

what the American Health Care Act will do.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, will hurt people—women, seniors, individuals with disabilities, and middle class families. It will result in universal chaos, not universal coverage.

I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this measure.

AN EXERCISE IN SMOKE AND MIRRORS

(Mr. LAWSON of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LAWSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Republican plan to repeal and replace the Affordable Care Act is an exercise in smoke and mirrors.

This proposal would give tax breaks to the wealthiest Americans while burdening the hardworking families with higher healthcare costs. The Republican plan also allows soaring new healthcare costs for our seniors and shortens the life of the Medicare trust fund, endangering seniors and disabled Americans who depend on Medicaid coverage. This is completely unacceptable to Floridians.

We need to hear from the Congressional Budget Office about what this bill would really mean in numbers. The American people deserve to understand what the Republicans are trying to do with their health care.

I will continue to fight to ensure that Floridians with preexisting conditions don't have to worry about losing their healthcare coverage, and that young adults can stay on their parents' insurance until they reach age 26, and that we are going to do all we can to make health care affordable and accessible for all Americans and not just for a select few.

WORST OF TIMES

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, when President Trump was campaigning, he said that these were the worst of times for African Americans, conveniently or ignorantly forgetting slavery and Jim Crow. He said it couldn't get any worse.

Well, it is getting worse with a Justice Department that has already retreated on voting rights and that has empowered private prisons to take advantage of people which are disparately proportionate to African Americans for prison incarceration; a HUD department where the Secretary has said slavery was akin to immigration and where \$6 billion is to be cut from the budget; an education department that doesn't believe in public education that has given African Americans a chance for the American Dream; and a healthcare bill that takes away health care from the poorest and makes it to where many will not have health care,

and Medicaid will be decimated and possibility eliminated.

These are the worst of times and President Trump, Mr. Speaker, is showing African Americans things can get worse. They are getting worse, and they are on a daily basis.

MORE HEALTH OPTIONS FOR FAMILIES

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, we see more and more that ObamaCare or the Affordable Care Act is, indeed, unsustainable.

Today I rise, once again, to share another story or two about some of the highlights that some of my constituents are feeling back at home.

Last night, I hosted a telephone townhall to have an opportunity to hear from people in my district, once again, about some of the unsustainable, horrible stories that they have to tell about the experiences they have had with the ACA: sky-high premiums; poor access to health care; options that are less and less, especially in rural California and rural America; deductibles that have risen so high that insurance isn't really affordable for them to use at all.

Recently a physician within my district contacted my office and said that, after more than 30 years of a successful practice with happy clients, he is no longer able to provide the type of care his patients need due to the overburdensome paperwork requirements. This is providing less choices for people, especially the middle-income families that have to choose between the things they want to save for for their future and for their dreams and now happen to have much higher premiums, less choices, and a deductible that makes their insurance almost useless to them.

The American Health Care Act will give back more options for families and other Americans that desperately need this help and to meet all the goals that we are setting out to do.

MEND THE LAW, NOT END THE LAW

(Ms. ROSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my opposition to the repeal and replacement of the Affordable Care Act.

I will be the first to admit that ObamaCare has its flaws, but we should mend the law, not end the law. Because of the ACA, we have seen the uninsured rate in Nevada and in my district reduced by half.

The GOP replacement would not only drop 15 million Americans from their insurance and raise healthcare costs on hardworking Nevada families, but it

would end funding for Planned Parenthood, taking away affordable healthcare services that so many women in my district rely on.

Recently I received a letter from a constituent whose family has a history of breast cancer. She is so concerned that she and her daughter will stop receiving the regular cancer screenings that they need to survive.

Mr. Speaker, it is unconscionable for us to vote on a bill that would create a life-or-death situation for millions of Americans across the country.

□ 1215

MEDICAID EXPANSION

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

Mr. KIHUEN. Mr. Speaker, I have a new name for the process Republicans are using to destroy the Affordable Care Act. Instead of repeal and replace, how about we name it "we cut and gut"? Cut taxes for millionaires and billionaires, and gut coverage for hardworking Americans.

The bill would also undermine the Medicaid expansion in the Affordable Care Act. In Nevada, our own Governor Brian Sandoval, a Republican, made the decision to work with Democrats and expand the Medicaid program. Because we expanded Medicaid, 320,000 Nevadans now have health coverage, and Nevada's uninsured rate has dropped from 23 percent to 12 percent, one of the largest declines in the entire country.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would ask my Republican colleagues: Do you really want to turn your backs on hardworking families just to give billionaires a tax cut that they don't need or deserve?

