

that I have seen not in the past 2 years but over the last 12 or 15 years in terms of good manufacturing jobs lost in our region.

And what I find most exciting about this recovery that we are in is that we are making things again. And it's already been talked about tonight. But we are making things in America again. For the 11th consecutive month, the manufacturing sector has expanded in this country. We have got to depend on making things for our economic growth, not on the paper industry of Wall Street. And we have seen the problems with that, starting in 2007 and beyond.

I want to bring up a few highlights from an article from the Erie Daily Times today, an article that talked about Erie County, where my home is from: manufacturing employment rose in May for the third month in a row. Viking Plastic in Erie County had increased employment from a low of 65 workers to nearly 100. GE Transportation, which reduced payroll by 1,500 workers in 2009, has called back 200 permanent and temporary workers.

Economic growth is being seen throughout my district in the manufacturing sector. I visited a small electronics manufacturer, AMS Electronics, in Butler, Pennsylvania. They're performing well, despite the downturn, having increased their client base with the help of their local manufacturing extension partnership, a program that we fund through an act called the America COMPETES Act, which has recently been passed through the House.

So there is good news coming out of western Pennsylvania. Just even yesterday, I was at Donjon Shipping, a new manufacturer. We're building currently a tug boat; working on a barge next. Making things, permanent products that are going to be helping to improve the wealth of our Nation and bring great jobs here.

So I want to just reiterate what so many of my colleagues have said tonight, that there is good news. America is recovering. Not as fast as those out there need us to. Obviously, too many people still unemployed. But when you've lost 8 million jobs, 8 million jobs. We're on track this year to create more jobs than were created under 8 years of the Bush administration. I think that's important to remember.

So we are moving forward. We are creating jobs in this country. I just wanted to tell a little bit about the good news from western Pennsylvania. I want to thank everyone for their help tonight here with bringing this message to the American people—the message that we are continuing to recover. This summer we're going to see what we call the “summer of stimulus,” where we're going to see, I think, great numbers with highway projects that will increase by more than 600 percent from July of 2009 to this July.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Will the gentlelady yield?

Mrs. DAHLKEMPER. Yes.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Given that you're from a State that is in the heart of the Manufacturing Belt, can you talk a little bit about what is going on in your district and the efforts that we're making here to create jobs and what kind of progress the recent surge in manufacturing has brought to communities in Pennsylvania?

Mrs. DAHLKEMPER. One of the great things about my part of Pennsylvania, and I really think Pennsylvania in general—I have to be a bit biased here—but we have a great ethic and we have people with great skills. We have been a manufacturing-based economy for a long time. So when businesses come there and they see the work ethic of the people, they want to stay, expand, and grow. And what we're doing is trying to provide that climate that will allow our businesses to grow and to provide those opportunities maybe for those new entrepreneurs that they have an opportunity to actually take that product that really could do great things in our country and do great things actually throughout the world. Because I see more and more of our businesses actually exporting also, and work that was going to Mexico and to China actually coming back, because we can make anything as well, if not better, than anybody else in the world. And we know that.

So we're working hard. As I mentioned, great numbers coming out of our district because there's new products, there's new clientele, there's expansion and creation going on throughout many different sectors of our manufacturing-based economy. And so whether we're talking about some of the tax credits and incentives we've been trying to do either through the recovery package or with other pieces of legislation, we are working hard to get back to that manufacturing base. At least from my part of the world, my part of the country, it's important. I know not so much in Florida, but in Pennsylvania it certainly is the backbone of our economy, along with agriculture.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, it's okay. You're right. In Florida, we don't have a strong manufacturing base, but we want to make sure that folks in Pennsylvania are able to thrive economically so they can come down and vacation and they can afford to take a vacation and come down to south Florida and across my beautiful home State and spend their hard-earned dollars that they have been able to use and invest in their small business and come down and make sure that they can help our economy thrive.

Thank you, Madam Speaker. We yield back the balance of our time and thank the Speaker for the opportunity and look forward to hearing from our colleagues.

□ 2120

#### SOCIAL SECURITY AND THE ECONOMY

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, that's one of the great things about our system, we have a chance to speak from both sides. As I listened, I was surprised to hear I had taken so many positions that I had never taken. But let me just say that with regard to Republicans being for privatizing Social Security, that bill did not pass. It didn't even get around here to get passed because so many Republicans were not in favor of it. And, in fact, you can go back and find this Republican saying repeatedly then and still saying that what we should do is what was not done when Social Security came into existence, and that is take Social Security tax dollars and put them in a Social Security account.

Now, until I got here 5½ years ago, I was under the impression that it was some kind of modern creation that Social Security tax dollars were taken away, they never even get to the Social Security Trust Fund but went to general revenue with IOUs being placed in file cabinets for the Social Security Trust Fund. But lo and behold, come to find out, Social Security tax dollars have never, ever gone into the Social Security Trust Fund, not since its inception.

