one, no right of gaining access to records can be given unless a Federal agent goes to a judge first. They have to go to the FISA court. Also, there has to be a connection to national security interests or to a foreign government. We've got that level of protection. When they go and make these requests, of which there have been 300-some requests, then they can go and they can gain access to a record.

Now, these are business records. These aren't records in my basement or your basement. These are records that a company has, like a phone company or a bank, but they're used in only the limited case where a judge first grants permission.

So what does that mean?

That means that it is constitutional in that the individual American's due process rights are observed because a Federal agent first has to go to a judge, a judge has to apply due process to that request, and then from there then access can be given to records, not in an individual's house but from a business. And then during the course of investigation—again, remembering, this is if there is a threat of a national security incident only.

Then during the course of an investigation, it's well understood if we're investigating a terrorist, if we get a lead that Khalid Sheikh Mohammed has a phone, we get his information, we are able to access records that are somehow connected to an alleged terrorist—or now an admitted terrorist, Khalid Sheikh Mohammed—we have to be able to have the means. Do we tip off someone like a Khalid Sheikh Mohammed that we're looking at his records? Of course not. That would be absurd.

So, it's a very different time and a very different war and we're observing Fourth Amendment rights. Now, Khalid Sheikh Mohammed is not an American. He is not an American citizen. He is not an American. But for Americans, when we are seeking a request for a record of an American, the Federal agent first has to go and get this approved by a judge.

I urge people, Mr. Speaker, go to my Facebook site. We have all of the documents up to verify and show all of the reasoning behind the Patriot Act.

And again, this is a very important discussion this evening. I want to thank my colleague STEVE KING for bringing this to people's attention. It's a very important vote. I've spent all week trying to get the basis for whether the vote should be "yes" or the vote should be "no," and I have confidence this evening that it was the right vote to cast a "yes" vote.

And again, I encourage anyone who is interested to go to my Facebook site and get all of this documentation. Read for yourselves. Make up your mind. But in my opinion, this passes constitutional muster. And I can assure every American I would not vote for this bill unless I thought it did pass constitutional muster.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, and thanking the gentlelady from Minnesota for coming to the floor on short notice to add clarity to this discussion and this debate and having the courage to stand up on these constitutional principles.

I have had it pointed out to me that the Fourth Amendment of the Constitution limits the Patriot Act. It's the protection against unreasonable search and seizure. Unreasonable. And these searches and seizures that have been found to be reasonable, in many cases by our Supreme Court across this land, are very well settled law, and the Patriot Act fits within the parameters of existing domestic surveillance.

And I would add that this Congress has protected itself in this fashion: that the major components of this Patriot Act that have been extended are extended for 4 years. That means that this Congress comes back again and evaluates the Patriot Act for constitutional and functionality within this 4-year period of time, and it will require reauthorization again. So we're carefully walking down this path making sure that the abuses do not take place.

And I, as a member of the Judiciary Committee and as one who has gone up

to the secure room and gone through a number of secure briefings that had to do with the functionality of the Patriot Act—it's a requirement on some of our parts here in this Congress to do that. I have also made a pledge to a number of other Members that I'll keep an eye on these constitutional functions and the respect for this statute that's given by the Federal agents that are allowed to utilize the Patriot Act. And that will be a never-ending vigilance here in this Congress. It always is. And protecting constitutional rights is a never-ending vigilance.

One of the people who is very duly vigilant who, when the rest of us take a little break and catch some sleep at night, is back keeping his eye on the functions of government, one of the relentless and incessant providers of protection of liberty and constitutional protection and one of the scholars on the Constitution here is the gentleman from Texas.

I'd be happy to yield such time as he may consume to Mr. LOUIE GOHMERT.

Mr. GOHMERT. I thank my friend from Iowa, my very dear friend.

As my friend knows, he and I've both been extremely vigilant in following up on these issues. But I wanted to point out, there is a lot of confusion. There are people on television that are just making these claims that the Constitution has been thrown away, and they haven't looked at how these three provisions that have been extended for 4 years were being used.

Now, my first year here, 2005, we were taking up the Patriot Act, and I had concerns then. I still have concerns, because these things, these powers, these three have been held constitutional, and I think they are. The problem comes in the potential for abuse.

