

the U.S. economy, the minority business community. Through their nationwide network of MBDA Business Centers, the MBDA has helped minority firms access contracts, capital, and enter market opportunities, both domestic and global.

Over the last 5 years specifically, this assistance has provided minority firms access to nearly \$20 billion in contracts and capital. I thank the MBDA for all it has accomplished over the last 45 years, especially the work at the Memphis MBDA Business Center in Tennessee Nine, my congressional district in Memphis, Tennessee.

In the coming years, the growth of America's workforce will come from minorities, and we need strong minority businesses to achieve maximum economic growth. I am certain the MBDA will lead the Nation to achieving our full potential.

HONORING DON MANN

(Mr. SCHRADER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a man who has spent over 37 years in public service, including 20 years in my district in beautiful Newport, Oregon.

I am speaking, of course, about Don Mann, who recently retired as general manager of the Port of Newport after 18 years at the helm. Don's tenure at the Port was marked by significant changes that will reverberate in that region for years to come. His leadership and vision are beginning to make the central Oregon coast an economic hub.

Don led the charge, putting together the proposal that relocated NOAA's Pacific Marine Operations to Newport, Oregon, against all odds and some pretty big cities to the north. It is an incredible achievement that cannot be understated.

Not to rest on his laurels, Don has continued to work hard improving the international Port of Newport, which will also provide significant economic development for that region.

I just want to say, Don, it has been a pleasure working with you. I have enjoyed it immensely. Your tireless work on behalf of Oregonians is recognized. I wish you and Carolyn all the best in retirement.

Take care, my friend.

SETTING THE RECORD STRAIGHT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING). 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, at this time I would like to yield to my dear friend, Mr. LAMALFA.

Mr. LAMALFA. I appreciate my good friend from Texas. Thank you for yielding time tonight.

I wanted to speak a little bit about some issues affecting California and the wise use of U.S. taxpayer dollars.

California's high-speed rail, on its surface, may have sounded promising to voters when they acted on it in the 2008 election—until you take a closer look at it.

Once the planning on the project began, the public found it would take billions of dollars to build and operate beyond what they were promised when it was on the ballot. What had been a \$33 billion ballot pricetag was exposed at a November 2011 public hearing as a nearly \$100 billion project.

After some scrambling to make plan changes, which likely render it illegal from the enabling legislation voters passed as Prop 1A, we now see the current \$69 billion plan, which uses low-speed modes in the urban areas of San Francisco and LA, again, found illegal under Proposition 1A. The tripled, then discounted, doubled pricetag is far from what 52 percent of California voters said "yes" to.

High-speed rail's ballot measure was delayed by the State legislature two election cycles before finally placing the High Speed Rail Initiative on the 2008 ballot, where Californians approved what they thought would be a reasonably managed project to connect San Francisco to Los Angeles with a 220-mile per hour train.

Because of Proposition 1A, the State could fund a portion of the construction with \$9.95 billion in bond funds, with the assumption that the rest of the money would come from private investors. At the time, the 2009 stimulus act was unknown.

The high-speed rail project that we have today has been plagued with poorly drafted funding plans, with little or no accountability to anyone for the absurd amounts of money spent so far. No accountability means millions of dollars spent on consultants, environmental impact reports, even lobbying here in Washington, D.C., and on numerous lawsuits from Californians who stand to lose their homes, farms, and businesses because they are in the path the high-speed rail would travel.

Recently, a Superior Court judge ruled that the High Speed Rail Authority needed to redraft a 2011 funding plan for the project. The judge halted all bond sales because the Authority hadn't attained the necessary environmental clearances for the areas of the State where construction is planned to begin, nor shown there was even a plan of financing to complete even the first phase of the project.

Meanwhile, the State schemes to inappropriately use truck weight fees or to use cap-and-trade funds in order to prop up the high-speed rail's bottom line.

If a Superior Court judge says that Californians can't spend any more money on the planning and construction of high-speed rail, why should America taxpayers via the Federal Government?

Nearly \$3.3 billion in grant money has been awarded to the High Speed Rail Authority by the Federal Government via the aforementioned stimulus package that was approved in 2009 by a different Congress. This is to spend on construction. However, the Federal grant award is based on California's ability to match the Federal dollars with State funds from the bond. So it is my hope the Federal Government will put all the money earmarked for the high-speed rail on hold.

Mr. Speaker, given the judge's recent ruling, I don't believe it is in the best interest of California's taxpayers or America's taxpayers to continue throwing money down this high-speed rathole. These Federal dollars should be used for pretty much anything else, such as building more freeway lanes, expanding airports, or, especially in this time of severe drought in California and the West, redirecting these scarce dollars to alleviate drought now and in the future with new water storage and infrastructure, which all Californians will benefit from.

