

This transmission shall constitute a submittal for purposes of both sections 123 b. and 123 d. of the Act. My Administration is prepared to begin immediately the consultations with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House Foreign Affairs Committee as provided in section 123 b. Upon completion of the 30 days of continuous session review provided for in section 123 b., the 60 days of continuous session review provided for in section 123 d. shall commence.

BARACK OBAMA.
THE WHITE HOUSE, January 7, 2014.

□ 1930

A GREAT DEAL OF NEWS TO REPORT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCALLISTER). 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, a great deal of news has come out. So many things have happened since we recessed in December. Some things did not get the attention they should have.

This is an article from the Daily Caller, December 18, entitled: "Senate Democrats Block Amendment to Restore Veteran Benefits by Closing Illegal Immigrant Welfare Loophole."

Mr. Speaker, it would seem by anyone's standard of morality that when someone promises something in order to encourage or get someone else to expose themselves to death, to brutal treatment, and that person does so—they join the military, go through rigorous training, spend a career 20 years or more defending the United States of America, following orders—that it would be morally reprehensible for anyone, or in this case any government, to pull back on the promises that were made to those who served relying on those promises.

In courts, that doctrine would be called "promissory estoppel." Promises are made to induce someone else to act, the other does act in reliance on those promises to the actor's detriment, then in a court system a civilian would be required under the doctrine of promissory estoppel to provide what was promised.

But the United States Government is not subject to such claims in court so it must rely upon Congress to have the moral compass and the conscience to keep our promises to those who have served enough years, long enough to retire. When I push for such benefits and the keeping of our word to our veterans, it is not something that enures to my benefit. I served in the Army, but only for 4 years. I did not reach the 20-year mark or more that would have entitled me to the promises that were made.

But I know so many who had the chance to go back and make more money in the civilian sector and not

give up their right of freedom of assembly and had to assemble at 5 in the morning, as we often did, or doing forced marches, as we did, or doing so many things that were not fun or pleasant, but doing so because it was proper training to be in the United States military. We owe those who have served to keep our promises.

When George Washington resigned as commander of the revolutionary military, it was an incredible act that constantly comes up both here and abroad when people both here and around the world look for an example of true selfless service to one's country. And how George Washington could serve as commander of the revolutionary military, the revolution is won, and he did what no one in the history of the world has ever done: won the revolution as commander of the military and then resign and in effect that I have done all you asked and now I am going home.

That was brought up to me in the Maldives Islands some time back that I was told was a relatively new democracy who were always worried about a military coup because we never had a proper example like George Washington, we never had a George Washington to set the proper example, and has had a military coup since, I was told. Not only did George Washington resign, but at the end of his resignation—and this was something that was said to all 13 Governors—he had a prayer for the country. Part of that prayer was that we would never fail to remember, basically honoring those who have served.

Then apparently on December 18, the United States Senate voted against restoring the benefits that were taken away from veterans because they didn't want to close a loophole in the law that allows for people who come here illegally to get welfare. Because if that loophole had been closed, then people who come illegally would not be able to get welfare, and the money saved by closing that loophole would be enough to fund our promises that have been broken to our veterans under the brand-new budget.

I hope very soon that we will have a chance to fix that in the House. It is the right thing to do. How else will we have the moral authority in Congress to do anything else? We can't keep our promises in answer to the prayer that George Washington had that we would never forget those, that we would help those who have served in the field, our military. That is a travesty.

On December 19, the next day, there was an article in the Washington Times: "Homeland Security Helps Smuggle Illegal Immigrant Children into the United States." It goes on to discuss a 10-page order by Judge Andrew S. Hanen. And Judge Hanen, it says, said the case was the fourth such case he had seen over the last month. And in each instance, Customs and Border Protection agents have helped to locate and deliver the children to their illegal immigrant parents.

