

deal was negotiated by the administration, in secret, without the proper input or oversight from the Congress. The grapevine tells us—because they are not talking to us directly—that it will do nothing to address currency manipulation, the mother of all trade barriers.

Just one consequence is an \$8,000 cost advantage to a Japanese vehicle sold in the United States, which is then used to subsidize parts, advertising, or to undercut the cost of a vehicle in the marketplace. In fact, Toyota made more in profits last year from currency manipulation than Ford made last year in its entire worldwide operations.

What I know about the domestic auto industry is that they can outcompete any of their competitors in the world, but they cannot outcompete the Bank of Japan or the Japanese Government.

Those who care about the constitutional responsibilities of Congress should oppose Fast Track.

FULLY FUND HOMELAND SECURITY

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my deep disappointment in the votes that were just taken by the House.

We should be fully funding Homeland Security in this country. In light of what went on in Paris, in light of September 11, in light of the fact that there are terrorist cells, we need the Department of Homeland Security to be fully funded.

If there are differences of opinion with the President on the immigration bill, then that should be fought in an immigration bill, but we shouldn't mix apples with oranges.

My mother used to say, "You shouldn't cut off your nose to spite your face." That is exactly what this House did just before: we cut off our nose to spite our face.

To prove a point of dissatisfaction with the President, we cut funds for Homeland Security. That is an irresponsible act, and I really wish it would be reversed. We need to fully fund Homeland Security. The fight on immigration is the fight on immigration. Let's not mix apples with oranges, to quote another metaphor.

I am terribly disappointed, and I say to my colleagues that the Department of Homeland Security needs to be fully funded. We should be adding funds to keep our people safe, not pulling them away.

COMMITTED TO FIGHTING THE WAR ON TERROR

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I started out this week to remind Ameri-

cans of the difficult times in which we live. Sadly, today, rather than passing a clean Homeland Security Appropriations bill upon which Americans are depending to secure this land, we had a political fight.

I want to remind those around the world that America still stands strong and committed to fighting the war on terror. In joining with our friends in Africa against the horrific actions of Boko Haram and the suicide bombings that they are forcing 10-year-old children to do, we stand with our friends in Europe and around the world.

Most of all, what we must do is find a way to steer the young lives that are being captured by the Internet and on-line brutality away from these kinds of dastardly acts.

I think it is important that we find a way to educate the young boys and girls in Nigeria and in countries around the world and to be able to say to them that there is a greater and better life of opportunity and humanity.

I am committed, as we move in this legislative process, to focus on removing the dastardly acts of these terrorists and on saving our boys and girls.

COSPONSORING LEGISLATION—CHANGES IN POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I will only take a few minutes and then yield the bulk of the time to Mr. CLYBURN.

I rise about a particular situation that has happened to me and, I am sure, has happened to other Members that you might not be aware of. Other Members can sign you on to a piece of legislation without your consent, and that happened to me just this week.

Representative DIANE BLACK signed me on to H.R. 217, which is a particularly strong anti-choice bill and a bill that I would never support. Now, it was an honest mistake.

My name is ADAM SMITH. Regrettably, there is an ADRIAN SMITH, who serves—well, not "regrettably." ADRIAN is a very nice man, but he is someone who has a name very close to mine, "ADRIAN SMITH." She thought it was ADRIAN SMITH she was signing on to the bill. She signed me on to the bill instead, and that creates two problems and two things that I would urge this body to change.

First of all, nobody should be able to sign you on to a bill without your signature. Now, I know we do that, and that speeds up the process, but it creates a situation where anyone can put you on any bill. In this case, I was put on a bill that is polar opposite to my personal beliefs and my 18-year record in Congress.

The second thing that is really problematic about this is you would as-

sume—well, okay—there is a simple fix: just take it off. To her credit, as soon as she noticed the mistake, Congresswoman BLACK did just that—she had my name removed as a cosponsor—but that is not what happens.