Instead, even after the judge's ruling, the High Speed Rail Authority said that they would continue to press forward the funding efforts to seize land from farms and businesses and hurriedly perform the necessary and very expensive environmental reviews. They now plan to front-load the project with funding from the U.S. taxpayer via the Federal funds we saw in the stimulus package because the State funding has been put on hold by the judge unless we in D.C. say "no."

California has \$8.6 billion in bond dollars left to spend on building the high-speed rail, as nearly \$1 billion has already been spent without yet turning a shovel. Assuming they still receive the \$3.3 in stimulus funding and the total cost to build is the lowball number of \$69 billion, this means the High Speed Rail Authority has less than one-sixth of the funding necessary secured at this time. To me, the math doesn't add up. Perhaps in Fantasyland, where the monorail rail runs, it does.

Would you continue to invest in something that has a majority of the already-secured funding put on hold because your illegal business plan has holes big enough to drive a train through? I think not.

The Authority also hasn't shown any restraint in using taxpayer dollars. To date, they have spent upwards of \$600 million on engineering and environmental consultants without ever breaking ground. The Madera-to-Fresno segment alone is going to cost \$987 million—an unbelievable amount of taxpayer dollars for a segment that can't even operate trains as a stand-alone project.

So many affected residents of the Central Valley, and all over the State, are happy the funding has been put on hold. Their farms, residences, and businesses are threatened to be seized, shut down, and destroyed for a project that will not ever happen.

I hope California wakes up and realizes that this project is just a pipe dream that has hit none of its goals for cost or ridership. The legislature has had many opportunities to stop this high-speed rail boondoggle, and they will have another chance again next year. State Senator Andy Vidak has revived my "Revote the Rail" measure that I tried to get legislated back in 2010 and 2011, and will try to get the high-speed rail issue on the November 2014 ballot.

As the LA Times poll says, 55 percent of Californians would like to vote again on the high-speed rail issue, and 59 percent say they would vote down high-speed rail. I support Senator Vidak's proposal, as I did before. It needs to move forward to give people choice, now that they have seen the real numbers.

Here in D.C., we need to stop Federal dollars for the rail and instead direct those funds towards real needs such as tried and true water storage projects, infrastructure that will turn the water, and the jobs, back on in the Valley, and keep California, the Nation's fruit and vegetable capital that it is, producing, in some cases, over 90 percent of U.S. fresh fruit and nut crops that U.S. consumers need and desire.

Once again, let's not put U.S. taxpayers on the hook for a high-speed rail boondoggle that benefits only those that make money off of it. Californians don't want, don't need, and can't afford it.

(1830)

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, sometimes it is very helpful to set the record straight, as my friend from Tennessee talked about earlier, and I thought that would be highly appropriate, given some of the lighthearted and sometimes mean-spirited barbs that have been sent the way of former Governor, Vice Presidential candidate Sarah Palin.

So I just wanted to set the record straight, Mr. Speaker, so that people will understand, and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will properly reflect just how prescient that Sarah Palin has been in the past.

We are going back 5½ years, but this was an interview that Charles Gibson did that gave rise to a "Saturday Night Live" skit. This was Charles Gibson, quoting verbatim from him, and then Sarah Palin.

Gibson: Let me ask you about specific national security situations. Let's start, because we are near Russia. Let's start with Russia and Georgia. The administration has said, we have got to maintain the territorial integrity of Georgia. Do you believe the United States should try to restore Georgia and sovereignty over South Ossetia and Abkhazia?

Sarah Palin: First off, we're going to continue good relations with Saakashvili there. I was able to speak with him the other day and giving him my commitment, as JOHN MCCAIN'S

running mate, that we will be committed to Georgia. And we've got to keep an eye on Russia. For Russia to have exerted such pressure in terms of invading a smaller democratic country, unprovoked, is unacceptable, and we have to keep—Gibson interrupted and said: You believe unprovoked?

Palin: I do believe unprovoked. And we have got to keep our eyes on Russia. Under the leadership there.

Gibson: What insight into Russian actions particularly in the last couple of weeks, does the proximity of this state give you?

This is the operative line here. Sarah Palin said: "They're our next door neighbors, and you can actually see Russia from land here in Alaska."

Gibson: You are in favor of putting Georgia and the Ukraine into NATO?

The interview goes on, but that is what Sarah Palin said: "They're our next door neighbors, and you can actually see Russia from land here in Alaska."

That should be relevant to people. If you are living next door on 1 acre of land, and the people that own the acre next to you have been guilty in the past of breaking into other neighbors' sheds and buildings, then certainly that is something that you ought to be watching more closely than people on the other side of the town that don't live next door. I mean, proximity can be an important matter.