Now, Republicans believe in the sanctity of marriage and the sanctity and importance of families in America. When someone chooses to violate United States law and enter the United States illegally without proper documentation, no matter how noble the cause is believed to be to help family—obviously that is a noble cause—but if it is done illegally, without documentation, it is an incredible disservice and affects so unfairly those who have stood in line, paid money after money, done everything the right way to gain entrance into the United States legally.

There is one person to whom I spoke last Thursday that he was married to a woman that he tried for so long to get legally into the United States and finally got her into the country legally. It is so grossly unfair to the millions of people who have come into this country as immigrants legally. We are a Nation of immigrants. As my friend STEVE KING says, there is really not a nation in the world, perhaps, that is not a nation of immigrants. But the United States certainly is.

One of the big reasons we have been able to become the most free—until ObamaCare perhaps—but the most free Nation in the world with the least government dictation and intervention in our private lives, and been the most blessed country, I believe, even more so than Solomon's Israel, is because we were a Nation of laws, as the Founders described it, a Nation where no one was perceived to be above the law.

I even paid a parking ticket because people perceived that I had violated a law and a National Park policeman who did not know the law, was ignorant of the law, decided to give it. It was easier to pay the \$25 than it was to help teach the National Park policeman the law on parking in Washington, D.C. Nobody is above the law. Nobody is supposed to be above the law.

There are verses throughout the Old Testament and New Testament. So many of the first hundred years of this Nation's existence had scriptures quoted from the Old Testament and New Testament as a basis, or reason, that particular legislation should be passed.

Well, one thing is clear in the Old Testament and New Testament: that showing partiality, showing favoritism, to anyone—as Leviticus talks about—whether it is to the very poor or the very wealthy, either way it is not right; it is wrong.

If we are going to ever attain again moral authority as a Congress, we have to make sure the law is applied fairly across the board. When someone chooses to violate our laws by coming into the country, then we have a President who took an oath to see that the laws of the United States are carried out and properly executed. That means everyone who answers to the President of the United States, including the Department of Homeland Security, including Customs and Border enforcement, all of DHS, should be following

the law and pushing others to follow the law and seeing that the law is followed.

But yet we see apparently case after case, shockingly, that Homeland Security is getting involved in the human trafficking business carrying children around the country, seeking them out.

□ 1945

How about we get the parent together with the child in a country where they are lawfully allowed to be?

How about being a good neighbor to Mexico? Instead of providing weapons to drug cartels, which have killed hundreds of our neighbors in Mexico, how about standing up against the drug cartels—not supplying them weapons, not seeing that drug deals are done, which may help one cartel over another, but actually being a good neighbor so that Mexico becomes the country where people want to stay and work?

I have talked to so many Mexicans who really want to live in Mexico, but they have trouble finding jobs. There is so much corruption in a country where a police chief or a law enforcement officer or someone trying to do the right thing or trying to stand up against the drug cartel can end up with his head on a pike. That is our neighbor. Why are we not helping our neighbor stop the killing in massive numbers of our neighbor Mexicans? Instead, we have the Department of Homeland Security, as found by the Federal courts, to continually be helping people violate our own laws.

I want families together, but the law needs to be followed. That is why you have judges, like I was, who have their hearts broken when they have to enforce laws that they don't always believe in, but it is because the laws are duly passed and signed into law by the executive branch, because we took an oath to enforce the law and to follow the law.

Then it was shocking to read this story in TheBlaze from December 27. The headline: "ATF Agent Sends Shock Waves Across Internet with Explosive Allegations About 'Fast and Furious' and Brian Terry's Death."

On down in the article, it says:

After the Terry slaying—in talking about Brian Terry, the Federal agent who was killed—and an attempted cover-up within the Justice Department, Dodson—in talking about this ATF agent—provided evidence and testimony to Congress. His revelations, later verified by an Office of the Inspector General's report, ignited a national scandal over Fast and Furious that resulted in a congressional contempt citation against Attorney General Eric Holder and the replacement of top ATF and Justice Department officials.

