

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of a great man and a great soldier.

In 2013, I had the honor of meeting Fred Stolley and presenting him with the Soldier's Medal, the highest honor a servicemember can receive for an act of valor in a noncombat situation.

Private First Class Stolley proudly served his country during World War II; and in 1944, he saved a fellow soldier from drowning. Stolley's commanding officer wrote a commendation letter praising him for saving the soldier who was twice his size and deeply troubled by the devastating news of losing his brother in combat.

After the war ended, Stolley returned home to Decatur, Illinois. He worked nights, weekends, and, between classes, building houses and hauling water to graduate from my alma mater, Millikin University, with a degree in business.

Out of respect for the soldier he saved, Stolley never requested a medal to recognize his act of heroism, but 70 years later, my office was able to present him with the medal in front of his family and friends.

This week, we lost a hero. Fred Stolley passed away at the age of 90.

It is because of people like him and all of our men and women in uniform that we are able to enjoy the freedoms that we have today.

My thoughts and prayers are with his family and friends as they lay him to rest in Decatur this afternoon.

LEAH CHASE, THE QUEEN OF CREOLE CUISINE

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

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in the spirit of Black History Month to honor Leah Chase, also known as the "Queen of Creole Cuisine," a renowned chef, author, and a civil rights icon in New Orleans.

As executive chef at her historic restaurant, Dooky Chase's, she has served luminaries such as Duke Ellington, Thurgood Marshall, President George W. Bush and President Barack Obama, among countless others.

In 1946, she married local musician Edgar "Dooky" Chase, Jr., whose family owned a small street corner stand.

At a time when New Orleans was starkly divided by segregation, Dooky Chase's Restaurant was one of the few places where groups of mixed races could gather publicly. As a result, the restaurant became a central hub for leaders of the civil rights movement to meet and discuss strategy.

Of course these types of gatherings were highly illegal, but due to the immense popularity of Dooky Chase's, there would have been a public uproar had law enforcement interrupted business. Leah took full advantage of this and hosted Black voter registration campaigns, NAACP meetings, and

countless other gatherings, and fed them well.

To this day, people from across the world are blessed by Mrs. Chase's warmth, hospitality, and, of course, her cooking. She has received countless awards, has been immortalized in song by Ray Charles, and inspired Disney's first African American princess, but she remains rooted in her ministry and committed to service.

This month, Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor some of the people who have paved the way for my generation and some of the people whose shoulders I stand on. So today, I congratulate and commemorate Leah Chase.

FEDERAL REGULATIONS BURDEN SMALL BUSINESSES

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, small businesses, the backbone of our economy, continue to be unfairly saddled by one-size-fits-all regulations. Most small businesses do not have the capacity to retain in-house legal or compliance departments, and unfortunately, many agencies often neglect their duties of assessing how new regulations may impact small businesses. There is also a pattern of Federal agencies providing inadequate analyses of the long-term economic costs of the rules that they propose.

Despite the President's promise in January of 2011 to "eliminate excessive and unjustified burdens on small businesses," very little has been done by this administration.

Yesterday, the House passed H.R. 50, the Unfunded Mandates Information and Transparency Act of 2015, which would require greater transparency of the Federal Government costs associated with unfunded mandates. I joined my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to approve a commonsense solution to reducing cost by improving transparency, awareness, and accountability in our Federal agencies. Just moments ago, the House passed H.R. 527, which would require better economic analyses of direct and indirect costs on small businesses.

I thank my colleagues in both parties for supporting these commonsense reforms.

TERRITORIAL VOTING RIGHTS

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

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, this month, as we pay homage to the many achievements and contributions to our great Nation by African American men and women, and earlier this week my colleagues spoke on this floor commemorating the 50th anniversary of the march on Selma and the subse-

quent passage of the Voting Rights Act, I want to call to the attention of my colleagues here in Congress that there are still American citizens today that do not have equal voting rights—some 4 million citizens, to be exact. These are citizens and residents of America's island territories: the U.S. Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, Guam, and Northern Mariana Islands.

These overseas U.S. territories have been part of the United States for over 115 years. That is more than half as long as there has been a U.S. Constitution.

Our service has gone above and beyond, giving this great Nation even its very banking system, through fellow Virgin Islander Alexander Hamilton. Our service has gone even to having the highest rate of military service in the United States, with some 7 percent higher than other areas, the national average, in casualties in Afghanistan and Iraq.

I implore this Congress and urge them to pass the Voting Rights Act, and also to extend those rights to its U.S. citizens abroad.

□ 1230

RECOGNIZING THE LEADERSHIP AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF DAVID NORTHERN, SR.

