

House in which the Speaker said when he took the gavel here, the people's will will be reflected because they would bring things to the floor. They accused us of not doing that. That was their right to do so, but now I suggest they are following a policy that they have severely criticized and said was wrong. So if they were sincere then, we would simply ask the majority leader to bring the bill to the floor and see if he is right or if I am right; to see whether we have the votes or we don't. The American people deserve that vote because they are overwhelmingly for that vote, and then they can take their own view from there as to who they agree with and who they don't agree with.

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

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MARCH 3, 2014

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARR). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

CONGRATULATING DR. ABNER WOMACK

(Mrs. HARTZLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute).

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dr. Abner Womack, professor emeritus at the University of Missouri, for receiving the Distinguished Service Award. This is the highest award awarded by the American Farm Bureau.

As a farm boy with a knack for numbers, he has used his expertise to build the internationally renowned Food and Agriculture Policy Research Institute that provides high-quality analysis for Congress and the USDA. This system of statistical models allows congressional Members and their staff to analyze the effects and tradeoffs of competing policies. Dr. Womack's academic integrity is evidenced in the strong academic, nonpartisan reputation that FAPRI enjoys.

However, Dr. Womack's reach far exceeds that of Capitol Hill. I want to commend him for his tireless effort to reach out to farmers across Missouri and around the world. His passion for agriculture and vast knowledge of statistical models, paired with his ability to effectively communicate complex ideas in a commonsense manner, have made him a priceless asset to all he encounters.

Again, I want to thank Dr. Womack for his lifelong efforts in supporting American agriculture, and recognize him for this achievement.

RAISING THE MINIMUM WAGE

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my fellow colleagues to allow an up-or-down vote on H.R. 1010, which would give at least 25 million Americans a pay raise. For many Americans, most of whom are women, who work 40 hours a week at \$7.25 an hour, they gross a mere \$290 a week. That comes out to \$15,000 per year, just barely above the Federal poverty guidelines.

In America, no one should have to work full time and raise their family in poverty. In Georgia alone, raising the minimum wage would give more than 500,000 hardworking people a raise. Most Americans support raising the minimum wage, but my Republican colleagues refuse to give it a vote. Obviously, many of them have never experienced life working at \$7.25 an hour.

The American people are calling for an economy that works for everyone—where a hard day's work earns a decent day's pay, and everyone has an opportunity to build a brighter future.

SUPPORT LOCAL ACT

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in the House as an original cosponsor of H.R. 4100, the Local Organization Cooperative Agreement and Facility Maintenance Act, or the LOCAL Act.

For the past several years, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has partnered with local nonprofit organizations to cooperatively manage and maintain recreational facilities at lakes and reservoirs on these Federal lands.

In my district, the Friends of Raystown Lake Group in Huntingdon County have been able to collect and retain user fees generated from the public's use of the lake, which they then reinvest to perform operations and maintenance on that site. Recently, an administrative ruling forced the Army Corps to terminate these agreements at facilities across the country. The Friends of Raystown should be commended for their volunteerism, not penalized by Washington's bureaucracy. The LOCAL Act will allow these and other agreements to remain in force.

I would encourage my colleagues to support the LOCAL Act to ensure the Army Corps can continue these cooperative agreements that are good for the community and good for taxpayers.

CONSTITUTIONALITY OF EXECUTIVE ACTIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-

uary 3, 2013, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, these are interesting times in America. For most of us who went to law school, we were taught that for an adversarial system of justice of law to work, there has to be active participation on both sides of an issue, of a person charged with a crime, on defense, or litigation over a law itself. So Chairman GOODLATTE from just across the river in Virginia called a hearing in the Judiciary Committee this week. We had another hearing about the constitutionality, or lack thereof, of actions by this administration, and it is very alarming.

□ 1200

Professor Jonathan Turley, with whom I have disagreed on many policy issues, has a wonderful grasp of the Constitution; and he recognizes the dangers when an administration decides to pick and choose which laws will be enforced and goes further and issues executive orders, not like prior administrations that simply explain on most occasions or illuminate some law as to how they think it is to be interpreted, but to actually make law and executive orders. That is just unconscionable for somebody that took an oath to defend the Constitution.

I can't recall times that I have agreed with The LA Times before, but they had an editorial that indicates even The LA Times understands the danger of what is going on right now in this country with this administration.

