

Again, congratulations to the Lady Gators' awesome softball team and their coach, Tim Walton, for his great coaching and leadership.

I would just like to end by saying it is great to be a Florida Gator.

**CONGRATULATING VIC STORY, JR.,
ON BEING NAMED 2015 SWISHER
SWEETS/SUNBELT EXPO FLOR-
IDA FARMER OF THE YEAR**

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

Mr. ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Mr. Vic Story, Jr., on being named the 2015 Swisher Sweets/Sunbelt Expo Florida Farmer of the Year. This is a tremendous honor and one he truly deserves.

As the head of his family's citrus business, Mr. Story has demonstrated a lifelong commitment to the citrus industry. He is not only a successful grower, but he is widely regarded as a leader in Florida agriculture.

He has played a key role in educating the media, the general public, and elected officials like me about the importance of citrus to the State of Florida and this country. He has taught me a lot, and I am proud to count him both as an adviser and a friend.

On behalf of the 17th District of Florida, Florida's heartland, I would like to commend Mr. Story for his contributions to the industry and to his community. I wish him the best of luck as he competes with other State winners in October for the title of Southeastern Farmer of the Year.

**RECOGNIZING CAPTAIN GLENN
SULMASY**

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of a career of service both to our country and to those preparing to defend it.

Since 1988, Glenn Sulmasy has served our Nation as an officer in the United States Coast Guard. Since 2001, Captain Sulmasy has served on the faculty of the United States Coast Guard Academy as a professor of law and risen to the chairmanship of the department of humanities.

In each role, Captain Sulmasy has worked tirelessly to engage and educate cadets, faculty, government officials, and the public on national security law, public policy, and international conflict. He is a recognized expert in these areas.

Captain Sulmasy's expertise has not been limited to the academy. He is the author of multiple books and countless publications, a noted academic on the topic of national security, and a fellow in Homeland Security and National Security Law for the Center for National Policy here in Washington, D.C. There

is no doubt his knowledge has been an asset to our Nation as it struggles to understand the security intricacies of our current world.

His commitment to the protection and defense of our Nation is commendable. And as he prepares to retire from the Coast Guard Academy, I join with countless other Americans in thanking him for his service and wishing him the best of luck in the future.

□ 1300

**CONGRATULATIONS TO MIN-
NESOTA'S TOP SPELLER MAX-
WELL MEYER**

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Minnetonka's Maxwell Meyer, who is a seventh-grader at Minnetonka Middle School East, for his performance at the Scripps National Spelling Bee.

Maxwell was among the 49 survivors of the preliminary round last Wednesday when 234 other spellers were eliminated. Maxwell then spelled both of his words right in the nationally broadcast semifinal round on Thursday and, unfortunately, came up just short of the finals after failing to score enough points on a written vocabulary test.

The National Spelling Bee, Mr. Speaker, showcases some of the brightest, most dedicated young students across the country, and Maxwell makes his community and the State of Minnesota proud.

To reach this stage of the spelling bee takes countless hours of hard work, learning the skills and knowledge to be an accurate speller. For some, that means even reading the dictionary.

Maxwell's efforts had folks all over the State of Minnesota cheering him on, and we congratulate him on his success.

**COMMUNICATION FROM LEGISLA-
TIVE CORRESPONDENT, THE
HONORABLE BILL SHUSTER,
MEMBER OF CONGRESS**

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Anthony DeThomas, Legislative Correspondent, the Honorable BILL SHUSTER, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, June 3, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives that I have been served with a grand jury subpoena for testimony, issued by the United States District Court for the Central District of Illinois.

After consultation with counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena

is consistent with the privileges and rights of the House.

Sincerely,

ANTHONY DETHOMAS,
Legislative Correspondent.

**TIME FOR CONGRESS TO AUTHOR-
IZE WAR IN IRAQ AND SYRIA**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, today, along with my colleagues WALTER JONES of North Carolina and BARBARA LEE of California, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 55 in order to force this House and this Congress to debate on whether U.S. troops should withdraw from Iraq and Syria. We introduced this resolution under the provisions of section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution.

As all of my House colleagues know, last year, the President authorized airstrikes against the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria on August 7. For over 10 months, the United States has been engaged in hostilities in Iraq and Syria without debating an authorization for this war.

