

some of our most vulnerable. I think it is not the way we should go. We shouldn't be having government by cliff, but we also ought to be dealing with it in a thoughtful and reasonable fashion to make the adjustments that make it sustainable.

In the meantime, the Republican leadership ought to waive that rule—like they routinely do for things that they care about, like passing billions of dollars of unfunded tax cuts—to be able to allow the rebalancing to occur and the decisionmaking to be made in a thoughtful and reasonable fashion.

TWITTER AND FOREIGN TERRORIST ORGANIZATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this week we learned that three British school girls between the ages of 15 and 16 left their families and have gone to fight with ISIS in Syria.

How were they recruited to join? Well, apparently through social media. And they are not alone. Terrorists have used Twitter to radicalize thousands of young impressionable minds throughout the world and recruit new jihadists. They have also used it as a way to fundraise millions of dollars for their reign of terror. ISIS also uses Twitter to broadcast its barbaric acts and propaganda to the world.

On February 3, ISIS tweeted a video of its evil, horrific burning of a captured Jordanian pilot. Last August, when ISIS released a gruesome beheading of American journalist James Foley, it did so on, yes, Twitter. There are many more examples.

All of these groups—ISIS, AQAP, AQIM—are officially listed as designated Foreign Terrorist Organizations by our government. Federal law prohibits giving aid or helping a designated Foreign Terrorist Organization. These FTOs use Twitter, an American company, as a tool, and no one is stopping them.

Why are American companies and the U.S. Government allowing social media platforms to be hijacked by terrorists? Some suggest that if the U.S. Government were to shut down terrorists' social media accounts, such measures would be violating terrorists' free speech rights. They are wrong. There are no constitutional protections to those who incite violence. No one supports the Bill of Rights more than I do, but free speech has its limitations, just as there are no constitutional protections for child pornography.

Terrorists should not have access to an American-controlled social media platform so they can kill, rape, pillage, and burn. There is precedence for this position. The Supreme Court has already ruled and held in the case of Holder v. Humanitarian Law Project that if someone has aided a designated Foreign Terrorist Organization, they do not have constitutional protections of free speech.

Twitter has argued that the Feds do not want the terrorists' Twitter accounts taken down because they, the Feds, want to track the bad guys. However, keeping these Twitter accounts up has neither stopped nor slowed the terrorists' recruitment, propaganda, calls for violence, or fundraising efforts. Instead, allowing the terrorists to continue using Twitter has helped radicalize hundreds of foreign fighters and raised millions of dollars for them.

The sad reality is that today, there are more terrorists using social media than ever before. Private American companies should not be operating as the propaganda mouthpiece of designated foreign terrorist organizations.

Mr. Speaker, during World War II, we never would have allowed America's foreign enemies to take out ads in The New York Times recruiting Americans to join the Nazis and go abroad and fight and kill Americans. Today is no different. Social media companies need to do more. Private companies not only have a public responsibility but a legal obligation to be proactive.

Section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act states that it is unlawful to provide a designated Foreign Terrorist Organization—like ISIS—with “material support or resources,” including “any property, tangible or intangible, or services.” That is about as comprehensive as you can get. You don't need to be a law school professor to understand this law actually applies to Twitter.

It is mind-boggling to think that those who behead and burn others alive are able to use our own companies against us to further their cause. This is nutty. But that is exactly what is occurring. As a result, there are more than 15,000 foreign fighters, many of whom have been radicalized online, now fighting in Iraq and Syria. That is more than there were in the 14 years of war in Afghanistan.

Designated Foreign Terrorist Organizations should not be allowed to use private American companies to reach billions of people with their violent hate propaganda and recruitment. It is time to put a stop to this. It is time for Twitter to take down terrorists' accounts.

And that is just the way it is.

HOMELAND SECURITY FUNDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate what the gentleman has just said about those challenges and threats, along with the undermining of our national security, but it is further at risk this week by our own hand; that is, the Congress of the United States.

The Department of Homeland Security will not be funded. There are 230,000 people who work at that Department, and 30,000 of them, mostly administrative personnel, will be laid off. The others, known as critically impor-

tant—essential employees who are on the front line—will work, but they won't get paid.