In his book, Dodson uses cautious language to characterize his account of circumstances surrounding Terry's death, saying the information is based on firsthand knowledge, personal opinion and press reports. He asserts that the DEA had information about and may have orchestrated a large drug shipment through Peck Canyon that December night.

He was talking about the night Brian Terry was killed.

He alleges that DEA agents shared that intelligence with FBI counterparts, who advised criminal informants from another cartel that the load would be "theirs for the taking."

Dodson laid out a strategy in which Federal law enforcement agencies, like the FBI, allow criminal activity in order to increase the clout of FBI informants embedded within cartel organizations. "If they can get these guys (informants) in a position so they're closer to the tier 1 or tier 2 guy (in the cartel), they'll do it . . ."

Further down, the article says:

"Essentially, the United States Government is involved in cartel-building," Dodson said.

The claims sound eerily familiar to allegations brought forward by high-ranking Sinaloa Cartel operative Jesus Vicente Zambada-Niebla, who is currently facing trial in Chicago on Federal drug charges.

Further down, it says:

"(They) were given carte blanche to continue to smuggle tons of illicit drugs into Chicago and the rest of the United States, and were also protected by the United States Government from arrest and prosecution in return for providing information against rival cartels which helped Mexican and United States authorities capture or kill thousands of rival cartel members," the defense motion in the case reads.

It is incredible what is going on, and it is only appropriate that, if Congress is to continue funding these agencies and these departments, we should have—and do have—the right to know what they are doing with our money. That should also mean getting to the bottom of Fast and Furious. There should be a select committee to get to the bottom of what happened in Fast and Furious. Eventually, there should be mainstream media components that actually do their job for a change, which is so important to keeping a free nation, by actually going after the administration they have put in place and demanding answers to the questions of what happened with Fast and Furious.

We owe our friends to the south, our Mexican neighbors, answers to what happened. It is outrageous for a government to treat a neighbor like this. There is no reason that the country of Mexico should not be one of the top 10 economies in the world. Mexico should be one of the top 10 economies in the world. They have the natural resources. They have got people willing to work and who are doing phenomenal work as we have seen even in this country. They have a beautiful country, but they need to be rid of the drug cartels. They need to be a nation of laws.

This eerily brings us back to the demand that some who come into this country illegally make now: we want you to quit being a nation of laws, ignore the law and say that we are legally here, though we came illegally. Ironically, if we do that, we are no longer a nation of laws, which would make us like the nation of Mexico, where graft and corruption in so many places is the rule of the day, where cronyism is the rule in so many places,

where they don't have the freedom that we have here from the fear of drug cartels.

I have mentioned a Washington Times story. Unfortunately, there was one in the Washington Times today, entitled: "Is Islam a religion of peace or a religion of war?" written by Rahat Husain. In this, Mr. Husain shows that he is either one of the laziest reporters in the world or that he is one of the biggest liars.

I quote from the article:

Of course, those who seek to vilify more than 1.6 billion Muslims in the world do so with a serious disregard for logic or morality. In 2010, Congresswoman Debbie Riddle and Congressman Louie Gohmert put a theory into the public discourse, that there was such a thing as a "terror baby."

I have never used that term to describe anybody. So, from Mr. Husain, Mr. Speaker, that is an outrageous, abominable lie.

Now, it is quite possible he could have gotten that from so many of the media sources that do what they do so well. I go back to a sign that used to be above a blacksmith's shop. It was a recreation of an old blacksmith's shop just south of Fort Benning in a quaint, old village. The sign above the blacksmith's door said: "All types of bending and twisting done here." So what happens is that some in the mainstream, so-called, take a point that I make, twist it into something I didn't say, create this straw dog that they can beat up over and over and over and run that use up so much on the Internet that, if you click on my name, you will see this term, though I have never used it, and the point I made was a valid point.

This article says:

Despite the moral depravity of referring to infants as terrorists—

which I never did. Mr. Husain is a liar—

Congressman Gohmert defended the notion and got into a shouting match with CNN's Anderson Cooper, insisting on the validity of his idea.