On February 11 this year, nearly 4 months ago, the President sent to Congress the text for an Authorization for Use of Military Force, or an AUMF, on combating the Islamic State in Iraq, Syria, and elsewhere, yet Congress has failed to act on that AUMF, or bring an alternative to the House floor, even though we continue to authorize and appropriate the money required for sustained military operations in those countries.

Frankly speaking, Mr. Speaker, this is unacceptable. This House appears to have no problem sending our uniformed men and women into harm's way. It appears to have no problem spending billions of dollars for the arms, equipment, and air power to carry out these wars. But it just can't bring itself to step up to the plate and take responsibility for these wars.

Our servicemen and servicewomen are brave and dedicated. Congress, however, is the poster child for cowardice. The leadership of this House whines and complains from the sidelines, and all the while it shirks its constitutional duties to bring an AUMF to the floor of this House, debate it, and vote on it.

Our resolution, which will come before this House for consideration in 15 calendar days, requires the President to withdraw U.S. troops from Iraq and Syria within 30 days or no later than the end of this year, December 31, 2015. If this House approves this resolution, Congress would still have 6 months in which to do the right thing and bring an AUMF before the House and the Senate for debate and for action. Either Congress needs to live up to its responsibilities and authorize this war,

or by its continuing neglect and indifference, our troops should be withdrawn and come home. It is that simple.

I am deeply, I am deeply troubled by our policy in Iraq and Syria. I do not believe it is a clearly defined mission with a beginning, a middle, and an end, but rather just more of the same. I am not convinced that by enlarging our military footprint, that we will somehow end the violence in the region, defeat the Islamic State, or address the underlying causes of the unrest. It is a complicated situation that requires a complicated and more imaginative response.

I am also concerned by recent statements by the administration about how long we will be engaged in Iraq, Syria, and elsewhere fighting the Islamic State. Just yesterday, on June 3, General John Allen, the U.S. envoy for the U.S.-led coalition fighting ISIL, said that this fight may take “a generation or more.” He was speaking in Doha, Qatar, at the U.S.-Islamic World Forum.

Mr. Speaker, I will insert for the RECORD a Times of Israel article entitled, “Islamic State Fight May Take ‘Generation or More’—US Envoy.”

[From the Times of Israel, June 3, 2015]

ISLAMIC STATE FIGHT MAY TAKE ‘GENERATION OR MORE’—US ENVOY

As key Iraqi province falls to Islamic State, Gen. John Allen says failure to defeat group would ‘wreak havoc’ on humanity

The Islamic State group is a “global threat” which will take a generation or more to defeat, Washington’s envoy for the US-led coalition fighting the jihadists said Wednesday.

Despite “strategic momentum” against IS—” or Daesh as he called it—General John Allen conceded that the fight would continue for several years in a keynote speech to the US-Islamic World Forum in Doha, Qatar.

And he added that if IS was not defeated it could “wreak havoc on the progress of humanity.”

“This will be a long campaign,” he said.

“Defeating Daesh’s ideology will likely take a generation or more. But we can and we must rise to this challenge. In an age when we are more interconnected than at any other time in human history, Daesh is a global threat.”

In a wide-ranging speech, Allen added that IS also poses a new type of threat because of its “depravity.”

“As someone who has spent nearly four decades as a United States marine, I have come closer than many to the reality of inhumanity.

“But I have never seen before the kinds of depravity and brutality in this region that ISIL represents and, in fact, that ISIL celebrates,” he added, using an alternative acronym for IS.

Allen was speaking the day after attending talks in Paris with ministers from around 20 coalition countries.

The meeting followed the fall of the city of Ramadi, the capital of Iraq’s largest province Anbar, to IS. That loss has been described as the worst defeat for the coalition since it formed nearly a year ago.

US Pentagon chief Ashton Carter blamed Iraqi forces, saying there was “an issue with the will of the Iraqis to fight,” in comments that angered Baghdad.

Iraq on Tuesday pleaded for more global support in the fight against IS.

The loss of Ramadi in Iraq plus the ancient city of Palmyra in Syria has led some to question the effectiveness of the US-led coalition in recent weeks.