Now, in Texas, we have the Texas Employee Retirement System. Teachers have an employee retirement system. And those systems have done many times better than Social Security for one reason: They put dollars into the retirement fund so the fund was able to grow. And because it was able to grow, people can get several times more in the way of retirement payments from those retirement systems than you can from Social Security. In fact, when I first got here in 2005, I had my staff run a check to find out—and I gave them a hypothetical to submit to Social Security as well as to the Texas Employee Retirement System and another retirement system to find out what kind of monthly income you would receive under that hypothetical.

It turned out, the best Social Security could tell us was that under the hypothetical we gave them, that the monthly income from Social Security to a deserving senior would be somewhere between \$600 and \$900 a month. Well, if anybody is familiar with seniors and the costs that they end up being out of pocket, you will know that \$600 to \$900 does not go far enough, but that's what Social Security payments would be. And as I recall the hypothetical, it was \$30,000 average for 30 years before retirement, and that was the best we could get, \$600 to \$900.

However, when that hypothetical was provided to the Texas Employee Retirement System, which puts real money into an account, it turns out the monthly payment was somewhere between \$2,600 to \$2,800 per month—the same hypothetical—and the difference was that real money went into the trust fund.

But President Franklin Roosevelt knew, apparently, when this began that there would not be real money going into the trust fund, and every President since then has known that. President Roosevelt, President Truman, President Eisenhower, President Kennedy, Presidents Johnson, Nixon, Ford, Carter, Reagan, Bush, Clinton, George W. Bush, and Obama, they've all known. No money that is pried out of the hands of those who earn it and those that pay those who earn it, none of that money goes into the Social Security Trust Fund, not a dime. Now, that's tragic.

I was pushing that back at the time in 2005. And true, there were Republicans who did not support that, and there were lots of Democrats who didn't because, as we've seen since my friends across the aisle have had such a huge majority in recent years, they've done nothing about Social Security tax money going into the Social Security Trust Fund. They control both Houses. They could have passed a bill requiring Social Security tax money to go into the trust fund in January of 2007. Madam Speaker, I can tell you, there would have been a lot of us Republicans voting for that had they decided to bring that to the floor. If it was brought to the floor this week, next week, I would vote for it. Social Security tax money must go into the Social Security Trust Fund.

But there has been a reason that they have not wanted that to go from the general revenue into the Social Security Trust Fund to shore up Social Security, and that's because there are so many other little pet projects and pet ideas that this money goes to fund. I heard my friends across the aisle talking repeatedly about how important infrastructure was. Isn't that ironic, because after President Obama was sworn in, became President, the Democratic Party had such big majorities—a majority here in the House and was veto-proof, or had a supermajority down in the Senate at the time—they didn't do anything about Social Security being shored up. They didn't do anything about infrastructure, not in the way that it was talked about.

We heard so many beautiful, eloquent speeches from friends across the aisle on how this spendulus stimulus bill was going to pay for all of this wonderful infrastructure. America was led to believe that the whole \$787 billion was going to end up being for infrastructure and really be good for America. Well, there was a little bait-and-switch that went on, which is easy to do.

My colleague, for whom I have great respect, I heard saying that Repub-

licans have "hamstrung the deliberative process." So apparently, as best I can figure—I'm sure he's smarter than I am, but the deliberative process then, apparently, must mean that you rush in with a 2,000-page bill not once but repeatedly, say, There's no time for anybody to read this. Too many jobs are being lost every day. There's no time for this to go through committee. There's no time for amendments. There's no time for anything. People are losing their jobs as we speak. You've just got to vote for it now.

Now, see, to me, just from the very practical, pragmatic growing up that I had, a deliberative process would have meant that it had time to be viewed and get some sunshine into those 2,000 pages to figure out where all this pork was going, that that would have been part of the deliberative process.

□ 2130

But apparently, as Republicans, we hamstrung the process that they called deliberative, where you rush in with a 2,000-page bill repeatedly, say there's no time to read it, just pass it and then we'll find out what's in it. See, I wouldn't have thought that was deliberative. But apparently, since my colleague said Republicans hamstrung the deliberative process, that must be what he's talking about.

So they rush in with this \$787 billion stimulus bill. You could have polled Americans after it passed and the majority would have said, you know, this is going to be great for building infrastructure. We need infrastructure. Little did they know that 6, less than 7 percent of the \$787 billion was ever even thought to have anything to do with infrastructure. So that's why I say a bit of a bait and switch there.

America wasn't even sold on it, but the few that were thought that was going to be for infrastructure and that didn't happen. Just such a tiny, tiny bit of it.