On the bill that is out there with the original cosponsors, my name does not simply disappear. A line is drawn through it, and it is said next to it "withdrawn" as if, at some point, I did cosponsor the bill and then changed my mind.

I don't know how we change this rule, but when this happens—when it is clear that someone signs you on to a bill you had no intention of being on—your name should be removed. Period. End of story. It was never really there in the first place.

Now, as a part of my permanent record, there is my name as having been on a bill—to all appearances as my own choice—that, in a million years, I never would have cosponsored.

I rise to make that point clear to my constituents, first of all. I never signed on to it, and I never had any intention. Second of all, as I will do in a letter that I will send to the Speaker and to the minority leader, I would urge us to at least change that second policy.

Once it is clear that you never intended to sign on to a bill, your name should simply be removed. It should not be there with a line through it as if you did intend to sign on to the bill at one time. I think this is potentially damaging to a lot of Members.

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

ONE RIVER, ONE BOAT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend, Mr. SMITH, for allowing me to share this time with him.

Mr. Speaker, in keeping with the tradition of the First Amendment—a law deeply ingrained in the core of American values—I would like to put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the poem "One River, One Boat."

This poem was written by South Carolina's poet laureate, Marjory Wentworth, in anticipation of reading it at today's gubernatorial inauguration. It illustrates the history of my home State and ponders a look at the path the State seems to be embarking upon going forward.

Ms. Wentworth has recited a poem at the last three gubernatorial inaugurations, but she will not be reciting a poem at today's. She was told that her participation would make the program too lengthy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have attended several inaugurations of South Carolina's Governors. Some were shorter than others. None were allotted a specific amount of time. South Carolinians are proud of their poet laureates, but all have not always agreed

with the import of their writings. I believe it is wrong to not include this prolific, artistic expression in this year's ceremony.

Recently, individuals across the globe are living in fear of censorship when free speech and expression should be a fundamental right. We have even seen cowardly individuals use their own beliefs to badger, batter, and even murder those whose views and expressions they have found discomforting.

We have seen many instances of arbitrary actions against the powerless by the powerful when words and actions threaten their comfort levels. Such actions should not be.

I applaud Ms. Wentworth for her touching words, and I am reading her poem today in hopes that the people of South Carolina, across the country, and peoples around the world are as touched by her words as I have been.

ONE RIVER, ONE BOAT

(By Marjory Wentworth, poet laureate of South Carolina)

Because our history is a knot
we try to unravel, while others
try to tighten it, we tire easily
and fray the cords that bind us.

The cord is a slow moving river,
spiraling across the land
in a succession of S's,
splintering near the sea.

Picture us all, crowded onto a boat
at the last bend in the river:
watch children stepping off the school bus,
parents late for work, grandparents

fishing for favorite memories,
teachers tapping their desks
with red pens, firemen suiting up
to save us, nurses making rounds,

baristas grinding coffee beans,
dockworkers unloading apartment size
containers of computers and toys
from factories across the sea.

Every morning a different veteran
stands at the base of the bridge
holding a cardboard sign
with misspelled words and an empty cup.

In fields at daybreak, rows of migrant
farm workers standing on ladders, break
open

iced peach blossoms; their breath rising
and resting above the frozen fields like
clouds.

A jonboat drifts down the river.

Inside, a small boy lies on his back;
hand laced behind his head, he watches
stars fade from the sky and dreams.

Consider the prophet John, calling us
from the edge of the wilderness to name
the harm that has been done, to make it
plain, and enter the river and rise.

It is not about asking for forgiveness.

It is not about bowing our heads in shame;
because it all begins and ends here:
while workers unearth trenches

at Gadsden's Wharf, where 100,000

Africans were imprisoned within brick walls
awaiting auction, death, or worse.

Where the dead were thrown into the water,
and the river clogged with corpses
has kept centuries of silence.

It is time to gather at the water's edge,
and toss wreaths into this watery grave.

And it is time to praise the judge
who cleared George Stinney's name,
seventy years after the fact,
we honor him; we pray.