Allen said the coalition had achieved some gains against the extremists.

He noted that IS had been defeated in many places in Iraq and that it has “lost over 25 percent” of the populated territory it once held in the country.

Another area of coalition success, Allen claimed, was its ability to disrupt the group’s access to finance.

“We are sharing information to block their assets to the global financial system. We are uncovering their points of access in the region and abroad for financial support,” he said.

He said the coalition had gained valuable intelligence on the organisation’s financial enterprises, but admitted that “Daesh still maintains financial resources”.

These included extortion, looting, kidnapping for ransom, and human trafficking, said Allen.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, if we are going to invest a generation or more of our blood and our treasure in this war, then shouldn’t Congress at least debate whether or not to authorize it?

According to the National Priorities Project, based in Northampton, Massachusetts, which is in my congressional district, every single hour the taxpayers of the United States are paying \$3.42 million for military actions against the Islamic State—\$3.42 million every hour, Mr. Speaker.

This is on top of the hundreds of billions of tax dollars spent on the first war in Iraq. And nearly every single penny of this war chest was borrowed money, put on the national credit card, provided as so-called emergency funds that don’t have to be accounted for or subject to budget caps like all other funds.

Why is it, Mr. Speaker, that we always seem to have plenty of money or the will to borrow all the money it takes to carry out wars? But somehow, we never have any money to invest in our schools, our highways and water systems, or our children, families, and communities? Every day, every single day, this Congress is forced to make tough, serious, painful decisions to deprive our domestic economy and priorities of the resources they need to succeed. But somehow, there is always money for more wars.

Well, if we are going to continue to spend billions on war, and if we are going to continue to tell our Armed Forces that we expect them to fight and die in these wars, then it seems to me the least we can do is stand up and vote to authorize these wars, or we should end them. We owe that to the American people. We owe that to our troops and their families. And we owe that to the oath of office that each of us took to uphold the Constitution of the United States.

I want to be clear, Mr. Speaker: I can no longer criticize the President, the Pentagon, or the State Department when it comes to taking responsibility for this war against the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria. I may not agree with

the policy, but they have done their duty. At every step of the way, beginning on June 16, 2014, the President has informed Congress of his actions to send U.S. troops to Iraq and Syria and to carry out military operations against the Islamic State. And on February 11 of this year, he sent to Congress the draft text of an AUMF.

Mr. Speaker, while I disagree with the policy, the administration has done its job. It has kept the Congress informed, and as military operations continue to escalate, they sent an AUMF to the Congress for action.

It is this Congress, this House, that has failed and failed miserably to carry out its duties. Always complaining from the sidelines, the leadership of this House failed to act last year to authorize this war, even as it escalated and expanded nearly every month. The Speaker said it wasn’t the responsibility of the 113th Congress to act, even though the war started during its tenure. No, no. Somehow it was the responsibility of the next Congress, the 114th Congress.

Well, the 114th Congress convened on January 6, and it still hasn’t done a single, solitary thing to authorize the war against the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria. The Speaker asserted that Congress couldn’t act on the war until the President sent an AUMF to Congress. Well, Mr. Speaker, the President did just that on February 11, and still the leadership of this House has done nothing to authorize the use of military force in Iraq and Syria. And now the Speaker is saying he wants the President to send Congress another version of the AUMF because he doesn’t like the first one. Are you kidding me?

Well, I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, it doesn’t work that way. If the leadership of this House doesn’t like the original text of the President’s AUMF, then it is the job of Congress to draft an alternative, report that revised AUMF out of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, bring it to the floor of the House, and let the Members of this House debate and vote on it. That is how it works.

If you think that the President’s AUMF is too weak, then you make it stronger. If you think that it is too expansive, then set limits on it. If you are opposed to these wars, then vote to bring our troops home. That is what we are here to do. That is what we are charged to do under the Constitution. And that is why Members of Congress get a paycheck from the American people every week—to make the hard decisions, not run away from them.

All I ask, Mr. Speaker, is that the Congress do its job. That is the duty of this House and of the majority in charge of this House—to simply do its job, to govern, Mr. Speaker. But instead, all we witness is dithering and twiddling and complaining and whining and blaming others, and the complete and total shirking of responsibility over and over and over and over again. Enough, enough.

