There is much to be proud of on this Yom Hàatzmaut.

As Israel prepares to make difficult decisions about peace and security, it should know that the United States' commitment to the Jewish state is unshakeable.

I join my colleagues in wishing the people and government of Israel a Chag Sameach, a happy holiday on this 66th Independence Day.

KEEPING IT IN THE FAMILY

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my dear friend and colleague, Ms. FRANKEL, for a wonderful presentation.

I know, in having traveled with Congresswoman FRANKEL, that we share a great respect and admiration for the nation of Israel, and we should be the best friend Israel has in the world because they believe in the things we do, in the same values.

Where else in the Middle East do people get to vote, whether you are Muslim, Jewish, Christian, except in Israel? If you are a woman, where are you respected and given the full rights that men have, except for in Israel? Where in the Middle East are homosexuals not persecuted and even killed?

We ought to be Israel's best friend in the world; and I am very concerned that, at times, it feels like we may not be. So I join my friend in wanting to do everything we can to shore up that relationship with Israel, and I thank her for her dedication.

I also believe firmly that it is true that those who bless Israel seem to end up being blessed. Go figure. So I am grateful for that presentation.

Mr. Speaker, I did want to answer or attempt to answer a question that I have been asked many times about media reporting and presentations and why some stories get covered by the mainstream media, particularly by the three main networks for broadcast television and CNN and MSNBC as well.

I saw a chart that was put together by a group, called the Minority Report, but I wasn't as interested in the group as I was in finding out if the relationships set forth in the chart were actually accurate, so I had my staff help me. Let's find out. Is this chart really accurate? I was really staggered by what was in the chart.

This is not the entire chart, but it is most of it. Their chart was entitled, ''Keeping It in the Family,'' and it was very interesting.

As you see the chart here, at CNN, the vice president and deputy bureau chief in Washington is Virginia Moseley, who is married to Tom Nides, who is the former Deputy Secretary of State under Hillary Clinton, the former Secretary of State.

You have Bianna Golodryga, married to Peter Orszag, who was the former Director of the Office of Management and Budget under the Obama administration. You have Ben Sherwood, and he is the brother of Dr. Elizabeth Sherwood-Randall, who is the former adviser to JOE BIDEN and also an adviser to the President.

At ABC News, you have Ian Cameron, who is the former executive producer of ''This Week,'' and he is married to someone named Susan Rice, who, obviously, was the National Security Advisor to the President before she went to the U.N.

You have Claire Shipman, who is married to someone named Jay Carney. Claire Shipman is a correspondent with ABC News. Then you have Matthew Jaffe, who is married to Katie Hogan. Katie Hogan was the Deputy Press Secretary for President Obama's 2012 reelection campaign; and she is the spokesperson for Organizing for Action, OFA, which is working hard, apparently, to turn Texas blue, as they say. Anyway, Matthew Jaffe is a reporter with ABC News.

Then not to leave out NBC News, you have Robert Gibbs, the former White House Press Secretary for President Obama. You have him as a contributor to NBC News. You have the former senior adviser to the President, David Axelrod, who is known for the massive and important advice he has given to President Obama as a senior political analyst for MSNBC.

Oh, we don't want to forget, over here, CBS News. You have the president of CBS News, who is David Rhodes. David Rhodes is akin to—is the brother of—Ben Rhodes, who is the person who coined the phrase ''kinetic military action,'' instead of using the word ''war.''

He coordinated the edits, apparently, of the Benghazi talking points, and of course, he had a great deal to do with what was done in Libya by this administration and the way that was discussed with the media.

So it is not necessarily surprising that Sharyl Attkisson ran into the buzz saw she did at CBS News when the president of CBS News is the brother of someone who was helping pull the strings at the White House.

In fact, some of the articles that were pulled to point out some of these relationships—an article by Ed Morrissey on April 29 of 2014 talked about the newly released White House email, which shows that the Rice talking points on Benghazi were politically motivated.

It says, in part, in the article:

> The YouTube story was designed to distract from ''policy failures,'' according to Barack Obama's aide Ben Rhodes—or the brother to the president of CBS News.