Mr. Speaker, the silence is deafening.

THERE ARE RADICAL ISLAMISTS WHO WANT TO DESTROY OUR WAY OF LIFE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it is the end of another week in session.

Mr. Speaker, I want to revisit an important issue. It seems that what some of us were trying to point out for 8 years under the Obama administration fell on deaf ears, that there really are radical Islamists who want to destroy our way of life in the United States, who look at us as infidels, and not just Christians, Jews, secularists, and others, but even Muslims who do not adapt and accept the radical Islamic ways.

That works to the advantage of some because we have seen for 8 years CAIR, Muslim Brotherhood-affiliated groups, groups that were listed as co-conspirators in the Holy Land Foundation trial

back in 2008, where the named defendants were convicted of many counts, and they were supporting terrorism. They have ties all over the United States and they have ties to people who constantly had access to President Obama's White House, the State Department, and so many other areas.

We saw time and time again the Obama administration looking the other way as serious matters arose involving radical Islamists, both in the United States and abroad. The Obama administration's approach was: If we can just teach these racist, bigoted, Americans to love all Islamists. Because they wouldn't point out that some are radicals, as my Muslim friends don't hesitate to point out.

But this administration didn't want to point out that there are radical Islamists, that they are part of Islam, that many of them are experts in Islam, like Baghdadi, who heads up the Islamic State. He has a Ph.D. in Islamic studies, so it is kind of difficult to say that he has nothing to do with Islam when that is the basis for everything he said and did.

If one goes and looks at the pleading that the judge declassified from 2008 of testimony given by Khalid Sheikh Mohammed in a court at Guantanamo Bay, he makes very clear that he is not insane, that he is very lucid. He files a very impressive document explaining himself.

For everything that he said, for example, about the need to kill Christians and Jews, he had a direct quote, not from the Koran. Like where often Members of Congress, if you bring something up on the floor about Islam or the Koran, then it is amazing. It hasn't happened in a while, but Members who bring something like that up, they frequently find themselves being presented a Koran. Somebody drops off a Koran.

But, as an expert in the field pointed out to me when I showed him the Koran that was dropped off at my House, he says, that is a Koran, it is not a Holy Koran; because what they have done is they have taken what they call the Holy Koran and they have eliminated the verses that support terrorism and the killing of Jews and Christians. So if you read from cover to cover this Koran, you don't see any of the verses that the most radical Islamists rely on for their killing, their beheading, their betraying, their lies. And it is okay, they believe, to lie if it ends up supporting the cause of their radical beliefs about Islam.

One of the reasons that I contend with so many others here that Egypt ought to be one of our dearest friends is because they have an elected president. Yes, he was a former general, like Eisenhower, like George Washington, like Andrew Jackson, like so many who had been generals before they became President. They understand warfare.

But the radical Islamists in the United States, so many of them, Mus-

lim Brotherhood-related groups, they pointed out time and again: Look, we know we are going to have to get to violence at some point. But for now, we are making so much progress in taking over the United States without using violence that right now violence distracts from what we are trying to do.

Some of us continue to point out that what the Obama administration constantly used as their fight against, not radical Islam—they couldn't say that like President Trump does—but they would say against violent extremism: We have got to spend millions and millions, and hundreds of millions of dollars fighting violent extremism.

They believed what the often Muslim Brotherhood-affiliated individuals would say: Yes, if we spend that money teaching people to love and accept Islam, then the problem goes away and there is no more violence.

Which is, in and of itself, a complete lie.

So the Obama administration has been spending money on things. I am told by someone who was looking at the ways that the Obama administration spent hard-earned taxpayer dollars paid to the government, and then the Obama administration would turn around and spend it. I am told by someone in Homeland Security—I haven't seen it—but they even had a project spending taxpayer dollars to fight radical Islam by teaching schoolchildren pro-Islamic songs to sing. It is one of the reasons I am so glad we have had a change of President.

I know that there are so many people across the aisle, not necessarily people here in this body, but across the country, who keep saying: Oh, there is so much prejudice against Muslims, and that is the whole problem. If we can eliminate the prejudice against Islam, against Muslims, there will be no more violence.

There are those that are in this body here who have gone so far to show how open-minded they are and how much they embrace the ideals of Islam, and are in no way bigoted, that they have exposed this body to criminals, to hacking; and who knows just how far the security breaches go.