Mr. Husain's writing does not deserve to be considered as serious literature if he is either that lazy or that significant of a liar. All he would have to do is research. Hopefully, he did that research, which would mean he is clearly one of the largest liars around. Now, if either Anderson Cooper or Mr. Husain or others would do a little homework—it doesn't take that much—they would find that something called "birthright tourism" is big around the world. It is significant.

As I pointed out to Anderson Cooper, there had been an article shortly before that about a Chinese tourist agency that, for a certain amount of money, would get you a tourist visa into the United States when you were pregnant. They would help you get your baby born and then get you an American passport before you left. Then I saw, right after that, an article where there was a Muslim-owned hotel in New York that was hurt because they said they

were the first ones to come up with this idea of having, in their case, basically, Muslim pregnant women come to the United States, have a baby, and then they would help you get the American passport when you returned to your country.

The point that I was making—and it is still a legitimate point—is that there are people who hate the United States, who come into this country, who have a child. Children are a gift from God. They are—that is why abortion is so wrong—and the responsibility that comes with having a child: to train them up in a wholesome environment as best you can, not to hate people. Yet we have children who leave this country with an American passport and go back to the country where their parents are citizens, and they are then raised to hate America.

Some may remember that, in 2011, a man named Anwar al-Awlaki, an American citizen, was killed by a drone in Yemen. Anwar al-Awlaki had been here on Capitol Hill numerous times. He had friends at the White House. He had friends in this administration. He had been on Capitol Hill, leading Muslim staff members in Muslim prayer. Why? How could he do it? Because he was an American citizen. How was Anwar al-Awlaki an American citizen? His parents came here on a visa to go to college.

□ 2000

He was born, returned to Yemen, was raised to hate America, raised to hate our Western democracy, and as an adult became a terrorist who incited others to terrorism against the United States.

Perhaps some have heard of a guy named Al-Amoudi. Actually, I had the paperwork, held it up for the Director of the FBI, Director Mueller, and he was not aware at all that the Boston mosque that the Boston bombers attended, were started—we had the paper on the Boston society that did that. Al-Amoudi was the founder.

Al-Amoudi was a friend and an adviser in the Clinton administration, but during the Bush administration, he was arrested at Dulles Airport and later pled guilty and was sentenced to 23 years in prison for supporting terrorism.

It might be worth noting for someone in Homeland Security or the State Department that Al-Amoudi, convicted and now imprisoned for supporting terrorism, while his wife was here on a visa, they had a child, who is an American citizen.

A man named Morsi was President of Egypt until he began to disregard the constitution of Egypt, to the extent that people rose up in Egypt in numbers greater than anywhere in the history of the world and demanded his ouster. As the Coptic Christian Pope has said, this wasn't a coup; this was the Egyptian people rising up as never before, reportedly, over twice the numbers that President Morsi claims voted for him to make him President.

It appeared he was doing as Chavez had done. It appeared he was doing, as one Egyptian told me, as the President who was elected in the Gaza Strip had done. Once he had an election, he pulled all the power to himself, and they didn't need elections after that. There would never be anybody defeat him, like Chavez did in Venezuela. They could see it happening. As one Egyptian told me in Egypt within the last few weeks, if the Egyptian people had waited another year to try to remove Morsi from office, they would have been unable, because he would have pulled that much power unto himself.

So I think accolades should go out to the Egyptian people for rising up and demanding democracy, demanding the fruition of a true Arab Spring, and for people who are ignorant or promoting lies, like Mr. Husain, if you would do some checking, you would find that I have moderate Muslim friends around the world. Anyone—Muslim, secularist, any persuasion, race, creed, color, or religion, if they believe in freedom, they are brothers in liberty. Something I think it would do well for this administration to learn at some point before it is too late is, we should be able to work with the enemy of our enemy.

