

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 discomfiting.

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 Jan-
uary 6, 2015, the gentleman from Texas
(Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 min-
utes 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 fund-
ed, 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 Amer-
ica know, we have crises all around us.
We have threats to our security all
around us that require immediate at-
tention.

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 ulti-
mate leader of the country cannot
bring himself and, therefore, his
spokespeople cannot bring themselves,
to say the words "radical Islamic ter-
rorism," because that is what we are
talking about.

And for an administration to dimin-
ish the seriousness of radical Islamic
terrorists wanting to destroy Western
civilization is worse than having our
leadership's head in the sand, or wher-
ever 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 call-
ing jihadists adherents to 'radical
Islam.' At least, that's the reasonable
takeaway from this extraordinary ex-
change the White House press sec-
retary had today with a reporter."

And I will jump down to a statement
by President Obama's chief spokes-
person:

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 justifica-
tion that they have cited that I think is
completely illegitimate, right? That they
have invoked Islam to try to justify their at-
tacks.

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 in-
dividuals who are terrorists. And what they
did was they tried to invoke their own dis-
torted deviant view of Islam to try to justify
them.

And I want to stop there. The Presi-
dent's mouthpiece says that he is not
going to call it "radical Islam" or "Is-
lamic terrorism" because that is a de-
viant view. Well, if you look at the def-
inition of "deviant," that is what devi-
ates 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 ter-
rorism, 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 terror-
ists realize they are winning. And the
Organization of the Islamic Con-
ference, the OIC, composed of the Is-
lamic 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 be-
cause they include one that is not ac-
tually 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 de-
stroy our life and kill us. It is very
simple.

And what is remarkable—and I think
it is very important that both Demo-
crats and Republicans have the oppor-
tunity 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 Mus-
lims, and the terrorism that is a threat
to us and Western civilization, is rad-
ical 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

strength and enough power to be taken seriously so that they are totally defeated and wiped off the map, whether it is in Syria, northern Iraq, wherever they find themselves, because they are at war with us.

And I mentioned it before, Mr. Speaker, but as we have had this administration do a cleansing—not necessarily a book-burning but a burning, in essence, of parts of the training books that talk about radical Islam, that tried to educate our FBI, our State Department, our intelligence communities, all of our government workers on what radical Islam is, what it believes, the intelligence officer said: We have blinded ourselves of the ability to see our enemy. And that has never been more apparent than it has been this week, with the radical Islamic jihad terrorist attack in Paris and in Nigeria.

Even though there weren't reporters killed in Nigeria, those lives were every bit as much precious—around 2,000 lives. Somehow, much of the mainstream media had trouble reporting that. They were concentrating on the horrors of the journalists killed in Paris, and rightfully so. But they should not be neglecting the horrors for those villagers, so many of them Christian, who have been killed because they did not believe in radical Islam.

And one of the reasons, I would submit, that we should have had a President there in Paris—and I know it would have been difficult for this President, but he should have been there locked arm-in-arm with Prime Minister Netanyahu. Words keep leaking out about things that are said, about strained relations that this administration has with the Netanyahu administration. There is a leader whose eyes are clear and his vision is clear, and he can see exactly who is at war against him, who is helping him and the nation of Israel and who is not helping him and the nation of Israel.

And as we know from history, anytime a nation's enemies see that nation's strongest ally pulling away, it is provocative. And the more the United States distances itself from Israel, from those who recognize that radical Islamic terrorism is a threat to Western civilization, then the more radical Islamists win.

□ 1300

I really, honest to goodness, didn't think we would be 6 years in to President Obama's administration with him still not willing to acknowledge that radical Islam is a threat, is at war with us.

It is a religion. This administration may not like it, but it is a religion. It is a radical form of Islam. I hope one day that our top leaders in this country will have the courage of President al-Sisi in Egypt and that will reflect, as General al-Sisi has, the will of the people of their country.

