

Additionally, the Fish and Wildlife Service is also failing to implement a comprehensive plan for species recovery. In testimony, the head of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, when I asked over a month ago if they had a recovery plan, said: Well, yes.

I said: Well, what is it?

He said: Well, it is 20 years old, so it is really out of date.

I said: Well, then, you really don't have a plan.

And they acknowledged that.

Part of the comprehensive recovery plan does include provisions like those in legislation that we voted on yesterday in the Natural Resources Committee, the Save Our Salmon Act, of which I am a cosponsor. This act would begin to limit the impacts of predator species that are one of the principal causes of the decline of salmon and smelt in the delta. So the Save Our Salmon Act needs to be heard here on the floor, and I hope it will be passed and ultimately signed into law.

So the requirements made by the National Marine Fisheries Service, the Fish and Wildlife Service are unprecedented, I say again; and the impacts, intended or not, are real. They will be severe throughout California, especially in the San Joaquin Valley that I represent a part of, affecting as much as 6 million acres of productive, prime agricultural land that produces half the Nation's fruits and vegetables. That is the number one citrus State in the Nation, the number one dairy State in the Nation, number one production in wine and grapes. The product lines, 300 commodities, go on and on and on. That is how devastating these decisions could be if, in fact, they were granted.

So I urge the administration to reject these harmful actions. Common sense, at some time, must be applied. Let's prevent this train wreck from happening. Let's get to work on fixing a broken water system in California that was designed for 20 million people. Today we have 41 million people living in California. It was designed for the agriculture we had in the sixties.

Today, we are far more productive in our agricultural efforts, and it was never designed in a way to provide for environmental water as it is being requested today. So it is a broken water system because, when we have continuous dry years, it cannot serve all the demands that are placed upon it for our people, for our farms, and to ensure that we have the ability to maintain the environment for future generations to come.

I yield back the balance of my time.

CHALLENGES FACING THE COUNTRY

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER), my good friend and a great Member of Congress.

REESTABLISH INTEGRITY OF ARTICLE I OF THE CONSTITUTION

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, for the past 7½ years, this President has ignored Article I of the Constitution and the will of the American people.

The balance of power detailed in the Constitution is very clear: Congress writes laws; the President executes those laws. But through controversial executive orders and questionable regulations and selective enforcement of laws, the President has time and again bypassed our government's critical system of checks and balances to drive his own personal agenda of Big Government and big regulation.

Congress must reset this balance, reclaim its legislative power, and reestablish the integrity of Article I of the Constitution.

The most blatant attack on our Constitution is his executive order to suspend immigration laws for nearly 4 million people who are in our country illegally. In acting alone, the President has made clear his desire for amnesty for illegal immigrants, in direct violation of the laws of this Nation.

We are a nation of immigrants. But more importantly, Mr. Speaker, we are a nation of laws. This issue will only be resolved when the executive branch enforces existing law and works with the elected Members of Congress instead of sidestepping the Constitution and disrespecting the will of the people.

Mr. Speaker, Americans are desperate for greater security and economic opportunity. This comes with elevating, not undermining, the spirit of self-government, on which our Nation was founded.

This is not a Republican or a Democrat issue. This is an American issue, and it touches the core of our system of government. It is time that we restore and protect Article I of the Constitution and put the people first.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, such an articulate person in Congress is appreciated by all of us, especially so clear thinking. That is exactly the kind of thinking we need in the executive branch.

Mr. Speaker, we have an article just in from Carolyn May today: "441 Syrian Refugees Admitted to the U.S. Since the Orlando Attack, Dozens to Florida." It says:

"The administration has accelerated the pace of resettlement despite warnings from top security officials about potential vulnerabilities in vetting migrants from terror-hotspots like Syria and reports that ISIS operatives have infiltrated the refugee flows.

"In written testimony prepared for a Thursday hearing of the Senate Intelligence Committee, CIA Director John Brennan again warned about the potential for ISIS operatives to manipulate the refugee system, as well as other immigration paths."

While our CIA Director from this administration was warning the Senate here on Capitol Hill about ISIS being amongst the Syrian refugees—and ISIS leaders themselves have said, oh, yeah, we are going to have some of our killers amongst the so-called Syrian refugees. Because we don't really know where they are from, and that was pretty clear from testimony sometime back from FBI Director Comey, who said, sure, basically we will vet them, but we have no information to vet them with. Whoever they say they are, wherever they say they are from, especially if they say they are from Syria, we really don't have a good way to disprove or to prove.

So, yeah, we will vet them. But since we have nothing to check with—as he said, you know, we had tremendous information from Iraq. We had the government's own records, but we got nothing to vet the Syrians.

