

rule of law that are the hallmarks of our intelligence professionals.

Finally, once again, let me just thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your leadership for these past years. I also want to sincerely thank every member of the Intelligence Committee.

I want to thank Congresswoman TERRI SEWELL for being here tonight and for being involved in this bill. You were a big part of our success.

We debate, and we argue, but we always negotiate, and we always keep in our minds what is most important: the security, privacy, and civil liberties of the American people.

Together with the Senate—and I thank Senators FEINSTEIN and CHAMBLISS again—we have produced for the House to consider today a truly strong bill, which I am proud to support. I urge all my colleagues to support it as well.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, again, I want to thank my ranking member, and I want to thank all the staff—Republican and Democrat staff. These bills don't come together for the fond wishes of us Members alone.

We have very dedicated and committed staff who sit down and work through the issues, just the way the Members do, and we wouldn't have this product today if it weren't for that collaboration, and I want to thank all of them for that.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank DUTCH on a personal note. There is a lot to not like in this town, and there is a lot to not like in this place, but it shows you—and I think it shows Americans—that when you sit down and have mutual respect for each other, even though we disagreed on certain issues, you can come to a conclusion that is in the best interest of the United States.

Through forging that relationship, I think we forged a lasting friendship that I will always be grateful for, so I want to thank you for that.

Thank you for your work on national security, and thanks to all the staff who brought us here today. We have a lot more work to do, so we can't be too nice to them.

We are going to have to get a lot of pounds of flesh between now and the end of the year, to get a lot of work done.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would ask and encourage this body to support a bill that will provide national security safety for the United States for the following years.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 1681.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the

rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE JIM JORDAN, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable JIM JORDAN, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, June 24, 2014.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a subpoena, issued by the United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio, for my testimony in a criminal case.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I will determine whether compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and rights of the House.

Sincerely,

JIM JORDAN,  
Member of Congress.

#### ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION INVASION

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, our current immigration policies and political rhetoric broadcast to people around the world that they can come here illegally without consequence. In fact, if they do, they will be rewarded for it. We send this message, and then we act surprised when an illegal immigration invasion into our country sky-rockets.

A growing crisis at our southern border sees tens of thousands of children being abandoned at our doorstep. Their parents miscalculated. They heard someone talk about the DREAM Act and thought their children would be taken care of.

Ultimately, this crisis was brought on by Democrats and Republicans who have advocated granting legal status to those people who are here illegally, especially in terms of the so-called "DREAMers."

While most of those advocating such policies have good motives and good hearts, they have unintentionally created a humanitarian and bureaucratic crisis that our government is not equipped to handle.

I say we should send them home. The children and those who have come here illegally need to be sent home, whether they are adults or children.

#### PLAYING POLITICS FOR THE CAMERA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-

uary 3, 2013, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to address you here on the floor of the House of Representatives, and I appreciate the opportunity to do so.

There are a number of topics that are on my mind, and generally for me, Mr. Speaker, it flows from the previous debate.

As I listened to the deliberation and the dialogue and I will say the cooperative nature that came between the chairman and the ranking member of the Select Committee on Intelligence here this evening, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that kind of dialogue, and I think our Founding Fathers would be very pleased if they could see that this work that is being done, a lot of it behind closed doors in the Select Committee on Intelligence, is being done in a deliberative process, sometimes in a classified setting, but often in a non-partisan environment.

It seems as though, when the television cameras come on, the partisan nature of this United States Congress is amplified by the media's coverage of the events that take place, and when the doors get closed, we get serious about policy in a different kind of a way.

We are no longer messaging to America or simply having that kind of debate and dialogue that our Founding Fathers envisioned, and I don't know that it is particularly a phenomenon that is unique to the United States Congress.

At the time of our Founding Fathers, we didn't have instantaneous media communications that went out across the District of Columbia or into the States or across the country, for that matter, or the world.

□ 1945

As technology developed, they had the printing press. The printing press allowed for newspaper to be printed in a limited form, in a compressed and compact form. And as that message went out across the country, sometimes it took weeks for the actions here in Congress to penetrate into the public. And by then, there was another wave of action and another wave of action, an entirely different rhythm here in Congress as compared to the rhythm that we have here. I think the pace of what we do in this Congress is related to the ability to translate a message out to the American people and out to the world.

And so now going from an era when information traveled at its fastest pace, as our Founding Fathers helped shape this Nation, information traveled at its fastest pace about as fast as a horse could gallop. That was the closest thing they had to lightning speed of communications back in 1776. Today, information travels at the speed of light, and it is not only that there is a single piece of information that goes

out of here at the speed of light, but all kinds of pieces of information can go out simultaneously everywhere, not just to the District of Columbia, not to the surrounding States alone, not to the 50 States that we have and the U.S. territories across the reaches of the globe and the Pacific, for example, but everywhere in the world it can go at the speed of light, which is as close to instantaneously as possible. And it can be transmitted out of an iPhone. It used to be a BlackBerry and they got a little bit too slow for us. Now, we can send video around the world in real time from a device that hangs from our belt. That has changed the posture of the politics in the United States Congress. It has changed the messaging. It has changed the civilization, and it changed the culture in different ways.

So now, we have people sitting in their living rooms all over America who for a long time now have been able to sit down from that desk and do email. That is a methodology that is now more than 20 years old, the ability to transfer instantaneously a letter that we might write on an electronic page and click the “send” button and it can go anywhere around the world at roughly the speed of light. But now there are millions of people sitting there who have practiced with email extensively and set up their email trees. And now a faster way to do that is on Facebook, and a more compressed way is to send it out by Twitter. There are a number of different social media that people are exercising, and there will be more that will be developed.

While that happens, the American people are projecting their opinions and their observations instantaneously to their families and to their friends, to the people who are part of their distribution list, those who are their followers on their friend list. This has changed the way we do business in this country, and it has brought about public opinions that are accelerated in a faster way; a far, far faster way than how public opinions were formed in, say, the era of our founding.

