

can't be used to pay for salaries and expenses of task forces or councils established by the President and headed by a czar.

This is what he's trying to do. He's trying to put a sunset on the czar policy, because it seems to an awful lot of people in this country, the term "czar" means absolute power, and they've created these positions of absolute power without any oversight.

I will start with my friend from Georgia.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. I thank my friend from Texas for yielding.

A czar is something that I've been getting a lot of questions about lately. Everywhere I've been in Georgia's Third Congressional District, I'm starting to get questions about the czars. People are wondering who these 34 or 35 czars are. We have already had one exposed to the extent that he eventually resigned.

People are starting to understand more and more that these czars are being appointed by the President with no confirmation by the Senate. And they're beginning to say, hey, how is this happening? What's going on here? How long are they going to serve? Do they work directly for the President? Who are they accountable to? What if they have some type of job that's under Mrs. NAPOLITANO or under Geithner, or whatever? Who do they report to? What's the deal? They would report directly to the President.

And so we need, really, sunshine on all the appointments, but especially, as the gentleman from Louisiana, H.R. 3569, at least a sunset on all these czars. This is something that the American people are very inquisitive about.

I think that because of the number of these czars and because of some of the really Communist views and really ultra left-wing views that some of these czars have that are being exposed is just bringing more and more attention to it. And I think the American people want some accountability. I'll go back to the statement, they're sick and tired of being sick and tired of more government being stacked on.

We've got 10 percent unemployment nationwide. We've got some areas with 15, 16, 17, 20 percent unemployment. The only jobs that are growing right now are in the Federal Government. That's the only thing that's growing.

With that, Judge, I hope that anybody who could be watching might encourage their Representative to look at H.R. 3569.

Mr. CARTER. We're just about to run out of time. We had a surprise guest come from the back of the room. Would you like to tell us about the czars? Did we stimulate you?

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. You sure did, Judge. I want to thank you for bringing this up. It's just not who these folks are that we don't know; it's what they step on. I look at this as sort of the fourth or the stealth branch of government.

I came here, I know all my colleagues here, certainly the freshmen, we came knowing that we have a serious responsibility to fulfill on the different committees of jurisdiction that we're appointed to. I bring up just one example, the car czar, and what has happened to the auto industry in this country.

As I could tell, I expected when we had these issues, that we have a committee, I believe it's called Energy and Commerce, that would have dealt with the issues surrounding that industry. And yet everything that has happened in the car industry, of firing an executive from a private organization, to taking over ownership of General Motors, to dictating winners and losers in terms of the auto dealerships, all directed under the leadership of a czar.

Frankly, I know that that's the responsibility of Congress. We have a responsibility to approach that carefully and judiciously and make those types of decisions. The Constitution provided us that authority and that responsibility, and the czars are just stepping all over the Constitution.

Mr. CARTER. Reclaiming my time, thank you. We feel real good when we can call a colleague out of the dark. We're glad you're here. We are just about to wrap up our time.

Before we stop, I'm doing something different today. We've been talking about an awful lot. This is probably the most we've talked about in a single hour. As soon as this is over with, as soon as I walk across the street to my office, if you go to www.house.gov/carter, we're going to have a live Webcast for the next hour-and-a-half where you can ask questions and make comments about what we've talked about here, or anything else that's bothering you or that you're concerned about, I want to have it, so that you can tell Congress what you think. I've already started doing this. I enjoy it. I've already got 300 questions waiting right now. I'm going to advertise a little bit and welcome people to come to this Webcast.

Mr. Speaker, how much time have I got left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. One minute.

Mr. CARTER. Thank you, everybody, for participating. It's most important you remember the subject of this conversation, and that is the rule of law that holds this society together. Never forget. We're all talking about rules and laws and how they seem to be stretched and violated. We've got to get back to the rule of law governing this Nation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

ISRAEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHOCK) is recognized for half the remaining time until midnight.

Mr. SCHOCK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We come together tonight to talk about a very important issue and a very important relationship that we enjoy with our only true democratic ally in the Middle East, the State of Israel.

We've seen in the last week this issue come to light with the instability in that region, with the new facility that was just discovered and made public on Friday by the United States, Great Britain and her allies. This just reinforces in the minds of many of us in Congress the importance of us remaining steadfast in making sure that the State of Iran, that country, does not receive a nuclear weapon and that we do all that we can to support our ally, the State of Israel, and peace in that region.

