the United States, it would cost the American taxpayers an additional $6.3 trillion over the next 50 years. At least 45 million foreigners, mostly poor, would be inserted into our society.

Is that going to make America a better place? Are the working people, the people who are part of the American family, going to be better off because of that? Absolutely not. And the voices of the American people need to be heard because we have people posturing as if they are doing a favor for the less fortunate by advocating this amnesty for illegal immigrants which would bring in tens of millions of more poor people from foreign countries into our country.

With our national debt approaching $18 trillion, a budget deficit of over half a trillion dollars and two unsustainable entitlement programs that we need in order to maintain some sort of security for the American people, Medicare and Social Security, these are currently on the road to bankruptcy, and if we bring in these millions more people, we can expect that the expenses of our government will shoot up trying to provide benefits for people who now—by the way, now after making them legal, they are entitled to those benefits.

Someone who is here legally is entitled to every benefit and protection as people who are here who were born here. And if we legalize the status of illegals, we are taking tens of millions of foreigners who are here illegally and granting them the rights to all those programs.

America cannot afford amnesty for those foreigners who are here illegally. We must take care of the needs of the American family, of American citizens, and of legal immigrants into our society who have joined our family. Their interests have to come first over the interests of—yes, and let me just say, there is no doubt that those people who are here illegally in our country, the vast, vast majority, 90 percent or more, are wonderful people.

We should not fool ourselves into thinking that we can somehow take care of all of the wonderful people in the world. We can't do it. As we try to do it and try to open up our borders even more than the 1 million legal immigrants that we have, we are going to attract even a bigger flood into our country which will put even more pressure on us. What we are doing in that case is hurting our fellow Americans.

Even if these people are wonderful people who come here legally and they are seeking opportunity, I am sorry, we can't take care of the whole world, and we can't tell the world that whatever good person comes here illegally we are eventually going to give them amnesty and they will be eligible for all our programs.

There is an argument about what are called the DREAMers, young people who were brought here by their parents. They didn't come here voluntarily. Their parents brought them here when they were 2 or 3. And now they don't have legal status. There are a lot of obstacles in their way. They want those obstacles removed. They want themselves to be legalized. But do you know what will happen if we do that, if we say that a young person going to school because they are young and they have been brought here by their parents, what is going to happen? What will be the message if we do that?

If we legalize the status of just the DREAMers, we are telling the people throughout the world, man, when you come here illegally to the United States, make sure you bring your children. We are telling people throughout the world, bring your children to this country so we can take care of the needs of your children.

We have needs of our own children in the United States of America. And they are wonderful kids out there that we care about, but we have to care about our own kids first. People who have come here legally have that right. They are part of our family. American citizens are part of our family. But the well-being of children from foreigners in various countries throughout the world has to be second on our list, down on our list, way down as compared to the well-being of our own people.

Yes, if we take care of the DREAMers, what is going to happen is we will be encouraging a mass flow of young people into our country. Younger people who are in school, we will have to take care of their education, et cetera. That is not right. You can't give the incentive to people to come here and expect that we are not going to have many, many more people coming here. We will have many more DREAMers coming here if we legalize the status of those who have been brought here illegally by their parents.

This issue continues to be presented as a humanitarian imperative, as something that without cost we could help these people among us. We can do that without cost? There is nothing without cost. We are being presented that we can have an amnesty as if it is not going to cost the American people. It is costing us right now. What we have done in the last 20 years to ignore this influx of illegals into our country has already caused great damage to the well-being and the standard of living of American workers at the lowest level.

People say they think they are appealing to Mexican Americans by being for amnesty for illegals. The hardest-hit community in America, perhaps the hardest-hit, and certainly minority communities, including Mexican Americans, they know where their jobs are going. They know when they have a job and an illegal comes across the border from whatever country, Asia or Mexico or Honduras or Ireland or wherever they are coming from, if they are taking the job of an American, the Mexican American community is the hardest-hit. Their education funds are the hardest-hit. Their neighborhoods are the hardest-hit.

That is why I believe that Americans of Mexican descent are patriots. They are part of the American family. And that is why I do not believe that they want to legalize the status of every illegal that has poured into our country. It hurts their families more than anyone.