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

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to recognize the leadership and accomplishments of David Northern, Sr. He is a resident of Grayslake and a good friend. On January 25, Mr. Northern was presented with the Most Influential African American of Lake County Award for 2015.

I have known David for several years in his role as a community leader and as the executive director and chief executive officer of the Lake County Housing Authority. Under David's leadership, the housing authority has become a more effective, people-centered, and collaborative agency.

He and his team have found a balance allowing them to successfully serve those in need of housing while also being mindful of the fiscal effects on the county as a whole.

David is a kind and genuine person who feels a personal responsibility to his community. For David Northern, building a strong community is not just his job, but his passion.

I want to congratulate David on his well-deserved award and say that it is an honor to call him my friend and to recognize his contributions to the people of Lake County.

MATTERS OF GRAVE CONCERN TO AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) is recognized

for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to have a discussion with my fellow colleagues and with those people throughout the United States who are watching this and reading this in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The issue I wish to discuss is a matter of grave concern to me and I believe to the American people as well.

I came here 26 years ago. Prior to my arrival in the United States Congress, I had served 7 years in the Reagan White House. I was a speechwriter to President Reagan, and I was a special assistant to the President, which was a designated rank at the White House.

I recall what it was like in the time leading up to Ronald Reagan's election, and I recall specifically how Ronald Reagan dealt with the great challenges he faced. Before Ronald Reagan came to the White House, America was in retreat.

There was a sense of pessimism throughout our country. Our economy was topsy-turvy. There were high levels of inflation and high levels of unemployment. Our country was in jeopardy. Our country felt a danger because while we were in retreat, communism—Soviet communism—was on the offensive throughout the world.

Well, Ronald Reagan, in 8 short years, turned that situation totally around. He turned the economy around, and he turned around the spirit of the people. We went from being pessimistic to being the most optimistic and forward-looking people in the world. Yes, he helped the economy, but foremost, Ronald Reagan ended the cold war.

Mr. Speaker, I am 67 years old. During my life, most of us felt that some day, we would be at war with the Soviet Union—a shooting war—and that it might take the lives of millions of people. We were told to hide under our desk when we were young and cover up our heads in case there was a nuclear attack on our country.

Ronald Reagan expanded the United States military. Many times, when people look back and they understand the success that we had in ending the cold war, they believe that it was due to the increase in the size of our military.

Let me note that did play a factor because it was a deterrent factor, and it was a factor that awed many people in the developing world, as well as our enemies in the communist world, but that is not what switched and that is not what changed our retreat in the cold war to a great victory and the bringing down of the Berlin Wall.

What changed it was a change in strategy that Ronald Reagan initiated during the time that he was President. He was a strong leader. We came into the White House and people asked: What is your strategy for dealing with the Soviet threat to our freedom and the peace of the world? He said: The strategy is very simple. We win, and they lose.

That is what he set out. The guidelines that he set out for us who worked for him in the White House and throughout the administration were that our goal was to be that the United States would win the cold war and the Soviet Union would lose.

Well, during that time period, Ronald Reagan did not deploy American troops overseas like people think that he did. Yes, he expanded our military power, but he made very few deployments—major deployments—of American troops.

In fact, in one deployment which he made to Beirut, where he sent thousands of marines to Beirut, I personally was arguing against it in the White House and went around finding out what it was all about.

After a few short weeks, it turned into a fiasco. It turned into a tragedy, as well as a fiasco, I might add. 300 Americans, marines and sailors, lost their lives when their headquarters was blown up—their bunker, you might say. Their barracks in Beirut was blown up.

Ronald Reagan's advisers at that time advised him to send in tens of thousands of more American troopers, send in the entire 2nd Marine Division and show these terrorists they can't kill marines and get away with it.

Ronald Reagan made his best decision as President at that time not to make such a huge, major deployment of troops into Beirut; otherwise, we would have been in a quagmire for the rest of his administration. They would have been there, stuck in this war zone in Beirut, a no-win situation. Reagan knew that.

He also knew when he told us, No, we are going to get out of there as soon as we can rather than get stuck in the quagmire, he initiated another policy, a security policy based on a different doctrine from sending American troops to garrison in the world or sending American troops to fight other people's battles.

What it was, was Ronald Reagan initiated the Reagan Doctrine. The Reagan Doctrine was basically to recognize that the enemy of our enemy was our friend and to do everything we could to identify our friends around the world who would help us defeat the Soviet Union.

The Reagan Doctrine had us helping people in Nicaragua who were fighting against the Sandinista dictatorship which was allied with the Soviet Union. It was in Africa where you had Cuban troops being confronted by insurgency movements that we supported that were pro-democracy, or at least anti-Soviet, and in Afghanistan where the Soviet Army itself was being confronted.

