

In fact, I did walk on the floor here, and I noticed that Ms. KAPTUR is here, Mr. TONKO is here, and you are having a vigorous discussion which is important with the American people.

I am about to be in receipt of a bill that will come down that will be presented to the floor here in just a minute, so if I keep talking here for just a minute.

Mr. GARAMENDI. If I may interrupt here for a second?

Thank you for the courtesy that you provided to me in the Rules Committee when the liquefied natural gas—the LNG bill came up and when we talked about how we could use that strategic asset to enhance another strategic asset, the American shipbuilding industry. You were kind.

We had a wonderful discussion in the committee and then again on the floor. It is another way in which we can grow the American economy, by using public policy in this way, and there are many, many other pieces to it.

I think your staff has just arrived with the papers that you need, so I will yield to you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SESSIONS. I would, pending receiving those, which is just about to happen, say to the gentleman that his ideas that he brought to the Rules Committee, in fact, were received well, the ideas about shipping in American ships, building of American ships, the opportunity for American ships to employ people as they transported American products around the world.

We will be ready here in half a second, so anybody who is watching gets high drama.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, I have always looked forward to a dialogue, a bipartisan dialogue, on important issues, and I didn't quite know that we would come to that at this moment while we await your staff bringing down their papers.

In the meantime, I thank my colleagues very much, and I yield back the balance of my time.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 527, SMALL BUSINESS REGULATORY FLEXIBILITY IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 2015, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 50, UNFUNDED MANDATES INFORMATION AND TRANSPARENCY ACT OF 2015

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-14) on the resolution (H. Res. 78) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 527) to amend chapter 6 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the Regulatory Flexibility Act), to ensure complete analysis of potential impacts on small entities of rules, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 50) to provide for additional safeguards with respect to imposing Federal mandates, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

THE EFFECTS OF THE PRESIDENT'S ECONOMY

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. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I do appreciate my friend's discussion today. In fact, there is an article I would like to move right into regarding the President's proposal to help middle America by going after corporations.

□ 1815

This is an article of Money News from Newsmax, by Peter Morici. This points out:

Posturing as champion of needed public investments and fairness, President Barack Obama wants new taxes on the overseas earnings of American businesses. That would kill jobs and punish retired Americans. Although special deals permit some corporations to pay low taxes, most pay a heavy burden. The estimated effective U.S. corporate tax rate is about 27 percent and is well above the 20 percent imposed by other industrialized countries.

The United States is virtually alone by taxing the overseas profits of its multinationals when those are repatriated. This has encouraged U.S. firms to invest nearly \$2.1 trillion of their earnings abroad instead of bringing some of that money home to create jobs in America. Now the President wants an immediate 14 percent tax levy on those assets to raise about \$500 billion and to impose a 19 percent tax on future earnings to finance infrastructure investments.

Madam Speaker, we have heard this before, this mantra about how we are going to build infrastructure. If you will just give us, as it was the last time, \$900 billion, we are going to rebuild the infrastructure of America.

What happened?

We got Solyndra, and some Democratic friends got lots and lots of money and grants and all kinds of benefits, and we didn't get the infrastructure we were promised. Every time the President wants to trot out a new program, he throws that in because it worked. Seriously, it worked 6 years ago. Americans bought into it, and the majority here bought into it. Let's give him the money so we can build infrastructure, and we saw that that was a word that was not kept.

There is the point that many have made about the President's new proposals that he brought up in the State of the Union Address to help the middle class, to help the Nation's poor, and we have seen how the middle class has been helped under this President—the middle class has gotten smaller. The gap between the ultra rich and the poor has gotten wider, and we have more poor. We have got more people on food stamps than ever in history, more than anybody could have ever imagined when that program was started, and it continues to be a massive problem for much of America.

There is trouble getting a job. Oh, I know we keep being told that the Cook

numbers work well. Gee, the economy is doing so well. But across America, people understand "I am not doing well." If they have been able to keep their jobs, they have not seen their wages keep up like they should have. At the same time, the administration is trying to convince the middle class and the Nation's poor: "I am taking care of you."