I was fortunate to be a part of a delegation that traveled to Israel. In fact, there were 25 Members who traveled the first week of August to Israel on a fact-finding trip; 25 Republicans, which was the largest delegation of Republicans ever to visit the State of Israel at once. The Republican delegation was led by our whip, ERIC CANTOR. The following week the Democrats were led by Majority Leader STENY HOYER, and my understanding was there were over 30 Democrat Members who went on that trip, which is the largest number of Democratic Members to travel to Israel all at one time.

If you do the math, that's over 50 Members, which is well over 10 percent of the Congress traveling to that region within a 2-week period and I think underscores the importance that this Congress believes that relationship is and the need for us to press for peace and the need for us to support our allies.

I want to take some time to reflect on my views of what I learned on that trip and some reflections of what I learned on that trip. Also here tonight, I have one of my good friends and allies who has joined me to share his experiences as well.

I would like to take this time to yield to my good friend, Mr. THOMPSON.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. I thank my good friend from Illinois for yielding and thank him for coordinating this time tonight when we truly do talk about our most important ally, a friend that we have and a good democratic friend in a very dangerous part of the world in the Jewish State of Israel.

It was a privilege to be able to visit the country of Israel and to go with other colleagues, to go there with an open mind and to be able to sit down and to visit and talk face to face with the President of Israel, with the Prime Minister of Israel, to meet with the military, to go into the West Bank and sit down with the Prime Minister of the Palestinian Authority and to look at the defense issues that Israel lives with each day and has since the beginning of that democratic nation; to visit all the borders on all sides of Israel and to look out into, whether it was Jordan

or Syria or Lebanon, places where, at one time or different times during their short history where missiles rained from and mortars came down on men, women and children in that State of Israel. It's a country that is very familiar and lives every day where defense is on their mind, and a strong defense.

□ 2210

In particular, it was striking to me when we were in the southern part of Israel, and we were overlooking the Gaza Strip. All the borders are being relatively peaceful right now, but at the Gaza Strip and just outside of this small farming community of Sderot where we looked and the leaders of Israel chose, in a goodwill, good-faith offer of peace, gave up what I thought looked like a pretty good piece of real estate that sat along the Mediterranean Sea, and that was the Gaza Strip.

They moved the citizens of Israel out of there, and relocated them into other parts of Israel in the hopes of obtaining a lasting peace and long peace with the Palestinians; and in exchange, what they received is about 3,000 missiles and mortars that came raining down on them.

I think the most striking conversation I had—and I know my good friend was there—was with a young mom of a 9-year-old, and she had grown up in that farming community. Her grandparents lived there. Her parents lived there. She lived her entire life there, and she lived through that time when those missiles rained. She talked about how—and we saw as we were driving in to Sderot bus stations that looked a little unusual but that was because they were designed also as bomb shelters. We saw the playground, which had a great piece of equipment sitting in it. My kids are grown now, but my boys would have loved it. It looked like a giant caterpillar and kind of weaved around. But to look closer, it actually was a bomb shelter for children that they would run to whenever a missile was launched and would soon be landing.

Now from the time the siren sounds in Israel, they have about 20 seconds until that missile lands and explodes. That young mom I think put it so striking for me. Her words I hear over and over again in my mind, imagine yourself, you are a parent, and you are driving down the road. That siren sounds, and you've got 20 seconds to get to safety. You've got two children. They're both strapped in car seats in the back seat. Which one do you pick?

I think we take for granted our safety and security in this country. We certainly have had our attacks here. We've been relatively safe since 2001 because of the measures that were taken by President Bush and by the Congress at that point, and we have not experienced another attack on our soil in those 8 years. But we certainly have issues that I look forward to talking about further tonight in terms of

future threats to not just our country but to the country of Israel. And I thank my good friend for yielding.

Mr. SCHOCK. Well, thank you for your insights, and obviously I share those observations and would like to take the opportunity to share some of my own. First, let me say that I thought the trip to Israel reinforced what I had already known and that was that the Israeli citizens want peace. I saw this message on the faces of young soldiers. I've heard a passionate thoughtful cry for peace in Prime Minister Netanyahu's words, and I even prayed for peace with Israelis as they ended their prayers on Shabbat.

Furthermore, I found that like every nation in this world, Israel is a nation of contrasts. Specifically, it is a land hemmed by unambiguous borders, yet filled with lines that have been blurred beyond recognition. New and old, the archeological and the militarily strategic, the political and the religious were all indistinguishably bundled together until each lost its own identity and had become part of the same interwoven fabric.