We have an Attorney General who has been requested to produce documents lawfully, informally, refused to do so, been subpoenaed to produce information documents, has refused to do so unlawfully, to the point that the committee had a hearing and ultimately found the Attorney General of the United States in contempt of Congress, which came to this floor and, in a very unusual action found, the Attorney General, the highest law enforcement officer in this country, in contempt of Congress, basically in contempt of the Constitution.

This has far wider implications than most in America seem to grasp because, when the highest law enforcement officer in America refuses to comply with the law, holds himself out as being above any law, creates laws that he wants to defend—at least the administration creating laws that they want to defend or follow—and actually saying in this room—I just had the President of the United States say in this room: I am going to go around the Congress—if you don't do what I want, I am going to go around the Congress.

The ramifications for that are so staggering to anyone who has contemplated the founding of this country that it is beyond words. The Founders set up these checks and balances believing that, surely, there would be people in the judiciary—although they

saw that as the least powerful branch, though it has now become the most powerful—they saw Congress as always being willing to defend its own laws, even to the point of defunding anything in the administration that did not protect and defend the law.

They saw a President as standing up and refusing to follow things that were not the law. They felt like each branch would judiciously protect their own powers under the Constitution, and that balance would allow this Nation to go forward as the freest Nation in the history of the world.

But today, we are living in a time where all of that is in jeopardy, when one branch can act to the total disregard of another branch or other branches. We have seen that with executive orders that just completely change the law as written and completely intentionally disregards the law of the land. It is staggering.

The LA Times had an editorial on February 27 that talked about the Attorney General's posture on just picking and choosing which laws he would provide a defense for.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here as someone—as a prosecutor, as a lawyer, as a judge, as a chief justice—who at times absolutely did not like laws—particular laws—but knew if this Nation were to remain for years to come, we had to either change the law legally; or as lawyers, as officers of the court, as judges, as chief justices, we had to follow the law.

Back in the '80s, I was ordered by a State district judge to file an appeal—to represent a man on appeal after having been convicted of capital murder. I was then, as now, a very conservative person.

I went to the judge after I got the call that I was going to be appointed and begged the judge not to appoint me, that I was doing civil trial work, I wasn't doing criminal work, please don't appoint me to appeal a criminal conviction because I will have to go back to school to do a proper job of representing a man on appeal of the death penalty.

I knew if he appointed me—because I took an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States, I would spend incredible hours to make sure I properly represented the man on appeal, even though I didn't know any more about the facts of the case than I had read in the papers. From the papers, I got the impression that he had probably gotten what he deserved.

But the judge appointed me to appeal a capital murder conviction in which the defendant was sentenced to death. I didn't want the case, didn't ask for it, begged not to have it.

But I knew that if our system was to work, I had to do everything ethically and legally I could to present my client's side of the case. As I got into it and I read the entire long, long transcript—every word of it—I realized the man had not gotten a fair trial, and unknown to the district attorney, an as-

sistant district attorney had acted inappropriately, and it caused great harm and jeopardy to the case for the defense.

I did the very best I could for my client legally and ethically, and the case was reversed at the highest criminal court in Texas.

Even when, as attorneys, we would disagree with the law—and as we have heard from this Attorney General and people in this Justice Department over and over—even when someone is absolutely convicted, clearly is a criminal, they deserve a proper defense.

So how this administration and this Attorney General and this Justice Department can justify picking and choosing which laws they will defend and which laws they will let fall without a defense is unimaginable. For people who have learned anything about our Constitution, we have to zealously represent the clients, the laws that are put before us to represent.

This administration has now repeatedly chosen not to defend some laws when the highest law enforcement in the land, we know, actually was willing to help convicted absolutely-known criminals to get pardoned, to get lighter sentences.

We bring people in who have fought—or at least one individual who fought to get a convicted murderer of a police officer—who the evidence indicated stood over him after he shot him and shot him repeatedly—a police officer—and yet, the Attorney General can justify bringing someone in; the President justified bringing someone in by saying: Oh, no, but everybody is entitled to a defense, that is how our system works.

Then when he has a constitutional obligation to produce documents to Congress and just says: I am going to ignore that requirement of the law, I don't care, and not only am I going to ignore that requirement of the law, even after the extraordinary event of having the United States House of Representatives declare the highest ranking law enforcement officer in the country to be in contempt of Congress—which is really in contempt of the Constitution—still has the nerve to come in here during the State of the Union, which is really thumbing the nose at the Constitution—at Congress—that: I will ignore the law, I won't follow the laws I don't like, I won't defend the laws I don't like; and then this week actually go out and tell State law enforcement officers—highest ranking State law enforcement officers—that, in essence, if they don't like a law, then just don't defend it.