Here, where the Confederate flag still flies

beside the Statehouse, haunted by our past,
conflicted about the future; at the heart
of it, we are at war with ourselves

huddled together on this boat
handed down to us—stuck
at the last bend of a wide river
splintering near the sea.

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

RADICAL ISLAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it has been an interesting short week. And with all the drills in the world going on, it is important that we deal with our Department of Homeland Security. And I am proud the House has taken quick action to pass such a budget and passed it handily.

Homeland Security needs to be funded, and the President needs to sign the bill. We have finished that today and are sending it to the Senate. Hopefully they will work quickly and deal with this issue because, as people in America know, we have crises all around us. We have threats to our security all around us that require immediate attention.

The world is watching as we play golf while they come together, millions at a time, to stand against radical Islam and Islamic terrorism.

So it has been interesting to see the White House as the only significant international capital where the ultimate leader of the country cannot bring himself and, therefore, his spokespeople cannot bring themselves, to say the words "radical Islamic terrorism," because that is what we are talking about.

And for an administration to diminish the seriousness of radical Islamic terrorists wanting to destroy Western civilization is worse than having our leadership's head in the sand, or wherever their head is. It is important to wake up and recognize what the world has recognized, what our Muslim friends have recognized—that radical Islam is a threat to our very existence and way of life.

The Weekly Standard has an article, January 13, by Daniel Halper, which says: "The White House won't be calling jihadists adherents to 'radical Islam.' At least, that's the reasonable takeaway from this extraordinary exchange the White House press secretary had today with a reporter."

And I will jump down to a statement by President Obama's chief spokesperson:

Mr. Earnest: I think the reason is twofold. One is I certainly wouldn't want to be in a position where I'm repeating the justification that they have cited that I think is completely illegitimate, right? That they have invoked Islam to try to justify their attacks.

And the reporter said:

But to call it radical Islam you feel would be playing into their hands.

Mr. Earnest: Well, I think what I'm trying to do is I'm trying to describe to you what happened and what they did. These are individuals who are terrorists. And what they did was they tried to invoke their own distorted deviant view of Islam to try to justify them.

And I want to stop there. The President's mouthpiece says that he is not going to call it "radical Islam" or "Islamic terrorism" because that is a deviant view. Well, if you look at the definition of "deviant," that is what deviates from what most people do or say or think.

So it would appear, Mr. Speaker, that the deviant thought process is not what the reporters had and not what the major countries in the world have and not what our Muslim leader friends in the world have. It is what this White House has. Theirs is the deviation from what is truth, because the truth is—as much as this President doesn't want to say it, and he doesn't allow his spokespeople to say it, I will say it, Mr. Speaker: this is radical Islamic terrorism, and it is a threat to Western civilization.

And the more our leaders refuse to recognize it for what it is, the worse it gets because the radical Islamic terrorists realize they are winning. And the Organization of the Islamic Conference, the OIC, composed of the Islamic states in the world, all 57—I know it gets confusing to some in this country's leadership whether we have 57 States and they have 50 or they have 57 and we have 50. But they have 57 because they include one that is not actually a state. But they are the ones that started the campaign after 9/11 of calling anyone who expresses concern about radical Islamic terrorism "Islamophobes."

I fear God. I don't fear any man. I am not a phobe of anything. But it is time to recognize truth, and that is that radical Islamic terrorists want to destroy our life and kill us. It is very simple.

And what is remarkable—and I think it is very important that both Democrats and Republicans have the opportunity to travel around and speak to world leaders in their own countries because when you are there in their country talking to them, as some of us on both sides of the aisle have done in those Middle Eastern countries, led by moderate Muslims who don't believe they need to have an explosive jihad, they recognize that the terrorism that is a threat to them, as moderate Muslims, and the terrorism that is a threat to us and Western civilization, is radical Islam. They recognize that it is a religion.

And they recognize that when people in the name of Allah and Islam take territory and claim they are their own caliphate, their own government, then you had better understand who they are and what they are. And in this case, the Islamic State has enough