

for the past 14 years, overseen Rwanda's rebirth and has made the world proud of Rwanda's incredible resurrection and progress.

At yesterday's memorial service in Rwanda, he offered these simple words of everlasting hope:

As we pay tribute to the victims, both the living and those who have passed, we also salute the unbreakable Rwandan spirit.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, salute the Rwandan spirit and applaud the Rwandan people on just how far they have come in just a few years, just 20 years. At the same time that I applaud the Rwandan people, I admonish, I encourage, I plead, I ask, I beg the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda to continue their quest for justice and to bring those to trial, those who have, up to now, escaped the might of justice and the appeal of justice-seeking people throughout the world.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I must remind our own government that in 1994 we stood on this floor, in this Congress, in this Capitol, in this Nation, and we promised ourselves, we promised the world, we promised anyone who had ears to hear, that we would never, ever again allow such brutal violence to occur anywhere else in the world, that we had finally learned our lesson and that we would never have to relearn this awesome and brutal lesson. And yet, Mr. Speaker, we still see the same thing occurring, the same atrocities, the same murders and rapes, the same pillaging, the same acts of inhumane treatment toward fellow human beings. We bear witness that this same thing is again happening all over our world.

Whether Syria or South Sudan, our Nation, the United States of America, the American people, and the entire global community must rise up and stand up shoulder to shoulder and ensure that humanitarian rights are protected all over this world. As we have witnessed in Rwanda, global inaction has already led to genocide. Global inaction will always lead to genocide. We simply cannot idly stand by and allow genocide to continue in our world.

Mr. Speaker, I must close with a quote from the English poet John Donne, who said:

Any man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in mankind.

I want to paraphrase Mr. Donne's quote and say that any human's death diminishes me, because I am involved in humankind.

Again, hats off to you, my honorable and humble colleague from the great State of New York. You don't surprise me being the chief sponsor of this particular moment in time in the history of this institution because, Mr. MEEKS, this is just simply another step for you, because when it comes to the history and when it comes to justice for people throughout the world, it is a step forward, and you are a stepper for mankind.

Mr. MEEKS. Thank you, Mr. RUSH. I thank you for having the broad shoulders that I stand on and for being here.

Let me wrap up. Over the last several months, thousands of Rwandans have watched as a torch symbolizing the memory of those who perished, known as the Flame of Remembrance, was passed hand to hand, village to village, across the nation. In a fitting climax to its journey, that torch finally arrived yesterday at the National Genocide Memorial beneath dark skies and a gentle rain. But the rain did not distinguish the flame, nor will it for the next 100 days. The Flame of Remembrance will burn in Rwanda's capital of Kigali and remind the world of the 100 days of violence which marred its streets 20 years ago. Let us work together to make sure, Mr. Speaker, that it never happens again and that we can live in peace.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1845

NEW BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT LEASE AND PERMIT DATA

(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, yesterday, the United States Department of Energy released its 2014 strategic plan, which reiterates how the President is committed to an all-of-the-above energy strategy.

I personally was pleased to hear the administration reiterate their commitment to expanding all of America's domestic energy resources, including fossil fuels, which is fundamental to the Nation's future economic security.

The report also outlined the administration's goal to "decouple our economy from the global oil market."

Unfortunately, the administration's policy continually falls short of their unbelievable rhetoric.

Just one example: since President Obama took office, total Federal oil production has declined 7.8 percent and Federal natural gas production has declined 21 percent. It is no wonder, for according to new data released this week from the Bureau of Land Management, Federal onshore oil and natural gas leases and permits are at the lowest levels in more than a decade.

Mr. Speaker, real energy security will take actually pursuing, rather than merely claiming, an all-of-the-above energy approach.

IRAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, there is a deeply troubling matter that has come before our government here in the United States. Once again, Iran is at the bottom of it. They have shown since 1979, since President Carter basi-

cally was pushing for the ouster of the Shah, we turned on an ally who was not a good man necessarily, but we—well, actually, President Carter—hailed the Ayatollah Khomeini as a man of peace.

What has been wrought—to use the words of Samuel F. B. Morse—has been years and years of terrorism in the hands of violent radical Islamic jihadists.

Then we get word that Iran has named one of the people involved in the original hostage-taking incident in Tehran in 1979 as its Ambassador to the U.N.

At this time, I want to recognize my very good friend from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN), who has really taken the lead in an appropriate response from our House.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas for his leadership in getting this time tonight so that we can talk about this important issue.

Mr. Speaker, last week, we learned something shocking and appalling. The Iranian government wants to appoint a terrorist as their Ambassador to the United Nations. A man who assisted in the 1979 terrorist attack on our embassy in Tehran. A man who helped hold American diplomats hostage for 444 days. This is a man that the supposedly moderate new government in Iran wants to represent Iran on American soil in New York City. This is unconscionable and this is unacceptable. It is time for all of us to speak up with one loud and unified voice against this injustice.

