

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

#### APPROVE KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE

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

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, our friends in the Senate are once again playing games with the future of our country.

Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID has kindly offered to allow Senators to vote on a nonbinding resolution expressing support for building the Keystone XL pipeline. That is right, a nonbinding expression that requires no action and no real solutions.

Well, grand gestures and words alone don't create jobs. The American people deserve real action. Senate Democrats who claim to support approving the Keystone XL pipeline need to stand up and demand that HARRY REID allow a real vote to approve the Keystone XL pipeline, a vote that actually puts words into action and rhetoric into results.

The American people have waited long enough. Montanans are tired of the political games, the endless delays, and politicians who refuse to put job creation ahead of partisanship. The House has acted. It is time for the Senate to step up and do the same.

#### NATIONAL DAY OF PRAYER

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow marks the 63rd annual National Day of Prayer. On this day, we praise God for the many blessings bestowed upon us. During times of great adversity and in times of great prosperity, Americans of all walks of life seek God's guidance.

Today, we face many great challenges, including brave men and women serving in harm's way and an economy that must grow faster and lift more Americans, especially those in need, to greater security. We pray that the families of this Nation may find renewed strength and belief in God's word and grace.

We also seek the Lord as we pray for those who serve in our military. We ask for God to protect them and watch over them.

Mr. Speaker, let us seek God's guidance and pray he will grant us the wisdom to overcome the many trials and tests before our Nation and its people.

On the National Day of Prayer, may God bless this great Nation and all its citizens.

#### TWELVE DOLLARS

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, \$12. In Nigeria, \$12 is the cost of a bride slave. Recently, around 200 girls went to school and never came home. They were kidnapped and, for \$12 apiece, sold to the Islamic militant terrorist group Boko Haram. They were forced into marriage and raped—modern sex slavery.

This inhuman human trafficking crime is a world problem that needs action. Today, the United States took a huge step forward in the battle against this scourge. The Judiciary Committee passed three bills fighting this growing problem here in America.

The Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act that I sponsored, along with CAROLYN MALONEY of New York, was passed and supports and protects victims of this horrible crime. It punishes the sex trafficker and now punishes the buyer, the child rapist. It helps rescue child victims and treats them as victims, rather than child prostitutes.

No life deserves to be stolen and sold for \$12. Children should not be for sale anywhere, at any time, for any reason.

And that's just the way it is.

#### AMERICA'S CREDIBILITY AROUND THE WORLD

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DAINES). 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, there is a lot going on in the world right now, and America seems to continue to lose credibility around the world when we travel abroad, and we have leaders from other countries, especially moderate Muslim allies and friends, who wonder why we are not helping in the war against terrorism, the war against radical Islam.

□ 1930

Moderate Muslims realize what it is. It is radical Islam. It is exactly what the wonderful people of Egypt rose up and rebelled against by the millions. In fact, there were more millions of Egyptians that signed a petition in support of removing Morsi than even he ever claimed voted for him.

The Muslim Brotherhood responded, and they have burned churches, and they have persecuted Christians and Jews. The Coptic Christian Pope has

told us of his concern about his support for radical Islam because the United States and even a couple of Republican Senators down the hall had supported, seemed to support, went over and said: let's release Morsi. They seemed to want Muslim Brotherhood back in charge.

So it was shocking for this administration to say we are not going to supply the military equipment to those who are against radical Islam that we had agreed to provide to those who represent radical Islam—the Muslim Brotherhood.

Yes, their party—their political party in Egypt is called the Freedom and Justice Party because, under their definition, freedom means the freedom to worship only Allah and justice means only justice that comes from shari'a law, so they have a little different definition of freedom and justice.

In their less than 100-year history as an entity, the Muslim Brotherhood has killed so many innocent children, women, and men who had no grievance or gripe with Islam, but it should also be noted that one of the reasons that moderate Muslims are so supportive of our effort to stop radical Islam is because, whenever a moderate Muslim stands up to radical Islam, they immediately go to the front of the line to be killed or persecuted by radical Islamists, so we share that.

That is why the enemy of our enemy can be somebody with whom we just may be able to cooperate.