We heard our friends during the last hour talk repeatedly about small business and how the stimulus was so good for small business. What they forgot to mention, they may not be aware, but of that \$787 billion, less than 1 percent was for small business. How about that?

So it was all about small business and infrastructure, and yet less than 7 percent was for infrastructure and less than 1 percent geared, aimed at small business. Interesting.

So is it any wonder that, with people thinking that 6, 7 percent of \$787 billion will build all the infrastructure we need and less than 1 percent will help small business more than anybody else, that it hasn't had the desired effect?

And I couldn't really see my colleague's chart well enough to see what the last month was where they were talking about all these private jobs being created.

But forget the charts. Let's look at real numbers. And the real numbers for the month of June came out, and I

don't have a big pretty chart for it, but the fact is that in the month of June there was great news and then there was really bad news. The great news was that for the month of June, 431,000 jobs were created. That is great news. The really bad news is that 411,000 of those were temporary census workers. So much for all those private sector jobs we were hearing about.

I heard my colleagues talk about Republicans just want to nickel and dime the middle class. I've got an awful lot of Republican friends, and I don't remember any Republicans I know of wanting to nickel and dime the middle class. The ones I know of see people in the poorest sector of America, see people in the middle class of America and want them to do even better. But it won't happen when the government is taking over control of everything. You kill incentives.

And I've mentioned this before, but it is just such a clear lesson of what happens when the government gets involved and decides it's going to be the one that creates the jobs.

And it was 1973, as an exchange student for the summer to the Soviet Union, going out to a collective farm, 30 miles or so from Kiev in Ukraine, and farmers sitting in the shade when their fields looked terrible. This is in the middle of summertime. Well, anybody's worked on farms or ranches knows in the middle of the morning is when you want to be working hard because you want to try to get done before the sun gets to its hottest in the afternoon, and so you start when the sun does and you try to finish before it gets to its hottest. And here it was, the best time of the day to be working, and they were all sitting in the shade with no movement toward going to work.

And so I spoke a little Russian back then and asked, when do you work in the field? And they all laughed. And one of them said, I make the same number of rubles if I'm out there or if I'm here in the shade, so I'm here. That's what the government did. It kills incentives when it decides it's going to take over the job market.

And I loved hearing the discussion about big corporations, big pharmaceuticals, big oil. You know, we've heard this Wall Street, they're all the big buddies of the Republicans. And yet, if you go check, Wall Street has traditionally given 4-1 to Democrats over Republicans. That was true for Goldman Sachs. If you don't just look at the officers, but you look at their spouses and their children, then you find a 4-1 average giving to Democrats over Republicans.

And the big pharmaceutical companies that were mentioned, they let greed get the better side of them in coming out in support of the ObamaCare bill. And for the short term they'll make billions, maybe hundreds of billions more than they would have without the bill. But in the long term, they've written their own death warrant. The same with AMA, AHA. They

sold their souls. Short term, they'll come out good. In the long run their professions, as we know it, will be changed forever for the worst for American health care. And we're already seeing those things.

I get out in my district. I've been in other parts of the country. I'm hearing the people say, you know, we've decided not to hire because this crap-and-trade bill may get passed. We've already had this health care monstrosity wrapped around our necks. We're going to have to end up having to pay more than ever.

You know, the President went out there to have a big photo OP with Caterpillar, and then it turns out they were going to lose over a million, was it \$100 million this year?

We know jobs are being lost all over the country because of that health care bill. There was no need to push good jobs out of this country. When I hear my friends say, I couldn't believe they said the Democrats want it manufactured here and Republicans don't. That's ridiculous.

I went with a bipartisan group to China 5 years ago, bipartisan because there were both Republicans and Democrats. And the ones I talked to on both sides of the aisle wanted to see jobs return to America, manufacturing jobs. And I thought that perhaps, as we talked to CEOs, the number one thing I would hear was they left the U.S. and went to China because labor was so much cheaper there. That was not the number one thing I heard.

The number one thing I heard was the corporate taxes in China, 17 percent, U.S. 35 percent, plus States pop them on top of that, and local governments do as well. And so not only that, but China would cut deals with them. No income tax for 5 years, then gradually increase up to 17 percent.

And one of the things I loved hearing was that the quality of the work by American workers was greatly exceeding that that could be done in China by the workers there. That was good to hear. Quality control in the U.S. was so much better.

But that huge 35 to 40 percent hit that they had to take before they competed in the global economy was just too much. It was putting them under. And they could go to China, and with the dramatic cut in corporate tax, they could build state-of-the-art facilities that allowed them to have workers who were not capable of as good a quality control here, and then their state-of-the-art facility would be paid for by the time, many times before the taxes really kicked in in earnest at less than half of what they were in the United States.