The doctrine supported those who were struggling for freedom against oppression. We helped people in Europe, the Lech Walesas and the various leaders throughout Eastern Europe who organized resistance against the Soviet domination of their countries. Whether

it was Poland or Czechoslovakia or Hungary, they received covert support from President Reagan.

Reagan wanted, yes, to defeat the Soviet Union, and that is what we did. We did it in a way by helping those who were on the front lines, struggling against what we saw as an evil—that is, a government in Russia that was controlled by an atheistic theory that an atheist dictatorship imposed upon people could reestablish new values among human beings and, thus, create a whole new world.

That monstrous philosophy—monstrous because it had monstrous implications in terms of human freedom, but also in the control and slaughter of those people who did not agree with that vision—that had to be defeated because it threatened the entire world.

By the time Ronald Reagan was finished with his Presidency and the leadership that he provided to the free world and all those who were struggling against communism, we succeeded. The Berlin Wall came down. This was done because of great leadership and a great strategy on the part of this man.

Today, we look at a totally different world from the world that Reagan left us. Unlike the world that he inherited from his predecessor, President Carter, Reagan left us a world where the upward trend toward our civilization was undeniable, that it looked like we could have generations of peace and that our enemies respected us to the point that they would not put us in jeopardy because it would be putting themselves in jeopardy. Reagan gave us chances for peace, prosperity, and freedom throughout the world.

Today, we face a totally different world. It is a frightening world. We have, today, an adversary that is every bit as evil, potentially harmful, and destructive to the people of the world as what we faced when Ronald Reagan came to the Presidency at the height of the cold war.

Yes, everything was dangerous at that time, and Reagan gave us peace and security. Today, we are facing evil and danger as even before in the cold war, but perhaps we can compare this even to the evil and danger that America and the Western world faced in the early thirties and the late twenties when nazism and fascism raised its ugly head.

What happened? During that time period, had we and the Western Allies been able to deal with Adolf Hitler, perhaps there would not have been this huge conflagration of World War II which took the lives of hundreds of millions of people.

But they did not deal with that as Ronald Reagan dealt with communism when he became President, and Hitler and the fascist threat eventually, with their aggression, put the free world and those other people who sought a better world in such a spot that war erupted and World War II, that great conflagration, happened. It was avoidable.

Well, today, we face a similar threat. We face an evil that, as I say, is every bit as dangerous as the evil that was faced by Reagan and faced before World War II.

It is a radical Islamic philosophy that will slaughter people in the West without thinking twice about it or, what is even worse, will slaughter people in great numbers in the West after strategizing of how to do it more effectively—not only slaughtering Christians and other non-Muslims, but this evil force is seeking to dominate that part of the world in which the majority of people are of the Islamic faith.

This radical Islamic terrorist evil murders more Muslims than, indeed, they murder Christians, although they have been very aggressive in their murder of Christians in a very demonstrable way, in a way that would try to intimidate the Christian world and the non-Muslim world, but we have brave and courageous people within the Muslim world.

We must not let ourselves be brought to the point that the radical Islamic movement wants us to be in, and that is to alienate the rest of the billion of Muslims who occupy this planet and make them our enemy.

Like Ronald Reagan, we must seek out our friends throughout the world who are struggling against radical Islamic terrorism and dictatorship and make sure that we back them up, so they will have a chance to defeat this threat and this ongoing murder and chaos that is engulfing their own countries.

Today, we have such heroes overseas. Let us note, in the last 6 years, this threat has grown, has gone from miniscule to being a threat that, if we do not deal with it, could erupt into the same type of global conflagration that we saw in World War II and perhaps—or at best—would leave us with a war, with a global split in the world like happened under communism that we defeated under Ronald Reagan.

□ 1245

Yes, we could see, if this threat of radical Islam is not confronted with American leadership, 10 years down the road, there could be a massive conflagration that would encompass, for example, what would happen if we do lose total control and things go totally out of control into the gulf areas, in the Persian Gulf and in the Arab world. If that part of the world becomes dominant, if the dominant force in that part of the world becomes this radical Islamic philosophy, it will then move to the “stans.” It will then move to the great parts of Africa and of Central Asia, and that will tip the balance of power in this planet and will lead to the type of global conflagration that all of us want to avoid and to prevent.

But we must have the type of decisive leadership and the type of actual commitment to winning this battle against the radical Islamic dictatorship that these people are trying to su-

perimpose upon the world. We need the strong commitment that we saw under Ronald Reagan. We need that, and we do not have it. We do not have the leadership we need or the type of chaos that is now erupting in the Arab world would not be happening.