Mr. Speaker, we brought this up, but it is important to take note that this body—there were no Republicans that hired them, but Imran Awan seemed to be the ring leader, Abid Awan, Jamal Awan, Hina Alvi, Natalia Sova, each making \$160,000-plus from the House of Representatives. The Awan brothers are of Pakistani descent. I am told the leader is now back in Pakistan while they are being investigated, but their immigration status appears unclear right now. They had been hired as IT specialists, computer specialists, to help some of my Democratic friends with their computer systems. And as suspicious activity continued to mount over the last 12 years, it was dismissed.

And I am reading from an article that Luke Rosiak, March 8, from The Daily Caller wrote.

□ 1230

I'm reading from an article that Luke Rosiak, March 8, of the Daily Caller wrote:

It was dismissed because these five individuals were being unfairly picked on because they are Muslim.

Well, some of us don't care what their religious beliefs are unless their religious beliefs happen to cause them to believe that our Constitution needed to be eliminated and replaced by nothing but sharia law, and our elected leaders needed to be replaced by what they believe is a holy appointment of a caliph or an imam.

This article from March 8 says that congressional staffers suspected of improperly accessing sensitive data allegedly controlled their stepmother with violent threats in a plan to use her to access assets stored in the Middle East in their father's name.

So just when we thought this whole matter could not get any more bizarre, these five, according to one of their employers here in this House, he says—and I have no reason to doubt him—that they are Muslim. But I know my friends. They don't want to ever be perceived as being bigoted because they are not. But they have gone so far overboard in trying to show how open-minded they are, they have exposed this body to security breaches that are really unbelievable.

I understand from my friend, DEVIN NUNES, that these individuals were not, best they can tell, ever given access to the classified material in the separate classified system that the intel community has.

Talking about running the Democratic House Members' computer networks, this article says: "Days before U.S. Capitol Police told House Members three Pakistani brothers who ran their computer networks may have stolen congressional data, their stepmother called Fairfax County, Virginia, police to say the Democratic staffers were keeping her from her husband's deathbed."

A relative described her situation as being kept in captivity by the brothers for months while they schemed to take their father's life insurance.

The brothers, as IT professionals—computer experts—for Congress, could read House Members' emails and also had full access to their calendars: who they were meeting with and where they were meeting.

Anyway, the article says they "allegedly used wiretapping devices on their own stepmother and threatened to abduct loved ones in Pakistan if she didn't give them access to money stowed away in that country."

"On February 2, House officials banned Imran, Abid, and Jamal Awan from the House of Representatives network as part of a Capitol Police criminal investigation into House computer security."

But longtime employers, including—and it has been in the news—our friend, Congresswoman DEBBIE WASSERMAN

SCHULTZ, and others are named have stood by these suspected criminals. But they did say they had access to their data.

They say we have “‘seen no evidence that they were doing anything that was nefarious’ like steal or hack, and were being unfairly picked on for being Muslim.

“But a Fairfax police report obtained by The Daily Caller News Foundation Investigative Group says that separately from that investigation, on Thursday, on January 5 at 2 p.m., ‘Samani Galani called police after her stepchildren were denying her access to her husband of 8 years, Muhammad Shah, who is currently hospitalized,’ and police responded to the Springfield home she shared with him.

“‘I made contact with her stepson, Abid, who responded to location and was obviously upset with the situation. He stated he has full power of attorney over his father and produced an unsigned, undated document as proof,’ officers wrote.”

Then the officer said: “He refused to disclose his father’s location.”

So he didn’t even have a signed power of attorney yet continued to assert—and, again, this is someone who is given access to the privileged computer material of people here on Capitol Hill. I am told by other IT professionals that do work here that, if you know what you are doing and you have access to even one Congress Member’s computer, which means their calendar, their emails, and notes taken and stored on the computer about meetings, then it is very easy—you are good—to access virtually anybody else’s information here in Congress.

I was told some time back by one of my friends in Intelligence that at one time there was concern about positions I had taken like in support of Egypt against the Muslim Brotherhood and that there were those who were monitoring people that came to my office. I was told that they know everybody that walks into your office.

So when you see these kinds of reports, Mr. Speaker, it is a little disconcerting. It is disconcerting that people are not more concerned here in this body about the potential for the kind of breach that is being stated here.