So what we need to do now is make sure that as we discuss legalizing the status of illegals, of amnesty—they don't want to call it that, they want to call it comprehensive immigration reform—that we keep in mind these things could have a dramatic, negative impact on the well-being of American people. Whose side are we on? That is what you have got to ask.

What are the answers to this? Let me just say that solutions are not easy, but I would suggest there is a simple but not easy solution. We should make sure that anyone who comes here illegally does not get a job. We need to E-Verify all the jobs that are here in the United States to make sure they are not going to illegals, and they should be going to Americans or legal immigrants. And we should make sure that no illegal immigrant or the immigrant's family receives government benefits, whether it is health care or education.

I don't believe in deportation, actually. I think deportation is the wrong tactic. But unless you are going to—the President, obviously, didn't fulfill his obligation for deportation, but he didn't take another step that would then deter illegal immigration. The step to do it is no deportation. It is dehumanizing. No sweeps through people's community. But don't give jobs and benefits that belong to the American people to foreigners who are here illegally. That is the solution.

They will go home. They will go home in peace. They have our well wishes. But they are not going to have our jobs and our scarce resources that should be going to the American people.

□ 1415

I would ask my colleagues, as this discussion on the legalizing of illegal immigrants takes place, that we be honest with each other, and yes, that we be compassionate, but that our compassion is aimed at the American people and legal immigrants and not just compassion for those who come here illegally.

No matter how wonderful people these people are, we have to consider the American people first.

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

SECURITY THREATS TO THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I don't know if my dear friend from California

has seen this, but following up on his comments, this is part of the front page of the Army Times, April 28, and it says here:

Thousands more will be forced out; staff sergeants now on hit list.

It talks about the career killers, but because of the cuts to our military, we are forcing out thousands and thousands of patriots who wanted to make a career of the United States military. I, along with my friend from California, don't necessarily think it is a good idea to be saying: look, if you are illegally in the country, all you have to do is go displace yet another American patriot and take their job in the military, force them out into the civilian sector, where our United States military veterans have a much higher unemployment rate than the general population.

That is not a good idea. It is not fair to our patriots, and it should not be something that this Congress passes, to once again not only run out patriots who wanted to make the United States military a career, but force them out with illegal immigrants using their job, taking their jobs, forcing them into an unemployment sector, where their unemployment rates are so very high. They shouldn't be high.

People should be willing to hire veterans. They have phenomenal work ethics, or they wouldn't have been in the military, unless they got bumped out early for not working; but otherwise, from my 4 years in the Army, right after we turned to being a volunteer Army, it was a very difficult time. Our military was not appreciated.

I went through officer basic at Fort Riley, Kansas, and it was a standing order not to wear your uniform off post because of hatred for the military, and if you got caught by yourself in uniform, there might be a gang that would beat you up. It happened, so it was a standing order. You couldn't wear your uniform off post because of potential violence upon our military by American citizens.

It has blessed my heart to see America begin again to appreciate those who answer the call of their country, serve their country, and do so honorably and well in the United States military, which should result in our promises to our military and promises that, to some, helped induce them into the military of good health care, good veterans' care.

Now, I was only in 4 years and don't have a disability. I have never been provided any VA assistance or health care, but for those who need it, deserve it, were promised it, we can't be having a socialized medicine system that ends up being like most socialized medicine systems become; and the way ObamaCare will eventually lead this country into being, with regard to health care, you get put on lists.

Socialized medicine doesn't go broke because you get put on lists, and you die waiting for your procedure in sufficient numbers, at least we have people die who won't get the procedure, or perhaps they need a hip or a knee, pacemaker, or whatever it is, they don't get them because they are having to wait in line.

We shouldn't do that to our Nation. We should repeal ObamaCare outright before it takes us there, but for the sake of this country, we can't continue betraying our veterans and not ensuring that they have the best health care that is available.

If VA clinics or hospitals aren't doing the trick, let's give them a card that lets them walk into any health care facility in the Nation and get the best care we have got, and let's keep our promise to them that we will take care of that.

