RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Armed Services:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 27, 2010.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI: This letter serves as my intent to resign from the Committee on Armed Services, effective today, May 27, 2010.

Sincerely,

BILL SHUSTER,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

ADMINISTRATION GIVES FALSE IMPRESSION

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, one day after the administration announced that President Obama would send National Guard troops to secure the border, the State Department announced that—surprise—the Guard troops would not be used to stop illegal immigration. This suggests the National Guard announcement was designed to leave Americans with a false impression that the administration was going to strengthen border security.

There appears to be a contradiction within the administration; we don't know who to believe from one day to the next. We are starting to learn on health care, on taxes, on transparency, on the stimulus, and now on immigration policy that the administration's words are seldom what they appear to be.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. POE of Texas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. KLEIN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. KLEIN of Florida addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MORAN of Kansas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. WHITFIELD addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

□ 2310

LEGAL CESSPOOLS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

There are certain requirements of this body that the Constitution sets forth. This is the body that controls the purse strings of the country. This body has an obligation to make sure that we act cautiously and carefully in spending the money that we legally steal from those who produce it. It would be theft except we are authorized to pass laws to make it legal theft when we take it from people who produce that money in this country, but it should come home to folks around this body that we have an obligation to those people to be conscientious in the things we do; and, accordingly, it is the obligation of this body to prepare a budget in order to have control over our appropriations.

The people who I serve with, who have been here for years, say this is the first year they recall ever not voting on a budget in the House of Representatives. There is no budget. When politics is more important than actually protecting the country that we are sworn to protect, then from a political viewpoint, it's easy to see why someone might want to do this for the first time in so many years and avoid putting forth a budget. Because if a budget were brought forth in this election year with so many people already upset—with tea parties so angry at the vast overspending—they would be able to see exactly how off the charts this body's spending has been and is projected to be with that money that we legally steal from people who produce it in the country.

So we haven't had time or the political fortitude to step up in this body and to prepare a budget as is required. We have an obligation to protect private property; but as we have seen with the gulf coast, that hasn't happened.

We heard this week from the Minerals Management Service and from those with the Department of the Interior that they have been on guard since day one, since this bill happened. Well, why wouldn't they have been on guard since day one when drilling commenced?

We know from the records and from the hearings we've had that, when the Deepwater Horizon platform was put in place back in 2001, for the first 40 months it was in place, every month, as is supposed to occur, there were offshore inspections done. From there, it gets very fuzzy. We find out that MMS can't tell us exactly how many inspections there have been since then of the Deepwater Horizon platform and of their drilling operations.

We did hear in our hearing and during the question-and-answer time—it was part of the public record yesterday in Natural Resources—that they're not really sure how many times the inspections occurred, but what some of us, through some digging, had found out is that there is one entity, and one alone, in the Minerals Management Service that is allowed to be unionized, and that is the offshore inspectors.

Now, that struck some of us as strange because the offshore inspectors