Anyway the article goes on: “The father died days later, with his children denying him a final moment with his loved one, and the body was taken to Pakistan, where there were significant assets in their father’s name. Galani was shocked to learn that his death certificate”—that of her husband—“listed him as divorced, according to a relative of Galani’s. The relative spoke only on condition of anonymity.

“‘They kept their stepmother in sort of illegal captivity from October 16, 2016, to February 2,’ the relative said, telling her they were in charge of her life and said she was not allowed to speak to anyone. The fact that she did not speak English made it easy for them to take advantage of her.

“As Shah laid hospitalized, ‘they would not let the father communicate with the wife, they would say he’d be meeting her when they said so.’

“The brothers bugged her house with hidden listening devices and told her ‘her movements were under constant surveillance and conversations within the house and over the telephone were being listened to. They would repeat what she had told people to prove that they were really listening.’

“‘This happened in the United States of America, can you believe it?’ the relative asked.

“Galani obtained a secret cellphone and stood in the yard to communicate with relatives, who encouraged her to call the police. . . .

“After she did, Abid ‘threatened her very severely, made her fearful, they told her they are going to abduct or kidnap her family back in Pakistan, and she had to apologize.’”

Imran is the individual who had done computer work here for so many of our Democratic friends here in the House.

“Imran then tried ‘to manipulate her. She said to him, ‘if you say you are my son, then why are you keeping my phone conversations listened to?’” So he said he would remove the devices. He came into the house and she saw him remove a couple,’ including under the kitchen counter.”

So it is interesting. We have these guys who Members of Congress said: They don’t need a background check. We can trust them. We are open-minded. They are Muslims, but we are not prejudiced. We don’t even require a background check because we know we can trust them.

Mr. Speaker, we don’t know what they did here in the House, but in their stepmother’s house they planted listening devices. Apparently, they knew where to get them, and they knew how to use them in the home. It still leads one to wonder: What all did they do during the 12 years they were working on computer systems here on Capitol Hill?

Still, we know the allegations have been talked about at length in the media about the hacking of the Democratic National Committee, but I keep asking: Are these the guys that set up the Democratic National Committee’s computers, guys that are good at planting listening devices and who are good at setting up cameras to monitor movement and what is going on? Did these guys help the Democratic National Committee set up their system without any background checks? Are these the guys that made it so vulnerable to being hacked by Russians or most anyone else who cared to try?

“Galani learned from a life insurance executive that ‘a few days before the father’s death, the beneficiary was changed and Abid became the beneficiary,’ the relative said. On top of that, the Springfield house where she lived would go to Abid.

“Galani fled from the brothers and has filed a second police complaint

with Fairfax County over insurance fraud and other abuses.

“Abid did not return a request for comment from” the Daily Caller.

It also pointed out that, after Mr. Shah passed away, these people that were doing computer work for Members of Congress without background checks came into her house. She said that whatever documents were there they stole, along with a couple of laptops that were their father’s property, and they left for Pakistan.

Now, I heard somebody that should have known that the ringleader here that headed up the computer company that serviced so many of the—well, this article talks about a handful of Democrats, but I have been hearing that at one time, over the years, over the last 12 years, they may have serviced as many as 80 different Democratic Members of Congress’ computers.

But the relatives are coming forward now, according to the article, because Members of Congress have attempted to downplay the brothers’ potential crimes and have limited the investigation to just the Capitol Police, who lack the ability to investigate cyber breaches and international crimes, and despite naming the brothers as suspects, have not even arrested them. This is, apparently, a Muslim woman who says that she is fighting to protect the country—talking about the United States—these are very bad people.

This kind of reminds one of the father who came forward to point out that his son had become radicalized and was a terrorist threat because, under the Obama administration, they purged the training documents so FBI agents, State Department officials, and intelligence officials would not know what to look for to spot radical Islamists.

We know most Muslims are not terrorists. They are not radicalized. Most are loving people and want to live in peace. That includes friends of mine who have lived all their lives in Afghanistan and were glad to fight against the Taliban in Afghanistan because they didn’t want radical Islam. They are Muslim. They didn’t want radical Islamists running the country.

□ 1245

Radical Islamists hate moderate Muslims as much as they do Christians and Jews.

So, this lady says she is trying to protect our country because Members are not realizing how exposed Congress has been. As she says—she is the stepmother: These are very bad people.

Politico reported that Imran and his wife, Hina Alvi, are personal friends with the former DNC chair, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, when she was subject to an email hack that was blamed on the Russians.