If the story is properly written about Egypt—and one day it will be. It won't

be by people at The New York Times. It will be by people who are not trying to twist and turn and create history the way they want it. It will be by historians that are really looking at what has happened.

They will see that in the last 6 years that, besides Israel, the country that has been most fearless—and by “country,” I mean the people of the country—most fearless in standing up for freedom and against radical Islamic terrorism, unfortunately, has not been the United States because of our leadership. It has been the nation of Egypt.

Certainly, Israel has stood strong and fearless. Their nation has been under attack nonstop. God bless them and protect them. Egypt was not under attack other than by the radical form of Islam, the religion of radical Islam, and this administration helped oust one of this country's allies.

Like him or not, there were plenty of agreements signed by this country with President Mubarak, and this administration disregarded them. That is a problem for other countries and other leaders who want to sign agreements with this administration, but they don't know that our country can be trusted anymore.

As people see the decline of respect for America around the world, they should understand that it is being credited to the lack of reliability of the United States to keep its word, to support its friends, not to turn its back on its friends. This Nation's leaders have begun repeatedly appearing more helpful to our enemies than to our own friends. They don't know who to trust.

I mentioned to Secretary Kerry that I have talked to people in the Middle East, Muslim leaders, who say: We talk among ourselves, we are all worried we may be the next ally to be thrown under the bus.

He wanted to know who said that. Well, obviously, I couldn't tell him because he would throw them under the bus.

For many of us that have traveled around the Middle East and talked to leaders in the Middle East, we understand what they feel. Maybe they are not able to be as open and candid with this administration for fear of it turning on them the way it does anybody within the administration here in America or outside the administration.

God help the whistleblowers. If you want to stand up for truth, justice, and the American way in this administration and point out massive problems that could subject our country to attacks, to terrorism, God help you because this administration is coming after you. They will use the Justice Department, they will use the EPA, they will use the IRS.

This administration has been weaponized to go after anybody that dares to stand up, especially within the administration. People that want to stand up and tell the truth, they are attacked, they are threatened with prosecution.

If someone like General Petraeus, who has defended the administration—but this administration knows that General Petraeus has information that would virtually destroy any credibility that the administration might still have nationally and internationally—so what else would this administration do but leave over his head, for over a year-and-a-half, the threat: We are going to prosecute you, so you better keep your mouth shut.

They actually know just the threat of prosecution helps diminish potential credibility. So if you wonder why General Petraeus has not come out in the last year and a half and said, “No, those weren't our talking points, somebody that created them needs to be prosecuted, it was a fraud on the American people,” he is not going to say that.

He has got this administration hanging a prosecution over his head. What do you expect? I doubt he will ever be able to say it without worrying about something over his shoulder coming after him.

Here he is. He has been defensive of the administration. He has been a good soldier. He has said what they wanted him to say. He hasn't told all he could say, and they are going to make sure he doesn't—or if he does, he pays a heavy criminal price. That is where we are now in America.

It may have been the kind of administration Richard Nixon dreamed of, but he knew he could never get there. He couldn't weaponize the IRS. He apparently dreamed of it. This administration has done it.

For the President, for his spokespeople not to be able to call the terrorism a result of radical Islamic terrorism, it weakens our country, it emboldens our enemies, and as we have seen, you may take out Osama bin Laden, but when you withdraw our troops prematurely before Iraq soldiers are ready to stand on their own and you have blinded ourselves of the ability to recognize that any believers like Khamenei or Ahmadinejad, the former President of Iran, if you have blinded yourself of the ability to learn and educate our administration on what they believe, then you are going to fall prey to everything they decide to do toward you and about you because you don't understand where they are coming from.

I repeatedly reflect on that scene in the movie “Patton,” and although he didn't know Rommel was not there with his tank division, he yells out in the movie after his tanks have defeated Rommel's: Rommel, you magnificent fatherless—I am paraphrasing—fatherless man, I read your book.

