

ISSUES OF THE WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my dear friend from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

IN MEMORY OF SHARON RUNNER

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for so graciously allowing me the time here today. Indeed, it is a timely moment, and I want to share it with the American people.

Indeed, it has been a difficult week for California and for the leadership of women who we have seen come forward in our State over recent years, especially in the political arena.

My colleague Representative MIMI WALTERS from southern California earlier this week paid tribute to Marian Bergeson, a great political leader in our State in her time who we lost several days ago.

Well, now we have lost another gem, and that is Sharon Oden Runner. I learned of her passing this morning.

She underwent, some years ago, a very, very daring and amazing lung transplant to overcome the condition she had. She fought hard all these years and did quite well with that until recent times.

So this tribute today to her is for her, her family, and that memory.

Sharon and I came up together in the California State Legislature. Back in 2002, we both won terms in the State Assembly. She was just a good pal right out of the chute there.

As new freshman members, we were getting to know our way around Sacramento and the State legislative process. Several of the freshman bonded. There was a pack of us guys and Sharon, you know, because there are a lot more guys in politics, it seems.

So Sharon, being just a few years older than the rest of us guys, she kind of seemed like the one that was keeping us a little more in line as we would go about doing our business in the State legislature, cutting up a little bit here and there once in a while amidst the seriousness or at the events you do around town at night meeting other people and such.

So I soon dubbed her "Ma Runner," lovingly and affectionately, and she took that okay. And she was the one who would say, You boys, now, you stay in line here, okay?

But we all had a lot of fun together and worked hard together and fought the battles together in the California legislative process.

It was really fun to see her ascend. When our current majority leader here, KEVIN MCCARTHY, became our assembly leader there, Sharon ascended right there beside him as the assistant leader for the Republicans as well. And she really did well in that role and was effective and just really good to get along with and made sure that all the

members had what they needed in order to do well.

Sharon's spirit was one of always being so positive, reaching out to everybody. She worked to get more women elected to the legislature as well.

And she was one with very strong moral convictions as well, to make sure that her faith in God was something that she brought forward with her policy and was something that wasn't very far away in how she conducted herself and for her family and for those that she came into contact with.

So we had that opportunity to serve 6 years together in the State Assembly. And then, with term limits being what they are, we soon met up again in that legislative role over on the California State Senate side.

Now, at that point, Sharon was again struggling with her lung battles there and got that amazing lung transplant, that life that was given to her by a donor that she carried forward for these years until finally the issues became too complex. And, again, we lost her this morning.

So our hearts do go out to George, Micah, Bekah, all of her friends, all of her extended family. Those who had a chance to know her and were touched and graced by her, we are better for it. We know that we will always cherish the memories.

George and Sharon had a unique time together as the first husband-wife team in the California State Legislature. He was in the Senate for a while, and she was in the Assembly. A lot of history was made by them through measures they were able to put on the ballot, the things they always fought for morally and policy-wise. They will always be remembered as working together.

Now, as George soldiers on, our hearts are with you. We wish you God's strength and peace and only the sweetest memories to your whole family.

We remember Sharon today. God bless her, and God bless her memory.

□ 1615

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I do so much appreciate my friend, DOUG LAMALFA, a very touching tribute to what is obviously just a wonderful individual that we will be missing.

For some time now the Democrats have been doing 1-minute speeches. On the last day we vote during the week, we are allowed to have unlimited 1-minute speeches, and for—I don't know—2 or 3 hours, my friends across the aisle have been doing 1-minute speeches, and I am so pleased that they are doing that. I think that is terrific. That is so much better than taking away the civil rights of people who have the right to assemble on the floor, to have sessions, to vote on bills, to debate bills because the previous violations of the rules by my friends across the aisle were just unprecedented.

I would like to commend our Speaker for this aspect, comparing what he did and did not do today compared to what

Speaker PELOSI did the last day of our session in July of 2008 because today I know leadership and staff saw the massive number of Democrats assembled to give speeches here, and the rule allows for that. There was no effort to shut down debate, gavel us out early, but that is exactly what Speaker NANCY PELOSI did in July of 2008.