Moderate Muslims in Afghanistan do not want radical Islamists leading and in charge of Afghanistan again. There is a simple answer to the problem of us leaving Afghanistan, which will soon become Taliban-run again, and this administration is bungling—even though the bungling began in the last administration, in fairness it did—but the final bungling will be by this administration if we don't take action to prevent those who fought for this country from believing their loved ones died in vain. I don't believe they did. They fought for liberty. But I have heard from too many family members who have lost loved ones in Afghanistan who have said, Don't let our loved ones have died in vain.

The Taliban were defeated in a matter of months in Afghanistan, and we did it with less than 500 embedded special ops and intelligence. We gave air support and provided some weapons, and they defeated the Taliban.

The former vice president under Karzai in the first administration, former Vice President Masood, a friend of mine—a Muslim—rushed out of his home to embrace me when I got there not too long ago, because he knew I was his friend. I don't want him to live under radical Islam. He doesn't want to live under radical Islam.

This friend said, Look, if you could just help us get an amendment to our constitution. I said, What are you talking about? He said, Under our constitution that you apparently rubberstamped, in essence, a strong centralized government was created in a country that has been and is and will be for the foreseeable future very tribal, very regional. We tried to make it into a strong centralized government

when what the people wanted was a federalist system where the states, where the regions had some self autonomy like we are supposed to have in this country.

He said, If we could elect our own governors. It is a shock to so many that the constitution that we thought was okay under the Bush administration allows the President of Afghanistan to appoint the regional governors, to appoint the mayors, to appoint the chiefs of police. He appoints the top-level teachers. He appoints a slate of the legislators for a part of the legislature. He has powerful abilities to manipulate the purse strings.

What we created in Afghanistan—or helped them create—was a formula for disaster and corruption. How could you give one man that much authority to appoint and not expect corruption, when you get to appoint all the governors. As my friend, former Vice President Masood told me there at his home, if we could have an amendment that allowed us to elect our governors, allowed us to elect our mayors, allowed us to elect—or select, at least—our own chiefs of police, then our regions would be strong enough to prevent the Taliban from taking back over the whole country, and we could rally together, as we did before, to overrun them and run them out of the country.

I said, What makes you think that the United States could help push an amendment through your own constitution? That needs to happen here in Afghanistan, I said. He pointed out, Do you have any idea how much our federal government budget is? I had to admit I didn't know. He said, around \$12.5 billion of your dollars. He said, Do you know how much Afghanistan provides of our \$12.5 billion or so budget? I didn't know. About \$1.5 billion.

Other moderate Muslims there were all in agreement. You need to help us with this. He said that most of the rest of that \$11 billion comes from the United States. You have the leverage to help us get an amendment to our constitution.

Instead of trying to work out some messed up Status of Forces Agreement, as we have seen this administration try to do in Iraq, to no avail, instead of doing that, why don't we start pushing Karzai and say, you help get an amendment in there so you don't get to appoint everybody who is anybody in this country. We will let each state or each region elect their own governor. Let's get that amendment in there. Otherwise, we are going to cut every dime of support off. That might have some sway.

We have the ability, we have the leverage, and we have, for a little bit longer, before we totally lose it, some moral authority to seek that on behalf of our moderate Muslim friends in Afghanistan who don't want to be killed because they fought with us and for us in defeating the Taliban before we became occupiers, before we gave them a centralized government that the

Taliban can easily take over when we leave.

We owe them that, and we owe ourselves that, because if we can empower the enemy of the Taliban to continue to keep the Taliban at bay in Afghanistan, we have done a great thing. We have helped our country, and we have helped our moderate Muslim friends in Afghanistan who do not want to live under Taliban tyranny again, and they don't want to die and be killed because they helped us and then we abandoned them. We owe them that.

I hope Mr. Husain that is writing this garbage for The Washington Times will do a little research. He will also find out, if he did so, that President Morsi, the Muslim brother who was elected President, reportedly—some say it was a fraudulent election, or election results—but anyway, he was made President and then began to abuse the constitutional powers and tighten the reins around him.