What is happening in this chaos that we see is this rise of ISIL, a group of people who are so committed to establishing a Muslim dictatorship throughout their part of the world and throughout Africa and, yes, even throughout the rest of the world where other non-Muslim communities live. These people are dedicated to terrorizing the world into submission to their authority, and they see their authority as coming from their radical version of God, through their radical version of Islam.

Again, most Muslims deny and reject that type of Islam. But let us not forget, let us not ignore the fact that this radical philosophy is based on their interpretation of Islam. That it is a religious fanaticism that could, just like communism was a religious fanaticism—it was an atheism fanaticism. And we have seen Christian fanaticisms in the past, and they did great damage and cost the lives of great numbers of people in their day. This radical fanaticism, unless we defeat it now, will perhaps drag the entire planet into a World War II-like conflagration. How do we stop that? How was Ronald Reagan able to stop the rise of communism, the Soviet expansionism that he faced when he took office and, in 7 or 8 short years, managed to turn that around and defeat that very enemy?

First, he had the commitment to defeat it. And I will say today that I don't believe our President has the commitment to defeat and destroy radical Islamic terrorism and the radical Islamic dictatorship that these fanatics would superimpose upon us. Instead, I think our President believes, in good faith, that he can reach an accommodation with these folks, with these fanatics, that an accommodation can be reached and that we should try to prove to them that we are not their enemy.

Well, they know they are our enemy because they get their word from God, not from the President of the United States. That is what they believe. They see these overtures, the fanatic radicals like in the Taliban, they see it as a weakness, and it only encourages the radical Islamic movement for our President to try to reach accommodation or to say pleasant things to them without being aggressive, with seeming to be unwilling to actually draw a line in the sand.

Our President, as most people know, has trouble even uttering the words “Islamic terrorism” in one sentence. We are not going to be successful in defeating this threat that would murder us by the millions of people if they get the chance if our President is not even willing to utter the words “Islamic terrorism” in the same sentence.

We have a President that, after our Ambassador was murdered in Benghazi, tried to foist off on the American people the false story that our Ambassador was killed because a demonstration against a movie that insulted Islam got out of control and the demonstrators killed our Ambassador. For weeks, this President himself participated in spreading that lie.

Now, what message does it give us? First of all, my gosh, our President isn't going to tell us the truth about radical Islam. But what did the Muslim terrorists think? At that moment, the Muslim terrorists were thinking: My goodness, we have a guy that is so weak that he can't even condemn us and condemn the killing of his own Ambassador by our movement. This emboldened them.

And that is why, we heard early on support for various “reform movements,” and we all hoped that the Arab Spring would be a reform movement. Instead, our President, unlike Ronald Reagan, who sought to help those people who were the most aggressive opponents of Soviet communism, this President has tried to seek out those people in the Muslim Brotherhood and elsewhere and reach an accommodation with them.

That is why today we see enormous chaos and the rise of a radical, fanatic Islamic movement, ISIL, that will burn people alive, that will recruit people throughout the West to murder people in a newspaper, like we just saw in Paris, for drawing a cartoon that in some way made fun of their beliefs, as if people aren't free to make fun of other people's beliefs. No, they think it is all right to murder those people, and that is less civil—that is not even a sin, that is a mandate, as compared to murdering unarmed people.

An unarmed cartoonist, newspaper cartoonist in France and his colleagues, a policeman who happened to be a Muslim, laying there helpless on the ground, and they murdered him outright. This is fanaticism. This is part of a fanatic, radical Islamic movement that has to be stopped. They will not stop at killing one policeman who happens to be a Muslim on the ground. They will murder millions of others if they get the chance. They are trying to establish themselves throughout the Arab world right now. We need to make sure we stand by our friends.

Yet, unlike Ronald Reagan, and there was no doubt he was standing behind our friends who opposed Soviet communism, but what are we projecting to those people who are standing firm against this fanatic, radical Islamic movement that would put an Islamic dictatorship on the people? What are we telling our friends who are standing up against that?

Well, how about President el-Sisi of Egypt? El-Sisi was a general who stepped in at a time when Egypt could have gone either way. We had a radical Islamic movement going there. Yes, there was an elected President, and he

broke his word to his own people in trying to institute a caliphate in Egypt. They rose up against him in an aggressive shout from the people of Egypt, saying: We will not let our country become an Islamic caliphate. This is Egypt. We believe in a democratic government here, and we believe in an Egyptian government—not some radical, fanatic Arab government that was superimposed on them by members of some Muslim Brotherhood that operates behind the scenes.