Amazingly, at this moment, the President of the United States does not have the legal authority to keep this man off of our shores. The President can deny visas to diplomats if they have been caught spying on ourselves or our allies, but he can't keep someone out of our country if they are a terrorist. They can be admitted as a diplomat and get a visa.

Last week, Senator TED CRUZ and I introduced legislation to fix this problem. Our bill would give the President the authority he needs to do the right thing and to deny this man a visa. Senator CRUZ received strong support from Democrats in the Senate like Senator CHUCK SCHUMER of New York. The bill passed the Senate unanimously last night 100-0. How many issues pass the Senate 100-0?

I am working here in the House to quickly move this bill forward so that we don't have an Iranian terrorist walking the streets of Manhattan with diplomatic immunity.

It is mind-boggling, but if Osama bin Laden himself had been named an Ambassador to the United Nations by somebody, the President would not have had the legal authority to deny him a visa. We have got to fix it. That is why this legislation is before us. The Cruz-Lamborn legislation would give the President the ability to do the right thing and to deny this Iranian terrorist a visa.

Time heals some wounds, but time should not cause amnesia. Letting this man into the country with all the pomp and circumstance of diplomatic immunity would cause pain to those who are hostages. It would jeopardize the safety and security of this Nation.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and for House leadership to move it quickly to passage as soon as possible.

I want to thank the gentleman from Texas once again for taking leadership and bringing this issue to the attention of the American people through this time here on the floor tonight.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my dear friend from Colorado.

In fact, when I heard that such an outrage was being suggested, I said to my staff, we have got to do something. I was told, and I should have suspected, my friend DOUG LAMBORN from Colorado was already out there, he already has a bill, H.R. 4357. I was brought a Dear Colleague letter accompanying that, and I said we have got to help our friend do what is right for America.

I was pleased that TED CRUZ was able to get that pushed through in the Senate. Frankly, it shows there is still hope for the Senate. That is encouraging. You look for hope where you can get it.

But I remember so well 1979–1980. I was in the Army at Fort Benning. This attack occurred and we were outraged. There was nobody I knew in the Army who was dying to go to Iran. But really everybody I knew at Fort Benning and other posts, we expected to go because it was an act of war.

Our embassy was attacked in Tehran, it was an act of war, and nothing really happened for 444 days. There was a failed rescue attempt. I still, Mr. Speaker, have asked from the floor before, and I wish somebody could verify for sure, but I had a friend from Fort Benning who had told me that the original plan for the rescue required that 12 helicopters would go 500 or so miles inland into Iran to a staging area there.

At the time they knew where the hostages were. There was still good intel. They knew where they were. So this was going to be an effort to rescue them. This was the original Delta Force. Our friend General Jerry Boykin, now at the Family Research Council, was one of the original Delta Force. I have talked to him about that time out there in the desert.

They were to rendezvous with some aircraft that would have supplies, things they needed. In order to make the trip, as General Boykin confirms, they knew they had to have six helicopters there make it that far inland.

What I would like to get substantiation on or just prove, that originally the military proposed, the joint military group proposed 12 helicopters to go in. Their reasoning, as a friend from Fort Benning pointed out—this is back when I was in the Army this was being told—the reasoning was when you go

across hundreds of miles of sand, desert, with turbine engines, that you run the risk of having a high loss rate of your helicopters.

So they asked for 12, thinking since six was absolutely essential to have at the staging area inside Iran, that they should allow for 50 percent loss of the helicopters. What I still want to find out, is it true that the 12 helicopters were proposed, but that the White House said: No, 12 would look like an invasion, so let's scale that back to eight. I was told the dialogue went: Well, if we have eight and we have four losses, then we only get there with four and there is no mission; if we don't do it now, we may not know where they move them. We really should go with 12. But I was told the White House said: No, we can't go with 12. We don't want to make it look like an invasion, scale it back to eight.

General Boykin confirmed that there were eight helicopters that made the trip. But when they got to the staging area, when it was clear that only five helicopters were going to make it, he said there was an automatic abort at that point. Unfortunately, as we know from the news of what happened, one of the choppers as it attempted to rise up, the pilot must have had vertigo—it is very easy to happen in the desert sand as the sand swirls around you—but whatever the reasoning, the helicopter slightly turned, the rotors went through the C-130, and we lost American lives out there on the desert floor at the staging area in Iran.

I don't fault anyone who was part of the Delta Force. They were some of the most heroic people America has produced. They were willing to risk it all, and some did give all in the effort to go after our hostages.

