

to the credit of the United Nations Security Council, the United Nations Security Council imposed modest sanctions on the Iranians about a year ago, and there is some evidence that these sanctions are beginning to work.

The United States sanctions, which were led by then-ranking member ROSLEHTINEN and now chairwoman, and by then-Chairman BERMAN, now ranking member, and frankly that relied upon the work of Senator KIRK in the Senate, focused on a gasoline embargo. It's an odd fact, but Iran, which is a country which exports crude oil, imports about 40 percent of its gasoline because its economy is so dysfunctional that it cannot refine its own products. Before the U.S. sanctions were imposed, the price of a gallon of gasoline heavily subsidized in Iran was 38 cents a gallon. Today it's \$1.58 a gallon.

Now what does this mean? It means that an Iranian citizen who used to have to work 1 hour to fill their gas tank once a week now has to work 5 hours to fill their gas tank once a week. This is not a huge sacrifice, but it's making a dent in the economy of Iran.

It is our intention, obviously, not to in any way punish or jeopardize the well-being of the Iranian people. They are our friends, and we want them to be our friends and allies for years to come. But the simple, and I think compelling, logic of these sanctions is we are compelling the Iranian leadership to choose between pursuing their nuclear weapons ambitions but suffering economic consequences or abandoning those nuclear weapons ambitions and having the opportunity to restore their economy to some basic degree of health.

By the way, at a time when crude oil prices were rising, the Iranian economy stagnated. They had a negative growth of 1 percent last year, and they had stagnant growth the year before that. So at a time when they should have been enjoying robust economic growth because of rising crude oil prices, they were stagnant because of the effectiveness of these sanctions.

Perhaps the best evidence of effectiveness was from President Ahmadinejad himself, who this week stood before their parliament defending a cabinet member of his who is accused of some wrongdoing and said that one of the reasons why they had to engage in the wrongdoing was their economy was in bad shape because "we can't do international banking transactions anymore." Well, there's some good news.

What I'm suggesting here is that the House should move rapidly to embrace and support the legislation that the Foreign Relations Committee marked up yesterday. And I think that legislation will enjoy broad Republican and Democratic support, as it did yesterday. I believe it was approved unanimously by the committee. I would then urge our administration to work with the Congress and sign such legislation and implement it.

Now, listen, Madam Speaker, I fully understand that sanctions alone may not be sufficient. And I'm not here today to argue for that proposition. What I am here today to argue for is the proposition that the sanctions we have imposed thus far have shown some signs of success. I think this is the time to intensify those sanctions, not to weaken them. I think this is a time for us to intensify our unified national resolve on this question. And despite our very profound differences on matters of economics and social policy, which is what a democracy ought to have, there should be no difference between us on the question of standing in a unified fashion in favor of more intense sanctions against Iran. The need is urgent and compelling.

□ 1440

You know, Madam Speaker, if someone had stood in this Chamber in the mid-1990s and said, If we don't focus our intelligence efforts on an obscure group of former mujahedin rebels in Afghanistan called al Qaeda, if we don't do that, the day may come when we will have a domestic Pearl Harbor, when the World Trade Centers will collapse, when thousands of people will perish, when the Pentagon, our own air space, will be attacked by civilians in our country, I think one would have thought that the Member was auditioning for a Tom Clancy film. It would sound very fantastic, very unlikely, and almost like science fiction or a spy thriller.

I wish September 11, 2001, had been fiction—I wish. That we had not had to go to those funerals and comfort those families who suffer today, I wish that were the fact. And there will be some who will say that the scenario we talked about earlier, about a nuclear IED exploding in Times Square or the National Mall or an NFL football game, is too provocative or too sensational or too scary. I hope they're absolutely right; I hope it's total fiction.

But I think we ought to know better. I think we ought to know better that there is a regime which has demonstrated its deceit, which has manifested its evil toward its own people and to our troops in the Middle East, that has used language that is more than just purple language, that is language that goes beyond the pale about the annihilation of Israel and of all those who would stand with Israel, and that now stands accused—or persons alleged to have been tied to that regime now stand accused in our courts of participating in a conspiracy to assassinate a foreign diplomat on our soil. These are people we should be concerned about.

And as we look at the question of whether such an attack could happen, I think the question is unequivocally: Yes, it can. Our responsibility is to, with equal equivocation, say, no, it won't, no, it won't; that we will use the resources at our disposal—our international alliances, our economic lever-

age, our diplomatic skill—to try to move the Iranians to the point where they would accept a reasonable deal which says if you want to have nuclear power plants in your country, that's your sovereign right; but you must buy your fuel from outside the country and you must abandon your ability to manufacture and synthesize fuel. That's a reasonable and fair settlement. We should use every tool at our disposal to encourage the Iranian Government to accept such a settlement.

And as any wise President should do, as President Obama has done, as President Bush did before him, as President Clinton did before him, as President Bush did before him, as Presidents Reagan and Carter did before them, any prudent American President must reserve the right to defend our sovereign interests with whatever tools are necessary should the need arise. I pray that the need will never arise. And I think if we act intelligently, forcefully, but urgently, I think that we can avoid that day and avoid a situation like I described earlier.