But here is the text of what "Saturday Night Live" did on September 13, 2008. We know that "Saturday Night Live" has altered sketches that, in the past, at least once I recall seeing, where they were afraid it might make President Obama look bad, and they certainly didn't want to do that.

Okay to take shots at Republicans, but they certainly didn't want to be fair and hit back at President Obama the same way, and even as Lorne Michaels, comic genius that he is, has indicated, yeah, they do lean left there at "Saturday Night Live."

This was a sketch involving Tina Fey as Sarah Palin, Amy Poehler as Hillary Clinton. They were appearing together in the sketch, and these quotes are verbatim from the sketch.

Tina Fey, as Sarah Palin says: "But tonight we're crossing party lines to address the now very ugly role that sexism is playing in the campaign."

Then Amy Poehler, as Hillary Clinton: "An issue which I am frankly surprised to hear people suddenly care about."

Tina Fey, as Palin: "You know, Hillary and I don't agree on everything."

Poehler as Clinton says: "Anything. I believe that diplomacy should be the cornerstone of any foreign policy."

Then Tina Fey, acting as Sarah Palin said: "And I can see Russia from my house."

So that is where the line came from. There are many in the United States that actually believe Sarah Palin said "and I can see Russia from my house." It was a very clever sketch. It was funny. I laughed when I saw it.

I also knew how intelligent, and what a great leader and Governor Sarah Palin had been, and what a great leader she is, but we can all laugh at ourselves.

I just didn't realize that that was going to take off, and by the writers at "Saturday Night Live" giving Hillary Clinton a line that said, "Anything. I believe that diplomacy should be cornerstone of any foreign policy," sounding like a diplomat or a politician, and then trying to make Sarah Palin sound very much less so, when, actually, the best quote remembered from Hillary Clinton will probably go down as the statement made here on Capitol Hill in reference to the four American heroes serving in harm's way whose lives were taken by radical Islamists in an act of terrorism that had nothing to do with the video.

Our Secretary of State, having suffered a blow to the head, we were told that kept her from testifying originally, she was able to say: "What difference, at this point, does it make?" Not realizing, obviously, that when Americans are murdered, who are working for this government, and even working for her with her as the boss, it is rather important to find out precisely why those people were murdered.

In fact, some Libyans told me that very thing back before Christmas. They said, so many Americans want to know who killed your four Americans. That is important, but an even more important question is why they were killed.

So we have Hillary Clinton, who is saying, at this point, what difference does it make why they were killed, how they were killed?

Just the reverse of the way "Saturday Night Live" made those two individuals look through the caricature, Sarah Palin called the shot with Ukraine years ago. I would say prophetic, but it is not prophetic. It is a bit prescient, but it has more to do with someone who has studied international relations, understands leaders like Putin, understands their lust for power, and understands they have got to be stopped, instead of carrying a plastic button over to dogmatic, totalitarian, wannabe leaders of Russia and saying, here, let's press this button and we will restart, reset everything.

That is no way to conduct foreign policy. The greatest strides in the security and safety and acquiring the security and safety of the world have come when people knew they were dealing with an evil empire and stood up to it.

I was asked just shortly ago, why did you vote "no" on the bill that was brought to the House floor to provide money, give loans to the Ukrainian people?

I developed a great love and care for Ukrainian people as a college student on a summer exchange program, and I found a lot of commonality with college students, some of the college students there in Ukraine.

I made the mistake of saying "the Ukraine," Mr. Speaker, but one of my

Ukrainian college friends corrected me when I was there as an exchange student. He said: Do you say I am going home to “the Texas”? I said, no.

He said: We don’t say “the Ukraine.” You come to Ukraine. It doesn’t need the article “the.”

So there in Ukraine, people are suffering. They feel the boot of Russian power coming at them, at first from the Crimea, and it may go farther.

I understand, having been there a number of times, in Ukraine, that there are parts of Ukraine that have sympathies with Russia, that love the days of the Soviet Union when they didn’t have to look for a job themselves.

The government would tell them how far they were allowed to go in school. They would tell them what their job would be. You step out of line, you could go to Siberia. They actually miss those days.

Whereas most Ukrainians seem to have that yearning that George W. Bush talked about as President, a yearning to be free—not all people have it, as we have seen. Some prefer security over complete freedom, and that needs to be understood.

As Franklin was quoted, paraphrased as saying: Those who would give up liberty for security deserve neither.

I know there were Soviets after the fall of the Iron Curtain, after the demise of the Soviet Union, who were panic-stricken. You mean, I have got to find a job? I mean, the government has always told me everything to do.