Well, we almost lost Egypt. And if Egypt would fall today or would have fallen then, there would be no chance of stopping this fanatic movement that threatens the world and threatens especially other Muslim countries. There would have been no chance at all. President el-Sisi is a courageous man who has stepped forward, and our President took a long time and is still taking a long time in getting solidly behind the effort to prevent Egypt from becoming a bastion of fanatic Islamic radicalism that would threaten the world.

General el-Sisi, I visited him a year ago, and he expressed: My goodness, we bought all of these helicopters from the United States, and we need them now because there is an insurgency going on with radicals out in the Sinai desert. We need these helicopters. And it took forever for our administration, this government, to provide them the spare parts, the spare parts for that effort. They have jumped through hoops. We were doing them a favor. No, we should look at these people as doing us a favor. They are on the front lines battling this.

And President el-Sisi just recently did something that all Americans and peace-loving people throughout the world should applaud, and that is he went directly to Muslim groups in Egypt and spoke to them and spoke on the record saying we have got to cleanse ourselves from this fanaticism in which we are intolerant of other people's religions, these people who would murder other people and commit acts of terrorism. President el-Sisi, that was courageous of him. We need other leaders to follow in his footsteps.

Has our administration done anything to congratulate President el-Sisi in making that incredible stand? What type of things have we done to prove that we are behind him in this effort? He also did something else. President el-Sisi was the first President of Egypt ever to visit a Coptic church, a Christian church in Egypt. Yet this administration has been just so-so when it comes to el-Sisi. Yes, we have not undermined him, but we have not given him support, which would have been a signal to all of the other leaders there to stand firm and America will stand behind you.

We have people like, for instance, the King of Jordan, who was only here just a few days ago, and what happened? A Jordanian pilot was put into a cage and burned to death as a public spectacle.

A Jordanian pilot. Why did they do that? Why did these fanatics do that? Because they meant to terrorize the people of the world, terrorize the people of Africa, terrorize other people who would stand up against them. And what was Abdullah's reaction to that? He left his meetings in the United States and flew back to Jordan. It is now being said that he personally flew a bombing mission against the ISIL people who burned that man alive. Now there is a leader, and we should be backing him up.

But what do we hear just in the paper the other day? That Jordan is having difficulty in getting the supplies of weapons and arms that they need to make sure that they can stand firm against ISIL and this horrible, radical fanatic movement that is sweeping through their part of the world.

Ronald Reagan knew that we needed to support great leaders who would help us end the cold war. We will bring about war if leaders like King Abdullah in Jordan and President el-Sisi in Egypt—if people think we won't get behind them, how can we count on others to take that stand.

How about the Kurds up in northern Iraq? They are the ones bearing the burden, bearing the brunt of all of the fighting that is going on now in Iraq. The other people, when we tried to work things through Baghdad and tried to accommodate leaders who were halfheartedly in this battle and really weren't committed, what happened? We gave them enormous amounts of military equipment that ended up in the hands of radicals, ended up being used as vehicles and guns to destroy and kill people who want the type of world that we want to live in, which is a world of tolerance and freedom and peace and prosperity, not radical, fanatic Muslim dictatorship.

□ 1300

Instead, the Kurds have stood firm. The Kurds are the one group in Iraq that have stood firm and are the one group that has received the least support from the United States as compared to the others.

Now, Baghdad, which wants to put their thumb down on the Kurds, we are going along with a demand with those people that all our aid that goes to the Kurds goes to Baghdad first. That is recognizing the people who are not really on our side, their power, over the people who are on our side.

In fact, there was a meeting in London just in the last few days—I guess it was last week—to determine what would go on in Iraq. The United States was, of course, maybe not sitting at the table, but helped organize this and were part of the process of trying to get this meeting together. We didn't even insist that the Kurds were there. The Kurds weren't even at the table.

This is a betrayal of the people who are on the front lines fighting the big fight of today against radical Islamic terrorism. We betrayed them. This is horrible.

What kind of message does that send to other people around the world who have to stand up against this onslaught of radical fanatic Islamic terrorist dictatorship that would be superimposed on them?

We have got to make sure that these people understand—whether it is Abdullah—or how about the Crown Prince of Abu Dhabi, for example? Here is a man who is so strong in his conviction and leadership in that part of the world to try to stop this terrible threat. Yes, he is treated well. We should be honoring him.

Our administration should be leading the efforts to take the Abdullahs and the Crown Prince there in Abu Dhabi and President el-Sisi. These people deserve demonstrable support, not just sort of halfheartedly getting behind them.