I was told by friends who love Israel that this is really exciting because Morsi is really our friend. He is really cleaning up the Sinai. After Morsi was removed, we found out the Sinai has been incredibly militarized by Morsi. What would you expect of a man who had said that Jews are descendants of apes and pigs? That is not a friend of Israel.

Yet you have the Egyptian Government now taking action to demilitarize, to fight the radical Islamists in the Sinai that pose a threat to the Suez Canal, that pose a threat to our friend, Israel, and they are actually trying to take action. What did this administration do? They had promised 10 Apache helicopters to the Morsi presidency, to that regime.

When the people of Egypt rose up in true democratic form and demanded and got the ouster of a man trying to become a tyrant, this administration wanted Morsi put back in place, and even sent a couple of Republican senators over there to ask for Morsi to be released from prison. They didn't even know, as General el-Sisi finally admitted to me in the presence of our Ambassador, that, yes, they had evidence that Morsi was trying to have a contract to have General el-Sisi killed. Murdered. Trying to higher a contract killer. That was just one of the many problems that Morsi created.

President Morsi said he backed off his membership, his participation in the Muslim Brotherhood. Right. There is video of him having orders dictated, delivered to him, on what he should do by the supreme leader there.

What happened when Morsi was removed? The Muslim Brotherhood went berserk.

□ 2015

They began burning churches by the dozens, killing Christians, persecuting Jews and Christians like never before, persecuting moderate Muslims.

I am so proud of the people of Egypt. They want a democracy. A man named

Amr Moussa was appointed as chairman of the Constitutional Convention. Incredibly diverse groups there, incredibly diverse interests; yet they all agreed on this to start out, under Moussa's leadership, that unless 75 percent of all of those delegates to the Constitutional Convention agreed on a provision, it wouldn't be there.

As Chairman Moussa pointed out to me personally, he said, you know, we learned from your Constitution. Basically, he said, you know, our prior constitution, under Morsi, had no provision for impeachment. There was no way to lawfully remove him under that constitution, which was the way Morsi wanted it.

In their new constitution, they have provisions for impeachment. And this Constitutional Convention was led by moderate Muslim friends like Amr Moussa. And it was endorsed by the Sheikh of al-Azhar, a very well-respected Muslim leader, and has been endorsed by so many Muslim leaders.

They don't want radical Islam in charge. Moderate Muslims can be and are our friends.

And instead, this administration canceled the order for the 10 Apaches, or at least suspended it. And what is Egypt doing with the Apaches they already have?

They are fighting radical Islamists in the Sinai, and they are making sure ships get through the Suez Canal. Well, that should be a worthy endeavor, worthy of this administration not condemning a true democracy-in-the-making in Egypt, but trying to help them keep the Suez Canal open, trying to help them demilitarize the radical Islamists controlling the Sinai, as a threat to the Suez, to Egypt and to our friends, Israel and Jordan, and others.

If that Constitutional Convention is approved, which will be voted on in Egypt January 14 and 15, article 64 is a provision for freedom, stating that freedom of belief is absolute. You have an absolute freedom to believe in whatever religious beliefs you care to believe in without the government's harm.

What we are seeing here is really, if it works out, the people approve it, is the beginning of what we saw in Turkey with Ataturk so many decades ago, when he overran radical Islam and Turkey bloomed and became a great nation under his leadership and under those who followed what he set forth.

Article 93 of the new Egyptian Constitution commits that Egypt is obligated to observe all human rights that Egypt has ever endorsed and in all treaties to which it has agreed.

Article 235 was shocking to me. In their new constitution, the moderate Muslims of Egypt, who want a democracy, they felt so badly about the radical Islamists that make up the Muslim Brotherhood burning so many churches, persecuting, killing so many Christians, that article 235 requires that the first parliament pass a law to deal with the churches that were burned to en-

sure that Egypt rebuilds those churches for them.