We can lament what others have done to undermine our national security and share—I think in a bipartisan way—the conclusion that we ought not to further those enterprises, but as I said, Mr. Speaker, by our own hand we are about to shut down the Department of Homeland Security. We have but 4 days to pass a bill continuing its funding.

I will say with all due respect, Mr. Speaker, to my friends on the other side of the aisle, shutting down the government is a strategy they have employed on a number of occasions. In 1995, we shut it down twice, for almost a month, maybe a little longer.

□ 1215

Just a few months ago, we shut it down again as a strategy—not as a happenstance, but as a strategy.

Again, Mr. Speaker, there are those who are saying in this House: Well, it won't matter if we shut down the Department of Homeland Security. Some of the folks are funded on fees, others will be required to work anyway, so let's just keep playing this Russian roulette with America's security and the safety of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, we are approaching the eleventh hour, and the House has not yet been given the opportunity to vote on a bill that, essentially, was agreed to by the Republican Appropriations Committee and reported to this floor, and we essentially passed it, but we passed it for a short period of time.

There was no debate on funding levels, Mr. Speaker. There was no debate on whether this provision and that provision should or should not be in the bill. We passed it.

Then the Republicans, Mr. Speaker, to accomplish another objective, have done what they said in the pledge to America they would not do, and that is put two different issues in the same bill. Well, they have put a poison pill in this bill.

If we fail to act and send the President a bill he can and will sign, a bill free from partisan policy riders, then thousands of our Homeland Security agents will be furloughed, and almost—as I said—200,000 others will be forced to work without pay.

Is that what America has come to? Surely not—the impact on our border security, law enforcement, and homeland security will be serious and make our country more vulnerable to threats.

I came to the rostrum after a gentleman on the other side of the aisle correctly expressed concerns about the threats that confront us. I would hope he would join me in advocating and urging the Republican leadership to bring to the floor a clean—and by clean, I simply mean a bill on which both parties have essentially agreed.

Chairman MIKE McCaul, the Republican who leads the House Committee

on Homeland Security said yesterday—Mr. Speaker, this is the Republican chairman of the Homeland Security Committee: “I fully believe we should not be playing politics with the national security agency like the Department of Homeland Security, particularly given the high threat environment that we’re in right now.”

What American would say it makes sense to play politics with Homeland Security in light of what the gentleman has just referenced and which all of us know to be the case?

We have people who want to harm us as a people and as a nation. Mr. Speaker, this body has a responsibility to the American people to do everything we can to make them as secure as we can and to make our country as secure as we can.

Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM, with whom I served in this body who now represents South Carolina and is a Republican Member of the Senate and an expert on national security, he told his Republican colleagues this—and, again, I quote: “The worst possible outcome for this Nation is to defund the Department of Homeland Security, given the multiple threats we face to our homeland, and I will not be part of it.”

None of us ought to be part of it. 435 of us ought to vote to fund the Homeland Security Department starting on Friday. I urge the Republican majority to heed this advice of Mr. McCaul, of Mr. GRAHAM, and, frankly, countless other Republicans in the Senate and some in the House to do the responsible thing and let this House work its will on the single subject of our national security.

If a clean Homeland Security appropriation bill were to come to the floor, I am confident—and I tell my friend and the majority leader, Mr. Speaker, every Democrat will vote for it. We are 188 strong.

Surely, there are 30 responsible Republicans who care more about our national security than their politics who would join us in voting for that bill—I am confident of that—many more, I think, than 30, but at least 30 would be needed, with 188, to get to the 218, and we would fund the Department of Homeland Security, and we could do it tomorrow.

We could probably do it today by unanimous consent—well, no, I don’t think we could do it by unanimous consent because there are some who continue to play politics with our national security.

If the majority is dissatisfied with our immigration policy which they articulate and legitimately can have an alternative view to express and to try to enact, that is the democratic process.

Offer a bill to change that which they do not like, not hold hostage the Department of Homeland Security until hopefully, from their standpoint, the President is bludgeoned into signing a bill that he does not agree with and he does not believe is good for our country and believes is bad for our economy.