So this editorial, just in part, from the LA Times, points out that:

The six State attorneys general who have declined to defend their States' bans on same-sex marriage in court got some encouragement this week from U.S. Attorney General Eric H. Holder, Jr. In a speech to the National Association of Attorneys General, Holder said that it was sometimes appropriate for attorneys general to abandon their usual obligation to defend the constitutionality of State laws.

This page supports same-sex marriage unreservedly. But even so, we worry that Holder's comments will embolden additional State attorneys general—Republicans and Democrats, liberals and conservatives—to pick and choose which of their States' laws they will defend in court.

It also says further down:

Yet when attorneys general are elected, as in 43 States, the temptation will be to transmute a popular political stand into a constitutional objection.

Even if Holder is right that attorneys general should refuse to defend State laws in "exceedingly rare" circumstances, those laws ought to be defended by someone.

Further down they point out that:

They probably would react differently, however, if a future Attorney General refused to defend the constitutionality of statutes that treat attacks on gays and lesbians as hate crimes.

I would imagine this Attorney General would find that unconscionable; but once we began to ignore the law and become a Nation of men—and that is generic, including men and women, whoever is in authority—instead of a Nation of laws, then we become like the nations that so many people try to flee to come to America because there is graft, there is corruption, because the rule of law is not followed.

It is whatever the dictator, the drug group, whatever the people in power think should be the law will be the law, and it becomes an unbearable place to live.

There is a reason that fences end up being built around a country not to keep people in, as in the Soviet Union days, but because people want to come flooding in, which would overwhelm our country, overwhelm our ability to provide government services, and end the ability to be a Nation where people want to come.

□ 1215

There is a reason. It is because we have been a Nation of laws that has applied the law fairly across the board.

Clearly, because the government is composed of human beings, there will be mistakes and there will be abuses, but in abuses, even Presidents have been held to account. That keeps us being a Nation of laws. Yet, when the highest-ranking law enforcement officer in the country refuses to provide information to Congress that he lawfully is required to produce, this country is in grave jeopardy. I am pleased that even the LA Times has gotten a glimpse of the potential problems here.

In a couple of different hearings, I have asked the highest-ranking law enforcement officer in our country for the production of documents provided to the defendants, to the defendants who were convicted of supporting terrorism, making them terrorists. I have asked for the copies of the documents that were provided in discovery to convicted terrorists. I have been told there could be classification problems, and as I have pointed out, if you gave them to the terrorists, you can give them to Members of Congress.

After yet another request last June, in writing—months and months later—I finally get a response that, in essence, says, Here is a Web site where you can go look at some of these documents. We have got 500 documents that were introduced at trial, and so that should take care of it.

No, it doesn't.

The Justice Department gave terrorists thousands and thousands of pages of documents, and even in the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals' opinion, the Fifth Circuit, they point out that there were 9,600 or so transcripts of recorded conversations. Those were given to the people convicted of terrorism, and yet this Justice Department refuses to allow Members of Congress to see those.

The Founders had the idea that there would be oversight and that Congress would supervise what happened in the executive branch. That provided that balance of power to keep us from moving in the direction of a monarchy or of a totalitarian government. Yet, when this body finally gets around to some oversight, it is dismissed. What do we do? We vote to hold the Attorney General in contempt and then allow him to remain in contempt without consequences.

Perhaps the proper remedy, under the thinking of the Founders, is, if an Attorney General refuses to enforce the laws that Congress passes and other Presidents sign into law, then you defund the particular individuals in the Department of Justice until such time as they start doing their jobs. You don't defund the people who are out enforcing the law, protecting the country, but you defund those people who are thumbing their noses at the Constitution and at proper, legal, constitutional oversight. We haven't done that.

So the American public, the laws, and the Constitution remain at risk because people who have defended terrorists and who have worked to get even terrorists lighter sentences and pardons and things like that don't think laws duly passed by Congress, signed into law by the President and upheld by the Supreme Court are worth defending. Then don't stop there. Not only actually start telling the highest law enforcement officers in the country that they should start ignoring laws in rare cases but to ignore the laws when you don't think they are appropriate.

We also know we have a Justice Department that, in their efforts to avoid making radical Islamist terrorists think that we might not like them, started outreach programs under the prior administration. I asked the prior FBI Director: Since you say that this Muslim community is like every other community in the Nation, how are the other outreach programs going with the Baptists? The Catholics? The Jews? The Buddhists? There is no other outreach program to any other religious group, so that would seem to indicate there is something special here.