So, Madam Speaker, thank you for this time this afternoon. I'd like to again thank the staff for its indulgence. I commend the chairwoman of our committee and the ranking member. And I look forward to supporting their legislation, broadening our unified, bipartisan national effort to stand strong against the tyranny and evil of this regime and for the welfare of innocent people throughout the world and throughout our country.

I yield back the balance of my time.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.J. RES. 2

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, I request that my name be removed as a sponsor to H.J. Res. 2.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

DOMESTIC AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to be here on the floor to hear my friend from New Jersey's comments, very well thought through. And I feel sure we can find some commonality in our concerns and appreciate the man's heart and mind. Thank you.

One of the things under the debt ceiling act that was passed early August was a requirement for a vote on a balanced budget amendment. There are different versions of a balanced budget amendment. One has most of the things we hold dear, not only a requirement of balancing the budget, but also

a cap to spending as a percentage of gross domestic product, and also an increased supermajority in order to pass any tax bills raising taxes.

My concern has been that we had a wave election last November. We got over 80 new conservative freshmen, and we haven't cut spending like we should. I am more and more compelled that we need a cap on spending. All of our Members support that. But the question will be: What version of a balanced budget amendment will come to the floor for a vote?

I really do appreciate the comments of my friend from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS). There's been a lot going on in the Middle East. And it's not looking very good for those who love freedom, the right to make their own choices, because you find in some of the documentation of those who have pushed, supported rebellion, the so-called Arab Spring, their definition of freedom is the freedom to live under shari'a law and be completely governed by shari'a law. That's the freedom that their Arab Spring brings.

And it's been interesting, there's an article here from the Washington Examiner by Gregory Kane. The title says, "Obama Becomes 'Silent Cal' on Libya, Shari'a." I'd just like to read this for the RECORD. And I'm inserting "President" into the mention of President Obama:

With each passing day, we're learning more and more about the people President Obama tossed us into bed with in Libya.

Here's a headline from the London Daily Mail, a British newspaper:

"Now the rebels impose Shariah law as Islamic rules become 'basic source' of Libyan legislation."

In the story below the headline, readers learn from the chairman of Libya's National Transition Council that the country's new parliament will have "an Islamist tint," that "any existing laws contradicting the teachings of Islam would be nullified" and that men would be allowed to have as many as four wives.

Again, the question must be put to Barack Hussein "American Values" Obama, president of the United States: exactly how do Shariah law and polygamy reflect American values?

Remember, when President Obama justified American and NATO airstrikes in Libya to support the rebel forces that toppled the regime of Moammar Qadhafi he claimed that preventing bloodshed was an "American value."

But there was bloodshed aplenty, as least on the side of Qadhafi forces. Qadhafi himself was a victim of the bloodshed, and the circumstances of his death that have come to light shed more light on what a sham Obama's claim of acting to preserve American values really is.

In a separate London Daily Mail story about Qadhafi's death, the paper printed the photo of an unidentified rebel who claimed he was the one who killed Qadhafi.

"We grabbed [Qadhafi]," the young man said. "I hit him in the face. Some fighters wanted to take him away and that's when I shot him, twice, in the face and in the chest."

Later, it was revealed that more was done to Qadhafi than this young rebel merely shooting him in the face and chest.

Some reports say that, before he died, Qadhafi was sodomized with either a knife, bayonet or some other sharp object.

So let's recap:

President Obama commits American forces—as part of NATO.

□ 1450

I'll parenthetically add, when he did not have the sense to come before Congress and make the case here, as many of us on both sides of the aisle have been advocating. No matter who the President is, Republican, Democrat, if you can't come to Congress and make the case as to why American lives and American treasure should be put at risk, is it really something we ought to be doing as a country?

Now, resuming with the article:

1. President Obama commits American forces—as part of NATO—to supporting a rebel faction in Libya whose goal is to overthrow Qadhafi. Obama does this while having absolutely no clue about what kind of people make up this rebel faction.

2. The rebel forces prevail, primarily through NATO airstrikes. It was a NATO airstrike that took out a Qadhafi convoy fleeing Sirte that allowed rebel forces to capture the deposed Libyan leader.

3. Qadhafi ends up in the hands of what can only be considered a mob. He is beaten, tortured, possibly sodomized, and fatally shot in what has been oxymoronically described as "mob justice." His body is then put on public display in a meat store.

4. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton flies into Libya and announces, with the smug arrogance we might expect from an official from Obama's administration, "We came, we saw, he [Qadhafi] died."

5. Leaders of Libya's National Transition Council announce that Shariah law will prevail in Libya.

6. President Obama is mum on No. 5.

He—President Obama—hasn't said one word about the blatantly false account of Qadhafi's death that interim Libyan Prime Minister Mahmoud Jibril initially gave reporters.

He hasn't condemned the "mob justice" that led to Qadhafi's death, the beating, the torture, the alleged sodomizing. He hasn't mumbled so much as a syllable about Qadhafi's body being put on display in a meat store.

Obama hasn't said one word about Shariah being the law of the land in the new Libya. The man who was unavoidable for comment when it came to justifying American intervention in Libya has now pulled a complete Harpo Marx Act.

On this issue, Obama—President Obama—has made "Silent" Cal Coolidge look like a motor mouth.

That's an article from Gregory Kane in the Washington Examiner.

Then, interestingly, from the American Thinker, an article by Andrew Bostom, "Liberated Libya: Al Qaeda Flag Aloft Benghazi's Courthouse."