What is actually happening behind the scenes?

We know for at least the first 5, 6 years of this administration and for the first time in our Nation's history, 95 percent of the Nation's income went to the top 1 percent. Before this administration, the Obama administration, that had never, ever happened.

It is tragic when you see the effect that it has on families. It is tragic when you see that people had such hope for this President's helping the poor, not adding to the poor. They had hope for climbing up through the middle class and maybe, one day, having a shot at being wealthy. Unless you are a President or a former President, it is kind of tough to make that kind of move because not everybody gets paid a million bucks or even \$100,000 for giving a speech. So most of America that was suffering before is still suffering. In many cases, it is much worse.

The people who really understand money management are pointing out: wait a minute. If you break down what the President is proposing in order to help, supposedly, the middle class, and if he is going to tax these evil corporations on money they have earned overseas when they have a corporate presence here and there, some of us have been proposing: if you will just eliminate any penalty, then they will bring that money into the United States; they will use that capital here in the United States; jobs will be created, and plants will be expanded; and there will be more people able to join unions of non-government working people because those are the kinds of jobs that would come back. If you lowered the tax on corporations down to where China has it, you would see companies come flooding back into the United States that built their plants in China.

As our good friend Arthur Laffer has pointed out, the rich are the people you are not really able to tax because they will move on you. They will move, and they will change the way they make income. I know people like Democrat Warren Buffett like to say: "Oh, gee. I am willing to pay more taxes." It is one thing to say it. It is another to write the check, and that hasn't happened. If he wanted to pay the same income tax rate that his secretary pays, then he could pay that. Write the check. You don't have to keep it all. It is okay. You can send it to the government if you want to. Unfortunately, when you tax corporations as much as we do in the United States, and when that tax gets passed on to the consumers—because, if it doesn't, they don't stay in business—then it is back to the middle class paying those taxes.

If you start taxing these multinational corporations for money they have earned in another country and they have paid taxes on in another country—and if you are going to tax it to bring it into the United States—then they are not going to bring it in. If you are going to tax them for even having a presence here, then you will find the presence will go. The jobs that are here in the United States will go. You are going to have trouble ever taxing the multinational corporations, like the richest people in the world, because they will move. They will change the way they do business to avoid that tax. It is the middle class and those amongst the poor who actually pay tax—income tax, that is—who end up taking the biggest hit.

If you want to make taxes fair, let's go to a flat tax across the board. If you make more, you pay more. If you make less, you pay less. I like a deduction for the home mortgage interest, and I like charitable deductions. But, otherwise, let's just drop all of them. If you make more, you pay more. That would be fair.

Instead, if you want to look around to what has really done massive damage to the ability of the middle class and the Nation's poor, particularly African Americans, there has been a tremendous problem getting employed, staying employed, and having higher wages because this administration keeps bringing in people, giving them work permits—people who have come in illegally. Now we know that the big corporations are even given a \$3,000 bonus if they will hire someone who came here illegally, one of the 5 million.

Now, Texas has created most of the jobs that the President stood right here and took credit for. It was rather interesting. I know people in this administration like to make jokes about Texas, but it would have been nice if, when he took credit for creating jobs, that he would have thanked Texas for being the place that really bailed him out and kept him from having to stand up and report a net loss of jobs. So we are glad to help out, not because we are helping the President but because we are helping real people in America.

If he really wants to help the Nation's poor, the working poor, those few who are left in the middle class, he would quit giving people who have come in illegally work permits, which actually incentivizes more people to come in illegally, and then there wouldn't be any need for him to come in and say we have got to raise the minimum wage, because we know—there is no question—when you raise the minimum wage, people who are trying to break into the working of America don't have jobs. People lose their jobs.

For businesses that are barely getting by at a profit, when you force a higher minimum wage, then those people who are brought in at the entry level naturally don't produce as much

as people who have been there a while because it takes a learning curve. But the minimum wage is the entry level if it is even at minimum wage. Most businesses I talk to around east Texas will pay more than the minimum wage even for startup employment. But once you raise the minimum wage, they are going to have to lay somebody off, and somebody is going to have to work harder because they cannot afford, like the government, to be operating in the red—they would go broke—because they don't get to print their own money and create their own monetary system.