So perhaps this is an area we should believe the Islamic State leaders when they say "we are getting our terrorists in amongst the Syrian refugees." And apparently the CIA Director takes this seriously. And we hope, at some point, the President will as well.

Before people get too harsh in their judgments of the FBI or the FBI agents who had questioned the Orlando shooter, the killer, the murderer, the Islamic radical in Orlando, it is important that we keep in mind that—you know, the 9/11 Commission was composed of Republicans, Democrats, and this bipartisan group used this term, "violent extremism." They only used that three times, because they knew from their good report. They talked about the "enemy" 39 times. This administration doesn't like to talk about an enemy, so it is not appropriate for the FBI nor the National Intelligence Strategy.

And this FBI counterterrorism lexicon was developed in 2009 after this President took office because they wanted to make sure that we don't offend the people who want to kill us and destroy our way of life. So there are terms that are off limits in this administration, in the FBI, in the national intelligence community.

I haven't gotten any updates officially, but from what I understand from friends that work in these areas, there is no real update. You want a quick end to your career in the FBI or in our intelligence agencies, then all you have to use are the terms "jihad," "Muslim," "Islam." If you talk about the Muslim Brotherhood, your career is pretty well over. You don't want to talk about Hamas or Hezbollah. "Al Qaeda," that was used one time in the National Intelligence Strategy that this administration put forth.

But for heaven's sake, even though the radical Islamists are making clear that they want an international caliphate in which everyone bows their knee to Allah and to the twelfth imam, the imam that is going to come back and lead everybody, you sure don't want to say it in this administration.

And it is not appropriate to talk about sharia. Unfortunately, polls these days are showing that there is a massive number and a massive percentage of people who have already immigrated into the United States who are Muslim that say that they owe their allegiance more to sharia than to our Constitution.

I know that people constantly say we should not discriminate, and certainly we should not, you know, as a judge, as a prosecutor, as a chief justice, discriminate based on things that were inappropriate. But if somebody is committing a crime, has committed a crime, wants to destroy our way of life, bring down our government, destroy Western civilization, it is okay to discriminate against those people because what they have done or want to do is called a crime.

If they want to bring down our Constitution and have it submissive to sharia law, the appropriate term for that is treason. And it is okay to discriminate against people who want to destroy your country, destroy your government, bring down the Constitution, and it is okay to discriminate.

If someone wants to immigrate into this country—and we are getting word that some are instructed not to talk about or mention their religious beliefs and just say it is none of your business—it is important to find out, before we give American citizenship to people, whether or not they can take the oath as a citizen honestly, truthfully, with no hesitation. Because if they cannot, then we need to discriminate against them and prevent those people who want to commit treason from becoming American citizens.

□ 1445

It is called self-defense. It is called self-preservation. So, no, we don't want to ever discriminate against anybody based on race, creed, color, national origin, gender, age; but if somebody is not willing, because of their religious beliefs, to state that the Constitution is something to which they can pledge their complete allegiance, then they are not supposed to get citizenship. It is supposed to be denied.

If you want to call that discrimination, then that is the kind that is okay. But the administration is going so far out of its way to try not to offend people that want to kill us and bring down our way of life that you can't talk about who our enemy is. So for the three of us who have been through many of the materials that have been purged from our training materials because they offended radical Islamists and Muslim Brotherhood sympathizers, it is important to understand, our FBI agents are not allowed to be properly trained to recognize what a radical Islamist believes, what he or she reads, the appearances that they have to ascribe to, all these things. They are teachable because they are being taught to radical Islamists that want the international caliphate.

I know the immediate reaction to killings. I have dear friends on the other side of the aisle, and I know that they are honorable and truly believe the best thing to do is to start having restrictions on guns; but if we were simply dealing with people who should not be in this country—and if they are in this country, they should not be walking free; and if they are in this country, they should never have been allowed to get guns under the laws, if they exist, if this administration were properly training our agents and enforcing the laws—then we wouldn't have to go after the guns, and these people would be alive today.

I understand their concerns. The anger is normally with the instrument used. I was reading, again, earlier about the 100 days in Rwanda, when between 500,000 to a million—many estimates say around 800,000 Rwandans—were killed mainly with machetes and clubs. Most of these people didn't have guns, but they were intent on terrorizing the nation—at least the Tutsi people—and terrorize them they did. They killed them. They terrorized them. There was widespread rape. It was just a disaster of biblical proportions. Just horrendous.

But when someone is intent on terrorizing to that extent, they use whatever weapons are available, whether it is a machete, a club, a gun, a pressure cooker, or whatever they have available, or fertilizer, as is so often used for making bombs.