I will never forget being in Ukraine in recent years, and I had gone with a Ukrainian translator friend. My Russian has gotten pretty bad since college, not having any need to use it.

We were in a Ukrainian restaurant. It was off the beaten road, and so it was mainly Ukrainians there. But in one area of the restaurant there was a very large, extended Russian family. That was clear. And the patriarch was clearly Russian, speaking Russian. He appeared to have had too much to drink.

A little trio came by, a couple with musical instruments, one, a young Ukrainian, with an incredible operatic voice, and they would perform at tables and do requested songs.

They came over to the extended table with the extended Russian family, and the patriarch called out that he wanted to hear “Moscow Nights,” and I bet the group knew “Moscow Nights,” but they said that they didn’t know that.

□ 1845

So they asked for another song, and they performed it. It was magnificent. Then the boisterous Russian patriarch said—and the translator was helping me—he said: We never knew why you, in Ukraine, wanted to pull away from Russia. We love you Ukrainians. We love you. We wanted to stay together, as brothers. We never understood Ukraine wanting to pull away and not be part of Russia.

And the guy was probably late twenties, maybe 30, that was the singer; and he very politely said in Russian to the Russian: Have you been here to Kiev before?

And the Russian said: Yes, but it has been perhaps 20 years.

And the young Ukrainian said: Ah, so how do you find it now compared to 20 years ago?

And the Russian patriarch, having had too much to drink, said: It is magnificent. You have done a fantastic job. Oh, we love all of the buildings, all of the growth, all of the wonderful things you have done here. We want to be brothers. You have done a magnificent job.

And the young Ukrainian singer yelled: That is why we wanted to be apart from Russia. You kept us oppressed. You took away the best we had. You stepped on us. You mistreated us. You would not let us reach our potential. That is why we want to be separate from Russia. That is why we separated from Russia. That is why we do not want to be part of Russia. You took the best we had and left us nothing. We can do much greater things when you allow us, as Ukrainians, to be in charge of Ukraine.

And I wanted to stand up to give the young man a standing ovation. I was just thrilled that he was so passionate and felt so strongly about Ukrainian freedom.

There are so many in Ukraine who feel that way. They don’t want the Russian boot on their throat. Some are not aware that when—perhaps the most evil man of the 20th century, Hitler—Hitler’s forces marched into Ukraine, they were actually met initially with banners and lauding that the Ukrainians looked upon them as liberators from Russia.

And if they had not been so consumed by the ridiculous superrace mentality that they had sold themselves on, they would have recognized that the Ukrainians would have helped them; but, instead, they brutalized them, wantonly killed Ukrainians, and forcefully turned the Ukrainians against the Nazis.

Had the Nazis not been so consumed with their narcissism and self-aggrandizement, they probably could have used the Ukrainians’ help and never suffered such a brutal winter in Russia as they did. That is history.

And I am very proud that we have a former Governor from Alaska that understands people like Putin, understands that Putin may have suffered from a debility, like Stalin did. Stalin described it—the English translation was “with power, dizziness.”

So Putin gets a little bit dizzy. Gee, let’s take the Crimea—because he has done, as Khrushchev did of our late, great President John Kennedy—Kennedy was a brilliant man. There was no question he was a man of courage, as illustrated during World War II.

We are told that he was taking a number of medications when they met

in Vienna in the summer of 1961; but he also acknowledged, after his meeting with Khrushchev, that Khrushchev just brutalized him, and he seemed to be embarrassed with how he performed.

Khrushchev, on the other hand, had said he was immature. He was weak. That was his assessment of Kennedy because he already knew that he had backed Kennedy down during the Bay of Pigs.

The plan that was hatched during the Eisenhower administration, Kennedy was apprized of, but then it was changed. Kennedy takes office as our President, and he finds out there is going to be more American involvement.

Unfortunately, within 3 days of the invasion to be launched into the Bay of Pigs to attempt to overthrow Fidel Castro in Cuba, President Kennedy got cold feet and pulled back on the support that was going to be offered.

The people were devastated, killed, or taken prisoners. It was a disaster. Kennedy said, later, that he would have preferred an all-out invasion to appearing so weak, words to that effect.

A meeting between Khrushchev and Kennedy in Vienna—I believe it was June of 1961—reaffirmed in Khrushchev’s mind that this was a weak, immature leader.

Then toward the end of July of 1961, President Kennedy gave a powerful speech, basically making clear that we have a commitment to West Berlin. We have a commitment to West Germany; and we would not, under any circumstances, allow the Soviets to prevent us from making good on our promises.

He even used the word “force.” We didn’t want to use force; but if it was required, it would be used. Khrushchev had already taken his measure of the man, knew he could push him further, and the Berlin Wall began being built.