What a statement to the world about the freedom they want to see take place. That is why it was so moving to people that told me about being there firsthand during those, the revolutionary masses, as they came forward by the millions, holding hands, figuratively and literally, Christians, moderate Muslims, secularists, Jews, saying we don't want radical Islam.

It is high time this administration began helping the enemy of our enemy, instead of trying to help our enemy.

As General al-Sisi asked me, are you and the United States still with us in the war against terror?

He and others commented to the effect that United States leaders do not seem to believe we are still having to fight terrorists anymore. They are fighting them in this new government.

Now, to be sure, they have got a long, tough road ahead because they are already where this nation is heading, with a massive welfare state, where so many of the citizens are getting giveaways from the government, where they have tried this idea of redistribution of the wealth and it has led to many more and more richer people, and much, much poor people, just as we have seen in this Nation in the last 5 years, and it needs to stop.

Another thing that needs to stop was reported in Breitbart, written by Frances Martel: "State Department Whistleblower Has E-Mail Hacked." The story talks about the whistleblower who helped expose misconduct by Hillary Clinton's security detail had his Gmail account hacked and key evidence against State Department officials deleted, according to an exclusive New York Post report.

Diplomatic Security Service Criminal Investigator Richard Higbie had exposed earlier this year that the State Department allegedly covered up reports alleging improprieties by Secretary of State Hillary Clinton's security detail in which they had engaged with prostitutes abroad. Those reports would have also exposed the Belgian Ambassador's alleged attempts to solicit. And it goes on.

But the article says the Gmail hack deleted 4 years' worth of messages, according to Schulman, including significant damning evidence against high-ranking officials in the State Department. It also included messages with evidence sent to Members of Congress and their offices investigating the story. Higbie has called for the FBI to investigate the hacking, and continues to have unanswered questions about other strange occurrences since he began to expose the covered-up investigation.

The article goes on, and that goes hand-in-hand with another story that was reported in the past 6 months or so of a whistleblower having her and her husband's home burglarized, and they ended up taking all of that reporter's files that she had used to expose

wrongdoing, misconduct, within the very department that raided her home and took her records and won't give them back.

At the same time, this administration continues to send people to the nation of Israel, the Jewish State, the home where people could come by the millions after 6 million were killed in the Holocaust of World War II.

We have the nerve to send people over to the leaders of Israel and tell them they have got to give away more land, when every time they have given away land, whether it was northern Israel, that is now southern Lebanon, or whether it is the Gaza Strip, anything they have given away ends up being used as a staging area from which to attack it; and those to whom the land is given use our money we provide for books to teach their children to hate Jews, to hate Israelis, and to hate the United States.

As I have said for years, you don't have to pay people to hate you. They will do it for free. We could make our word good to our veterans if we just quit paying the people that hate us. Let them hate us for free. Maybe they would learn to like us and come ask to work with us and find out we are actually pretty decent people if we quit paying them to hate us.

The Palestinians, was reported, January 1 in this Jerusalem Post article, said Palestinians reiterate plans to reject any framework accord presented by the U.S. And yet we send over a Secretary of State, well-meaning, and others, to demand Israel give up more land to people that say they will reject it, but give us more land from which we can attack you.

I think about the verses in Jeremiah, where the prophecy is there that there will be grapes grown in the mountains of Samaria, that some are saying doesn't belong to Israel. Well it used to; 1,600 years before a man named Mohammed was born, King David was ruling in that region.

But over the years, over the decades and centuries, people have said, look, that area, those mountains of Samaria will not grow grapes. That is ridiculous. And yet in the past couple of years, I have tasted those grapes. The vineyards are beautiful. They are Israeli, Jewish vineyards in the mountains of Samaria, just as Jeremiah prophesied would happen, that God would make it happen.

And we send a Secretary of State over saying, you have got to give away what you believe God providentially provided to you. We, the United States, know more than any god you believe in. Give it away.

It has been prophesied. I would hate to go against prophecy.