So our FBI, they are not able to use these words. The term "religious" has been used three times in the counter-terrorism lexicon, "religious." And, of course, it is important to the current administration to use the term "religious" from time to time because, as our Department of Homeland Security has already told us and as the Secretary of Homeland Security reaffirmed this week, we know that rightwing extremists are every bit as much a threat to the United States as Islamic radicals. Something I am not hearing a lot about, but I sure hear it when I get fussed at by rightwing extremists.

I know some people think that I am a rightwing extremist, but if you look back at the things the most liberal people in the country were saying in the early 1960s, boy, I am right there mainstream. We will see again in November, but apparently I am pretty mainstream with the people of east Texas.

But they have the same beliefs that our Founders did. They want freedom, and they want liberty, and they want their constitutional rights, which includes the right to keep and bear arms so that, if somebody with a machete or somebody with a club or somebody with a gun who is intent on terrorizing, it won't only be the terrorists and the criminals who have the guns. They want to keep their guns.

So what I am hearing from rightwing extremists that stay mad at me be-

cause I don't speak up enough to their way of thinking is that they are angry because we have an administration that won't identify the enemy. Clearly, most Americans understand radical Islamists are at war with America. Pointed out numerous times, but around the world, Muslim leaders have just been aghast and are asking me: What is wrong with your country? You are helping the wrong Muslims. You are helping the Muslim brothers who are at war with you. How about being a friend of those of us who are not at war with you?

And they are right. This administration has brought too many people alongside who do not like this country.

Let's look at the Orlando terrorist, the radical Islamist. He was 29 years old, and he was born in America. I have been warning about this for years, but people come here on visas, have a child, and then people here mistakenly think that that means they have to be an American citizen, where it seems pretty clear to some of us if we change the legislation to say that we stand with all the rest—I don't know of any other place that does what we do, but we stand with at least most, if not all the rest, of the world, and changing our law to say: just because you are born in America does not mean you are an American citizen.

I have even heard somebody on FOX News say: Well, there is no way around it. If you are born in America, it doesn't matter who you are or where you are from, you are an American citizen.

That is simply not true. If you go back and look at the debate over the 14th Amendment, the proponent of the 14th Amendment made it very clear that there are some groups that will not be American citizens under the 14th Amendment. We still recognize today the fact that if you are a diplomat here from a foreign country, then you are not subject to all of the laws of the country, and your children born here in America are not citizens. So, hopefully, those who think it is automatic no matter where you are from, they will be educated and know that is simply not the case.

So we also have the right to tell people: No, if you come here illegally, just because you sneak in to the United States illegally or pay a gang or a drug cartel to get you in illegally does not mean that you are going to start increasing legally the population of the United States.

But under existing laws, Omar Mateen was a 29-year-old American-born citizen. According to The Denver Post, Mateen's family was from Afghanistan, but he was born in New York City. According to CBS News, Seddique Mir Mateen, the father of Omar Mateen, has well-known anti-American views and is an ideological supporter of the Afghan Taliban. That is what I have been warning about. People who hate America, who have sympathized with those who want to

destroy America, have kids here, and we say that their kids are American citizens. We are creating time bombs within our own Nation.

The older Mateen hosts a program on California-based satellite Afghan TV station called the Durand Jirga Show, and the primary audience being ethnic Pashtun Afghans living in the United States. According to CBS: “In his Facebook videos, the alleged gunman’s father has often appeared wearing a military uniform and declaring himself the leader of a ‘transitional revolutionary government’ of Afghanistan. He claims to have his own intelligence agency and close ties to the U.S. Congress—assets he says he will use to subvert Pakistani influence and take control of Afghanistan.”

The younger Mateen was previously married in 2009 to a woman who, according to FOX News, was born in Uzbekistan, but the couple divorced in 2011. According to Omar Mateen’s ex-wife, he “was not a stable person. He beat me”—which is okay under many Muslims’ interpretation of sharia law. My wife doesn’t agree with that, and, therefore, I do not either—“he would just come home and start beating me up because the laundry wasn’t finished or something like that.”

Mateen is currently married to Noor Salman and has a 3-year-old son.

I was speaking tongue-in-cheek about my wife. Actually, my mother is deceased since 1991, but growing up with an older sister, it was made clear you don’t touch a girl. No matter if she hits you, you don’t hit her back. You come tell us. That is the way I have lived.

But, you know, many around the world who believe sharia law is much superior to the U.S. Constitution think it is just fine to beat a woman. That is not legal in America, for those in doubt. Thank God.