But whether the proposal was originally 12 and it was scaled back to eight, or whether the administration, the Commander in Chief, just said go with eight, either way the error was where the buck stops, at the top with the Commander in Chief. Because just like President Kennedy admitted after he withdrew the full air support that he had promised during the Bay of Pigs invasion, as he said afterwards: We should have gone ahead. We would have been better off doing a full-scale invasion instead of having something as embarrassing and humiliating as this—or words to that effect, is what I had read.

If you are going to rescue American lives, you commit whatever it takes. The military is always ready to commit whatever it takes.

Our problem comes in the chain of command usually at the very top. That is why it has been so tragic in Afghanistan that in a period of half the time of President George W. Bush being Commander in Chief, President Obama as Commander in Chief had around twice or so the fatalities and even more of injuries, debilitating serious injuries.

The rules of engagement are critical in a battle like that. Whether it is

going to rescue hostages, whether it is going to provide a peacekeeping mission, it is absolutely imperative that our military have the full authority to protect themselves, win whatever battle may be confronted, and come home.

The lesson that all too often is not learned from Vietnam is not that we should never get involved in foreign battles. The lesson is and should be, the one that has not been learned is this: if we are going to commit American men and women to combat, then give them authority to win and bring them home. That should be the lesson of Vietnam.

□ 1900

It should be the lesson of Iraq. It should be the lesson of Afghanistan, and yet, we still have people in Afghanistan who don't really understand why they are there, but don't want to be the last American to die in Afghanistan.

As we see surveys around the world indicating that the United States has lost tremendous respect—and in areas where our President, along with many of the rest of us thought, okay, we have a President who did a lot of growing and learning in an Islamic country as he has indicated.

So surely, he will help our relationships with and in Muslim countries; and yet, as you look at surveys in Muslim countries around the world, we are less respected now than we were under President and Commander in Chief George W. Bush, especially when you are dealing with radical Islamic leaders.

There are so many people in Iran. I have met some of them in surrounding countries, refugees from Iran, who verify that there are so many Iranian people—they love Americans, but clearly, their leadership does not.

It is a slap in the face for the Iranian leadership to think that they could get away—to think that we have such a weak Commander in Chief that they could send over someone who is a participant in an act of war, an international crime against humanity, attacking an embassy and taking hostages and mistreating those hostages; yet they thought they could get away with it.

If you look at what has been happening around the world, perhaps it is not that difficult to understand why Iran thought they could get away with something so heinous as to send a participant of the original international crime, an act of war of attacking our Embassy and holding hostages.

Well, some may say: this guy, we don't know that he was there when the Embassy was actually attacked.

But as I know from my judge days and prosecutor days—the Federal law, State laws I am aware of, and in the international circles—anyone who aids, encourages, and abets is considered a principal of the crime.

So that is what we have here, an arrogant, condescending slap in the face of the United States President, Congress, everyone who has any leadership

in this country, a show of no respect to send someone who is well-known to have participated, despite the efforts to minimize roles he may have had.

So why would they think they could do that? You look, gee, the Russians and the Chinese have taken the measure of our President. They know he is the Commander in Chief. They know how our government functions. Iran has done the same thing. Syria has done the same thing.

Others around the world have looked, and they saw, and I have even had some world leaders say: look, Mubarak—none of us really liked him—but he was your ally, and he gave you a longer period of peace on the Israeli border with Egypt than any other time; so we couldn't believe when you turned on your ally, you have written agreements with Mubarak. We don't understand how you could just toss aside an ally who has helped you so much.

People in other countries have said: we couldn't believe Qadhafi had blood on his hands; and yet, after 2003, he had some kind of conversion experience after he saw the U.S. go into Iraq.

He said: look, I am giving up my nukes, you can take them, you can come in and inspect whatever you want, and I will be your best friend in fighting terrorism.

As some other moderate Muslim leaders in the Middle East have said: he was your friend. As other leaders in the Middle East have said: he provided you more help and more information on terrorists than any other country but Israel.

So what did we do? We came after Qadhafi. We bombed his forces, and it seems pretty clear, without the United States' assistance, Qadhafi would have stayed in power. We would still be getting information on terrorism in the Middle East from Qadhafi and his people.

We would have four people that didn't die in Benghazi, and terrorism wouldn't be so profoundly manifesting itself in north Africa and the Middle East, but this administration turned on someone who had turned into a friend to the United States, an enemy of terrorism.

We have moderate Muslim friends in Afghanistan who actually defeated the Taliban for us. My heart breaks for my friend Masood and others who risked their lives to fight the Taliban, who defeated the Taliban under the leadership of General Dostum, who some now in this administration call a war criminal. He fought the Taliban like the Taliban fights. He defeated them. He did us a great favor.

The Taliban was acknowledged to have been in disarray and completely defeated, and then we decide to nation-build. I know this is not the fault of President Obama, it was done before he came in, but we decided to nation-build.