Then it goes on to set out part of Mr. Ben Rhode's email, and he says in the email, Ben Rhodes does—the brother of David Rhodes, the president of CBS News:

> To convey that the United States is doing everything that we can to protect our people and facilities abroad; to underscore that these protests are rooted in an Internet video and not a broader failure of policy; to show that we will be resolute in bringing people who harm Americans to justice and standing steadfast through these protests; to reinforce the President and administration's strength and steadiness in dealing with difficult challenges.

On the toplines, he says:

> Since we began to see protests in response to this Internet video, the President has directed the administration to take a number of steps. His top priority has been the safety and security of all Americans serving abroad.

Indeed, that was exactly what people in the administration were saying. That was what the people at CBS News were parroting. Since that came from the brother of the CBS News president, that seems to have worked pretty effectively.

There is another article here, ''Worldly at 35, and Shaping Obama's Voice.'' It was an article in The New York Times in March of 2013 by Mark Landler.

It says:

> As President Obama prepares to visit Israel next week, he is turning, as he often does, to Benjamin J. Rhodes, a 35-year-old Deputy National Security Advisor with a soft voice, strong opinions, and a reputation around the White House as the man who channels Mr. Obama on foreign policy.

□ 2000

Mr. Rhodes is drafting the address to the Israeli people the President plans to give in Jerusalem. But his influence extends beyond what either his title or speech-writing duties suggest. Drawing on personal ties and a philosophical kinship with Mr. Obama that go back to the 2008 campaign, Mr. Rhodes helped prod his boss to take a more activist policy toward Egypt and Libya when those countries erupted in 2011.

On further in the article it points out:

> Two years ago, when protesters thronged Tahrir Square in Cairo, Mr. Rhodes urged Mr. Obama to withdraw three decades of American support for President Hosni Mubarak of Egypt. A few months later, Mr. Rhodes was among those agitating for the President to back a NATO military intervention in Libya to head off a slaughter by Colonel Muammar Qaddafi.

Further down in the article it says:

> At the White House, Mr. Rhodes first came to prominence after he wrote Mr. Obama's landmark address to the Muslim world in Cairo in June, 2009. The speech was notable for Mr. Obama's assertion that governments should ''reflect the will of the people,'' prefiguring his policy in dealing with Mr. Mubarak and Colonel Qaddafi.

Another article from March of 2011 by Rick Moran. It starts out with a reference to Alice in Wonderland, when Rick Moran says:

> A ''war'' is a war, is a ''war,'' right? Not if you live in the Rabbit Hole and have to answer to Alice—

talking about Alice in Wonderland—

> as Commander in Chief.

But Byron York is quoted—and I take it this was an article by Byron York inserted in Mr. Moran's piece—and says:

In the last few days, Obama administration officials have frequently faced the question: Is the fighting in Libya a war? For military officers to White House spokesmen up to the President himself, the answer is ''no.'' But that leaves the question: What is it?

In a briefing onboard Air Force One Wednesday, Deputy National Security Advisor Ben Rhodes—

Again, this is 2011—

—took a crack at an answer. ''I think what we are doing is enforcing a resolution that has a very clear set of goals, which is protecting the Libyan people, averting a humanitarian crisis, and setting up a no-fly zone,'' Rhodes said. ''Obviously, that involves kinetic military action, particularly on the front end.''

That came from Ben Rhodes.

And then Mr. Moran's article says:

What we are doing in Libya is making war, whether the Obama administration admits it or not. People aren't getting killed by ''kinetic'' anything. They are dying the old-fashioned way—they are getting blown up.

This gives a whole new meaning to ''KIA.''

Another article from Patrick Howley from May 11, 2013, entitled, ''Top Obama Official's Brother is President of CBS News, May Drop Reporter Over Benghazi Coverage.''

It says:

The brother of a top Obama administration official is also the president of CBS News, and the network may be days away from dropping one of its top investigative reporters for covering the administration's scandals too aggressively.

Down further it says:

That reporting revealed that President Obama's Deputy National Security Advisor, Ben Rhodes—brother of CBS News president David Rhodes—was instrumental in changing the talking points in September, 2012.

