

While the President's actions will undoubtedly save lives, we know that in communities like the U.S. Virgin Islands, and the many other minority communities across this country, there needs to be more comprehensive action to address the underlying issues that are at the root of gun violence.

The citizens living in these communities experience inexcusable levels of poverty. In the U.S. Virgin Islands, more than 30 percent of children are living below the poverty level and in Chicago, most of the South and West sides have 40 to 60 percent of residents living below the poverty level.

If we are serious about making our communities safer and reducing gun crime, we must take comprehensive action to not only reduce the likelihood of mass shootings like San Bernadino or New Town, but also address the systemic divestment of resources, education, support in communities of color across this country that lead the scourge of gun violence that play out on our inner-city streets every day.

In addition to The President's action, this congress needs to make it a priority to make adequate investments in early childhood education and other programs aimed at lifting children out of poverty.

Additionally, making meaningful reforms to our criminal justice system and increasing resources to reduce the flow of drugs and illegal guns through our ports will help fight back the firearm black market.

This is not about the second amendment: an overwhelming number of Americans—most gun owners themselves—agree, that we must do something to stop guns from getting into the hands of people who shouldn't have them.

This Congress has in its power, the ability to save thousands of lives. Let us not allow the near daily occurrence of mass shootings to become the new norm. We must act to pass comprehensive gun legislation.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, last week, President Obama announced a series of executive actions aimed at reducing gun violence across the United States. President Obama laid out these much-needed steps in the face of Congressional inaction, which will help to reduce the senseless gun violence that affects countless communities across our nation.

In 2014, firearms claimed the lives of more than 33,000 Americans. Over 2,800 of those fatalities took place in my home state of Texas. Perhaps there will be a time when we no longer will have to read headlines about mass murders in our schools or movie theaters. But until then, our nation must take concerted steps to strengthen background checks, improve mental health services, and keep firearms out of the hands of criminals and the mentally ill. This is what President Obama has sought to achieve and I truly believe that this can be done without infringing on law-abiding citizens' right to bear arms.

There have been numerous critics of President Obama's executive actions to reduce gun violence. However, we can no longer stand by as gun violence claims the lives of more innocent Americans. The President is limited in what he can achieve through executive actions alone. That is why Congress has the responsibility to pass comprehensive gun safety legislation now and put our nation on the path

to preventing such violence from happening again.

Mr. Speaker, gun violence affects individuals of all backgrounds in communities all across the United States. It is not a Democratic issue nor is it a Republican issue. It is an issue that affects every American in one form or another. Successfully reducing gun violence in this country will take more than just legislative action from Congress. It will take the collective effort of every American to change the course of our history and end gun violence in America once and for all.

RADICAL ISLAMISTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. COMSTOCK). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for half the time remaining before 10 p.m.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, we have now learned that the administration is releasing or has released Muhammad al-Rahman al-Shamrani, a 40-year-old citizen of Saudi Arabia. He was transferred to Saudi Arabia on January 11, 2016.

Apparently, The New York Times had gotten ahold of documents regarding—and this is from an October 2008 recommendation for the continued detention under the Department of Defense control for Guantanamo detainee, and then it gives the long number—it is Muhammad al-Rahman al-Shamrani.

If you read what purports to be secret—I don't know how The New York Times got it—but you read over in his file that this Guantanamo detainee—that would be Mr. Shamrani—on 14 October 2007 stated: "When I get out of here, I will go to Iraq and Afghanistan and will kill as many Americans as I can. Then I will come here and kill more Americans."

He also stated: "I love Osama bin Laden and Mullah Omar, and if I ever get out of Guantanamo, I will go back to fight the Americans and kill as many as I can."

The detainee stated he hated all Americans and will seek revenge if ever released from Guantanamo. The detainee said that, if he is released, he would again participate in jihad against the enemies of Muslims, to include the United States. The detainee is proud of what he has done, and he is willing to do anything to fight against the enemies of Muslims. The detainee stated he decided to become more religious because of his dislike of the U.S. and its citizens.

So for those who have been confused about the rules of civilized warfare, there is nothing illegal, unconstitutional against the Geneva Convention for holding people who are part of a group who are at war with your country until the group they are a part of announces they are no longer at war with you.