My dear friend, Andrew C. McCarthy, has an article out in National Review Online today. He posted it at 4 a.m. I know Andy is up that time in the morning because, sometimes, we exchange emails at that time in the morning.

He is a brilliant lawyer, constitutional scholar, historian, and a patriot himself, who was the lead prosecutor in ensuring that the planner, the one most responsible for the first World Trade Center bombing in 1993, when President Bill Clinton was in office, he made sure he was convicted.

If one actually looks at comments by the brother of that al Qaeda leader, you find references to his brother saying: hey, you know, there is violence, there is going to be a lot more violence against the U.S., but I will be glad to help negotiate this thing if we can get release of The Blind Sheikh.

Morsi, who became president of Egypt, a Muslim brother, he made clear, before he was even elected, that he wanted to secure the release of The Blind Sheikh who plotted, planned, carried out the first bombing of the World Trade Center, which we can be thankful that it didn't result in more death and more damage.

We should have learned a lesson from that. We didn't learn it. We continued, under the Clinton administration, to treat that like it was some civilian crime, instead of what it actually was, an act of war. As an act of war, it should have stirred more of a response.

So perhaps there was someone in the White House after the World Trade Center was bombed in 1993, who wondered out loud within the White House: well, what difference at this point does it make why they bombed the World Trade Center or what we might have done to provide more security? What difference at this point does it make?

Because perhaps, if that kind of thinking were not in the White House during the 1990s, perhaps we could have looked more closely at the causes of the 1993 World Trade Center bombing and looked more closely at the forces behind it and determined, wow, this is really a group that is at war with the United States, radical Islamists have been at war with the United States since 1979.

We just didn't know it. There was a war going on, but it was one-sided because the other side, the United States, didn't know there was a war, so they weren't fighting a war. They just kept retreating.

In 1979, an act of war occurred in an attack against our embassy. The man, the Ayatollah Khomeini, radical Islamist who became the head of Iran, that President Jimmy Carter welcomed as a man of peace, that one of the top advisers right now in our Homeland Security Department spoke up for as a featured speaker at the Ayatollah Khomeini man of vision ceremony that was held some years back in this country.

Now, this featured speaker on behalf of the man of vision, the Ayatollah Khomeini, he is advising the Homeland Security Department; not only that, the FBI in 2011 gave him their highest civilian award. Some people do not understand there is still a war going on. Some in this administration and some in the Senate and some in the House may refuse to recognize it, but there is still a war going on.

Mr. McCarthy writes:

Here is the main point: The rioting at the American embassy in Cairo was not about the anti-Muslim video. As argued here repeatedly, the Obama administration's ''Blame the Video'' story was a fraudulent explanation for the September 11, 2012, rioting in Cairo every bit as much as it was a fraudulent explanation for the massacre in Benghazi several hours later.

Once you grasp this well-hidden fact, the Obama administration's dereliction of duty in connection with Benghazi become much easier to see, but let's begin with Jay Carney's performance in Wednesday's exchange with the White House press corps, a new low in insulting the intelligence of the American people.

Mr. Carney was grilled about just-released emails which corroborate what many of us have been arguing all along: ''Blame the Video'' was an Obama administration crafted lie, through and through. It was intended, in the stretch run of the 2012 campaign, to obscure the facts that (a) the President's foreign policy of empowering Islamic supremacists contributed directly and materially to the Benghazi massacre; (b) the President's reckless stationing of American government personnel in Benghazi and his shocking failure to provide sufficient protection for them were driven by a political-campaign imperative to portray the Obama Libya policy as a success—and, again, they invited the jihadist violence that killed our ambassador and three other Americans; and (c) far from being ''decimated,'' as the President repeatedly claimed during the campaign (and continued to claim even after the September 11 violence in Egypt and Libya), al Qaeda and its allied jihadists remained a driving force of anti-American violence in Muslim countries—indeed, they had been strengthened by the President's pro-Islamist policies.