Because of this, it has been an expansion of our economy, the expansion of our efficiency. We are far more productive than we were before because we can communicate more quickly than before. But at the same time, it has opened us up for the kind of attacks that come from people who, in the era of our founding, in that era of say 235 years ago or so, they had no capability of reaching Americans, no capability of getting to our shores, and no capability of penetrating into the domestic life of Americans. We were safe enough then from the Barbary pirates. We had to go there before they would attack us.

Yet, at that era of time, 20 percent of the Federal budget that was appropriated in this city was committed to paying tribute, which was bribes, you might say “mordida” in today’s terms, to the Barbary pirates. Now we find ourselves still fighting the same kind of ideology, of people who would use

cyberspace to attack us, who would use airplanes to attack us, both of which were not envisioned by our Founding Fathers, both of which can get here far faster than a Barbary pirate corsair could be rowed across the Atlantic Ocean. That has changed the rhythm of what we do.

The Select Committee on Intelligence sees a lot of this. They see the most immediate intel that we have. They try to address this appropriately. And some of the things that we need to do is intel on our enemies.

So I am hopeful that this bill which has just been passed will contribute to making it safer for Americans, and make our enemies, whose simple design is that they would want to kill us because we are not their culture, not their religion, not their—and when I refer to them as “civilization,” I have to put that in quotes, Mr. Speaker. But that is the situation that is in front of us.

As the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence delivers a bill to the floor about which most of us don’t have inside knowledge of, we have to keep in mind what has happened with the intelligence community and the results of the attacks that have taken place around the world. That takes me to what we saw, heard, and learned and thought we knew, to a greater degree than most Americans would agree did know, with regard to Iraq.

We went in there to liberate them in March of 2003. I was here in this Congress then. I remember the intelligence that was delivered. I remember the rhythm that was taking place, the message delivered by the President and the Vice President, the agreement on what they had for intelligence that went from U.S. intelligence, Israeli intelligence, French intelligence, everybody in the intelligence community for the world agreed essentially on the same thing, and Saddam was removed from power. American and coalition forces went in to do that, and in the ensuing aftermath of the liberation, we saw an ebb and flow of forces in Iraq.

One of them was a surprise for me to learn, as al Qaeda stepped in to places and took over in places like Fallujah and Ramadi—that we allowed that to happen on our watch. We occupied bases in Iraq. We had swept through the country and cleaned the country up. We had set up a government and turned it over to the voice of the Iraqi people. Free enterprise was starting to flow. Oil was starting to flow and was starting to go into the treasuries of Iraq. And yet, cities like Fallujah and Ramadi and others were taken over by al Qaeda. We watched that happen. That happened under the Bush administration. After it got to a certain point, President George W. Bush began to look for solutions. He was not willing to accept a capitulation in Iraq, an all-out pullout of Iraq that would have allowed for al Qaeda and our American enemies, generally Sunni-related forces, to take Iraq back over again.

That was what we had under Saddam, not al Qaeda but the Sunni forces dominated Iraq. And the forces within Iraq that had been pushing back on American forces and Shia forces within Iraq, our President was not willing to accept that. President Bush was not willing to accept that.

He put together the surge, the counterinsurgency strategy that was drafted by General Petraeus. General Petraeus took some time off from his combat leadership in Iraq to sit down at Fort Leavenworth and write the counterinsurgency strategy. That strategy, before it was actually brought forward and published, was a strategy that was beginning to be developed to be implemented in Iraq.

I had the circumstance of timing to have been in Iraq before the surge was a name but when the concept was being discussed and developed by our commanders in the field and pushed by General Petraeus at the time. I saw the success of the surge as we went in and aligned ourselves with the tribal interests of the Sunnis as well as the Shias, who understood that al Qaeda was too brutal, that they could not be trusted to simply allow the Iraqi people to run their own country and run their own government, and so they aligned themselves with the people who they envisioned would be the successful ones on the other side of the violent and bloody conflict that was ensuing.

That aligned the right people on the right side, on our side of that particular battle, Mr. Speaker, that particular phase of the war in Iraq. There were many battles. It allowed for the surge of U.S. forces to step in, sweep al Qaeda out and build an alliance and an allegiance with local tribal interests say, in Anbar, and in multiple provinces and really all of Iraq to establish a peaceful foundation that would allow for a legitimate government of, by, and for the people of Iraq, and a free enterprise system to be put in place. They had then an opportunity to succeed and an opportunity to build a stable democracy in the country of Iraq.

Those were the circumstances that the Bush administration left for the Obama administration. However, I would add one piece to this that is apparently not being discussed in today’s news media, Mr. Speaker, and that is this: on November 17, 2008, after Barack Obama was elected for his first term in office, President Bush, under his administration, I will say allowed or recommended or assented to our U.S. Ambassador to Iraq, Ryan Crocker, who is an individual who is a wonderful public servant, one of the most knowledgeable people that we have on that whole area of the world we call the Middle East and whom has impressed me with the deep knowledge and the good judgment he has, and the careful rhythm of the work that he does, someone who has an eye on the moving of the organism in that part of

the world and how U.S. policy influences that part of the world. So I wanted to put these commercials in for Ambassador Crocker because I remain very impressed with Ambassador Ryan Crocker.

It came to be his task to sign, however, a new status of forces agreement with Iraq. The moment I read that status of forces agreement, which was signed by Ambassador Crocker on behalf of President Bush, November 17, 2008, after President Obama was elected, so under the lame duck era of President-elect Obama and in the last months of President Bush's administration—Ambassador Crocker signed the status of forces agreement, which agreed to pull all military forces out of Iraq, agreed to abandon the bases that we had established, abandon the airstrips that we had established, and the defensive positions, and the ability to project force in Iraq was not only diminished, it was essentially eliminated by that agreement.

I was alarmed that the administration would negotiate and agree to such a status of forces agreement that so weakened our ability to project power in Iraq; that with all of the blood and treasure that was invested, it sent the message that said either we don't care any longer or we have such confidence in the Maliki regime and such confidence in the new government that had been set up throughout those bloody years in Iraq that we didn't need to be there any longer.