Each day's itinerary was packed with life-changing events; the oppressive heat that hit me every time I stepped off the bus also seemed to also challenge all of my preconceived ideas about Israel. And while I found our agenda to be filled with the study of distorted lines, there were always those stark borders which clearly separated Israel from her neighbors and delineated fact from fiction.

I found this truth as we toured the Western Wall. As I watched old rabbis press their heads against the blocks of Herod's Temple, I found no ambiguous lines. I was clearly standing at the foundation of modern Israel. Conversely, I did not hear Israel's genesis in the echo of my footsteps through the solemn corridors of Yad Vashem. True, I heard an irrefutable argument against the unforgettable atrocities that happened when the world's Jewry does not have a land to call its own. While important, Yad Vashem's lesson does not speak to Israel's birthright. Plainly, Israel does not exist because of the Holocaust.

Unfortunately, I believe President Obama crossed this unmistakable border in his Cairo speech, linking the history of Israel not to the Western Wall or Masada but to the actions of a mad man. President Obama implied that Israel was thrown together to ease the guilt of a post-World War II Europe. I find this absurd. One can easily trace the tenacity of Masada straight through 2,000 years of history to the weary resolution on the faces of David Rubinger's famous photo "Paratroopers at the Western Wall."

Israel does not date to the instability caused by Adolf Hitler, but to the stability engendered by Abraham. Additionally, the President spoke of mutual respect but failed to show the Israelis the same respect he displayed to Palestinians. He spoke of the daily humil-

iations endured by Palestinians, but did not mention the daily fears endured by the residents of Sderot as they go about their lives tethered to bomb shelters.

The President also crossed the border between fact and fiction when he put settlement construction on a pedestal as the principal bargaining chip for peace, thereby providing cover for Palestinian leaders to harden their opposition to all construction in the settlements. This misstep was completely unnecessary. It is well known that Israel has no intention of building new settlements. However, the nation also has no intention of stopping normal life in the settlements; and, unfortunately, the President inadvertently called for the latter.

Admittedly, this is a difficult topic for us to understand, and it was only on my trip that I realized the line between Israeli parents and grown children is much more blurred than it is here in the United States. I love my mother dearly, yet I do not wish to have her live right next door to me. However, many Israelis want exactly that. They want to walk to their father's house for Shabbat and employ their mother as a readily available and reliable baby sitter.

Settlements need what is referred to as natural growth, but this term is a misnomer. The settlements have no intention of growing the geographic size of their settlements. Instead, they want a natural filling in of the existing land. They want their son to be able to build a house on the vacant lot next to their home. To deprive settlers of this ability is to deprive them of living the Israeli lifestyle. I wish President Obama had toured the Alfei Menashe settlement with us so he could have learned this lesson himself. The President also needs to learn that the world cannot preach from on high to Israel.

When the President tours U.S. cities, he does not encounter bus stops that double as bomb shelters. When he sees groups of crowded students around the White House, he does not see assault rifles slung over the chaperone's shoulders. He does not live in fear. And due to these facts, the President does not have the capability to lecture Israel on what she must do to keep peace or to make her citizens safe.

Finally, I turn my attention to the largest topic facing Israel, the Iranian threat. Using more than 7,000 centrifuges, Tehran has amassed enough uranium to produce a nuclear device. At their current pace, Iran would be able to produce two more atomic weapons each year, provided they find ways to further enrich this fuel. Never before—not India, not Pakistan, not even North Korea—has a group of criminals so defiant of international law had such destructive capability; and as the people of Iran have become more vocal in their pleas for responsible leadership, the ayatollahs have become more erratic and unpredictable.

As such, we must quickly and decisively act to end this danger. Without a doubt, the United States has failed to do enough to stop Iran from becoming a proud owner of the bomb. It is true, Congress has taken a multitude of votes on this issue. However, the majority of these were simply press releases disguised as legislation. To right this wrong, I have added my name in support of multiple bills this year to strengthen sanctions against Iran.

By no means are these pieces of legislation sufficient. The United States must use every unilateral and multilateral tool it has at its disposal to cut off Iran economically, diplomatically, and politically until this shadow of a state abandons its diabolical goals.

□ 2220

These actions can only help Iran make the decisions sooner. Iran must see it can stand with peace, prosperity, and the international community, or it can continue to live in squalor and obscurity, relegated to the trash heap of the international community with the other juntas, regimes, and cabals.

