

lending programs, it would be difficult for them to object on budgetary grounds.

For every dollar put into Ex-Im, Cheney said, “there’s been a \$20 return to the U.S. economy.”

And again, the same speech, Vice President Cheney said:

Ex-Im Bank is remarkably effective at helping create jobs, opportunities for trade, stable democracies, and vibrant economies throughout the world. The Bank has made a tremendous contribution as a rapid response, service-oriented agency designed to meet the export financing needs of American businesses.

Indeed, the Bank has been reauthorized a number of times throughout its history—almost always unanimously, until of late—each time making it more effective for the economic climate of the time.

So let’s have a conversation about how to make it better. Let’s have a conversation on how to get the word out to businesses that they have yet to tap into their potential global markets. Let’s talk about how to get our economy running and get ahead of our global competitors.

Let’s remember, as Congressman CÁRDENAS alluded to, every single developed entity in the world has an Ex-Im Bank-like entity, and if we do not reauthorize the Ex-Im Bank, it is the equivalent of and tantamount to unilateral disarmament in a global economy—one in which global trade has increased fivefold just since 1980.

What is the Export-Import Bank about? It is about jobs, jobs, jobs. Yes, 200,000 last year, but over a million in the last 4 years.

Every month we spend debating the merits of the Export-Import Bank instead of encouraging companies to explore the world market, the economy loses billions of dollars in potential export opportunities. The jobs, especially in manufacturing, stagnate. People remain unemployed when they want to work.

As a member of the House Financial Services Committee, I am encouraging, I am urging, I am beseeching, I am pleading with the chair to hold hearings as soon as possible on reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank. We have been waiting 15 months for something to happen. And it is time to move forward.

Let us be clear-eyed and cold-blooded about what the cost is of not doing anything. At a recent roundtable of businesses who had been involved with the Export-Import Bank there was a gentleman present from a company in California. I believe his name was Steve Wilburn and the company was named FirmGreen.

Literally, in the course of the conversation he raise his hand and he said, I just lost a multimillion-dollar order of sales, and I am told the reason I lost it is that our competitor manufacturer, which was in another country, persuaded the purchaser that the cloud hanging over reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank may mean it will

not be there when you need it. We lost millions in sales because Congress dithered.

Ladies and gentlemen, at the end of the day, this is the most straightforward imaginable proposition. This is about shoring up, strengthening, supporting the manufacturing sector of the American economy and creating good-paying jobs.

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

CURRENT EVENTS AFFECTING AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to my dear friend, Dr. VIRGINIA FOXX.

Ms. FOXX. Thank you, Congressman GOHMERT, my classmate and friend. I appreciate very much you yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, last week, I had the opportunity to visit a remarkable public school in Kernersville, North Carolina. In addition to preparing students academically for college, the North Carolina Leadership Academy is publicly committed to giving their 400 students “the opportunity to develop true leadership qualities and become creative thinkers and problem-solvers while retaining a sense of responsibility for their families, their community, and their country.”

NCLA has an ambitious mission, and they are executing it so well that last year this charter school had over 700 applicants for 95 openings. The wait list has over 600 names, and is growing.

□ 1630

It was a privilege to spend time with the remarkable students and faculty of NCLA. I was truly impressed by their commitment to scholarship, by the leadership skills of the students, and by the remarkable academic progress that was on display.

All NCLA students in grades 7–12 participate in Civil Air Patrol, a program established by Congress in 1946 that uses military-style uniforms, customs, courtesies, ceremonies, and drill in order to improve student leadership skills, fitness, and character. This program is working.

NCLA places a strong emphasis on family involvement; and the level of commitment demonstrated by parents, families, and the Piedmont community at large was impressive.

Community engagement is a key to success of any school, and the community’s support for NCLA is a good reminder that decisions about the education of our youth should remain local.

I have been a strong supporter of charter schools for my entire legislative career. In the North Carolina

State Senate, I supported charters as one of the best hopes to genuinely reform our school system.

In Congress, those of us who support charter schools should express that support by ensuring that Federal policy encourages States to adopt expansive charter laws.

Further, we need to ensure that Washington does not put up bureaucratic roadblocks that would keep State, city, and county governments from experimenting with new ideas and establishing effective charter school programs.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot say enough about how impressed I was to spend time with the educators of the North Carolina Leadership Academy, individuals who seek daily to impress upon the students the values encapsulated in the school motto of “Scholarship, Leadership, Citizenship.”

I expect many good things from the remarkable young scholar leaders currently being educated by this wonderful school. The community will reap the benefits of having this school in its midst for years to come.

Mr. GOHMERT. I appreciate so much my colleague from North Carolina. Having been a president of a university, she knows all about education.

It is certainly one of the areas where we are failing American youth these days, and you would have thought that, if the Federal Government were the answer to everybody’s problems, then when President Carter started the Department of Education, everything would have gotten instantly better; but over 35 years later, it turns out the Federal Government is not the answer to better education.