I think of the history of the United States' involvement, Mr. Speaker, and the times we have gone into places like Germany, Japan, the Philippines, Korea, for example, around the world where America has invested blood and treasure, we have also established bases to operate from, to project power, to project force, to protect freedom throughout the reaches of the interests of the United States of America, and at the cost of hundreds of thousands of lives and billions, in fact trillions of dollars, we have not in the past washed our hands and walked away as if we wanted to be finished with it, except that as I speak, Mr. Speaker, it occurs to me that we did have General Winfield Scott in Mexico in about 1845. We signed the Treaty of Hidalgo which essentially gave Mexico back to Mexico after the Americans had invaded and occupied the state of Mexico, including Mexico City. We could have stayed. We could have established an American presence there. We could have brought the American civilization into Mexico. Looking back on it historically, perhaps we should have done so, but that was the time when American blood and American treasure was just packaged up and brought back home again, although out of that bargain came the Gadsden Purchase and also a new line of American border between the United States and Mexico. So there was something gained from that.

In this case, we sacked up our bats and went home. We left a few marines

in the embassy in Baghdad. The rest of it, we left to the Iraqis. As the intelligence came up, Mr. Speaker, and we watched what was going on, we learned that ISIS was growing and the conflict in Syria reached a questionable peak last September, last August, actually, around Labor Day in September when President Obama announced that he was planning on doing a tiny little, it'sy-bitsy, teeny-weeny surgical strike into Syria, and that was when Secretary of State Kerry said it would be, and this is not an exact quote, but what I remember is that the strike would be infinitesimally small. So a tiny, little military ding on Assad's regime to send a message to him: Don't use your chemical weapons any longer on Syrians. Well, that never happened. It didn't happen partly because we needed the British cooperation. Or, apparently, the President wanted the British cooperation and David Cameron, the Prime Minister, went to the British Parliament and said, I would like to have authorization to conduct a military operation strike—I don't know if he said infinitesimally small—in Syria.

□ 2000

And the British Parliament rejected that proposal, and so David Cameron was powerless to go forward in support of a U.S. effort that might have been a military strike or two, however small they might have been, in Syria.

Then our President, President Obama, toyed with the idea of coming to Congress and asking us for the permission or the endorsement or the authority to conduct operations in Syria.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear that my opinion is, constitutionally, the President of the United States is Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States. Some in this Congress would argue that the President can't issue a military strike order without first getting the consent of Congress.

I would argue instead that we are living in an era where the President of the United States must have that authority. He must have the authority to, in an instant, order a military strike if that is what the circumstances and the intelligence say is required. It is the President's decision. If the President orders our military into operations and over a period of time—and I think that an appropriate period of time today is a 30-day window—then if it is going to go beyond that, he should come back to Congress and ask for our support and ask for our endorsement of those military operations. But the initial strikes, the President has to have the authority, and has the authority under the Constitution, to order an immediate and military strike.

The President didn't do that. He followed David Cameron's request before the British Parliament, and then when the British Parliament said, no, he toyed with the idea of asking Congress. Congress sent enough messages out

through the media that essentially was a whip check on the vote of Congress on whether we would authorize military force going into Syria.

When the President understood he wasn't going to get that authorization, then he decided apparently not to act in Syria, and he decided apparently to lead from behind—which is the definition of following, not leading—and he decided apparently to do the things in foreign policy that we have seen him do continually, and that is best described by the word “dither.” The President has been dithering on foreign policy, especially the things that require immediate response.

There is a theory in human nature and philosophy that says that if you procrastinate, then eventually the decision will be made for you, that if you dither, the decision will be made for you.

Action in Syria, or the decision, was resolved by dithering and waiting, and now it became clear that we can't identify good guys on either side of this argument. We had good guys. And I didn't advocate for this, Mr. Speaker, and so I am somewhat of a Monday morning quarterback looking back on this Syrian issue.

We had some intelligence that identified the people that were good people, those who wanted to see a free Syria. The Free Syrian Army initially led by Syrians that believed in a free Syria and Syrians that believe that Syria needed to remain a nation-state, a country unto itself, that was owned, operated, and run, a government that responded to the people of Syria, that was the initial ideology that drove the Free Syrian Army by the intel that I picked up. I have traveled into that part of world a number of times, Mr. Speaker.

One of the colonels who was a leader in the movement was essentially, I'll say, given over to the Assad regime in a military operation and was then pressed into prison, and that made him powerless. At that point, al Qaeda and the offshoots of al Qaeda and the factions of it began to assert themselves and infiltrate the Free Syrian Army to the point where we are not able any longer to identify the positive forces in Syria. You have al Qaeda and their affiliates, including ISIS, that are operating there, that have established the foundations for what they believe is to be the future caliphate of Islam.

As a result, partly the result of the U.S. not asserting itself, partly the result of perhaps not having intelligence that was good enough in that part of the world, the U.S. didn't act. The President led from behind. The U.S. didn't act. The British Parliament said “no” to David Cameron, and we have a mess in Syria. We have had multiple executions and beheadings taking place, Christians being persecuted and killed in Syria as well. Now the foundation of ISIS has flowed out of Syria and is flowing across Iraq.

This group, the ISIS, has asserted themselves to the point where some are

saying we need to avoid a civil war in Iraq. I will argue instead we are almost past that. We are almost past the point where the civil war has actually been engaged and it is closer to the point where it could be over, resulting in an ISIS invasion and occupation of nearly the entire nation-state of Iraq. They pushed that far into the countryside where the majority of the real estate is controlled and occupied by them.

This is an astonishing development, especially considered in light of the President's statements 3 or 4 months ago when he told America and the world that we didn't need to worry very much about ISIS because they are simply the junior varsity—the junior varsity, Mr. Speaker. How could a force, a junior varsity that doesn't have an identifiable source of military supplies and munitions—although we have some intel on where that comes from—that doesn't have a confident, identifiable source of funding to pay their people or buy their equipment munitions—although we have some fairly good sources on where that comes from—how could this junior varsity rise up in a period of 3 to 4 months from the time that the President said that they are the JV, how could they rise up and take over that much of Syria and flow into Iraq and invade and occupy Anwar province, for example, and now take the refinery at Baiji, the largest refinery in Iraq, and shut down or control the oil supply in Iraq? Now they have diverted it back to their own uses. Now we are at gas rationing in Iraq. Baghdad is threatened to be surrounded. The President has announced some days ago that he is willing to send up to 300 military personnel into Iraq presumably to prepare to evacuate Americans.