We sent tens of thousands of troops into Iran, whereas we had only had less than 500 there at the time that the Taliban was routed.

How could we do that? Well, we provided them weapons, we gave them air cover, we gave them intel. We had embedded special ops and intelligence, and we let them do the fighting, and we whipped the Taliban by letting the enemy of our enemy defeat our enemy.

Now, this administration refers to them as war criminals? They were our allies, they were our friends. They defeated the Taliban. So we mistreat our friends who risked their lives fighting our enemy for us—and for themselves, make no mistake.

Then this administration is constantly reaching out to the Taliban: we want to talk, we want to sit down with you—and offered at one time to buy them luxurious offices, international offices—if you will just sit down, you don't even have to agree to reach an agreement, just to sit down with us and talk; we may let a lot of your people who have murdered Americans go free if you just sit down and talk with us.

Then the Chinese have seen how we have turned on allies and reached out to our enemies. They have had their eyes on certain places near China, South China Sea, other places surrounding China, they have had their eye on places, just like Russia has.

Now, they see the United States turning on allies, embracing enemies. They ask the same questions. They are bound to ask the same questions some of our allies have expressed: Are you still fighting against terror? Because they are still fighting you and we can't tell that you are helping in the fight anymore.

So China starts making moves they never would have made 5 years ago because they wouldn't have wanted to risk a U.S. response; and Russia wouldn't have made the move 5 years ago, but they have counted the cost, they have measured the leader of the United States of America, just like Khrushchev did in the early 1960s. They have figured: we can move on Crimea, and the United States will do nothing.

That is why they laughed when the President announced that he was going to put sanctions on some of the Russian leaders. They were shocked. That is all you are going to do? That is it? Wow. Let's move some more troops to Ukrainian border. Maybe we can grab some more of Ukraine, and the U.S. will continue to do nothing.

Weakness is provocative. It has always been; it will always be. I knew I owed 4 years to the Army, and I would do that before I did anything else, so I majored in what I loved, history. There are so many lessons repeated over and over in history.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, it was shocking to hear an educated Secretary of State that knew that you pronounced Genghis Khan as "Genghis Khan" actually make the statement that the Russians were making a 19th century move on Crimea, when history dictates that what the Russians did in moving on Crimea, an area they have had their eyes on and wanted to take

is—yes, it is 19th century, it is 20th century, it is 21st century, it will be 22nd century if the Lord tarries. It was 18, 17, 16, 15, 14, 13. It has been in every century.

You go back to the Dark Ages, whether you say that is 500 to a 1000 A.D. or whether you say it is specifically 476 to 800 A.D., whatever you call the Dark Ages, these were the kind of moves that were made then. People made moves—assaultive moves on other people, places, and things because there is evil in this world.

Mr. Speaker, there is the good that our Founders acknowledged, that God put there. It is why they said we are endowed by the Creator with certain inalienable rights because they knew there was a Creator, that they knew there was evil in the world, and they set up as many obstacles to power grabs in this country as they could.

They felt pretty comfortable that Congress would never allow either the Supreme Court or the President to usurp legislative power without reining them in. It is time that we did that.

My dear friend, DOUG LAMBORN, produced H.R. 4357. It says this:

The purpose is to deny admission to the United States to any representative to the United Nations who has engaged in espionage activities against the United States, poses a threat to the United States, and other purposes.

It goes on to say:

A bill to deny admission to the United States to any representative to the United Nations who has engaged in espionage activities against the United States, poses a threat to United States national security interests, or has engaged in a terrorist activity against the United States.

Then it goes on in detail, as far as changing section 407(a) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, in order to make it possible where we could deny entrance to Iran's proposed U.N. Ambassador. It is time we did that.

There was a story from Fox News, dated March 31, that is entitled, "One-time hostage of Iranian militants urges denial of visa to new Iran envoy involved in siege."

□ 1915

This was written by Eric Shawn. It says:

Hostages captured after the 1979 siege on the U.S. Embassy in Tehran are seen in this undated file photo.

Former American hostage Barry Rosen, held by student extremists at the U.S. Embassy in Tehran for more than a year, said Monday it would be an "outrage" and "disgrace" if Washington gave a visa to one of the militants recently named by Iran as its new U.N. Ambassador.

"It may be a precedent, but if the President and the Congress don't condemn this act by the Islamic Republic, then our captivity and suffering for 444 days at the hands of Iran was for nothing," Rosen said. "He can never set foot on American soil."

This is a quote from Rosen.

He also said:

It's a disgrace if the United States Government accepts Aboutalebi's visa as Iranian Ambassador to the U.N.

Rosen was the Embassy's press attache who was blindfolded and held at gunpoint, along with 51 fellow Americans taken hostage. In a statement to FOX News, Rosen demanded that the Obama administration deny a visa to Aboutalebi to prevent him from taking up Tehran's U.N. post.