That is what happened in Afghanistan, when President Bush committed to go after the Taliban in October, November, December of 2001. We put in less than 500 Americans—special operations, Special Forces, intelligence—we gave them air support, we gave them some weapons, and we had to negotiate.

The Bush administration did a phenomenal job of negotiating with Northern Alliance tribal leaders because they knew, to be successful about the Taliban, they were going to have to work together, so we were able to pull that off. There may have been some cash that actually was utilized to grease the skids to make it work, and it worked.

Within 4 months or so, the Taliban was defeated. The legendary General Dostum that this administration wants to classify as a war criminal defeated the Taliban for us as the leader of the Northern Alliance tribes.

In a meeting with him, along with DANA ROHRBACHER, STEVE KING, and a few others were meeting with some of the Northern Alliance leaders, since we knew about that last final battle where the Northern Alliance went after the last stronghold of the Taliban elevated high up a hill or mountain, General Dostum, through an interpreter, explained he knew that, if they sent people on foot, they would never get there.

There would be too many bullets and rocket-propelled grenades. They would

never make it to the Taliban stronghold. They knew, if they could get there and rout them there, that that would be the end of the organized Taliban, at least for quite some time.

So General Dostum realized the only way to really have a shot at getting there was for around 1,000 horsemen to go charging up that hill, up toward the stronghold with bullets, rocket-propelled grenades, all kinds of things coming at him, but he knew that if they would move quickly enough, they might get past those and be able to destroy the last stronghold of the Taliban.

It worked. They did lose many of the Northern Alliance tribal soldiers, but they made it and totally routed the Taliban. What an incredible victory.

General Dostum offered to take me next time I came to Afghanistan. He asked if I rode horses. I said: sure, I grew up riding horses. He said: oh, then you need to come up with me, I will take you up that famous ride that is so legendary all over Asia.

After that, the interpreter advised me something I wasn't aware, that they don't have leather saddles in Afghanistan. I inquired: What kind of saddles do you have? And he said: they are made of wood.

That changed greatly my desire to go riding uphill on a wooden saddle, but it still is amazing what they did. They did it with our encouragement, our support, our logistical support, our aerial support.

There are other occasions when, with someone embedded with the Northern Alliance, the Northern Alliance leaders could say: Do you see over there on that ridge that little hump? That is a bunker that contains many, many Taliban.

They get the coordinates, call it in, the bomb would be released. It would go to the target and take it out, and then the Northern Alliance soldiers would finish off those who made it through the bombing.

Some in this administration think that means they are war criminals; whereas the fact is they fought the Taliban in their own country the way they have always fought and the way the Taliban fights, and they defeated them.

Then we did an unfortunate thing. We helped them with a constitution that centralized the government. In a very regional federalist area, tribal area, we should have helped them have a more federalist country where the states, the regions, have the power.

But apparently, our leaders at that time thought it would be easier to deal with one centralized government than potentially many hardheaded leaders of small countries or small states.

But we should have let them have their small states and their tribal areas because as some of the northern leaders very intelligently had pointed out: if you would help us get an amendment to the constitution that you helped push on us, that allowed us to

elect our own governors, our mayors, pick our own police chiefs, then we could control Afghanistan better and then the Taliban, when you leave, can't just knock off our President and take over the whole country. Then it would be harder for them to take over the whole country, they might get one region, and then the rest of the regions could rise up and take them out of that one. We can defeat them, but not with the structure that you gave us.

There was no reason for us to lose the hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of American military members under the command of Commander Barack Obama, but he had said it was the important war. The war was won by early 2002, and then we became occupiers. That was unnecessary.

Let them run their own country. They defeated the Taliban with less than 500 Americans, and now, we have lost a number of times that original number that went in and were embedded.

That has helped create an image of the United States around the world, as this administration has continued to allow the slaughter of American soldiers in Afghanistan, for what point, we don't know. At the same time, we were allowing our soldiers to be handcuffed with rules of engagement that restricted them or threatened them with court-martial if they were to defend themselves and it turned out somebody got hurt who is not a soldier.

So the world saw the United States beg the Taliban to sit down and negotiate with us. This administration was sending out word: look, you don't even have to agree to anything. If you will just agree to sit down with us, heck, we will buy you a luxurious office complex in Qatar. We may even release some of your murdering thugs that we have confined. Heck, we will release some of them anyway, just to show our good faith. Heck, we will do whatever, if you will just sit down and talk with us.