If you read and learn and educate yourself about your enemies, you have got a better chance of defeating them, but this administration continues to make it more and more difficult to understand who our enemies are. All of this backing up and crawfishing, well, you know, this isn't all Islam.

Of course, it is not all Islam. That is how I can go to Afghanistan and hug dear Muslim friends, we have the same enemies—and a big old bear of a man who led the Northern Alliance to defeat the Taliban by February of 2002 in the initial defeat is now the Vice President, and thank God he is.

Some of us that just met with the new leadership recently—and I have known General Dostum for a while and met with my good friend the Honorable Massoud.

President Ghani basically has gathered around him people a bit like what Lincoln did. He took people who opposed him, ran against him, but because he clearly cares deeply about Afghanistan, he gathered around him a team of rivals, and the good thing is, unlike the current administration here, he is not afraid of having people with opposing viewpoints around him.

He is just like Lincoln. Lincoln had rivals all around him, and he listened to their input. He got their opinions, and it helped him make better decisions. This administration here needs to do what President Ghani in Afghanistan is trying to do, and it is not easy because our U.S. administration here has been reaching out for the Taliban.

Initially, the Taliban are defeated, and then this administration comes in—and I know the prior administration started the massive occupation of Afghanistan with tens of thousands of troops.

This President comes in, and in his campaign, he said that was the real war. Well, yeah, but once you defeat your enemy in that part of the world, you don't help yourself by becoming an occupier—you add over 100,000 troops to the country that is so thrilled that you relieved them of radical Islamic leadership, then you become an enemy because, now, you are an occupier. We didn't do ourselves any favors.

There are people, unlike the Iraqis who threw down weapons and ran, turned them over to the Islamic State, in Afghanistan, the Northern Alliance was willing to fight the Taliban initially, and they are still willing to fight.

In fact, before President Ghani was elected—that was so much uncertainty: Is President Karzai going to try to have another term, even though it is against the constitution? Are they in for a civil war?

There was a great deal of trepidation on the part of the Northern Alliance that fought against the Taliban on our behalf with less than 500 American special ops and intelligence people embedded.

They knew we withdrew, and the Taliban were able to take over the national government. Then they were in for a war, and one of them told me: Look, since you have taken back the weapons, you don't support us anymore, and you are doing everything you can to help the Taliban—that is this administration—we realize the odds are that we will lose our lives, but we are not going down without a fight.

Well, fortunately, they have got a team of rivals leading the country. Prayers are with them. They are moderate Muslims that I trust, and they want the best for Afghanistan.

According to the military leaders I have talked to repeatedly in Afghanistan and others, the country of Pakistan has been the biggest supplier and supporter of the Taliban. The Taliban didn't do themselves any favors when they just, in such evil fashion, attacked a school and killed 140 or so precious people, including children.

There are many more in Pakistan that are saying: You know what, it is time to stop supporting the Taliban, it is time to worry about Pakistan.

Some have even started saying it is time to quit persecuting the Baloch people.

□ 1315

The arbitrary lines that were drawn many decades ago put probably the bulk of the Baloch people in southern Pakistan where most of their minerals are. It put the Baloch people within the arbitrary lines drawn for a country called Iran. In fact, the Baloch area actually is where the Straits of Hormuz are. It is where much of the oil and gas is.

I have grown to admire and love many of the Baloch people. I wouldn't mind seeing them having an independent Balochistan. I wouldn't mind seeing an independent Kurdistan in northern Iraq, because unlike what is portrayed in much of the mainstream media, the Kurds never threw down their weapons and ran away or turned them over to the Islamic State. They are people we can trust.

Mr. Speaker, a solution to our problem there would be to announce that we are going to provide weapons directly to the Kurds. We don't have to go through Baghdad, because Baghdad doesn't want them to have the equipment they need. They are afraid of them. Let them have the equipment they need to defeat the Islamic State. Yes, I know, that would not make Turkey happy, but Turkey has said: Not only are we not fighting the Islamic State—even though we have pledged in our NATO alliance that we will help fight any enemy of our fellow NATO signatories—we are not going to help, and we are not going to let you use any of the NATO bases or U.S. bases here in Turkey. You are on your own.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if Turkey is not going to fight them and they are a threat to all Western civilization, then we are just going to have to supply the Kurds and let them take them out.