I have talked with enough high school students who also say the Federal Government is not the answer to their food problems. I have met with cafeteria workers and leaders who say that kids are not eating the food. They are required to choose from lists of foods to put on the plates that they had heretofore not heard of before that students don’t want, don’t like.

The football players were saying last fall: How in the world can we go to football practice and all we get is this piddly little bit of meat and other stuff we can’t eat?

So obviously, education, food has not been helped, certainly not according to my constituents in east Texas, the vast majority; and education itself does not seem to have made all that great or remarkable progress since the Carter administration started the Department of Education and Congress began putting strings on virtually everything they did in the way of educational support.

The 10th Amendment had some real meaning and was really visionary. It was the last of those first 10 Bill of Rights and, in essence, said everything that is not specifically enumerated as a power of the Federal Government is reserved to the States and the people; that is because the genius of our

Founders collectively was the best answers are found locally, not by bureaucrats in Washington, D.C.

I was shocked to go online years ago and see that one of my school districts was bragging that, gee, about half of their employees were actually teachers. I was shocked. I would have thought that, if we really cared about education, the big bulk of employees would be teachers.

So I did further investigation and found out that before the national Department of Education was created under Jimmy Carter, there was between 70 and 80 percent of the Texas educational employees who were teachers.

Naturally, when Washington gets involved, there are more requirements for the State agency—education agency in each State; then with more State education accountability and requirements to Washington, there became more bureaucrats there, which meant there had to be more bureaucrats in the local school districts.

If we want to ever get back to having the best education that we can get for our dollar, we need to get back to observing the 10th Amendment. The best educational accountability comes not from some bureaucrat on his buttocks here in Washington, but from those who are there locally that see what is happening in the school.

We have done enough damage. One of the disagreements I had with former President George W. Bush, who I like and admire—I think it unfortunate that people do not appreciate either his intelligence or his very, very clever wit.

Unlike Mr. Gore, who seemed to have trouble being able to make good enough grades to stay in graduate programs, former President Bush didn't have any problem getting through and getting an MBA from Harvard; though obviously, Harvard is not what it used to be when it would embrace and allow debate from all sectors. Now, it is the liberal sector, or they don't really appreciate you.

So, anyway, No Child Left Behind was a big mistake. When Governor George W. Bush pushed accountability at the State level, he was acting within the bounds of the Constitution.

I had hopes that this administration would actually keep the promise that they would dismantle No Child Left Behind. It has been eased, but not nearly what should have happened.

It turns out that the administration has been so busy with other aspects that, apparently, it has not had the time to devote to dismantling No Child Left Behind, as they might have hoped.

We have this story from today, April 29, 2014, Washington, D.C., from Judicial Watch, "Benghazi Documents Point to White House on Misleading Talking Points."

The article says that—as a release from Judicial Watch, that they announced today that, on April 18, 2014, it obtained 41 new Benghazi-related State Department documents.

They include a newly declassified email showing then-White House Deputy Strategic Communications adviser Ben Rhodes and other Obama administration public relation officials attempting to orchestrate a campaign to reinforce President Obama and to portray the Benghazi consulate terrorist attack as being "rooted in an Internet video and not a failure of policy."

Other documents show that State Department officials initially described the incident as an attack, a possible kidnap attempt.

The documents were released Friday as a result of a June 21, 2013, Freedom of Information Act lawsuit filed against the Department of State to gain access to documents about the controversial talking points used by then-U.N. Ambassador Susan Rice for a series of appearances on television—Sunday news programs—on September 16, 2012.

Judicial Watch had been seeking these documents since October 18, 2012. The Rhodes email was sent on Friday, September 14, at 8:09 p.m., with the subject line, "Re: Prep call with Susan: Saturday at 4 p.m. ET."

The documents show that the prep was for Ambassador Rice's Sunday news show appearances to discuss the Benghazi attack. The documents list as a goal, "to underscore that these protests are rooted in an Internet video and not a broader failure of policy."

I might insert parenthetically here that, actually, this must be taken in context in 2012 because there was an election only weeks following this incident, and the big campaign line that Osama bin Laden is dead, GM is alive, al Qaeda is on the run, didn't look nearly as tantalizing if it turns out al Qaeda—al Qaeda may be on the run, but if they are, they are running toward American interests and killing an American Ambassador and other State Department personnel.

This article goes on to say:

Rhodes returns to the "Internet video" scenario later in the email, the first point in a section labeled "Top-lines."

And here is the quote:

We have made our views on this video crystal clear. The United States Government had nothing to do with it. We reject its message and its contents. We find it disgusting and reprehensible, but there is absolutely no justification at all for responding to this movie with violence, and we are working to make sure that people around the globe hear that message.

Mr. Speaker, it also should be noted here that it was not only sending Susan Rice out to mislead the American people before the election into believing that this was not a failure of policy by the Obama administration, which it clearly was, but actually, it was all about a video.