The United States did nothing; and it reaffirmed, in Khrushchev’s mind, that what he had assessed in Vienna—that Kennedy was immature, was weak—was even more true than he had thought before.

He knew he could push this man; and as a result, he was willing to risk thermal nuclear war to put missiles with nuclear weapons into Cuba. He would never have been so brazen as to put nuclear weapons on missiles within 90 miles of Florida had it not been for his repeated assessment in the first year of John Kennedy’s Presidency that he was weak.

Well, he misread him. Kennedy showed weakness in 1961 at least three times, but he did have courage. It just took him a while to get up to it.

But as a result of the weakness that was assessed by Khrushchev, we almost came to mutually assured destruction, where the Soviet Union and the United States would have launched nuclear weapons toward each other. It was a very, very dangerous time for the world.

We are now under the administration of President Barack Obama; and I cannot imagine any Russian leader perceiving anything but just absolute weakness, as a leader, when the microphone picked up what President Obama said before the election: you know, tell Putin that, after the election, I will have a lot more flexibility.

The message was clear. I am willing to cave on all kinds of things. I have to look strong right now, but I will cave on all kinds of things once we get past the 2012 election.

For all the things that he is, Putin is not stupid. He knew exactly what that message was, though most of the voters in the 2012 election did not; and as a result of that and so many other things, Russia believes they can cow America, and we will not stand up. When this President draws led red lines, they won't be enforced.

I am going to go back to something Sarah Palin pointed out in her interview, and this is actually in NewsBusters. It talks about the interview that Sarah Palin gave with Charlie Gibson, and it sets the record straight.

Palin foresaw that, because of Putin's actions and Russia's movement against Georgia, that if we did not send a very clear message that such offensive border-neglecting actions were not rebutted, then there would be other invasions to follow.

She has been skewered for saying, back in 2008, that if Russia was not stopped, then next, they would move against Ukraine. She was belittled for that; and yet, she had read Vladimir Putin far better than anybody in this administration.

She knew what they were capable of. She knew what they wanted to do, and she knew there is only one way to deal with bullies, and it is not to repeatedly give them your lunch money. If you continue to attempt to appease bullies, not only will they continue to take more and more and more, but they will have no respect for you whatsoever.

That is also a problem we have had with radical Islamist leaders in the world. They understand one thing: strength. That is why the United States Marines were sent to the shores of Tripoli.

It was not the negotiations that Thomas Jefferson and others engaged in with the Barbary pirates, those radical Islamists. That didn't do any good. It wasn't until the Marines fought as bloody or tough or tougher than the radical Islamists that they realized, gee, we had better leave these guys alone.

But for the valiant, fervent fighting of the Marines, then we would have continued to have to pay huge portions of our United States budget for extortion to get our sailors back.

Sarah Palin understood that. She understood that you have got to stand up to bullies, so I think it is important that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD properly reflect that Sarah Palin had it right.

Saturday Night Live assessed her wrong. Sarah Palin had Putin pegged. She had the actions of Russia pegged. She knew what they would do next.

So what have we done? Ukrainian borders are violated by Russia, and we want to go by as our friend is being brutalized, assaulted, and throw money at our friend who is being brutalized.

□ 1900

That is not much of a friend. If I am being assaulted, I would hope a friend would stop and help me and not just throw money on the way by. In fact, we have agreements in writing that require more than simply throwing money at Ukraine when they are being brutalized by Russia. Russia's economy is not all that strong. And I don't know if Ukraine would get this desperate or not, but we know that Putin, just to show Ukraine that they can hurt them, has stopped the flow of natural gas before.

Perhaps at some point, Ukraine will get desperate enough to say: Well, they may have a very weak leader over in the United States that will not come help us, but something we can do to hurt you, Mr. Putin, you do one more thing and those pipelines of yours that bring you so much money into your treasury will be history, and then see how you do.

I hope it never gets to that point. I hope that Russia doesn't continue to push matters until they push us, as Khrushchev did, to the brink of world war again. But in seeing the debate between President Obama and Governor Romney in which President Obama chided him by saying the 1980s called and they want their foreign policy back, we have now seen the appeasement repeatedly of this administration. And that is why I have said before that Neville Chamberlain called to this administration, and he wants his foreign policy back, because it appears it is being utilized once again. It didn't work for England against Hitler, and it will not work now against Russia and Putin.

I was very small as a kid in elementary school, but I learned early on I may get my nose bloodied, but I am going to make the big bully hurt. And when I made him hurt enough, after he had bloodied my nose, he left me alone. He could have hurt me. But it doesn't matter whether you are big or small, if you want to deal with bullies by appeasement over and over and over again, then it is clear you are going to continue to encourage bullying. I was never for bullying. I would stand up to it as a young kid in elementary school, and I am for standing up against it when we have the most powerful military in the history of the world—until this administration finishes with it. We still do for now.