There are violent people in every religion, but as Thomas Jefferson was so shocked to find out, there is one religion that has a small component of it that believes that a sure way to paradise is to kill innocent men, women, and children because they don't believe religiously like those radicals do. That is the reason Thomas Jefferson got his own copy of the Koran that the Library of Congress still has. He wanted to see for himself. He was so well read. He couldn't believe there was a religion that had a holy book for a basis that would allow anyone to interpret it in such a way as to kill innocent men, women, and children.

There have been, to be sure, purported Christians over the ages who thought it was their duty to go about brutalizing people who were not Christians, but anyone who studies the teachings of Christ about how we are to individually act knows those would not have been Christians doing the kind of violence that they did. It is not supported by the Bible. What is supported in the Bible is that if you do evil, be afraid, because God does not give the government the sword in vain. Individually, we are not supposed to judge and be vigilantes, but there is in an orderly society a need to have a government that will punish evil and encourage good conduct.

This little experiment in a democracy, in a republic and representative form of government, is so fragile. It bothers me when I read and hear those words from Ronald Reagan that freedom is never more than one generation from being gone and, even more troubling, that a generation that loses liberty does not get it back in that same generation. I have hoped that I would find a time and place where Reagan was wrong about that, but I have not yet.

So, when we see liberties being lost, privacy rights being violated right and left by our Federal Government, all kinds of snooping on American citizens without probable cause, not only by the NSA—and certainly they have the highest cause for which they are working, which is for our protection, but yet, when our privacy is completely eroded, is our safety worth losing all of our privacy completely?

We lost a dramatic amount of our privacy when, without a single vote from the Republican side of the aisle, the Democrats in the House and Senate passed what they called the Affordable Care Act, which has become so unaffordable, because the Federal Government will get everyone's medical records.

I was a bit staggered and maybe too naive. After I had heard people speak so emotionally from the heart about the protection of privacy and what happens in the bedroom, I was a little staggered over these years to see people on the Democratic side of the aisle—my friends over here—who were so thrilled to be giving every bit of private information about their most pri-

ate body parts, about their most private activities, to the government in whole and bulk, and even said, That is not violation enough; let's do a contract with General Electric, and let them keep these records for us.

It is not like the government and private industry can't be hacked. Talk about loss of privacy. I don't really have anything to hide in any of my medical records, but it is nobody else's business. Yet, wholeheartedly, people rushed and applauded the giving of all of that most private information to the Federal Government.

This week, I have been so proud of my friend JEB HENSARLING, as chairman of Financial Services, who has been trying to rein in this Consumer Financial Protection Bureau—wow, what a misnomer—that is gathering information about our credit cards, our debit card activity, our loans when these were supposed to be private between us and our lenders as long as there was proper oversight to make sure they were not violating the Constitution. Yet the Federal Government, as they are, starts getting all of our debit card and credit card information. They now have all of our medical records that they are getting. They are now watching and have the ability to check every email, to check Web sites you visit. They have the ability to examine every log of every call that you make. People who once said I was crazy for giving this example some years back may begin to realize I wasn't so crazy. The example was this:

When the Federal Government has the obligation to supervise every aspect of your health care—when you force government-run health care on the people of this Nation—and when you have that same Federal Government that can monitor every credit and debit card purchase you make and when they know where you go online and when they can go into your emails, is it so hard to believe that at some point some American citizen would not get a letter from the Federal Government, saying:

We noticed that you purchased bacon and butter at the grocery store this last weekend, and we also noticed that your cholesterol level is over 200. What were you thinking? We can't let you do something like that, so we are going to have to punish you. We are going to have to start charging you more money. We are going to have to start supervising your activity. You are going to have to start going and working out. We saw that you let your membership at the gym lapse, and you are not going anymore. We can tell by where your car goes, by following the GPS on your car, that you are not going to the gym like you used to. You need to start going back to the gym. You need to quit buying butter and bacon, and then we won't punish you financially like we are now.

□ 1230

Is that so hard to believe that that would start happening, could start happening? When you give the government this much private information, then liberty is sure to go shortly thereafter.

In quoting Benjamin Franklin, it has been written different ways over the years—some say he didn't say it—but basically, he certainly advocated that those who are willing to give up liberty for their safety deserve neither.

How much of our privacy and our liberty are the American people willing to give up just so that we can feel a little safer? Because when you do that, you will not be safe from your own government. Your own government then becomes the biggest threat to your liberty, to your freedom.