So with great reluctance and frustration, Representative JONES and Representative LEE and I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 55. Because if this House doesn't have the stomach to carry out its constitutional duty to debate and authorize this latest war, then we should bring our troops home. If the cowardly Congress can go home each night to their families and loved ones, then our brave troops should receive that same privilege.

Doing nothing is easy. And I am sad to say that war has become easy, too easy. But the costs in terms of blood and treasure are very, very, very high.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this resolution and demand that the leadership of this House bring to the floor of this House an AUMF for the war against the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria before Congress adjourns on June 26 for the Fourth of July recess.

Congress needs to debate an AUMF, Mr. Speaker. It needs to do its job.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague from North Carolina, Congressman WALTER JONES.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend, Mr. MCGOVERN, for always being out front on this issue, and I am delighted to join him. As he said in many of his comments, the House has a responsibility to the men and women in uniform and to the American people.

I have the privilege to represent Camp Lejeune Marine Corps Base, Cherry Point Marine Corps Air Station. I have over 70,000 retired veterans in the Third District of North Carolina. They are frustrated too. They believe sincerely that we must meet our constitutional responsibility and have this debate. And as you have said, Mr. MCGOVERN, be for it or be against it, but have the debate. That is what is absolutely frustrating.

I joined you and BARBARA LEE in a letter to Mr. BOEHNER in September. On August 27 we wrote a letter to the Speaker of the House asking him to please allow a debate on reauthorization of our involvement in the Middle East. Then on September 25 I wrote by myself to the Speaker of the House and asked again for the debate.

As you have stated, he did say publicly that because of the forthcoming election in 2014, that he thought it would be proper to have the debate in 2015, which you have already stated.

□ 1315

In 2015, the Speaker of the House said he was waiting for the President to submit the AUMF. As you have stated, the President did submit an AUMF, which many of us in both parties for different reasons were dissatisfied with, but it was the vehicle with which to go to the committee, to have the debate, and then to bring to the floor for a debate of the full House.

I quote frequently down in my district what James Madison said: "The power to declare war, including the power of judging the causes of war, is

fully and exclusively vested in the legislature."

He didn't say the executive branch. He said the legislature, we in the House and we in the Senate. He didn't say the President. He said the legislature. If we don't bring it forward ourselves and if the Speaker wants the President to submit the AUMF—which he has already done, but now, as you stated, he is asking for another AUMF.

I do not understand. Our Nation has spent \$1.7 trillion or \$1.8 trillion in Iraq and Afghanistan combined. This is the first war in Iraq, not the continuation that we are into now. We are spending billions and billions of dollars every day. As you say, we have cut programs left and right. Even our veterans are concerned about their benefits being cut, and many of them did serve in Afghanistan and Iraq.

I take it upon myself to go to Walter Reed. I will go to my grave regretting that I voted to send our kids to Iraq, which was an unnecessary war initially, very unnecessary, but we went; 4,000 of our kids died, and 30,000 were wounded, and 100,000 Iraqis were killed. Anyway, that is history now. I know we can't change history, but, hopefully, we can learn from history.

The people are frustrated. I talk about this down in my district, Mr. MCGOVERN. That is why I support this H. Con. Res. 55. I don't know how many billions of dollars we are expending in Afghanistan. I know that that is a different subject, but I want to make my point.

The billions of dollars that we are expending in Afghanistan is just so ironic that John Sopko, who is the Special Inspector General of Afghan Reconstruction, talks about how the waste, fraud, and abuse is ongoing. We have had marines from my district who were sent to Afghanistan to train the Afghans to be policemen and soldiers, and the people they were training turned the guns on them and killed them.

We are sending our young men and women into these Middle East countries and other countries, and we don't have an end to the plan. I am not a military person, but I have heard from military leaders. If you have a strategy, that means you have an end point to your strategy, but we don't have an end point to our strategy. That is why it is so important that we bring it up.

What you are trying to do is to force a debate on an AUMF to get this Congress to reengage itself. I am like you, sir. I get tired of funding all of these programs. In fact, on FOX today, they were talking about the weapons that we have given to the Iraqis, and their army is disbanding half the time. The weapons that we have given them—from machine guns to Humvees—are now in the hands of ISIS, and we are now bombing the equipment that we sent to the Iraqi Army. It does not make any sense.

