

money from one area and to send it to another one, that doesn't fix the problem.

This budget, from a fiscal perspective, is fatally flawed policy. It is going to put extraordinary financial burden on future generations. From an environmental perspective, it is completely nonsensical in that it takes money away from environmental restoration and environmental initiatives and community resilience. It is going to result in increasing FEMA disaster spending by leaving these communities vulnerable by failing to address these hazards.

I urge, Mr. Speaker, that, as we move forward, we move forward with commonsense reforms to reduce spending, to bring the debt under control, to begin reducing our national debt, and to make sure that we are spending money in places where it makes sense, to fulfill commitments to the people in St. John and St. Charles Parishes, to ensure that our communities and our economy are more resilient, and not to continue mortgaging our future and continue allowing our environment to degrade, as it is in coastal Louisiana.

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

LESSONS FROM THE VIETNAM WAR

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Louisiana, my neighbor—wonderful points being made.

I also want to call attention, Mr. Speaker, today to the 43rd anniversary of the release from imprisonment of American POWs from North Vietnam, among whom is our friend and hero here in the House, SAM JOHNSON.

It was nice of staff to have a little reception for Congressman JOHNSON, and it is important to remember such things and try to learn from our mistakes. Because once again, in the last couple of weeks, I have heard references to mistakes of the past, like the lesson we should have learned from Vietnam, and then they get the lesson all wrong.

We really didn't allow our military in Vietnam to win the war in Vietnam. Our pilots, our military operations, they could have won that war had they been allowed to do so.

And the best indication of that is, after 7 years that SAM JOHNSON spent in just the most horrid conditions, horrendous torture, joined by other American heroes, like JOHN MCCAIN, who was 3 years at the Hanoi Hilton, where SAM JOHNSON was.

I know he was shot down 5 years before the release, but it was only the last 3 years that he was placed in confinement there with, I believe, 10 others in the worst of the worst facilities, so bad that even today, after they

cleaned up some of the torture chambers and tried to dress them up, they still won't let Americans go into the original Hanoi Hilton where they held 11, including SAM JOHNSON, in the most horrid of conditions.

But the chronology, basically, in a nutshell, Nixon promised that he would, if he was reelected, he would get us out of Vietnam. So after reelection, they start the Paris peace talks—and I realize this is a gross generalization. They start the Paris peace talks. The North Vietnamese storm out. So Nixon orders carpet bombing of sites in North Vietnam that they had never been allowed to bomb before, including the areas in Hanoi itself.

SAM has related personally that, when they first heard the first bomb drop, they thought: Wow, one might fall here. And then they were absolutely overjoyed that, finally, their country, the United States of America, was finally bringing the war to the North Vietnamese leaders. They had not done that.

So there was massive bombing for 2 weeks. After 2 weeks, tremendous bombing, then the leaders came rushing back to the peace tables: Let's work this out.

They got a peace accord agreed to. They agreed to provide all the names, locations of Americans who were killed in action or missing in action, provide all of the POWs. Apparently, American officials knew pretty quickly they didn't give us everybody, and that is another dark chapter in our history. But they agreed to release the POWs.

As SAM JOHNSON and others were being released from the Hanoi Hilton, he said probably the cruelest of the officers there was laughing and smirking at the Americans as they were allowed to leave and go to a bus and, basically, said: You stupid Americans. If you had just bombed us for one more week, we would have had to surrender unconditionally.

Yes, that is right. The lesson of Vietnam should have been that we should never, ever put our military in harm's way without giving them all of the equipment and ordnance they need to win and the order to win. If we are not willing to give them rules of engagement that allow them to win, they should not be sent.

Yet, since this administration has been in office, there have been three to four times more American military lives lost.

I am told by many in the military, because of the rules of engagement, because of where they are placed, without being able to properly defend themselves, that, under Commander in Chief Obama, three to four times more military members, American military members, have given their lives, their last full measure of devotion, than were lost during the 7¼ years in which the war in Afghanistan raged at its highest under Commander in Chief Bush. The difference is you had one Commander in Chief that gave them

more authority to win and a second, a later Commander in Chief, that tied their hands behind their backs.

So that brings us to where we are today, 43 years after SAM JOHNSON and other American POWs were released from North Vietnam. The real lesson of Vietnam still hasn't been learned because we have still got American military members being killed abroad, in Afghanistan, without giving them the rules of engagement to protect themselves.

And if that were the end of the story, that would be bad enough; but it is even worse when our military members have been subjected to the examples of having American military members punished, sent to prison if they dared to put the safety and lives of their men as the first consideration of their actions and their orders.