There is no radical Islamist in the world that respects that kind of talk from an American leader, from any leader. Oh, please, we beg you, please sit down and talk with us. They don't respect that. That projects weakness to them.

There is one thing they respect, and that is power, when used appropriately. They may hate it, they may despise the way it is used, but they respect power when it is used effectively. This administration has not done that at all.

Go back to Iraq. The Bush administration basically had set up a status of forces agreement by the end of 2008. Most of the terms were agreed to. The Bush administration, many of us believe, could have gone ahead and finished, had that signed before President Obama took office.

But as I understand it, it was considered a generous outreach by George W. Bush and his administration to the incoming President. Why? Because not only is he not stupid and he is not

crazy and he is witty, but he is a gracious man.

That is why he had Ted Kennedy to the White House so many times, even though Kennedy would go out and bash him almost every time he had been over. He is a gracious man, and he thought it would be a gracious act, from what I understand, to allow the Obama administration to get the credit from finalizing the status of forces agreement with Iraq.

But then the brazen attitude by the new administration not only didn't sign the status of forces agreement that the Bush administration had teed up, they didn't get any status of forces agreement.

Mitt Romney was not very eloquent in the way he pointed it out, not very effective in the way he pointed it out, but he did bring it up in one of the debates—he couldn't even get a status of forces agreement done with Iraq.

It is something that this administration should have been embarrassed about. After all, we had done for Iraq under this President, this administration, we just crept out of Iraq with nothing even in the way of a thank you agreement, a thank you note—in fact, rather left hard feelings when we left.

After we left them the ability to elect their own leaders, their own government, this administration bungled the status of forces agreement to the point there was none. We lost further respect there. We have lost respect around Afghanistan.

When talking with General Dostum and some of the Northern Alliance leaders, they talked about how the United States had lost respect around radical Islam. These are moderate Muslim friends of mine—and, yeah, they do fight ruthlessly, but that is their area—they talked about how the United States had lost respect among radical Islamists around the world.

□ 1945

They see us as a toothless tiger, a paper tiger, someone to be laughed at, not to be concerned about or respected and certainly not feared.

I have met with Baloch people from Pakistan, who are constantly terrorized by the Pakistani Army and by other military—brutalized, terrorized, kept in fear for their lives so many times. They happen to be in the area where Pakistan's best minerals are located. You would think that the Pakistani leaders would treat them better since they have such a big area of the country and they comprise such a big component of the country that has some of the most valuable land because of the minerals in the whole area. It is the same in Iran. There are Baloch people who are indigenous to south and southeast Iran, and they are mistreated terribly by the Iranians.

But a thought came to mind. In having met with Baloch people previously, in knowing the geography of the area and in having heard American commanders and Northern Alliance individuals as well, all have indicated most

of the supplying of the Taliban in Afghanistan is coming through the Baloch area of Pakistan—not because of the Baloch. They don't want the Taliban helped. They certainly don't appreciate radical Islam.

So I asked our Northern Alliance leader friends—former allies before this administration—what if we started suggesting, because of the mistreatment of the Baloch in Pakistan, that it is time to give the Baloch their own independent country?

Let them be independent—to have their own area to which they are indigent—because, if we did that, the Baloch in charge of southern Pakistan would, indeed, stop any supplying to the Taliban coming from Pakistan or anyone else who went through the Baloch area through which so much of the supplying of the Taliban has been going. Who would benefit? The world would benefit. Our American soldiers would have benefited. We could have done that years ago.

Instead, the last time I looked, there were about twice as many people—American military individuals—who had died in Afghanistan compared to the number who died when Bush went to war in Afghanistan. So, under Bush, he was about 7 years in Afghanistan compared to the years of President Obama's. President Obama has had fewer years, yet more Americans have been killed.

Why?

Because, under this Commander in Chief, the rules of engagement have handicapped our own military. Many of them have been killed by the very people they were supposed to train and because there was just simply not enough respect for the United States under this administration—because we saw what this administration would do. If radical Islamists reared up and killed Americans, we saw what this administration did. They apologized that Korans were burned.