We need to take action. We hold the purse strings. We need to cut off any funding for any effort that might be undertaken to grant this international terrorist a visa so that he can come on American soil and have diplomatic immunity.

So I am quite proud of my friend from Colorado, Mr. LAMBORN and I have traveled to Israel together. I have seen him conduct himself in international settings in ways that should make Colorado proud of him, as well as the United States.

My friend TED CRUZ got a bill through the Senate that passed 100-0. As reported by the AP April 7:

The Senate approved a bill Monday to bar a man with ties to the 1979 Iranian hostage crisis who's been tapped to be Iran's Ambassador to the United Nations from entering the United States.

By voice vote, Republicans and Democrats united behind the legislation sponsored by Senator Ted Cruz, Republican of Texas, that reflected congressional animosity toward Tehran and its selection of Hamid Aboutalebi. Iran's envoy's choice was a member of a Muslim student group that held 52 American hostages for 444 days in the 1979 seizure of the Embassy in Tehran.

The "nomination is a deliberate and unambiguous insult to the United States," Cruz said in remarks on the Senate floor in which he describes Iran's anti-Americanism since 1979, and added, "This is not the moment for diplomatic niceties."

I am very proud of my friend TED CRUZ, the Senator from Texas. This is the way we need to respond to Iran's slap in the face of the United States.

Again, if you look at the way this administration has reached out to Iran, they have laughed openly and said yes, they were negotiating, and yes, they reached a preliminary agreement with this White House, but they are not stopping anything in the way of developing nuclear weapons. They made that clear. They are not abandoning their nukes.

So what have we done? We gave them a free space in which to keep developing nukes. We don't know what they have been doing behind the scenes because there have not even been inspections in all the facilities that we know of, and they brag that they are not abandoning anything.

And what else did the administration do? The administration eased up and allowed them billions of dollars in relief from the sanctions which, no doubt, would help them pursue nuclear weapons as they move forward.

It is just tragic why and how this administration is giving the impression to nations like Iran that we will not stand up to them. But, again, look at what we did as a nation. We reelected President Obama, knowing that before the election he had turned to the leader from Russia and basically said: Tell

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

People elected the President, knowing that he had telegraphed to the Russians that he would show a lot more weakness and would be able to give the Russians a lot more of what they wanted after the election in 2012.

If you look at this administration's activities after the election in 2008, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton was sent over with a goofy-looking button that they thought had, in Russian, "reset," when, actually, I don't know what that says. She thought it said "reset." It didn't say that. And we embarrassed ourselves.

But the message was very clear because the Russians, and Putin in particular, knew that the reason that relationships have been strained was that, toward the end of the Bush administration, the Russians moved on Georgia, and the reaction was swift from President Bush. He didn't do as much as I might have thought should be done, but he was embarrassed. He was bound to have been embarrassed because he said he looked to this man and knew that he was a man of peace, or words to that effect, and it had to feel like a bit of a betrayal to President Bush when he moved on Georgia.

The Russian activities of moving on Georgia, totally abandoning and betraying the outreach by the Bush administration, put a significant chill on U.S.-Russian relations. That is why they were chilled. That is why diplomatic relations were so stiff at the time that this administration took over.

So when you know that it was the Russian invasion and move on Georgia that caused a strain in relations, to the Russians, when this administration says, Hey, we are really sorry for the way we acted in the past; we want a new relationship; we want to hit a reset button or whatever we put in Russian on this thing, we want to start over, the message was clear to Vladimir Putin: we're sorry that we were offended when you broke your word to us and invaded Georgia; we're sorry that you were an aggressor, you attacked and invaded and went into a neighboring country. This administration was apologizing for the Russians being that aggressive, and the message was clear that we are not the country we once were. And the message was sent to go ahead and take what you think you can, and he has.

Countries around the world are looking at us. We know we still have the greatest military. Despite all the cuts, it is still the greatest military in the world. And yet, if you don't have leaders willing to show strength, then people will take advantage. It is not a 19th century historical action; it is a 21st and every century since man has been on this planet.

Some have asked, gee, if these inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness really are inalienable, why do all people around the

world not have them? And the answer, I think, is because yes, they were an inheritance bequeathed to us by our Creator; but just as any inheritance, if the heir does not claim that inheritance and have a willingness to protect it and fight for it and maintain it, then you won't keep it.

Thus, when Ben Franklin was purportedly asked, "What have you given us?" he replied, "A republic, if you can keep it."