And the reason I ended up catching a lot of grief from some of the leaders in our party back in 2005 as a freshman was I wanted to have sunsets on some provisions so that we could get leverage, because as we saw from Attorney General Gonzales, when he was head of the Justice Department, and as we have seen with Attorney General Holder, Departments of Justice are not very forthcoming no matter what party they are when the Congress asks for information. Now, they will say, Oh, yeah, we'll give you whatever you need, but they're not very forthcoming.

And it's not until powers that they want to keep come up for sunset, that they could go away and they need them renewed, and they know they need them renewed because they are helpful in keeping the country safe, but it's only then that they come forward and say, Oh, by the way, what was it that you made in your request a year ago that we never did provide you? And that basically happened back in 2004 and 2005.

And that was one of the reasons I was pushing we've got to have sunsets, because the only way to deal with these issues and make sure the abuses are

not occurring of these constitutional powers is to put sunsets, and that way they come forward with the information and those of us that have the security clearances can go in. Now, not everybody who has security clearances has enough interest to go wading through this material like my friend from Iowa and I have.

But I think part of the problem has been people have been confused with the abuses that occurred, the outrageous abuses that occurred with the national security letter power, which has been reined in some, still not enough for my liking. And I really would like to rein in the national security letter power even further because it is not required to go before a district judge like these powers that we extended tonight for 3 years. That's where the abuses were. That's where the IG report said they were. And so that's where a tremendous amount of vigilance needs to be placed in making sure that the Justice Department does adequate vigilance themselves in not abusing the power they have.

And I'm sure I didn't make the Director of the FBI very happy when I pointed this out to him in committee, but it's what I believe, and that is that this Director came in to the FBI and eventually implemented—he called it a 5-year up-or-out policy. So that if you were a supervisor in the FBI, of a field office anywhere in the country, and you did 5 years in that location, at the end of 5 years, you had to either move to Washington, move up to Washington, or get out of the FBI. Move out, basically.

□ 2020

We have lost thousands of years of experience from our FBI. Now, I know what it is to be an aggressive prosecutor, young, out of law school. Had a little more hair back then. And boy, we are going to get the bad guys. There's something to be said for experience.

So it's not been uncommon to have FBI field offices around the country go, for example, from having a supervisor with 25 years of experience, he or she had seen it, done it, been there, and able to learn from mistakes, make wise decisions, and yet because of the 5-year up-or-out policy, they end up having to leave because they're not moving to Washington. And when they do, we have had offices, for example, come in and the new supervisor has 5 or 6 years' experience, the head supervisor. We go from 25, 26 years to 5 or 6; it's not good for the FBI. These are fantastic agents. Take nothing away from their knowledge and ability, but there is something to be said for 25 years of experience as a law enforcement officer. We lost that.

As we lost that, we began to see these vast abuses of the National Security Letters. And people need to know that the National Security Letter power was not up for renewal tonight. It is something I would like to address further because it has such tremendous

potential for abuse. I am hoping we can deal with that. I also further hope that those who were really upset or concerned will not just take demagogued statements, but will actually look into this, as I have.

And I have spent no telling how many hours pouring through material, classified material, pouring through the laws, the interpretation of the laws. These powers are basically the same powers the FBI has, these three that we renewed tonight, basically the same powers the FBI has to go after organized crime; and now they're allowed to do it with terrorism.

They pertain to terrorists, or agents, foreign agents of foreign powers. So if they're properly supervised, as I know my friend from Iowa and I will do unless we get kicked off of the Judiciary Committee, but as long as we're allowed to be there, and as unpleasant as some people find our positions at times, we want to make sure there's adequate supervision.

That's what I intend to do. That's what I know my friend from Iowa intends to do. That is what our friend MICHELLE BACHMANN from Minnesota will do. That's one of the most diligent people I have ever seen in anything. And I'm not sure there is another Member of Congress or the Senate that has a master's in any area of law. She has a master's in law.

So you have got people that are diligent, that understand the law, have studied it, and are looking into the allegations. I am comfortable with what we did tonight only to the extent that I know that there will be an awful lot more nights like I have had the last two nights where I get 1½, 2 hours sleep because there is so much to review, so much to cover, so much to read because of this important responsibility we have been handed.