Things that brilliant colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle have said over the years about our liberty and about our privacy are really becoming an issue now, and I am not hearing my friends across the aisle that raised those important points now talking about them. And I know when you have someone in the White House that is from your own party, it is kind of tough to stand up and say, This is a mistake. This is wrong.

But it is time that friends across the aisle—Senators who are Democrats—start standing up in numbers and saying: Enough. You have usurped too much power that the Constitution gave to Congress.

Just because you don't like the fact that we take a long time and it is not pretty to see laws being made doesn't mean you get to skip the whole process. The Founders wanted gridlock. They wanted it tough to pass laws. They didn't want us meeting year round like we do. I am sure if the Founders were around today, they would be appalled that we meet as much as we do. And when some people back in east Texas say: Gee, why aren't you in Washington? I'm saying: You're safer when we're here because it means we're not passing another law that takes your liberty away.

The Founders wanted some gridlock. They didn't want it too easy to pass laws. Because they knew when that happened, every little emotional issue that came up would cause Congress to come in and pass something even though the moment was fleeting and we should not be doing things quickly and emotionally.

Thomas Jefferson was not part of the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia in 1787. He was amazed at how good the document was. But he is reported to have indicated that if he could change one thing, he would make it a requirement that before we could pass a law, it had to be on file for a year to make sure people have plenty of time to discuss it.

We see how good an idea that would be if we didn't just run in here and do things out of emotion, and we would never, ever pass another bill so we could find out what was in it. My party

has not done anything as blatant as ramming through bills. My copy of ObamaCare was right around 2,500 pages. But we have had some bills that we have not been given time to read and to properly go through.

We were going to take up a flood insurance bill yesterday, and I am grateful that it got moved off because we haven't had enough time to know what the bill has actually got in it word for word. Summaries are not enough, on many occasions. Sometimes if it is not a big deal, a summary may do it, but somebody besides some staffer needs to be looking at every word.

That is one of the benefits of going through what we call regular order. The subcommittee gets to have a markup where they discuss every part of the bill, and anyone can offer an amendment to any part of the bill. And then it goes to the full committee, and anyone at the markup can offer an amendment to any part of the bill, and it gets debate and discussion. That is a good process.

I believe that when we took the majority, we would do even better than we have. We have done a lot better than the 4 years from January of 2007 to when we got the gavel back in January of 2011. I was appalled at the completely closed rules and how it was just staggering. We had no input. Nearly half of the country basically had no representation at all on all of the important bills because they just rammed them through without any input from Republicans—who represented Democrats and Republicans. They didn't get represented in those districts.

It is important, no matter who is in charge, that if it is really a critical issue that needs immediate laws passed, changes made, that we fully vet every law that we pass.

We had an Over-Criminalization hearing today. One of the huge mistakes—and it has been a very bipartisan mistake—is that over all these years, when Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle want to show how strongly we feel about something and how tough we are, we slap a prison sentence on things, and one of the greatest injustices that Congress has done is to pass laws that say any violations of the regulations under this law will carry a term of imprisonment.

In our hearing today, there was an estimate that there are probably 300,000 regulations, the violation of which carries a prison sentence. Congress has never seen them, never debated them, and knows nothing about them.

We have heard testimony from people who have been sent to prison who did some act and had no idea there was a law against what they did. They did time in prison as a result.

There was a man from Houston who was doing business during retirement by raising orchids. He ordered some orchids from South America. They were sent to him, but the proper forms were not filled out by the people that sent

them to him, and under the law, any violation of those postal regulations requires time in prison.

So what happened? He was arrested in his home in Houston. And since the law gives choice of venue and it had been mailed through Miami, they took him to Miami, where he didn't even know anybody, didn't have the money for bail, and ends up doing 18 months in prison, during which time he had a stroke. He couldn't testify. His wife had to.

There was a poor guy from Washington State that was trying to create a better battery. He had every chemical properly stored. One day, driving home, the EPA SWAT team had black Suburbans come up behind him, the side, in front, and forced him off the road, yanked him out of his car, threw him to the ground, handcuffed him, threw him in jail, and then drug him to Alaska.

His heinous crime was that when he mailed a chemical to Alaska, legally, properly, he didn't know that it was not enough to check the box that it had to go by ground. It couldn't go by air. He didn't know that you needed a little sticker that had a picture of an airplane with a red line through it. That sticker with the plane with the red line through it had to be on there. And since he didn't do that, that caused him to deserve to be run off the road by the EPA SWAT team, thrown to the ground, handcuffed, hauled up to Alaska, and put in prison.