Muslim moderates are concerned because they see the United States trying to embrace radicals. Again, I am so proud of the moderate Muslims in Egypt in joining, literally and figuratively, arm in arm, hand in hand with Christians and secularists in Egypt and coming to the street in millions and millions and millions and demanding a leader who would not usurp power that was not his in the constitution, demanding his removal, demanding a constitution that would allow them to impeach a leader like Morsi had become as a Muslim Brother. They made clear: we don't want radical Islamist leaders or people in our government because they have one goal, and that is taking overall power, subjugating everyone else, including moderate Muslims and Christians.

That is why it was so ironic to hear one of the Justices of the Supreme Court, in effect, saying just pay the tax and then you have got your religious beliefs, because that is a shari'a law belief. And I know she is not aware of that. But actually, under shari'a law, if you are a Christian, you can pay a tax and subjugate yourself humbly before the Muslim government and they will allow you to practice your religion so long as you remain subjugated to shari'a and to the Muslim leaders.

But in this Nation, you are not supposed to have to pay a tax or a fine in order to practice your religious beliefs. In Egypt—God bless those people—they didn't want to do that either, so they got rid of the Muslim Brother leaders.

What else did they do, Mr. Speaker? They declared the Muslim Brotherhood as a terrorist organization. And if one reads the opinion from the Dallas Federal court and also from the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals in the Holy Land Foundation trial, it seems pretty clear the evidence is there that Muslim Brotherhood should be accepted as a terrorist organization.

□ 1930

And groups like CAIR, who have such a powerful influence in this administration, who can call and have an intelligence briefing shut down at Langley, as they have, who can call and complain that the training materials at the FBI offend them and have them purged so those FBI training materials no longer offend a front organization for the Muslim Brotherhood, as found by the Dallas court and the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals.

Now there is a story from England. The BBC news reports "David Cameron Orders Review of Muslim Brotherhood":

Prime Minister David Cameron has commissioned a review of the Muslim Brotherhood's UK activity, No. 10 says.

The Muslim Brotherhood is an Islamist movement which has been declared a terrorist group by Egypt's government.

Recent press reports have suggested members have moved to London to escape a crackdown in Cairo, where the group backs ousted President Mohammed Morsi.

Well, they had that in common with at least one or two of our U.S. Senators who went over there to back Morsi.

In any event, the article goes on:

Number 10 said the review would examine the group's philosophy and activities, and the government's policy toward it.

According to the Times, it was prompted by evidence received by the government that Muslim Brotherhood leaders met in London last year to plan their response to events in Egypt.

The Prime Minister's official spokesman said that the "main conclusions" of the review, which is due to be completed by the summer, would be made public.

Asked what had triggered the review, he said the government had received a succession of reports from its Embassies in the region, building up a picture which the Prime Minister believed should be examined.

But No. 10 does not provide any details on which bodies are to be involved in the review.

The Muslim Brotherhood was founded in Egypt, but now operates in many states and has influenced other Islamic movements around the world with its model of political activism combined with Islamic charity work.

While the Brotherhood—and it has the Arabic name—says it supports democratic principles, one of its stated aims is to create a state ruled by Islamic law or shari'a.

Its most famous slogan, used worldwide, is "Islam is the solution."

The organization's backing installed Mr. Morsi as Egypt's first civilian president in 2012, but he was ousted—and this is the same mistake that CNN and this administration makes; they called it a military coup last year—after widespread street protests.

As the millions and millions and millions of people in Egypt made clear, millions more than even Morsi claimed voted for him, it was not a military coup. This was an uprising by the people of Egypt demanding the Constitution be followed, and the ouster of a president who was grabbing power at scary speed, and many knew if they didn't move at the time they did, a year later would be too late. He would be like dictators often are, elected, then seize all power, and you can't ever get rid of them.

In any event, this article says:

In December, the new Egyptian government declared the Muslim Brotherhood a terrorist group after blaming it for an attack on a police station that killed 16 people.

A Downing Street spokesman said in a statement: "The Prime Minister has commissioned an internal government review into the philosophy and activities of the Muslim Brotherhood and the government's policy toward the organization."

So, anyway, it is interesting, Egypt has declared the Muslim Brotherhood to be a terrorist organization, and they should know better than any nation in the world.

I thank God for the Egyptians that rose up. Estimates are a third of the

population went to the streets to demand removal. And I didn't know till I was over there last fall, they didn't have any provision in their Constitution for impeachment, so they needed a constitution where they could impeach a president who usurps power that is not his under the Constitution.

Now, England is taking a look to see if they shouldn't declare them terrorist organizations.

The reason we can anticipate that, in the near future, this administration will not declare the Muslim Brotherhood to be a terrorist organization is because they get advice from two front organizations, as the courts have said, of the Muslim Brotherhood. That would be the Council on American-Islamic Relations, CAIR, and I can see them, their building from my window, so they have got a good spot to keep watch over Capitol Hill, and also, ISNA, the Islamic Society of North America. And its leader is Imam Magid, who, as far as I know, is frequently giving advice, continued advice to the State Department, the White House on anything to do with Islam.