We had assembled a group. It may not have been quite as big as the Democrats had today, but we had a group over here, and under the rules at that time, they were 5-minute speeches, which could still be done, but they chose 1-minutes. We signed up for 5-minute speeches. When the Speaker NANCY PELOSI saw a number of Republicans, appropriately under the rule, here in order, signed up. We weren't just sitting there. We had signed up and were sitting in order as we are supposed to. She immediately gavelled down the proceeding early, violated the rule that allowed us to speak in the order, just as the Democrats did today, and this is the way it is supposed to be.

Yet, earlier this month we had our friends across the aisle—and I haven't seen this written up much, but they took positions at their microphones and at the Republican microphones. We tried to go into session, and we even had Democrats not only sitting where Republicans were supposed to be seated on the Republican side, we had them grasp microphones to prevent Republicans from being able to be recognized.

Finally, in the wee hours, we had the Speaker recognize a Republican chairman. He couldn't get a microphone. He is standing over here. Why? Because of the violation of the rules as the Democrats tried—not just tried. They were preventing Republicans from exercising their civil rights under Jefferson's rules of the House, under congressional rules, and our constituents had a right to be heard, just as our friends across the aisle had a right to be heard today.

Now, in those 1-minute speeches, the massive array we heard this afternoon, there were a few common themes, and I think that is wonderful. Football is my favorite sport. I enjoyed it in junior high, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12th grade, enjoyed every year of it. It is such a team sport.

We saw a team acting in concert, working together. They all had their talking points. They all hit them and hit them hard. Some were very unfair, but they, from their standpoint, were acting as a team. But for one thing, they kept using the term "vacation," that the House is going on vacation. One said a month vacation, I think, but I know I heard one say 7-week vacation, another one said 8-week vacation. They weren't all together on how long they were attributing to be vacation.

I have told some of my friends at FOX News and different news commentators that when you criticize the month of August, that is traditionally, as I understand it—going back to the

early days of Congress, that has been a month when traditionally Congress has not been in session. That is why I love September.

In July I remember the disastrous bill, when John Boehner was Speaker, had the supercommittee, the sequesters that were going to gut our military. I will never forget it, after I was rather upset that that bill was going to gut our military, our Speaker said: Listen to me. Listen to me, those sequesters will never happen.

Well, I knew they would. I said they would. But we passed some bad stuff in July in prior years. I think we have done much better this year.

As far as this “vacation,” I am intrigued to know that that is what the Democrats are going to do with the time we are not in session, one 8-week vacation, as one of my colleagues across the aisle said. Eight-week vacation, that is what they think it is when we are not in session.

But from my standpoint—and I am looking at my friend, DOUG LAMALFA, over here. I know from his impression and other people that I work with on this side of the aisle every day that we don't consider not being in session a vacation. August, man, that is a great opportunity to hear from your constituents. I know we have at least one field hearing.

I was requested to come meet again with some of the Egyptian leadership, and I have been urged to go visit with some of our friends in Israel again. I don't know if I will make that.

This is a terrific time to get away from the inside-the-beltway thinking. It is only when you get away from the inside-the-beltway thinking that so many Congresses have gotten addicted to that you hear from real common sense. Back home, it is common sense. Inside the beltway, it is sense because it is certainly not common.

It is a great time when we are in recess to reassess in the recess, and September ends up being a good month. We don't normally pass terrible bills in September. It has happened, but normally when people come back after having to visit—because we are not in session, people know we are not in session. When they hear from constituents during the month of August, they are much more ready in September to do what we should have been doing.

So I know my friends across the aisle, they have their talking points, going on this big vacation. They consider it a vacation. We consider it an incredible opportunity to clear our heads, to get this inside-the-beltway thinking out of our heads, hear from our constituents, have some field hearings in different places in the country. I find it helpful.