This article is dated March 8. Apparently, Imran still hasn’t been fired, even though he was banned from the House network, but that has been circumvented by having him serving as an adviser.

Well, Imran began working for her in 2005, the article says, and soon after, his two brothers and two of their wives all appeared on the congressional payroll, collecting more than \$4 million. That is over this period of time, of course.

The brothers had numerous additional sources of income, all of which seemed to disappear. While they were supposedly working for the House, the brothers were running a car dealership full time that didn't pay its vendors. After one Rao Abbas threatened to sue them, he began receiving a paycheck from another Democratic member of the House of Representatives, also from Florida.

While they were working for House Members—and it should be pointed out, not any Republican Members—they were working for House Members, including members of the Homeland Security and Foreign Affairs Committees—the dealership took and never repaid a \$100,000 loan from Dr. Ali Al-Attar, who is a fugitive from U.S. authorities and is linked to Hezbollah.

This is perfectly consistent with what was going on for 8 years under President Obama. You had Imam Majid, who had been president of an organization that was listed as a coconspirator.

So, whatever happened to all of those coconspirators named by the U.S. Department of Justice?

Well, I understood from a former member of DOJ under the Bush administration that they took this first case, and if they were successful in getting convictions, then they would turn around and go after the other coconspirators.

But the interesting thing that happened immediately after that conviction in late 2008, we had a new President, and Eric Holder became Attorney General. Eric Holder had no interest in prosecuting the named coconspirators of those convicted of supporting terrorism.

So, we spent 8 years with the Obama administration listening to people who identified not just being part of, but leading coconspirator groups and supporting terrorism.

Of course, he was an American citizen by birth. His parents were both from Yemen. They came here on visas. He was born. They went back and trained him to hate America, as I first pointed out, had been occurring 7 years ago, after a friend in an international setting advised me that this person knew of radical Islamic leaders who sent their wives to the United States to have babies so they can bring them back, teach them to hate America, and they would be American citizens. They could come in and out at will.

I know CNN refused to do a proper investigation. They like name calling better than doing proper investigations.

Our Nation is threatened by people that hate us. Different countries had what many referred to as birth right travel programs.

China was bragging that they had the best birth right travel programs. You pay money to this travel group, they would get you a visa to come to the United States. Of course, you would want to come during the third trimester of pregnancy so you can have a child in the United States.

Then, some of them would advise: We will even help you make sure your child has an American passport before he or she leaves the U.S. so that your child can never be denied entrance, whether it is for college, for work, for whatever, they can come in and out as they pleased.

That is how a man named Anwar al-Awlaki, an American citizen, helped the Clinton administration, helped the Bush administration.

I had someone who was working at one time for the administration advise me that the Obama administration was really upset because they thought Anwar al-Awlaki was helping them as kind of a double or maybe triple agent. When they found out that he was not actually helping the United States, he was still helping radicalize individuals, was behind some of the radicalization of people that went on to kill Americans in the United States.

With all of those ties, in fact, there are photographs of him leading right here in this building in which I stand, Mr. Speaker, Friday prayers with Muslim staffers here on Capitol Hill; leading those prayers.

President Obama thinks that with all his ties to people in his administration, to people on Capitol Hill, this guy, an American citizen, free to come in and go as he wishes, was so dangerous, we could not possibly allow him to come back and have a trial where he could testify about all his connections to people in the Obama administration, or Bush or Clinton administration. This guy is so dangerous, we better blow him up in Yemen; silence him forever. We don't want to give this guy a trial. Silence him forever—the first American citizen to be ordered killed by a President without a trial, with a drone strike. That was Anwar Al-Awlaki. There are so many others.

A Muslim brother, the former President of Egypt who was ordered removed by the largest gathering of peaceable demonstrators in the history of the world, these were incredible Egyptian people—Muslims, Christians, Jews, secularists—all joined together to demand the removal of this corrupt, evil Morsi.

Even though we did have Senator MCCAIN fly over there and demand the Egyptians release this Muslim brother and put him back in charge, he was on his way to becoming what Chavez was to Venezuela, he was about to be to Egypt.

So it wasn't just Democrats that were fooled. But thank God—I do thank God—that the Egyptian people would not have it. Morsi claimed to have had 13 million or so votes, but the Egyptians tell me, when I have been

over there visiting with friends, that they knew there was a lot of fraud and that he probably did not get elected with a majority of the votes. But the Muslim Brotherhood made clear to his opponents and those who wanted him removed: If you try to remove Morsi, we will burn this country down.