It has been an honor to be over there numerous times and spend time there even when the State Department said it was too dangerous to go. DANA ROHR-ABACHER and I went and spent 3 days when the State Department was telling us it was too dangerous to be there. But I knew that there was no way their leaders were going to let anything happen to us. And they didn't. They were trustworthy.

Mr. Speaker, one of the problems this administration has is figuring out whom we can trust and whom we can't. I know that this administration continues to talk about these moderate, vetted Syrian Army soldiers that we can really help. Well, if they were there 3 or 4 years ago, most of them are ready to throw in with the Islamic State or with al Qaeda subsidiaries. In fact, they have done that very thing. They have fought together.

I don't know if "naivete" is the proper word, but when this administration started supplying their so-called free, vetted moderate Syrian Army personnel and the equipment, they kept ending up in the Islamic State's possession. They even suspended sending them more weapons and equipment for a while, but then some months later they picked it back up. I don't know why, what made them feel they were more believable than they were before, but amazingly, they started sending it, and it started ending up in Islamic State hands.

It is heartbreaking to be, as a few of us have, in northern Iraq in the Kurdistan area with real, patriotic Kurds who love their people and who have fought not just for themselves, but they have fought for other groups, Shi'a and Sunni, without throwing down their weapons. They have fought and died. But to look in their eyes and see the hurt as they say: Couldn't you give us some Humvees, some up-armored vehicles? Because we are fighting against the Islamic State, and they are using American armored personnel carriers. They are using American tanks. We don't have anything that can penetrate your American tanks or your personnel carriers. Those are invulnerable almost completely to IEDs because you up-armored them and gave them to the Syrian Army that gave them to ISIS, or you gave them to the Iraqi soldiers that left them for ISIS.

The commander who had lost soldiers said: You don't know what it is like to see a big, armored vehicle that is going to be used for a suicide bombing coming at your soldiers who have weapons that can't possibly penetrate those vehicles. And they are shooting. They are doing everything they can to try to stop them, but because they are the best America has in the way of fighting vehicles, we can't stop them, and we know my guys are going to get blown up as this American vehicle gets close, and it has been set up to be a suicide bomb.

Mr. Speaker, since this administration has not been effective in fighting IS for so long, for too long they looked at them as the junior varsity, the JVs, shouldn't we at least help those who are fighting to help us, along with themselves, by giving them vehicles that could match up against the vehicles we provided to the Islamic State? It seems like the least we can do. It really does.

This administration was going to be the most transparent in history. There

is a story out this week from PJ Media. Josh Earnest doesn't think President Obama is upset about missing the solidarity gathering of world leaders. The world leaders see that our way of life is at risk, and our leadership doesn't see it. He thinks if we give a good enough speech, we coddle, we offer to buy offices in Qatar, or we release more of their murderers, that surely they will recognize how truly wonderful, kind, and generous we are and they will stop their evil ways of killing innocent people. It is not going to happen.

I have Christian friends that say: Yes, but as Christians, we are supposed to turn the other cheek. That is as individuals. Individual Christians should live out the beatitudes as Christ gave them. But the government has a different role. If you do evil, you should be afraid because the government, within the bounds of Christianity—Romans 13:4—is supposed to punish the evil, eliminate the evils, and protect your people. I don't try to convert anybody using my position in government, but for those who misunderstand Christian teaching, you need to read Romans 13.

We have an Attorney General still holding on, Holder the Holdover. He said he is concerned about the so-called lone wolf attacks in the United States—one of the things, Mr. Speaker, I don't think, again, that this administration understands. They talk about these lone wolf attacks, and yet when you get down to the bottom of it, you find out, gee, they had talked to al-Awlaki, the man born in the United States so he gets an American birth certificate, an American passport, and American citizenship because his parents came over and had him while they were here, so he is an American citizen. He is radicalizing people.