Last year, the last week of August, I was invited to meet with President Sisi in Egypt and the Coptic Christian Pope, meet with him again. I was told at the time that I was the only Member of Congress—I don't know if it is still true—who had been allowed to meet

with the Director of Egyptian Intelligence. Anyway, I don't know if I will be able to get back there or not during this recess, but it was incredibly invaluable.

I came away from that meeting in Egypt determined to do anything I could to stop the Iranian treaty that was not only going to devastate the Middle East, that was already starting to spark nuclear proliferation, because all of our former allies, before this President got ahold of them, they were saying: Wow, we can't count on the United States anymore. Iran's going to have nuclear weapons. That is what this has made sure. So we have to start figuring out what we are going to do to get nuclear weapons for ourselves. The worst possible result.

The Iran treaty is a treaty. It was a treaty, it is a treaty, and that has become even more clear as Iran has violated so many aspects of the Iranian treaty. Unfortunately, the Senate refused to recognize that it was a treaty. They considered the fine Senator CORKER's bill that actually turned the Constitution upside down and allowed a treaty to proceed as if it were effective and had been ratified with only a third of the Senate voting to ratify it instead of the two-thirds that the Constitution requires.

It was that visit in Egypt with their top officials that just clarified in my head that we have to stop the Iranian treaty for the good of the United States, for the good of the Middle East, for the good of our allies, our Muslim allies in North Africa and the Middle East, and for our dear friends in Israel. But so far it hasn't happened, and Western civilization and the advances we know are more threatened than previously.

The second talking point that we heard repeatedly from our friends across the aisle during so many of the 1-minute speeches was the talk about we are leaving here without doing a thing about the Zika virus. I don't fault anybody who has been standing up here and repeating the talking point that we haven't done anything about the Zika virus, we haven't done anything about the Zika virus, because there are so many bills that get brought to the floor.

There are so many amendments, so many things, it is just virtually impossible to get through them all. I read as many as I can. Some people have told me I am probably reading more bills than most people, but you just can't get through them all. There is this mentality that if we are in session, we have to be passing bills. Any day we are in session, we have to be passing the bills.

Talking to people who were here before, they said it wasn't always like that; that you could have hearings, you could have investigations, you could have a lot of meaningful things going on without people being forced to come over here and vote. But that is the mentality now. Whether it is Demo-

crats in the majority, Republicans in the majority, gee, if we are in session, we have to vote on stuff.

So with that understanding, it's easy to understand how so many Democrats had missed and didn't realize that, actually, we did vote. Not only did we vote to address the Zika virus, we voted to appropriate \$1.1 billion toward dealing with a potential Zika virus pandemic. So for research, for vaccine, for all of these things.

So I don't fault anybody. I know nobody would have come down here and said we didn't do anything about the Zika virus, intending to mislead. They just didn't remember that we did vote to spend \$1.1 billion dealing with that issue.

Also, probably the most frequently mentioned thing during the last 2 or 3 hours of speeches by my friends across the aisle was regarding guns and gun violence. One of the nicest guys in Congress even used a quote from somebody else in saying that Republicans are “frozen in their own indifference.”

Now, that is deeply troubling. I don't know a single Republican who is indifferent to gun violence.

□ 1630

It is just that we look at Chicago, we look at Washington, D.C., we look at where the most murders are occurring in the country, where more Black lives that matter are taken, and we look at those places and we see whatever they are doing about gun violence, it is the wrong thing, because they have an epidemic of gun violence.

What are they doing?

Oh, wow; they are the most restrictive cities regarding gun violence in the country.

Now, in my home State, dear Dallas is still mourning the loss of five precious lives of law enforcement officers needlessly, senselessly taken by an evil that was encouraged by chants and songs repeated over and over and over talking about police as pigs in a blanket, fry them like bacon, encouraging the devastation and murder of police officers. Well, in Texas, that is a capital murder. And we do use capital punishment.