And yet this article from the Telegraph, Iran Nuclear Deal, Saudi Arabia warns it will strike out on its own. As STEVE KING, MICHELLE BACHMANN and I, ROBERT PITTENGER, traveled to some of the countries in the Middle East, as others of us traveled around the Middle

East back in September, it is incredible, but this administration, with what it is doing in Iran, the rest of the Middle East believes is going to allow Iran to have nukes and Saudi Arabia and our other allies and our enemies all want nukes, and nuclear proliferation will become just a rule of thumb, which is why I think this article appeared January 2 in the Washington Times, showing a comment that makes sense now, but "Anti-Communist Icon Decries Obama: U.S. No Longer Leads the World."

This was from Lech Walesa, and he had great hopes for the United States. He obviously had great hopes for this administration.

He said whatever hope in the world existed that Obama would reclaim moral leadership for America when elected in 2008 is gone, and instead the President has failed to bring that dream to fruition, he told CNN.

We have to do everything we can to recreate, to reclaim America's role, and it seems that Obama would manage that, but he didn't accomplish that. America did not regain its leadership status. We're just lucky there were no bigger conflicts in the world, because if it had had bigger conflicts, then the world would be helpless.

The trouble is, 2014 will be a year in which there are bigger conflicts, bigger issues. It is time we did the moral thing by our military veterans. It is time we did the moral thing by stopping the spending of children and grandchildren and great grandchildren's money. And it is time we did the moral thing by our friends and quit helping our friends' enemies hurt our friends.

□ 2030

We need to regain, as Lech Walesa said, the moral authority we once had. That can be done, and we need to seize the day and do it.

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

JOBS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WENSTRUP). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is good to return from our 3 weeks back in our districts. I suspect that most of us spent time talking to our constituents, observing the good and the bad and the cold and the wet—not in California, where we have been in the midst of a drought—but working, as we should, back in our districts and also spending some time with our families along the way. For me, it was one of those periods of time where we were reaching out, trying to gain an understanding of the challenges that face our constituents.

As I returned here today, I realized that in 1964, Mr. Speaker, right below you on the podium where one of our key assistants is now standing, a fellow by the name of Lyndon Baines Johnson gave a speech—here is a picture of him—on January 8, 1964, speaking to a joint session of Congress. I think it was his first speech after becoming President, following the tragic assassination of President Kennedy. There he stood. And among the things he told America was that it was time for a war, a war on poverty, and he urged the United States to take on the troubling and continuing issue of poverty in the United States.

I remember that speech. I was in college at the time. I remember him standing there, and I remember that challenge, following shortly upon the challenge that President Kennedy had given us to ask not what our country could do for us but, rather, what we could do for our country.

So those two things came together, and they have been with me these many, many years, together with one other very famous and very important challenge. And this was from Franklin Delano Roosevelt. It is etched into the marble in his memorial here in Washington, D.C. President Roosevelt said:

The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much; it is whether we provide enough for those who have too little.

That ethical moral position was taken up by Lyndon Baines Johnson when he declared the war on poverty 50 years ago—50 years ago—at a time when seniors in the United States, 47 percent of them, were impoverished.

I remember well during those years when my father took me to the county hospital to visit a neighbor, the poverty, the ward, the odor, the hopelessness.

So what did America do? What did America do to face this challenge? Well, Social Security was already in place, one of the fundamental pillars to deal with poverty among seniors. In this Chamber, in the Senate Chamber, the men and women who then represented the American people put forward an extraordinary effort to deal with poverty in the United States. And one of those major second pillars to address poverty was the establishment of the Medicare program for seniors. Men and women over 65 years of age were guaranteed that, if they lived to 65 in the days and years following, they would have a health insurance program, which was an incredible step forward.

Many other things were done. Programs were put in place for jobs, job programs across this Nation, in Appalachia, in the Central Valley of California, and all across this Nation. There was an outpouring of sympathy, an outpouring of the basic morality of this country took place.

In 1967, 29 percent of the children in this country were in poverty. In 2012, it was 19 percent, one out of five. That is