I see here another article today. This is from Neil Munro of The Daily Caller: "Obama Quietly Adds 5.46 Million Foreigners to Economy."

That should be great news for the economy, but since there haven't been 5.46 million jobs created in this administration, that means that they are going to take over jobs and that Americans who emigrated legally are going to lose their jobs. When you tack on that you get a \$3,000 bonus under ObamaCare if you hire somebody who came illegally and got one of these work permits—they are not required to have ObamaCare, and so they don't have to provide health insurance; therefore, the companies don't have to pay the \$3,000 penalty—it gives incentives to hire people who came illegally and got the work permits.

Now, we had before our Judiciary Committee today some witnesses, and I greatly appreciated Chairman GOODLATTE for calling the hearing. It was very enlightening. We had a sheriff, a law professor, a couple of people who work on the immigration issue. I didn't realize until the testimony that, when released, about 50 percent of those people who have come here illegally and who have committed a crime commit another crime. I had somebody else explain it to me after the hearing.

If you come here and if you have no respect for the law in the United States, is it any mystery that you are going to be more likely to disregard the criminal laws as you have the immigration laws? Fortunately, everybody doesn't see it that way who emigrates here illegally, but it is a problem.

□ 1830

If you are a 21-year-old store clerk that is just trying to make it, you are not making that much money, but you are trying to make it, you are working tough hours in a thankless job, and unbeknownst to you as a 21-year-old store clerk, the Obama administration—Homeland Security has followed the lead of the President. They have not been deporting people that came illegally, committed crimes, like they should be. So unknown to you, the 21-year-old store clerk, that man who has committed crimes before and has not been deported because this administration is not following up to the oath that was taken, you are about to have

your life taken away from you by someone that should not even be in the country.

I was with another Member of Congress today when staff came and notified him that one of their staff had been hit by another car. It was the fault of the other car, and the people in the other car got out, walked around, and then by the time the officer got there, they complained one of their group couldn't walk, couldn't use their legs. So here comes the ambulance. Who knows. Maybe they have figured out our system well enough to know you just file a lawsuit even though you were at fault for the wreck, file a claim against the insurance company.

But there are people who are here in this country illegally who would like to be here legally, and we ought to help and encourage them to do just that: Come legally; follow the law; make application.

There are those of us whose offices help those who come legally. We have been helping people who have immigrated legally to try to get their spouse into the country, and we find out that actually this administration, by the executive amnesties and decrees, has apparently used the fees that were paid by people who came legally, trying to bring in others legally, trying to do everything right, some paid a higher fee to try to speed up the time with which they could get their spouse or loved one in the country, and with the stroke of the pen this President apparently put those on hold, said: We are going to take those fees that people who were acting legally and within the law paid to get their loved one in, we are going to put their applications on hold because I have got a whole bunch of people over here who entered illegally that I want to come in. I am sure they will vote Democrat when they get the chance, but I need them beholden to the Federal Government, so we are going to bring in these people that didn't believe in following the law, give them amnesty and a work permit, allow a \$3,000 bonus under ObamaCare to businesses that hire them, get rid of their American workers, their legal immigrants, and hire people that came in illegally.

The question arises, and it is a very important question because it has criminal consequences, if anyone within the United States Government, executive branch particularly, takes money that was ordered for one purpose under the law and converts that money's use to another without getting the permission of Congress, without jumping through the hoops that are required to use that money for another purpose and use it for a purpose such as getting a lease in Crystal City so that you can set up your amnesty mill, you have got a problem, and so do we because you may have violated the law, and it may be a crime.

I am hopeful that we are at the early stages of getting to the bottom of that so we can find out whether somebody

broke the law. We know that there are criminal statutes regarding government workers if they use their position, particularly at the IRS, and yet Lois Lerner basically got caught red-handed, took the Fifth Amendment. Even still, the President, the executive branch didn't want to get rid of her, so paid her to stay home for a while. But nobody has been prosecuted, nobody has been pursued out of those laws that were broken in the Internal Revenue Service to go after conservative groups.