To perpetuate this misleading, some might argue, fraudulent presentation of anything but facts included producing a commercial with Secretary of State Hillary Clinton saying the United States had nothing to do with

that video, repeatedly making the point to add cover to their cover story that it was not a failure of policy by the Obama administration that caused and failed to suppress the attack at Benghazi, but it was some video by some lone person out in California who must be stopped.

They spent tens of thousands of dollars running this commercial in foreign countries to help give cover to what were the true facts, the true facts being that this was nothing about a video; it was all about a planned concerted attack, which it turns out may have even utilized weapons that the United States provided to these rebels over many of our objections on this House floor, and with the President saying he really didn't need congressional support because he had Islamic countries and France wanting us to get in there and provide weapons and air cover to the al Qaeda-backed rebels.

□ 1645

We knew there was al Qaeda involved. As we said on the floor back during those days, we just don't know how extensive it is. We think we ought to wait until we know how extensive the al Qaeda involvement is. But this administration wouldn't have that. They moved ahead. They furnished weapons. And it could very well turn out that there were people in our party that said, okay, all right, if that is what you want to do, but it certainly wasn't this congressional body that did that.

The President got his will. They furnished weapons to rebels that included al Qaeda. This administration refused to provide the security that was requested by more than one person, but including Chris Stevens, himself. It refused to provide it.

How bad would that look right before the election: A mere matter of weeks before early voting started, and it turns out that not only did they not provide security as requested, when it was requested, heck, they may have even provided the weapons to the rebels who killed our Ambassador. It was the first time an Ambassador had been killed since the Jimmy Carter administration, and here it was happening again.

This administration knew exactly what would happen when America finds out that an administration is toothless, is ineffectual, and has actually brought assistance to radical Islamists becoming in charge of a country. Because, after all, it was the Carter administration that did as this administration did with Mubarak and Qadhafi in saying they have got to go, pushed an ally out. It was not a very nice one by any stretch, but an ally.

And then President Carter welcomed the Ayatollah Khomeini as a man of peace. So then for the first time in what was a long period, a radical Islamist got control of a major country. That opened the door to many thousands and thousands and thousands of Americans being killed in the

decades ahead. That kind of ineffectual foreign policy that Jimmy Carter had saw the results at Benghazi.

But this article goes on to point out that:

Among the top administration PR personnel who received the Rhodes memo were White House Press Secretary Jay Carney, Deputy Press Secretary Joshua Earnest, then-White House Communications Director Dan Pfeiffer, then-White House Deputy Communications Director Jennifer Palmieri, then-National Security Council Director of Communications Erin Pelton, Special Assistant to the Press Secretary Howie Ledbetter, and then-White House Senior Advisor and political strategist David Plouffe.

The Rhodes communications strategy email also instructs recipients to portray Obama as “steady and statesmanlike” throughout the crisis. Another of the “goals” of the PR offensive, Rhodes says, is “to reinforce the President and Administration’s strength and steadiness in dealing with difficult challenges.” He later includes as a PR “top-line” talking point:

“I think that people have come to trust that President Obama provides leadership that is steady and statesmanlike. There are always going to be challenges that emerge around the world, and time and again, he has shown that we can meet them.”

The documents Judicial Watch obtained also include a September 12, 2012, email from former deputy spokesman at U.S. Mission to the United Nations Payton Knopf to Susan Rice, noting that at a press briefing earlier that day, State Department spokesperson Victoria Nuland explicitly stated that the attack on the consulate had been well planned.

The email sent by Knopf to Rice at 5:42 p.m. said:

“Responding to a question about whether it was an organized terror attack, Toria said that she couldn’t speak to the identity of the perpetrators but that it was clearly a complex attack.”

In the days following the Knopf email, Rice appeared on ABC, CBS, NBC, FOX News, and CNN still claiming the assaults occurred “spontaneously” in response to the “hateful video.”

And it is worth noting, there were people that used those words, “steady” and “statesmanlike.” And certainly this would have appeared to be a real problem for the administration that someone speaking soon after the attack and the murder, the assassination of Chris Stevens and three American patriots, Ms. Nuland, not knowing that she was supposed to use talking points and mislead the American public and the world, spoke the truth because she hadn’t gotten the email, the talking points to mislead Americans and the world. So she spoke the truth.

It was very clear, as it was to those in Libya, that this was a complicated attack. It was well planned, well coordinated, and it had nothing to do with the video.

This article goes on:

On Sunday, September 16, Rice told CBS’s “Face the Nation”:

“But based on the best information we have to date, what our assessment is as of the present is, in fact, what began spontaneously in Benghazi as a reaction to what had transpired some hours earlier in Cairo where, of course, as you know, there was a violent protest outside of our Embassy sparked by this hateful video.”