When he got acquitted of that, the Justice Department wasn't happy with it, so they looked around and realized when they ransacked his home he had every chemical properly stored, but there was a law that says if you ever abandon these certain chemicals for over a certain number of days, then you committed a Federal felony. And even though it was the Federal Government that forced him to abandon those, and even though they were properly stored, he was in jail in Alaska and away from the chemicals beyond the time that the law allowed, so he went to prison for abandoning chemicals because the government drug him away from them.

These are the kind of laws that are out there. We ought to pass a law in this body that says no criminal penalty may attach to a violation of any regulation unless this Congress has passed a specific law putting a criminal penalty on that specific regulation. We should not be able to leave it to bureaucrats to decide what becomes an offense punishable by imprisonment.

So when you take the violations of privacy that have now been passed into law—all of our medical records, now our credit card and debit card records, our emails, all of our phone logs all being usurped and grabbed by the Federal Government—and couple that with abuses that we have seen over the years by the Federal Government of people's rights under color of law, and understanding that when this Federal

Government violates your rights, your privacy, your freedoms, you have nowhere else to go and there is no appeal to anyone else, it is time this body and the Senate took action to make sure the Justice Department follows the law and doesn't just pick and choose. And also that we make sure the White House doesn't just make up law out of whole cloth and decide which laws they liked and which ones they didn't. There are oaths involved here, and there should be consequences for not following them.

Then, we need to investigate further these executive departments who think they are above the law. And when Members of Congress duly request documents that were provided to people convicted as terrorists and we are told that terrorists can have them but you, Members of Congress, cannot, then it is time to defund people that will not abide by the law and will not participate in proper oversight.

It is also time we had a select committee that properly investigated Benghazi. It is time we had a special prosecutor, not some big donor to the President, to investigate this horrendous scandal in the IRS that not only has smidgens of evidence, it has overwhelming evidence of people's rights being violated. It is time that we started making sure as a Congress that people who enforce the law actually enforce the law.

We have seen the desire by this administration to embrace Islam as closely as possible. And I know the attitude is that if we bring people close from Islam into the administration, that will help us get across that we mean no ill will. The trouble has been we have brought foxes into the henhouse to give advice to the chickens.

We have a report from the last couple of weeks. The Clarion Project had been making Freedom of Information Act requests. They finally got some documentation that shows—and this article is from the Clarion Project. The Clarion Project investigation has discovered a jihadist enclave in Texas where a deadly shooting took place in 2002.

□ 1245

Declassified FBI documents obtained by Clarion confirmed the find, and show the U.S. Government's concern about its links to terrorism. The investigation was completed with the help of Act for America Houston.

The enclave belongs to the network of Muslims of the Americas, a radical group linked to a Pakistani militant group called Jamaat ul-Fuqra. Its members are devoted followers of Sheikh Ali Mubarak Gilani, an extremist cleric in Pakistan.

The organization says it has a network of 22 villages around the U.S., with Islamberg as its main headquarters in New York. The Clarion Project obtained secret MOA, Muslim of America, footage showing female members receiving paramilitary training at Islamberg. It was featured on the Kelly File of FOX News Channel in October. A second MOA tape released by Clarion shows its spokesman declaring the U.S. to be a Muslim-majority country.

A 2007 FBI record states that MOA, Muslim of America, members have been involved in

at least 10 murders, one disappearance, three firebombings, one attempted firebombing, two explosive bombings, and one attempted bombing.

It states:

The documented propensity for violence by this organization supports the belief the leadership of the MOA extols membership to pursue a policy of jihad or holy war against individuals or groups it considers enemies of Islam, which includes the U.S. Government. Members of the MOA are encouraged to travel to Pakistan to receive religious and military/terrorist training from Sheikh Gilani.

The document also says that "The MOA is now an autonomous organization which possesses an infrastructure capable of planning and mounting terrorist campaigns overseas."

Other FBI reports describe the MOA in similar ways with a 2003 file stating: "Investigation of the Muslims of the Americas is based on specific and articulate facts given justification to believe they are engaged in international terrorism."

MOA members believe the holiest Islamic site in the country is located at the Islamville commune in South Carolina. Other MOA entities include the International Quranic Open University, United Muslim Christian Forum, Islamic Post, Muslim Veterans of America, and American Muslim Medical Relief Team.

On further down it says:

The MOA referred to its Texas commune as Mahmoudberg in on-line instructions for a parade in New York in 2010. A posting on an Islamic message board in 2005 advertised a speaking engagement in Houston by someone from Mahmoudberg.