When Morsi was removed, the Muslim Brotherhood tried to do that. They burned many churches—dozens of them—attacked synagogues, and then they tried to blame this on the army and others in Egypt, but it was very clear it was the Muslim Brotherhood carrying out their threat that, if you remove the Muslim brother leader Morsi from Presidency before he took all control, all while he was taking his commands from an imam, a religious, holy, radicalized Islam. I am told they had him on video taking orders from such an imam.

Well, he didn't get back into power, and they recognized the Muslim Brotherhood as a terrorist group.

My friend, TED CRUZ, has filed a bill with many cosponsors, as I understand, and we filed one here in the House, to recognize the Muslim Brotherhood as the terrorist organization that it is.

I know that replacing ObamaCare as a system for taking care of people's health is a priority for so many of us, but we have got to multitask and not lose sight of the fact that we are still under the threat of radical Islam. They still want to kill us. They still want to eliminate our way of life here in the United States.

So, while we are, hopefully, about to create a better healthcare system in the United States, we have got to make sure the United States is protected. And for those who are so open-minded that they want to make sure that no Muslim ever suspects them of being prejudiced, they would allow people to get into our computer system constantly, without a background check, we are being put at risk.

We were put at risk when the Obama administration listened to CAIR, the Council on American-Islamic Relations, the group you hear from immediately after there is a terrorist attack, basically challenging people: How dare you say this was a Muslim. Well, it was a radical Islamic. Oh, so you are an Islamophobe.

I kept hearing from people inside homeland security that we were spending more time and effort training our officers to spot Islamophobes than we were training them to understand radical Islam. But that is exactly why Tsarnaev was never stopped, was never picked up and prevented from killing and maiming people in Boston.

The FBI agents, doing the best that they could, being deprived of Kim Jensen's 700-plus pages of radical Islam that the Obama administration did not want FBI trainees to see and to know.

They finally brought it back toward the end, but most FBI trainees never got any training on what radical Islam looks like. They never knew what questions to ask. They never knew what

questions to ask at a mosque. And yes, if somebody is suspected of being a radical Islamist, you should go to the mosque and talk to their friends, find out how they were acting, find out what their new religious practices were. There are people that understood and have studied radical Islam. They knew. Kim Jensen knew.

□ 1300

So I am very hopeful that people like Kim Jensen will be given free rein to once again fully train our Justice Department officials, people like Phil Haney. I am hopeful and prayerful that Phil, after he had so much information that was deleted under Secretary Napolitano establishing ties to terrorism—they wanted them deleted because many of them had ties with the White House and it would make the White House look bad.

But when Secretary Napolitano talked about, Yeah, we get pinged and then we connect the dots, well, she oversaw the elimination of dots, she oversaw the elimination of the ability to ping, as she said, and she exposed our country to dangers that were completely unnecessary if proper training had been given to our people in the Justice Department, in our Homeland Security Department, in our intelligence agencies and groups.

It really is clear from what has been going on. I have only been here under two Presidents—President George W. Bush, President Obama—and now the third, President Trump. But under the first two administrations that I served with, we were told repeatedly that use of the section 215 program or the 702 program that allows wiretapping of foreign agents, we were assured that if an American citizen were picked up, nobody knows the name, it is immediately masked, the conversation is minimized, so you don't have access to that.

We were told a lot of things that turned out to be lies. And it does appear that Snowden was guilty of treason from what we have seen. He should be tried and, if convicted, punished severely. But I sure learned a lot from what got released. I learned that we were lied to during the Obama years about what was or wasn't being done in surveilling American citizens, and at least the last part of the Bush administration. It could be the Presidents didn't know. But somebody knew. If we do not, in this body, give President Trump the ability to do what he became famous for—and that is say "You're fired"—then this country is not going to get back on a sound basis. There will continue to be people who will monitor others illegally, improperly, unconstitutionally, and use that information to get rid of leaders who don't play ball with them. That is dangerous.

We hear of foreign intelligence people who are corrupt spy on their own people, and they are impressed with what was going on under the Obama admin-

istration and feel like that was a dream come true for anyone in intelligence, to be able to monitor the people of a country, like has been going on. I mean, it has got to be cleaned up or we lose our freedoms. Once you have the ability to reach in to people's private lives, that completely—you don't even have to have a case. You can destroy their lives.