The Judicial Watch documents confirm that CIA talking points that were prepared for Congress and may have been used by Rice on “Face the Nation” and four additional Sunday talk shows on September 16 had been heavily edited by then-CIA Deputy Director Mike Morell. According to one email:

“The first draft apparently seemed unsuitable because they seemed to encourage the reader to infer incorrectly that the CIA had warned about a specific attack on our Embassy. On the SVTS, Morell noted that these points were not good and he had taken a heavy hand to editing them. He noted that he would be happy to work with then deputy chief of staff to Hillary Clinton, Jake Sullivan, and Rhodes to develop appropriate talking points.”

The documents obtained by Judicial Watch also contain numerous emails sent during the assault on the Benghazi diplomatic facility. The contemporaneous and dramatic emails describe the assault as an “attack.”

Just as State Department number two person in Libya said Chris Stevens described it: We are under attack. There was nothing about a video. The American people were duped right before the election, as was the intent.

Back to the article:

September 11, 2012, 6:41 p.m., Senior Adviser Eric Pelofsky to Susan Rice:

“As reported, the Benghazi compound came under attack and it took a bit of time for the ‘annex’ colleagues and Libyan February 17 brigade to secure it. One of our colleagues was killed—IMO Sean Smith. Ambassador Chris Stevens, who was visiting Benghazi this week is missing. U.S. and Libyan colleagues are looking for him.”

Further down, it notes how much material is blacked out in so many of the emails. Judicial Watch President Tom Fitton said: “Now we know the Obama White House’s chief concern about the Benghazi attack was making sure that President Obama looked good.” “And these documents undermine the Obama administration’s narrative that it thought the Benghazi attack had something to do with protests or an Internet video. Given the explosive material in these documents, it is no surprise that we had to go to Federal court to pry them loose from the Obama State Department.”

Well, that has led to this printing that I did of another Judicial Watch FOIA request. This is an article from here in D.C.:

Judicial Watch announced today that on March 25, 2014, it filed a Freedom of Information Act lawsuit against the Federal Bureau of Investigation seeking agency records related to the awarding of the Louis E. Peters Award in 2011 to Mohamed Elbiary, a member of the Department of Homeland Security Advisory Council. Elbiary is alleged to have close ties to radical Islamist organizations, including the Muslim Brotherhood.

And I will insert parenthetically here that, actually, when a Muslim Brother, Morsi, was President of Egypt, a periodical there was bragging about six top Obama officials who were Muslim Brothers, and one of them was Mr. Elbiary from Texas.

This points out here:

Judicial Watch seeks the following documents in its June 24, 2013, FOIA request:

Any and all records regarding, concerning, or related to the awarding of the Louis E.

Peters Memorial Award to Mr. Mohamed Elbiary on September 8, 2011.

Further down, it says:

Elbiary, who in his role as Homeland Security adviser has regular access to classified information, most recently came under fire in November 2013 for tweeting out the message that America is an “Islamic country with an Islamically compliant constitution.” In its December 2013 “Special Report: U.S. Government Purges of Law Enforcement Training Material Deemed ‘Offensive’ to Muslims,” Judicial Watch identified Elbiary as one of nearly a half dozen “Islamist influence operators” within the Obama administration “seeking to advance an ideological agenda completely at odds with our constitutional system.”

Of course, that was December of 2013 when actually it was December of 2012 when the Egyptian Muslim Brother-controlled government had a periodical that talked about, a year before this, the six Muslim Brothers who had such powerful influence and roles in this administration.

This goes on to talk about Mr. Elbiary and his role in the Homeland Security Department. Personally, I had an opportunity to question Janet Napolitano as Secretary of Homeland Security more than once about Mr. Elbiary.

And actually, on the night before one of our hearings, I had talked to the head of the Texas Department of Public Safety, Steve McCraw, a great man, a great patriot, a former FBI agent. He understands what is going on in this country. And he was alerted that Mr. Elbiary had downloaded two documents from a classified database that Mr. Elbiary only got access to because Janet Napolitano, to the best we can find out, just unilaterally gave him a security clearance so he could go into these Web sites. And he did it from his own computer, and he did it at his home. They could tell all of this by the intelligence they were able to gather, and it was clear he had downloaded two documents.

What was in an article and published was that the article writer said that he had talked to someone in the national media who said that Elbiary had shopped those two documents to this national media source, and they didn’t accept it. They were concerned about accepting classified documents and printing them, and so they didn’t.

□ 1700

The next day at our hearing I brought this up to Secretary Napolitano. She said she didn’t know what I was talking about, basically, and she would look into it. What she didn’t know is that I knew when she made those false statements that her chief of staff the night before, her chief of staff had talked to Steve McCraw and had told him, look, I know you are concerned—basically that is what he said:

I know you are concerned, but I have given a full briefing of what happened to the Secretary herself. She knows what is going on. She is fully briefed on the matter.

So either Secretary Napolitano lied to me and the Congress in our hearing

under penalty of perjury, or her chief of staff just completely made up that he had just briefed the Secretary on this troubling security breach.