In addition to his views on women and African Americans, Mateen has also had a history of anger toward members of the LGBTQ community. According to Mateen’s father, his son was very angry about a recent incident involving two men kissing in public. Per Mateen’s father, as reported by The Washington Post: “We were in downtown Miami, Bayside, people were playing music. And he saw two men kissing each other in front of his wife and kid and he got very angry,” the father told NBC News. “They were kissing each other and touching each other and he said, ‘Look at that. In front of my son they are doing that.’”

I do recognize, apparently, according to reports, Mateen had visited the gay bar before. Apparently he had also visited a Disney park, people believe in casing the place for potential attack. Whatever his reasons for going to the gay bar before, whether he had those tendencies and because of his Muslim radical Islamic teaching, he hated himself for it, whatever the reason, we know that what he is taught is that no matter how bad the sins are that he has committed, if he can go out of this

life killed while he is killing Christians, Jews, non-Muslims, Muslims who have converted to something else, if he can go out, be killed while he is killing people like that, it doesn’t matter what sins he has committed in his life, under his radical Islamic beliefs, he goes to paradise. I believe with all my heart nobody in the universe was more shocked than Mateen after he went to the other side.

It appears that Mateen first started walking down the path toward radicalization sometime after the end of his first marriage. Friends of the shooter describe how he became steadily more religious after his divorce and even went on a religious pilgrimage to Saudi Arabia.

□ 1500

As reported by multiple news outlets, Mateen has twice been investigated by the FBI. The first investigation involved comments he made which suggested he had an affinity for Islamic extremist groups. The second investigation involved connections to a Florida man who traveled to Syria and became a suicide bomber for.

Per the Washington Post, “Neither probe turned up evidence of wrongdoing. Mateen,” according to them, “had a blemish-free record.”

That is ridiculous.

As a result of these two FBI investigations, Mateen was at one time placed on a terrorist watch list maintained by the FBI. According to the LA Times, Mateen was removed from the list after the FBI’s two investigations were concluded.

But, again, we have to remember, the FBI is not allowed to talk to people about jihad: What are your beliefs about Islamic jihad? Do you think it is a simple, peaceable conversion within your own heart and mind? Or do you believe jihad means it is okay to go out and kill people who disagree with radical Islam or your view of Islam?

If you can’t talk about someone’s beliefs in Islam, you can’t get to whether or not they have been radicalized.

So we have some incredibly talented and intelligent FBI and intelligence agents that are completely ignorant of what they need to know because this administration has made clear to them you don’t go there.

If you have ever learned about jihad, Muslim, Islam, takfir, Muslim Brotherhood, Hamas, Hezbollah, al Qaeda, caliphate, if you have ever been taught about those things and what to recognize in a radical Islamist, then you better keep your mouth shut about them or you will lose your career, as one of the original Homeland Security employees, dedicated patriot Philip Haney, learned when he was pointing out terrorists.

So it makes it tough when you are in the FBI, in our intelligence, and you know the President will not call somebody a radical Islamist. And I know our President was belittling those of us who said it is important to recognize

our enemy. The chairman of the Homeland Security Committee had said earlier today those very words.

Those are very important words. He said we have to define our enemy to defeat it. He said if this President won’t define it, this body will. Our bill that we passed today didn’t define it at all. It didn’t mention the words “radical Islam,” “jihad,” “Muslim Brotherhood,” “Hamas,” “Hezbollah,” “al Qaeda,” “international caliphate,” or those who were more devoted to sharia law than to our Constitution. So this is a little bit of a problem.

This article from the Daily Mail has this as a summary: “Seddique Mateen is the father of mass shooter Omar Mateen, 29. Mateen Senior is an Afghan who hosts the Durand Jirga Show. This show is aired on YouTube channel”—I am not even going to say.

“He visited Congress, the State Department and met with political leaders during a trip to Washington, DC, in April. He also attended a hearing on Afghanistan security while in the capital. Pictures from 2015 show him meeting” with some folks up here. “Police seen searching him home, located close to where his son lived.”

Obviously, his father’s strong support or expressed support of the Taliban should have caused concerns. And I know the word “discrimination” has been overused, to the point that people who saw in Mateen the potential radical Islamist mass shooter were cowed by political correctness, as was the company he worked for when they refused to deal with the complaints about his radical Islamic problems. Political correctness killed 49 people.

Should we ban political correctness because it closed the eyes of the FBI agents to seeing they had a radical Islamist they were talking to during their two investigations? Should we indict political correctness or ban it from America because the FBI, when they investigated and talked to the older Tsarnaev brother before he killed and maimed in the Boston bombing—should we ban political correctness because the FBI didn’t know what to ask?

The FBI Director himself—at that time, Mueller. I had understood they had not gone to the mosque where Tsarnaev was attending after they got word he had been radicalized.