□ 2140

So if my friends across the aisle were really serious about bringing manufacturing jobs here, then the solution would be to eliminate the corporate tax. It's one of the most insidious governmental creations in this country.

Insidious because everybody gets to talk about these mean, evil corporations and how we want to sock it to the corporations, when the insidious truth is no matter how much tax you lay onto the corporations, if they don't pass that onto the consumer, they don't stay in business. And that's why so many have left and gone to other countries, one of the biggest reasons why they've left and gone to other countries.

Now, we've heard some are not building here for refineries or energy businesses because of this looming threat of the crap-and-trade bill. Our President in 2008 had commented that he wasn't going to—basically, he said he wasn't going to put coal power plants out of business, but he would skyrocket the cost of energy. And that's where we're headed, and so that will drive businesses out of the U.S.

We've had the moratorium declared by the President that was then struck down as unconstitutional. But this administration did not want to let a little thing like the Constitution get in the way, so this week they've come back with another moratorium, basically throwing the Constitution, the judicial sector, throwing them away because just as they did with the auto task force, no confirmation from the Senate, just appointed people, and they took charge of the automobile business.

They came out with a declaration as to what dealerships would close, which ones would have their property taken without due process of law. They came out with a bankruptcy plan that did not go through the requirements of bankruptcy law. They found a judge—I don't know the judge, but bankruptcy judges have to be confirmed I believe it's every 10 years. It's not a lifetime appointment. Many of them would like to be district judges. So apparently it wasn't hard to find a judge who would sign off on an illegal, unconstitutional auto task force plan, and no accountability to anybody. And once the Congress let it go without stepping in and being the check and balance on illegality and unconstitutionality, then there was only one branch left to stop such unconstitutional, illegal activity, and that was the Supreme Court.

To her wonderful credit, Ruth Bader Ginsburg put a 24-hour hold on it. And apparently the administration improperly scared the Supreme Court into thinking that if they extended the hold any longer than 24 hours, all the automobile industry, all of those related to the auto industry would go under and it would all be on the Supreme Court's head. And supposedly, the Supreme Court would never let such a ridiculous thing, unconstitutional thing go through again, but they let it through then.

And so we know that this administration is capable of doing end runs on the Constitution. And it looks like that's what they're doing again on the moratorium. So with the moratorium being

in place, as one person in Louisiana said, we stand a chance of losing more jobs from the moratorium than we do from the oil spill. And of course beat up on Big Oil. Yet as the Deepwater Horizon rig was exploding and sinking, there were still deals being cut with this administration and this majority's dear friend British Petroleum, because they were one of the few big energy firms that were supportive of the crap-and-trade bill. So they hated to see their good friend get in trouble.

They were hoping it would blow over, they would get control of this disastrous well in the gulf coast. But they didn't, and eventually the administration and majority had to throw them under the bus. Whereas, if they had been able to get control of the oil well, you would have seen a big photo op with the BP executives as they pushed through the crap-and-trade bill. So, hopefully it will not come back and get passed because it will mean so many jobs that will be lost in America.

And you know, I know they meant well, I know the intentions were good across the aisle when we debated that bill here in the House. And so many people came in here and said nobody is going to lose their job as a result of this bill. In fact, we're going to create jobs. It's going to be like Spain. We're going to create so many green jobs. Well, since then we found out Spain has actually lost two jobs for every one green job they have created, and now they are trying to abandon the very thing that this administration and this majority are trying to push us toward.

But it was so ironic that so many people I am sure unintentionally saying that no one would lose their job because I know it wasn't intentional because obviously they hadn't written the bill, they hadn't read the bill, they had their talking points. But if you read toward the back of the bill, I don't remember the page number, I had it here on the floor and was reading from it at the time, the bill itself created a fund to pay people who lost their job as a result of that crap-and-trade bill. Not only that, it created a fund that would help reimburse them travel expenses to help them move to where their jobs were going as a result of that bill.

So, whichever left wing organization wrote that bill, or whoever's staffer helped them write it, they knew people would lose their jobs right and left. That's why they were creating a fund in there. But my friends across the aisle had not read it. Apparently, the deliberative process from their standpoint was ram the stuff through, don't read it, don't get bothered with the actual provisions in the bill. Push it through, and we'll find out what's in it later. Apparently, that's deliberative. That's no bill to saddle America with. It means more lost jobs.

Now, we had another job fair last week in east Texas, this one in Nacogdoches. We had over 550 people attend, around four, five dozen employers that were there. Some people left

with jobs that didn't have them. Some people have hope for the future through the interview process.

And, normally, when you throw a party, you are really thrilled when people show up. But just as I saw in Marshall and Longview when we had a job fair there, and Lufkin, you look in the eyes of folks who have lost their jobs and you can't be pleased that the turnout is big because every one represents hurt, it represents lost finances, people struggling, many of them struggling for self-esteem because even though it wasn't their fault, so many get their strength and their pride from the job that they hold. And so it's very difficult to see so many people out of work.