So it is not that Republicans are frozen in our indifference. It is just that we look at the kind of gun laws that have been posed and pushed by our friends across the aisle and we see that the places that their laws have been enacted by Democratic leadership in those cities, with massive deaths, especially of the precious Black lives that matter; but they don't want to talk about those.

You don't have to look too far to see what has been going on. It is offensive to those of us who are not frozen in our indifference on gun violence. We want it stopped.

When you get beyond the pejoratives that are being muttered on this floor against Republicans and you start looking at what the actual news is so you can learn what would be the best

way to deal with gun violence, you see this article today from National Review: "Federal Agencies Can't Keep Track of Their Own Guns."

The article says:

"The federal government needs to crack down on guns. Its own stockpile, anyway. The Washington Examiner reports: The federal government has spent \$1.5 million on guns and ammo since 2006, and lost nearly 1,000 weapons along the way, including Uzis, assault rifles, and grenade launchers, according to the House Oversight Committee chairman.

"In a hearing to urge tightened control of weapons, Representative JASON CHAFFETZ, chair of the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee, said, 'The loss of a single firearm is cause for concern—the loss of what amounts to roughly five a month is unacceptable.'

"These guns were acquired by the Department of Homeland Security, the Bureau of Land Management, and the Federal Bureau of Prisons, for use by their agents. Inventory is managed by the General Services Administration, the agency tasked with managing the affairs of other federal agencies. It's important for certain federal agents to be armed if their job requires it. But it's also important for the federal government to keep track of its expensive supplies, especially when those supplies have destructive potential. And these aren't your run-of-the-mill weapons. Uzis, grenade launchers, the ever-nebulous assault rifles: plenty of firepower for agents who have dangerous jobs. They simply vanished, at an alarming clip: 1,000 guns lost over the last 10 years come out to just under two per week. So sure, maybe it is easier to get a Glock than a book"—although, that is simply not true—"but only if you're neighbors with the local branch of the Department of Homeland Security."

This article—and it is not even a recent article—in the Washington Examiner by Paul Bedard says: "Gun prosecutions under Obama down more than 45 percent."

I haven't been able to find anything that indicates differently; that they have stepped up prosecution. My understanding is they continue to decline, but they are at least much lower than they were under President Bush.

This article says:

"Despite his calls for greater gun control, including a new assault weapons ban that extends to handguns, President Obama's administration has turned away from enforcing gun laws, cutting weapons prosecutions some 40 percent since a high of about 11,000 under former President Bush.

"If you are not going to enforce the laws on the books, then don't start talking about a whole new wave of new laws," said a gun rights advocate.

"In the wake of the horrific mass killing at Sandy Hook Elementary School in Newtown, Connecticut, Democratic lawmakers have begun pre-

paring a new collection of anti-gun laws, including renewing the assault weapons ban, banning the purchase of high-capacity clips that spring bullets into guns, and tightening rules on who can buy weapons."

The thing is this administration was given a heads up twice over the older Tsarnaev. He has been radicalized. But because of the purge of the training material that the FBI has experienced—Michele Bachmann and I and LYNN WESTMORELAND—and TRENT was there for a while—we were going through the materials that had been purged.

It was ridiculous, what they classified them. So we couldn't tell you, Mr. Speaker, exactly the things. Some were silly cartoons and things. But speaking hypothetically, you had verses from the Koran. Actually, there were verses from the Koran that were eliminated. They were found to be troubling to the people that were purging the materials.

And who does this administration look to?

They look to CAIR, the Council on American Islamic Relations. They look to Imam Majid, former head of the Islamic Society of North America. They look at a number of groups and individuals who were listed as coconspirators in the largest prosecution of support for terrorism in the United States history. The prosecution got guilty verdicts in, I believe, November 2008, and we changed Presidents, and Eric Holder came in as the new Attorney General; and instead of going after those listed coconspirators that both the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals and the district court had said there is plenty of evidence to support their being named as coconspirators, they didn't go after them. They dropped it. They let it go.