I would like to think that if the Secretary, as here, had unilaterally put what Egypt considered a member of the Muslim Brotherhood into our very tight inner circle and given him a secret security clearance without going through the normal vetting that is supposed to be required, and if that person that she unilaterally got that position had breached the protocol and downloaded documents from a classified setting, that somebody, for Heaven's sake, would have alerted the Secretary of Homeland Security. But she sat right there and told me that, no, she didn't know anything about it.

The next time I asked her about it, however, she said she had looked into it and there was nothing to it. Unfortunately for her, and unfortunately for our country and its own security, no one had bothered to properly look into the matter because the reporter who published the article that he had talked to, a national media source, said Elibiary tried to get him to publish the classified documents. Nobody called that reporter. Nobody talked to that reporter. He probably wouldn't have disclosed his source, but nobody bothered to even talk to the reporter that knew Mr. Elibiary had shopped those documents.

If homeland security could be so poorly run at the highest level, over its own security, is the rest of America really very safe? The FBI in 2011 gave their highest civilian award, or one of the highest awards, to this same person who was a featured speaker at the tribute to the Ayatollah Khomeini. In fact, the tribute was entitled, "A Tribute to the Great Islamic Visionary, Ayatollah Khomeini." Well, there were no cameras allowed in that big tribute, so we don't know exactly what Mr. Elibiary had to say in tribute to this great Islamic visionary, the Ayatollah Khomeini, who was responsible for kick-starting this radical Islamic effort against the Great Satan, the United States, from their way of thinking.

So he is entitled to the FBI's great tribute to civilians? It kind of gives you a little insight, Mr. Speaker, into how in the world the FBI, after the United States got two heads-ups from a foreign government that was not necessarily our friend, that Mr. Tsarnaev had been radicalized. They talked to Tsarnaev. The best we could get from the hearings that we had when we questioned Director Mueller, the FBI Director at the time—apparently they talked to Mr. Tsarnaev, and he didn't confess to them that he had become radical. They talked to his mother, and she didn't confess that he had become radical. And when I said that you didn't even go out to the Muslim temples there in Boston where the Tsarnaevs attended to ask questions—you can ask questions if you had proper training. Oh, yes, that is right, be-

cause CAIR and ISNA were identified by a United States District Court, that was upheld by the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals, that CAIR and ISNA are front organizations for the Muslim Brotherhood. Yes. CAIR and ISNA, they regularly complain. They give instructions. They give insights to this administration. And CAIR, particularly, had complained about things that radical Islamists might find offensive in the FBI training material, so they were purged.

A couple of us went through these documents that were purged, but we were told the setting and the information was classified so I can't go into it. But, Mr. Speaker, I can tell you it was shocking that some of that stuff was purged. Some of it was stupid. It didn't have to be there. But when, as one of our intelligence officers told me, we blind ourselves to our ability to see our enemy, then when you go investigate someone that you have been given a heads up is radicalized and is a threat to kill Americans, you don't know what to ask. Because if you knew what to ask, you would go to the mosque and say, who knew Tsarnaev? Have you ever heard him talk about "Qutb's Milestones," that publication he wrote, you know, the one that Osama bin Laden said helped to radicalize him?

If you know about radical Islam, you would know the questions to ask. But our FBI, our intelligence, they are not allowed to get that information anymore because it might offend a radical Islamist. Thank God for the moderate Muslims around the world who do not want radical Islamists in charge of their country. And our friends that originally helped to defeat the Taliban, the Northern Alliance in Afghanistan, are in trouble because we have abandoned them, and this administration now won't have anything to do with them. They fought the Taliban. They defeated the Taliban, and the last great fight consisted of Northern Alliance leader, General Dostum, a legend, riding with about 2,000 Northern Alliance tribesmen on horseback. Dostum said they had to go on horseback because they knew soldiers on foot would never make it up the hill, that mountain, to get to the Taliban stronghold. Their only chance to get through the rocket-propelled grenades and the bullets was to ride on horseback. And they knew many of them wouldn't make it, but they really believed enough of them would that they could defeat the Taliban. That is the kind of courage—and, yeah, they fight the Taliban the way the Taliban fights. They are pretty tough folks. But they are the enemy of our enemy, the Taliban.

So this administration doesn't really want to have anything to do with the Northern Alliance that were our allies. Instead, they keep wanting to cut some kind of a deal with the Taliban. And all the Northern Alliance said was, Look, you know, you helped force this constitution upon Afghanistan that centralizes the government when we are

really more tribal, we are more regional. But you gave us a government where the president gets to appoint every governor, every mayor, every police chief, most of the higher level teachers, a slate of many of the legislators that has some powers of the purse. All they ask is let us elect our own governors, mayors, and pick our own police chiefs, and that way the Taliban just can't knock off the president or co-op the president and take back over Afghanistan, which is what is about to happen the way this administration has so poorly handled our foreign policy.

They said that if you could at least push through an amendment that let us elect our governors, mayors, and get our own police chiefs, then we could be regionally strong. So maybe the Taliban gets one region, but the rest of us could rise up and put him out of business again.