Now, how does apologizing to radical Islamists for burning Korans that their own people had desecrated and passed messages through—prisoners who had been provided these free Korans had sent messages, had used them, and so they had to be destroyed. When they were found burning, the radical Islamists used the occasion to kill innocent Americans, and this administration apologized to the country responsible for the killings.

In civilized countries like the United States has been—and still is in most places—the law has been and continues to be, unless they are under shari'a law, that provoking words are never a defense to a physical assault or a murder. No matter what anyone says to you, does to you—no matter what it is, no matter how vile—it does not justify a physical response no matter what is said. Under shari'a, it is different, but our Constitution is supposed to be the law of the land in this country, not shari'a law.

Our fellow Texan, Mohamed Elihiary, is a man who was given FBI's high ci-

vilian award, a man who is described by the Muslim periodical in Egypt as being one of the six top Muslim Brotherhood leaders in this administration, a man who spoke as a featured speaker at the huge tribute to the Ayatollah Khomeini, Man of Vision, a man who is given a secret security clearance without proper vetting, without proper investigation by Janet Napolitano, as the Secretary of Homeland Security.

Even after he was found and known to have downloaded inappropriate material and tried to shop them, Homeland Security said: Oh, well. We never found any evidence that he tried to shop the documents from the classified sources he downloaded. They didn't even bother to talk to the reporter who stated in print that he talked to a well-known national publication to which Mr. Elihiary had shopped the documents. They didn't investigate that. Janet Napolitano lied about that. It was not properly investigated or they would have checked to try to find out with whom he was supposed to have shopped these documents. They didn't even check.

But he sure has kept his secret security clearance. He is still proud of that FBI award. He still has a foundation called the Freedom and Justice Foundation, which is just like the Muslim Brotherhood, which is the same name as the Muslim Brotherhood political party. Yet this administration continues to count on him as one of their top advisers.

That is why Muslim leaders around the world, especially in the Middle East, have told some of us—and I talked to some other Congressmen who had been on a trip recently to the Middle East, and they encountered the same thing—why are you guys helping radical Islam now instead of helping us fight it? We are wondering which one of your allies you are going to throw away next.

It is not hard to understand why world leaders who have been our allies would wonder such a thing when you see it with our best ally in the Middle East—the one that respects the rights of women, that doesn't kill homosexual, gay, individuals in their country, the one that allows Muslims to vote, to work and to provide them protection—the one country that allows all of those things. That is our ally Israel. Yet we have the Secretary of State out there, previously some months back, talking about: Gee, it may look like they want a new intifada—another murdering spree—accusing Israel of wanting more murdering when they have done everything they can to try to protect themselves.

Nobody in the media—not in this country—talks about the rockets that have never stopped flying into Israel from radical Islamist-controlled areas. Instead, you have liberals in this country—friends of this administration—who are out there, saying: Do you know what? We need to cut off anything we do with Israel. That kind of

talk is supported by our own Secretary of State when he says: Gee, they are risking being guilty of apartheid. He tried to walk it back, but he has illustrated so much anti-Semitism that it is time for him to go. It is time for this administration to take a stand even though our mainstream media here in America doesn't like to hold him accountable.

Heaven help those at one of the mainstream media sources if they want to get to the truth of something like Benghazi. Their jobs are going to be gone. First, they are going to be told to back off, and then they are probably going to lose their jobs. We can't expose the truth about the present administration because, if they were interested in exposing the truth, then it would be after the highest ranking Attorney General in this country said to me: You don't want to go there, buddy. I said: Are you talking about contempt? and he made it clear that he was.

In fact, I want to look at exactly what the highest ranking Attorney General said to me in our hearing on April 8, 2014:

You don't want to go there, buddy. You should not—

Then I said: Are you talking about contempt?

You should not assume that this is not a big deal to me. I think it was inappropriate—he is talking about Congress holding him in contempt because he refused and continues to refuse to provide documents that he has, that he should have produced and that he continues to refuse to produce.

He said: I think it was unjust, but never think that it was not a big deal to me. Don't ever think that.

That is our highest ranking law enforcement officer in the country who was talking like that. So it was interesting.