So we have a lieutenant in Leavenworth who, when an Afghan on a motorcycle refused to honor the signs, the orders to stop, refused to stop or even slow down when shots were fired in his direction, and so you have to give some credit to this administration and the military leaders and the orders that make their way from the top down and the rules of engagement as to why, just in recent weeks, we have lost military members when someone on a motorcycle rode up and exploded themselves.

They knew. Our American military that died in that suicide motorcycle bombing, they knew what had happened to the lieutenant. All of our people in Afghanistan know what happened when this administration makes an example out of an officer who dares to put the safety of his own people ut-
tmost in his mind.

It is a sad time in America. Our allies notice that, if we will not even take the life, the treasure of our own American military more seriously, then how can they possibly put their faith in us that we will keep our word and protect them? They have seen what happened in Ukraine.

□ 1330

They didn't really lift a finger to help the Ukrainians against the Russian aggression. In fact, after Russian aggression against Georgia, President Bush put some sanctions in place. Relations got more chilled between the United States and Russia because of the egregious, unfair actions of Russia in Georgia.

The first thing this President did was send Hillary Clinton over with a plastic, red button. They put the wrong interpretation on it. They meant to say a reset button, and they got the wrong language on there.

The message was very clear to the Russians: Ah, President Obama and Hillary Clinton don't care if we violate their allies. They don't care if we invade their friends. They don't care. They want a reset button and basically have apologized for getting upset that we in Russia invaded Georgia. So Hillary Clinton and President Obama are fine with us invading other places.

What were they supposed to think that this administration would do when they invaded Ukraine? Well, they guessed right, that this administration wouldn't really do anything about it.

Oh, I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. I forgot. This administration did do something about the Russian aggression. In fact, the President delivered it. He didn't know the microphone was picking him up when he said, basically:

Tell Vladimir that I will have a whole lot more flexibility after the election.

So they got the messages. We can pretty much abuse and invade, whatever we care to do. It is outrageous what has happened to American reputation abroad.

So today is the 43rd anniversary. We salute SAM JOHNSON and all those POWs that were released today from North Vietnam. I wish we had learned the lesson from the horrors that they experienced.

In fact, there is an article here by Anne Bayefsky. It originally appeared on FOX News. This was released February 11, 2016, by Human Rights Voices:

"There is a dangerous scam gaining traction at the United Nations, backstopped by the White House."

That is our U.S. President's House. "It's called 'violent extremism.' Given the U.N.'s long and undistinguished history of being unable to define terrorism, and an American President who chokes on the words 'radical Islamic terrorism,' pledges to combat 'violent extremism' have become all the rage.

"It turns out that the terminological fast one is a lethal diplomatic dance that needs to be deconstructed, and quickly.

"In 1999, the Organization of Islamic Cooperation"—that is the OIC—"enemy" insert parenthetically, Mr. Speaker—the OIC, Organization of Islamic Cooperation, has all of the Islamic nations except the United States included in it, and they also include the Palestinians that are in the nation of Israel.

I always get confused whether the OIC has 50 states and we have in the United States 57 States or whether the OIC has 57 states and we have 50. So I shared that with our President when he was running for the Presidency as he got confused whether the U.S. has 57 states—no, that is the OIC—and the United States has 50. It is confusing.

The article states: "In 1999, the Organization of Islamic Cooperation . . . adopted an 'anti-terrorism' treaty stating that 'armed struggle against foreign occupation, aggression, colonialism, and hegemony, aimed at liberation and self-determination . . . shall not be considered a terrorist crime.'

"In practice, that means it is open season on all Israelis, as well as Americans and Europeans who get in the way. Each of the 56 Islamic states"—actually, the OIC is 57 because they claim Palestine—"and what the UN la-

bels the 'State of Palestine,' is a party to this treaty.

"The September 11 terror attacks then launched a growth industry in U.N. counter-terrorism chit-chat and paraphernalia.

"Year-after-year, Islamic states have prevented the adoption of a UN Comprehensive Convention Against Terrorism by refusing to abandon their claim that certain targets are exempt.

"In 2001 the U.N. Security Council created the Counter-Terrorism Committee. But it is unable to name a state sponsor of terrorism. In fact, from 2002 to 2003, Syria, a state sponsor of terrorism, was a member.

"In 2005 the U.N. Commission on Human Rights, once chaired by Colonel Qaddafi's Libya, created the U.N. expert on 'the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism'—as if countering terror is not about protecting human rights.