No question. We don't know the full extent, but no question, it had to have helped the President in the election of 2012. All you have got to do is keep your opponents from being able to form groups like the Democrats have. Of course, a lot of the Democrats' funding comes from government money that goes through unions and ends up helping Democrats, but these are groups that were raising their own money that they had earned. It wasn't money received from the government. People who actually did build that, they did earn that, and they were wanting to pool their money for political purposes, but the IRS put them on hold for long enough, some of them for years, so that they could not play any role in the 2012 election.

This administration was able to use the laws or the Tax Code and use the IRS in ways Richard Nixon could have only dreamed of. He had an enemies list, but he was not able to carry out the vendetta like some in the IRS appear to have done. So that is here in this country as people are suffering, workers struggling, especially African American minority workers, their unemployment rate so dramatically higher.

I have had people ask me—and I am not really sure of the answer—if President Obama actually should get all the credit for the jobs that have been created in the United States, then why in the world was he creating them all in Texas, most of them in Texas? That just seems a little strange. But I would think his supporters would certainly fall away from supporting someone in the Democratic Party that creates jobs mainly in a very red State. But if that is true and he gets the credit for creating all the jobs in Texas, over a million, then he is to be congratulated on the bipartisan nature of that effort, although the Senate would wonder whether or not he actually participated in that.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn to one of the more horrendous acts that man has inflicted on man. The Islamic State—and that first word is "Islamic"—released a video that shows, or purports to show, Jordanian pilot al-Kaseasbeh prior to being burned alive. The video released today appears to show him being burned alive.

Some say: How could they do such a thing? It seems to me that if one human being can take a dull knife and

jaggedly cut off the head of another human being, he is probably pretty capable of burning another human being alive.

There is evil in this world. Adolf Hitler manifested pure evil. It is the only way he could have been responsible for the mass killings of 6 million Jews in Europe.

It is unbelievable, but when the United States fails to lead, fails to point out the horrors and the ideology behind it and goes to war against those who invoke this kind of evil and push it and use it against human beings, at a time when the United States is called the lone superpower, then the vacuum in the world of power is filled by the most evil among us, and that is what is happening.

It is unbelievable, and yet this is who these radical Islamists are. One story after another in the news about that pilot being burned alive, and yet we come to the story of the President addressing this today, this one entitled, "Obama Comments on Jordanian Pilot Burned Alive, Doesn't Know What 'Ideology' Islamic State Follows." The President is quoted as saying:

I just got word of the video that had been released. Should in fact this video be authentic, it is just one more indication of the viciousness and barbarity of this organization.

He wouldn't even call the organization the Islamic State, which is what they call themselves. The President says:

It, I think, will redouble the vigilance and determination on the part of a global coalition to make sure that they are degraded and ultimately defeated.

It is interesting. The President doesn't say we are going to defeat this radical ideology, this Islamic State, we will defeat them, we will stop them. It brings to mind the response of Winston Churchill. He was making sure everyone knew that Britain was not going to let evil win, that they were going to fight them on the beaches, fight them on the land, fight them in the air, fight them wherever they found them.

Our leader in this current world crisis here in the United States, the position some say is the most powerful leader's position in the world, says:

And it, I think, will redouble the vigilance and determination on the part of the global coalition to make sure that they are degraded and ultimately defeated.

But it doesn't stop there. Our President goes on to say:

It also indicates the degree to which whatever ideology they are operating off of, it is bankrupt.

"Whatever ideology they are operating off of"? It is called the Islamic State.

I have seen amazing prosecutors at work trying to pull together a case. I have seen incredible law enforcement minds at work as they try to put together pieces of the puzzle to figure out some law enforcement mystery, figure out the source of some crime. But I don't think it would take the more brilliant law enforcement officers in

our country—so many that I have met and come to appreciate their intellect. I don't think it takes them to figure out what ideology they are out of, because the first piece of the puzzle when we are looking to determine what ideology these evil men are working out of, let's see, what do they call themselves?