When I think about the threat of Iran, I am reminded of the saying that those who do not study history are destined to repeat it. I'm reminded of my tour of Yad Vashem. I recall an eerily similar declaration to annihilate Jews. I remember a leader who perverted a religion to justify his actions. And I am reminded of the famous British Parliamentarian Edmund Burke, who once said, "The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is for good men to do nothing," which is exactly what too many Christian leaders did in that day: nothing.

This eerie similarity exists today, not with a leader who quotes the Bible but with one who quotes the Koran. His comments echo those of Hitler's; his stated goal is the same.

So what is necessary for peace? I would contend that there will be no peace until leaders around the world regardless of faiths denounce such comments, until leaders within the Muslim community reject this rhetoric, and until leaders of the Islamic states shun such hate speak within their borders. Whether someone builds a second garage or a second home within a defined community is not what stands between war and peace. A community of citizens who pervert a religion to justify hate and murder are what stand in the way of peace. This is precisely what we should all fear. It was radical Islamic terrorists who attacked the United States on September the 11th, who blew up subways in the UK. This ideology is the true barrier to peace.

I am reminded of a note that was left by the terrorists in Spain during the Madrid bombings. They said, "We will win and you will lose. Because you love life, and we seek death."

Therein lies the real problem with Iran. Unlike the threat of mutual destruction during the Cold War with Russia and the U.S., both knowing that

if one attacked, the other would retaliate, we are now dealing with a regime that is not a socialist state like Russia but a religious state, whose leader espouses no fear of death but rather a clearly defined goal to destroy the state of Israel. This threat must be at the center of our President's and Congress's attention for the sake of Israel's security but also for the sake of our own.

Settlements, the West Bank, and a President who seems more interested in giving dictation rather than providing assistance—when spoken aloud, these problems seem rather insurmountable. I believe they are not. There is a path to peace which is as clear as the border formed by the security barrier. We only need to have the courage to take the first step on this path by ensuring Israel has our undeniable support.

Fortunately, we are not alone. The vast majority of Americans support Israel. We recognize that Israel stands as a lone beachhead of democracy in the Middle East. We know that we take our security for granted and do not judge those who are not afforded this luxury. In short, regardless of the muted lines within Israel, we know where the stark borders between our supporters and detractors are in the Middle East.

During our meeting with Shimon Peres, he said, "Israel and her neighbors seem to be able to live in peace. We just have a problem writing it down."

Focusing on the real threats to peace and democracy around the world, requiring leadership on the part of the Arab states to root out terrorists within their borders, and continuing to support and stand by our ally in the region, as, Mr. Netanyahu definitively stated, "With God's help, we will know no more war. We will know peace."

With that I yield to my good friend from the state of Louisiana, Dr. FLEMING, for his impressions of his trip to Israel and the state of the region there in the Middle East.

Mr. FLEMING. I thank my friend and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHOCK).

The three of us here this evening spent really an awesome time in Israel during August. But I want to take you back in time, Mr. Speaker, in history 71 years to today. Literally 71 years to today, and what we see in the newsreels. And that was that Lord Chamberlain waved a stack of papers in front of the camera and he uttered, We have peace in our time. And what was he talking about? He had just come from a meeting with Herr Adolph Hitler, and along with France and a few other nations, but not Czechoslovakia, they had come to an agreement to cede to Hitler the Sudetenland, which at that time was the strategic part of Czechoslovakia that was so necessary for their protection. He ceded that. Of course, Hitler claimed that it was mostly populated with Germans, but,

nonetheless, Lord Chamberlain and others agreed to let him have it. And we know that today as a policy of appeasement.

He also said that he actually went there for the purpose of honor and peace. And then Winston Churchill, who was in the Parliament, replied that he went there for honor and peace but he returned with neither. Because we know that within months, Hitler began a very aggressive campaign and went on to, of course, not only take Czechoslovakia but also Poland. And, of course, as we say, the rest is history.

And what is that history? The history is that there were 20 million people killed during World War II, Mr. Speaker; 6 million of them were Jews. And in visiting the Holocaust Museum in Israel, in Jerusalem, Yad Vashem, something very interesting, I think, occurred in my mind that I never thought about until it was brought out.

We saw a lot of very interesting things there. A lot of personal stories about families who were broken apart, most of whom died in the Holocaust, people who were in death camps, a lot of personal letters and books and eyeglasses and things like that that told individual stories. We know the factual parts of this. We have all seen the documentaries that talked about the gas chambers and the ovens. And we, of course, have heard about and read about the Final Solution and Hitler's attempt to take executing human beings to a whole new scientific level, which he was able to achieve. Nothing before and nothing since has been done.