"In 2006 the General Assembly adopted a Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy. It manages to cast terrorists as victims. 'Pillar Number One' starts by worrying about 'conditions conducive to the spread of terrorism.' 'Youth unemployment,' for instance, purportedly results in 'the subsequent sense of victimization that propels extremism and the recruitment of terrorists.'

"In 2011 the U.N. established the Counter-Terrorism Center—at the initiative of Saudi Arabia. The Saudis threw \$100 million at the venture and became chair of the 'Advisory Board.' Saudi financing of radical charities and 'academic' exercises around the world are somehow left out of Center events on investigating and prosecuting terror financing.

"Integral to the best-defense-is-a-good-offense routine, has been the constant unsubstantiated allegation of an 'Islamophobia' pandemic.

"For the first decade of the 21st century, the Islamophobia charge was hurled in UN resolutions on the 'defamation' of Islam or the 'defamation of religion.' Defamation meant the freedoms of human beings should be trumped by the 'rights' of 'religion.'

"In 2009 'defamation' was repackaged by the General Assembly as 'human rights and cultural diversity.' Ever since, the over 100 countries of the 'Non-aligned movement' vote against Western states and demand the freedoms of human beings be trumped by 'cultural diversity.' And that's cultural diversity Iran-style. In December 2015, the UN resolution praised Tehran's Centre for Human Rights and Cultural Diversity—the brainchild of former Iranian President and well-known human rights aficionado Mahmoud Ahmadinejad.

"In the last six weeks alone, Islamic states have staged two UN meetings focusing on 'Islamophobia and inclusive societies,' and 'countering xenophobia.' Two weeks ago, the servile Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon couldn't mention 'antisemitism' on the anniversary of

the liberation of Auschwitz without connecting it to 'anti-Muslim bigotry.'

"Of course, the Islamophobia drumbeat skips right over the xenophobia, antisemitism, and exclusively that is endemic—and officially-sanctioned—in Islamic states.

"This is the substrate from which Ban Ki-moon has now manufactured a 'Plan of Action to Prevent Violent Extremism.' Introduced in January, the General Assembly is meeting on February 12, 2016 to push the plan forward.

"After one mention of 'ISIL, Al-Qaeda and Boko Haram,' the Plan insists that violent extremism 'does not arise in a vacuum. Narratives of grievance, actual or perceived injustice . . . become attractive.' 'It is critical that in responding to this threat,' stresses the Plan, that states be stopped from 'overreacting.' Topping 'conditions conducive to violent extremism' is 'lack of socioeconomic opportunities.'"

Mr. Speaker, this just shows the ignorance in the U.N. in propagating such a plan and the sheer naivety, if not outright intentional misleading, of those who would read their report.

Lack of socioeconomic opportunities is not what caused one of the wealthier Islamists to put together and carry out a plan of attacking the World Trade Center, the Pentagon, and, apparently, this Capitol. He was wealthy. So are many of those who are funding terrorism. It arises out of radical Islamic beliefs.

Nobody should have to ever say: We know all Muslims don't believe this. It should go without saying. We know that. But for those that do, it is sheer idiocy to claim that Islam has nothing to do with the radical Islamic terrorism that is occurring.

When you have one of the most world-renowned experts on Islam who has studied his whole life on the Koran, the holy Koran, as he would call it, the tenets and the pillars of Islam and even has his Ph.D., we are told, in Islamic studies from the University of Baghdad—Mr. Speaker, I think I forgot to mention he is the head of ISIS.

The head of the Islamic State is one of the world's foremost experts on Islam, and he says the Islamic State is exactly what Islam is all about.

I know, when I was a judge, people had to put on evidence as to educational background and study in an area so that I, as the judge, could determine whether that man or woman was actually an expert in their field.

I would say the head of ISIS, with his educational background and his research and study, certainly is far more of an expert on Islam than our President or Valerie Jarrett or anybody in this administration.

The article says: "Here we go again. The bigots, fanatics and killers are allegedly driven by our annoying insistence on fighting back—which the Plan astonishingly calls 'the cycle of insecurity and armed conflict.'

"As per usual in U.N. negotiations, the Obama administration has jumped

on board while Islamic states are holding out for greater elaboration of their grievances and even more 'nothing to do with religion or Islam' clauses.

"The U.N.'s idea of a win-win is an illusory 'global partnership to confront this menace' that allows states to define violent extremism any which way they want: 'This Plan of Action pursues a practical approach to preventing violent extremism, without venturing to address questions of definition.'