The courthouse in Benghazi, is the iconic seat of the revolt which toppled Qadhafi—Libya's "(im) moral equivalent" to Egypt's Tahrir Square. During the tumultuous months of Libya's brutal civil war, it was here that rebel forces established a provisional government, and propagandistic media center, crowing to foreign journalists about their "heroic" struggle "for freedom." [Picture of al Qaeda flag]

One can now see both the Libyan rebel flag and the flag of al Qaeda fluttering atop Benghazi's courthouse.

I've got a blowup of that right here.

Just so those who felt so compelled to assist members of al Qaeda, we knew

they were members of al Qaeda. We didn't know how many were part of the Libyan rebel forces, but we knew there were members of al Qaeda. We knew that there were people who were rebelling against Qadhafi, that as much as they wanted to kill Qadhafi want to kill Americans. And now we also know NATO forces, as the President kept saying, Oh, no, we're going to leave that to NATO forces. The United States military makes up 65 percent of NATO's military. It's American.

So let's look and recap the good that we've done in supporting those members of al Qaeda who took out Qadhafi, with whom this administration had lawful dealings before they decided to support taking him out and, hiding under NATO's name, took action to see that he was thrown out and, now, killed, brutalized.

So here we are, the al Qaeda flag flying over the courthouse in Benghazi. That's the daylight photo. Over here on this third we have the nighttime photo; and, once again, there is the al Qaeda flag waving proudly over that historic courthouse in Benghazi.

Going back to the article from the American Thinker:

According to one Benghazi resident, Islamists driving brand-new SUVs and waving the black al Qaeda flag drive the city's streets at night shouting, "Islamiya, Islamiya! No East, nor West," a reference to previous worries that the country would be bifurcated between Qadhafi opponents in the east and the pro Qadhafi elements in the west.

Elhelwa adds these salient details:

Earlier this week, I went to the Benghazi courthouse and confirmed the rumors: an al Qaeda flag was clearly visible; its Arabic script declaring that "there is no God but Allah" and a full moon underneath. When I tried to take pictures, a Salafi-looking guard, wearing a green camouflage outfit, rushed towards me and demanded to know what I was doing. My response was straightforward: I was taking a picture of the flag. He gave me an intimidating look and hissed, "Whomever speaks ill of this flag, we will cut off his tongue"

How about that for an American value?

"I recommend that you don't publish these. You will bring trouble to yourself."

What glorious American values. Our President assured us that, without the support of Congress, without even a debate in Congress, he had to rush headlong into helping these people that turns out are, as we were concerned might be, al Qaeda. We had to help al Qaeda, with whom we had declared war, basically, by the President of the United States after 9/11 because they had declared war on us. And so this President, without coming and having a debate, decides he's going to go help these people before he knew who all exactly we were helping because they reflect American values.

Going back to the article. The author says:

"He followed me inside the courthouse, but luckily my driver Khaled was close by, and interceded on my behalf. According to Khaled, the guard had angrily threatened to

harm me. When I again engaged him in conversation, he told me "this flag is the true flag of Islam" . . .

Well, how about those American values that our President used our treasure, put our military members at risk in order to effectuate? Now we've got the al Qaeda flag flying in Libya, in Benghazi, over the historic courthouse that was the headquarters during the assault on Qadhafi.

□ 1500

We found out on 9/11 there were people in the world who were at war with us, and it turns out they had been at war with us at least since Iran, since those days when a naive but well-intentioned President named Carter had declared the Ayatollah Khomeini as a man of peace coming to Iran. The same President who gave away the Panama Canal that so many valued Americans lost their lives digging, creating, defending, was given away. There will be a price to pay for that at some point down the road by this country.

But we're already paying the price and have been since 1979 for the administration at that time while I was in the Army at Fort Benning watching those things happen, knowing it was a crime for me as a military member to criticize anybody in the chain of command, which was President Carter. We had to bite our tongues as we watched that administration welcome in the Ayatollah Khomeini.

So many lives have been lost. So many people tortured, killed. We've got Christians on the run all over the Middle East, Christians being killed around the Middle East. The last Christian church has now closed in Afghanistan that we sent American treasure and lives, lost so many American lives in order to rout the Taliban. And then we turn the country over to what the people there tell us is a very, very corrupt administration. Having met with leaders of the Northern Alliance with a few other Members of Congress, it's clear we have not done a good thing enforcing a centralized government in a country that cannot sustain it without mass corruption and brutality.

We also know from the recent comments of Karzai himself he's prepared to make peace and be an ally of people sworn to destroy us.

Afghanistan can be salvaged, but we have to be smart in the way that we do that. At the same time, we know that more of the 9/11 hijackers were from Saudi Arabia than from any other country. It certainly appears that there are people in Saudi Arabia who have made massive amounts of money because of our dependence on their oil who have used that money to fund terrorism that has been used against the United States to kill our precious men and women of our military.

We need to become energy independent. We need to get rid of any Department that has had as its avowed goal for 32 years to get off dependence on foreign energy and every year has

done a poorer and poorer job of that, although they have made some nice contributions for people at Solyndra and other bankrupt companies. It's time to get rid of the Energy Department.