We know that the Egyptian paper had reported in December of 2012, when the Muslim Brotherhood was running the government, that six Muslim Brothers were in very key and top positions of power and advice within the Obama administration. They heralded that as a great thing for the Muslim Brothers to have that much influence in Washington.

So there shouldn't be a great deal of wonder at why this administration, with one of those individuals, reported an Egyptian paper, being a top adviser in homeland security, charged with keeping us safe, that we have, according to the Egyptian paper, a Muslim Brother, Mr. Elibiary, who was given a secret clearance by Janet Napolitano, and given access to confidential material or secret material. And we, apparently, get advice from this man, whose business started a foundation, or he started a foundation called the Freedom and Justice Foundation.

Most of us would say freedom and justice? That is great. He believes in freedom and justice. Until you look up the meaning of freedom and justice. Under shari'a law, freedom and justice means freedom to worship Allah only, and justice only under shari'a law. And so it is no big surprise that the Muslim Brotherhood political party in Egypt called itself the Freedom and Justice Party.

But if there are enough leaders here in the United States that know what is good for us, we will see what Egypt has done, what England is doing. And even Russia has noticed that radical Islam is an enemy. They have even tried to warn us, but found we don't take warnings well.

We should declare the Muslim Brotherhood to be a terrorist organization.

THOUGHTS ON THE CAUSATION OF THE FORT HOOD SHOOTINGS

Now, that brings me to another point about the first Fort Hood shooting that was clearly an act of terrorism by an enemy combatant.

Even though this administration calls it workplace violence, it was an act of war by a warrior for radical Islam. And he was able to kill the 13 people, Nadal Hasan, for more than one reason. One was, political correctness kept superior commissioned officers from calling it like they saw it because they didn't want to be called some racist or Islamaphobe, the term that the OIC, the Islamic council, had put together to try to intimidate people from recognizing the danger that radical Islam was.

They didn't want to be called Islamaphobe, and they knew, going all the way up the chain of command, that they might be looked upon badly if they reported this man for what they saw, not a moderate Muslim, but a man that was a potential problem, a person who was being radicalized.

Another problem was that the people we entrust with rocket-propelled grenades, with tanks, with all kinds of weapons, with helicopters that can fire blistering rounds thousands of meters away and kill hundreds and thousands of people, they have that much authority, that much ability, that much power, we trust them with these tremendous weapons that kill people, and yet, we tell them, but we don't trust you to have a pistol with you on a military installation.

So just as when a killer walked into a cafeteria in Killeen, Texas, that adjoins Fort Hood years ago, he knew no one would have a gun there, and so he killed a lot of people, including a woman's parents. She had put her gun in her glove compartment, and knew she could have saved her parents if she had been able to keep her weapon.

So she fought for and obtained passage, as a new State representative, for a concealed-carry permit. So we now have concealed-carry because of that first shooting incident in Killeen.

But this administration didn't learn anything when they called that shooting workplace violence, didn't learn anything about reporting potential threats, and so more people died at Fort Hood.

I think it is time, Mr. Speaker, that we said, you know what?

Military Members, men and women who are putting your lives at risk for us, with whom we have entrusted weapons of mass destruction, we are going to trust you with a firearm. So if you will get a permit, and they show they are qualified—I know my 4 years in the Army, every year we had to go qualify—make sure they are qualified with the firearm they have, and let them carry firearms.

I started to put it in the bill that I drafted, that they would be concealed, but I think we should leave that to the

commanders. So we, just as I was coming over here, got the draft from legislative counsel and will be filing it this week.

It is a bill to authorize qualified members of the Armed Forces to carry firearms on military bases and installations, and for other purposes. And this act may be cited as the Save Our Soldiers Act, or the SOS Act.

It does apply, would apply to all soldiers, sailors, airmen, Marines, Coast Guard. It applies to all of our uniformed military. And it says, in general, any qualified member of the Armed Forces may carry a firearm on a military base or installation. Then it goes through to set forth how you go about applying for the permit to do that.

If we can trust them with weapons of mass destruction, we ought to be able to trust them with a pistol, with a firearm.

□ 1945

So, Mr. Speaker, I hope that this gets legs and that we will get this passed through the House with widespread bipartisan support. Especially in this election year, people seem to be more acutely attentive to what their constituents think, so that is why I know it would be a bipartisanly-passed bill if we will bring it up this year and then send it to the Senate.

Our friend from Nevada, Senator REID, may not want to bring it up; but then if he won't bring it up, then the only other alternative would be for voters to turn out members of Mr. REID's party, so he wouldn't be the Majority Leader.

Then we could get someone who would bring that bill to the floor, so that we don't have another attack at Fort Hood or another Navy Yard or somewhere else and have to go: Gee, what could we have done?