Just a couple more points, and then I am going to yield back to you your time.

I want to thank you and BARBARA LEE—and that is why I joined you—because I see the frustration of the marines down in Camp Lejeune. They have been deployed three, four, five, six, seven times, and they know that they might be called upon again, and they will go.

Just like all of those who serve in our services, they will go back and go back and go back; but, as you have said many times and as James Madison said, it is our responsibility, not the President's responsibility, to initiate these AUMFs.

I hope that the President will follow with what the Speaker has asked him for, which is for a second AUMF. If he sends a second AUMF, then there is no excuse that our leadership of the Republican Party has—and I am a Republican—to not bring it to the floor.

Mr. MCGOVERN, I thank you again. I am pleased to have thought to join you in this effort. We need to meet our constitutional responsibility. I go to Walter Reed. I see the broken bodies, and I see the amputated legs.

I have signed over 11,000 letters to families in this country who have lost loved ones in Afghanistan and Iraq. I want to fulfill my duty as a Member of Congress and follow the Constitution and have the debates on spending blood and money in these foreign countries.

Thank you for allowing me to be a small part of this.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I want to thank my colleague from North Carolina for his eloquent statement and for his passion on this issue and for his courage on this issue because I know that it is not easy to stand up and raise some of these questions. He has done so consistently, and I think the country owes him a debt of gratitude, so I thank the gentleman for that.

I think, as Mr. JONES pointed out, there is a constitutional principle at stake here. We have a responsibility when it comes to matters of war, and it is a little bit puzzling to me that we have a lot of complaining in this Chamber by some in saying that the President is not consulting enough with Congress or he is doing too many things with executive actions; yet, when it comes to the issue of war, we don't want to have anything to do with it. It is just too easy to do nothing.

I know that these issues are uncomfortable—they are complicated; they are difficult—but our job is not to run away from an issue if it is uncomfortable. We have to deliberate on a lot of issues that are important to the American people and to the national security of this country.

I don't think it takes any courage for a Member of Congress to be quiet on this issue and cheer the White House on if the military operation is going well or criticize it if it is not, but never have to take a vote. That is not leadership; that is cowardice. That is shirking our responsibility.

I don't care whether you are a Democrat or a Republican. We all, for the

sake of protecting the integrity of this institution, should insist that we assume our proper role when it comes to issues of war. War is a big deal. It is a big deal—at least it should be a big deal.

As I said earlier, what bothers me is that, in this Chamber and in this city, it has become easy. We don't talk about it. We had a debate on the defense authorization bill last week. A number of us tried to bring amendments to the floor to kind of force this issue, and we were told this is not the place to talk about the war—the defense authorization bill, which authorizes a lot of the funding for this war.

If that is not the place to talk about it, then where is the place to talk about it? With every attempt that we have launched to try to force a debate on the floor, we have been frustrated. We have been told you can't do it. Here we are in June, and we have been at war now for many, many months. The time has come for us to stand up and be heard on this issue.

Look, I have great reservations about the White House's policy in Iraq and Syria. I don't support much of what the President is doing right now. I know his heart is in the right place, but I don't think that the ultimate answer here is to expand our military footprint. I have reservations.

Even if you believe that you ought to give the President all of the power in the universe to do whatever he wants around the world, you still ought to support what Congressman JONES and Congresswoman LEE and I are trying to do, and that is to make sure that Congress has a role in this, that we authorize whatever action is going to take place from this point forward.

Again, you could vote to expand the President's authority. You could vote to limit the President's authority. You could vote to say we don't believe the President should have any authority to launch even more wars in the Middle East. That is what the debate should be about.

We should be talking about the specifics of our policy. I mean, is there a clearly defined mission here? I don't see it. A clearly defined mission has a beginning, a middle, and an end; but we ought to have that debate.

How does this all end? We were told initially, Oh, it won't be that long; then it was a few years. Now, it is going to be a generation or two. The length of time that we are going to be expected to be engaged here gets longer and longer and longer and longer with each passing month. Isn't that worth a discussion? Isn't that worth a debate?