But what I keep hearing also from businesses is the same thing, similar thing: they can't get credit, they can't get loans from their bank. Banks are telling them they're not going to extend their line of credit because they got regulators breathing down their throats. Because regulators, on instructions from this town are out there telling them, micromanaging, telling good community, solid community banks that were not the source of the problems—the source of the biggest problems were those on Wall Street that give four to one to Democrats. That was the big source, the investment banking firms, not the community banking firms. But the community banking firms, on instructions from those who were closest to the investment banking firms telling the regulators to go after them. And even hold them to having more in reserve than the law requires. Had that admission from regulators themselves.

And so people don't have capital because this obese monstrosity of a government that keeps growing can't control its appetite. And so it sucks up all the capital and throws it away on the government's pet projects.

□ 2150

It's no way to run a country. It's a way to lose a country.

Well, I didn't intend to spend that much time on the economy, but having heard so many comments from my friends across the aisle on what I believed and what I support, which were things that I simply do not, and have not supported, I had to address that.

But there are so many dangers in the world. One of them, of course, is this out-of-control spending. And one final thing on the economy, my friends across the aisle keep talking about how bad it's been since 2007, 2008, 2009. And the fact is they've been controlling everything but the White House since January of 2007. So when they took control and they let spending explode on their watch—they were right. They won the majority because Republicans did not control spending, and too many Republicans equated compassion with spending.

And so Democrats over and over, over and over came to the floor and

said, you know, a hundred billion, \$200 billion deficit in 1 year is outrageous. It shouldn't be allowed. We need to be in the majority so we'll control the spending. We'll cut the deficit. We'll get back on track. And so Republicans appropriately lost the majority because they had not controlled spending.

And what has happened since? Spending has gone through the roof. And under this administration, once the Democrats had the White House and both Houses with such huge majorities, spending became giddiness, and that hundred, \$200 billion deficit in a year has bloomed now to a \$1.5 trillion dollar deficit in a year. It's unbelievable.

And at the same time, it's been encouraging to see this administration in the past week show some friendliness toward our wonderful ally Israel, because all of the snubbing and pettiness by this administration in the way that it's treated Israel in conjunction with willing allies like *The New York Times*, like the 5,000-page editorial that was written about, there's just so much pettiness and snubbing of our friend Israel from this administration and its allies that they're hurting this Nation. Because when you hurt Israel, you hurt a true democracy in the middle of the Middle East, you hurt this country. You hurt any democracy when you hurt democracy that exists in the Middle East.

And I read this weekend an editorial written by Caroline Glick, and it's entitled, "Fit for *The New York Times*." And Caroline Glick is so articulate. I wanted to read verbatim what she had to say about the article in *The New York Times*. So I will read from Caroline Glick. This was published July 9, 2010.

She says, "Two important statements this week shed a light on the nature of the Palestinian conflict with Israel. Both were barely noted by the media.

"On Saturday the London-based *Al-Hayat* newspaper reported that Palestinian Authority Chairman Mahmoud Abbas gave U.S. mediator George Mitchell a letter detailing a number of concessions that he would make towards Israel in a final peace treaty. These included a willingness to accept permanent Israeli sovereignty over the Jewish Quarter in Jerusalem's Old City and over the Western Wall. The *Al-Hayat* report received enthusiastic and expansive coverage in the Israeli media and in media outlets throughout the world.

"What was barely noted was that just hours after the report hit the airwaves, Abbas's chief negotiator Saeb Erekat categorically denied the story. In an interview with Israel Radio, Saeb Erekat said the story was untrue.

"Abbas has been the recipient of adulatory press coverage in Israel over the past several days. Last week he thrilled the Hebrew-language media when he invited Israeli reporters to a sumptuous feast at his Ramallah head-

quarters. And then the *Al-Hayat* story came out. Lost in the excitement was Abbas's eulogy for arch terrorist Muhammad Daoud Oudeh who died over the weekend. Oudeh was the mastermind of the PLO's massacre of 11 Israeli athletes during the 1972 Munich Olympics. Abbas himself served the operation's paymaster.

"As Palestinian Media Watch reported, in a condolence telegram quoted in the Abbas-controlled *Al-Hayat al Jadida* newspaper, Abbas touted Oudeh as, 'a wonderful brother, companion, tough and stubborn, relentless fighter,' and described him as 'one of the prominent leaders of the Fatah movement.'

"So while the local and international media pounced on the *Al-Hayat* story as proof that the Palestinians are serious about peace, they failed to mention that their hope was based on a story that the Palestinians themselves deny. So too, in their rush to embrace Abbas, they failed to mention his glorification of an unrepentant mass murderer who commanded the terror squad that massacred Israel's Olympic athletes.