Well, here is something else that is pretty powerful. Sarah Palin in her speech to the Conservative Political Action Committee on March 8, 2014, said this:

Those policies that the Cabinet have to explain and justify, how do you convey to Putin the threat that sounds like, "Vladimir, don't mess around, or you're going to feel my flexibility, because I got a phone and I got a pen and, um, I can dial real fast and poke you with my pen. Pinkie promise."

Well, obviously, she was having some fun herself, but she makes the point. A phone and a pen won't do it. When you are talking about a bully that does not mind violating borders, killing people, and subjugating masses of people, you have to stand up to them.

I think one of the clear indications not only that we had a weak administration on foreign policy, but also we didn't use common sense in protecting ourselves came very clearly before the Boston bombing when the Russians, the Russian leaders—the Russian people like us pretty well, but the Russian leaders don't like us particularly and certainly don't respect us. But even so, they realized that we actually have a common enemy, and that is radical Islam, radical Islam that would love to see Russia fall, Ukraine fall, and the United States fall, would love to see them all fall under a giant global caliphate. So we have that common enemy who wants to destroy each of our ways of life.

So Russia, despite their dislike and distaste in some ways for the United States, actually reached out and said: Hey, we are not sure you realize, but this Tsarnaev, he has been radicalized, and he is dangerous. We are not going to reveal too many secrets here, but any intelligent administration will take what we have said that Tsarnaev is dangerous, he has been radicalized, and he is a threat to you and do some digging. And the best we can find out, even after questioning the Director of the FBI, the best we can find out is they apparently went and talked to Tsarnaev himself.

Well, okay, I guess you've got to do that. Good idea. If somebody is very good at questioning, if somebody really understands the radical Islamist mind, if he knows who the Islamic authors are that have inspired radicalism, if he knows who the imams are that have helped radicalize people, then you can ask the right questions about which imams you have been around, what authors are your favorite authors, what do you think of Qutb in Egypt and the writing that he had, that milestone that Osama bin Laden credited with helping radicalize him. If you know the questions to ask, you can find out whether somebody has really been radicalized.

But as a few of us have found out when we reviewed the material purged from FBI training material, we are not allowing our FBI agents to be properly trained as to the threat and the beliefs of radical Islamists. Again, as one of our intelligence officers has told me, we have blinded ourselves of the ability to see our enemy. And it continues. We continue to have people advise this administration who have known associations with radical Islamists. The Egyptian paper, back when it was controlled

by the Muslim Brotherhood, bragged that they had six Muslim brothers who were top advisers in top positions in this administration. So we are not allowing our FBI, our intelligence officials and agents, to be trained to properly see this threat.

So the Russians say: Hey, this guy is a threat to you. You had better check him out, and you will find out what we are talking about. He had been to an area where people were often radicalized. He had gone to an area that he came to America claiming asylum, to need asylum from, and he goes back to that area? Well, that should have been a red flag right there. He didn't need asylum from that area. He just went back and got radicalized. But our blinded FBI agents were not able to ask those questions, and when I chided the FBI Director for not even going out to the Muslim mosques to talk to people out there, to ask questions, to ask questions to find out if the Tsarnaevs have been radicalized, the FBI Director said that they did go out there to the mosque. I didn't hear it at the time, but I heard it on the replay when he adds, "as part of our outreach program."

They didn't go out there to investigate the Tsarnaevs to save Bostonians' lives. He didn't even know that the Islamic Society of Boston was started by a man named Al-Amoudi, who is in prison for 23 years for supporting terrorism. After being a very important adviser, he helped find Muslims to go into the military as Muslim chaplains. He helped the Clinton administration. He actually helped the George W. Bush administration early on until they figured out, whoa, this guy is supporting terrorism, and they had him arrested I believe it was 2003 out at Dulles Airport, and he is in prison now because they recognized what he is. But our FBI Director, the FBI agents didn't even know you had a terrorist supporter that started the mosque where the Tsarnaevs went.

So when the Russians see that we give America—that we don't really like, we don't really trust, but we give them a heads-up to actually save American lives, and even with a heads-up like they gave us, we can't properly protect the people of Boston because of political correctness in this administration, well, it just adds to the assessment by Putin and the other leaders in Russia that these are people that don't recognize danger when it is pointed out to them with a big sign saying "danger" on it.

