

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

equation, it is not going to revert to a few of the people in the region. The people who have first claim on this land are the Paiute Indians, who resided on it for thousands of years before the Federal Government came in and crowded them out.

This vast high desert area is worthy of protection, whether it is monument or wilderness. Many Oregonians, including people in eastern and central Oregon, agree that this is worthy of protection. I met with a number in central Oregon this year who were organized, Friends of the Owyhee, for instance, people who think that this largest area in the lower 48 States of pristine beauty, of great environmental import, is the largest unprotected area in the lower 48 States.

Now, I listened to my friend from Oregon who represents the area, Congressman WALDEN, express his concern and frustration. He talked about his challenges with the Steens Wilderness Area and talked about his deep concern that the administration may consider a monument in the future for this area, monument status for hundreds of thousands of these acres.

It is interesting to note, I was involved with that process, but not as deeply as my friend Congressman WALDEN, who I think can justly claim credit for having been the driving force behind protecting the Steens Wilderness Area. But it never would have achieved wilderness status without the prospect, the looming threat, of a monument status.

□ 2145

I was pleased in a small way to have helped facilitate that going forward. We are all better off as a result of the process that took place.

I was rather surprised that, in the course of his extensive comments on the floor of the House a week ago, while talking about the cooperative effort and the value of the work for Steen's Wilderness, he did not reference at all the process that has been taking place in the Malheur Basin, where we have seen advocates for local ranching interests, environmentalists, and people in the refuge management itself all come together from 2010 to 2013, developing a vision to protect this area, having one of the largest water projects in the country over the next 15 years: a plan, a vision, a commitment. And it was done on a cooperative basis.

You can review what is going on with the ongoing media coverage or with these armed, out-of-State thugs who have invaded the wildlife refuge with no hint of what has happened there to be able to build a consensus, a vision, to protect and enhance this area.

The notion somehow that government ought to get out of the way and turn this all over to the private sector is a bit strained.

First of all, it should be noted that about half the jobs in this little county of 7,000 people are themselves government jobs. Many of them in the wildlife

refuge are some of the best jobs in the region.

They may not make much difference in Portland, Eugene, Seattle, or Washington, D.C., but in a region like this, it is having hundreds of family-wage jobs with good benefits, pensions. It makes a huge difference to the local economy.

I am concerned that we are just passing over this expectation that we have an opportunity to be able to work with the affected people, move it forward, protecting this area as opposed to having folks who are threatening public employees and who have engaged on a personal basis in threatening people. We have had to shut down a number of government operations. It is sad, it is unfortunate, and it is wrong.

We don't need outsiders coming into Oregon or politicians enabling or encouraging people to behave in this reckless, lawless fashion. We should, as a matter of fact, cut them off.

There should be no electricity to the compound. They shouldn't be using the computers of public employees. We shouldn't have them ordering out for pizza or delivering food. This is goofy. It wouldn't happen in any other area if armed thugs took over a Federal facility.

I have great sympathy with my friend and colleague, PETER DEFAZIO, who felt that, by the Federal Government not acting on the Nevada lawbreakers who refused to pay the heavily discounted grazing fees—a fraction of what they would pay if it were in private hands—and allowing this to go on unabated, they are encouraging this lawless, reckless behavior.

I am pleased this evening that I am joined by my friend and colleague from California, Congressman HUFFMAN, who, prior to coming to Congress, had a long, distinguished career dealing with environmental protection and dealing with balancing these interests and solving problems while we protect public interests.

I yield to the gentleman for his comments this evening.

Mr. HUFFMAN. I want to thank my friend from Oregon for his leadership and advocacy and calling us together for this important discussion tonight.

I want to thank him also for bringing up our great conservation hero, Teddy Roosevelt, a Republican President who I can't help but think is rolling in his grave over the fact that cornerstones of his legacy—the protection of public lands, the protection of wildlife—are under constant assault by too many of our friends across the aisle and, for the last 2 weeks, by some very wrong-headed individuals who are heavily armed at a wildlife refuge in southern Oregon.