This is a calamity of colossal proportions, Mr. Speaker. Apparently, it was unforeseen by the White House and the President of the United States, the wise Commander in Chief and the people in the White House who have the maximum access to the entire intelligence community, the intelligence community that is being discussed and reauthorized here on the floor of the House tonight by the chair and the ranking member, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

I would think that the question that it doesn't take much intelligence to ask is: Mr. President, how did you miss this? How did you declare ISIS the junior varsity? How could they have emerged as this powerful force that is sweeping across Iraq?

This isn't a civil war. This is a blitzkrieg by the enemy that is taking over the civilian governments and invading and occupying the towns in Iraq and executing the people who do not fit their particular religious sect. They are persecuting Christians. They are driving Christians out of that part of the world, and they are killing those that they choose to.

It isn't that alone. They bragged over a week ago that they had executed

1,700 Iraqi soldiers. Most of these soldiers will be Shi'a. And it is the Sunnis that are doing the executing and the killing. They have long been the most aggressive, the most militant, the most brutal, and the most violent force of the Islamic world, in that part of the world, in Iraq in particular.

ISIS has apparently and, according to some news accounts, are so violent and so brutal that they have even caused al Qaeda itself to step back from them and say: You are too violent and too brutal. Now, that is going a long way to think that people that would fly planes into the Twin Towers on September 11, 2001, and burn to death the Americans that they did would find that the brutality of ISIS is so brutal that they would want to distance themselves from it.

I am not sure I believe that analysis. I think that that is one of those conclusions du jour that we come to; once you hear somebody say it, it gets repeated again and again, and pretty soon others pick it up, no one challenges it, and now we think that al Qaeda has been repulsed by the brutality of ISIS. I am not convinced of that.

Mr. Speaker, I can say this: I am repulsed by their brutality. I am repulsed by the beheadings that they do. I am repulsed by the videos. I am repulsed by the pictures. I am repulsed by the summary executions of hundreds, and probably thousands, of people that don't fit their religious sect that find themselves within the enforcement capability now of the black-flagged ISIS.

I am repulsed by what has come out of there. If we could see the actual reality of all the things that are going on within that part of the battle zone and in the aftermath of it as they go down through the streets and do their ethnic cleansing, I think we will find that thousands of people have been summarily executed by ISIS.

I think we will find that at least hundreds have been beheaded. I think we will find that thousands have been shot in the back of the head as they have their hands tied behind them and they are forced to kneel. I think we will find that in those numbers there will also be hundreds, and perhaps thousands, that have been forced to lay on the ground in a ditch and simply executed with AK-47 fire into the back of their heads or wherever. I think we will find that some—in fact, the videos are out there now—have been forced to kneel beside a pit in a hole in the ground that has a fire burning in it from gas poured into the hole, had gas poured onto their heads and then pushed into the hole to be burned to death in a pit.

That is the kind of brutality that we have that is taking over that part of the world. That is the kind of people that have raced across the desert, in the open desert, and faced no air power from the United States of America whatsoever. They have only faced this: the President sitting in the White House dithering, a President who has

decided—he gave a speech a week ago last Friday at noon in this town, and this speech was, he came out to do his press conference and he said—I am going to give this my summary version, the STEVE KING interpretation of the President's speech that day, a week ago last Friday at noon. He essentially conveyed this message to us:

Things aren't going as well in Iraq as we had hoped. There is an enemy that has penetrated into Iraq. We are not going to have boots on the ground in Iraq. I have several options. We are going to study the options for a few days. It will take at least that long to evaluate. There will be no boots on the ground. We have options, but we are not going to deploy any options until such time as there are political solutions. If there is not a political solution, there is not going to be peace in Iraq.

So he says: I am going to require the Iraqis to produce a political solution before we will use any of the options that we have that might—he didn't say this—but that might help them, was the implication. There will be no boots on the ground. We are going to study this for a few days. Then after we study it, we are going give the Iraqis an assignment, and the assignment will be: produce a political solution and then maybe we can get around to helping you.

Huh. Well, that is the formula, Mr. Speaker, for dithering. That is the formula for dithering rather than fiddling. And while Iraq is being invaded by the black flag, radical Islamists to establish a caliphate, the President is dithering in a very similar way that Nero was fiddling while Rome was burning.

Iraq is collapsing. The soil in Iraq has been sanctified by the blood of our warriors and our heroes to the tune of billions upon billions of U.S. dollars, much of it borrowed from foreign countries to keep this budget and this economy afloat. All of that price, and we don't know how this is going to come out?

I actually don't expect that the entire nation-state of Iraq will be swamped by the black flag ISIS. I don't actually expect that, but it is a significant threat that that happens—a significant threat. As we watch the map, as the flood and the takeover of that sanctified sand in Iraq is getting greater and greater on the side of ISIS and smaller and smaller for the Shi'as, and while the confusion within what I would call the legitimized Government of Iraq causes them to retreat and back up, it looks like their last redoubt is likely to be Baghdad.

The President has dithered, and the opportunities for air strikes from the military have diminished and now the opportunities to actually bring what would otherwise be a cheap delay, at least, of that invasion, an invasion that runs at the speed that is as fast as an American military, an American armor penetrated into Iraq when we

went in to liberate in March of 2003. ISIS is penetrating into Iraq at a speed almost that fast without nearly the equipment, without nearly the planning, without nearly the communications as the Iraqis peel backwards in front of them.

□ 2015

This is something more similar to—well, I will put it this way: when Desert Storm came about and needed to be done, there was much discussion in the public airways in this country about the Republican Guard in Iraq, these crack troops that were highly trained and well equipped.

Even though their tanks were a little bit on the old side, they were supposedly well maintained and well positioned, and their armor could not be penetrated. To send U.S. forces against them in the desert was going to be a bloodbath supposedly, if you listen to some of the pundits here in this country, generally the liberal ones.