Mr. Speaker, why wouldn't that be a good strategy? We don't even need Americans to carry that out. We don't need Americans sitting and hoping, as John Kerry once said about Vietnam, that they are not the last one to die leaving Afghanistan. I have been to too many funerals of people who gave the last full measure for this country in Afghanistan. We owe it to them not to let it fall immediately back into Taliban hands, and we could prevent that without any more American blood being shed.

We prop up financially the Afghan Government to the point that if we put enough pressure on—and I know this administration always puts pressure on the wrong people. Instead of the Palestinian terrorists, we put pressure on Israel to keep giving away their security and safety. In Afghanistan, we pressure the people of Afghanistan to give up their security and safety because we want to cut a deal with the Taliban. The thing to do is to empower the enemy of our enemy, and they will keep our enemies at bay. That is what needs to be done in Afghanistan.

That is why it is so important lest anyone is attempted to ask the question about Benghazi, what difference, at this point, does it make how our four Americans were killed? Well, it makes a difference because if we had learned the specific breakdowns and causes during the Clinton years of two Embassies being attacked and Americans dying, then perhaps we would have been better prepared at Benghazi. But since we didn't learn the lesson under the Clinton administration because people in that administration apparently were wondering what difference does it make how or why these people died and let's just move on, and so Americans died in the future. If we are going to stop that in the future from here, we need to know at this point what happened in Benghazi.

Now, not only is this administration continuing to thwart efforts to get to the bottom of what happened at Benghazi, it also sends our Secretary of State to insult the Israelis yet again.

This time, as this article from the Daily Beast, 4/27, points out:

The Secretary of State, that is John Kerry, said that if Israel doesn't make peace soon, it could become 'an apartheid state,' like the old South Africa. Jewish leaders are fuming over the comparison.

If there is no two-state solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict soon, Israel risks becoming 'an apartheid state,' Secretary of State John Kerry told a room of influential world leaders in a closed-door meeting Friday.

Senior American officials have rarely, if ever, used the term 'apartheid' in reference to Israel, and President Obama has previously rejected the idea that the word should apply to the Jewish state. Kerry's use of the loaded term is already rankling Jewish leaders in America—and it could attract unwanted attention in Israel, as well.

It wasn't the only controversial comment on the Middle East that Kerry made during his remarks to the Trilateral Commission, a recording of which was obtained by The Daily Beast. Kerry also repeated his warning that a failure of Middle East peace talks could lead to a resumption of Palestinian violence against Israeli citizens. He suggested that a change in either the Israeli or Palestinian leadership could make achieving a peace deal more feasible. He lashed out against Israeli settlement building. And Kerry said that both Israeli and Palestinian leaders share blame for the current impasse in the talks.

Yeah, let's figure that out, Mr. Speaker. Israel and Palestinians share the blame for the breakdown of Palestinian peace talks because Israel says you just have to recognize we have a right to exist as a Jewish state so we don't suffer another Holocaust.

□ 1715

And the Palestinians say: you are the little Satan, America is the great Satan, we intend to wipe you off the map. At no time will we be willing to recognize your right to exist. So no, we are not going to agree to allow you to exist, so the only agreement we will enter is if you agree that we have to still plan on wiping you off the map.

And this is the kind of agreement that Kerry thinks should be made.

According to the 1998 Rome Statute, the crime of apartheid is defined as:

Inhuman acts committed in the context of an institutionalized regime of systematic oppression and domination by one racial group over any other racial group or groups and committed with the intention of maintaining that regime. The term is most often used in reference to the system of racial segregation and oppression that governed South Africa from 1948 until 1994.

So let's see, in Israel, Palestinians get the best jobs anywhere between their Palestinian area and Israeli area, and they are allowed to hold those jobs, make the money, and go back into the Palestinian area; and let's see, why does Israel want to protect itself? Oh, yes, before they put up a fence, it made it too easy for Palestinian suicide bombers to just walk into a school yard, walk into an area where innocent children, women, and men are occupying or having a good time and blow them up.

Finally, as a matter of their own self-security, they said: no, we are going to

have to have fences, so you can't just walk in and blow up innocent people.

How have the Palestinians taken to that? Well, they have taken to it by continuing to have, in their textbooks, references to Jewish people as rats or vermin and other such references.

They elicit hatred from the little schoolchildren against Jews. They name holidays and landmarks and monuments and streets after people who have been able to kill innocent people in Israel.

You know, that is one thing about the United States, we don't normally name holidays and streets and landmarks and monuments for people who kill innocent other people. We name holidays and streets for people like Martin Luther King, Jr., an ordained Christian minister who said, by his life, you don't use violence to kill innocent people.

Those are the kind of people we respect here in America. Those are the kind of people we name holidays and streets for, but not in Palestine. Oh, no. Oh, no. And this Secretary of State blames Israel. He does say there is some blame to share, but as the Prime Minister of Israel, Benjamin Netanyahu, said standing at that podium right there:

If the Palestinians lay down their weapons, there will be peace; if the Israelis lay down their weapons, there will be no Israel.