But the important thing, Mr. Speaker, about this that we must understand that really teaches us a second lesson today: The first one being the danger of appeasement, but the second is that while the Jews were being carted off to the death camps, and, of course, many of them attempted to reach safe harbor in the United States and many other countries and were denied that and, in fact, in many cases were thrown out of other countries, there was no one to speak up for the Jews. No one, not even the United States. Even we have the blight of having turned our backs on the Jews. And there was no state, there was no country to speak up for the Jews, who at that time lived in many places of the world. And because of that, after World War II and all the countries began to come together, it was decided that the Jews would have their own homeland.

□ 2230

And of course we know that the U.N. provided for that, and what was then called Palestine today is called Israel. Israel is a state, and that's so important because now Jews have a country to stick up for them. They have a people who will never back down from an evil dictator like Adolf Hitler. They will stand up for their people, and they will stand up as our ally against these things.

But the interesting thing is it's often said that what we don't learn from history is destined to repeat itself. And what we have today is a Hitler-like figure, Mr. Speaker, of course, Ahmadinejad, who is saying many of the same things that Adolf Hitler said in those days, giving the same threats.

Very few people took Hitler seriously when he said that he intended to kill the Jews, and that is what he did. Now we have Ahmadinejad who is making the same statements, and we watch before our very eyes he's building a nuclear arsenal.

And what are we doing, Mr. Speaker? Well, we are talking about sanctions. And how effective are these sanctions going to be when it's necessary to have Russia and China to help us with that? And of course, all we are getting from them is rhetoric. In fact, the only thing structurally that's been done in all of this discussion is we've given up missile defense in the Czech Republic and in Poland. So we are already beginning the appeasement process in this world while we have another Hitler-like figure out there beginning to plan the destruction of the Jews once again.

So I think we need to stand, Mr. Speaker, with our brothers and sisters in Israel, in their protection. Because in as much as Israel is so capable of taking care of itself—we all know just what a small strip of land that is—and while Israel can protect itself in many ways, there is no way that Israel can protect itself from an intercontinental ballistic missile with a nuclear warhead, and that is precisely what Iran is doing today.

And apart from that, Iran is exporting terrorism around the world. We know that Hamas and Hezbollah; we know that al Qaeda—who is providing al Qaeda, Mr. Speaker, with the weapons they are using to kill our own sons and daughters? Again, it's Iran. So Iran is emerging as, I guess—Ahmadinejad and certainly the mullahs behind him, are really, I think, showing a tremendous parallel to pre-World War II Germany.

And I think that we need to learn from the lessons of the past, and that is that number one, we should never allow a policy of appeasement. It never gets peace and it never gives honor. It always leads to war. It's always a matter of people overseas, folks who really are out for the destruction of others, it gives them an opening to attack other countries.

And then secondly, never again should Israel be without its own country and certainly without its friends around the world. Never again should we have a situation, Mr. Speaker, as we did during World War II that was a holocaust which, of course, we know that Ahmadinejad denies to this day.

And there are many that say, look, this is just a little strip of land out there in the middle of the desert. You've got Arabs out there and you've got Jews and they're fighting over this land. Really, if you think about it, the

Jews occupied this land as far back as 3500 B.C. Islam didn't even come into existence until thousands of years later, and in fact, we know that Christianity started even before Islam.

So of course there have been three major religions that have existed there and still exist there today, and as far as I'm concerned, they can exist there forever. But I think that there's no reason to think that there isn't a legitimate right for Israel to claim that as its own state.

And in summary—and this is, I think, to kind of tie it all together, Mr. Speaker—we talked about the issue of the two-state solution, and Mr. Netanyahu believes that is the way to go. We should have two states: a Palestinian state and a Jewish state. But remember that Israel is a democracy, and just simply by being outgrown by Palestinians or Muslims, it could lose its status as a Jewish state. And I think that it's essential that we not only support this two-state solution in supporting Israel, but that we support the right for Israel to exist as a Jewish state and always will.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield for a question? Actually, both of my colleagues.

When we were there, we had an opportunity to visit a number of the settlements, and I have been distressed that our President, President Obama, has been almost dictating that Israel give up part of its sovereign nation, these settlements. We were there. We walked them. We saw the strategic location of them.

I wanted to get your impressions of what your thoughts were. Should Israel give in to that direction and give up its sovereign land, those settlements that it has today?