Some of the rest of us would repeat, for the umpteenth time: you should let people who are qualified to carry firearms carry firearms.

We have seen, over and over, killers go to where they know firearms are prohibited, like the Colorado shooter going to a theater farther away than one close because those that were closer allowed firearms to be carried inside.

It would be terrific if we could do that for our military, and I know there are some commanders who take the nod from our Commander in Chief and say: oh, we don't think that is a good idea.

But it is a good idea. It is something we should do, and it is time we moved in that direction.

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

THE HUDSON RIVER SCHOOL OF PAINTING

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

ognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) for 30 minutes.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, since my election to the United States House of Representatives in 1988, I have been immensely proud to be a part of New York's congressional delegation.

My colleagues from New York and I—both Democratic and Republican—have united many times to fight for causes that are critical for our State. In the wake of terrible tragedies, like September 11, 2001, and, most recently, Hurricane Sandy, we have come together to perform our most important duties as Members of Congress, which is our obligation to do what is best for the people of New York.

It is important, though, that we don't solely band together in times of tragedy; rather we must also gather in celebration of the people and occasions that make our Empire State a great State. That is why I am delighted to rise today in recognition of the Hudson River School of painters, the first school of art indigenous to the United States.

The Hudson River runs through my district and the districts of many of my colleagues, some of whom will be speaking here today as well; and we are very, very proud of that river and proud of what it represents.

The Hudson River School of Art is comprised of a group of 19th century painters, including Thomas Cole, Frederic Edwin Church, Asher Brown Durand, Jasper Francis Cropsey, Sanford Robinson Gifford, Albert Bierstadt, John Frederick Kensett, George Inness, Worthington Whittredge, and Thomas Moran.

Today, these artists' paintings can be found in the United States Capitol, the National Gallery of Art, and the State Department, as well as the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York City, the Art Institute of Chicago, and the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston.

Next to me are portraits of two of the Hudson River School's most celebrated painters, Jasper Francis Cropsey and Thomas Cole, the father of the Hudson River School.

Now, the artist who did these sculptures is Greg Wyatt, my friend who is with us today, whose primary medium of artistic expression is cast bronze, and I would like for everybody to see these because they are truly magnificent and represent the greatness of our State and the greatness of the Hudson River.

On the third easel—right here—is Cropsey's 1860 masterpiece "Autumn on the Hudson." It is truly beautiful, just as this portrait shows.

As its name suggests, some of the Hudson River School's most notable works portray the majesty of New York's Hudson River Valley. However, the Hudson River painters capture the grandeur of a variety of New York's national treasures, and, again, I am proud to represent part of the Hudson Valley.

From the Hudson Valley's lushness in Durand's "The Beeches," to the maj-

esty of the Catskills in Gifford's "A Gorge in the Mountains," to the tranquility of the ocean in Kensett's "Eaton's Neck, Long Island," the Hudson River School brilliantly encapsulated New York's diverse, yet unparalleled beauty.

I rise today not only to celebrate the Hudson River School's contributions to America's artistic canon, but also to the environment they so beautifully immortalize.

Hudson River School paintings helped Americans across the Nation understand the natural magnificence found across distant corners of the U.S. This understanding, in turn, helped nurture the idea that such magnificence ought to be preserved for future generations.

This idea culminated in 1916 with the creation of the National Park System and persisted into the 1960s when an environmentalist used Hudson River School paintings to demonstrate the need for legislation, such as the Clean Air Act and the Clean Water Act, to protect America's stunning resources.

How glad we are that this Congress passed those laws. It follows then that the Hudson River School illustrates not only what art can do for the individual spirit, but also for the health of the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the residents of New York and the United States might gain an appreciation for the Hudson River School and its tremendous impact on our Nation and its culture. To help show our appreciation, I have introduced House Resolution 480, honoring the Hudson River School painters for their contributions to the United States.

As a New Yorker, I am truly grateful to these artists for immortalizing the pristine beauty of New York's past. In the forthcoming speeches, my colleagues from New York will highlight their own appreciation for the Hudson River School and its invaluable contributions to our Nation.

I want to also add, Mr. Speaker, that we have a number of people who have journeyed here from New York to celebrate these contributions and witness this Special Order.

Among those is our distinguished former colleague, the gentleman from New York, Congressman Maurice Hinchey, my good friend. I welcome Maurice, his wife, and his daughter back to Washington and all the people here today, including Greg Wyatt, Barnabas McHenry, and so many other wonderful people.

I now yield to my colleague from New York (Mr. TONKO).

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening in recognition of the accomplishments of the painters that are so prominent that are part of the Hudson River School of painting, and I do want to thank our colleague, Representative ENGEL, the gentleman from New York, for hosting this Special Order on the House floor to honor the 19th century Hudson River School of painting.