I said: You didn’t even go to the mosque where they attended?

He said: We did go to the mosque—and I didn’t hear it until it was replayed later—in our outreach program. That is right.

In a previous hearing to that, he had explained: Look, the Muslim community is like every other religious community in America. There is no difference whatsoever. We have a wonderful outreach program with the Muslim community. It is going great. But it is just like every other community.

He said it over and over.

When it was my time to question, I said: Since it is just like every other community in America, Director

Mueller, how is the outreach program of the FBI going with the Buddhists and the Jewish community and the Baptist community and the Hindu community? How are your outreach programs to those religious communities?

He had to back up and try to figure out something to say. And basically, it was: We have a combined outreach to all those other groups. We don't have a specific outreach to all of those others—the Baptists, Christians, or Jews.

They don't have an outreach program like that because, to the FBI way of thinking, we have outreach to all religious groups in America as a whole, and because of our concern about American safety, apparently—why else would they have it?—we have a specific outreach to the Muslim community.

Well, isn't that strange? If you only have an FBI and a government outreach program to one religious group in America, then it is a little bit hard to honestly say that there is no difference whatsoever in these religious communities, because if that had been truthful statements made to our committee here on the Hill, there would not be a Muslim outreach program.

I was, I have to say, very gratified that, after having evidence in the FBI's possession for about at least 18 years, some of which was used in the Holy Land Foundation trial in which a verdict was obtained in November 2008, they had evidence to show that the Council on American-Islamic Relations was a coconspirator in supporting terrorism.

So finally, in 2009, after years of their outreach program with CAIR as a community partner, they finally had to send a letter to the Council on American-Islamic Relations, or CAIR, and say: Well, because of some of the stuff that came out at the Holy Land Foundation trial, we are going to need to suspend our partnership.

How many partnerships does the FBI have with the Jewish community or with the Hindu community or with the very peace-loving Sikh community? How many? We can't find any. And I look forward to hearing from the administration if they have such wonderful outreach programs that they have started since the Director of the FBI testified before us.

We continue to blind ourselves, as our intelligence officer told me, to our ability to see our enemy, and people in America are going to continue to die.

Though I care deeply about some of our Democratic friends—they are wonderful people—they think the solution is stopping Americans from getting certain guns.

Can't you just agree, I had a reporter say yesterday, to ban assault weapons? I have been engaged in the legal profession long enough in different capacities to know that, once you ban an assault weapon, you can ban every gun that exists.

It reminded me of when I was thinking about going to law school, although

my late mother and a doctor in Mount Pleasant kept telling me: LOUIE, you are smart. You can really help people. You would be a great doctor. Don't throw your life away and go to law school. You could really help people. You would be a great doctor.

And my mother hoped I would. And if not that, at least I would be a college professor.

My dad used to send me clippings—Dad is still alive and 90 years old this year—when I was expressing interest in going to law school. There was never a shortage of newspaper clippings about how rotten lawyers were. Headlines would be things like: There Are Too Many Lawyers in America; Lawyers Are Destroying America; quoting Shakespeare, First, We Kill All the Lawyers—all these types of articles. Normally, he would put a little note on it: Son, are you really sure about this?

Well, I love and respect my father. And I finally wrote a letter back: I have done a lot of soul-searching, Dad, and I have come to the realization that the law is a tool, like a hammer. The law can be used constructively to build up or it can be used very destructively to destroy. It is all about the hand holding the hammer.

A so-called assault weapon in the hands of an American military member, in the hands of law enforcement, or in the hands of someone whose home is being invaded by multiple burglars with guns is a good thing to have.

If the principal at Sandy Hook had been running, as she so heroically did, at the gunman with any kind of gun in her hand—any kind of assault weapon, as some want to call some guns—there would have been people saved.

So, once you say we are banning assault weapons, then you are on the road to banning all weapons. Every gun, every machete that has killed hundreds of thousands of Rwandans in 1994, I believe it was, in the wrong hands, is an assault weapon.

Why can't we focus on the hands that are holding the weapons? Why can't we train our FBI and our intelligence community to recognize hands that are going to use a machete, a gun?

I know people report it was an AR-15 that the Orlando shooter used. It was not. It is an awfully small caliber, but whatever.

Let's train them to figure out which Americans are intent on committing treason, not by speculation, but by the things they have already said and done. And if we had not blinded them, San Bernardino could have been stopped, the Orlando shooting could have been stopped, the Boston Marathon bombing could have been stopped.

I know Janet Napolitano took credit for the system working when the underwear bomber was stopped, but that was some heroic Americans. One intelligence person told me that, actually, the reason the bomb didn't go off is because his rear end had sweated too much and defused the fuse and it didn't go off.