Mr. FLEMING. If the gentleman will yield back, I will just simply say that my first impression beyond the fact that Israel is such a lovely country—I mean, just gorgeous, right in the middle of the desert next to the Mediterranean Sea. And of course we were able to see the Dead Sea and many sites that are holy to us as Christians. But just how small that country is, like a postage stamp, as narrow as 5 miles at its waist. And we saw a patchwork of villages, one being Palestinian and one being Jewish, all throughout the country.

And even though, often cases there were checkpoints and there were fences between them, you couldn't really see that. All you could see looking over is you would see evidence of a Palestinian village and you would see evidence of a Jewish village all sitting there peacefully. It's almost difficult to believe how much war and how much violence has existed there for so long.

And of course with that we visited Sderot, which is, I guess, a flash point where there have been rockets hurled and that sort of thing.

So I think that was really what I found to be very impressive.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman will yield.

Mr. FLEMING. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. It struck me that many of those settlements are in strategic locations. They're high ground from which terrorists, the Palestinians, lobbed missiles and rockets onto the men, women, and children of Israel. And those were taken as a part of the war in 1948, and frankly, they're extremely important areas to hold on to.

I kind of think of the—as I think about our President, President Obama, dictating onto the Israeli nation that they should give up the space, it's a little bit like somebody coming to us and saying, okay, now you need to give back New Mexico, California, and Nevada to the sovereign nation of Mexico. We wouldn't stand for that. I would certainly hope that the sovereign nation of Israel would not stand for that as well.

Mr. SCHOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. SCHOCK. Okay. To your point, I think what you're suggesting is, number one, should any of these properties be, quote, given back or surrendered, but, number two, should that really be the focus of our effort towards peace.

It seems to me a little disingenuous on the part of our administration to suggest that somehow what stands between the current situation and a path road to peace is the issue of settlements is really a misnomer.

The reality is the State of Israel has shown throughout their history that they are the ones who have bargained in good faith and time and time again shown a willingness to give up lands as they have and only to their own peril; as you mentioned, what you saw in Sderot with the bomb shelters and the people who have suffered as a result of them giving up the Gaza Strip.

But the issue of Israel willing to give up this settlement or that settlement or redraw the boundaries, you and I both heard from Netanyahu's own words that they're not wedded to any set boundary. But what we also heard was out of the lips of the Prime Minister of the Palestinian Authority, which was his unwillingness to accept Israel as a Jewish state.

□ 2240

Therein lies the real problem with the pathway to peace and a two-state solution: the Palestinians' unwillingness at this point to recognize Israel as a Jewish state. I would only also add that while we are talking about settlements, Iran continues to march towards acquiring a nuclear weapon. While I certainly respect this administration's plans to begin talks and to negotiate and to try and solve this diplomatically, I would remind the American people, and my colleagues here, that this is the same administration that we want to talk to that has lied to the international community and hidden from them a nuclear facility which

the world was just made aware of last week.

So I would only question the sincerity and the ability for us to truly negotiate with trust with this regime who up until last weekend we were not even aware of an additional nuclear facility. So it's very alarming. I will tell you, I don't know what my distinguished colleagues here feel, but we have two bills that are still in this Chamber, H.R. 2194, which is the Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act, and then the Iran Sanctions Enabling Act, which was H.R. 1327. Both of those bills have a majority of Members of Congress supporting it. And it just seems to me a shame that this body has not acted on that legislation to put another tool in the chest of President Obama as he goes forward to negotiate with Iran, the fact that these sanctions are there if and when they become necessary to use.

And I would just yield back.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman. I certainly thank you for naming those pieces of legislation. They are extremely important. They do have the large support of this entire Chamber.

I would ask the Speaker support that bill and to bring that bill to the floor so that we can do the right thing by this most important ally that we have in the Middle East and would serve the needs. I think what you have talked about tonight really most recently addresses the most immediate threat in Israel and I think the most immediate threat to the United States, and that is the situation in Iran.

Mr. Speaker, Iran has recently revealed the development of a secret nuclear facility. And Iran's admission of the operations of a secret nuclear facility is a serious problem and a serious threat. While this new revelation is alarming, it's not unexpected. Iran has deceived the world time and time again. And any attempts to assure the world that their nuclear program is peaceful should be seen for what it is, and that is just another lie.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it's time to impose meaningful sanctions on the Iranian Government. We have legislation that has been drafted and introduced and has the support of the majority Members of this Chamber. We must not continue a foreign policy that extends a hand of cooperation to our enemies while they continue dangerous acts of deception. If the nuclear facility was designed for civilian purposes, we have to ask, why did Iran conceal its existence?