What about, for example, even Qatar today? Qatar is trying to make a decision as to what to do in the face of this. For example, they permit us to have airstrikes against ISIL—this radical Islamic group up in Iraq—they are permitting us to use an air base in Qatar to launch those attacks, but we should make sure people understand and are grateful to them for it and be demonstrable about it.

Part of it is, yes, stand up with your friends. If somebody does something good, like Qatar has just done and wants to go back—and, by the way, has taken some steps in the right direction after taking some steps in the wrong direction—they lost faith in us, I believe, and now, they are coming back in our direction. We should encourage that.

The other half of the equation is we need to be tough on the guys who are our enemies, who are going the wrong way, who are supporting radical Islamic fanatic terrorism, like, for example, Pakistan.

We are still giving billions of dollars over a 10-year period to Pakistan. We are giving hundreds of millions of dollars of military equipment and foreign aid to a country that is, yes, supporting the Taliban.

Almost all of the people that we have lost in Afghanistan can be traced back to terrorists who are using Pakistan as a home base, but not only as a home base, the ISI have been actively involved in helping these fanatic terrorists that our people were up against in Afghanistan.

How do we know that? Well, we do know that it is known, but maybe just the fact that they were giving safe haven to Osama Bin Laden—the murderer of 3,000 Americans on 9/11—they gave safe haven to this man. This was, "Oh, we didn't know." No one believes that. They knew.

Now, to add insult to injury, they have taken the doctor who gave us the location of Osama Bin Laden and helped us bring Osama Bin Laden to justice, that doctor, Dr. Afridi, is now languishing in a dungeon, in a 10-by-10-foot cell in Pakistan.

That act by Pakistan is a hostile act to the United States, and for us to walk away and ignore it is to encourage others to treat us in the same way.

We must be tough on our enemies and friends to our friends. Is that a difficult formula? Is that too difficult for people to understand?

We are losing today because I believe this President has been treating our enemies better than he has been treating our friends in many cases, in terms of willing to reach out to them. We should be reaching out and trying to do everything we can to help the friendly countries rather than reaching out to seek accommodations with these evil countries.

Nowhere is that better demonstrated than the announcement that we had secretly negotiated a deal with Fidel Castro's regime in Cuba—secretly negotiated. Congress didn't know what was going on, and now, he has announced by edict his executive orders.

Here is a President—maybe he likes Castro a little bit because Castro, after all, he could rule with edicts, just like our President now likes to rule with edicts, rather than go through what we call your regular order as seeking the legislative branch and seeking compromises and establishing policy in that way.

Instead, this President reversed 50 years of American policy towards Cuba on his own rather than coming here to Congress and working out something with us and trying to find what was the best way and opening up Cuba to having the beginning of an economic relationship and having Americans go freely there and then to come to the United States.

Well, he did that, and there were no concessions, none, that the Cubans made for this President to give up that 50 years, 50 years of “this is what our policy is, you are going to have to do this—free elections, opposition parties, et cetera—then we will recognize you.” This President gave it up and no concessions on the other side.

Now, by the way, what message does that send to all these other countries? Again, it is not just Cuba. What message does that send to all these other countries when we complain about human rights or we try to set a standard, some standard, that will, indeed, take that country in the right direction?

We end up giving up a 50-year policy with no concessions; thus every little petty dictator in the world or, even worse, every group that is out there who is trying to decide whether or not to go with radical Islamist terrorism or not, they know they can make whatever decision they want and eventually the United States is going to cave in because we are projecting weakness.

As I say, the one thing Ronald Reagan did that was terrific was to rebuild our military, and it did—it created a sense of awe, but it was a sense of strength. He used that sense of strength, but it was his strategy in

helping those people throughout the world who are our friends and the friends of things we believed in and the enemy of our enemies. That is what worked. We are sending the wrong message to the people who will be the enemy of our enemies.

We are undermining by not providing positive and forceful support for those people who are standing up—the Crown Prince of Abu Dhabi and these others and Abdullah and Jordan and President el-Sisi in Egypt—by not demonstrably standing with them, we send the wrong message throughout the world. That is why things are falling apart. That is why things are not going in the right direction.

This isn't we just happen to live in a time when things are chaotic. That is not the case. Just like Ronald Reagan didn't just live in the times when there was a Soviet communist threat that was undermining the peace of the world. That didn't just happen. It was the basis of things that, yes, what they did, but also our response to that threat.

Today, this administration, I believe, has led us down a path that has created the chaos that we now see, created a situation where you have a radical fanatic Islamic dictatorship movement that not only tries to take over and dominate the Islamic part of the world, but is threatening terrorist acts and has engaged in terrorist acts.