Those are the people that are advising this administration about what to purge out of the training materials for the CIA, the intelligence, the State Department, Homeland Security, the Justice Department.

Our folks don't know what they are looking for when they are told to go find out if somebody has been radicalized. Twice, at least, the Orlando shooter was brought to the attention of the FBI. These are caring, well-informed law officers, except when it comes to radical Islam, because you have CAIR and others making sure they don't know what to look for when they are looking for radicalized Islamic terrorists.

If materials weren't purged, if people who had dedicated their lives to studying radical Islam who are not actually Muslims themselves, if they were allowed to train as they once were and educate and help our officers of the Federal Government know what to look for to find a radicalized Islamic terrorist, then the Boston bombing would not have happened, the Orlando shooting would not have happened, the San Bernardino killings would have not happened.

This administration has done grave danger, grave harm to this country.

Yet, it is like the "Wizard of Oz." Don't look at what is going on behind the curtain. Look at this shiny object, the gun. Oh, they used a pressure cooker. Well, never mind. Still, let's talk about the gun.

Well, if we are going to be honest and you feel like whatever a radical Islamist used to kill people, that is what we are going to talk about. We are not going to talk about radical Islam.

By the way, for my Democratic friends who called me a racist because I said the Orlando shooter was a radical Islamist, that he had pledged allegiance to the Islamic State, we learn when people point out mistakes we have made. But Islam is not a race. So it makes no sense to call me a racist, as my friends across the aisle did when I pointed out that the Orlando shooter pledged allegiance to the Islamic State. They were thinking that that meant a race. And it is not a race. It is a religion. For a radical Islamist, it is really the makings of a theocracy.

Then, this article from today by Neil Munro out of Breitbart says: "Obama's Flack Claims Credit for Dallas Policing As Murders Spike 40 Percent."

I have been so impressed with the Dallas police chief. The things he said, the way he has comported is exactly the way I would hope a police chief under such a terrible situation would comport himself. But this is a real story because he has been utilizing President Obama's practices for policing.

As this article points out:

"President Barack Obama's preferred policing practices deserve the credit for changing the crime rate in Dallas, his spokesman says. But spokesman Josh Earnest does not seem to be aware the city's"—Dallas—"murder rate has climbed 40 percent this year as Obama's preferred policing practices were implemented."

Some of the 2016 dead in Dallas had their pictures in this article.

The article goes on and says:

"The spokesman's July 13 statement came in response to a reporter asking a question about the value of the policing changes that Obama is pressuring state and local police forces to adopt. 'This latest tragedy, the murder of the five cops, took place in a community, Dallas, that the White House actually touted for having done a good job implementing new policing rules? I mean, doesn't that suggest that they're either ineffective or insufficient to prevent these kinds of things from happening?' asked the reporter.

"The police 'reforms that have been put in place in Dallas have made a difference.'"

The reforms that have been put in place in Dallas that have made a difference is a quote from Josh Earnest, the spokesman for the President.

He goes on and says:

"That is a reflection of why it's important for other communities to make this issue a priority in the same way

that Dallas has. It's making a difference in the lives and the people in Dallas, because it's not just those incidents of concern about police conduct that have declined; the violent crime rates declined, too."

That is from Josh Earnest.

The story goes on. Now that we have finished Josh Earnest's ignorance of what really happened in Texas, in Dallas, the article says:

"Actually, violent crime is up across the board in Obama's model city of Dallas. According to The Dallas Morning News, 67 people were murdered in the first five months of 2016, compared to 48 in the first five months of 2015. Also, robbery is up from 1,576 to 1,805, and aggravated assault is up from 1,501 incidents to 1,747 incidents. The relatively good news is that sexual assault nudged down from 336 incidents in 2015 to 312 incidents in 2016.