But I hope people understand National Security Letters have been the area where there has been great abuse. Supposedly that's been reined in. But the reason some of us on the Republican side demanded sunsets on these is not because we think they are unconstitutional, but because we have got to have leverage to use with the Justice Department, no matter which party is in power in the White House, to make sure that our freedoms are preserved and Congress can use its power, have power, have leverage that gets respected by the Justice Department.

I appreciate my friend for yielding.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time and thanking the gentleman from Texas, Judge Gohmert, who does do due diligence in this Congress, it occurs to me as I listen to the discussion here and participate in it, that there was a decided lack of enthusiasm for the Patriot Act on the part of Barack Obama when he was a partisan Senator. The most liberal Senator by voting record out of the 100 Senators in the United States Senate, and that includes BERNIE SANDERS, the self-proclaimed socialist who voted somewhat to

the right of Barack Obama when they were in the Senate together.

This candidate for President then, Barack Obama, had a position that was less than favorable towards this Patriot Act, but as he became President, sat down with his briefings, which I presume and hope are daily briefings, and he began to understand the threat against the United States that exists domestically and abroad. His position on the Patriot Act began to migrate. And perhaps as we speak now he is picking up his pen to sign the Patriot Act, the extensions of the three provisions that were approved here tonight that extends them for a 4-year period of time.

That, Mr. Speaker, brings this back before this Congress. And it means also that all of the people that are utilizing the Patriot Act within the sections 206, the roving wiretap; and 215, the business records component of this; and section 6001(a), the lone wolf component, each of which were extended here by this Congress for 4 years, all of the Federal agents that would be utilizing these provisions will be very well aware that Congress will be reviewing these provisions within 4 years of today. So they will be very careful I think to comply with the law. And I think this is a prudent extension rather than the effort to make it permanent. I think it's prudent to temporarily extend these provisions of the Patriot Act.

As the gentleman from Texas alluded, and I will just say I would like to reiterate and emphasize this point, of all of the things that we have heard and the things that we have heard up in the secure room from the classified standpoint, the things that we have heard before the Judiciary Committee and the many hearings that we have had, the challenge that was put out towards President Bush in a partisan effort, I think, to undermine the Patriot Act before the last Presidential election in November of 2008, all of those efforts, not one individual was produced who had had their constitutional rights usurped. Not one. Not one had lost their constitutional rights under the Patriot Act.

It would seem to me that of all of the encounters that have taken place under the Patriot Act for all these years, if there had been serious abuses of people's constitutional rights, we would have heard from an individual. And then a statement is made that, well, we won't know because we don't have access to these records, that they are all secret. Well, but the records are reported to the FISA court, and the FISA court evaluates them. And the reason we know that those records exist is because there is a requirement of the court reporting. But still, not an individual has come forward who has had their constitutional rights and their civil rights abused.

Now, that doesn't mean I am not taking a position here, Mr. Speaker, that it has not happened. And I am not tak-

ing the position that it could not happen. My position is that if it had been endemic, if it had been something that was systematically grinding through the civil rights of Americans or individuals that are in the United States and under the protections of our laws and our Constitution, we would know some of those names, we would know some of those faces, we would understand those incidents.

And one of the hardest things you can do in this business is to try to explain something that is law without putting a face on it; to try to explain a flaw that they argue might exist within the Patriot Act without being able to give an example or an anecdote to put that face on it so people can see by example how things work.

We are only dealing with data here. We are dealing with data here because we don't have the individual examples. They have not come forward. They have not been identified, however mightily some have tried to produce them. So I support the extensions that we passed here tonight. It is something that I have worked with here in this Congress into my ninth year. It's very much something we have examined, I think, very thoroughly with hearing after hearing, and intense debate, and amendments that were offered, as well as the secure briefings that take us much deeper into the practices of the Patriot Act.

So the three components that were extended here tonight for 4 years, the roving wiretaps, which are just absolutely necessary. If you can imagine Khalid Sheikh Mohammed running around, or Moussaoui running around the United States with a gym bag full of disposable cell phones, using one for a little while and tossing it in the trash, and then another and another and another, you have got to be able to switch and have the roving wiretap follow the individual rather than follow a single land line that might be there.

□ 2030

It just makes simple sense. It existed since the eighties for domestic investigations of crime, including organized crime.

We have the business records component of this, also extended for 4 years, that allows those business records to be accessed, to be able to look for patterns, patterns that would indicate the acts, the planning of terrorism against the American people.