It's time to get serious about stopping the dependence on foreign energy. We know we've got enough natural gas. We can actually do that now. We have at least 100 years of use of natural gas. And I am fine taking a percentage of the royalties the Federal Government could get off of natural gas produced, oil produced on our own land, our own Federal land, and using it toward alternative energy. But I am not, as most of my friends here, are not in favor of borrowing more money to throw at companies like Solyndra that cannot make it on their own.

Or like the solar company in Nevada, the friends of Leader HARRY REID also getting massive money, 42, 44 cents of every dollar, which we had to borrow to throw at their friends who had gone bankrupt.

It's time we started using some common sense. You don't rush in to help in a rebellion until you know who you're helping, and this administration did not do that because to think that they knew who we were helping is really unthinkable.

That's my hope and prayer that this administration did not understand who it was helping who would one day fly al Qaeda flags over a building where housed the Government in Libya.

And we have sat idly by and watched Iran grow greater and stronger in strength in its move toward creating nuclear weapons, just as my Democratic friend from New Jersey was talking about, Iran getting closer and closer to having nuclear weapons. Plural. Our strong ally in the Middle East, who is becoming surrounded by those who want to take it out, Israel, is at threat for losing its very existence, an existence that was acknowledged and affirmed unanimously in the United Nations before it was taken over by people who sympathize with those who fly the al Qaeda flag.

Back in those days, it was a unanimous decision: How could a country, a Jewish state like Israel, not be created after the worst genocide, Holocaust, in the history of man?

They needed a country of their own, and what better place than in a place where King David ruled 1,400 years before there was a man named Mohammed, 1,400 years before the creation of modern-day Islam.

Well, I'm proud to say that Joel Rosenberg is a friend of mine. I was visiting with him last night. He's got a brand-new book out. Can't wait to read it. Joel Rosenberg has an article in the Washington Times, Friday, October 21, needs to be entered in the RECORD, and I'll do so by reading it.

The headline, the title is "Confronting the threat from Iran."

Joel Rosenberg writes:

The brazen Iranian terrorist plot to assassinate the Saudi ambassador, kill Americans

and blow up the Saudi and Israeli embassies in Washington was a wake-up call. The radical regime in Tehran has crossed a red line. Iran has murdered Americans in Iraq, Afghanistan and Lebanon over the years. Now it appears to have ordered terrorist attacks inside our nation's capital. Should this prove true, Iran has engaged in an act of war.

Now the question is: Who will neutralize the threat from Iran before the mullahs finish building nuclear warheads and the ballistic missile systems to deliver them?

"The international community must stop Iran before it's too late," Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu warned in his United Nations speech last month. If Iran is not stopped, we will all face the specter of nuclear terrorism, and the Arab Spring could soon become an Iranian winter. . . . The world around Israel is definitely becoming more dangerous."

"Iran has not abandoned its nuclear program. The opposite is true; it continues full steam ahead," warned Maj. Gen. Eyal Eisenberg, home-front command chief for the Israel Defense Forces, in a September speech. He warned that the Arab Spring could turn into a "radical Islamic winter" and "this raises the likelihood of an all-out, total war, with the possibility of weapons of mass destruction being used."

The Obama administration is not taking decisive action to neutralize Iran. President Obama's policy of engagement with the mullahs has morphed into a policy of appeasement, and it has failed. Yet the White House has all but taken the use of force off the table. In September 2009, then-Defense Secretary Robert M. Gates said, "The reality is, there is no military option that does anything more than buy time." In April 2010, the New York Times reported that Mr. Gates had "warned in a secret three-page memorandum to top White House officials that the United States does not have an effective long-range policy for dealing with Iran's steady progress toward nuclear capability." Little has changed in the past 18 months. What's more, the administration is pressuring Israel not to launch a pre-emptive strike against Iran despite the growing threat of a second Holocaust.

The American people, however, expect and deserve better. A bipartisan poll conducted in September by Democrat Pat Caddell and Republican John McLaughlin found that 77 percent of Americans think the Obama administration's current policies toward stopping Iran's nuclear program "will fail." About 63 percent of Americans think Iran is the nation posing the greatest threat to us, ahead of China and North Korea. Remarkably, 63 percent of Americans also approve of pre-emptive military action against Iran if economic sanctions do not stop its nuclear program.

□ 1510

And they have not.

It is very clear that these sanctions have not slowed Iran from pursuing nuclear weapons. It appears very clear to those who look very long and who study the issue very long that Iran is counting on developing nuclear weapons before the sanctions totally cripple them, because they know, when they get nuclear weapons, they can then use them to extort the removal of the sanctions. They will not work in time. It's time to face up to that.

Going back to Joel Rosenberg's article:

War, of course, is not the preferred solution. There are a range of options a serious

American president could take to neutralize the Iranian threat. But none of them is likely to work unless the president is willing to publicly put the military option on the table and order the Pentagon to accelerate planning for massive airstrikes and special operations.

Will any of the Republican candidates for president step up? Articulating pro-growth economic policies is vital to the 2012 campaign, to be sure, but the GOP candidates must not drink the Kool-Aid that the economy is all that matters to the American people. To the contrary, anyone who is asking for the Republican nomination must articulate a clear, compelling and detailed strategy for neutralizing the threat posed by the apocalyptic, genocidal death cult in Tehran.