These weren't lone wolves. They got information, they got advice, and they got radicalization from somebody else. It is tough to find anybody self-radicalized because apparently there are plenty of imams in this country that are not the general rank-and-file imams. They are imams that are ready to radicalize those—and twist and convert into evil—that would kill innocent children, women, and men.

Mr. Speaker, we need to recognize the threat that is upon us, and you can't do that when an administration will not even call the evil for what it is. I know indications are, gee, the economy is getting so much better. We still have over 90 million people that are not counted as unemployed because they just finally gave up looking for a job. To me, that is unemployed. But we don't count them in our statistics. And this staggering story came out today, written by Wyton Hall:

In a stunning Tuesday report, Gallup CEO and Chairman Jim Clifton revealed that "for the first time in 35 years, American business deaths now outnumber business births."

I can't help but think that has something to do with the massive overregulation by this administration con-

tinuing to set records in the number of regulations it sets. How in the world can businesses keep up with over 70,000 new pages of regulations year after year? They did it again in 2014, over 70,000 pages of new regulations, and they are expected to follow them and manage to keep a business. You don't have to look very far to find CEO after CEO or a person that started a business, no matter how massive, who said: In looking at all the regulations now, it is a good thing I started my business when I did, because if I were trying to start it now, I never could. I couldn't overcome all of the massive government overregulation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we see ObamaCare continuing to fail and continuing to provide less care for more money. But not to worry. A lot of your good health care dollars are going to fund navigators who will never put a Band-Aid on anybody or never even blow on a cut to make it feel better. No. They will never even pat somebody on the back. They are bureaucrats. They are not in the health care business, nor are the thousands and thousands and thousands of new IRS agents who are not looking out for your health. They will probably give you ulcers. But they are part of the health care dollars now.

So people keep asking me: LOUIE, I don't understand. My deductible is higher. I am paying more money than ever. I am getting less care. I am getting turned down for things. I don't get to choose my doctor. I sure don't have the insurance policy I wanted. I don't understand.

I have to explain: Well, that is because you are paying for a lot of government workers that don't really help in anybody's health problems at all. They create health problems, more likely.

With all of this as a background, all of the failures of the Federal Government, the Federal Government, in fact, is intruding in people's private lives. As they access email and gather phone logs of every call to and from American individuals, we were assured that would not happen when the PATRIOT Act was extended. I was not here when it was passed. We were told it was only if you were a foreign terrorist, a known foreign terrorist, or you had ties to foreign terrorists would you be even eligible to have your phone logs gathered, emails checked. "Only" we were told. Well, that turned out not to be true. That was just an outright lie. It is time to stop the government intrusion into people's private lives unless the government has a warrant.

As a judge, I had no problem signing a warrant if there was probable cause spelled out in the affidavit. There were times I would turn away law officers and say: You have plenty of speculation there that sounds good, but you don't have facts that get you to probable cause.

That should be in there, under the Constitution, before the government can start invading your privacy.

Then when the House and Senate were controlled by the Democrats, President Obama is in the Oval Office, they passed a bill creating this Consumer Financial Protection Bureau that apparently is out there thinking they need to be able to monitor everybody's debit and credit card records so that they can see if anybody is being taken advantage of.

□ 1330

Well, how about following the Constitution and not getting anybody's bank records or credit card or debit card records unless you have probable cause or unless the person gives permission.

I am hoping that is going to be a bill that we pass because I have talked to enough Republicans and know how we feel, and there are Democrats who feel the same way. Of course, they are the ones that created this monster, but that needs to be reined in. And now with that as a backdrop, we have the story: "Obama backs government-run Internet."

And I know there was somebody who wrote into the Longview paper that they want net neutrality. They love the idea of the government playing more of a role in the Internet. Well guess what? When the government takes control of the Internet in the name of neutrality, it will probably not be neutral, according to most Americans' opinions.