□ 1845

We will start with that clue. They call themselves the Islamic State. Well, that would seem to indicate that perhaps the ideology they are out of would be an Islamic ideology. Since these people get real upset if anybody draws a cartoon—for example, about the prophet Muhammad, as they call him—then perhaps it is that people that hold Muhammad as a prophet is another unifying clue to the ideology.

Perhaps since they are willing to kill people, as they did in Afghanistan when Korans were found being burned because they had been defaced by Muslims using them to pass messages—and the proper remedy for defaced Korans is to destroy them like that—but nonetheless, they killed people because they didn't like Americans—people they consider infidels—burning the Korans that were defaced by Muslims.

These seem to be clues that keep bringing us back to the fact that the most evil people in our world today appear to claim radical Islam as their ideology, and I know there are Muslim Brothers who have made clear they want a caliphate.

One of the top advisers in the Homeland Security Department here tweeted out back last August, I believe it was, that the caliphate is inevitable, so people just need to get used to the idea. In fact, as I understand it, he put together a long message in recent days that went on a tear after Christians and, as I understand, basically pointing out that maybe the Islamists should be called evangelical Islamists.

Well, that has a different meaning, and I am sure Mr. Elibiary doesn't quite understand the term "evangelical" because evangelical Christian means you bring peace to the world and you introduce them to knowledge of Jesus Christ. You bring them knowledge of Jesus Christ as a man of peace, and you don't kill them if they don't accept Jesus as their savior.

There have been Christians during different historic times in the world that were barbarians and deserved to be put to death for being so barbaric, but the current state of the world is that the most evil people right now are not Christians.

One of my Republican friends and I were talking earlier today. I am a Baptist. When a Baptist church, Westboro or any other, does things that are really despicable, we call them out. My friend was Catholic. He said that if the Catholic church does something improper, he calls them out.

We also understand that there is a reluctance among moderate Muslims to

stand up and condemn the ideology of radical Islam that is so barbaric because they know that if they do that, they shoot to the top of the hit list of people to be taken out. They understand that.

They become horrific apostates in the eyes of radical Islamists and should be taken out, in the minds that are so marred by this evil radical Islamic thinking that would allow someone to have their head jaggedly cut off or to be put in a cage and set on fire.

To whom much is given, of them much is required. For those who believe the teaching of the Bible, we believe that.

We are going to have the President's National Prayer Breakfast Thursday morning. There should be people from over 140 or 150 countries there, and that is one time I am greatly appreciative of the President's espoused faith. We can put politics aside. We are supposed to. We did last year while I was co-chair. JANICE HAHN was cochair.

We can thank God. Radical Islamists can't put aside their evil ideology because they want to force it upon everyone, and they are not going to rest until they are dead and they take as many of what they call infidels with them as possible.

So it shouldn't have been a big surprise to see this story from Breitbart:

ISIS members marched into a Syrian town Friday demanding that all crosses be removed from the churches or have the buildings be completely destroyed.

That is according to the Assyrian Patriotic Party.

Two trucks carrying 20 armed ISIS members stormed into the predominantly Assyrian town of Tel Hormizd in Hassakeh and forced the residents to remove the cross from the main church tower. Hassakeh, an area made up of five Assyrian villages, is located on the Khabur River.

That is radical Islamic ideology, Mr. Speaker, for those in this town who are not aware; but I guess if you are part of this administration, you shouldn't consider that to be all that radical because this administration, under their watch, with Commander in Chief Barack Obama, had orders given to remove crosses from the chapels on our military installations.

So maybe—is it possible—radical Islamists could just be following the example that was set by the top commander in our United States military that we want the crosses removed from our chapels?

Well, unfortunately, the radical Islamists in the Middle East go further. They want all Americans dead. They want all Jews dead. They want Israel wiped off the map. They want the United States, as the great Satan, to become a caliphate, paying homage to their choice of leaders, not ours.