At the next debate, each of the Republican candidates for president should be pressed to directly answer the following questions:

1. As president of the United States, what specific actions would you take to stop Iran from obtaining and deploying nuclear weapons and using terrorism to advance its Islamic Revolution?

2. If you had intelligence that Iran was on the verge of building operational nuclear weapons, would your administration support an Israeli preemptive military strike on Iran's nuclear facilities?

3. Would you as president seriously consider ordering a pre-emptive strike by U.S. military forces to neutralize the Iranian nuclear threat?

Former Massachusetts Gov. Mitt Romney recently delivered a foreign-policy address in South Carolina in which he raised the Iranian threat. "Will Iran be a fully activated nuclear weapons state, threatening its neighbors, dominating the world's oil supply with a stranglehold on the Strait of Hormuz?" Mr. Romney asked. "In the hands of the ayatollahs, a nuclear Iran is nothing less than an existential threat to Israel. Iran's suicidal fanatics could blackmail the world." Mr. Romney noted that he would "begin discussions with Israel to increase the level of our military assistance and coordination" and would "reiterate that Iran obtaining a nuclear weapon is unacceptable." However, he did not specifically discuss how he would stop Iran from getting the bomb and sponsoring terrorist attacks.

Businessman Herman Cain has soared into the top tier of presidential candidates with a bold pro-growth tax-simplification plan, but he has spoken little of foreign policy. He has identified Iran as one of America's most serious national security threats and has been clear about his strong support for Israel. Drawing on his experience as a civilian contractor for the U.S. Navy working on ballistic-missile projects, Mr. Cain rightly has called for enhanced missile defenses to blunt an Iranian nuclear threat "I would make it a priority to upgrade all of our Aegis surface-to-air ballistic-missile defense capabilities of all of our warships, all the way around the world," Mr. Cain told the Values Voter Summit in Washington earlier this month. "Make that a priority, and then say to [Iranian President Mahmoud] Ahmadinejad, 'Make my Day.'" His instincts are right, but missile defenses are insufficient to neutralize the Iranian threat.

Few of the GOP candidates better understand the Iranian threat—and the dangerous end-times theology of the current Iranian leadership, which is preparing for the coming of the Shia messiah known as the "Twelfth Imam"—than former Sen. Rick Santorum of Pennsylvania. Thus far, however, he has not made Iran a major element of his campaign. Former House Speaker Newt Gingrich, Rep.

Michele Bachmann and Texas Gov. Rick Perry have barely mentioned the issue, though certainly they understand the dangers.

Only Rep. Ron Paul among the Republican contenders doesn't grasp the seriousness of the twin Iranian threats of terrorism and nuclear weapons. "One can understand why [the mullahs] might want to become nuclear-capable, if only to defend themselves and to be treated more respectfully," Mr. Paul has written. The congressman opposes economic sanctions on Iran. He opposes pre-emptive strikes on Iran. Indeed, Mr. Paul has indicated he does not have a problem with Iran acquiring nuclear weapons because he doesn't think the mullahs in Tehran would actually use such weapons against their enemies. What's more, he has stated that he would not come to Israel's defense if Iran fired nuclear weapons at the Jewish state.

This article by Joel Rosenberg is an excellent article, and it used to be taken seriously.

Knowing Herman Cain personally, Governor Rick Perry personally, MICHELE BACHMANN personally, Rick Santorum personally, Newt Gingrich personally, I know they're all concerned about it, but because of the way the debates have been structured, this has not been an issue that has been pushed. I know all of those individuals well enough to know their hearts and to know they do not want Iran to have nuclear weapons and that they will do what's necessary to prevent it. The trouble is none of those individuals will become President or even have the chance to become President for 18 months.

It's time that the American people convinced the American President of this, who helped create the situation where al Qaeda—our enemies, our sworn enemies who want to destroy it—can fly their flags over the Libyan courthouse. It was more than the Libyan courthouse. It was the brief capital, the headquarters, for the people that this President chose to help.

A dangerous time.

Now, I have filed House Resolution 271. It has got a slew of cosponsors. They're all Republican, but I would hope that some of my friends on the other side of the aisle would join in with us on this.

Madam Speaker, I would hope that people would encourage their Members of Congress to sign on if they support what's here.

Basically, most of this resolution—it's not terribly long; it's just six pages—and most of that are whereas clauses stating facts.

□ 1520

The text is as follows:

H. RES. 271

Whereas archeological evidence exists confirming Israel's existence as a nation over 3,000 years ago in the area in which it currently exists, despite assertions of its opponents;

Whereas with the dawn of modern Zionism, the national liberation movement of the Jewish people, some 150 years ago, the Jew-

ish people determined to return to their homeland in the Land of Israel from the lands of their dispersion;

Whereas in 1922, the League of Nations mandated that the Jewish people were the legal sovereigns over the Land of Israel and that legal mandate has never been superseded;

Whereas in the aftermath of the Nazi-led Holocaust from 1933 to 1945, in which the Germans and their collaborators murdered 6,000,000 Jewish people in a premeditated act of genocide, the international community recognized that the Jewish state, built by Jewish pioneers must gain its independence from Great Britain;

Whereas the United States was the first nation to recognize Israel's independence in 1948, and the State of Israel has since proven herself to be a faithful ally of the United States in the Middle East;