This is what he said on February 13 of 2013. Amazing. ABC News will call my office and say: What is your basis for that? Will they ever call the Attorney General and say: How do you reconcile what you said under penalty of perjury before Congress to what you told us in our interview? Oh, gosh. No. ABC News could never do that because they might hurt the guy who is in the White House, who they helped put there.

So, in the interview with ABC News in February of 2013—it is not hard to find. If I can find it, surely ABC News or somebody should have been able to. He said to GOHMERT to never think it wasn't a big deal to him. Obviously, he is saying now it was a big deal.

This is what he said back over a year before:

But I have to tell you that, for me to really be affected by what happened—he is talking about contempt of Congress—I'd have to have respect for the people who voted in that way, and I didn't, so it didn't have that huge an impact on me.

That was Attorney General Eric Holder to ABC News in February 2013.

Now, I had in the back of my mind that it had not been a big deal to him. Why didn't ABC News remember this?

□ 2000

Nobody at ABC News, even the one who interviewed him would have remembered: oh, you know, he told GOHMERT, don't you ever think it wasn't a big deal? Nobody remembered this from a year before at ABC News.

Now, I wouldn't use this line, but what my old practice court professor in law school used to say—Matt Dawson, a tremendously effective trial lawyer—but he used to have a line, if you were caught saying two different things, like our Attorney General has been—two different things about the same topic, Matt Dawson used to say: Well, were you lying then, or are you lying now?

Like I say, I am not saying that. I am just reflecting back on what Matt Dawson would say if confronted with those two different quotes.

What I, as a Member of Congress say, is this is really outrageous. It is time to have people in this administration that the world will respect, that the country will respect, that will be fair and evenhanded, will not come into Congress and mislead Congress, will not hold up, stonewall, prevent the American people from knowing the facts about how innocent people came to be killed with guns that this Justice Department forced to be sold to people who should never have been allowed to have them.

They are entitled and we are entitled, as a Nation, to have a Secretary of State that is respected and does not say outrageous things and accuse allies of outrageous offenses when those allegations are so far from true.

Yes, I know Secretary Kerry says he wishes he hadn't chosen the word "apartheid." How about intifada, about accusing fellow Vietnam veterans of acting like Genghis Kahn? I always thought it was Genghis Kahn until I heard young Mr. Kerry talking about Genghis Kahn.

It is time for us to regain some respect in the world, and it is time for us to stop radical Islam before there is another holocaust.

I read a fantastic book written by Joel Rosenberg that came out this spring, "The Auschwitz Escape." I didn't even know anyone had escaped from Auschwitz. It is a novel.

When you read about the novel, you get interested and find out there were people that escaped from Auschwitz because they wanted to get the news out to the world about what was happening, that this wasn't just a prison work camp, that they were rounding up Jews by the hundreds of thousands and bringing them in and, at Auschwitz, putting them in showers and, instead of water coming out, poisonous gas did; and then their bodies were taken right across and burned in a giant crematorium. The people that were there always saw the smoke, always smelled the vile smell of Jews' bodies burning.

Then you find out that, once people escaped, they got information out, it still took far too long for America or

the Allies to do anything to stop it. We could have bombed the railroads that were taking Jews into these prison camps, like Auschwitz, where they were being killed in masses.

Even after people escaped and got word out, we didn't, the Allies didn't, and the railroads continued running, and the cattle cars cramped with Jews being taken. Initially, they were taken to the prison camps, and a decision was made, as they walked up to an individual, you go here, which means you are going to work until you can't work, and then we will gas you, and then burn you; or you are not worth keeping, so you are going to go get killed immediately.

In the end, the attempted genocide killed 6 million or so Jews. Because they were war criminals? No. Because they had committed a crime of any kind? No. Because they were Jews; that is a crime against humanity.

The leaders of Iran have said they want to destroy the Great Satan, which is the United States, and they want to wipe the Little Satan, Israel, off the map. They want the Jewish vermin, as they sometimes call them, eradicated.

There is some like the J Street Group, say: no, no, no, we can work with these people. And I have to point out to any Jew who wants to work with Iran and the current leadership of Iran, these people can't be trusted.