Many Americans who turned on their TVs last week I think were probably surprised to see that this heavily armed extremist group had taken over a national wildlife refuge and that they were threatening to kill anyone who stands in their way.

They were led, of course, by Ammon Bundy, the son of the infamous Cliven

Bundy, that great philosopher who romanticizes slavery, refuses to pay legally required grazing fees, and organized his own armed insurrection in Nevada a couple of years ago.

Americans were surprised to see that this group, which was part of a larger protest against Federal authority, public land policy, and environmental land violations, was so violent and so heavily armed and so extreme in their demands.

I think so many Americans are just surprised to find that people would be so violently opposed to our Federal Government's role in protecting public lands and wildlife that they would do this kind of thing.

But as a member of the House Natural Resources Committee, I have to tell you I am disgusted by these reckless, dangerous, and criminal actions, but I am not totally surprised. I am not totally surprised.

Because on any given week in the Natural Resources Committee, you can hear the intellectual underpinnings of these dangerous, violent actions. You hear the divisive, over-the-top antigovernment rhetoric that is spewed by too many of our colleagues across the aisle, Members of Congress who may now be criticizing ever so gently the tactics of the armed criminals in southern Oregon.

But out of the other side of their mouth they justify their actions by arguing that their anger and frustration with the government is somehow justified and legitimate and that we should essentially sympathize with them rather than be outraged by their seditious, violent actions.

I am amazed and grateful for the fact that our Federal land management and law enforcement authorities have been so patient and so passive and so deferential because of their determination to try to bring this to a peaceful resolution. I admire and respect that. I know where they are coming from.

But let's be clear about this. There has to be accountability for the occupiers. This armed group of thugs occupying a refuge in the State to my north can't be allowed to do this without consequences.

Because many people—you mentioned our colleague, PETER DEFAZIO—believe—correctly, in my view—that this wouldn't have happened had there been some consequences to the Bundy ranch standoff 2 years ago.

Unfortunately, despite a very similar action, despite all of the same heavily armed threats and violence and the near avoidance of a tragedy that could have cost untold numbers of lives, there really were no consequences.

My understanding is that Cliven Bundy still owes well over \$1 million in ranching fees to the Federal Government and that he is still grazing his cattle without permission.

And because there has been no consequences, his son and the current gang that is occupying the refuge obviously took the lesson that they could do it

again. And they will do it again and again, as long as we continue to give them a pass.

So there has to be accountability. There has to be some type of consequences for people that do this. But there also should be accountability for politicians who tacitly fuel incidents like this with their inflammatory and hyperbolic rhetoric that always casts environmental protection as an assault on individual rights and that falsely describes our national public lands as some type of a threat to State and private property owners. It is not right.

The truth is, in California and across the West, our public lands are a cornerstone of lots of local and State economies, including those in my district. I have huge tracts of Federal public lands in the Second Congressional District of California, from vast national parks and recreational areas to three different national forests, to numerous national monuments and lots and lots of BLM lands.

For many of my constituents, Federal lands help them put dinner on the table. It helps them pay their bills. Ninety-one percent of western voters surveyed responded that they believe public lands are an essential part of their State's economy. We need to remember this.

So I want to protect public lands, and I want to work cooperatively with the Federal agencies that manage them to iron out differences.

Our Federal Government isn't perfect. They make mistakes. Sometimes they are not the best neighbors. Sometimes they aren't always as responsive and respectful to the communities and individuals that live nearby.

Part of our job as Members of Congress who represent those communities is to try to make sure that the government, for its part, is doing the right thing: listening, being a good neighbor.

I have seen it work time and time again. And the notion that the only way to resolve differences with Federal land management agencies is to take up arms and threaten a violent insurrection is just absolutely nonsense.

So those are a few of my thoughts. I certainly could go on at length about some of the success stories I have seen in my district, where communities have come together and actually collaborated with the Federal Government, not just as a neighbor, but as a partner to do things, including things that brought jobs to those communities.