We will have more and more bombings like we saw at the Boston Marathon. We will have more and more terrorist actions taken in Western Europe as we saw in Paris or in Africa, unless we step forward and let the world know that we are strong, we are strong in our commitment, and we stand by those who will help us in this battle.

I recently visited New York City, and I had not been there for a long time. I had never gone to the 9/11 Memorial. I visited the 9/11 Memorial, and I would advise anyone who has not been there to go there.

This is a memorial to the 3,000 Americans who died on 9/11, most of them there at the World Trade Center in those two great towers that were brought down on that day. You should go. Anyone hearing my voice—my colleagues, others—should go and see this.

They have managed to get a picture of almost every one of the victims who died that day. Many, of course, were firemen and policemen who, when the airplane struck that building, instead of running away and rushing away, they ran towards the building, they ran there to see what they could do to help, and they gave their lives, these heroic people.

We have to have a government as heroic as our own people if we are going to triumph over the people that slaughtered those people today. They slaughtered them in 9/11, and they will slaughter them today.

I looked at those pictures of those 3,000 people—and I was in the government when that happened, and I

worked with Reagan before that, but on 9/11, we had been here a long time, and we are all part of this.

We owe it to the people of the United States, all of us on both sides of the aisle and in the executive branch and whoever else who is the government of this country, we owe it to our people to make sure we are doing the right thing—and I looked into their faces, and I brought my children with me to see this, and I said: Look, all of those people, do you know what they are telling us? They are telling us, to me and to all of us here in this body, you let us down, you let us down.

Don't do it again. Don't let there be another wall in another city with 20,000 pictures on it because they have got some sort of dirty bomb or something. These people that we are facing today are capable of that.

I am not arguing for major deployments of military units overseas, occupation, garrison in the world, like we did for too long, and I do not think it was right for us to go into Iraq in the first place.

I do argue that when we find people on our side, like Ronald Reagan did, we need to have a strong military, and we need to make sure that the world respects us.

Then we need to have stands and activities and actions that win their respect, them knowing that we stand with those people who will stand firm against this threat to the world.

Otherwise, some day, there could be another World War II-like thing 10 years down the road when we say: Why didn't you stop that fanatic Hitler when he was just walking around, goose-stepping around in these towns in Germany when he could have been stopped? Why didn't you stop him then?

Then there was hundreds of millions of people. This could lead to that type of conflagration.

One thing we know, unless we stop this radical movement there now, they will find ways of killing thousands of Americans, and there will be other walls, with other pictures, saying: Why didn't you do something?

I call on my colleagues now to seriously look at this challenge that we face. My negative comments about what I believe is the President not dealing with this situation in the right way is something that I am saying from the heart, and I am not doing this for political reasons.

□ 1315

Let me just say today that we see examples of where we need to take stands. We need to make sure, for example, that the nouveau regime in Iran is facing a President of the United States and an American Government that are making demands that they do not use this system that they are developing now. They have signed a treaty saying they would not have a nuclear weapon. We should hold them to that treaty, and we should be helping

the people in Iran, who are struggling against that nouveau regime. I do not say we should attack Iran with American military might. We should be supportive, and we should have been so all along.

There were demonstrators in the streets of Tehran, and there was no message. There was no message at all of support from our government at that time. That was one of the first things this President did—he refrained from helping and supporting those young activists for democracy in Iran. The Baloch people are fighting against the corruption and oppression of the Pakistani Government, which is dominated by these radicals. We should be helping the Baloch, who can also be active in Iran, I might say.

There are options that we can have throughout the world today—actions both in terms of policy and in terms of actually helping people struggle for freedom—that will ensure the peace of the world 10 years down the road, as Ronald Reagan did when he took over. He left us a better world. We need to take the steps now to make sure that, when we leave this body, when we leave Congress—and whoever becomes President the next time around—that we leave this government so that our people have a greater chance for freedom, a greater chance to live in peace. We need to make sure that our people can live in peace and prosperity.

Those pictures on the wall at the 9/11 Memorial shout out to us: Do your duty. You didn't do it. You let us down. Don't do it again. Make sure the American people are safe. You have a challenge now. Meet that challenge. Stand firm. Stand strong behind those who are with you.

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

SILENCING A PRESCIENT VOICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WESTERMAN). 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, we have heard a great deal about protocol this past week, and it all centers around the invitation by the Speaker of this House to the Prime Minister of Israel to come and speak to the body, as he has done twice before.

It is worth pointing out, Mr. Speaker, that Bibi Netanyahu is one of the most prescient voices that we have in the entire world to address some of the subjects and some of the dangers that face the United States of America, and yet this administration is caught up in a conundrum over protocol.