So, of course, just like Khrushchev's assessment that turned out in the end to be wrong, I hope and pray that we don't get to the brink of nuclear war because leaders around the world have assessed, as Khrushchev did, that the American President is weak and can be pushed around indefinitely. I don't think President Obama can be pushed around indefinitely, but I sure don't want him to be pushed all the way to nuclear war before we finally take a

stand, as Kennedy did. And you don't have to get that far if you stand up against the bullies early on, as Neville Chamberlain was not willing to do, and as a result, millions and millions died, and millions suffered unthinkable tragic suffering because leaders wanted to go the appeasement route.

For all the flack Sarah Palin has taken, she had Russia pegged. And it is not because she ever said "I can see Russia from my house." She never said that. She accurately said you can see Russia from parts of Alaska—not her house.

□ 1915

She was willing to laugh at the skit, but now we are not talking about laughable things. We are talking about freedom being taken at the point of military weapons in Crimea, in Ukraine.

We see China moving in areas and places they have never had the courage to move because they knew America would not stand for it and we would rally other nations against China. The Chinese leaders know that at times, as good as the economy seemed to be going, they are a fragile economy. As I have said before, I think if China knew that they could call all the debt of the United States and push us into a bankruptcy-type mode in the United States, they would except they would suffer dramatically, and if they ever get to the point where they think that they can take this Nation down financially without losing their own, they would do it. That is why it is a terrible wrong as a government to allow ourselves to become further and further indebted to China.

Today, apparently the news we were seeing, their economy has taken a hit today. I look forward to learning more about that this evening, but it is time Americans woke up, Mr. Speaker, and realize that appeasement of bullies, of thugs, has never worked. It will never work, and when you are the most powerful, have the most powerful military in world history in the face of growing bully power, you don't abandon yours.

We want to help those who cannot feed themselves in America. We want to help those who cannot provide for themselves in America. Certainly we differ on our side of the aisle. For those who are able-bodied and can work, let's get the economy going so that people have a job and can do for themselves and make more. Let's don't continue to make people more and more dependent on the government.

I know my friends across the aisle do not want to see the world fall into war as it did in World War II, do not want to see us come to the brink of thermo-nuclear annihilation as it almost did during President Kennedy's term, but it is important to understand from history that is where you go when you show weakness.

We can defend ourselves without putting tens of thousands or 100,000 troops into a country like we did in Afghani-

stan. For heaven's sake, we defeated the Taliban with less than 500 Americans in there helping the Northern Alliance. We helped them with weapons, we helped them with air cover, we helped them with intel, and they defeated our enemy for us, and this administration will point to the Northern Alliance and call them war criminals because they fought like the Taliban fought. We can fight our enemies by empowering the enemy of our enemy. They are Muslims. We can live with the Northern Alliance as long as they don't ever turn on us. As long as they are going to fight our enemy, then let them fight our enemy.

Yet for the government that was given to Afghanistan at our pushing—a tribal, regional country like Afghanistan was given a strong centralized government that would lead to nothing but corruption. We should have known it when it happened, so how do we deal with the problem there? As my friend, former Vice President Masood said, You help us get an amendment into our Constitution that allows us to elect our governors, elect our mayors, pick our own police chiefs, take that power away from the appointment power of the President, and we can protect our regions and keep the Taliban from taking over.

This administration does not seem to want to push for something like that. It can't even get a status of forces agreement that was teed up completely for them by President Bush in Iraq but then was fumbled by this administration.

I was meeting, had a visit with a Baloch friend today. If you have done homework, you know, Mr. Speaker, that the Taliban is apparently getting supplied mainly from Pakistan, and much of the supplies come through the more southern area, the Baloch area of Pakistan. We also know that the Baloch have been victimized, oppressed, persecuted, killed, and terrorized by the Pakistani military, the Pakistani government. Iran has done the same thing because the Baloch people are indigenous to the southern part of Pakistan and on into the most mineral-rich areas of Iran. So we don't have to go to war with Iran, we don't have to go to war with Pakistan, but if you start assisting the Baloch people to stop the oppression and perhaps have their own independent country, the Taliban stop getting supplied by Pakistan. Iran doesn't have all of the minerals. They have those mineral areas, a big part, an important part of them at least are run by the Baloch people, and we can do business with them.

There are ways to deal with the enemy of our enemies so that they keep areas around the world in check so you don't have to lose so much American lives. Most people are not aware that most Americans have been killed under the administration of this President. It is time we stood firm. It is time we let the bullies of the world

know Sarah Palin was right, and we need to stand up to them.

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

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3189, WATER RIGHTS PROTECTION ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4015, THE SGR REPEAL AND MEDICARE PROVIDER PAYMENT MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2014; AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM MARCH 17, 2014, THROUGH MARCH 21, 2014.