So I hope Americans are not fooled. I hope Americans don't buy into this because when the United States Government takes control of the Internet, then we are going to start having the same problems they have in China, in Russia, and other parts of the world where their government does control their Internet, and they control your freedom to search for what you want or to say what you want.

I know of numerous occasions where people said they were in China typing, and they mention anything about the government, even if it is not terrible what they said about the government, they start typing again, and they have lost their Internet connection. They have learned not to say anything about the government, let it go, and they keep their Internet connection better.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to also touch on this because we passed the funding for the Department of Homeland Security. I hope the President doesn't veto the bill. I hope the Senate will pass what we passed. There are some things in there I would have liked to have been different, but I read the bill totally. There are some parts that aren't great, and there are some parts that are great. I am very proud—my friend JOHN CARTER has some great language in there. I know he has worked very hard on language that is very good.

As I was reading the bill this weekend, I said, that was JOHN CARTER's specific language from an earlier bill. Overall, it was a good bill. The amendments helped it. I voted for the bill.

And now hopefully the Senate will do the right thing and pass it, and we will send it to the President and we will fund the Department of Homeland Security without all of the amnesties he has unconstitutionally created.

But if the President wants another way of doing things, I haven't heard anyone else suggest this, but I brought it up with some friends this morning. Perhaps we go ahead, if he doesn't think that he likes that and we are not able to override a veto, maybe it is time to start setting goals for the administration, and when they don't meet them, we just take that money from them and block grant it out to State and local law enforcement.

There are some jail cells open. We don't have to provide the hundreds of millions of dollars to hold people being detained. The local law enforcement is tired of holding people on behalf of the Federal Government and not being reimbursed. Let them do the job they are supposed to do of enforcing the law.

I know the Arizona case said, the Supreme Court said Arizona could not be enforcing immigration law, that was a Federal job, but we certainly have the authority to say, you know what? Let's block grant that money out and let State and local government do that, enforce our laws for us. I think we will get a whole lot better job done. So that may be something else to consider. If the President is not going to sign a bill that funds homeland security, maybe we need to fund it, and if they can't meet their goals, block grant it out to local authorities.

In the time I have left, I wanted to touch on a significant article by Patrick Poole of PJ Media, because, as he says, it is a look back on this year's parade of failure, and expect more in 2015.

His article is titled, "The National Security 'Not Top 10' of 2014." So my paraphrase is the top 10 failures in national security by this administration.

Number one: befriending "moderate al Qaeda" in Syria. Patrick Poole said: "There are some ideas so at war with reason and reality they can only exist in the fetid Potomac fever swamps of D.C. think tank and foreign policy community. Such was the case in January when three of the best and brightest from those ranks published an article in Foreign Affairs (the same publication that in 2007 brought us the 'moderate Muslim Brotherhood') contending that the U.S. needed to befriend the Syrian jihadist group Ahrar al-Sham as some kind of counter to more extreme jihadist groups, like ISIS and Jabhat al-Nusra. The precedent they cited was the U.S. failure to designate the Taliban after 9/11.

Mind you, at the time they wrote this, one of Ahrar al-Sham's top leaders was a lieutenant for al Qaeda head Ayman al-Zawahiri, who openly declared himself a member of al Qaeda. After most of their leadership was wiped out in a bombing in September, they have gravitated closer to the

jihadist groups they were supposed to counter and their positions have been bombed by the U.S., much to the consternation of other vetted moderate rebel groups. So ridiculous was their proposition that the original subtitle of their article, 'An al Qaeda Affiliate Worth Befriending,' was changed online to 'An al Qaeda-Linked Group Worth Befriending' in hopes of minimizing the absurdity of their case."

But this administration bought into it.

And I understand there may be a Republican Senator or two that buys into it. It doesn't make it any less preposterous.

Number two of the top 10 national security failures:

Obama administration deploys three hashtag divisions in response to Russian invasion of Ukraine.