Whereas the United States and Israel have a special friendship based on shared values, and together share the common goal of peace and security in the Middle East;

Whereas, on October 20, 2009, President Barack Obama rightly noted that the United States-Israel relationship is a "bond that is much more than a strategic alliance";

Whereas the national security of the United States, Israel, and allies in the Middle East face a clear and present danger from the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran seeking nuclear weapons and the ballistic missile capability to deliver them;

Whereas Israel would face an existential threat from a nuclear weapons-armed Iran;

Whereas President Barack Obama has been firm and clear in declaring United States opposition to a nuclear-armed Iran, stating on November 7, 2008, "Let me state—repeat what I stated during the course of the campaign. Iran's development of a nuclear weapon I believe is unacceptable";

Whereas, on October 26, 2005, at a conference in Tehran called "World Without Zionism", Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad stated, "God willing, with the force of God behind it, we shall soon experience a world without the United States and Zionism";

Whereas the New York Times reported that during his October 26, 2005, speech, President Ahmadinejad called for "this occupying regime [Israel] to be wiped off the map";

Whereas, on April 14, 2006, Iranian President Ahmadinejad said, "Like it or not, the Zionist regime [Israel] is heading toward annihilation";

Whereas, on June 2, 2008, Iranian President Ahmadinejad said, "I must announce that the Zionist regime [Israel], with a 60-year record of genocide, plunder, invasion, and betrayal is about to die and will soon be erased from the geographical scene";

Whereas, on June 2, 2008, Iranian President Ahmadinejad said, "Today, the time for the fall of the satanic power of the United States has come, and the countdown to the annihilation of the emperor of power and wealth has started";

Whereas, on May 20, 2009, Iran successfully tested a surface-to-surface long range missile with an approximate range of 1,200 miles;

Whereas Iran continues its pursuit of nuclear weapons;

Whereas Iran has been caught building three secret nuclear facilities since 2002;

Whereas Iran continues its support of international terrorism, has ordered its proxy Hizbullah to carry out catastrophic acts of international terrorism such as the bombing of the Jewish AMIA Center in Buenos Aires, Argentina, in 1994, and could give

a nuclear weapon to a terrorist organization in the future;

Whereas Iran has refused to provide the International Atomic Energy Agency with full transparency and access to its nuclear program;

Whereas United Nations Security Council Resolution 1803 states that according to the International Atomic Energy Agency, "Iran has not established full and sustained suspension of all enrichment related and reprocessing activities and heavy-water-related projects as set out in resolution 1696 (2006), 1737 (2006) and 1747 (2007) nor resumed its co-operation with the IAEA under the Additional Protocol, nor taken the other steps required by the IAEA Board of Governors, nor complied with the provisions of Security Council resolution 1696 (2006), 1737 (2006) and 1747 (2007) . . .";

Whereas at July 2009's G-8 Summit in Italy, Iran was given a September 2009 deadline to start negotiations over its nuclear programs and Iran offered a five-page document lamenting the "ungodly ways of thinking prevailing in global relations" and included various subjects, but left out any mention of Iran's own nuclear program which was the true issue in question;

Whereas the United States has been fully committed to finding a peaceful resolution to the Iranian nuclear threat, and has made boundless efforts seeking such a resolution and to determine if such a resolution is even possible;

Whereas the United States does not want or seek war with Iran, but it will continue to keep all options open to prevent Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons; and

Whereas Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu said in January 2011 that a change of course in Iran will not be possible "without a credible military option that is put before them by the international community led by the United States": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) condemns the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran for its threats of "annihilating" the United States and the State of Israel, for its continued support of international terrorism, and for its incitement of genocide of the Israeli people;

(2) supports using all means of persuading the Government of Iran to stop building and acquiring nuclear weapons;

(3) reaffirms the United States bond with Israel and pledges to continue to work with the Government of Israel and the people of Israel to ensure that their sovereign nation continues to receive critical economic and military assistance, including missile defense capabilities, needed to address the threat of Iran; and

(4) expresses support for Israel's right to use all means necessary to confront and eliminate nuclear threats posed by Iran, defend Israeli sovereignty, and protect the lives and safety of the Israeli people, including the use of military force if no other peaceful solution can be found within a reasonable time.

That's House Resolution 271. And I certainly hope that more Members of Congress will join us in supporting that position because time is running out.

It is also my hope and prayer that the rumors that have gone around about what this administration has told Israel behind closed doors do not have support. In fact, that's my hope and prayer. Because if this administration were to be telling Israel behind closed doors that if they move to protect themselves against a nuclear attack by Iran without the United

States' permission—which would not be given—then Israel, since they do not have all of our stealth capability, do not have the most sophisticated bombs we have, will likely lose many planes and will be in need of replacement planes and parts.

I hope and pray that the rumor that they're telling them, we will not support them with replacement planes, replacement parts if they defend themselves, is not true. But this President, though he's been so vocal about why we needed to go support Libya, why it was in our American values, interest, has not talked a lot about what he's telling Israel behind the scenes.

Israel is in grave danger. We have been a friend because we believe in the same value of human life, the same value of freedom, of liberty. We owe it to them, our friends, our allies.

□ 1530

If we're not going to have the nerve to take action against a country that is sworn to be at war with us and to destroy us and take us out at all costs, then we should at least not stand in the way of a friend who wants to do so.