Mr. BURGESS (during the Special Order of Mr. GOHMERT), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-379) on the resolution (H. Res. 515) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3189) to prohibit the conditioning of any permit, lease, or other use agreement on the transfer, relinquishment, or other impairment of any water right to the United States by the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4015) to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare sustainable growth rate and improve Medicare payments for physicians and other professionals, and for other purposes; and providing for proceedings during the period from March 17, 2014, through March 21, 2014, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

MONEY IN POLITICS

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak to the Chamber this evening. I want to talk about the topic of money in politics, which is something I think Americans across the country are increasingly anxious about because it really jeopardizes the voice they should have in their politics, in their democracy in their own government.

Yesterday, there was a special election in Florida's 13th Congressional District, and the results of that election will get commented on at length in the coming days. People will try to make forecasts about what it means for the 2014 election cycle. Generally,

they will analyze it. They will look at the data and they will prognosticate as to what the implications of it are going forward.

A lot of that commentary will miss what I think is the most sinister aspect of the election yesterday that was held in Florida, and that is the tremendous amount of money, the tremendous amount of money that poured into that election, not from ordinary, everyday citizens, not from the people who really have a stake in the outcome. They were the ones asked to go to the polls, but the money that poured in there that bought advertisements, to the tune of about \$12.7 million, almost \$13 million spent on that campaign, about 30 percent of it was donated to the candidates themselves. So 30 percent of that \$13 million was donated to the candidates themselves. The rest of the money came from outside sources—party committees, super PACs, anonymous donors, the ones who have been flooding the airwaves in the last couple of election cycles with negative advertising. That is where the great majority of the money that came into that special election yesterday was sourced, and that, I think, is a harbinger of things to come.

If you look back at the 2010 cycle, you look at the 2012 election cycle, both at the congressional level and at the Presidential level, tremendous amounts of money pouring into campaigns and into elections, much of it coming from sources that don't identify themselves, secret money, these big super PACs who weigh in and try to determine the outcome of elections.

Where does that leave the everyday citizen? Where does that leave the person out there who is sitting at their kitchen table, who is watching their television and is seeing all of these negative TV commercials pouring in? Where does that leave them in terms of their feeling about whether they have a voice in the process?

I talk to my constituents, I listen to the way they feel about the current system of funding campaigns, and there is an increasing sense of disillusionment out there, deep cynicism that election outcomes are determined by Big Money and special interests and that the voices and opinions and priorities and concerns of everyday citizens are being cast aside. That is the legacy of the influence of Big Money and special interests on our politics today.

So yesterday's election in the 13th District of Florida put a fine point on it. It demonstrated how much money can go into one special election. It was historic, \$13 million being spent. More importantly, it is a lesson as to what we are looking at down the road. This idea that if you have got a big wallet you get an extra voice in our democracy, that somehow your opinion and your ideas count more because of the size of your wallet and your ability to throw millions of dollars into campaigns, well, that is not what a democracy is about; that is plutocracy. That

is a government and a system that is dominated by Big Money and special interests and leaves the voices of everyday citizens behind so that they start asking themselves: Does my voice matter? Can I have an impact? Do my ideas count? If I am only able to write a check for \$25 to a candidate who I think will do the right thing for me, can that \$25 check compete against a \$1 million check that some big donor can write to fund a Super PAC?

This is why people across the country, it is not the only reason, but it is one of the main reasons why people across the country are so disaffected with Washington and Congress and government, because they feel like their voice is being drowned out by the big-moneyed interests out there.

Mr. Speaker, we have to do something about this because if we are going to restore the confidence and trust of Americans across this country, they need to believe again that their voice matters. They need to believe that when they are trying to understand the issues in an election and follow the debate and become informed, that that information will come to them from responsible sources, not from these shadowy hidden secret donors out there that have found a way to dominate the airwaves.

So that special election yesterday I think was a warning to us all that this trend towards Big Money and special interests weighing in to what ought to be a democratic process that is owned and invested in by everyday citizens, that that trend is continuing and it is worsening.

□ 1930

At the end of that path lies deep, deep cynicism on the part of the American people. You can feel it; you can almost touch it when you go out into your district and you talk to your constituents who are angry and frustrated and want to see this place respond to their concerns and to their needs.

So what can we do about this? I said a moment ago that we have got to do something soon; we have to address this cynicism that people are feeling, or they are not going to trust us at all. They are not going to believe that we can deliver for them in the people's House.

This is the House of Representatives. It has the name the "people's House." We run every 2 years. We are as close to the people as elected representatives can be. They want to see that we are listening to them.

Right now—I said this last week—in some ways, when it comes to the relevance of this body to the average American out there, we are hanging on by a thread.

We are hanging on by a thread because, increasingly, they think that we answer to Big Money and special interests, and we stop listening to the average person out there.

So we need to do something about this. We need to fix this. We need to