While it might be worth reminding this administration that ours is a government made up of three equal branches, it is even more important to remind this administration that, when Iran is pursuing a nuclear weapons capability with which to threaten the peace and security of the entire world,

when ISIS and groups like it are slaughtering people the world over, when ISIS is crucifying and killing and torturing people in Iraq—when they are burning their prisoners alive in cages—this administration is caught up in protocol. Mr. Speaker, that is a profound distortion of priority.

Ironically, this administration, for all of its talk of protocol, not only violated protocol when it traded five Taliban leaders for Sergeant Bowe Bergdahl, but it broke the law itself. This administration has repeatedly sought to unconstitutionally usurp the powers of the legislative branch by brash fiat. It chooses to listen to these mysterious voices of those who did not vote in our Nation's election. Its constitutional overreach is evidenced by Cuba, immigration, ObamaCare, and a number of others.

Let us put that litany aside for a moment and just consider the arrogance of this administration as it comes now to proclaim that the Speaker of this House has somehow broken protocol by inviting the Prime Minister of our most vital ally on Earth to speak on this floor.

Worse, Mr. Speaker, it has sought to go after and silence the guest speaker, himself. In hearing the visceral rhetoric of this White House, one would think our Speaker had invited the prime minister of an enemy nation instead of one of our best friends on the planet. Unfortunately, this administration's claims of breached protocol are an attempt to overshadow the real elephant in the room, and truth itself.

The actual outrage here is not about the Israeli elections, as some might say. It is not about the doomed diplomatic overtures of this administration. The real crisis and the real threat is a nuclear-capable Iran, and Prime Minister Netanyahu—with the greatest credentials on Earth related to this threat—in coming to speak to all of us is acting as a trusted ally should act. I hope this administration and this Congress and the American people will listen to him very carefully.

The true problem here, Mr. Speaker, is that an outspoken enemy of our Nation, one that is, indeed, the leading state sponsor of global Islamic terrorism, is actively pursuing nuclear weapons that could create the gravest of threats to the United States, Israel, and the entire free world.

How quickly we forget that Iran considers the United States of America the "Great Satan." How quickly we forget that last year, on November 4, Iran, once again, celebrated "Death to America Day," commemorating the 1979 seizure of the United States Embassy. How quickly we forget that "death to America" is the rallying cry of Hezbollah, which has been backed by Iran, and it launched attacks on Israel just last week, killing and wounding good men.

How quickly we forget that one of Iran's stated goals is "wiping Israel off the map." How quickly we forget that

Iran collaborates with anti-U.S. regimes in South America and is actively seeking to exploit our borders and, of course, this administration's complete inattention to them. How quickly we forget that Iran continues to cooperate with North Korea in the development of long-range missiles capable of carrying nuclear warheads to the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, is this administration so naive or, worse, so arrogant as to believe that we can have any type of credible, diplomatic agreement with the leadership of such a regime?

I think it is embarrassing, Mr. Speaker, to the United States of America that this supposed breach of protocol has somehow permitted this administration through anonymous, yet somehow authoritative, sources to politically threaten the elected leader of our only democratic ally in the region—calling him names in the media and being vindictive in its every interaction with him. None of this salve for the administration's wounded ego has furthered the interests of the United States one iota. Ultimately, it has only diminished America's national security and Israel's right to defend herself.

Mr. Speaker, there are, unfortunately, only three things that will prevent Iran from eventually gaining nuclear weapons: one is a fundamental change of the regime in Iran; two is a direct military action to destroy their capability to build a nuclear weapons capability; or, finally, Mr. Speaker, it is the conviction in the minds of the jihadist leadership in Iran that military action will occur if that capability is not dismantled.

Mr. Speaker, indifference, cowardice, diplomacy—call it what you will, but in the end, ignorance, whether intentional or unintentional, is not a viable alternative to the truth. Along with so many others in this body and, really, in America, itself, I have every conviction that when Prime Minister Netanyahu speaks on the threat that Iran's pursuit of nuclear weapons and its sponsorship of terrorism pose to global security, he will be speaking the truth. Once again, for the sake of America, for Israel, and for the free world, I pray that we all listen very carefully.

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

DISASTER ASSISTANCE FAIRNESS AND ACCOUNTABILITY

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

Mr. MACARTHUR. Mr. Speaker, on October 29 of 2012, Super Storm Sandy battered the coast of my State, New Jersey, leaving behind a wake of devastation and interrupting the lives of many, many thousands of people in our communities.

We are still recovering from this. It was the second-costliest hurricane in