After World War II, when it was learned the extent of the Holocaust, of killing 6 million or so Jewish people simply because of their race, simply because of who they were, the world reacted so strongly and appropriately, they said: we can't allow this to happen again, we need to create the nation of Israel where Jews can go and be protected in a Jewish state, the only Jewish country in the world.

Amazingly, people that had no concept of what the Bible were actually carried out prophecies from the Old Testament, to the letter, by what they did. Maybe there is something to that Old Testament and its prophecies.

For those in this administration, perhaps they are hoping that is not the case because this Secretary of State has, in essence, cursed Israel more than once and that Old Testament that prophesied Israel would be reborn, as it has been exactly, it says those who curse Israel will be cursed and those who bless Israel will be blessed.

You only have to go back a year before or just last year, November 13, 2013. Here is another article about our Secretary of State from Haifa, Israel:

America's Ambassador to Israel has been in damage-control mode after his boss, Secretary of State John Kerry, wondered rhetorically if Jewish opposition to peace negotiations with Palestinians was driven by a desire for a third intifada. Intifada is an Arabic word for uprising and was the term given to intensified Israeli-Palestinian violence from 1987–1993 and from 2000–2005.

Our Secretary of State is saying out loud in a foreign country that, gee, he is wondering if the Israelis want an

intifada again in which hundreds and hundreds of Israeli citizens will be senselessly killed again.

You know, there was a reason—and I was talking to one of my Democratic colleagues yesterday about Secretary Kerry's remarks. There was a reason the majority of the United States said: you know what, we are concerned about some aspect of John Kerry. We don't want him to be the spokesman around the world for the United States of America. So it could be credited to President Obama, we will give him another chance. We will let him speak for America, I will appoint him Secretary of State.

And he has shown yet again, you know what, there really was a reason that the American people did not want him to be the international spokesman for America. It is time, I believe, he came home and ceased being Secretary of State.

Here is an article from yesterday by Ben Shapiro. He is a Jew. He is brilliant. He is a friend. He wrote yesterday an article titled, "The Anti-Semitism of the Obama administration." He talks about Kerry's comment about the apartheid state. Ben says in his article:

This is pure anti-Semitism. Blaming Israel for its incapacity to make peace with people whose stated goal is to murder Jews cannot be construed as anything other than Jew hatred. Likening the Jewish state to South Africa, despite the fact that there are well over a million Arab citizens with full voting rights and despite the fact that the Palestinian territories are completely Judenrein, is more of the same.

Upon tape of his remarks hitting the press, Kerry immediately backtracked, stating, "I will not allow my commitment to Israel to be questioned by anyone, particularly for partisan, political purposes." He then disclaimed that he ever said Israel was an apartheid state and said, "If I could rewind the tape, I would have chosen a different word to describe my firm belief that the only way in the long term to have a Jewish state and two nations and two people is through a two-state solution."

Sadly, Kerry is simply not believable at this point. The Obama administration has demonstrated a consistent pattern of anti-Semitic rhetoric—even aside from their practical undermining of any Israeli attempt to stop the Iranian nuclear program with repeated national security leaks. It peppers the top ranks of the Obama White House.

And then the article goes on to point out some of the leaks that were done to hurt Israel.

But Secretary Kerry should be encouraged. Here is an article, "Far Left J-Street Defends Kerry's Apartheid Accusations Against Israel," posted by Jim Hoft on Tuesday, April 29:

J-Street calls itself the organization that "gives political voice to mainstream American Jews and other supporters of Israel," but it is far from a pro-Israel group. In 2010, it was revealed that radical far left billionaire George Soros donated \$245,000 to the leftist organization in 2008 and another \$500,000 in subsequent years.

Cofounder Daniel Levy was caught on tape telling an audience that the creation of Israel was "an act that was wrong."

Wow.

Yesterday, this far left anti-Israel group defended John Kerry. Pro-Israel groups

blasted J-Street today after the far left Jewish group supported John Kerry's apartheid accusation against Israel. The Zionist Organization of America responded to J-Street's comments: J-Street has again demonstrated that it is an extremist group, hostile to Israel, by supporting Secretary of State John Kerry's "apartheid" accusation against Israel.

This is the administration that condemns, cajoles our friend Israel, supports and coddles terrorists, radical Islamists in Afghanistan and Palestine, that went rushing into Libya when many of us were saying: look, this isn't a good idea. We know al Qaeda is supporting the rebels. Let's wait and see how much of these rebels are al Qaeda.

But he helped them anyway, and now, we find out, here is an article from today from *The Blaze* titled, "The Massive Amount of Weapons Meant for Libyan Rebels That Actually Ended Up in Terrorists' Hands."

It is a good article from Sara Carter. The trouble is these weapons were actually intended for the terrorists because we knew—we had information there were al Qaeda terrorists that were part of the rebels against Qadhafi.