The article further down says more about Mr. Rhodes being a 35-year-old New York native; David Rhodes, president of CBS news since 2011.

So it is rather amazing, but it should be more clear to people. People wonder why the mainstream gives such favorable coverage to the Obama administration. Well, blood is thicker than water, is one saying.

In the case of our mainstream media, they totally dropped the ball on Benghazi and continue to report on anything else they can besides Benghazi.

I am very grateful that the mainstream media on the left and right back in the seventies did not drop the Watergate investigation. They stayed on it until the truth came out. Back in those days, the mainstream media was so important to protecting our freedom and protecting Americans from a President who had an enemies' list and protecting America from a President that seemed a bit paranoid at times.

A man, a fellow Christian and an amazing man of faith after his conversion during the Watergate investigation, Chuck Colson, talked in his book, ''Born Again'' about how after the Kent State debacle and students were killed, it turned basically into a bunker at the White House. It was ''we'' against ''they,'' and if you were critical at all, you didn't deserve to be in the bunker. You were an enemy.

We are very fortunate that when a President begins to have that kind of mentality and so afraid of anybody who is critical, we are fortunate he did not understand just how far a President, how far an administration could push the IRS into going after political enemies, as we have now seen that it has.

Whether or not the IRS's weaponization was before the 2012 election, the President had a call to arms right here in front of the House and the Senate and the Cabinet members, Joint Chiefs of Staff and Supreme Court, sitting right here, when he mistakenly asserted what he believed were facts about the Citizens United ruling by the Supreme Court, and it was so wrong, to the point that Justice Alito sat right here just feet away from where I am standing, shaking his head and saying, Not true, not true, not true.

Nonetheless, people at the IRS heard the call. They paid attention. And they came to understand that maybe the Supreme Court says conservatives can run ads and get involved in political issues like union groups do, but maybe we can stop them. And they effectively did that by putting their investigations into their tax status on hold and refusing to give them any kind of decision until well after the 2012 election, thereby silencing those voices.

I have had reporters who obviously don't understand the Tax Code and the power of the IRS say, Well, what difference does it make? Those groups probably shouldn't have been applying for tax status like they were anyway. Obviously, showing the ignorance of the reporters when they ask such questions. Because the way the Internal Revenue Code is set up, if someone in the general population just decides I want to get a bunch of friends together who have political beliefs like I do and we are going to pool our money together and then we are going to start spending it on issues to educate the American public, and somebody has got to account for all that money, you don't want the IRS coming after you as you accumulate money to spend on political education of America.

So you have to go begging to the IRS for the proper designation so that you can go about gathering money without them coming against you as being a single individual raising money to spend on political issues.

That also, Mr. Speaker, is one of the reasons why we need to throw out the Internal Revenue Code. Just pass a bill that says as of a certain date the Internal Revenue Code will be totally void, and that gives us a deadline to shoot for.

I like the idea of a flat tax. There are people that I love and respect that think a fair tax is a better way to go. But by scrapping the Internal Revenue Code, throwing it out on a date certain, then we would only have so long to get a new Tax Code figured out. We would be serving notice to people that that is when it would change.

I have heard our President say so many times that people need to pay their fair share. Well, it doesn't look like that is ever going to happen until we have a flat tax, where if you make more, you pay more; you make less, you pay less. That is what we ought to be doing.

Anyway, as a result, we have an IRS that became weaponized on behalf of one political party and one administration. And we do need a special prosecutor. I have been pointing that out for quite some time. There are criminals laws that may have been violated. That is why we need a special prosecutor, not the Justice Department. We have seen their kind of ''just us'' rather than ''justice.''

We need a special prosecutor that is not appointed by Eric Holder. We need to get to the bottom of who violated the law. Because it appears laws were broken.

But some wonder why the mainstream media doesn't get into the IRS weaponization more. We see the familial relationships between the mainstream media—not that I am saying CNN and MSNBC on the extreme left are mainstream media, but they are part of the media who avoids reporting anything negative about this President. Well, you hate to report things negative on your own family. So that is understandable.