According to the reports, the commune is 7 to 10 acres large, is in an "extremely wooded area" and two or three trailer homes moved there in December of 2001. However, ACT members visited the area as part of Clarion's project or investigation and interviewed one nearby local who confidently said it is closer to 25 acres in size and spoke of a presence dating back to the late 1980s.

Further down, the FBI reported in 2007 that:

One commune resident used to be a leader at the MOA commune in Badger, California. That site was called Baladullah.

In March 2001, one of the Baladullah members was arrested for transporting guns between New York and South Carolina. Another was charged with murdering a police deputy that caught him breaking and entering a home.

Interviewed residents all agreed that MOA members are private, yet, when the ACT members were spotted in the area, they were immediately and repeatedly approached. At one point a commune resident gave them a final warning to leave, despite the fact they weren't even trespassing or harassing MOA MEMBERS.

"It was definitely very threatening and menacing," an ACT member told me.

Multiple sources confirmed that one resident of the commune is a police officer. According to a nearby neighbor, one of the MOA members used to drive trucks for the U.S. Army in Kuwait.

Further down it says:

"Police were denied"—this was after a shooting in 2002 out at the site—"police were denied access to the trailer homes and were not allowed to directly interview the women who covered their faces in their presence. Communication with the women had to be done by passing notes through a male intermediary."

Anyway, this was the subject of an email from one of my college friends,

and one of my other college friends sent an email in response saying, this could not possibly be true because the mainstream media would have been all over this if this were really true.

Well, the report of these 22 villages is true, and the mainstream media has not, does not, probably will not cover it because the administration doesn't want to make anyone uncomfortable who might be radical Islamists.

Another article from FOX News Insider, February 20, talked about a 2007 FBI record stated that MOA Members have been involved in at least 10 murders. Talked about these things.

Other FBI reports describe MOA in similar ways, with the 2003 file stating, based on the facts, this appears to be factual information. It was obtained from FBI records. It seems to be consistent with the prior administration.

Though they brought Muslims in to give advice on dealing with radical Islam, they pursued terrorists, like in the Holy Land Foundation trial, there were around 200 or so named co-conspirators in the Holy Land Foundation trial.

The goal, as one of the prosecutors told me, was to get those convictions, if they could, and they knew it would be the most important biggest terrorist convictions in American judicial history, and if they got those, then they would go forward and start prosecuting others of the named coconspirators who were not indicted but were named.

We know there is plenty of evidence out there regarding coconspirators because there were some coconspirators that filed a motion with the Court to have their names struck from the pleadings. The Federal District Court that examined the evidence in Dallas said, no, there is plenty of evidence here to support that CAIR, Council of American Islamic Relations, ISNA, Islamic Society North America, are large front groups for Muslim Brotherhood.

Went up to the Fifth Circuit and the Fifth Circuit confirmed that there was plenty of evidence to support their names being part of it.

Yet, this administration continues to coddle and get information and instruction from CAIR, ISNA. The president of ISNA, Imam Magid, continues to be a highly praised adviser to this administration.

So, when people across the country say this couldn't possibly be true because the mainstream media would have been all over it, I can't believe our Federal Government will allow this kind of thing to go on, well, the reason it has is because, even though FBI reports continued to say over the years that these appear to be violent and associated with violent activities, the State Department, under this administration, continues to refuse to list the Muslims of the Americas as a terrorist organization, which means they get to continue to build villages, to train in paramilitary fashion around the country, from Texas, South Carolina, New York, California, across the country,

until such time as this administration gets serious about what is going on.

Had the information from an article this week, this article from National Review Online, "Convicted Terrorist Worked As an ObamaCare Navigator in Illinois." It shouldn't be a surprise this kind of thing has happened because we found out that these so-called navigators, under ObamaCare, what might be more appropriately entitled the Unaffordable Care Act, these navigators are being allowed to gather people's most personal and private identification information, but they are not being vetted.

We have known from the beginning, when the law kicked in, that the navigators were not vetted for prior criminal activity. So we shouldn't be surprised that there was a convicted terrorist that worked as an ObamaCare navigator in Illinois.

Then we have people, enrollees, finding it impossible to cancel their plans. More than 6 weeks later, Weekly Standard reports, after spending 50 to 60 hours on the phone, this man's policy is still not canceled. So much for freedom when it comes to health care in this country under ObamaCare.

Another report published by foxnews.com: "ObamaCare may increase premiums for 11 million workers."

Anyway, it should be clear that, even though we heard a staggering statement by the Democrat Majority Leader in the Senate that people who were reporting the horror stories about ObamaCare, pointing out how the Affordable Care Act really isn't, it was devastating, that these were lies, they were not true.