We have the lone wolf provision, which says an agent of a foreign power, if that agent of a foreign power is operating, under the suspicion that that's the case, they can go in and do investigations, that also is extended for 4 years.

It was a difficult negotiation here in the House and in the Senate. It did come down to the last minute. Sometimes here in Congress we can only do things at the last minute.

I would like to, Mr. Speaker, transition this subject matter into another

subject matter that I understand the gentleman from Texas is prepared to discuss. In this brief segue, and I expect to yield so the gentleman from Texas can take this subject matter up, but in this transition and in this week, I think it's important that the House of Representatives and the American people consider what has happened with regard to especially the Middle East. Having come back from a trip through that area of the world and been briefed on a lot of our national security issues over in that part of the world, it comes to mind as I watched President Obama's speech last week about the Global War on Terror and about his efforts from a tactical, a geopolitical and a diplomatic effort in the Middle East, naming country after country that have gone through the Arab spring, as we now call it, the unrest in places like Egypt and Tunisia, and the list goes on. Certainly Libya is part of this. As I read carefully through President Obama's speech that I understand he delivered at the State Department about a week ago or so, if you take Israel out of the speech, the rest of it read like George W. Bush delivering the Bush Doctrine. A lot of that philosophy I support, that if you give people an opportunity to grasp and achieve and succeed with the beginnings of freedom, they'll turn their focus from hatred and from terrorism towards building their communities, their families and their countries and towards commerce. That philosophy is beginning to emerge with a level of success in Iraq, for example. It has been a belief of George Bush and known as the Bush Doctrine for a long time. As I listened to President Obama, who was critical of that approach and that doctrine and our involvement in places like Iraq and Afghanistan, I would point out that he gave a Bush Doctrine speech, with the exception of Israel. There, President Obama, I'll say, broke the mold and went down a new path, a bit of a surprising path, unless you are reading between the lines on his position on Israel in prior times, to make the argument that there would be a two-state solution between Israel and the Palestinians, that the Palestinians would have a single contiguous country. Right now it's either two pieces, West Bank and Gaza, or three pieces, West Bank, Gaza and whatever their claim might be to the Golan Heights. If you look at the map, it's not possible to tie together a contiguous Palestinian state without severing Israel from its components.

It was interesting, also, that President Obama said, well, this is how we want to do this, a contiguous Palestinian state, a two-state solution, and the issue of Jerusalem, we'll just set that aside for now but they have to go back to the '67 borders. That had to have caused a lot of Israelis and American Jewish people and those of us who have a strong support and affinity for Israel to take a deep breath and gasp and wonder what did the President

mean? Why did he throw all that confusion into the situation in Israel? And the statement that he made resulted in putting Israel at even greater risk, undermining their security, making their negotiating position less stable and encouraging more pushback from the Palestinian effort and their sympathizers and the terrorists that are part of the government, the Palestinians, who refuse to acknowledge Israel's right to exist. You cannot negotiate with people who are determined to annihilate you, and as Binyamin Netanyahu said, they're not going to concede the strategic locations that allow Israel to defend itself.

When Prime Minister Netanyahu spoke behind where I stand right now a couple of days ago, I think it was an historic speech, I think that he laid out the parameters that can allow the Jewish State of Israel to survive and defend itself against its enemies—and there are many—and I think he went about as far as he could without openly challenging the President of the United States who, by the way, had to walk back some of his comments a few days after his speech. So I'm happy with what has happened in the aftermath of President Obama's speech that I believe erroneously said that Israel would have to go back to the pre-'67 war boundaries.

But I want to, Mr. Speaker, as I turn this floor over to the gentleman from Texas, say to you and here before the American people that that speech took place here in the United States Congress because of the activism and the foresight and the effort of Congressman GOHMERT who put that request together and got a lot of us to sign the letter of invitation and with that support took it to Speaker BOEHNER who, as I understand it, issued the invitation, and the timing of it was impeccable timing in the aftermath of President Obama's speech, and at the time that there are critical issues taking place in the world, the Prime Minister of Israel, Binyamin Netanyahu, stepped here on the floor of the United States Congress and spoke before a joint session of Congress, and the joint session of Congress that received him as a representative of Israel with the warmest of welcomes that anyone could ask for, with instantaneous and spontaneous standing ovations, two or three of those before a word was uttered and several more before there was any word of substance uttered, the warmth and the bond and the commitment to stand up and support Israel not just in spirit, not just politically, but tactically and monetarily as well, was clearly demonstrated here in the joint session of Congress. That is thanks to the gentleman from Texas.