□ 1515

Well, we can't always count on a terrorist's rear end sweating too much to save hundreds of American lives. We have to have an intelligence community and a law enforcement community that can recognize when enemies are within our gate, as this President continues to bring them.

It should disturb a lot of Americans, as this article from Alan Neuhouser points out, that the "Security Firm That Employed the Orlando Gunman Guards U.S. Nuclear Sites."

The article points out: "The security firm that employed the Orlando gunman behind the worst mass-shooting in U.S. history says it's guarded '90 percent of the U.S. nuclear facilities'—raising concern that would-be terrorists could easily gain inside access to the most sensitive sites on American soil and release untold devastation."

And it goes on to make some good points, but I don't think we would worry about someone going into one of these nuclear facilities, getting nuclear material to make a nuclear weapon. That would probably not happen, but it is quite conceivable they could get nuclear material and create a dirty bomb, a bomb with nuclear material in it and around it so that it is dispersed, causing more death.

This article from Stephen Dinan, from The Washington Times says: "American-born children of immigrants proving fruitful recruiting ground for jihad in U.S."

Thank God, most of the children of immigrants that have come into the United States have helped and have made this country what was at one time the freest nation in the history of the world. We are not listed as the freest nation anymore, not near the top.

This article from The Daily Caller says: "Co-worker: Orlando Terrorist's Employer Ignored Unhinged Comments for Fear of Being Politically Incorrect."

"Daniel Gilroy used to work at G4S Security and complained to the company numerous times about Mateen's derogatory comments regarding homosexuals and people of other races. He also talked about massacring people."

"Gilroy said, G4S Security did absolutely nothing in response to the complaints for fear of being politically incorrect, as 29-year-old Mateen was an open Muslim, Florida Today reports."

Political correctness has now gotten so far afield, it is killing people. Let's talk about banning political correctness that keeps our FBI and intelligence from being able to talk about radical Islam.

According to Peter Hasson from The Daily Caller: "DHS Secretary: Right-Wingers Pose Same Threat As Islamic Extremists."

I mentioned earlier, people that—right-wing extremists that are mad at me are mad because we are not doing enough to stop radical Islamists from destroying our country, terrorizing our

country, terrorizing our freedoms, telling us we can't say what we believe because we have lost our freedom of speech. We can't practice our Christian beliefs as the Bible teaches, because it may offend someone.

For heaven's sake, let's compare. These radical Islamists believe that the way to paradise and to complete forgiveness of Islamic sins, no matter how bad, is to be killing a bunch of non-Muslims. When your life is taken, you go straight to paradise.

On the other hand, I know the President loves to castigate Christians and say, hey, you know, Christians had the Crusades. Anybody that was out there saying, I kill you in the name of Christ, is not killing people legitimately in the name of Christ, because Jesus said, "Greater love hath no one than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends." And, of course, he was talking about men and women.

There is a pretty clear, distinct difference between what radical Islamists believe as well as what Christians who truly believe the teachings of Christ, what they believe.

Yet, Jeh Johnson, the Homeland Security has released before: You have to watch those Evangelical Christians because they believe what Jesus said, you know, that you want to share the Gospel with people so that they learn love and not hate.

So these real Evangelical Christians, like my friend, TRENT FRANKS from Arizona, wow, he is a hulking threat because he believes that the two greatest commandments in the world are love God and love each other, and on those two laws hang all the law and the prophets.

The Daily Caller also has an article about—and this is a member who is above the countering violent extremism advisory group. He is now elevated to the advisory council where Muslim Brother sympathizer, Elibiary, from Plano, Texas—he was until they finally had to let him go after he tweeted about the caliphate, the international caliphate being inevitable. But this is who has replaced him. I am not sure how to pronounce it. It looks like Marayati, something like that. He "is the president of the Muslim Public Affairs Council. He currently serves on the Homeland Security Advisory Committee's Foreign Fighter Task Force as well as HSAC Subcommittee on Faith Based Security and Communications . . . In 2001, Al-Marayati suggested that Israel—not Islamic extremists—was ultimately behind the September 11 terrorist attacks . . . In 2013, Judicial Watch noted that Al-Marayati told attendees at a 2005 conference for the Islamic Society of North America"—another named co-conspirator in the Holy Land Foundation supporting terrorism trial—"that 'Counter-terrorism and counter-violence should be defined by us'"—talking about the Muslims that think Israel was behind 9/11.

He said: "We should define how an effective counter-terrorism policy

should be pursued in this country," America. "So, number one, we reject any effort, notion, suggestion that Muslims should start spying on one another."