I am listening to this dialogue and have been to the locations now a number of times, and I see where they have dug their tank pits, and they take a bulldozer, dig the sand out in two directions, pull the tank down in, they set that tank in, in a fighting position, and it can fire.

It can fire from that fighting position, and any kind of horizontal fire will be blocked by the dirt that surrounds it, but from the air, they are sitting ducks.

That seemingly did not occur to the liberal people who were pontificating about how fearsome the Republican Guard was, but we know what happened when the American Air Force began to fly sorties over the Republican Guard and over their armored divisions.

A similar, in fact, a greater vulnerability existed for ISIS, as they traveled down the paths through the desert and the roads—easy, easy targets for the U.S. Air Force.

While this is going on, the President had decided: I am going to spend some days thinking about this, we have to study this, we will gather all this intel together, and then I am going to require a political solution for the Iraqis, I am going to dither.

Frustrating and infuriating, it should send a message to the Iraqis there isn't a will there. Our enemies know that, so they push on us. They push on us in Iraq, and we are watching the real estate be taken over, with black flags flying over it.

We are watching the will of the Iraqi troops to collapse in the face of the enemy. We have watched, as I said, the refinery of Baiji is now invaded and occupied, Fallujah is, and Ramadi is—multiple cities—Tal Afar, on and on, multiple cities in Iraq taken over, who now have a black flag of al Qaeda's affiliate, ISIS, flying over it.

The influence of America is diminished and pushed backwards. Iraq looks to Iran as an ally. They wonder if the U.S. is going to do anything.

That is what we are faced with, Mr. Speaker. We are faced with a Russia that is pushing hard against the free world, a Putin who took the glory of the Olympics and the Russian hypernationalism that flowed from it and decided that he would immediately, after the Olympics in Sochi, went in and invaded and occupied Crimea.

He had a base there with a lease on it. If it was just a place to operate from, he could have done that peacefully, without violating international law and without going and invading and occupying. He could have operated freely out of his naval base there in Crimea. He chose not to do that.

I think it is ironic that Yalta was invaded and occupied by Putin. That was the location where Stalin and Churchill and Franklin Delano Roosevelt negotiated the line across Europe that was to be the line in the aftermath of the Second World War, which became the Iron Curtain and became the dividing line between east and west.

Yalta was invaded and occupied as a component of Crimea, by Putin riding on the wave of Russian hypernationalism that came from the success of the Olympics, and now, he is pushing into Ukraine and testing them.

We know that—no, let's just say this, Mr. Speaker: we believe that, when troops show up and they are wearing Russian uniforms and they are carrying Russian weapons and they appear to be deployed as Russian troops in everything except a lacking of insignias on their uniforms and not flying a Russian flag, who do we think these people are? Do we think they are something other than Russians?

Why would we think that some force that looks, for all the world, like Russian forces—because Putin doesn't admit that they are Russian, somehow they might have come from someplace else. Who do we think they are? The Russians, the Russians in Russian uniforms, with Russian equipment, Russian supplies, Russian systems, everything except the Russian insignias.

Meanwhile, we don't hear from the President of the United States in a strong way, and meanwhile, Ukrainians wonder what is going to happen. They wonder if they have a chance of defending themselves. They wonder if any other part of the world is going to do that. Are we going to see the Iron Curtain be pushed westerly again?

When the Berlin Wall came down November 9, 1989, that was the crashing down of the Iron Curtain. For a time, freedom echoed across Europe, all the way across Europe. In fact, it echoed, at least theoretically, all the way across Asia, to the Pacific Ocean, and it has been pushed back again by the strong arm of Vladimir Putin.

Now, we are seeing a line of demarcation between east and west that is being redefined by Putin with his hypernationalism, in his effort to restore the old Soviet Union—the former Soviet Union.

The Eastern bloc countries are very nervous about what happens with a very aggressive Putin. They are very nervous because they wonder: Do they have an ally in the United States?

They wonder if they can hang on for another 2½ years until a new President is elected that is going to believe in America, in a robust America, an America that defends itself, an America that has bonded with its allies, an America that has tax and regulatory policies that allows for the growth over a free enterprise system, so that we can see an economic vigor that will drive our economy here and give us confidence in who we are again and go to the furthest outreaches of the world where Americans are doing business in country after country.

The AmCham, the American Chamber of Commerce, and nation after nation become the ambassadors of the United States. They teach the world about trade and free enterprise. They teach the world about we have an American—it is not a hypernationalism. What it is is a very active commercial style. I would give an example.

As I deal with the Australians, for example—and I have a special affection for the Aussies—they will come and make contact, and they will make friends, and they will be sociable. Then they will go away, come back again, and do that same thing.

On the third time, they are more likely to bring up the discussion about the business that they want to conduct, Mr. Speaker, but Americans are not like that. We are a little bit different.

We are more like the Donald Trumps, where we come in, we figure out what we want to do businesswise, we think we understand what the other party needs and wants in a business deal, we believe that all parties involved in a business deal need to have an opportunity to profit.

So if \$1 is going to change hands with one other person, two people need to benefit from that, the buyer and the seller. If it is a three-way deal, then three entities benefit. If it is thousands or tens of thousands of people—shareholders, for example—everybody is designed to benefit from that.

We go in and we say: Here is the deal. This is our proposal. This is why it is good for you. This is why it is good for us. This is why we ought to sign here on the dotted line. We will get around to all the niceties and discussion afterwards. Maybe we will have a meal or a drink together, but let's do the business, and then we will talk about the social side.

That is the American way. We do business fast. We do business efficiently. It is a culture that has developed in this country because we have had an unfettered ability to buy, sell, trade, make, gain—here in America, without a government interference, without the belief that we had to set at the table negotiators that represented

the government, negotiators that represented the unions, to sit and talk with the negotiators that represented the capital.

In America, we do business with capital—capital because we do business for a profit and capital deserves a return on its investment. Labor gets the benefit from that profit by increasing wages and benefits to hire the best people to produce that good or service that has a marketable value.