Some folks may remember that the response of this administration to help the Ukrainian people that I hold so dear, having lived with them for a summer back as a college student, the response of this administration was to launch a Twitter war that Russia wasn't terribly concerned about.

The number three failure of national security was Obama calling ISIS the "JV team."

I am sure Americans remember, and Patrick Poole discusses it, but to call the Islamic state a JV team betrayed his failure to get his security briefings as he should have to really understand what is happening in the world, because I don't believe for a minute, having talked to different intelligence people, I don't believe for a minute that our intelligence people did not know how dangerous the Islamic state was.

The number four failure of national security was the State Department official denying that Boko Haram targeted Christians.

Having been over there and having hugged and wept with those parents of daughters who were kidnapped and terrorized and made sex slaves, unlike the State Department official who says it wasn't about them being Christians—if you go hug them and weep with them and talk to them and their pastors, as I have, you find out it was precisely because they were Christians. Please, somebody in this administration, wake up. Radical Islam is at war with the United States and any Western civilization, and specifically with Christians.

When I asked these mothers whose daughters are still held kidnapped, probably sold into sex slavery by now—and this administration has not done enough because they don't see it as a war against Christianity—I asked, just to be sure, I said: Did they attack—Boko Haram, these radical Islamist terrorists—did they attack your daughter's school because they were girls, because they don't believe girls should be educated?

They said: Oh, no, they don't believe girls should be educated, but they attacked it because it is a Christian school.

That is precisely why they attacked it.

Number five: Homeland Security adviser's pro-caliphate tweet used by ISIS recruiters. I had been warning about this pro-caliphate Homeland Security top adviser in Janet Napolitano's regime in Homeland Security, a guy that has spoken, was a listed speaker to pay tribute to the Ayatollah Khomeini as a man of vision of the 20th century, who blasted the prosecution of the Holy Land Foundation, the largest terrorist support prosecution in American history, and he defended the convicted defendants, and he tweets out. Finally, it was enough to show the administration what most of us who had eyes and ears understood. He tweeted out, after ISIS killed more innocent people, that the caliphate was inevitable so just, you know, get ready. And then ISIS used that to help recruit.

Number six failure of 2014 of national security in this administration: Obama and the State Department give shout-outs to Islamic cleric who okayed the fatwa authorizing the killing of Americans in Iraq. And Patrick Poole lays out exactly what it involved. Not once but twice, as I understand it, he gave a shout-out to this Islamic cleric who authorized the killing of Americans in Iraq.

Number seven: Obama administration gives heavy weapons to "vetted moderate" Syrian rebel groups; they promptly turn up in hands of ISIS and al Qaeda.

Number eight: The White House defends the Muslim Brotherhood's "commitment to nonviolence. And that is what some of the moderate Muslim leaders in the Middle East have said, different countries saying, Why are you helping the Muslim Brotherhood? Do you not understand they are at war with you?"

Number nine: The Obama administration defends U.S. Islamic groups branded as terrorist groups by the UAE.

The UAE is run by moderate Muslims. Perhaps this administration could learn something by listening to them and who they recognize to be terrorist groups.

And number 10: Having banned discussions of ideology driving Islamic terrorism, the Pentagon says it can't understand the ideology of ISIS.

Well, duh. It is no wonder they can't understand it when you are not allowed to be educated about what these people believe. But there are people around this town that have been banned from teaching about radical Islam who perhaps should be unbanned.

In conclusion, I just want to reference the vote this week for Speaker. The vote is behind us. It is done. The Speaker was reelected. But one of the big concerns I had has not gone away, and it still needs to be addressed.

Those 4 years that Democrats controlled the House and the Senate, they set a record for the most bills brought to the floor where no amendments by

anybody were allowed. They wouldn't let us participate in the legislative process. And we railed against that. We said, You put us in the majority, we won't do that. And it breaks my heart that under the current Speaker, a new record broke NANCY PELOSI's record of more bills brought to the floor with no amendments allowed, a closed rule. That has got to change.