Well, that is exactly what FBI Director Mueller said they were going to do. They had this wonderful outreach program so that Muslims will come and report other Muslims in advance, just like Mateen's wife did; since she knew that he was about to go kill a whole bunch of Americans, she came forward and reported—oh, wait. No, she didn't, did she? I guess the outreach program didn't work so well there.

Well, maybe before the Boston bombing, maybe the outreach program worked there. Oh, that is right, they went to the mosque not about Tsarnaev being radicalized, as they had already been advised by the Russians, but just to have a meal and visit and talk. And, gee, the people at the mosque forgot to say: By the way, Tsarnaev is starting to demonstrate what we have seen every time somebody has been radicalized. And, oh, by the way, Director Mueller, you obviously are not aware—as he was not when I asked him—but our mosque was started by Al Amoudi, who your FBI helped put in prison after they finally were tipped off by—from what I understand—British intelligence, that Al Amoudi, who helped pick Muslims to serve in the Clinton administration, in the military, and also to be chaplains in the prison where, by the way, we are now getting reports and have for some time, that inmates are being radicalized.

Gee, imagine that. Al Amoudi doing 23 years for supporting terrorism, helped pick imams to serve in our prisons and in our government agencies, and in the military, and, gee, they are being radicalized. What a shock.

Well, the article goes on: "Investor's Business Daily took an editorial stand against the invite."

When the Obama administration invited Al-Marayati to a 3-day summit on fighting extremism in 2015, initially, the White House tried to conceal that from reporters, but it finally was made clear.

So Investor's Business Daily said: "Al-Marayati has a long record of defending terrorists and justifying violence against non-Muslims—an easy one for the White House to vet for extremism."

"According to White House visitor records, Al-Marayati has visited the White House 11 times since 2009 . . . Kyle Shideler, the director of the Center for Security Policy's Threat Information Office, told The Daily Caller that 'Al-Maryati's association with the HSAC underlines what an unfortunate farce the entire, Combating Violent Extremism, program is. Al-Maryati's only notable counter-terrorism contribution is having suggested Israel be included as a suspect on 9/11.

"His very organization," the Muslim Public Affairs Council, or MPAC, "has

historically cosponsored events in support of the very kinds of extremists he's been appointed to help oppose, which is no surprise, given that the organization's roots lay with men who literally studied at the foot of Muslim Brotherhood leader, Hassan Al-Banna' . . . 'As long as the Obama administration is more concerned with keeping groups like Al-Marayati's happy with them instead of investigating actual terrorism, we will never have a sane counter-terror policy.'

"The Daily Caller previously reported on Monday that a current sitting member on the HSAC Subcommittee on Countering Violent Extremism, Laila Alawa, is a 25-year-old immigrant of Syrian heritage who said the 9/11 attacks 'changed the world for good' and has consistently disparaged America, free speech, and white people on social media."

And if you look at the things that that other adviser to Jeh Johnson tweeted, here is a tweet that Ms. Alawa sent out: "I can't deal with people saying America is the best nation in the world. Be critical. Be conscious. Don't be idiots."

Yeah, people like my friend, and like the Speaker, you know, we think America is the best place in the world. But according to Jeh Johnson's adviser, we are idiots.

She tweeted: "The US has never been a utopia unless you were a straight White male that owned land. Straight up period go home shut up."

Wow. She also said: "You can't say something intolerant and not expect consequences. Not on my watch."

She said all kinds of hateful things about America, about Whites, about those who love this country.

Great article in The Daily Caller.

Did the FBI training purge cause agency to drop the ball on Orlando shooter?

Clearly, it did.

Well, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, every Republican I have heard speak on this issue, including those from Homeland Security, have acknowledged that the President and our intelligence need to start talking about jihad, Muslim, Islam, radical Muslim, radical Islam, Muslim Brotherhood. And they are not allowed to talk about it without risking their career, and that is why I voted "no" on the bill today.

□ 1530

These things have basically passed before. But all they talk about is countering violent extremism, countering violent extremism; five "countering violent extremism" on page 3. But it basically tells the Secretary of Homeland Security to keep countering violent extremism. It never mentions the term "radical Islam."

After the Orlando shooting, we have an obligation, when the administration won't call it what it is, to start calling what it is. I think the bill really didn't do what we needed done.

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

SURVIVAL OF PREMATURE BABIES AS YOUNG AS 20 WEEKS POSTFERTILIZATION

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

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I am fortunate this evening to have some precious friends in the gallery, and I am grateful that they are here. Their commitment to protecting the innocent unborn and their commitment just to America in general gives me great encouragement. My friends are Josh Decker and Rudolph Margraff. I am grateful that they are here.