Now, war was declared, as some of my Muslim leader friends in the Middle East and Africa tell me. It is obvious to the rest of the world that radical Islam

declared war on the United States back in '79 after President Carter laid the foundation to allow what he called a man of peace to come in and take over ruling Iran. His name was Khomeini. It was after that that our American Embassy was attacked and over 50 people taken hostages, Americans. Basically, we did nothing about it.

So I know the President likes to say that Guantanamo is used as a recruiting tool, but the fact is, oh, basically, if we get rid of Guantanamo, then that pretty much eliminates anger at America.

The fact is that while President Clinton was sending American military to protect Muslims who were being unfairly treated, there were not only attacks against Americans. There was planning going on, not only to attack the USS Cole, but to attack America, our facilities, our embassies, our buildings, and they were planning 9/11. There were no detainees at Guantanamo.

Yet, all of this plotting and planning—and from my discussions with people in the Middle East when I have been over there, with people who are from Iran, Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, when I have been in those countries—I haven't been into Syria, but I have been right there at its border—but they all say the same thing. What they use to recruit is in 1979 we were attacked by radical Islamists. We did nothing under President Carter.

In '83, we were attacked and around 300 marines were killed in Beirut. Congress, under Democratic control, said we are getting our people out. So President Reagan ordered the evacuation from Beirut. Instead of fighting back, we ran home. I understand that Reagan felt that was one of the big mistakes of his Presidency.

So the attacks have been ongoing. The World Trade Center attack in 1993, the attack on the Khobar Towers, so many attacks under President Clinton. He sent a lot of tow missiles, blew up some tents. It seems maybe like there was an aspirin factory.

It was not Guantanamo that was the driving force in all of those years, decades of war against the United States. It didn't exist. The elimination of Guantanamo will not end the animosity and the desire of radical Islamists to eliminate America from the map along with Israel.

□ 2130

And just to be clear, today the story from Susannah George, "Islamic State Claims Responsibility for Baghdad Mall Attack," they are still at war. Whether they are JV or not, they are killing people.

Adam Kredo from the Free Beacon reports today, "Obama Administration Stonewalling Investigation into 113 Terrorists Inside United States":

"Senators Ted Cruz and Jeff Sessions disclosed Monday that they had been pressuring the Obama administration for months to disclose the immigration

histories of these foreign-born individuals implicated in terror plots.”

Senators CRUZ and SESSIONS wrote to the Secretaries of State and Homeland Security and the Attorney General: “The American people are entitled to information on the immigration history of terrorists seeking to harm them.” They note that we already knew 14 of the people that were brought over as refugees turned out to be terrorists, foreign terrorists, radical Islamists, but they were given legal entrance as refugees.

We have a right to know how many of those 113 that have now been arrested for terrorism were foreign born, how many of them came in as refugees. These are all important.

Then we see the story from yesterday by Jonah Bennett that almost half of California driver's licenses went to illegal immigrants in 2015. Wow. Under the REAL ID Act, that means nobody from California should be able to use their driver's licenses to get on airplanes to travel in interstate commerce or foreign travel.

And then the story from Philadelphia, January 8, absolutely tragic. A man walks up shooting police. A discussion today that there may be other people that were involved. The gunman said he shot the Philadelphia officer for the Islamic State. The police have said that. However, despite the fact that this radical Islamic terrorist has said he shot the police officer repeatedly in an ambush for Allah and for the Islamic State, here is the headline from a story by Dave Boyer from today: “Obama Administration Wondering whether Shooting of Philly Cop Was Terrorist Act,” because they don't take the radical Islamist terrorist who shot the policeman for Allah and for the Islamic State. Perhaps they think he is confused. He doesn't sound confused. He sounds like he knew exactly what he was doing when he walked up and ambushed, trying to kill by repeatedly shooting a Philadelphia policeman.

The story of January 8 from Jay Solomon in *The Wall Street Journal*, “Nuclear Deal Fuels Iran's Hard-Liners,” and it makes clear, as it says down here: “As much as \$100 billion in frozen revenues are expected to return to Iran after sanctions are lifted, which U.S. officials said could happen in coming weeks. The White House hoped the cash windfall would aid Mr. Rouhani's political fortunes.”