□ 1645

"The 2016 spike comes after the murder rate jumped almost 17 percent in 2015, bringing the city's death toll up to 136 dead for 2015. The 2016 crime spike is so large that the city's now famous police chief, David Brown, has faced pressure to resign.

"Chief Brown's Career Has Lived By Crime Stats, and It Will Die By Crime Stats," said a March headline in the Dallas Observer. According to a March 28 report in the Dallas Morning News, Dallas Police Chief David Brown's plan to fight a drastic rise in violent crime—including a nearly 75 percent jump in murders—by moving hundreds of officers to different shifts and on to task forces is creating an uproar within his department.

"The Black Police Association has historically been supportive of Brown but called for his resignation Monday hours before the group met with the three other police associations.

"Council member Philip Kingston expressed concern Monday about Brown's plans. 'None of what you've presented here today is sustainable,' Kingston said."

Anyway, it goes on to discuss this.

But I am very impressed with the Dallas police chief. I think he has comported himself admirably under such horrendous circumstances and while going through such grief, losing five of his first-responding law officers.

But people need to know that the kind of things that were being urged by my friends across the aisle, that Obama believes are going to make a big difference, well, they made a difference. Murders are up 40 percent now in Dallas since they followed the Obama rules for policing. Very, very tragic.

I appreciated Dallas Police Chief David Brown's statement when he challenged Black Lives Matter.

"During a press conference Monday, Brown issued a challenge to Black Lives Matter protesters demanding change around policing in their communities. 'We're hiring. Get off that

protest line and put an application in. We'll put you in your neighborhood, and we'll help you resolve some of the problems you're protesting about.'"

Apparently, according to this article by Katie Pavlich, Brown grew up in the inner city and decided to become a police officer during the national crack cocaine epidemic. He saw a problem in his community, and he wanted to fix it.

Decades later, he is in charge of one of the most successful police departments in the country—that is, of course, before he started following the Obama administration's suggestions for effective policing in America.

Another problem that is rather dramatic—we feel it in Texas, but we are not alone. It is a problem across the country, illustrated in this article by Bob Price from July 5, "200,000 Criminal Aliens Booked Into Texas Jails Over Past 5 Years, Says Department of Public Safety."

"Nearly 200,000 criminal aliens have been booked into local Texas jails over the past 5 years. Those numbers included more than 155,000 criminal illegal aliens." Just shocking.

So this administration has lost—well, I guess it goes back to 2006. So most of the 1,000 weapons were lost during this administration's term, some of them on Bush's watch. But the 2,000 or so weapons—that we know have already killed at least one Federal agent—that were forced by this administration—and someday it is all going to come out. Fast and Furious is all going to be exposed at some point, and this administration is going to fall further in the estimation of its effectiveness.

We are already seeing things like, oh, here are our policing rules; they follow them; murder rates go up. Violent crime seems to go up, nearly all of it.

The border is porous. We have people pouring into the country. The Islamic State has made clear they are making use of our porous border and our willingness to harm ourselves by bringing in refugees that will include Islamic State terrorists. I think we need to take them seriously.

This article from June 28 from James Carafano says:

"Flash back 3 years ago, and remember when the Secretary of Homeland Security declared 'the border has never been stronger.' Well, if what is going on at America's border with Mexico is a success, Americans should shudder to think what failure looks like.

"Unaccompanied children crossing the border is up over 70 percent this year. Other categories and overall numbers are on the rise as well, reflecting significant increases since 2014. And it is not just the numbers that are troubling to Americans. They are worried about national security threats on the southern border.

"The groups are not just drug mafias—they smuggle, steal, hijack, rob, or kill (anything that makes a profit). And it is not just an American problem. By some estimates, since 2007, the

cartels are responsible for over 100,000 deaths."

And this is something that a number of my Republican friends, especially all of us from Texas, were having meetings about off the record with the Director of Homeland Security and the White House, demanding that President Bush do a better job of securing our border. And they were actually making progress up through 2008.

