

that we're developing in a safe and reliable manner, I'm able to put my kids through college. I'm able to maybe go out and venture into a business that otherwise I wouldn't be able to do because I didn't have the cash to do it. That is going to empower generations of American families for many generations to take them out of poverty and get them an education; and it's all being done on private capital, capital not coming from taxpayers but coming from good old-fashioned American business, coming out of the free enterprise system, utilizing those natural resources that are owned by those individuals that are empowering people for generations. And it's not being done on the taxpayer dollar.

To me, we should be joining hands and applauding that type of development of natural resource and commit ourselves to this comprehensive policy.

Mr. OLSON. If my friend from Pennsylvania would stay a minute longer, would you talk a little bit about the Marcellus Shale plate and how it has impacted your State?

Mr. REED. Well, I tell you, being from New York, being down in the northern tier of Pennsylvania, right now New York is in the process of finalizing its regulations to make sure that it can be done safely and responsibly, but I have the honor of representing the 29th Congressional District, which is right along the Pennsylvania border.

What we have seen is we have seen the spillover effect from the economic opportunities and economic development that is going on in the State of Pennsylvania from the development of the Marcellus Shale. One of the counties in my district, Chemung County, is leading the State in sales tax revenue numbers because of the economic impact coming across the border for our hotels, our restaurants, all of the activities we have talked about.

I've heard from retailers and I've heard from a dry cleaning outfit in my hometown of Corning, New York, that was raising an additional \$6,000 a month by cleaning the overalls and the uniforms from the Marcellus Shale workers that are performing work in the State of Pennsylvania. Do you know what that means? That means he was able to give his employees a bonus for the first time in years. He was able to hire more people in our home area. I mean, this development touches so many lives and so many people, from the actual pulling of the natural gas out, and all of the indirect benefits and everything else that's out there.

Mr. OLSON. I thank my colleague from New York for those comments. As you know, shale formations do not know State boundaries.

Mr. REED. Amen.

Mr. OLSON. So the Marcellus plate runs from Pennsylvania all of way down through West Virginia.

Mr. GARDNER. I want to thank both of my colleagues from New York and Texas for joining us tonight. We are

out of time, but I appreciate the opportunity to address the House with your expertise and your leadership and know that we are fighting for the American people, to do everything we can for American energy independence and American energy security.

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

OUR FRIEND IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOWDY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I come tonight deeply troubled about the situation in the Middle East, as so many people are, and also about the response of this country to our dear friend, Israel. It has been quite interesting to see as Iran comes ever closer to having nuclear weapons, just how much of a friend this administration has, at least from its viewpoint in Israel.

In recent days, we've seen the story, a number of news services provided one story, a reporter from The Washington Post, David Ignatius, traveling with Defense Secretary Leon Panetta, and this article from Fox News says:

Traveling with the Defense Secretary in Brussels to cover his meeting with NATO defense ministers, Ignatius writes, "Panetta believes there is a strong likelihood that Israel will strike Iran in April, May, or June."

That's awfully specific. There are some in Iran who have believed that we're a paper tiger and so is Israel, and we will prevent Israel from ever striking at all. And that if there were to be some kind of a strike, it would be much later in the year.

There's an article from last October about Defense Secretary Panetta. This one is from the AP, October 2 of last year:

Defense Secretary Leon Panetta warned Sunday that Israel is becoming increasingly isolated in the Middle East, and said Israeli leaders must restart negotiations with the Palestinians and work to restore relations with Egypt and Turkey.

□ 1930

It's really interesting because it was my impression that it was not Israel that had withdrawn from close relations, that it was Turkey that had actually allowed the flotilla to go challenge a legal and appropriate blockade of the Gaza Strip from which Israel was being bombarded on a constant basis. So they had a legal and legitimate interest in ensuring that more rockets did not flow into the Gaza Strip that would continue to be shot in an effort to kill Israelis.

The reason that the rockets were flying from the Gaza Strip was because the Israelis had had really a rather amazing group of towns there. People were making a living. There were beautiful homes and greenhouses, providing a way in which people could provide for themselves and to grow their own food. These were just well-run communities.

But the thought that the Israeli leaders had, apparently, was that if we will show this unilateral offer of goodwill to people who, in the last 40 years, have come to be called Palestinians—they obviously weren't for most of the history of mankind—but if they would do this amazingly gracious unilateral act, that it would be rewarded. And what Israel has found is that it has been rewarded with rockets flying into Israel in an effort to try to terrorize and kill Israelis.

Previously, years before that, Israel had made an offer and did provide land from which it had been attacked, which it had acquired in southern Lebanon. Lo and behold, they were rewarded by being attacked from southern Lebanon and having soldiers kidnapped from southern Lebanon. So it's interesting to hear this administration and people from this administration in the top positions talk about how Israel needs to restart negotiations, that Israel is becoming increasingly isolated, how Israel must reach out more, when it seems that each time Israel reaches out its hand, its hand gets shot at and efforts are made to chop it off.