Madam Speaker, mark my words. If that \$100 billion to \$150 billion is provided by this administration here in the United States of America to Iran, to its current radical Islamic leaders who hate the United States, who have not signed the deal that President Obama is so proud of—and they have breached it repeatedly already, we know—that money, some of that money will be used to finance the killing of Americans and Israelis.

Now, back when I was a judge—years and years ago, a prosecutor—we would

say, if you fund somebody who says they are going to use some of that money, as Iran has, to fund Hamas and Hezbollah, which we know are terrorist organizations, been named as such, and you know they are terrorist organizations, you know the money you are providing is going to, in turn, be provided to terrorist organizations.

See, back when I was a prosecutor or judge, we would say: You know what? If you are knowingly providing money to someone who has already said they are going to give it to terrorists who are going to kill people, well, it sounds like there is a case to be made for you being as guilty as they are. Certainly, it goes beyond the pale of gross negligence, but that is hypothetically speaking.

I am not a prosecutor. I am not a judge. I am not a chief justice anymore. But when is the sanity going to return when people who say they are your enemies who want death to America, continue to say “death to America,” continue to say we are going to provide more money, once you give us that \$100 billion, \$150 billion, once you give us that, we are going to fund more terrorism, and it is already being reported. Just the announcement that the money is coming has already stimulated more attacks on those who would hope to be free in Iran. It is tragic, just tragic.

But, in any event, we are living in perilous times. Many understand that there are radical Islamists who are at war with us. It is time to recognize that the release of a man who has said he wants to kill Americans and will after he is released should be taken at his word.

I know there is some claim that he may not have said the things that are attributed to him by our own officers, our own personnel that were monitoring him, but let me just say that is a real easy one. There is video somewhere, unless that has been lost with some of the emails that were being pursued by Congress. Unless it has been lost with emails that have been deleted to try to avoid turning them over to Congress, those videos can be consulted, and we can know for sure whether this Islamic radical that President Obama has released from Guantanamo said the things that our people said he said.

I was hearing some of my friends' comments about the gun laws. I know we all share the desire to lessen and eliminate gun violence in America. The thousands of felony cases that came through my court caused me repeatedly to think back. I don't recall anybody who committed a crime with a gun that got it legally. Outlaws don't get guns legally.

It has been made clear that the things our President has proposed would not have stopped one of these mass murderers that he now says spur him on to take action. I would encourage my friends: Let's work to take action that will actually stop the mass

murders, that will actually stop the gun violence, but that will not occur by taking guns out of the hands of law-abiding citizens.

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

ARMED STANDOFF IN OREGON

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. COMSTOCK). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) until 10 p.m.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to come to the floor this evening to speak about an armed standoff that is taking place in my State of Oregon.

This is the ninth day of armed occupation of the Malheur National Wildlife Refuge where we have some lawless, reckless behavior on the part of out-of-State zealots who have taken over a Federal resource.

This is really hard to comprehend for a moment. As has been mentioned by numerous commentators, imagine what would happen if armed protesters who were of a different color or of a different religion occupied a Federal facility in Chicago or Washington, D.C., or Philadelphia. We would not tolerate that behavior. We would watch people move in to remove them. And yet, here, we are talking about the ninth day with impunity these people have undertaken to exert their own vision for an amazing region, this high desert plateau in eastern Oregon, a region of vast, arid, high desert with many key lakes and wetlands, that is the location of a wildlife refuge that was created in 1908 by President Teddy Roosevelt. It was deemed important to protect this critical flyway, this wildlife habitat. We found people there slaughtering wildlife to take the feathers to decorate women's hats.

Now, I understand that there are some people who are involved who have some frustrations about issues of management of Federal resources. I appreciate that. This is a large, vast country, with 323 million people. In much of the West, a significant portion of the land is owned, managed, and administered by the Federal Government on behalf of all 323 million of us.

I have no doubt that occasionally there is frustration, there is a difference of philosophy. Occasionally, there are mistakes made. One of the problems we face is that my Republican friends in Congress for years have refused to adequately fund these programs, being able to take care of them appropriately, and that leads to frustrations as well.

But I think it is important to note that, contrary to the actions of these armed thugs, this land doesn't belong to them. It doesn't belong to the 7,000 residents of Malheur County or even 4 million Oregonians. This land is in trust for 323 million Americans.

If we overrule these interests and get the Federal Government out of this