Well, proper investigation reveals they are true. There may be some that have made stories up. When we get stories, we try to look into, are these really legitimate, but what we find is most of them are easily documented and easily legitimate.

ObamaCare is doing massive damage across the country to people's employment, to their health insurance, to their ability to see the doctor that they want and, in some cases, the doctor that has been keeping them alive.

Another report: "ObamaCare may increase premiums for 11 million workers." Well, I know it has increased them a lot. I can't afford the new policy that would be required. I liked my old one. I wasn't crazy about it. Aetna had some problems we never got worked out. But still, I had more freedom of choice before.

Mr. Speaker, the bottom line is, when the Federal Government has become so big and so intrusive that it gathers everyone's phone logs in the United States, can check into any phone calls made by anyone in the country any time, when the Federal Government gathers everyone's most personal and private medical information, when the Federal Government gathers people's debit and credit card purchases to protect them, when the

Federal Government can use drones to monitor, can monitor email activity, Web sites visited, and then that same government can say we are not going to follow these laws if we don't like them, don't think they are proper, and we are going to change the law over here because Congress didn't, and we prefer to have a law that says this so we will follow that, then it is no wonder that a constitutional professor like Jonathan Turley, liberal as he is, would express dire concerns about how long we can maintain this country.

We owe the American people an obligation to proper oversight, force them to follow the law.

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

□ 1300

CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION MONTH

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in recognition of Career and Technical Education Month; and let me say how proud I am to work alongside my colleague, Congressman G.T. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, my good friend and fellow cochair of the bipartisan Congressional Career and Technical Education Caucus.

CTE is an investment in the future of our economy, our workforce, and our country. From skills training in high schools to community colleges and professional programs, CTE plays a key role for workers at every age.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the Consolidated Omnibus Appropriations Act of 2014, which passed in January, increased authorization amounts for Perkins by \$53 million for FY 2014.

Now, that is a sharp contrast in terms of the cuts that had taken place in CTE and Perkins since 2010; so with that, I urge my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee to fully fund Perkins in the upcoming fiscal year and to make important investments in career training.

Now, all too often, Mr. Speaker, I hear from Rhode Island employers that they have job openings right now, but are unable to find local skilled workers with the expertise necessary to fill the position. Closing the skills gap is an important step to making sure that workers fit the needs of expanding industries.

With that, I look forward to continuing my partnership with Congressman G.T. THOMPSON; and I urge all of my congressional colleagues to join the CTE Caucus; and I ask them to fully support funding Perkins in FY15.

UKRAINE AND IRAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BENTIVOLIO). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the

gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I think this is a good time to reflect on a couple of things. One is certainly Iran. The other is certainly Ukraine.

I think that the American people obviously have a very important stake in what is going on in both countries. In Ukraine, in Kiev, we see people marching for freedom, demanding the kinds of freedoms that we, in the United States, are used to, the freedoms that we hold so dear in our country; and we saw the people initially being countered by brutal police attacks on them.

But you know, Mr. Speaker, the right prevailed, and the people in the streets won, and they clearly said that they don't want to have Russian domination; but, instead, they want to look toward the West, rather than look East.

The European Union has been negotiating with Ukraine for some time, and their president, now deposed, said that he would rather work with Russia into the Russian Customs Union, which is sort of, in my opinion, a rekindling of the old Soviet Union. That angered many people in Ukraine, and they took to the streets.

I hope that the European Union continues to make overtures to Ukraine. I think now is a very, very critical moment, in that the United States has a role to play with our European allies, to try to tell the people of Ukraine that we would like them to look Westward and that, in looking Westward, there will be opportunities for their country.

I am concerned that if there are too many stringent rules and regulations put up before a country can affiliate with the EU—and at the same time, Putin is saying here are these billions and billions of dollars, which makes it seem like it is a lot easier to go with Putin.

This is one of those rare visceral moments where I think action by the United States and our allies in the European Union will make the difference for generations to come; and I would hope that we would deal with Ukraine in a benevolent manner, so that they would be able to say: yes, we want to look Westward, and it is going to help our economy, it is going to help our people.

There are serious problems in Ukraine. Their economy is in shambles. And, of course, there has been a total lack of freedom and democracy, and the people of Ukraine demand no less.

I think that Secretary Kerry was absolutely right and the President was absolutely right in telling Russian President Putin that he had better think twice before he considers any kind of military intervention in Ukraine.

That is not something that can be or should be tolerated, and Russia must understand that it cannot be business