That is what has made America's economy great, is our attitude about buy, sell, trade, make, gain, do good, produce goods and services with a marketable value here and abroad.

Let's send our Americans abroad to do business, let them take our values there, let them encourage people to come here and do business with us, and let's open up our trade wherever we can all over the world, with a free and smart trade system, that if we are going to grant access to our markets, what we ask is let us also have access to your markets.

We don't believe etiologically in trade protectionism. We believe in free and smart trade. We don't believe in stupid trade. Stupid trade would be, well, you have access to our markets, but it is okay with us if we don't have access to yours. No deal.

Americans make a lot of deals, and we make them efficient, we make them smart, we make them fast, and we make them all over the world. That has been a foundation of the burgeoning growth of the American economy and the American civilization.

It has been restrained in recent years because we have a leadership that has failed to convince me that they believe in free enterprise.

We should remember that, even on the immigration flashcards that we have, Mr. Speaker, when legal immigrants come to America and they want to study to become citizens of the United States, they will study the history of this country and the things that are necessary to be prepared to take the naturalization test.

USCIS, the Citizenship and Immigration Services, has a collection of flashcards that they can study from, so they can be prepared for the test.

These flashcards are laminated. They are about this big. They are mostly red in their base with white letters on them, and you can look at them and ask this question: Who is the Father of our Country? Flip that card around. The answer: George Washington.

Who emancipated the slaves? Other side of the card: Abraham Lincoln. What is the economic system of the United States of America? Flip the card over: free enterprise capitalism, Mr. Speaker.

Now, I wish that the White House believed in it as much we ask our legal immigrants to believe in it as they prepare for the test for the naturalization to citizenship of the United States. That is part of who we are; yet our economy is stagnant, it is flat.

There seems to be an attitude that emerges from the administration that free enterprise and that capitalism itself is somehow a dirty word. No, it is a foundation of the economy of the United States of America. It is on the test.

They believe, as I watch their reaction, that somehow the capital, the employers, are victimizing both employees and customers and that there is plenty of money there and plenty of profit there to pay for more regulation, to pay for more taxation, and to pay for more raises and wages and benefits for employees that could be dictated by the White House.

That is not the American way. It has got to be free enterprise. The relationship between the employer and the employee is up to them, not up to the government. The government can't set wages.

A government can't determine that one work is comparable to another work. Only supply and demand can do that effectively and efficiently. That is the American way, Mr. Speaker.

There are other things that are the American way. For example, we don't support lawbreakers. We don't believe that people who habitually, in a calculated way, systematically violate America's laws should be rewarded for doing so.

We understand that, when Ronald Reagan said, what you tax, you get less of; what you subsidize, you get more of; and if you subsidize lawbreakers—if you reward lawbreakers, you get more lawbreakers.

I was disappointed with Ronald Reagan. I was disappointed twice during his administration. I watched him closely. I believe that Ronald Reagan understood the founding principles of this country so confidently and so clearly that no amount of lobbying, no amount of rhetoric, no amount of misinformation was going to change his adherence to the fundamental principles that are the pillars of American exceptionalism.

So here in this Congress, in 1986, in the House and down through the rotunda and the Senate, there was an intense debate about amnesty.

The debate went something like this: There are 1 million illegal immigrants in America. They have come across the border—generally across the border from Mexico—and it is too difficult, we can't deport them all—I think I have heard that before—so we must make an accommodation to them.

We are having difficulty getting enforcement at the border because there are competing interests in those who would drag down the effort to enforce our immigration laws, especially secure the border, but we can get full cooperation on border security and full cooperation on domestic enforcement if we just give amnesty to the million people that are here illegally, and from this point forward hereafter, we will all enthusiastically join together and enforce immigration law, and INS will be

in every office of every employer in America, examining your records, to make sure that you are carefully following the law and being there to be the tool to help enforce immigration law.

I listened to that, and I thought: President Reagan, you know you can't reward lawbreakers. If you do that, you are going to get more lawbreakers—just like if you subsidize any activity, you are going to get more of that activity, and if you tax it, you are going to get less of it.

Well, the penalty for violating the law is equivalent to a taxation. It is a deterrent for violating the law. The greater the penalty, the less law violators that you have.

□ 2030

The less the penalty, the greater the incentive, the more law violators you have. So, if you wanted to subsidize lawbreakers, you are going to get lots more lawbreakers.

These arguments, I thought, were so clear that I didn't need to go stand outside the White House with a sign. I could just write a letter here and there and with great confidence raise my family, run my business, and have trust that the President of the United States would veto that Amnesty Act that was to come to his desk in 1986.

It came to his desk and the people around him strongly encouraged President Reagan to sign the Amnesty Act and take all of this disagreement and all of this angst off the table that had to do with the million illegal aliens who had entered the United States illegally or were unlawfully present in America, give them a legal presence and be done with it, and INS will enforce this law at the border—Border Patrol—and internally at Immigration and Naturalization Services.

Ronald Reagan signed the Amnesty Act. In my construction office, as an employer, I hit the high levels of frustration, at least for that stage of my life, but I began to comply with the law.

When we had applicants for jobs that came in, I made sure that I took the records that they have. I made sure that I evaluated their documents and their Social Security card, if I could get it. Most of the times, I could then. And a driver's license. At least two forms of identification.

I made sure that our job application form collected the records necessary that were required by that 1986 Amnesty Act. I made sure that I kept those records for every applicant. I was prepared for our employees and the applicants for the jobs that wanted to come in and work for King Construction, and I made sure that I had all those records up to snuff. I was meticulous in keeping those records and making sure that my executive secretary kept those records because I feared—or I was concerned—I don't know that I was afraid, because I did it right—but I expected INS, or Immigration and Naturalization Services, the forerunner to



now ICE, to show up at my office and say, We want to see your records. We want to make sure that you haven't hired anybody illegally. We want to make sure you haven't entertained hiring anybody illegally. We want to make sure that you have collected the documentation so that you are not enabling the employment of illegal aliens in America.

Well, you all know this, Mr. Speaker. Nobody ever showed up from INS, as they didn't show up in millions of employers' offices around the country. The enforcement didn't materialize domestically. It didn't really get enhanced at the border either. The promise of enforcement came unfilled, but the promise of amnesty for a million people came in triplicate.