"Only U.N. con-artists could present refusing to identify a problem as the most practical way to solve it.

"More practically speaking, the latest Palestinian terror wave began by pumping bullets into a young mom and dad in front of their little kids for the crime of being Jews living and breathing on Arab-claimed land. In U.N. terminology, Eitam and Naama Henkin were 'extremist settlers.'

"So to all you extremist lovers of liberty: beware the violent extremists in U.N. clothing, and the morally-challenged commanders in chief bringing up the rear."

Well written. We have got to wake up. We had another bombing. We have more violence. We hear from ISIS leaders that they have been able to get some of their best warriors into the United States and into Europe posing as refugees. We have the head of the FBI who warns all of us in the House and all of us in the Senate and says we have cases regarding the Islamic State in every State in the Union.

□ 1345

Still, we let the administration get away with turning a blind eye toward the real problem and say we need to welcome more and more refugees. We are told by the people who are in charge of the vetting: We will vet them, but we have no information really to vet them with, so, sure, there are going to be some terrorists come in.

We have an obligation in this House, and those Senators at the other end of the hall, to our Constitution, and we are to provide for the common defense. We are supposed to provide that defense against all enemies—foreign and domestic.

For those who don't know the Constitution well enough, there is no right by someone illegally in the United States to have a hearing before an article III Federal District Court. In fact, there is no District Court mentioned in article III. The only court mentioned is the Supreme Court. As my old constitutional law professor said, there is only one court in the country that owes its existence to the U.S. Constitution. Every other Federal Court, every other tribunal, and magistrate in the country owes its existence—that is a Federal entity—owes its existence to the United States Congress. We have the right to create them; we have the right to remove them.

Our own military do not have a right to a United States District Court. Why? Because the Constitution says

Congress has the full authority to create disciplinary systems for the military. That is why the UCMJ, the Uniform Code of Military Justice, was created.

Why in the world should we have people in this administration advocating for people illegally in this country, people illegally in this country that want to do damage to America, and advocate that they have a right to a U.S. District Court that our own military heroes don't have a right to? The answer is: They don't have that right at all.

There is an article: Female Suicide Bomber Pair Kill 58 in Nigerian Refugee Camp. Having been there and having wept with family members who have lost kids, had kids kidnapped, held, their little girls raped repeatedly for months now, and the best this administration does is start a little social media campaign: Bring Back Our Girls, are you kidding me?

Give Nigeria all the Intel they need to wipe out Boko Haram. Let them do it.

The Taliban was totally defeated between October of 2001 and February of 2002. Without one single American life lost, we had embedded military in Afghanistan, no lives lost, and the Taliban was totally routed by February. Then we did something that wasn't very smart. We began basically an occupation of Afghanistan. It hasn't worked out well.

Here is an article: CIA Director Says Islamic Group has Used, Can Make Chemical Weapons. It quotes Brennan on CBS News and Lara on 60 Minutes as saying: The CIA believes the IS group has the ability to make small amounts of mustard and chlorine gas for weapons, and "there are reports that ISIS has access to chemical precursors and munitions that they can use."

Mr. Speaker, we need to have learned our lesson, and we haven't. If this administration doesn't stand up, more lives will be needlessly lost.

I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. STIVERS (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of his duties with the Ohio National Guard.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 757. An act to improve the enforcement of sanctions against the Government of North Korea, and for other purposes.

H.R. 907. An act to improve defense cooperation between the United States and the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.

H.R. 1428. An act to extend Privacy Act remedies to citizens of certified states, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 31, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until Tuesday, February 23, 2016, at 2 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

4329. A letter from the Deputy Director, Directorate of Cooperative and State Programs, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Maine State Plan for State and Local Government Employers [Docket No.: OSHA-2015-0003] (RIN: 1218-AC97) received February 9, 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 Education and the Workforce.

4330. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval of Regional Haze BART Alternative Measure: Washington [EPA-R10-OAR-2015-0398; FRL-9942-15-Region 10] received February 9, 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.

4331. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Benzyl acetate; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2014-0783; FRL-9941-49] received February 9, 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.

4332. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Clean Air Act Title V Operating Permit Program Revision; West Virginia [EPA-R03-OAR-2015-0594; FRL-9942-12-Region 3] received February 9, 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.

4333. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Diflufenzuron; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2014-0672; FRL-9939-59] received February 9, 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.

4334. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition Library Address; Technical Amendments [Docket No.: FDA-2015-N-0011] received February 9, 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.

4335. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Venezuela that was declared in Executive Order 13692 of March 8, 2015, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public