That is an affront to the Constitution, and anyone who has taken an oath to support and defend the Constitution should fight shari'a law supplanting our Constitution.

I was also talking today with someone who works with victims in Nigeria.

Boko Haram remains not only unapologetic for the death, torture, and suffering that they have caused to Christians in Nigeria, but they are emboldened. No one from the United States with power to stop them has lifted a finger, other than to tweet: "Bring back our girls."

Having been over there, talking to victims' families—I had it reaffirmed today—the Twitter campaign that was started by this administration against Boko Haram has not been effective. Again, they have been emboldened.

I was advised that there are Christian children in northeast Nigeria who haven't been to school for 2 years because they know that if they do, they will be killed. If they are boys, they will be killed. If they are girls, they will normally be made sex slaves or sold into sex slavery or made into wives who are basically slaves. They are told to convert or be killed.

In meeting with parents, whose hearts are broken, they have heard that the United States is the most powerful country in the world, but they don't know that because they can't understand, if the United States is so powerful—and if it was powerful and good and not evil like Boko Haram—then why wouldn't we lend something more than a tweet to stop the evil.

I also did note that there is a story of French planes helping with intelligence on the Nigerian border. That is encouraging.

The United States does not have to send boots on the ground to Nigeria in order to help defeat Boko Haram. Yes, I understand from people I know and respect in Nigeria that Boko Haram has infiltrated the main government, so it is hard to do anything effectively as the Nigerian Government, with Boko Haram becoming more and more powerful each week.

But because this country has been given so much, if we don't lend a helping hand to stop the most evil entities and people in the world, there will be American lives lost in big numbers in this country, and it is not going to be in the distant future.

In Africa, if Boko Haram takes over Nigeria, as they are well on their way toward pushing to do, then no Christian and no Jew in all of Africa is safe. In fact, they will seek to help establish that caliphate that the Obama adviser in Homeland Security had tweeted out last summer was inevitable.

Well, if Boko Haram is not stopped, they will be inevitable in Africa. Radical Islam—that ideology the President is not familiar with—that radical Islamism will take over Africa.

God bless the Egyptians. They stood up against the Muslim Brothers. The Muslim Brotherhood, by the way, has been labeled as a terrorist organization.

□ 1900

CAIR is part of the Muslim Brotherhood. Some countries consider CAIR to be a radical Islamic terrorist organiza-

tion, but not here in America because the President relies on them for advice.

The Muslim Brotherhood, in the United States, has not been labeled a terrorist organization, like it has in our ally, the UAE, Egypt, other places because, here in the United States, the Muslim Brothers' leaders are sought for advice by this administration.

If we don't stand up against radical Islam—as President Bush talked about, I would rather stop it over there than have to stop it here. Well, it is here. There are cells here. There are people who have been radicalized here.

There are people who have been born here, like al-Awlaki, who have their American citizen passport, and they have grown up hating America from wherever they were raised, and they have free access in and out of the United States because their parents, or at least their mother, came here.

I thought a few years ago it would be years before we saw that kind of effect here. But we know al-Awlaki, whom the President blew up with a drone in Yemen, was helpful in radicalizing people here.

Although the President is not familiar with the ideology that was at work at Fort Hood in that act of war at Fort Hood, the act of war in killing a military recruiter in Arkansas, the acts of war that have been taking place as they did in Boston, it is radical Islam.

And yes, you don't have to qualify that. We understand that most Muslims do not believe in radical Islam. We got that. We don't need the qualifier every time something is said about radical Islam. We get it. But radical Islam should be identified for what it is.

It breaks my heart to say it, but it is a fact. If we don't do more to stop radical Islam in the world, there are large numbers of Americans that are going to die that don't have to. It doesn't have to happen.

But we have to have an administration wake up to the danger that faces the world's Christians and Jews, and people who believe in democracy and who believe in representative government, and not shari'a law; because if we don't act as leaders on the world stage and positively point out, that is radical Islam, and we are going to stop radical Islam—and the moderates of the world understand we are not talking about them. They understand radical Islam is a threat to them and their lives if they stand up against it. They get that.