Then along came a new President. And they keep telling us, like this quote, the border has never been stronger. But the true facts belie that. We have diseases popping up where they shouldn't in places where immigrants who have come in illegally have come.

And then, if that is not bad enough, this report from The Federalist: "U.S. Negligence is Feeding ISIS' Global Appeal." And it goes on and documents in the article here just how bad negligence in this administration has become.

I couldn't agree more with one of the later paragraphs and the subtitle: "Weakness Invites Aggression. Muslim extremists around the world see that the American Government and much of American society do not take this threat"—radical Islam—"seriously."

Parenthetically, they talk about guns, guns, guns and won't look at the person carrying or using the gun.

The article says: "... and can't or won't admit its theological origins. Rather than feeling on the run, ISIS and the men it inspires to jihad must feel emboldened by this.

"The Left continually insists, as Muslim Advocates President Farhana Khera did at last week's Senate hearing, that by talking about Islam in any capacity when discussing terrorism, we are playing into ISIS' hands. The argument is that groups like ISIS and al-Qaeda want nothing more than for the West and moderate Muslims to attack Islam. To what end isn't clear.

"Al-Qaeda may be frustrated it can't get the West to believe its motives—last week it released a special edition of their magazine, Inspire"—this is Al Qaeda—"in which it called on jihadists to 'avoid targeting places and crowds where minorities are generally found' so their religious motives for the terrorist attack will be believed. But this isn't because al-Qaeda wants to instigate animosity between Muslims and the West. It's doing that by inspiring jihad. It simply wants the West," especially those of us in the United States, "to believe al-Qaeda is fighting a holy war."

They believe they are fighting a holy war.

"After the Paris nightclub attacks in November, Kerry vaguely described ISIS' motives, arguing that while the Charlie Hebdo attacks 'perhaps' had a 'legitimacy' or 'rationale' that you could attach yourself to,' indicating that murder is an appropriate reaction to insulting Mohammed, the November attacks were 'absolutely indiscriminate.'"

Well, this administration, they do not understand the importance of securing the border. They don't understand, if they are going to avoid being complete hypocrites, that if you are going to outlaw whatever gun a radical Islamist uses to terrorize and kill Americans, if you are going to outlaw those, then next you have to file the bill that makes the possession or purchase of a pressure cooker illegal. And we really need to go back to 9/11; they used box cutters.

Because if we are going to totally continue in this mode of refusing to recognize the problem with the murderer, the Islamic terrorist murderer, and look at only whatever weapon that murderer is using, then we are going to have to keep banning things. I am sure machetes, like were used to kill hundreds of thousands of people in Rwanda, we will have to outlaw them at some point. It will go on and on as long as we continue to ignore the true threat here to American lives in radical Islam.

And I know it sounds good. "No fly, no buy," that is clever. That is cute. But then when you have the Attorney General in front of your committee and you are wanting to know, what do you use to decide who is on the no-fly list, you can't get answers from the prior Attorney General, you can't get answers from the administration. They won't tell you.

But they want Americans to get behind this movement to allow a bureaucrat, unelected, behind the scenes—we don't even know who is doing it—to make a list of people they don't want to have guns. Maybe we could get Lois Lerner over there to help. I am sure a lot of people would love that. Make a list of who you don't want to have guns.

Unfortunately, we have seen the numbers that indicate most of the people on the no-fly list are people this administration should not have let into the country.

If we are going to do something about the murderers, let's get serious about it. Let's address radical Islam. Let's secure our border. Let's start enforcing the gun laws we have.

And let's allow the FBI to be trained to recognize what a radical Islamist believes, what they are reading, what they are doing, who they are following online, what mosque they are going to where more people are radicalized. Those are important things. And until this administration allows that to happen, we are going to keep losing precious American lives.

It has to stop. And if it is not guns, it is pressure cookers, box cutters, machetes, underwear bombs. We find out, you know, these terrorists, these radical Islamists, they have learned how to make bombs.