So, Mr. Speaker, it explains a lot, once you begin to see all of the marriages and all of the sibling relationships between this administration and people in the media—siblings in the media—people calling the shots and giving the advice in our major news media.

Mr. Speaker, we also sometimes are a little surprised as the mainstream media tries to desperately change the subject from the false reports and statements that were made about Benghazi and the coverup that we are now finding out about Benghazi. They are constantly trying to change the subject, in their desperation to protect their familial relationships in the administration.

I had a call today wanting me to come on the news tomorrow and talk about climate change. It used to be called global warming until people realized, wow, it is not really warming anything very serious, so we better start calling it climate change. And as any real scientists know, when you come up with a scientific theory, then there are certain facts that will prove your theory or your assertion. But when we talk about climate change, people are not doing that.

□ 2015

Whatever happens, if there are a lot of tornados, they say: see, it is climate change. If there are very few tornados, they say: see, it is climate change. If we have numerous hurricanes, they say: see, it is climate change. If there are not many hurricanes, they say: see, it is climate change.

No matter what happens in the weather, we are told it is climate change. The truth is I believe in climate change. I not only believe in climate change, I know it is happening, usually, most places, four times a year. They are called seasons.

Then we have climate changing—I will never forget, back in the midseventies, there was a cover of one of the main American magazines about how we were approaching—heading into a new ice age. I thought, well, that doesn't make sense. I do believe the Bible, and I don't believe the world is going to end in ice.

That just doesn't seem right, yet we heard scientists telling us: oh, no, we are at the beginning of a new ice age in the mid-1970s. We are at the beginning of a new ice age.

They were wanting to change everything we were doing. Oh, we have got to change everything we are doing about power, about fossil fuels, everything because we are at the beginning of a new ice age. About 10 years later, people saw: well, we may be slightly warming, so we had better quit talking about global cooling, and now, we are talking about global warming.

There is an interesting article that came out today from Mario Lewis entitled, ''National Climate Assessment report: Alarmists offer untrue, unrelenting doom and gloom.''

This article today says:

Tuesday, the U.S. Government's Global Change Research Program released its latest ''National Assessment'' report on climate change impacts in the United States.

As with previous editions, the new report is an alarmist document designed to scare people and build political support for unpopular policies such as carbon taxes, cap-and-trade, and EPA regulatory mandates.

Also in keeping with past practice, the latest report confuses climate risk with climate change risk.

Droughts, storms, floods, and heat waves are all part of the natural climate. Our risk of exposure to such extremes has much more to do with where we happen to live than with any gradual climate changes associated with the 1.3 degree Fahrenheit to 1.9 degree Fahrenheit increase in average U.S. temperature since the 1880s.

Since even immediate and total shutdown of all carbon dioxide-emitting vehicles, power plants, and factories in the U.S. would decrease global warming by only a hypothetical and undetectable two-tenths of a degree Celsius by 2100—

Eighty-five years, even if they got everything they wanted for 85 years, the article says:

It is misleading to imply, as the report does, that the Obama administration's climate policies can provide any measurable protection from extreme weather events.

The assessment is flatout wrong that climate change is increasing our vulnerability to heat stress. As hot weather has become more frequent, people and communities have adapted to it, and heat-related mortality in the U.S. has declined.

Cities with the most frequent hot weather, such as Tampa; Florida; and Phoenix, Arizona, have practically zero heat-related mortality. That is the most probable future for most U.S. cities if global warming continues.

The report also foolishly predicts that climate change ''intensify air pollution.'' As EPA's own data show, despite allegedly ''unprecedented'' warming, the U.S. air quality has improved decade by decade since 1970 as emissions declined.

The report blames climate change for the Midwest drought of 2012, but the government's own analysis concluded otherwise: ''Neither ocean states nor human-induced climate change, factors that can provide long-lead predictability, appeared to play significant roles in causing severe rainfall deficits over the major corn-producing regions of central Great Plains.''

This assessment ignores substantial data and research, finding no long-term increase in the strength and frequency of tropical cyclones and no trend in extreme weather-related damages once losses are ''normalized'' or adjusted for changes in population, wealth, and consumer price index.