But I have met moderate Muslims around the world who are willing to lay down their lives because they don't want radical Islamists controlling their country, and they hope, and they do pray, that the United States will wake up and recognize what ideology the President knows not of, and finally see it is radical Islam, and we are going to stop it.

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

THE MINDLESS, HEARTLESS EVIL OF ISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) for 30 minutes.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing that I fear more for America than that, as a country, we might allow ourselves to grow numb to human atrocity in our own country and across the world.

Eight years ago, President George Bush warned that: "To begin withdrawing before our commanders tell us we are ready would mean surrendering the future of Iraq."

He said: "It would mean that we would be risking mass killings on a horrific scale. It would mean increasing the probability that American troops would have to return at some later date to confront an enemy that is even more dangerous."

Mr. Speaker, many of us in Congress warned President Obama, both in a private letter and in open declaration, of the danger that ISIS represented as it began to rise in Iraq.

We also warned the President that negotiating with terrorists by trading high-level Taliban leaders would lead to an increase in terrorists trying to leverage America and the world by taking hostages. Yet, this President ignored this, and so many other commonsense warnings, and atrocity after atrocity has occurred since.

Today, Mr. Speaker, the world watched in abject horror as 26-year old Jordanian pilot, 1st Lieutenant al-Kaseasbeh, who was taken captive by ISIS, was doused in gasoline, placed in a cage, and burned alive.

Mr. Speaker, this horrifying tragedy is the natural end to the timorous policy of appeasing or negotiating with or neglecting to have a just response to this mindless, heartless evil cancer called ISIS.

And the question occurs: When will this President respond decisively to this hellish evil?

Will it take a direct attack on American shopping malls?

Will it take a direct attack on an American grocery store or a school or an American magazine or some other venue where American blood will have to be spilled before this President calls the evil of global jihad for what it is?

It has been a full year since ISIS retook Fallujah and wiped out America's blood-bought gains. It has been a full 7 months since 55 of my colleagues and I beseeched the President to prioritize security and humanitarian support for religious minorities in Iraq, including the Yazidi people, a group that has now been nearly wiped out completely by ISIS.

Mr. Speaker, this administration can no longer claim ignorance. This Nation is at war with Islamist groups like ISIS that support and perpetrate the terrorism of global jihad. Terrorists understand it all too well. The American

people understand it all too well, and it is time that this White House begin to understand it as well.

Mr. Speaker, if the Obama administration continues to sit on the sidelines and allows this unspeakable act of terrorism we have all witnessed today to go unanswered, as it has so many times before, we invite that sinister malevolence to our own shores.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. JUDY CHU of California (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 4, 2015, at 10 a.m. for morning hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

293. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for General Service Fluorescent Lamps and Incandescent Reflector Lamps [Docket No.: EERE-2011-BT-STD-0006] (RIN: 1904-AC43) received January 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

294. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Automatic Commercial Ice Makers [Docket No.: EERE-2010-BT-STD-0037] (RIN: 1904-AC39) received January 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

295. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-123, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

296. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-128, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

297. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-080, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

298. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department

of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-113, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

299. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-130, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

300. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-137, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

301. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-127, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

302. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-106, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

303. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Secretary's determinations, certifications, and notifications, pursuant to the Iran Freedom and Counter-Proliferation Act of 2012 (IFCA), sections 1244(c)(1), 1246(a)(1), and 1247(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

304. A letter from the Director, Mississippi River Commission, Army, Department of Defense, transmitting a copy of the annual report, in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act, for the Mississippi River Commission covering the calendar year 2014; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

305. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30990; Amdt. No.: 3619] received January 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

306. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters (Previously Eurocopter France) [Docket No.: FAA-2014-1058; Directorate Identifier 2014-SW-065-AD; Amendment 39-18053; AD 2014-26-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

307. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0582; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-065-AD; Amendment 39-18060; AD 2014-26-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

308. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0526; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-141-AD; Amendment 39-18061; AD 2014-26-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.