A good example was Senator Ted Stevens of Alaska. Somebody should have gone to prison for what happened to that man. As a former prosecutor, judge, and chief justice—I prosecuted people as a prosecutor, I sentenced people who were convicted when I was a judge, I ruled on convictions when I was a Chief Justice—I had to make sure due process was followed and the people got a fair trial, evidence was not obtained illegally. But in Ted Stevens' case, I know when I read that he had had this addition—I can't remember now; I am going strictly off recollection, but like 700,000 or so improvements to his home, and I thought, oh, come on, you have got to know, Senator, you can't have that kind of improvement free to your home. You can't do that.

But they came in with search warrants, took all of his documentation. They got all of his bank records, they got all of his computers, his flash drives, anything that had memory on it. They took all of his documentation. The man could not defend himself. He had, as it turns out, proof that he overpaid, maybe by half a million dollars, and that the prosecutor had material—a note, as I recall—from the contractor saying something like: Look, you are overpaying me.

Senator Stevens said: Yeah, I have got to overpay you because they will look closely at everything I do. I guess I am overpaying you, but I want the addition, and I have got to do this so I never get in trouble. Don't even cause the least suspicion. I have got to overpay you, so just take the overpayment.

He didn't have those documents, and he was not allowed to testify about documents that were not producible. He couldn't produce them because the prosecutors or the FBI, somebody kept those and refused to turn them over, which is a violation of the law, and it is a crime to unfairly prosecute somebody when you know they have evidence to prove they are innocent.

You don't even give it back to him so he can use it and show the truth?

Thank God there was a whistleblower who finally exposed—if I recall correctly, I believe it was an FBI agent. The judge hit the roof, of course. Any judge. I would have. You deceived us? You caused this prosecution, had the trial right before the election so he would lose? You changed the election?

You talk about the Russians, for heaven's sake. That was an intentional invasion, and it wasn't by Russians. It was by Americans. They ran that Republican Senator out of his office, basically destroyed his life. If he had been

in the Senate, he wouldn't have been in that airplane when it went down.

But that is what a corrupt government can do. They can come after anybody. We have got to clean out the Federal Government of people who have become dizzy with their power. I always thought it interesting, one of the most powerful dictators in history responsible for killing, starving millions of people, Stalin, one of his quotes was: With power, dizziness.

We have got a lot of dizzy people working in the Federal Government. Thank God that there are not more of those than there are people who love America, who really do keep their oath to the Constitution. But it has become very dangerous, and we have got to get to the bottom of this.

I have had people say: Louie, aren't you worried? I mean, you are talking about people who can destroy a Senator, can destroy all kinds of people. Aren't you worried they will come after you, try to destroy you the same way?

I am more concerned about my country. We have got to salvage this country's freedoms from the brink that it came to under the Obama administration.

Then we have a report, March 6, Paul Bedard, Washington Examiner: 300 Refugees Probed As Terrorists.

"In a bid to bolster President Trump's new executive order suspending travelers from six nations into the U.S., federal law enforcement officials revealed that they are investigating 300 refugees for terrorist ties.

"While U.S. officials would not provide details on the FBI investigations, they did say that they are refugees 'who either infiltrated with hostile intent or radicalized' since coming into the United States."

So these investigations are ongoing. I heard yet again this week a number of times, some of my friends across the aisle would say: Look, these refugees are not a problem. They are vetted for 2 years. We don't have to worry about them.

Yes, we do. We have already seen people who came in as refugees, people who were granted asylum. A couple of them, I believe it was Tennessee or Kentucky where they got asylum. They had not bothered to check or notice that their fingerprints were on IEDs that were set up to kill Americans.

So this 2-year vetting, oh, no, no, it is a long, tedious process to make sure they are okay. Well, I found out this week from an official with Homeland Security who said he wanted to know just how thorough the 2-year investigation and vetting was by the U.N. because he knew Homeland Security didn't do 2 years of vetting on these refugees. And, of course, the judges—who don't know "sic 'em" from "come here"—out in the 9th Circuit think they have the right under the Constitution to be dictators, and for them, without proper knowledge of what is and isn't a threat to this country, to

just dismiss orders that the President had the authority to make and just say, oh, they are unconstitutional, even though from their own statements they proved their own ignorance.