For example, the report says trends in the frequency and intensity of tornadoes are ''uncertain,'' whereas, in fact, there is no trend, and a new study by University of Colorado Professor Roger Pielke, Jr., finds ''with some certainty'' that ''the number of years with very large tornado losses has actually decreased'' during 1993–2013 compared to 1950–1970.

Similarly, the U.S. is currently in the longest period on record with no major category 3–5 hurricane landfalls.

This good news is not included in the report.

The assessment gives short shrift to the warming ''pause,'' which it calls ''short-term.'' In the assessment, the ''pause'' is depicted as running from 1998 through 2012. That is 15 years. In fact, the pause is now 17 years and 8 months long.

More tellingly, the assessment does not discuss the growing divergence between climate model predictions and observations.

The divergence, now in its 34th year and accelerating due to the pause, raises questions about the climate sensitivity assumptions on which dire climate change scenarios depend. Climate sensitivity is an estimate of how much warming will eventually result from a doubling of atmospheric carbon dioxide concentrations relative to preindustrial levels.

In its discussion of sensitivity, the assessment basically endorses the U.N. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's 2007 ''likely'' sensitivity range of 3.6 to 8.1 degrees Fahrenheit and ''best estimate'' of 5.4 degrees Fahrenheit. It neglects to mention that, partly due to the pause and model overshoot of observed temperatures, the IPCC's 2013 report lowered the bottom end of the likely range and declined to offer a ''best'' estimate.

More importantly, the assessment presents the debate over climate sensitivity as a ''he said, she said,'' as if a single paper by John Fasullo and Kevin Trenberth balances out some 16 recent papers indicating that the IPCC climate sensitivity estimates are too hot.

In other words, they are just wrong. The article says:

So despite an occasional fig leaf to hide the nakedness of its alarm message, the report does acknowledge that climate change has lengthened growing seasons, helping to make food more abundant and affordable, the assessment is unrelenting gloom and doom.

Its only hopeful message is that it's not too late to implement Kyoto-style climate policies.

Sorry, that's not good enough even for government work.

Mario Lewis is a Ph.D., a senior fellow at Competitive Enterprise institute.

And it really is important to real realize what is at stake here. It is something that shocked me back when we were trying, in my freshman term, to amend and reform the Endangered Species Act that has wreaked such havoc with our economy and continues to cause people to lose jobs.

There was reported decline in the unemployment rate from 6.7 to 6.3, and you heard all of the mainstream media, in helping their family members in this administration, just all abuzz and aglow with how wonderful that four-tenths of a percent drop was, failing completely to mention that that was only a fraction of the 800,000 who got so tired of not finding work—800,000 people gave up and quit looking for work and are now considered, under statistics, to no longer be unemployed, even though they are unemployed.

It doesn't account for all the people that are underemployed, that are out of college and can't find jobs; the historic high unemployment rate of our veterans coming back and looking for jobs, even as this administration not only wants to cut the military back to a fraction of its former self, back to pre-World War II levels, when we were not a superpower, and hatred and genocide began to reign supreme.

That doesn't explain why the administration and some people here in the House, friends of mine here in the House, that are saying: You know what? Let's give the few jobs left in our military to people that are not lawfully in this country.

If they will do that, even though it will displace one of the few military jobs left after we cut the military back so far and even though it will push them into an even-growing high unemployment rate for veterans, let's go ahead and give those few jobs left to people who are not lawfully in the country. It is not a good idea.

After pushing for over a year and a half for a select committee to get to the bottom of what happened at Benghazi and after we still haven't gotten to the bottom of the Department of Justice's role in forcing guns, which we know they did, forced guns to be sold to criminals and people that should not have had guns, that ended up with drug cartels in Mexico, with reports of hundreds of Mexicans killed by the weapons we forced into improper and illegal criminal hands, we—being the Justice Department of this administration—we haven't gotten answers to that.

That is why, even today, as I stand here, the highest-ranking law enforcement officer in the land stands in contempt of Congress; although I was gratified to hear him say, in answer to a question of mine, that I am not supposed to ever presume that it wasn't a big deal to him.