"These statements by Palestinian officials the media routinely characterize as moderates, demonstrates how deeply distorted and largely irrelevant the discourse on the Middle East has become. As the 'moderate' Palestinians insist they are uninterested in peaceful coexistence and territorial compromise with Israel, news coverage in Israel and throughout the Western world is dominated by other issues. Specifically, discussion of prospects for peace between Israel and the Palestinians is dominated by an endless discussion of Israel's Jewish communities in Judea and Samaria and Jewish neighborhoods in eastern, southern and northern Jerusalem.

"The most egregious recent example of this distortion was a 5,000 word article in Tuesday's *New York Times* regarding US charitable contributions to these Jewish communities. Titled, 'Tax Exempt Funds Aid Settlements in the West Bank,' the report was co-authored by five *Times* reporters. It was the product of weeks of research. And notably, the *New York Times* chose to publish it on its front page above the fold on the very day that Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu visited the White House.

"The *Times* article is a textbook case of the media's ideologically motivated aggression against Middle East reality. Any way you look at it, it is a premeditated affront to the very notion that the role of a newspaper is to report facts rather than manufacture news aimed at shaping perceptions and skewing debate.

"The article goes to great lengths to discredit the American citizens who make charitable, tax deductible donations to organizations that provide lawful support to Jewish communities in Judea and Samaria and Jewish neighborhoods in southern, northern and eastern Jerusalem. It paints a sinister picture of such contributions and

contributors and accuses them of actively undermining U.S. foreign policy.

“The contributors, we are told in the opening lines of the report are the Left’s bogeyman—Evangelical Christians and religious Jews. They are unacceptable actors in the Middle East because they both believe that Jewish control of Judea and Samaria is a precursor to the coming of the messiah.

“Reacting to the Times’ report, on Wednesday Honest Reporting noted that the article appears to be the product of active collusion between the Times and the radical, anti-Zionist, tax-exempt Gush Shalom organization. As Honest Reporting relays, in July of 2009, Gush Shalom sent out a communique to its supporters calling for the initiation of a campaign that, ‘includes a combination of legal action and public advocacy aimed at denying Federal tax exempt (501c3) status to U.S. charities supporting settlement activity.’

“The Times’ article bears all the markings of a political campaign. First, despite the valiant efforts of five Times reporters, the article exposes no illegal activity. At best, its investigation of more than forty organizations that contribute funds to the hated Jewish communities in Jerusalem, Judea and Samaria indicated that less than a handful of them are guilty of poor accounting practices.”

□ 2200

Assuming that Honest Reporting’s eminently reasonable conclusion that the Times report is the product of collaboration between the newspaper and radical anti-Zionist groups is accurate, the report is shockingly hypocritical. By publishing it, the New York Times is engaging in the precise behavior it argues the organizations it investigated should be punished for purportedly engaging in.

To wit, in the service of radical tax deductible organizations, the Times seeks to undermine U.S. foreign policy. For the past four decades, it has been the foreign policy of the United States to maintain a strategic alliance with Israel. The goal of Times-aligned groups like Gush Shalom is to undermine that alliance by discrediting and criminalizing those who wish to strengthen and maintain it.

The Times article uses dark language and innuendo to create the impression that there is something treacherous and evil about contributions to Jewish communities in neighborhoods in Judea, Samaria and Jerusalem.

For instance, the article argues, “The donations to the settler movement stand out from other charitable, and this is in brackets, from other charitable contributions that promote U.S. foreign policy goals, close brackets, because of the centrality of the settlement issue in the current talks and the fact that Washington has consistently refused to allow Israel to spend American government aid in the settlements. Tax breaks for the donations remain largely unchallenged and

unexamined by the American government.”

What the Times fails to acknowledge is that the reason these donations are “largely unchallenged and unexamined” is because it is the constitutional right of American citizens to contribute to charities that promote policy goals, even when those goals, like those of Gush Shalom, are antithetical to U.S. policy as determined by the U.S. Government.

The New York Times alleges that these communities are illegal. Its authority for this allegation is none other than the Palestinian negotiator Saeb Erekat. Erekat opined to the paper, “Settlements violate international law.”

The truth is that Israeli communities beyond the 1949 armistice lines are legal. But even if one were to accept the argument that they are unlawful, one would be accepting an argument based on the language of the Fourth Geneva Convention from 1949 which prevents occupying powers from transferring their population to the areas under occupation.

There is no possible reading of the convention that would prohibit the voluntary movement of Israelis to Judea, Samaria and post-1967 neighborhoods in Jerusalem. Likewise, there is no possible reading of the convention that would prohibit the provision of financial support to Israelis who voluntarily move to the areas in question. Yet it is precisely this indisputably lawful, voluntary movement of Jews to these areas which the Times acknowledges is often done against the wishes of Israel’s government that the Times article attacks.