This article from the AP from back in October quotes Secretary Panetta as saying:

"It's pretty clear that at this dramatic time in the Middle East, when there have been so many changes, that it is not a good situation for Israel to become increasingly isolated. And that's what's happening," he said.

Panetta said the most important thing now is for Israel and its neighbors "to try to develop better relationships so in the very least they can communicate with each other rather than taking these issues to the streets."

The Palestinians, meanwhile, have said they won't return to talks unless Israel freezes settlement building and accepts the pre-1967 war frontier as a baseline for talks.

This is somewhat akin to saying, well, if Mexico were to be launching rockets or doing things to terrorize American citizens, that if we'll just go back to where we were before the U.S.-Mexican War, then everything will be just fine. The United States went to war because of the same kind of unfairnesses that were seen by the Founders of this land. Dennis Miller put it this way: the Founders were willing to go to war when the British simply put a tax on their breakfast drink. So in all likelihood, they would be standing up firmly for a taking of liberties more so than we do sometimes today.

In fact, if we stood firmly on the liberties of the United States citizens and efforts by others in the world to destroy us, efforts by others in the world who have said they will destroy our way of life and they want to destroy our country, then perhaps we would be a little safer today.

I have a resolution that was filed—I've got lots of cosponsors—it was filed in May of last year, and I'm still in hopes that we can bring this to the

floor because this is the response we should have to nations around the world trying to isolate Israel. We should let them know how we stand with them. We stand with people who are democratically elected, we stand with people who have the freedom of worship, we stand with people who will not terrorize Christians, terrorize Jews, or terrorize Muslims, where all will be allowed to practice their religion—any religion—and those ought to be our best friends.

Yet, to the contrary, this Nation seems to run to the aid of those—like in Afghanistan right now, we were advised last year that the last Christian church has now been closed, driven out of Afghanistan. This is the Afghanistan that American treasure and American lives were sacrificed to secure what we thought would be a democratic nation where they would choose peace. And, in fact, there has not been peace. The Taliban have actually increased in number dramatically since the days when we had them on the run, had basically defeated them in early 2002.

We come back to this resolution, H. Res. 271, and it says:

Expressing support for the State of Israel's right to defend Israeli sovereignty, to protect the lives and safety of the Israeli people, and to use all means necessary to confront and eliminate nuclear threats posed by the Islamic Republic of Iran, including the use of military force if no other peaceful solution can be found within a reasonable time to protect against such an immediate and existential threat to the State of Israel.

This is the solution when a dear ally of the United States is being isolated by people who want to destroy it. And I know that—I believe Secretary Panetta did a very good job at intelligence, and I hope he will do as well at defense. But we would encourage people in this administration, Mr. Speaker, to go look at what has really been said and who has actually done harm to whom.

And what you find out is that Israel has not moved away from being a friend. In fact, Israel had a treaty with Egypt, and a leader named Mubarak, with whom this Nation had agreements, was doing all he could, apparently, it appeared, to keep that treaty, to keep Egypt's word with Israel. This administration, on the other hand, saw fit to encourage Mubarak to step down and to make way for what seems to be the military and the Muslim Brotherhood, who seemed to have made clear they're not going to honor the treaty with Israel. They're not going to honor what was brokered here in the United States.

So, once again, we have a United States administration who seems to have been left with egg on their faces, as President Carter's administration was. I don't know if they ever realized it, but when President Carter thought the Ayatollah Khomeini was a man of peace and was coming back to Iran and that it was a good thing, we soon found otherwise.

□ 1940

By 1979, they were at war with America, it's just that we didn't recognize that there were radical Islamists at war with us until after the attack on 9/11. Not even the attack on the World Trade Center in 1993 was enough to convince us, not an attack on the USS Cole, not an attack on our embassy, not an attack on different U.S. properties around the world; it took 9/11 before we realized there are radical Islamists that are at war with us.

Even though this administration has seen to the changing of the FBI lexicon, where, in training FBI agents and others who are in charge with defending our Nation, it's no longer appropriate to use words in the FBI lexicon—they're not there—of al Qaeda, radical Islamist. We use "radical extremism" instead. And as some experts on radical extremism—in other words, radical Islamists—have said, unless you understand what your enemy believes, how in the world can you prepare against an attack from that enemy?

And as someone else had told me, this administration has been in the process of blinding those who are charged with trying to protect us; can't use the terms that were repeatedly used in the 9/11 bipartisan commission report at a time when they didn't know it was politically incorrect to accurately classify people who wanted to destroy your way of life.

So, in this resolution regarding Israel's right to defend itself, it seemed that there was no better thing to do than to go to quotes and to the actual history in the region that points out that:

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.

It's been amazing, having been over in Israel in November and seeing the results of excavations under what they now know is the City of David, in existence about 1,600 years before Muhammad was born. It's just amazing now all of the evidence that's being found archeologically that substantiates exactly what Israelis have been saying for years.