Unfortunately, he said, a year ago to ABC News that it wasn't any kind of big deal at all because, to be a big deal, he would have had to have respect for the people that voted for the contempt;

and since he had no respect for the people that voted for the contempt, it wasn't a big deal to him.

So a year ago, it wasn't a big deal; and this year, apparently, it is still a big deal, but I am not supposed to think that it is not a big deal to him, even though that is what he said, and the familial relationships in the mainstream media continue to give cover.

As I have continued to complain about the inadequate investigation into the Tsarnaevs—the failure of this administration to properly investigate the Tsarnaevs, even after the Russians, who are not our friends, gave us, twice, a heads up. Look out. The older Tsarnaev has been radicalized.

Now, you have got people in the mainstream media parroting what the Obama administration is saying. Well, those darned old Russians, they should have given us more information.

They did us a favor giving us a heads up. We are not their friends. They gave us a heads up anyway.

They don't even—they purged the FBI training material, so our agents don't know the proper questions to ask to find out if someone has been radicalized.

□ 2030

They won't allow people that have spent their adult lives studying radical Islam—people like that, like Steve Coughlin—they are not allowed to even go give a briefing to people to explain what radical Islam is.

And then we hear people like the Department of Homeland Security Secretary at the time, Janet Napolitano, who seemed to take the position that, gee, you know, we are just not able to connect the dots. But yet it appears that, under her watch, not only did she promote what Egyptian Muslim Brother publications said were top Muslim Brother people into top Homeland Security and Obama administration positions, but she gave a secret clearance—and there is no way it could have been given after proper vetting because proper vetting would have showed that he was a main speaker giving tribute to the man of vision, the Ayatollah Khomeini, who has a foundation called the Freedom and Justice Foundation, which is the same name as the Muslim Brother political party in Egypt who defended the convicted terrorist supporter of the head of the Holy Land Foundation, said there was nothing wrong with what he was doing.

I am very proud of the Senator from Iowa. I want to do a shout-out, Mr. Speaker, down the hall and read a letter from Senator GRASSLEY. I was just there in Iowa a few days ago, Senator GRASSLEY's territory. The senior Senator from Iowa, CHARLES E. GRASSLEY, wrote a letter to the new Secretary of Homeland Security, Jeh Johnson, and he said:

My office recently received copies of disturbing internal Department of Homeland Security, DHS, emails regarding the admittance of individuals into the United States with potential ties to terrorism.

The May 2012 email chain between U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, ICE, and U.S. Customs and Border Protection, CBP, surrounds the question of whether to admit someone who had scheduled an upcoming flight into the U.S. Allegedly, the individual was a member of the Muslim Brotherhood and a close associate of a supporter of ''Hamas, Hezbollah, and Palestinian Islamic jihad.'' According to the same email, the individual had been in secondary inspection ''several dozen times of the past several years,'' but had not had a secondary inspection since 2010.

One of the responses to the initial email states: ''The CBP National Targeting Center, NTC, watch commander advised that the subject has sued CBP twice in the past and that he's one of the several hands-off passengers nationwide. Apparently, his records were removed in December 2010, and the DHS Secretary was involved in the matter.'' The email continues:

I'm puzzled how someone could be a member of the Muslim Brotherhood and unindicted coconspirator in the Holy Land Foundation trial—

Which, parenthetically, was a trial in which people were convicted of supporting terrorism, providing financial support for terrorism, convicted, and this individual mentioned was a named coconspirator in the pleadings.

The message and the email goes on:

—be an associate of (redacted), say that the U.S. is staging car bombings in Iraq and that it is okay for men to beat their wives, question who was behind the 9/11 attacks, and be afforded the luxury of a visitor visa and de-watchlisted. It doesn't appear that we'll be successful with denying him entry tomorrow, but maybe we could reevaluate the matter in the future since the decision to de-watchlist him was made 17 months ago.

Senator GRASSLEY's message to Secretary Johnson of DHS said:

In order to understand the events described in these emails, please provide the committee with answers to the following questions:

One, why was this individual removed from the watchlist in December 2010?