If the majority is dissatisfied, bring a bill to the floor. Former Homeland Security Secretary Tom Ridge, also a Republican with whom I have served when he was a Representative from Pennsylvania, subsequently the Governor of Pennsylvania and then our first Secretary of Homeland Security, I want to quote him as well as I have quoted the other two Republicans that I have quoted.

“Political folly” and “bad policy,” that is Tom Ridge, former Republican Governor and mentioned for President. He went on to say: “I think the political repercussions could be severe. And, on top of that, the men and women of Homeland Security deserve better.”

Who wants to work for an employer that simply takes them hostage every few months and says to them: You may or may not get paid, you may or may not be able to come to work, you may or may not be able to do your job. It depends upon whether or not our political ends are served.

I urge Republican leaders to keep the pledge they made to the American people to consider issues one at a time. Bring a comprehensive immigration reform bill. If you don’t like what the President has done, bring a bill that changes that. We have the power to do that. Do it.

We can work in a bipartisan way to change our immigration policies through legislation and fix what everybody in this body believes is a broken system.

Bring a clean appropriation bill to the floor to fund the Department of Homeland Security, and then, as well, bring a bill to the floor on comprehensive immigration reform or the bill that our Republican friends think is the appropriate bill to fix a broken system, and we will vote and debate on that.

But let the Department of Homeland Security do its job for America, for Americans. Let’s exercise responsible, adult legislating this time.

HONORING THE FUGUITT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL HONOR GUARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. JOLLY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an exceptional group of young men in Pinellas County, Florida, the honor guard at Fuguit Elementary School in Largo.

Last week, I had the pleasure of visiting with 21 young men of Fuguit’s honor guard who have recognized the importance of respect, discipline, commitment, and speaking out against bullying. These are remarkable young men in third, fourth, and fifth grade.

The honor guard program at Fuguit was started by former Principal Michael Moss; teacher Rhonda Correa; and her husband, Frank Correa, a Marine Corps veteran. The Correas have continued to lead the program today under the leadership of Fuguit’s principal, Dr. Kathi Bentley.

The purpose of the honor guard is to develop structure, discipline, and leadership in young students who otherwise might face academic or behavioral challenges.

Each student signs the honor guard pledge, which reads: “As a Fuguit honor guard member, I am a student leader of this school. As a member, I promise to be truthful, respectful, helpful, and hardworking. I will act like an honorable gentleman and respect and honor the flag of the United States of America. I understand my success is my Nation’s success.”

Each day, the honor guard opens the school with the presentation of colors and the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. Speaker, the young men committed to this program represent future leaders both in Pinellas County and also in our Nation, and they deserve the recognition and encouragement of this body.

I am honored to recognize Fuguit Elementary School’s honor guard members today: in third grade—Romeo Greene, Sean Lange, Blake Logan, Levita Maafu, Troy Mason, George Mercado, Walit Morton, Daniel Mattrass, Micah Timberlake, and Bryce Young; in fourth grade—Domenic Barclay, Johnnie Chattman, Ari Davis, Matthew Kosinski, and Tyrek Tripp; and in fifth grade—Jon Dameron, Anthony Gonzalez, William Maafu, William Muscu, Steven Suero, and Andra Witchard.

Today, these young men serve as role models to the rest of Fuguit Elementary School and are held to a high standard, both academically and behaviorally. I rise today to recognize their efforts and commend the leadership at Fuguit who are committed to the mission to help these students grow into future leaders.

In closing, I would like to share the honor guard’s poem that they recited to me at the end of my visit with them. It is a fitting tribute from 21 young men to the exceptionalism of our Nation.

“We are the beacon of light, the hope of mankind, that shining city on a hill, the most beautiful, the most bountiful, the most generous people in the history of the world, the country that has birthed the great titans of science and industry, the country that put a man on the Moon, the country that has liberated tens of millions from the clutches of evil, the home of the brave, the undisputed champion of freedom, the great Republic, the United States of America.”

I thank the Fuguit honor guard for serving as an inspiration to so many, including to this Member of Congress.

May God bless each of them and their families, and may God bless these United States.

2015 FUNDING FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from