The explosive emails that have surfaced thanks to the perseverance of Judicial Watch make explicit what has long been obvious: Susan Rice, the President's confidant and ambassador to the U.N., was strategically chosen to peddle the administration's ''Blame the Video'' fairy tale to the American people in appearances on five different national television broadcasts the Sunday after the massacre. She was coached about what to say by other members of the President's inner circle. One of the emails refers

expressly to a ''prep call'' that Ambassador Rice had with several administration officials on late Saturday afternoon right before her Sunday show appearances.

□ 1430

The tangled web of deception spun by the administration has previously included an effort to distance the White House (i.e., the President) from Rice's mendacious TV performances. Thus, Carney was in the unenviable position Wednesday of trying to explain the ''prep call'' email, as well as other messages that illuminate the Obama White House's deep involvement in coaching Rice. The emails manifest that Rice's performances were campaign appearances, not the good-faith effort of a public official to inform the American people about an act of war against our country. Her instructions were ''to underscore that these protests are rooted in an Internet video, and not a broader failure of policy,'' and ''to reinforce the President and administration's strength and steadiness in dealing with difficult challenges.''

Carney risibly claimed that the ''prep call'' was ''not about Benghazi.'' Instead, according to him, it was ''about the protests around the Muslim world.''

Two points must be made about this.

The first involves the administration's blatant lying. Benghazi was the only reason Rice was on the Sunday shows. If the massacre had not happened, there would not have been an extraordinary administration offering of one top Obama official to five different television networks to address a calamity that had happened a few days before.

Moreover, as is well known to anyone who has ever been involved in government presentations to the media, to Congress, to courts, and other fact-finding bodies, the official who will be doing the presentation is put through a ''murder board'' process. This is a free-wheeling session in which the questions likely to be asked at the presentation are posed, and potential answers—especially to tough questions—are proposed, discussed, and massaged. The suggestion that Rice, less than 24 hours before being grilled by high-profile media figures, was being prepped on something totally separate and apart from the incident that was the sole reason for her appearance is so far-fetched it is amazing that Carney thought he could make it fly.

The second point brings us full circle to Egypt.

Why would Carney claim, with a straight face, that Rice was being prepped ''about protests around the Muslim world?'' Because other than Benghazi, the ''protest around the Muslim world'' that Americans know about is the rioting, not protest, the rioting at the U.S. Embassy in Cairo a few hours before the Benghazi siege. When Benghazi comes up, the administration—President Obama, Hillary Clinton, Susan Rice, Jay Carney, et al.—love to talk about the Cairo protests. Why? Because the media—and, thus, the public—have bought, hook, line, and sinker, the fraudulent claim that those ''protests'' were over the anti-Muslim video. Obama & Co. shrewdly calculate that if you buy ''Blame the Video'' as the explanation for Cairo, it becomes much more plausible that you will accept the ''Blame the Video'' as the explanation for Benghazi; or, at the very least, you will give Obama officials the benefit of the doubt that they could truly have believed the video triggered Benghazi, despite a mountain of evidence to the contrary.

You see, the Benghazi fraud hinges on the success of the Cairo fraud. If you are hoodwinked by the latter, they have a much better chance of getting away with the former.

But the ''Blame the Video'' is every bit as much a deception when it comes to Cairo.

Thanks to President Obama's policy of supporting the Muslim Brotherhood and other Islamic supremacists in Egypt, post-Mubarak Cairo became a very hospitable place for jihadists. That included al Qaeda leaders, such as Mohammed Zawahiri, brother of al Qaeda emir Ayman Zawahiri; and leaders of Gama'a al-Islamiyya, the Islamic group, the terrorist organization that was led by The Blind Sheikh, Omar Abdel-Rahman, the terrorist I convicted in 1995 for running the jihadist cell that bombed the World Trade Center and plotted to bomb other New York City landmarks.

In the weeks before September 11, 2012, these jihadists plotted to attack the U.S. Embassy in Cairo. In fact, The Blind Sheikh's son threatened a 1979 Iran-style raid on the embassy. Americans would be taken hostage to ransom for The Blind Sheikh's release from American prison, where he is serving a life sentence thanks to Andy McCarthy. Other jihadists threatened to burn the embassy to the ground, a threat that was reported in the Egyptian press the day before the September 11 ''protests.''