Two, please describe the nature, extent, and reasons for the involvement of the DHS Secretary or her staff in the removal of the individual from the watchlist.

Three, what is the current watchlist status of this individual?

Four, how many people are on the hands-off list mentioned in the email?

Five, what qualifies someone to receive the ''hands-off'' designation?

Six, does filing a lawsuit result in being designated ''hands-off'' and, thus, avoiding secondary security screenings?

Seven, who makes the determination that an individual should be considered ''hands-off''?

Senator GRASSLEY says: I would appreciate receiving answers to these questions by March 3, 2014. Should you have any questions regarding the letter—and he goes on, and he signs it, CHARLES E. GRASSLEY, Ranking Member.

Then there is an attachment to his letter. And there is so much that is redacted here, Mr. Speaker, that there are a lot of gaps. But even so, it is easy to see how serious this is.

This was from Thursday, May 10, 2012, not quite a year before the Boston bombing. But as was pointed out in the letter, this email was from a U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement officer to the U.S. Customs and Border Patrol protection. The body says:

The NTC watch commander advised that the subject has sued CBP twice in the past and that he's one of several hands-off passengers nationwide. He said he checked if there was a copy of the lawsuits filed against CBP in the historical logs. Can you pass the lawsuits if they are at NTC? I assume the lawsuits were against the heads of DHS and presume it was a civil proceeding, but who knows where it was filed, since the subject lives outside the U.S. I didn't know that a Canadian citizen who lives in (blank) could sue DHS. Also not sure if the lawsuits were regarding him being stopped frequently or his admissibility/inadmissibility or both. If the lawsuits weren't about his admissibility/inadmissibility, we should proceed forward regarding that once the lawsuits are reviewed.

If the lawsuits aren't readily accessible at CBP/NTC, I can check with someone at CBP headquarters to get them. Apparently his records were removed in December 2010, and the DHS Secretary was involved in the matter.

I'm puzzled how someone could be a member of the Muslim Brotherhood and unindicted coconspirator in the Holy Land Foundation trial, be an associate of (blank), say that the U.S. is staging car bombings in Iraq and that is okay for men to beat their wives, question who was behind the 9/11 attacks and be afforded the luxury of a visitor visa and de-watchlisted. It doesn't appear that we'll be successful with denying him entry tomorrow, but maybe we could reevaluate the matter in the future since the decision to de-watchlist him was made 17 months ago. Thanks.

And then the name is blotted out.

Anyway, other messages. One in response down the email chain:

I spoke with CBP (blank) who is obviously very familiar with this traveler. I am of the opinion that (blank) meets the parameters for refusal based on the three INA 212(a)(3) terrorism charges and that when he enters the U.S. on a B1/B2 for lectures/speeches for organizations or for events where a registration fee is required or admission needs to be paid, he should probably be seeking an R–1 or an O–1 visa instead.

Perhaps one of the reasons he has not applied for an O–1 visa or R–1 visa is because of the terrorist-related questions these forms ask that he would then be forced to answer.

Does NTC have any background information or guidance it can share on the logs or former records this subject has had? Or if he has applied for any waivers of inadmissibility? Does NTC have any objections if CBP denies admission to (blank) under either terrorism grounds or improper non-immigrant visa?

Based on a review of the statements of the subject, I think it is clear that he meets the definition of endorsing and inciting. If he'd like to enter the U.S. in the future, he can seek a waiver to overcome those inadmissibility grounds, but none has been sought to my knowledge.

And the email prior to that said:

Yesterday afternoon, we, HSI (blank) office, received a lead regarding (blank) AKA (blank), an Egyptian-born Canadian citizen who is a member of the Muslim Brotherhood and close associate of (blank), an individual residing in (blank) who supports Hamas, Hezbollah, and Palestinian Islamic jihad. (Blank) has been looked at in secondary inspections several dozen times over the past

several years. However, he has not been secondaried since (blank) 2010. (Blank) has a reservation to depart (blank) Canada at (blank) on this Friday morning for a flight to (blank) that stops in (blank) first.