Some have said our effort had no chance. If all those who said they would have voted with us but it had no chance had voted with us, then it would have been overwhelming.

□ 1345

One of the Speaker's supporters came up to me yesterday on the floor and handed me this and said, "This is from an old novel." I think it is called "The Lion's Den." He said, "This applies to you," and I appreciate it more than he would know.

The quote is this:

No matter how the espousal of a lost cause might hurt his prestige in the House, Zimmer had never hesitated to identify himself with it if it seemed to him to be right. He knew only two ways; the right one and the wrong, and if he sometimes made a mistake, it was never one of honor: he voted as he believed he should, and although sometimes his voice was raised alone on one side of a question, it was never stilled.

There were 24 such people that spoke this week, and I hope they will be honored and not belittled.

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

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to clause 11 of rule X, clause 11 of rule I, and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, of the following Members to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence:

Mr. MILLER, Florida
Mr. CONAWAY, Texas
Mr. KING, New York
Mr. LOBIONDO, New Jersey
Mr. WESTMORELAND, Georgia
Mr. ROONEY, Florida
Mr. HECK, Nevada
Mr. POMPEO, Kansas
Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Florida
Mr. TURNER, Ohio
Mr. WENSTRUP, Ohio
Mr. STEWART, Utah

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Friday, January 16, 2015, at 4 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

62. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, Department of Defense, transmitting a notice of mobilizations of select Reserve units from October 2013 through September 2014, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 12304b; to the Committee on Armed Services.

63. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the System's Major final rule — Credit Risk Retention [Docket No.: R-1411] (RIN: 7100-AD70) received January 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

64. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-125, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

65. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the texts of Protocol to Convention No. 29: Protocol to the Forced Labour Convention, 1930, and Recommendation No. 203: Recommendation on Supplementary Measures for the Effective Suppression of Forced Labor, adopted by the International Labour Conference in Geneva; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

66. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

67. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Herring Fishery; Framework Adjustment 3 [Docket No.: 140221166-4963-02] (RIN: 0648-BE01) received January 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

68. A letter from the Staff Director, Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting a copy of the charter for the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights state advisory committees, pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

69. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Anchorage Regulations: Anchorage Grounds, Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbors, California [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0841] (RIN: 1625-AA01) received January 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

70. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Reduced Visibility, Sector St. Petersburg Captain of the Port Zone, FL [Docket No.: USCG-2014-1013] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

71. A letter from the Acting Director, Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the General Counsel, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Caregivers Program (RIN: 2900-AN94) received January 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following

titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CALVERT (for himself, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. ISSA, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Mr. NUNES):

H.R. 340. A bill to provide for a limitation on the number of civilian employees at the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 341. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require States to recognize the military experience of veterans when issuing licenses and credentials to veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DENHAM (for himself and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois):

H.R. 342. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to extend military commissary and exchange store privileges, without time-period limitation, to members of the Armed Forces who are involuntarily separated with a service-connected disability and also to extend such privileges to their dependents; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself, Mr. LOEBACK, Mr. LANCE, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MESSER, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, and Mrs. BUSTOS):

H.R. 343. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a charitable deduction for the service of volunteer firefighters and emergency medical and rescue personnel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. DELBENE (for herself, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. LEE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. KILMER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LOEBACK, Ms. ESTY, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. KUSTER, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. POCAN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. COHEN, Mr. HONDA, Ms. BASS, and Ms. BONAMICI):

H.R. 344. A bill to provide for the establishment of a pilot program to encourage the employment of veterans in manufacturing positions; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 345. A bill to make persons who conspire to commit, commit, or benefit from an act of human trafficking ineligible for admission to the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HONDA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. LEE, Mr. LOEBACK, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. VISLOSKEY):

H.R. 346. A bill to improve the financial literacy of students; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ROYCE (for himself and Mr. HINOJOSA):