And on top of all of that, we have the President determined to release as many people who want to kill Americans as he possibly can out of Guantanamo Bay. Under the rules of war for

civilized societies, when someone declares war on your country and you capture any of their warriors, you hold on to them, in civilized society, until such time as their friends and allies say we are no longer at war. Then you let them go.

And if their friends and allies keep fighting for 30 years, you hold on to them for 30 years, and then maybe they can help persuade them to stop fighting. But you don't let warriors go while the war is still going on.

Because, as we have seen—and it was repugnant to me to have a spokesman for this administration say, basically, well, we can't say that people we have released from Guantanamo have killed Americans, but I guess we could say, in essence, that people we have released—well, that Americans would not be dead if we hadn't released certain people from Guantanamo.

□ 1700

My word, let's quit playing the games and quit releasing people who want to kill Americans, who are at war with us, who were at war with us when they were captured, and whose friends are still at war with us.

Let's hold them at Guantanamo until their friends say, "We are no longer at war." Then they can be released, unless they have committed war crimes. If they have, then at that point we will try them for those crimes like Nuremberg. That is what a civilized society does. You don't release warriors to go kill more Americans while the war is going on.

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

GUN VIOLENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, this is the last hour that Congress will meet before the 7-week recess that the Republicans scheduled for today. We are going to devote this last hour to focus on an issue incredibly important to the communities of the people we represent and to this country, and that is the issue of gun violence.

As you may recall, Mr. Speaker, we had a sit-in where we came to the House floor to protest the congressional inaction in moving forward on sensible gun safety legislation, to bring attention, to break through this logjam and force our colleagues on the other side of the aisle to bring these bills to the floor for an up-or-down vote.

We tried motions to recommit and efforts to add these pieces of legislation to bills that were moving as amendments and every mechanism we could to try to force some action because the American people are demanding action—asking—demanding that we do

something in the face of the epidemic of gun violence in this country.

We talk a lot about gun violence, but I think it is important to recognize this is a uniquely American problem. We kill each other in this country with guns 297 times more than Japan, 49 times more than France, and 33 times more than Israel, just to give you some comparisons. Every day, 297 people in America are shot with a gun, and each day, 89 of these people die. On average, 31 Americans are murdered with guns every day, and 151 are treated for gun assault in an emergency room. Thirty thousand Americans die every year at the hands of a gun, and the United States firearm homicide rate is 20 times higher than the combined rates of 22 countries that are our peers in wealth and population. So it is important, as we make this final plea, to understand that this epidemic of gun violence is a uniquely American problem.

We just marked, the day before yesterday, the 1-month anniversary of the assault in Orlando at the Pulse nightclub that took the lives of 49 young people. We just marked the horrific occurrence in Dallas that took the lives of five American heroes, Dallas police officers. It feels like every day there is another mass shooting or a gun tragedy that we hear about and read about in this country.

What we ask the Republican House leadership is to bring two bills to the floor. There are, I think, 217 bills in total that will respond to gun violence in a variety of different ways, but we said let's start with the easy pieces of legislation, legislation that is widely supported by the American people that will make a real difference in reducing gun violence in this country and keeping guns out of the hands of people who shouldn't have them—that is, universal background checks to make sure that someone doesn't get a gun who is not permitted to have a gun under our laws, and keeping them out of the hands of domestic abusers, criminals, and suspected terrorists.

The second one is the no fly, no buy. It says, look, if you are on a terrorist watch list and we have determined you are too dangerous to get on an airplane, then you are certainly too dangerous to go into a gun store and buy any gun you want.

So those two pieces of legislation, which are really common sense, would be an important first step to demonstrate to the American people that we understand our responsibility to take some action to reduce gun violence in this country and to keep guns out of the hands of people who should not have them.

Rather than taking up those bills, regrettably, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle adjourned, and they went flying out that door so they could go home and enjoy a holiday in the summer with their family and friends without ever taking up a single piece of legislation to address gun violence.

We tried in every way to say to our colleagues: Bring these bills to the