I have a few more things I want to cover here. There's an article from National Review online from The Corner by Andrew McCarthy, another brilliant man and, I'm proud to say, a dear friend. The headline: "Did Obama appointee access confidential database in effort to smear Perry as 'Islamophobe'?"

At PJM, terrorism researcher Patrick Poole reports that Mohamed ElLibary, an appointee on President Obama's Homeland Security Advisory Council, is in hot water with the Texas Department of Public Safety (TDPS). The issue is whether ElLibary used his privileged access to a state law-enforcement database to acquire intelligence reports and then tried to shop them to the media, urging that they showed rampant "Islamophobia" at TDPS under Governor Rick Perry.

Poole says no story was published because, according to one press source, there was "nothing remotely resembling Islamophobia" in the leaked reports. The source told Poole, "I think [ElLibary] was hoping we would bite and not give it too much of a look in light of other media outfits jumping on the Islamophobia bandwagon."

The Islamophobia bandwagon was the subject of my column last weekend. Seems there are plenty of Islamists and Leftists climbing aboard.

ElLibary, you'll no doubt be stunned to learn, was also on the Obama DHS's working group on "countering violent extremism." That's the brain-trust that helped devise the new Obama counterterrorism strategy I outlined (here and here) a few weeks back—the one that envisions having law-enforcement pare back their intelligence-gathering activities and take their marching orders from "community partners." I call the new strategy "factophobia."

As noted by Poole and the Investigative Project on Terrorism, ElLibary's history includes an appearance at a conference honoring Ayatollah Khomeini; condemning the Justice Department's successful prosecution of a Hamas-financing conspiracy designed by the Muslim Brotherhood (the Holy Land Foundation case); praise for Brotherhood theorist Sayyid Qutb; and an aggressive

email exchange with Rod Dreher in 2006 (when Dreher, at the Dallas Morning News, countered ElLibary's praise for Qutb), in which ElLibary reportedly called Dreher "a Klansman without a hood" [ACM: I think that means "Islamophobe" and warned him: "Treat people as inferiors and you can expect someone to put a banana in your exhaust pipe or something."]

Who better could President Obama possibly choose to help formulate counterterrorism strategy? Actually, once you read the strategy, I think you'll agree that he made a perfect choice.

Then we have another article from National Review Online, again from Andrew McCarthy. Headline, "Napolitano: On ElLibary, I know Nothing. I Know Nothing * * *"

He said that Secretary Napolitano "professes not to know anything about the matter"—he's talking about ElLibary—"or about how I got a guy who appears at a conference honoring Ayatollah Khomeini, who praises Muslim Brotherhood theorist Sayyid Qutb, and who condemns the Justice Department's successful prosecution of the Muslim Brotherhood's Hamas financing network (the Holy Land Foundation case), somehow winds up on the Department of Homeland Security advisory council that helped devise the Obama administration's counterterrorism policy."

Actually, it turns out, as Secretary Napolitano testified, that actually she, as the Secretary of Homeland Security, gave this gentleman the secret security clearance which ultimately allowed him to access sensitive documents, at least three of which he downloaded and then tried to market to major media sources.

It is important to note that in the pleading that Khalid Sheikh Mohammed filed—and he is a very smart man. He may be crazy, but he is a very smart man. He did his own interpretation in English, so some of the articles are not quite appropriate, but he sets out a legal document and justifies all of the actions he took in working on 9/11's murder of 3,000 Americans. He takes verses from the Koran and uses them to justify his actions.

At one point in his pleading, which we have access to through our Web site—and this was declassified by the judge in the 9/11 cases involving five planners of 9/11. It was ordered released on the 9th day of March, 2009, and there are also transcripts of his colloquy with the judge in which he confessed to many other acts of terrorism, quite voluntarily, it was obvious.

But in his pleading, Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, on behalf of himself and the four other defendants who were ready to plead guilty, announced they were pleading guilty before this administration; and the Attorney General-to-be, Eric Holder, announced they were going to give these guys a show trial in New York. So they withdraw their guilty pleas so they could get a show trial in New York. Now that's not going to happen, and now it looks like, 4 years after these people agreed to

plead guilty, which will be December of next year, they will still not have been tried because of the actions of this administration.

But Khalid Sheikh Mohammed says: We do not possess your military might, not your nuclear weapons; nevertheless, we fight you with the almighty God. So, if our act of jihad and our fighting with you caused fear and terror, then many thanks to God, because it is him that has thrown fear into your hearts, which resulted from your infidelity, paganism, and your statement that God had a son and your Trinity beliefs.

Then he goes on and he says: God stated in his book, verse 151, Al-Umran, Soon shall we cast terror into the hearts of the unbelievers, for that they joined companies with Allah, for which he has sent no authority; their place will be the fire; and evil is the home of the wrongdoers. That is just one part.

He also says: We ask to be near God. We fight you, destroy you, terrorize. You'll be greatly defeated in Afghanistan and Iraq, and America will fall politically, militarily, economically. Your end is very near, and your fall will be like the fall of the towers on the blessed 9/11 day.

But this gentleman references that one of the reasons that it's okay to kill Americans is because many Americans believe there is a Holy trinity, a Father, Son and Holy Ghost. They believe that God had a son that Christians call the Messiah.