The State Department knew there was going to be trouble at the embassy on September 11, the 11th anniversary of al Qaeda's mass murder of nearly 3,000 Americans. It was well known that things could get very ugly. When they did, it would become very obvious to Americans that President Obama had not decimated al Qaeda as he was claiming on the campaign trail. Even worse, it would be painfully evident that his pro-Muslim Brotherhood policies had actually enhanced al Qaeda's capacity to attack the United States in Egypt.

The State Department also knew about the obscure anti-Muslim video. Few Egyptians, if any, had seen or heard about it, but it had been denounced by the Grand Mufti in Cairo on September 9. Still, the stir it caused was minor, at best. As Tom Joscelyn has elaborated, the Cairo rioting was driven by the jihadists who were agitating for The Blind Sheikh's release and who had been threatening for weeks to raid and torch our embassy. And indeed, they did storm it, replace the American flag with the jihadist black flag, and set fires around the embassy complex.

It is important here, Mr. Speaker, to note that the al Qaeda leader's brother, Zawahiri's brother, he was out there even after the attack on Benghazi's consulate, basically saying: Hey, there could be more rioting, more trouble, unless you work with me, and let's get The Blind Sheikh released and then we can avoid future violence. Amidst all that is what Andrew McCarthy is pointing out, claiming it was all about a video.

In his article, McCarthy says:

Nevertheless, before the rioting began but when they knew there was going to be trouble, State Department officials at the embassy began tweeting out condemnations of the video while ignoring the real sources of the threat: the resurgence of jihadists in Muslim Brotherhood-governed Egypt, the continuing demand for The Blind Sheikh's release (which underscored the jihadists' influence), and the very real danger that jihadists would attack the embassy (which demonstrated that al Qaeda was anything but ''decimated'').

The transparent purpose of the State Department's shrieking over the video was to create the illusion that any security problems at the embassy—violent rioting minimized as mere ''protests''—were actually attributable to the anti-Muslim video, not to President Obama's policies and patent failure to quell al Qaeda.

Because there was a kernel of truth to the video story, and because the American media had abdicated their responsibility to promote the predominant causes of anti-Americanism in Egypt, journalists and the public have uncritically accepted the notion—a false notion—that the video caused the Cairo rioting. That acceptance is key to the administration's ''Blame the Video'' farce in connection with the lethal attack in Benghazi.

At about 10 p.m. Washington time on the night of September 11—after they knew our Ambassador to Libya had been murdered and while the siege of Benghazi still raged—Secretary of State Clinton and President Obama spoke on the telephone. Shortly afterwards, the State Department issued a statement from Secretary Hillary Clinton blaming the video for the atrocity in Benghazi. That was the beginning of the fraud's Benghazi phase—the phase Susan Rice was prepped to peddle on nationwide television. But it wasn't the beginning of the fraud.

Secretary Clinton's minions at the State Department had started spinning the video fraud hours earlier in Egypt. The sooner Americans grasp that, the sooner they will comprehend the breathtaking depth of the President's Benghazi coverup.

Today, our Oversight Committee was having a hearing to see a retired general on the verge of tears finally coming forward, who was with AFRICOM. He knew what was going on, he knew the truth, and he could not remain silent; and so he came forward and said: Yes, there was really much more we could have done.

Mr. Speaker, I hope and pray that all of those who were part of the

AFRICOM intelligence community will find courage from the general coming forward—some I know that have left our intelligence service and gone on to good civilian jobs. He has broken the ice. They can come forward now. I hope, Mr. Speaker, they get the message. He has come forward, the ice is broken, you won't be the first should be the message.

All of the hostility—I mean, when I have an intelligence officer, former intelligence officer, tell me—when I ask, ''Where have you been?''—''I have been scared.'' I said, ''You have never been scared of anything.''

''I have been scared since 9/12.''

All of those who have been forced to remain silent, I hope they will come forward.

A mom with a son in our country's service had told me after 9/12 about where her son was and what he was doing. So I called him, and it took a long time to get hold of him. He wasn't forthcoming. His mom told me yesterday, or this week, that he'll be out of the U.S. service before long and he wants to talk and come clean. I hope more will start coming clean on the strength of this retired general's courage.