I have seen it in Trinity County with a process called the Trinity County Collaboration, where, believe it or not, environmentalists are working together with folks in the forest products industry and with Federal agencies and with all sorts of other interests and they have agreed to cut thousands of acres of trees as part of a comprehensive stewardship plan.

It can work. It is very unique, but it can actually work. And it can work in other places. It almost worked in the

Klamath, which is another part of southern Oregon where we saw this historic coming together of farmers and fishermen and tribes and government agencies.

The problem is that collaboration depended on an act of Congress to actually happen. Sadly, under current management, Congress is where collaboration goes to die. And so we were unable to do the right thing there. But it can be done.

I again want to thank the gentleman for his leadership in trying to interpose a little bit of sanity into this debate.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate your joining me in this conversation on your past activity and what we need to do in the future.

You are right. These are, if done correctly—and you have had some of these experiences in California—huge economic opportunities.

There are 47 million bird watchers in this country. They spend somewhere in the neighborhood of \$40 billion a year. In the Malheur Wildlife Refuge, almost 24,000 people made that long, long, long, long journey. And I will guarantee you they wouldn't have been sightseeing there but for the wildlife refuge.

You referenced the Klamath. It is a lost opportunity if we are not on our toes. Removing those four dams that have obstructed the flow of spawning salmon, prohibiting us from meeting our obligation to Native Americans, would create hundreds and hundreds of family-wage jobs for years in northern California.

It is just one more example of where Congress is missing in action and where Congress hasn't appropriately funded these agencies to be able to fully meet the opportunities.

It is hard for me to express my wonderment that some people will come to the floor and somehow try and celebrate the Hammond family, people who were convicted of arson and who have a record of having broken the law before.

Public records show behavior that is not that of people you want for your neighbors. These folks do not have clean hands. Yet, we have out-of-State, armed thugs taking over this facility to somehow talk about these convicted felons and undercut this process.

I am hopeful that we can work together for people to focus on the opportunities and have the administration step up, act responsibly, cut these people off and remove them, and to take action against other lawbreakers like we would in other areas of the country.

I appreciate you joining me today to have a little bit of conversation here to try and round out the picture that is missing from the media. It is probably not going to get us on Fox News, but these are things that the American public needs to know.

Because there is a path forward. There has been a regional consensus that has developed. There is a vision to protect the wildlife refuge and its economic activities and future. It is one that we should support.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CLYBURN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of attending a funeral.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 12, 2016, 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:

3961. A letter from the Under Secretary of Defense, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing Vice Admiral Kurt W. Tidd, United States Navy, to wear the insignia of the grade of admiral, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777a(b)(4); Public Law 111-383, Sec. 505(a)(1); (124 Stat. 4208); to the Committee on Armed Services.

3962. A letter from the Under Secretary of Defense, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing Colonels Sean A. Gainey and Patrick B. Roberson, United States Army, to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777(b)(3)(B); Public Law 104-106, Sec. 503(a)(1) (as added by Public Law 108-136, Sec. 509(a)(3); (117 Stat. 1458); to the Committee on Armed Services.

3963. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Strategy, Plans and Capabilities, Department of Defense, transmitting the Air Force Addendum to FY 2015 and FY 2016 Reports on the Plan for the Nuclear Weapons Stockpile, Nuclear Weapons Complex, Nuclear Weapons Delivery Systems, and Nuclear Weapons Command and Control System Specified in Sec. 1043 of the National Defense Authorization Act for FY 2012; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3964. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the National Health Service Corps Report to the Congress for the year 2014, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 254i; July 1, 1944, ch. 373, title III, Sec. 336A (as amended by Public Law 94-484, Sec. 407(a)); (92 Stat. 2277); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3965. 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 final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Test Procedures for Ceiling Fan Light Kits [Docket No.: EERE-2014-BT-TP-0007] (RIN: 1904-AD17) received January 6, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3966. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the "Report to Congress on Coordination of Federal HIV Programs for Fiscal Years 2009-2013", prepared by the Health Resources and Services