We must impose meaningful sanctions on the threat that endangers the safety of American citizens and America's allies. Now, the confirmation of this secret nuclear facility is troubling, especially to me at a time just days after the Obama administration announced plans to abandon the placement of a missile defense system in the Czech Republic and Poland and all because Russia was not happy with the

idea. Only 1 year since Russia invaded Georgia and 70 years to the day since the Soviet Union invaded Poland, the administration has announced the dismantling of one our most important missile defense systems at the expense of our allies.

Mr. Speaker, the abandonment of the European missile defense site, which could have protected the homeland of the United States against Iranian long-range missiles, is unacceptable. As I was talking with one of the Chairs of our missile defense caucus in this body, he described to me that there are plans for a better system to be put in place.

However, that new missile defense program will not be operational until 2018 or 2020. And while we do have other missile defense shields in place that will remain, he described it like this: it's like trying to bring down an airplane with a baseball. He supposed it could be possible, but it's a one-in-a-million chance. When you think of intercontinental ballistic missiles that travel the speed of 10,000 miles per hour, to me it's unacceptable at this point in time in our history when we have threats that sometimes come from other countries, such as Iran, sometimes from terrorists that hold no national identity, and it's alarming to me that we are taking down this missile defense program.

Mr. FLEMING. Would the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Please.

Mr. FLEMING. I appreciate the gentleman pointing out the fact that what we are doing in fact is removing a missile shield that is just before deployment, that would go into the Czech Republic, that would go into Poland. It would be, of course, subsurface. It would be something that would help defend much of that region of the country, including 80 American military bases; and, instead, we are going to exchange it for a whole different, a ship-based system which requires, first of all, a lot of development that is not yet in place.

As you point out, it is going to be another decade before it will even be capable. It would require ships being in exactly the right place at the right time. And it also begs the point: If Iran is developing nuclear material just for civilian purposes, why do they need all of this rocketry ability? They just ran a test, a three-rocket test, one of which had a range of 1,500 miles. Now why do you need that? I'm pretty sure Iran is not planning to go to the Moon. So for what purpose is that?

And what is also, I think, ironic is the fact that our President is talking about renewing the STAR treaty and taking our already reduced nuclear weapons down to an even lower level. If we do this with Russia at the same time as there are more countries than ever that have more nuclear weapons and more capability to deliver those weapons than ever, so again it goes back to the appeasement question:

Does it make sense to unilaterally disarm yourself while your potential enemies, and I would say in this case with Iran, our enemy, because they are killing our men and women through their proxies and through their surrogates and their weapons. Why in the world would we be doing that when in fact we have a growing threat from them?

And going back to Israel, it seems that wherever you see the U.S. military around the world, peace breaks out. You look at World War II, troops were in Japan, troops were in the Philippines, they were in France, they were in England and Germany. All those countries now are very peaceful democracies. And of course we went into Iraq, and Iraq is evolving into an oasis, if you will, of democracy, as is Israel.

So it seems to me that we need to stay on the same post-World War II course of certainly using Theodore Roosevelt's old philosophy, "speak softly but carry a big stick," rather than using a lot of rhetoric about all the things that we want to do and all the sanctions we want to take and yet disarm ourselves and our friends at the same time.

Certainly, one only has to ask around the world who is happy with this right now and who isn't. Well, it turns out our friends are unhappy with us and our enemies are happy with us all the way from Venezuela to Iran to Russia. They are all happy with everything we've been doing lately and the decisions our President has been making. We found out while we were in Israel that the President has a 4 percent, yes, 4 percent favorability rating. They are very unhappy with his position on Iran right now and also on the Palestinian question.

So I think that it's certainly nice to be liked overseas; but when you're liked by your enemies and also of course Poland and the Czech Republic are unhappy with us right now because we left them in the dust after agreeing to put a missile shield there and then pulling out after they've gone out on a limb for us, I think we are going, Mr. Speaker, in the wrong direction in the way we deal with our friends and our enemies in and around this question of Iran and the nuclear weapons that they have.

With that, I will yield back to my friends.

□ 2250

Mr. SCHOCK. Well, I agree, and it's why it's so important that we impress on this body the importance that we take up the legislation that we mentioned earlier dealing with sanctions, but also, we raise this issue in this body.