But in the remaining minutes, it should not be lost that today is the National Day of Prayer. For some that still are not convinced at what is at war here, we simply need to look at a statement from Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, the mastermind who is at Guantanamo. I am grateful to President Obama that he has kept him there. He is a threat to the world, and particularly the United States. He was the mastermind behind 9/11.

In the pleading he prepared himself on page 4—this has been declassified so anybody can find it on the Internet—he says:

> We do not possess your military might, not your nuclear weapons. Nevertheless, we fight you with the almighty God. So, if our act of jihad and our fighting with you caused fear and terror, then many thanks to God, because it is him that has thrown fear into your hearts, which resulted in your infidelity, paganism, and your statement that God had a son and your trinity beliefs.

In other parts of the pleading he makes clear that Jews should be destroyed.

Here he makes clear, also, anyone who has a trinity belief believes that God had a son. Then he quotes from the Koran saying:

> Soon shall we cast terror into the hearts of the unbelievers, for that they joined companies with Allah, for which he has sent no authority; their place will be the fire; and evil is the home of the wrongdoers.

So he bases his belief that anyone who believes in a holy trinity should go to the fire and burn forever on that part of the Koran. Others have different interpretations, but radical Islamists believe that.

That is why I think it is immensely helpful to go back to after the Declaration of Independence but before the Constitution.

In 1783, the Treaty of Paris was entered in Paris, France, between American diplomats and British diplomats. Britain was the strongest country in the world, and our American diplomats knew they had to come up with something that was so important that the strongest nation in the world would not quickly come back after the new United States.

□ 1445

When I first saw this document, I was shocked at the first words, and then it made sense. The beginning of the treaty that forced Great Britain to acknowledge United States' independence starts with these words: ''in the name of the most holy and undivided Trinity.''

They believed in the Holy Trinity. They knew that Great Britain believed in the Holy Trinity. They wanted something under which the Brits would swear that would be so important that they would not dare break that oath. That is why it started, ''in the name of the most holy and undivided Trinity.'' That is where we got our start. That is why radical Islam is at war with us.

I hope and pray on this National Day of Prayer that we will humble ourselves, admit our wrongdoing, turn back to the God who has protected us—and He will bless our land.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. LEWIS (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for April 29 and 30.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 2, 2014, at noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

5504. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act in the Office of International Affairs; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5505. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a piece of proposed legislation to authorize the Export-Import Bank of the United States for the period of October 1, 2014 through September 30, 2019; to the Committee on Financial Services.

5506. A letter from the Acting Director, Directorate of Whistleblower Protection Programs, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Procedures for Handling Retaliation Complaints Under the Employee Protection Provision of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 [Docket Number: OSHA-2011-0540] (RIN: 1218-AC58) received April 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

5507. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Advisory Committee: Bone, Reproductive and Urologic Drugs Advisory Committee [Docket No.: FDA-2014-N-0355] received April 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5508. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Listing of Color Additives Exempt From Certification; Spirulina Extract [Docket No.: FDA-2012-C-0900] received April 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5509. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Department's final rule — NRC Assessment Program for a Medical Event or an Incident Occurring at a Medical Facility; Management Directive 8.10 [DT-14-07] received April 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5510. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting consistent with the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Pub. L. 107-243), the Authorization for the Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 1991 (Pub. L. 102-1), and in order to keep the Congress fully informed, a report prepared by the Department of State for the December 17, 2013 — February 14, 2014 reporting period including matters relating to post-liberation Iraq, pursuant to Public Law 107-243, section 4(a) (116 Stat. 1501); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5511. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting a notice of a proposed lease with the Government of United Arab Emirates (Transmittal No. 05-14) pursuant to Section 62(a) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5512. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Syria that was declared in Executive Order 13338 of May 11, 2004; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5513. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), and pursuant to Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the stabilization of Iraq that was declared in Executive Order 13303 of May 22, 2003; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5514. A letter from the HR Specialist, Small Business Administration, transmitting two reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5515. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters (Type certificate Previously Held By Eurocopter France) (Airbus Helicopters)