He is scheduled to speak at some conference, in some city, on some night—it is all blacked out.

I am passing this right up to (blank) at HSI to forward to CBP regarding possible inadmissibility grounds related to INA 2012(a)(3) terrorism charges because (blank)'s potential inciting, endorsing, and association with terrorists. (Blank) has been looked at in the past, but hopefully this collection of 20 supporting open source articles will assist with making an informed inadmissibility determination.

But anyway, apparently, despite all of those open inadmissibility issues, according to the later email, the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security herself at the time, Janet Napolitano, had a hands-off list apparently including people like this member of the Muslim Brotherhood.

When it comes to the Boston bombing, I have met some of the Boston Police. I was impressed. And I would bet if the City of Boston Police Department had been given a heads-up by either the FBI or CIA that the Russians say this Tsarnaev guy has been radicalized, is capable of murder, then it would have entirely changed the investigation by the Boston Police Department into people that were killed that were known to Tsarnaev.

And I would bet you, since I am not aware of the Boston Police Department having had their training materials purged to exclude anything that might offend a radical Islamist, they may have been able to go out to the mosque and ask about Tsarnaev if they had known the allegation that he had been radicalized, and they may have been able to answer better questions about the type of Islamic leaders that the older Tsarnaev liked, that he read, that he endorsed, and they could have made a better decision than our own Justice Department did on whether or not he had been radicalized.

□ 2045

That should have been shared with the Boston police. If they had had that information without having had their training materials purged, they may have done a better job of protecting those people at the Boston Marathon.

Then you read emails going back and forth among our ICE agents, Customs and Border Patrol people who were shocked that a guy who is a Muslim Brother, who has incited people to hatred against the United States, who was a named coconspirator with people who were convicted of supporting terrorism, how it is the Secretary of Homeland Security could give him a pass, just as she did to a reported member of the Muslim Brotherhood—reported by an Egyptian magazine supportive of the Muslim Brotherhood—how she could just give him a secret security clearance. And even after I tell her about his downloading two documents from a classified source that she gave him access to and pointed out to her about a reporter saying he had tried to shop the two documents, she said she investigated, but I know they didn't because they never even talked to that one reporter that knew about the documents being shopped. They never checked.

As far as I know, he is still giving advice at the top level of Homeland Security as a Muslim Brother, according to the Egyptians. He is given access to our classified documents, and then we see that same Homeland Security Secretary that gave him access to classified documents that he reportedly—and according to somebody I trust—he had shopped them and tried to get a national news media to publish them. They didn't even look into it. They didn't even investigate that properly.

How safe can America be when Homeland Security is creating hands-off lists that put us at risk? With that, I yield back my time.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MULLIN). Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2148

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLE) at 9 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION RELATING TO THE CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE REPORT 113–415 AND AN ACCOMPANYING RESOLUTION, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. Res. 565, APPOINTMENT OF SPECIAL COUNSEL TO INVESTIGATE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

Mr. NUGENT, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113–439) on the resolution (H. Res. 568) relating to the consideration of House Report 113–415 and an accompanying resolution, and providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 565) calling on Attorney General Eric H. Holder, Jr., to appoint a special counsel to investigate the targeting of conservative nonprofit groups by the Internal Revenue Service, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4438, AMERICAN RESEARCH AND COMPETITIVENESS ACT OF 2014

Mr. NUGENT, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113–440) on the resolution (H. Res. 569) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4438) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to simplify and make permanent the research credit, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

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

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

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

Mr. RUSH (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of attending to a family matter.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 4120. An act to amend the National Law Enforcement Museum Act to extend the termination date.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 49 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 7, 2014, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

5544. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report of multiple violations of the Antideficiency Act by the National Institutes of Health, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Agency of Healthcare Research and Quality, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, and Health Resources and Services Administration, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); to the Committee on Appropriations.

5545. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of 6 officers to wear the authorized insignia of the grade of major general or brigadier general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5546. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report on Preventive Services and Obesity-related Services Available to Medicaid Enrollees; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5547. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the FY 2013 MDUFA Financial Report required by the Medical Device User Fee