The resolution says:

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

And, parenthetically, they now say they hope to have a missile that would be able to deliver a nuclear weapon from Iran to the United States.

The resolution says:

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 Hezbollah 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 cooperation 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.”

□ 1950

The resolution ultimately says that, in addition to condemning the government of the Islamic Republic of Iran for its threats of annihilation, it supports using all means of persuading the government of Iran to stop building and acquiring nuclear weapons, reaffirms the United States bond with Israel.

But ultimately, No. 4 says that, in this resolution, we express our 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.

Now, we know that in May of last year, President Barack Obama addressed the American-Israeli PAC here in Washington, D.C. And one of the statements that has not been lost on Israel, and should not be lost on the people who elected President Obama, and it certainly hasn't been lost on Iran, the President made this statement: “Israel must be able to defend itself by itself.”

This was made May 19, 2011. “Israel must be able to defend itself by itself.”

Ever since the President made those statements, it certainly seems that Israel has taken the President's words to heart. And yet, instead of the United States doing, as had been promised on many occasions, standing by Israel, our great ally, instead, our Defense Secretary, knowing that he's talking to a Washington Post reporter, knowing that it's not on background, knows that it will likely be reported, basically uses the opportunity to alert the nation whose leaders say they want to wipe Israel off the map, annihilate Israel, annihilate the United States, basically, tells Iran, hey, heads up. Israel may be coming in the next few months. Look out. Israel may be coming in the next few months.

It's still a mystery why our Defense Secretary, and he's a very smart man, why he would make such a statement without authority, because he's not subject to the slips like outing SEAL Team Six as the ones who took out Osama Bin Laden, or outing the undisclosed location, as the Vice President has done. He's a man not subject normally to those kind of gaffes.

This Defense Secretary warns Iran, as if the pressure behind the scenes this administration's been putting on our dear friend Israel was not enough, so now we've got to alert Israel's enemy, Iran. I hope that the administration will come out and give a good and legitimate answer to how such a warning to Iran helps Israel.

And I would commend to anyone, Mr. Speaker, interested in going online and reading in The Jerusalem Post an article dated February 7, 2012, by my friend, Caroline Glick, titled, “Our World: Obama's rhetorical storm.” I would commend that to everyone.

The truth is, we should stand by Israel. Iran, with nuclear weapons, is a threat to us, not merely to Israel. And this Nation should not leave it to Israel, without our best bunker busters, without our AWACs, without our satellites, without our stealth technology. We should not put them in the position of having to defend us with lesser weapons capability.

And I hope and pray that this administration will look more carefully at who the real enemy is, look more carefully at which nation was willing to come back to the peace table, willing to freeze the development of new housing areas, and which one was not, and which one of the nations, which one of the groups of people, in this case, the people of the West Bank, the Palestinians, their complete refusal to even recognize Israel's right to exist, their continuing teaching of children in the Palestinian areas that the Israelis are occupiers of Palestinian land. It's throughout the teaching of the children in the Palestinian areas, and they're doing that with our money. We're sending them money to teach children to hate Israel so that there can't be peace. It's time to look more carefully at where we're spending our money.

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

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House reports that on February 8, 2012 she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.R. 658. To amend title 49, United States Code, to authorize appropriations for the Federal Aviation Administration for fiscal years 2011 through 2014, to streamline programs, create efficiencies, reduce waste, and improve aviation safety and capacity, to provide stable funding for the national aviation system, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 9, 2012, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4905. A letter from the Secretary, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Swap Data Recordkeeping and Reporting Requirements (RIN: 3038-AD19) received January 12, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4906. A letter from the Deputy Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — New Animal Drugs; Cephalosporin Drugs; Extralabel Animal Drug Use; Order of Prohibition [Docket No.: FDA-2008-N-0326] received January 17, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4907. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's report on assistance provided for sporting events during calendar year 2011; to the Committee on Armed Services.

4908. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Mexico pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

4909. A letter from the Acting Chief, Planning and Regulatory Affairs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Applying for Free and Reduced Price Meals in the National School Lunch Program and School Breakfast Program and for Benefits in the Special Milk Program, and Technical Amendments [FNS-2007-0023] (RIN: 0584-AD54) received January 10, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

4910. A letter from the Deputy Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medical Devices; Ovarian Adnexal Mass Assessment Score Test System; Labeling; Black Box Restrictions [Docket No.: FDA-2011-D-0028] received January 17, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4911. A letter from the Deputy Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Temperature-Indicating Devices; Thermally Processed Low-Acid Foods Packaged in Hermetically Sealed Containers; Correction [Docket No.: FDA-2007-N-0265] (formerly 2007N-2006) received January 17, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4912. A letter from the Deputy Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revisions to Labeling Requirements for Blood and Blood Components, Including Source Plasma [Docket No.: FDA-2003-N-0097] (Formerly 2003N-0211) received January 17, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.