So we have got refugees coming in. Thank God somebody at the Homeland Security Department wanted to get to the bottom of exactly what occurs during the 2 years that the United Nations refugee program does in vetting people. So he went straight to the person in charge of the refugee program at that time. He said: I would like to get a description of the processes of vetting that refugees go through from these countries they allege they are coming from. What all does the U.N. do to vet these refugees?

And the answer came back: Well, actually, we don't do any vetting of the refugees. It is a long 2-year process most of the time, as we are trying to convince countries to take these people. We are not spending any of that time looking into their background. The 2 years is what it usually takes to get a country to accept them, figure out where they are going to go. No, somebody else must do that. We don't worry about that. We are just trying to find a place for them.

Mr. Speaker, the next time you hear somebody say, Oh, no, this is a very thorough 2-year process of vetting these refugees of making sure they are not a threat, then I hope it will come to your mind that a representative of the U.N. talking to one of our top Homeland Security people—and I am not going to give his name, but he was told: We don't do any vetting. We are just trying to find a place to put them. When we find somebody who will take them, we feel like we have done a great thing.

Well, maybe, if they are not terrorists.

□ 1315

But we have seen the data that indicates that for the amount of money it costs to bring a refugee from the Middle East to the United States and take care of them for a year, what happens to the money actually spent, you could take care of 12 refugees if they were kept in the area and provided a safe area. That is what the Obama administration should have done. Instead of drawing red lines that it couldn't find after it drew them, the Obama administration should have said: We are going to participate in creating a safe area, provide flyover and provide people there. We are going to provide a safe area for refugees to come to until the war is over and people can return to their homes.

Rather than create a system that will allow our enemies, the Islamic State and others, to do as they promised us they have been doing and will continue to do, and that is putting their terrorists in amongst the refugees, instead of doing that, putting our country at risk, let's let them stay near to their home, provide them safe-

ty, help provide them with what they need. Because when the greatest country, strongest country, most charitable country in the history of the world becomes so self-righteous that they feel like they don't need to do vetting, when they become so taken with appearing to be open-minded that they don't even protect themselves by doing what used to be called due diligence and checking on people to make sure they are not a threat to others around them, instead of doing that, we show irresponsibility when it comes to protecting America as when you are at risk of losing the country.

But Americans, by a huge majority of electors, electoral college, elected President Trump. They wanted a change. When you look at a map that shows all of the counties that voted for President Trump and those that voted for Hillary Clinton, you see that our friends across the aisle, part of a party that has really become a fringe party, has the fringes of the country. But the massive interior—most, except for some big cities here and there—is people that want to preserve and protect the most blessed place to raise a family that there has ever been.

I am sure Solomon's Israel was apparently an amazing place, but the people didn't have our freedoms. But we are in danger of losing them when we become so cocky that we think we don't have to check on people to make sure they are not a threat. That actually is a form of bias. They are so afraid that people might say that you are closed-minded that they don't even do a background check, but they would for someone who is not Muslim, then that is a form of bias.

We have got to use commonsense, we have got to protect America, or we will be cursed when we are gone and our children see what we have done.

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

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO THE UNITED STATES HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL COUNCIL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 2302, and the order of the House of January 3, 2017, of the following Members on the part of the House to the United States Holocaust Memorial Council:

Mr. DEUTCH, Florida
Mr. SCHNEIDER, Illinois

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. JONES (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of personal reasons.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, March 14, 2017, at noon 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:

763. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Army, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter indicating that one active Army military musical unit accepted services valued at \$9,160, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 974(d)(3); Public Law 110-181, Sec. 590(a)(1) (as amended by Public Law 113-66, Sec. 351); (127 Stat. 742); to the Committee on Armed Services.

764. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final NUREG — Operator Licensing Examination Standards for Power Reactors (NUREG-1021, Rev. 11) received March 6, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

765. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to significant malicious cyber-enabled activities that was declared in Executive Order 13694 of April 1, 2015, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

766. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a semi-annual report detailing telecommunications-related payments made to Cuba pursuant to Department of the Treasury licenses during the period from July 1 through December 31, 2016, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 6004(e)(6); Public Law 102-484, Sec. 1705(e)(6) (as amended by Public Law 104-114, Sec. 102(g)); (110 Stat. 794); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROE of Tennessee: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 1181. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify the conditions under which certain persons may be treated as adjudicated mentally incompetent for certain purposes (Rept. 115-33). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 1259. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the removal or demotion of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs based on performance or misconduct, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-34 Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 1367. A bill to improve the authority of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to hire and retain physicians and other employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-35 Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.