Three times the number of people that were projected to be amnestied by the 1986 Amnesty Act were actually granted amnesty. Over 3 million of them were granted amnesty. I have met with a respectable number of them at random and happenstance over the years, and I asked them, What do you think of amnesty? They will look at me and they will say, I support amnesty. I think it was a good idea. Amnesty was good for me, amnesty was good for my family. Amnesty is a good policy.

So I say, What do you think about the rule of law and what do you think about the reward when people break the law? Should they be rewarded for it?

Well, that takes them off in a place they don't want to discuss. They just know what was good for them. I don't disagree. It was good for them, but it was bad for America. It was really bad for America, because here we are 28 years later and we are still debating the issue. The carrot of amnesty still hangs out in front of people from all over the world that says, Well, Americans have a soft heart. They are the most generous Nation in the world, welcoming immigrants to the tune of 1.2 million legal immigrants a year.

We don't even care about the quality of the standards of those who are coming into America legally—not very much, anyway—because between 7 and 11 percent of the legal immigration in America is immigration that is measured by some kind of a standard that might be an index of what they can do to contribute to our country.

Every nation in the world should have an immigration policy that is designed to enhance the economic, social, and the cultural well-being of that country.

I have long stated and continue to believe that we must have an immigration policy here that is designed to enhance the economic, social, and cultural well-being of the United States of America. We can't operate an immigration policy that seems to be designed to become the safety valve for those in poverty in the world—over 7 billion people. The poverty in the world grows at a faster rate than we have the abil-

ity to drain off even those who are the most aggrieved by poverty.

By the way, the numbers that I have seen when we were back at about 6 billion people on the planet were that there were about 4.6 billion people on the planet that had a lower standard of living than the average person from Mexico.

So if you think about alleviating poverty, there are many places to draw people from where the poverty is worse. And there are many places to draw people from where the perpetrators of violence come in significantly greater numbers.

However, even the violent death rate in the United States is only one-third of the violent death rate in Mexico. If you compare violent death rates in other countries, Mexico is one of the safer countries from Central America and on south. I think you actually have to get down to Chile before you find a country that has a violent death rate in the Western Hemisphere comparable to the lower death rate of the United States.

At one time, Colombia had a violent death rate 15.4 times that of the United States. Our rate today is 6.5 violent deaths per 100,000. Roughly 10 years ago, our violent death rates was 4.5 violent deaths per 100,000. At that time, Mexico's violent death rate was 13.2. A 4.6 violent death rate in the U.S., a 13.2 violent death rate in Mexico.

Drug wars and the massive killings that have taken place that have exceeded 50,000 people in Mexico—maybe 70,000 or more that have died in the drug wars—that is part of the statistic that has taken Mexico at a higher violent death rate now of over 18 per 100,000, and perhaps there is some index here that the U.S. violent death rate has gone in that period of time from 4.6 on up to 6.5 violent deaths per 100,000, but the ratio remains the same. Mexico is about three times more violent than the U.S., but it is significantly less violent than countries like Honduras, El Salvador, and Guatemala.

It has been stated here in this Congress that the highest murder rate, I believe, in the world, is Honduras. I have not seen those numbers, Mr. Speaker, and I don't know that that is true, but I can tell you the violent death rate in Guatemala is 74.9 violent deaths per 100,000 compared to 6.5 violent deaths per 100,000 in the United States.

It is easy enough to do the math. It is a little more than 11 times the violent death rate of the United States in Guatemala. So there is significant violence there, but some of the people that are the perpetrators of that violence are also migrants.

If we look at McAllen, Texas, and the housing that is taking place as illegal immigrants come across the border, it looks like thousands and probably tens of thousands of what I will call migrants that appear to be coming from Guatemala, El Salvador, and Honduras, they come a thousand miles through

Mexico, arrive at the Rio Grande River, and stage themselves to try to come across the river into the United States.

They are brought across by coyotes who are part of the drug cartels. Sometimes they come on jet skis, sometimes in rafts, sometimes in inner tubes. They come across the river.

The staging that is there and the pushing of the people that are in here, the mix of the population that are being picked up at McAllen, Texas, is reported in the Guatemalan newspaper to be this. Of that mix of unaccompanied minors—certainly, they aren't all unaccompanied minors, but it is a special category—of that mix, 80 percent are male—that is, 8 out of 10 are boys, 2 out of 10 are girls—younger than 18. They are 17 and younger. Eighty percent boys, 20 percent girls.

Of the country of origin, two-thirds of them are from the three countries that we have defined as OTMs, or other than Mexicans—Guatemala, El Salvador, and Honduras. That is two-thirds of them.

We see pictures of little kids. We hear stories of a 3-year-old, a 2-month-old, 4, 5, 6, and 7-year-olds. Yes, they are there. They are there in some kind of numbers. Mostly, those younger kids are in the company of, generally, a mother or a parent.

Of those unaccompanied minors, 83 percent of them—let me get my numbers right here—80 percent are boys. Eighty-three percent of them fit this age group, Mr. Speaker, and that is they are either 15, 16, or 17 years old. Eighty percent are boys and 83 percent fit those three ages—prime ages for gang recruitment.

It isn't all innocents that are coming into America through this. Yet we have a heart, we have an obligation. The first thing we have to do is stop this, and we have to send them back and we have to require the countries of origin to distribute them in the places they want them to live in their country of origin.

We have an agreement. The reason only 12 percent are from Mexico is we have an agreement forged by a bill that passed this Congress in 2008 that requires Health and Human Services to negotiate a repatriation policy. So when we pick up the unaccompanied minors, within 48 hours they are to be turned over to Mexican authorities and taken back to their homes in Mexico, to a significant degree. And not always within 48 hours. That does work, which is why we don't see a larger number of Mexicans coming in on that.

But the OTMs—the other than Mexicans—are exploiting a loophole because we don't have an agreement with those countries. We need to change the statute here in Congress and send a bill to the President that negotiates an agreement so those countries can receive those unaccompanied minors. They will be required to do so. And if we fail to reach those agreements, we should then freeze the foreign aid to those countries so that that amount cannot increase to provide them an incentive.

