

Prepared statement from Rep. Louie Gohmert (TX-01)

After the attack on our military at Ft. Hood, we suffered another shooting on a military installation here at the Naval Yard, followed by the Obama administration appearing to do nothing effective to prevent such future attacks.

Our military members may be authorized overseas to carrying automatic weapons, shoot RPGs, drop bombs, fire tanks or missiles, so **why shouldn't they be able to carry a weapon on military installations here in the United States?**

Some commanders have an issue with either concealed carry or open carry or both. Some commanders have said that there are some people overseas we don't let carry weapons, and we know from experience that some have returned suffering potentially from PTSD who need to be checked out. Fine. If someone wishes to carry on a military installation, let them go through a check first, then allow them.

At a minimum, we should have military members in addition to MP's who are authorized to carry weapons, at least during their time as a person in charge of a particular area such as a duty officer or enlisted member.

As an article by Arthur Berg in The Wall Street Journal once said, these people want to conclude their attack themselves. So, if they are afraid someone will shoot them before they conclude it, then they would not commit the attack to begin with. Former Chairman McKeon had committed to pushing for language in a previous conference report to address these concerns, but was unsuccessful.

I would ask that the Committee please address this issue in the NDAA. I just know we have gotten military members killed twice, and to prevent our military members trained with weapons from defending themselves on their own military installation should be unconscionable.

**On a different note,** I visit with so many friends who are in different services of our military, and heard from a few just in the last week including one at Ft. Hood on Friday about an issue I would also ask be addressed in this bill. It is regarding the prohibitions in the free exercise of religion that some commanders enforce. We have individual Christians or Christian Chaplains who are told that they cannot end their prayer "in Jesus name." The Bible says Jesus told his followers that to ask for things "IN MY NAME." No Commander who has ever ordered a Christian not to mention Jesus would ever tell a Muslim you cannot mention the name of Allah. So Christians simply ask for the same protection for their religious beliefs.

**One other issue:** At Ft. Hood after the presentation of Purple Hearts last Friday, I was shocked to find out that the normal benefits that go with a Purple Heart were not accompanying the medal. One of the wounded with permanent scars and damage told me after I apologized for her not yet getting the Purple Heart benefits, said, "Sir, it was like the Army saying 'You don't really deserve a Purple Heart, so we will give you the medal but you don't get the normal benefits because you don't really even deserve the medal.' " Another soldier pointing to a Ft Hood victim with obvious significant skull damage said maybe he'd deserve benefits if he had only gotten a scratch like Secretary Kerry did in Viet Nam instead of being shot in the head.

Murderer, Traitor & Enemy Combatant Hasan gave repeated warning to senior Army officers that if he were ordered to deploy, he would have to protect what we know are radical Islamist enemies. He even quoted the identical jihadist texts used by al Qaeda from the Koran. He was clearly participating in the war against the U.S. military. If the Army needs money to pay the benefits to those at Ft. Hood who actually deserved the Purple Hearts, you could direct the firing of those who are denying benefits to such worthy American soldiers and give their pay and benefits to our Ft. Hood patriots."