Mr. Speaker, sometimes in the area in which we live, we can become very dispirited; but once in a while, a medical marvel comes along and revives us all. Recently, the Pediatrics Journal of the American Medical Association reported on the progress being made in saving the earliest babies born prematurely.

In a study conducted over 5 years in Cologne, Germany, the authors reviewed 106 cases of babies born from just under 22 weeks down to 20 weeks after fertilization. The authors found that with active prenatal and postnatal care, two-thirds of these extremely premature babies survived until they were discharged from the hospital.

Now, Mr. Speaker, these are much higher percentages than other recent studies have shown, and they demonstrate what active care, at what the authors call "the border of viability," can accomplish.

Mr. Speaker, I would just ask the Members of this body to consider and to absorb this encouraging and very enlightening news.

This issue is real, Mr. Speaker, and it was torn from the abstract in my home State of Arizona, recently, when a 21-week-old baby—that is, 21 weeks after fertilization—was born alive after surviving an abortion. This happened in a Phoenix abortion clinic. Unfortunately, the baby was not transferred to the hospital in time, and the baby died.

Mr. Speaker, if the American people knew how often tragedies like this occur, they would be so desperately outraged. I would call upon the Democrats in the United States Senate to allow a vote on the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act. That bill passed this body overwhelmingly months ago, and it protected these, the tiniest of our little brothers and sisters.

Mr. Speaker, protecting born-alive children is supported by 80 to 90 percent of the American people, and if the United States Senate has become so dysfunctional that they can't even pass a bill to give effective Federal protection to innocent, born-alive children, then maybe it is time to board up the doors and windows of this place, go home, and hope the barbarians of this world will show more courage and mercy than we do. It is no wonder the

American people are so fed up with the dysfunctional gridlock in the United States Senate.

Mr. Speaker, we are talking about protecting our born-alive little fellow human beings. The survival of these little babies is not a measure of their intrinsic and priceless value. It is a measure of our skill and will to help them live. I just hope that we can remind ourselves of our profound responsibility before God and to our oath of office to protect these, the tiniest of our little brothers and sisters.

Mr. Speaker, I truly hope the United States Senate will pass the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act. It deserves a vote. Democrats should allow it to come to the floor, and the Senate leadership should have the courage to put it on the floor for a fair up-or-down vote. If it gets a vote, it will pass.

We have not lost our humanity completely, but have we lost the courage to make sure that something like that gets a vote? There are a lot of little voices that we can't hear that I think would ask that question if they could.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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. 812. An act to provide for Indian trust asset management reform, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2137. An act to ensure Federal law enforcement officers remain able to ensure their own safety, and the safety of their families, during a covered furlough.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2276. An act to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide enhanced safety in pipeline transportation, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 20, 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:

5718. A letter from the Chair, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's report entitled "Report to the Congress on the Profitability of Credit

Card Operations of Depository Institutions", pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1637 note; Public Law 100-583, Sec. 8; (102 Stat. 2969); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5719. A letter from the Honors Attorney, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting the Bureau's interim final rule — Civil Penalty Inflation Adjustments [Docket No.: CFPB-2016-0028] (RIN: 3170-AA62) received June 15, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5720. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's report entitled "FY 2014 Outcome Evaluations of Administration for Native Americans Projects Report to Congress", pursuant to Sec. 811(e) of the Native American Programs Act of 1974; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

5721. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's interim final rule — Adjustment of Civil Penalties (RIN: 1212-AB33) received June 15, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

5722. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report entitled "Medicaid Incentives for Prevention of Chronic Diseases (MIPCD) Evaluation: Second Report to Congress", pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1396a note; Public Law 111-148, Sec. 4108(d)(4); (124 Stat. 563); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5723. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report entitled "Report to Congress on the Food Processing Sector Study", pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 350g(1)(5)(C); Public Law 111-353, Sec. 103(a); (124 Stat. 3894); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5724. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-146, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c)(2)(C); Public Law 90-629, Sec. 36(c) (as added by Public Law 94-329, Sec. 211(a)); (82 Stat. 1326); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5725. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-144, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(d)(1); Public Law 90-629, Sec. 36(d) (as added by Public Law 94-329, Sec. 211(a)); (90 Stat. 740); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5726. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 16-002, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(d)(1); Public Law 90-629, Sec. 36(d) (as added by Public Law 94-329, Sec. 211(a)); (90 Stat. 740); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5727. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. ACT 21-412, "Homeless Shelter Replacement Act of 2016", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5728. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. ACT 21-414, "Fiscal year 2017 Local Budget Act of 2016", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5729. A letter from the Regulatory Liaison, Office of Natural Resources Revenue, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's interim final rule — Civil Monetary Penalties Inflation Adjustment [Docket