I would remind the people, Mr. Speaker, who are sending their children here, releasing a child and saying, Go across a thousand miles of Mexico, go with enough pesos to pay mordida to get to the United States, and present yourself to the Border Patrol and say, I am afraid that I'll be killed in my country, I remind them that in this country, if a mother or a father loses track of their child and their child wanders off down the street, they are guilty of child endangerment. They are guilty of child abandonment.

If they are guilty of that, maybe not always on the first offense, but on subsequent offenses we do this. We take those children into the custody of our Health and Human Services, whichever the State may be, and we can terminate the parental rights and we can place that child into foster care and we can transfer that child into adoption. Because we in this country do not tolerate parents who abandon their children or fail to take care of their children or endanger their children.

That is the very description of what happens if you send a child across a thousand miles of a country. That has got to stop, Mr. Speaker. I will be introducing legislation very soon that addresses that very topic.

I appreciate your attention and indulgence, and I yield back the balance of my time.

#### MAKE IT IN AMERICA: INFRASTRUCTURE

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I have to catch my breath after listening the last hour to an unbelievable stream of consciousness.

I want to be very specific about some things that we really need to do here in Congress.

Often, we come to the floor in the evening and we talk about the subject of making it in America, rebuilding the American economy brick by brick, road by road, job by job, and putting the manufacturing sector back on its feet.

Today, my colleagues and I want to talk about one part of that Make It in America agenda, and that is not the trade, taxes, energy, labor, education, or research, but rather the infrastructure part of that equation.

Infrastructure is the foundation upon which any economy grows. And the American infrastructure has a problem.

Here is the problem.

The American infrastructure is falling down, falling apart, overused, overworn, and in desperate need of rebuilding. We can do it. America once built the greatest infrastructure in the world. We are falling way, way behind

in our own country and we are not even keeping up with other countries, such as China, which is building everything everywhere and laying in place an infrastructure that will carry them into the future.

□ 2045

Here is why we are not keeping up. Here is why we are falling down. Here is why we have potholes. Here is why cars are losing their ability to stay on the road. It is not because the drivers can't drive but because we are not spending the money that we once did. Way back in 2002, we were spending some \$325 billion a year. Right now, we are down to somewhere below \$250 billion on infrastructure. That is why we see bridges collapsing. That is why we have the transportation snarls and all of the problems in our transportation system.

As they say in the Middle East, just wait. It will get worse. Here in America, we are just 2 months away from this happening. We are going to fall off the transportation bridge. The funding for transportation programs, funded by the Federal Government, will run out of money sometime in August, perhaps in early September, depending on several factors that are simply unknown, but the funding for the maintenance and construction of our roads and bridges by the Federal Government will be over. There will be no more Federal funding available unless this Congress acts.

We have a roadmap. We have a plan. We have a program. President Obama and the Transportation Department, with Secretary Foxx, recently laid out a program called the GROW AMERICA Act. It is a program that would provide \$302 billion over the next 4 years, which is money that is desperately needed for rail, buses, ports, the freight system—"buses" meaning light rail, heavy rail. It is for the transit systems in our cities and the rail systems—Amtrak—bridges and highways. All of this is available. The GROW AMERICA Act is a real proposal. It is one that this Congress should take up. If there are some who have better ideas and better plans, bring them forward. For highways, it is about \$199 billion. For bridges and buses, it is about \$79 billion and about \$10 billion for the freight systems. For the rail, it is another \$10 billion to \$12 billion.

All of this is possible, but we need to do this. We need to finance it, and this program by the President is fully financed. The \$302 billion relies upon the existing excise tax that all of us pay for our gasoline, for our diesel fuel. The President would add another \$100 billion or so to fill up the pot so that we would have the \$302 billion, which is some 27 percent more than we presently are spending on the transportation system. Where does that extra money come from? It comes from corporate reforms, but that is not the only proposal on how to finance our transportation system.

In a few minutes, I will turn this over to my colleague from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), who will talk about that in some more detail. Also joining us tonight is my colleague from Kansas City, Missouri (Mr. CLEAVER), who will be talking about his transportation system in that area.

But this is a real plan—a real proposal—all of the details that we would need on how we could develop the freight programs: where you would connect the ports to the rail systems, how you would provide those intermodal proposals, how we could repair the bridges—the funding for it—over a period of time, and the highways. It is all coordinated around fixing the things that are broken, not necessarily adding but fixing first, fixing what is broken.

For the rail systems, critically important is the intercity rail, which is the Amtrak system here on the east coast. Then this happens to be the Capitol Corridor in my own district, which runs from Roseville, all the way through San Jose and through San Francisco. It is one of the most heavily used rail corridors in the entire system.

One of the things that we also talk about here in the Make It In America is that we spend our tax money on American-made goods. If we are going to spend \$302 billion of American taxpayer money, my legislation would increase the Buy American provisions, and I want to give you just one brief example of what it means:

This is the most modern locomotive in the United States, and it is, arguably, one of the most modern electric locomotives in the entire world. It is built in Sacramento. This is money that was made available in the American Recovery Act, the stimulus bill. Written into that bill was a provision that said that money—some \$800 million—for Amtrak locomotives had to be spent 100 percent on American-made locomotives. Siemens, the big German manufacturing company, looked at that, and it said: \$800 million and 100 percent American made? We could do that. So they took their factory in Sacramento and expanded it, and this is the first locomotive among those that will come off the lines—some 70 or 80 of them—that will be 100 percent American made. This locomotive will soon be operating here on the East Coast Corridor. Eventually, we will get those in Sacramento, but those will be diesel electric.

The final point I want to make before turning this over to my colleague Mr. BLUMENAUER is this. These were men and women in my district—Fairfield, California—in December of last year, who attended a job fair that I put on in Fairfield. I expected to find a few of my fellow citizens attending that. This job fair took place in December, and the temperature was just below 40 degrees. It was a foggy and rather cold day. More than 1,000 people lined up outside our job fair seeking a job.