I know I just have a couple more minutes, but let me mention, as some of the leadership in the Senate and even some on the Republican side here in the House is being encouraged and encouraging others, let's have some kind of legal status, amnesty-type bill for certain people.

Or how about in the NDAA that we are going to take up, why don't we put in there, if you are in this country illegally and you are willing to go into the service, then we will claim you are legal?

Recent veterans are struggling to find jobs, and information indicates our military members are being released from the military right and left because of the dramatic cuts to the military, far more than should ever have been allowed by this body, and they are having trouble finding jobs.

The unemployment rate for our veterans ought to be much lower than for anybody, and it is much higher than for the American population, and this administration now and some of our own leadership wants to encourage people illegally here to go take those jobs away from those being bounced out of the military and let them compete and bring down the level of wages for the middle class in America. It should not be allowed.

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

□ 1730

RECOGNITION OF THE 63RD ANNUAL OBSERVANCE OF THE NATIONAL DAY OF PRAYER

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to follow a gentleman like Mr.

GOHMERT here. My subject matter for this minute is about the National Day of Prayer. I would like to add to his comments: we should also pray for Israel.

Recognition of the 63rd Annual Observance of the National Day of Prayer will be this Thursday, May 1.

Our Nation has a rich prayerful heritage, a heritage that began with many of our first settlers to the New World and strengthened through the first national call to prayer invoked by the Second Continental Congress in 1775.

As reflected in the writings and speeches of our forefathers, prayer has had a profound influence not only on the lives of these great leaders, but also on the content of the Declaration of Independence and other founding documents.

In his farewell address, President George Washington warned about the consequences that will descend on a Nation that excludes religion from the public arena. He declared the "indispensable" importance of religion, and proclaimed that: "Reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle."

Today, prayer remains very important in our daily lives, not only to our society, but to each of us individually as well. It calls to mind our actions and helps support us in our daily tasks.

Today, I ask my colleagues to join with me to continue this tradition of prayer and ensure that God remains involved in the affairs of leaders of this great Nation.

ISRAEL'S MODERN HISTORY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CRAMER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) for 30 minutes.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I stand before you today to discuss the comments made recently by Secretary Kerry regarding Israel and apartheid.

I am not going to be one of the many people that are probably calling for Secretary Kerry's resignation in that regard. I too work in the arena of public policy, and I understand that sometimes you make mistakes in the things you say, you say things that you didn't necessarily intend to say.

I think it is very instructive to talk about it for just a few moments here. I want to remind everybody that Israel first fought a War of Independence in 1948 and 1949, and then fought again in 1967 in the Six Day War and then again in 1973 with the Yom Kippur War.

During these periods of time, they were attacked, unilaterally attacked by their neighbors. Some people say: Well, we need to go back to those pre-1967 borders. I ask anybody who was attacked, who has been in a fight where somebody sucker-punched them, who was the aggressor, why is it incumbent upon Israel to return the spoils of the

war? Folks attacked them, they fought the war, and they won, and they want to secure their population. Because of that, some people think that somehow Israel is the oppressor. They reacted to an act of aggression.

I just want to also read statements from President Obama from 2008 regarding the usage of the term "apartheid":

There's no doubt that Israel and the Palestinians have tough issues to work out to get to the goal of two states living side by side in peace and security, but injecting a term like apartheid into the discussion doesn't advance that goal. It's emotionally loaded, historically inaccurate, and it's not what I believe.

That is not what Americans believe either.

I think for me and what I want to tell anybody that is watching and anybody that is listening is, this should be proof positive; finally, the evidence of what many conservatives and many people who support Israel have been saying for the last 6 years. Finally, what we are seeing is—if this isn't proof, I don't know what is—the thoughts and the feeling and the mindset and what is in the heart of this administration regarding Israel. This is what they believe. This is who they are.

If you support Israel as the only ally, the only true ally for America in that part of the world, if that is who you support, then you must recognize this for what this is, Mr. Speaker. It is an abandoning. It is not only an abandoning of our ally, our great ally and our true friend, but is a castigation of who they are.

When we think about what apartheid is, Israel doesn't represent any of that. It is an open democracy that lets people live freely and participate within the confines of their security situation, and as the representative before me discussed, rockets being rained down upon them, homicide bombers coming into their children's school and blowing up their children, blowing up their buses on a busy street or a cafe where people are just trying to have a meal. That is their daily life. And we are supposed to castigate them for defending their nation, for their leaders defending their nation against that, and that is somehow apartheid?

The physical, racial, financial, I mean the spiritual and emotional oppression for the sake of race, that is apartheid. That is not what Israel is doing. That is not what Israel is about. That is not what Israel has done. Israel has tried to live peaceably in that region of the world among its neighbors. It has fought to exist. It fights every day to exist.

For the Secretary of State to use that term in describing who Israel is, what they are as a people, what they are as a government, it is not only reprehensible, it in my mind truly defines, it very clearly illustrates what this administration believes. So if you are a supporter of Israel, if you are a supporter of the only ally, the true ally of