And so, Mr. Speaker, as I wrap this up, I would thank you for your attention and your indulgence, and I would yield back the balance of my time.

## ISRAEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) will control the remainder of the hour.

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I am so grateful that I have such a dear friend from Iowa as Mr. STEVE KING. There's no price you can put on a dear friend like that. Thank you.

I would like to continue on in this discussion about the President's speech. I'm not quite sure what the President had in mind when he decided to rush over to the State Department and make a speech, when he knew the Prime Minister of our dear ally, Israel, was traveling to come to the United States. He knew that when he gave the speech that the Prime Minister would be at a great disadvantage. It was a speech, as I understand it, that wasn't run by the Prime Minister, was quite a surprise to him, and, in fact, when there were hints that the President might make the statements he did, there was a pleading not to do so.

□ 2040

I don't know if those are stories or, actually, how it occurred. That's no way to carry on international relations. It's certainly no way to treat our friends. It's not hard to understand that when it comes to international relations, if you treat your enemies better than you treat your friends, then your friends will desire to be your enemies, and you will get what you desire.

I don't know what the people in the White House are thinking; this is a friend. You don't do this to friends. So he jumps out and goes to the State Department where he has got a captive audience. Well, I say captive, apparently from what's on statements that have been made, the president of the Islamic Society of North America, which is a listed coconspirator in the Holy Land Foundation trial for funding Hamas, a terrorist organization, this president of the listed coconspirator of funding, or in the Holy Land Foundation trial for funding Hamas, made comments about the speech because he had been invited to be in the inner sanctum of our State Department by this administration.

This administration, this President, chose to make a speech, basically slapping a friend in the face, and at the same time invite the president of a listed coconspirator for funding terrorism to be in attendance so he could talk about how wonderful the speech was. The same Imam Majid, the president of the Islamic Society of North America that we find from reading the transcript of the speech that the number two person in the National Security Administration, the deputy National Security Adviser, said this spring, as he addressed the All Dulles Area Muslim Society, which they like to call ADAMS, for short, he thanked

Imam Majid, the president, this listed coconspirator, for his remarks and also to talk about how wonderful his prayer was at the White House Iftar celebration last year, which is the celebration in Islam that marks the end of the fasting of Ramadan.

And in the remarks, the deputy National Security Adviser of the United States commented on the President noting that this was really a continuation of the Iftar celebration that Thomas Jefferson had, once again, marking that the President is not getting good information about our Nation's history.

There are not 57 States; we are not, as the President said, producing more oil now than we ever have. You don't have to go back that far. We were producing 9.6 million billion barrels a day, and now we are producing 5.5. Do the math, if somebody will be honest enough to give the President the right information.

He says we never had more people on the border than we do right now. Somebody show the history of 1916 when a President—who I don't have a great deal of admiration for, Woodrow Wilson—knew that it was wrong to have a Mexican bandit, or a bandit group led by Pancho Villa come into the United States and be responsible for killing a handful of American citizens.

That was enough to motivate the President at that time to call up something new called the National Guard and to send General Pershing down there with over 10,000 troops to go into Mexico, root out the troublemakers—many were killed even though he didn't catch Pancho Villa, but the murders stopped. The intrusions into the United States across our sovereign border stopped. The 100,000-plus National Guard troops that were placed on our border in 1916 made sure that the intrusions stopped.

And by General Pershing going in, they made sure that they were not going to want to come try that again. That's how you deal with domestic or foreign terrorism. You can't try to love people and you can love your enemies and in Christianity we are taught to do that. And as individual Christians, that's what we are supposed to do.

But when we take an oath to defend this Constitution, when we have the responsibility of an oath to defend this Nation, to provide for the common defense, then it is incumbent upon us to provide for the common defense, and we have a different standard for which we have to answer.

So, yes, Christians are supposed to love one another. But the government's responsibility, as noted in Romans 13, is, as the scripture tells, someone tempted to do evil. If you do evil, be afraid, because God does not give the government the sword in vain.

We have a responsibility to provide for a free society and a safe society where people will be free to love each other and to make free choices. And, yes, when there is a religion that has