You know, we've been so focused on the issue of health care the last couple of months, and while this is an important issue that the President has made throughout the past year, the reality is we need to look no further than September 11 to know that, if this country

is not safe, if your allies are not safe, and that if terrorism is allowed to breed around the world, that really nothing else matters, and that nothing can be more detrimental to our economy and our way of life than for terrorism to breed, to be successful and, ultimately, be able to attack democracy, as we saw with our markets here after September 11, the great job loss, the great tumble that it took as a result of the attacks of September 11.

We need to remain vigilant in not only keeping our country safe but also supporting the allies around the world, and I think it's why my friends here tonight have spent some time talking about this important issue, which has been raised last week by the discovery of this facility, that the State of Iran has attempted to keep from the international community.

And one has to ask the question: why? If their intentions are what they say they are, if their intentions are pure and simple, if their intentions are non-nuclear or non-weapons grade, if their intentions are simply to provide energy to their people, certainly that is not something that requires the dark of night or secret. That is something that you would think one would be happy for full disclosure.

And our own estimates suggest that the centrifuges in that facility are not designed to produce energy-grade uranium but, rather, weapons-grade uranium. And so I think it adds to the doubt in many of our minds and the concern for our President to move rather quickly for, if not this facility, perhaps some others that we don't know about that are still out there.

So I think the gentlemen for being here tonight and sharing their perspectives of our trip to Israel and also impressing on the public the importance of us taking up the issue of Iran and dealing very swiftly with sanctions and, if not sanctions, supporting Israel's efforts to stop a nuclear Iran.

Mr. FLEMING. I would just say I would like to thank Congressman SCHOCK for having this Special Order hour this evening so that we could talk about this important issue, and it's one that we're going to be talking about a lot more in the coming days because it's pretty apparent that all of these issues are beginning to line up. They're beginning to stack up very rapidly.

And of course, the issue that we know our friends and Israel are facing is that if we are unable to bring the Iranians to the negotiating table or to have sanctions that work, then they're still the last option left on the table, which they reserve the right as a sovereign Nation to do, and that is, potentially take out the nuclear facilities in Iran.

We pray that it doesn't come to that, but it has already of course in Syria and Iraq back in the Hussein days, and we are looking for peaceful solutions. But we have counterweight around the world in Russia and China that as soon as we try to do one thing they want to

reverse it. Russia is a very significant trading partner with Iran. They're providing Iran with a state-of-the-art SAM missile system which is going to close the window for the capability of Israel to potentially attack Iran's nuclear facilities if that needs to be done, which is all the more important why decisions are having to be made at an even faster pace.

So, once again, I thank Mr. SCHOCK for bringing us together for this hour.

Mr. SCHOCK. I thank Dr. Fleming for being here.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. I also want to thank my good friend from Illinois and my good friend from Louisiana for being here tonight on this important topic.

I mean, the Constitution, when we were sworn in which seems like a lifetime ago back in January, we placed our hand on the Bible, raised our hand, and we swore to uphold and defend that Constitution. And within that, one of the first responsibilities is for common defense. That's the first, and I think the most responsibility that we have as Members of Congress is our safety and security, and certainly, this issue is one that is all about safety and security.

Frankly, history shows, and we know, that a strong defense is a strong deterrent. We want peace. We pray for peace. I long for a day when the whole world is at peace, but we know that we need a strong defense in order to serve as a deterrent to achieve peace. And I'm hopeful that we will see the day that—and I believe it was the President of Israel, Shimon Peres, who said he longs for a day when rising out of the desert we see buildings and not missiles and that we know the economic impact and that we have peace that we can also cherish.

So I thank Mr. SCHOCK for coordinating this evening.

Mr. SCHOCK. I thank Mr. THOMPSON.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ABERCROMBIE (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and until 5 p.m. September 30.

Mr. BACA (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for September 25 on account of legislative business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LIPINSKI) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LIPINSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GRAYSON, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POE of Texas) to revise and

extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, October 6.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, October 6.

Mr. INGLIS for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah, for 5 minutes, September 30.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DELAHUNT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SMITH of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 3607. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, to amend title 49, United States Code, to extend authorizations for the airport improvement program, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3614. An act to provide for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 30, 2009, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

3838. A letter from the Acting Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Country of Origin Labeling of Packed Honey [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-08-0075; FV-08-330] (RIN: 0581-AC89) received August 25, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3839. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Nectarines and Peaches Grown in California; Changes in Handling Requirements for Fresh Nectarines and Peaches [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-08-0108; FV09-916/917-1 FIR] received August 25, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3840. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Grapes Grown in a Designated Area of Southeastern California; Decreased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-08-0107; FV09-925-2 FIR] received August 25, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3841. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the