My time is running out, so let me direct you to the Treaty of Paris, 1783, such a historic document. The most powerful country in the world at that time, 1783, was Great Britain. They had the most powerful Navy, the most powerful military; and yet a ragtag bunch of people who believed so firmly in the ideas of freedom and being able to practice most of them—in fact, a third of the signers of the Declaration, they weren't just Christians; they, as Martin Luther King, Jr., were ordained Christian ministers, and they believed in freedom and that God was giving us a chance to govern ourselves.

So after this ragtag bunch defeated the strongest country in the world, Great Britain, and they sat down in 1783 in Paris, and we had there on our behalf John Adams, Benjamin Franklin, and John Jay, three of our brightest minds, they had to set about figuring out: What can we put on paper to have Great Britain sign that will be so important that they would not want to risk violating an oath? What kind of oath could we put on this treaty that Great Britain would be scared to violate?

□ 1540

This treaty will want them to recognize the United States of America. What can we do to make it serious enough that they would not turn around the next month and say we had no right to be independent despite what they signed? There is an original

copy of the Treaty of Paris in the State Department. Tours can be taken, I've taken tons of tours around Washington, D.C. Until my pastor and his wife, David and Cindy Dykes, were in town years back, I had not seen that. But I was taken aback, and I've got a copy of—this is a duplicate—of the Treaty of Paris, two pages, well, it's the first and last page here. There are 10 articles, so we've got the first and last pages here.

So how would you start a treaty in such a way that it would scare the strongest country in the world from violating their oath? Well, they figured it out, and they put it on the document. The biggest letters anywhere in the treaty are those in the first two lines, and they began "In the Name of the most Holy and undivided Trinity." Starting the Treaty of Paris with "In the Name of the most Holy and undivided Trinity," they knew would be strong enough to scare Great Britain into not violating the oath that they signed on that document.

Then you tie it in with Khalid Sheikh Mohammed's pleading, the very fact that they would sign such a document recognizing the Holy Trinity, according to Khalid Sheikh Mohammed and his interpretation of the Koran, that's justification for killing and terrorizing people that believe in the Holy undivided Trinity.

There's a war going on, and in Libya, apparently we fought for people who want to destroy us. The al Qaeda flag now flies proudly over this federal building in Benghazi, Libya. Congratulations to this administration for making that happen.

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

JOBS, JOBS, JOBS WILL RESTORE FAITH IN GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. BUERKLE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Madam Speaker, tonight I want to speak on the subject jobs, jobs, jobs. Jobs will restore faith in government. Invest, build and grow.

One does not have to be a Christian to understand or believe what the Bible says about three critical things that are important to living our lives: faith, hope, and love. Today I want to connect the idea of faith to faith in government. Hebrews 11.1 says, "Now faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen."

What are some of those things that are hoped for and not seen? When we drive a car, we have faith that when our light turns green and we go, the person driving the car in the other direction will obey the light when it turns red and stop. When we stop for a red light, we have faith that the car behind us will also stop and not ram us in the rear. We have faith that the pedes-

trians will obey the yield sign and not run out in front of our moving car. We have faith that if a driver turns on the right hand turn signal, they will not suddenly turn left in front of us. We have faith that other drivers will not recklessly endanger our lives by driving drunk. So whether driving to work or to play, it is faith that allows us to drive. And if another person runs a stop light, doesn't brake behind us, doesn't obey the yield sign, suddenly turns in front of us or drives drunk, they have broken the faith. In other words, when you're driving, the only thing that stands between you and death is faith.

If you fly on airplanes, you have faith. You have faith in a pilot that you've never met—that they're well trained, that they know how to take off and land, can handle a storm in the air, can handle an emergency, are physically fit, psychologically stable, and not drunk or on drugs. You have faith in the flight attendants that they've been trained to handle unruly passengers or an emergency situation. You have faith that the maintenance people have properly serviced the plane before it takes off. You have faith that the TSA employees have done their job and have not made an error that will put your life or the life of passengers in danger. You have a reasonable faith in the regulations of the FAA that the fuel, the engines, the body of the plane, and the runways are safe. A critical error anywhere along this line will damage and destroy your faith in air travel.

Train engineers have faith that drivers and pedestrians will not drive or walk around railroad crossing gates and endanger themselves or the train. Bus passengers have faith that the driver is not intoxicated, on drugs, or experiencing emotional problems that can endanger the public or their riders.

Look, Madam Speaker, how faith operates during medical emergencies. When we're at our weakest and suddenly become ill and need to be rushed to the hospital. We have faith that a well-trained ambulance and emergency medical technician will arrive quickly and provide us with care. We have faith that drivers on the road will pull over when they hear the sirens to allow our ambulance driver to get us quickly and safely to the hospital. We have faith in the doctors, the nurses, and the medical staff that they will provide us with the highest quality of care possible regardless of our perceived ability to pay or whether we have medical insurance.

Without the faith that our judicial system has laws that are rationally and morally sound and faith that our judges will conduct themselves in a respectful and fair way toward prosecutors and defendants, we cannot have a justice system that endures.

Earlier last month, I spent the day with the Johnson-Karlok family outside of Mokena, Illinois, during their family's harvest season. As we were sitting down for lunch, Mr. Johnson led us in a short prayer to thank God for