When the history was written, it turned out there were some Jews that helped the Nazis by pointing out where other Jews lived, where they could be arrested, or where they were being hidden. There is a special place for them in eternity.

People need to understand, the modern-day gas chambers are being constructed. They are too near completion in Iran. Right now, they are called nuclear weapons.

For a number of years now, we have been hearing projections: Iran is this close to having nukes, this close to having nukes. Joel Rosenberg raised a good point in one of his prior novels. He does great research.

In that novel, he had Iran constructing multiple—they waited until they had enough fissile material so they could construct several nuclear weapons, and I am sure that is their thought.

Just as with the 9/11 hijackers, yeah, they were crazy, but they weren't stupid. They were very methodical as they plotted to kill what they hoped would be tens of thousands of Americans, innocent people.

With glee, they thought about all the horror. With glee, some of those that helped plan, but were not actually part of the 19, that were joyful as they saw Americans deciding between being burned to death in the World Trade Centers or jumping a 1,000 feet to their death, and they rejoiced.

These same people in Iran who were so thrilled to see Americans burning, being crushed in the World Trade Centers as they fell or even jumping to

their deaths before they fell, they were so ecstatic about that, and these people are working on nuclear weapons. They cannot be trusted.

Mr. Speaker, there is something this administration can do that will regain America's respect around the world, that should stop Vladimir Putin cold in his tracks, that will stop China from evermore aggressive overtaking and reach beyond their borders, to stop thugs around the world who seek to take over countries, something that would stop them because they would fear and respect America, would be the very thing that will protect America, will protect Israel, will protect Saudi Arabia, will protect UAE, will protect Jordan, will protect Egypt, and that is for the United States of America to have its Commander in Chief issue the order: Take out anything that Iran has that may be proliferating nuclear weapons. Take it out.

If they scramble to save something, then let's go back and hit them again and again, not the people of Iran, unless these cruel leaders have buried nuclear facilities in civilian areas. If they had done that, then it would be the Iranian leaders that would be responsible for criminally harming civilians and putting them as cowards, putting them between the criminals and judgment day. We need to do that.

Israel doesn't have our F-35s. They don't have all of our stealth yet. They don't have the capability to carry our best bunker busters into Iran and eliminate their nuclear weapons. We do. Maybe it takes more than one sortie, one group of planes going in. Maybe it takes more than one, two, three.

We need to do it, take them out, whatever it takes, and that stops Iran in their development of the modern-day gas chambers, the modern-day holocaust that will occur in Israel and in America if we don't act.

I read about a survivor from one of the death camps when the American soldiers arrived. They were so thrilled, they went running up, and the Jewish inmate was then free, spit in his face and asked basically: Where have you been?

Six million people killed for nothing more than being of a particular race, and we could have stopped it far sooner. Who knows how many millions we could have saved if we had acted sooner?

But now, we know. We know, without a doubt, Iran wants to develop nuclear weapons, is trying to develop nuclear weapons, have said they want to wipe us out, have said they want to wipe out Israel.

It is time to take them seriously; and by doing so, you gain respect from the thug Taliban because they realize, as Qadhafi did: wow, if he will do that to Iran, he would do it to us.

And then we wouldn't even have to because they would fear us and respect us enough, respect our power—not us individually. They would respect the

power, and the world could see more years of peace and could see an end in sight maybe for 100 years or so of radical Islam. Moderate Muslims could live in peace. Jews could live more in peace. Christians could live more in peace.

There are Christians being persecuted around the world, probably in greater numbers than ever before, not in percentages, but in numbers. In countries like Iraq, where we gave them their freedom, they are persecuting Christians and Jews. In Afghanistan, where we gave them their freedom, they are persecuting Christians and Jews.

They were persecuting Christians and Jews in Egypt until the people rose up and demonstrations—literally went arm in arm, a beautiful, incredible scene for world peace, as Muslims, Jews, Christians, secularists took to the streets to rebel and demand the ouster of a radical Islamist who was seizing power, and had they waited another year, they probably would not have been able to do it.

□ 2015

For those who believe in the power of prayer, we need to continue to pray for Israel and we need to continue to pray for Egypt and the Egyptian leaders.