We debate a lot of things on this House floor that I would say are pretty trivial. We debate a lot of legislation that we know is going nowhere. Why can't we take the time to debate this issue of war? Why can't we take the time to do what is right by our servicemen and -women, who are being put into harm's way, to make sure that we are getting it right with regard to Iraq

and Syria and the war against the Islamic State? Again, I know it is uncomfortable; but so what? We need to do our job.

I will just close by reiterating something that Congressman JONES said, and that is that we have a lot of needs here in the United States. We can't get a long-term highway bill passed. We have tens of millions of fellow citizens in the United States of America, the richest country on the planet, who are hungry. We have some schools that are in disrepair.

Quite frankly, our kids deserve a heck of a lot better. We have infrastructure needs. I can go right down the list of the things that we need to do. We have people who are unemployed, and we have people who are homeless. We need more housing for people.

There are so many things that we have to do, and we are told we can't do any of it because we don't have the money; but, when it comes to wars that never end or wars that are going to last generations or more, we are an ATM machine.

If the money is not there, we will give you an IOU. We will put it on our credit card. People talk about the deficit and the debt; yet we are adding all of these billions and trillions of dollars because of these wars that are not paid for. No one says anything about that around here, but that is one of the biggest contributors to our debt. We ought to realize that.

When we talk about national security, I would just say to my colleagues that national security also includes the quality of life for people here in this country, whether people have a job, whether people have access to a good education, whether people have health care, whether people have food, whether they have shelter.

All of those things are important parts of our national security and our national defense. We are neglecting them on a regular basis, but we are spending every cent we have on these wars overseas.

This deserves a debate. Again, we would prefer that an AUMF come before the full House under regular order, where the House Foreign Affairs Committee would report out a bill, and we would just debate it, but we have been patient long enough, and nothing has been forthcoming.

Here we are in June with still no promise that anything may be coming—more excuses. That is why we introduced this privileged resolution. We are going to force a debate, and we are going to force a vote. We will do it again and again and again and again until this Congress lives up to its constitutional responsibilities.

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

□ 1330

THREATS AROUND THE WORLD

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ZINKE). Under the Speaker's announced

policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, there is so much going on these days, and I would just like to take up a very important issue that is going on right now.

There was an interview by our President that was discussed in the L.A. Times, an article by Christi Parsons and Michael Memoli, and I saw part of the interview on television. The headline of this story is "Obama Raises Possibility of Allowing U.N. Vote on Palestinian Statehood." Their sub-headline says, "Obama makes veiled threat about Palestinian statehood in an interview."

The article says, "President Obama took a step toward a tougher line with Israel in an interview released Tuesday, raising the possibility that the U.S. will allow a United Nations vote on issues related to the Palestinians if the two sides make no meaningful movement toward peace."

In an interview with an Israeli television station, Obama noted that his administration has "up until this point" quashed such efforts at the U.N., while insisting that the Israelis and Palestinians must negotiate a resolution; but he said it is a challenge for the U.S. to keep demanding that the Palestinians negotiate in good faith if no one believes the Israelis are doing the same.

Further down, it says, "Obama's critical tone toward Netanyahu, describing him as someone who is 'predisposed' to 'think perhaps that peace is naive', appeared to return to the tough language that marked administration statements earlier this spring around the time of the Israeli election. More recently, the White House had seemed to be trying to mend fences." Well, obviously, that is not the case now.

I thought it might be important, Mr. Speaker, to take a look at some of the comments that have been made by folks who say they are leaders, and we know them to be leaders of the Palestinians because Mr. Obama is getting some terrible advice.

I don't know who is advising him. Maybe he is still skipping those briefings, and who knows where it is coming from, but somebody needs—somebody, and I hope, Mr. Speaker, somebody close to the President—to start advising him on the position of the Palestinians. They cannot make their position more clear.

Prime Minister Netanyahu stood right here at the second level and made the statement, in essence, that, if Israel lays down its arms, there is no Israel; if the Palestinians lay down their arms, there will be peace.

They will not do so, and they continue to teach their children about how evil and horrible these Jews are, these Israelis are, that they need to be wiped off the map. They continue to name streets and holidays for those who would kill innocent Israeli children, innocent Israeli moms and dads as they