In short, the Times’ contention that there is something legally problematic about these donations is preposterous, both as it relates to U.S. law and as it relates to international law.

From a journalistic perspective, worse than the Times’ decision to engage in precisely the behavior it seeks to criminalize when carried out by its political nemesis on the Christian and Jewish right and worse even than the article’s false characterization of law is the article’s clear attempt to obfuscate the main problem with land issues in Judea and Samaria. This it does in the interests of manufacturing a false but ideologically sympathetic picture of the situation on the ground.

The Times only gets around to alluding to and obfuscating the real problem with the land issues in the 58th paragraph of the article. The Times reports “Islamic judicial panels have threatened death to Palestinians who sell property in the occupied territories to Jews.”

Actually, while this may be true, it is not the problem. The problem is that the second law promulgated by the Palestinian Authority just weeks after it was established in 1994 criminalized all Arab land sales to Jews as a capital crime.

Since 1994, scores of Arabs have been killed in both judicial and extrajudicial

executions for selling land to Jews. This open move to hide the fact that since 1994 the PA has dispatched death squads to murder both Palestinians and Israeli Arabs suspected of selling land to Jews is a shocking miscarriage of journalistic standards.

Whereas the New York Times required five reporters to work for weeks to come up with exactly nothing illegal in the operations of U.S. charitable groups that support Jewish communities the Times wishes to destroy, the Times would have needed to invest no resources whatsoever to discover that the PA kills any Arab who sells land to Jews. The PA has made no effort to hide this policy. It is in the public sphere for anyone willing to look at reality.

That is, of course, the real issue here. The entire New York Times investigation, so-called, of American charitable groups that support Jewish communities in neighborhoods in Judea, Samaria and Jerusalem is a blatant attempt by major newspaper to hide the real issues prolonging the Palestinian conflict with Israel. Those issues exposed by Abbas’s praise for a terrorist mass murderer, Erekat’s denial that Abbas has any interest in compromising with Israel, as well as by the PA’s policy of killing all Arabs who sell lands to Jews, do not serve the Times’ purpose of blaming the absence of peace on Israel generally and on the Israeli right and its supporters in the U.S. in particular.

And so it is that 17 years after the start of the so-called peace process between Israel and the PLO, and 10 years after the PLO destroyed that process by launching a terror war against Israel, and 4½ years after the Palestinians elected Hamas to lead them, we are still stuck in a distorted, irrelevant discourse about the Middle East.

We are stuck in a rut because politically and ideologically motivated media organs operate hand-in-glove with radical groups seeking to undermine Israel’s national sovereignty and end its alliance with the U.S. Together, they manufacture news that bears no relation with reality or the true challenges facing those who seek peace in the Middle East. But obviously for the New York Times, that is what makes it fit to print.

That was posted July 9, 2010, 7:27 a.m. by my friend Caroline Glick.

□ 2210

The article speaks for itself. It is a sad day when the New York Times has become such a political hack of a newspaper that in the summer of 1973, when I was in the Soviet Union, it was exciting. Actually, got a chance of going over there through Europe, coming out through Europe, to see a New York Times, especially in English. Exciting. And it was trusted to be the international resource. So it is a bit heart-breaking that as its sales circulation continues to plummet, it continues to lose money, that it continues to proceed with the very things that have

brought down its reputation and hurt it as such an objective resource. Doing reports growing up as a kid, you knew you could count on anything that you found in the New York Times and cite it as a valuable and accurate resource. Not so anymore. Not so anymore.

Israel is a friend, and I'm grateful that democracy has worked to the extent that this administration got concerned about its plummeting numbers enough that it realized maybe this time it should treat the Prime Minister of Israel with some respect, just as it is and just as it has heads of states of countries that despise us and have said they would be glad to see us fall as a Nation. It's nice if they could treat Prime Minister Netanyahu with the same respect that it treats some of our sworn enemies.

Very interesting. There's just so much to cover, so little time. But I did want to address that issue and the fact that Iran is continuing to have its centrifuges spin. It has been reported by this administration, by the IAEA, that Iran has apparently at least enough uranium material, at least, to manufacture two nuclear weapons. So the rhetorical question to be asked, How many nuclear bombs does it take to become an existential threat to Israel or to this Nation? I would submit a nuke in New York Harbor, coming up the Potomac, the Houston and New Orleans shipping channel taking out the majority of our energy resources, Los Angeles, the lake right up next to Chicago, the effect could be existential to the U.S.

This isn't a game. You can't keep walking around blaming the prior administration. Yes, I was upset with the Bush administration with the TARP. Yes, this administration went right out and hired the same people that helped push that thing through. And they're still pushing it. Still like it. Should have never been passed. That was a huge mistake by the Bush administration, and we should not continue to confound it.

Well, just as we've seen the New York Times can twist and distort, we've seen throughout America people distorting our heritage. And so in an effort to correct yet another distortion, I want to finish with this. This is from a book written by Peter Lillback, "Wall of Misconception." A small book, lots of resources. Dr. Lillback says: "Everyone agrees that George Washington was critical for the formation of America's values. Washington was conscious that his every act created a precedent for good or ill for all that would follow him. As our first President, everything he did established precedents for how our country was to work.

"So there is no accident that so many have sought to portray Washington as a man without faith. For if he exercised faith in the public square, this in turn argues that the Judeo-Christian system still has relevance and vitality in the public square today.

Did Washington's legacy include strong precedents of advocating the Judeo-Christian values in the public square? Recent authors have declared an emphatic no.

"Randall writes, 'Washington was not a deeply religious man.' Douglas Southall Freeman says, 'He had believed that a God directed his path, but he had not been particularly ardent in his faith.' James Thomas Flexner states that 'Washington . . . avoided, as was his deist custom, the word "God."' Judging from these writers, Washington could hardly be called a 'godly leader.' But are these claims correct?"

I could go on, as I have, taking people on tours through this building for about 2 or 3 hours with what Washington wrote and said and did. But continuing Dr. Lillback's book: "The very men who gave us the First Amendment did not intend to impose a radical separation of church and State that is advocated by so many today. In fact, the day after Congress adopted the words of the First Amendment, they sent a message to President Washington asking him to declare a day of thanksgiving to show America's appreciation to God for the opportunity to create America's new national government in peace and tranquility.

"So on October 3, 1789, President Washington made a Proclamation of a National Day of Thanksgiving. He declared: Whereas it is the duty of all nations to acknowledge the Providence of Almighty God"—I guess he did use the word God—"to obey His will, to be grateful for his benefits, and humbly to implore His protection and favor. And, whereas both Houses of Congress have by their joint Committee requested me 'to recommend to the people of the United States a day of public thanksgiving and prayer to be observed by acknowledging with grateful hearts the many signal favors of Almighty God'"—oops, he used it again—"especially by affording them an opportunity peaceably to establish a form of government for their safety and happiness, now, therefore, I do recommend and assign Thursday the 26th day of November next to be devoted by the people of the United States to the service of that great and glorious Being, who is the beneficent author of all the good that was, that is, or that will be; that we may then all unite in rendering unto Him our sincere and humble thanks, for His kind care and protection of the people of this country previous to their becoming a Nation; for the signal and manifold mercies, and the favorable interpositions of His providence, which we experienced in the course and conclusion of the late war; for the great degree of tranquility, union, and plenty, which we have since enjoyed, for the peaceable and rational manner in which we have been enabled to establish constitutions of government for our safety and happiness, and particularly the national one now lately instituted, for the civil and religious

liberty with which we are blessed, and the means we have of acquiring and diffusing useful knowledge; and in general for the great and various favors which He hath been pleased to confer upon us.

"And also that we may then unite in most humbly offering our prayers and supplications to the great Lord and Ruler of Nations, and beseech Him to pardon our national and other transgressions to enable us all—and deists doesn't ask God to enable us to do anything—whether in public or private stations to perform our several relative duties properly and punctually."

I see my time is running out so I will go straight to the bottom of George Washington's words: "to promote the knowledge and practice of true religion and virtue, and the increase of science among them and us; and generally to grant unto all mankind such a degree of temporal prosperity as He alone knows to be best.

"Given under my hand, at the City of New York, the 3rd of October, in the year of our Lord, 1789." Again, George Washington's words.

Therefore, Madam Speaker, I yield back.

□ 2220

#### EXTENDING AMERICA'S UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CRITZ) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. CRITZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today to address the egregious actions taken by both the House and Senate against unemployed Americans. Members of this body have continued to vote against extending benefits to millions of Americans who need it the most right now. While these citizens are facing the worst job market that this Nation has seen in generations, these Members have turned their backs on them. They claim that the Restoration of Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act is budget-busting legislation. Madam Speaker, any bill whose intention is to assist 14.7 million jobless Americans while adding a needed infusion of cash into our still fragile economy is not budget-busting legislation. It is the right legislation.

Senate Minority Leader MITCH MCCONNELL has claimed that the Republicans continue to block the extension of unemployment benefits because they are not "willing to use worthwhile programs as an excuse" to create "even bigger national debt than we've already got." Where were these same Republicans when we began our descent into fiscal disarray? Where were the Republicans when our national debt doubled when they had control of the White House and Congress? Where were the Republicans in stopping this atrocity from taking place?

And with that, I would like to put a chart up that some of my former colleagues used to show where we were