I applaud the Obama administration. I was thrilled and am so pleased that this administration has announced they are going to go ahead and furnish Apache helicopters to the new government in Egypt.

It is going to be tough for the Egyptians. They have got a tough economy. They have too many on welfare. They have got a lot of adjustments to make. But they want freedom. The masses of Egypt want freedom. They don't want radical Islam. They don't want radical Islam like that which rebelled and killed Qadhafi and took over Tunisia. They don't want that.

We need to encourage them. We need to help them. We need to help them eliminate all the weaponization that Morsi encouraged and allowed, it turns out, in the Sinai, as Egypt stands up against radical Islam.

So I really want to thank the Obama administration for following through in supplying the Apache helicopters that were supposed to be supplied.

As General el-Sisi, who has stepped down as general of the military, and who will likely be elected President, said previously, Do you not understand we use the Apaches to keep the Suez Canal open? We are using the Apaches to clear out the radical Islamists in the Sinai. Why wouldn't you want to help us do that? Why would you rather help radical Islam?

I know that in this body a majority would stand with our President and we would be proud of him if he would protect us and protect Israel, stop the nuclear proliferation in its tracks, not by promising to release murderers, not by talking Israel into releasing more murderers, and not giving Iran billions and

billions of more money and not eliminating any more of the sanctions against Iran, but just take out the nuclear capability that has developed so far. Because otherwise, if we let them get nukes, they will be glad to supply them to terrorists.

You don't have to have intercontinental ballistic missiles to get a nuke to America. You can put them on a boat and float them right up the Potomac, the Hudson, right up to Chicago, up to Houston, New Orleans, and take out 70 percent of our refining capacity.

So they could put a nuclear weapon on even a sorry Scud missile that is so inexact and launch it from a boat or a barge into the interior airspace. It doesn't need to hit the ground, but there is a huge range that even a Scud missile could make, and explode a nuclear weapon, creating an electromagnetic pulse, or EMP, that would fry most of the computer chips in the country, shut down most of our electrical capacity, shut down grocery stores, shut down stores relying on computers, shut down cars that have reliance on computer chips.

They could do all that with one nuke and a lousy missile that is not very exact. They could do that.

It is time we acted before they destroy America as we have known it, as it has come to be the greatest country in the history of the world. It has more individual freedom, but we see that waning. It has the greatest economy in history, but we have seen that wane.

Now we are told in a very short time China will be the biggest economy, unless something happens. How about if the United States stops the modern-day gas chambers from being completed, stops the radical Islamist enemies of America, Israel, and of moderate Muslims?

How about if we do moderate Islam a favor and take out the radicals for them as well?

Let's get peace on track. And you don't do it with a Secretary of State that condemns our closest allies and accuses our allies of being criminals. You don't do it by releasing murderous thugs of countries that hate us and are planning to kill us at some point whenever they get the capability. You do it by self-preservation.

In Texas, we are pretty proud of our self-defense laws. When somebody has told you they are going to kill you, and they are close to having the ability to do that, it is self-defense to stop them.

It is time.

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

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today and the balance of the week on account of the recent tornadoes in Arkansas.

Mr. HARPER (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of him

assisting with the emergency response to the tornadoes in Mississippi.

Mr. NUNNELEE (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of recent tornadoes in Mississippi.

Mr. RICHMOND (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and May 1 on account of attending to family matters.

#### SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 994. An act to expand the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 to increase accountability and transparency in Federal spending, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 22 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 1, 2014, at 9 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

5484. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Pine Shoot Beetle; Addition of Quarantined Areas and Regulated Articles [Docket No.: APHIS-2010-0031] received April 17, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5485. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Asian Longhorned Beetle; Quarantined Areas in Ohio [Docket No.: APHIS-2013-0004] received April 17, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5486. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Regulations Issued Under the Export Apple Act; Exempting Bulk Shipments to Canada From Minimum Requirements and Inspection [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-14-0022; FV14-33-1 IR] received April 17, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5487. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility (Baltimore County, MD, et al.) [Docket ID: FEMA-2013-0002] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8327] received April 17, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5488. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Certain Consumer Products [Docket No.: EERE-2013-BT-NOA-0047] (RIN: 1904-AD08) received April 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5489. A letter from the Executive Director, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission,