

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I am on the floor today because I believe that Congress must put an end to the waste of American lives and taxpayer dollars overseas.

Recently, President Obama requested \$500 million to train and arm Syrian rebels. In his editorial, "Congress Can Stop Obama's Ramp Up to War," Pat Buchanan made an excellent point, saying:

Before Congress takes up his proposal, both Houses should demand that Obama explain exactly where he gets the constitutional authority to plunge us into what the President himself calls "somebody else's civil war."

Buchanan goes on to comment:

Syria has not attacked us. Syria does not threaten us. Why are we joining a jihad to overthrow the Syrian Government?

Mr. Speaker, Iraq is another country in which America has again become involved to the detriment of our best interests.

A former commandant of the Marine Corps, who has been my adviser for the past 6 years, stated in a recent email to me, "We should not put boots on the ground." He went on to say that the situation in Iraq is "a Middle East issue that needs a Middle East solution," not more American troops.

Unfortunately, there are currently 750 American boots on the ground in Iraq, with authorization from the President for up to 770 in the future.

As our involvement in Iraq escalates, I am reminded of another important point made by Pat Buchanan:

It is astonishing that Republicans who threaten to impeach Obama for usurping authority at home remain silent as he prepares to usurp the war powers—to march us into Syria and back into Iraq.

Last August, Americans rose as one to tell Congress to deny Obama any authority to attack Syria. Are Republicans now prepared to sit mute as Obama takes us into two new Middle East wars on his own authority?

Mr. Speaker, Marine Lieutenant General Greg Newbold wrote an insightful editorial for *Time* in April 2006, titled, "Why Iraq Was a Mistake." From 2000 until 2002, General Newbold was director of operations for the Joint Chiefs of Staff and describes himself as "a witness and therefore a party to the actions that led us to the invasion of Iraq—an unnecessary war."

In closing, I would like to quote a paragraph from General Newbold's editorial regarding the distortion of intelligence that drew America into the Iraq war in the first place:

In 1971, the rock group The Who released the antiwar war anthem, titled, "Won't Get Fooled Again." To us, its lyrics evoked a feeling that we must never again stand by quietly while those ignorant of and casual about war lead us into another one and then mismanage the conduct of it.

Never again, we thought, would our military's senior leaders remain silent as American troops were marched off to an ill-considered engagement. It's 35 years later, and the judgment is in: The Who had it wrong. We have been fooled again.

Those are sad, sad words. We have been fooled again.

Mr. Speaker, we in Congress have the responsibility, based on the Constitution, to never get fooled again, but too many times we do not uphold our constitutional rights. I believe the words of Pat Buchanan and Greg Newbold articulate the many reasons that no President should bypass Congress and the Constitution to send our military into combat.

Mr. Speaker, before closing, I have a photograph from the Greensboro News-Record. Here we go again in setting up our men and women in uniform that possibly could get killed in a foreign country. Mr. Speaker, this is a group of Army soldiers bringing a flag-draped coffin off of a plane.

Please, God, don't let us forget that those in uniform are our children, and we must protect them by meeting our constitutional responsibility.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I will ask God to please bless our men and women in uniform, please bless the families of our men and women in uniform, and please, God, continue to bless America.

FOOD INSECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of summer food security programs for America's children because, unlike Congress, hunger doesn't take a summer vacation.

Today, in the United States, food insecurity is persistent and rampant. We are one of the richest and most powerful Nations in the world, yet one in five households with children experience food insecurity each year.

Any American suffering from hunger is cause for concern, but it is especially troubling to think that so many American children lying in bed at night are struggling to sleep because they are hungry.

Thankfully, most children in America who aren't able to get adequate sustenance at home are provided meals for free or at a reduced rate during the school year. In fact, 21 million children nationwide rely on free or reduced-price meals during the school year, and 825,000 of those children are from my State of Illinois.

But while we have worked hard to ensure our children are fed during the school year, we often overlook the fact that many of these same children lack access to these meals during the summer months. Of the many children who receive free or reduced-price lunches during the school year, only 14 percent currently access meals during the summer. This is why the USDA's Summer Food Service Program is so important.

As Members of Congress, it is imperative that we support and promote these programs so families who need help during the summer months can take advantage of them.

Recently, I had the opportunity to visit a Summer Food Service Program

in my district with the Greater Chicago Food Depository and No Kid Hungry Illinois. I was able to see firsthand how the program is benefiting children in Illinois and across the country. These programs are working and making a positive difference for our local families.

Take, for example, the story of Maria and her husband from Chicago Heights. Maria works part-time at a laundromat while her husband works full-time in a lumberyard. These two hardworking Americans are doing all they can to provide for their children. But times are still tough and food is more and more expensive. To help pick up the slack, Maria and her children visit the Lunch Bus.

The Lunch Bus is a great program that not only provides lunch for low-income children during the summer, but also provides a safe place for those children to play and meet other kids. There are families all over America like Maria's family that work hard every day to provide for their children; but oftentimes, despite their hard work, difficult circumstances cause them to come just short.

We in this Congress have a responsibility to stand up for these hardworking families and to ensure no child in America goes to bed hungry. That is why I am a proud cosponsor of the bipartisan Summer Meals Act, which will expand the USDA summer nutrition program to help more children across this country access quality meals during the summer months.

Rather than slashing these funds, we need to focus on positive steps we can take to end hunger across the country. The best way we can reduce the amount of Federal Government spending on food nutrition programs is by supporting legislation that creates jobs and helps families earn a living wage.

Moving forward, it is incumbent on all of us to promote summer food nutrition programs and to ensure that the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act, which expires next year, is reauthorized at sufficient levels.

□ 1015

As I said, Mr. Speaker, hunger does not take a summer break, and neither should we when it comes to taking care of America's children.

I will do all I can to make sure these children have access to nutritious meals all year round, and I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do the same.

STRATEGIC ENERGY POLICY—UTILIZING NATURAL GAS AT HOME AND ABROAD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in a dramatic shift from just a short time ago, the United States is reducing its dependence on

foreign sources of energy. It has the opportunity to become a major force in the international energy market. It is being made possible through the development of our domestic energy resources, namely the expansion of unconventional resources, such as shale gas and oil.

Through remarkable innovations, the U.S. has been able to access oil and gas from shale formations that were previously inaccessible or uneconomical to produce. As a result, we have quickly moved from energy dependence and a weaker footing to energy abundance and strategic leverage both domestically and abroad.

At a time when the economy has not recovered at an acceptable pace, gas production in particular areas, such as the Marcellus shale in Pennsylvania, have provided a key source of economic relief and job creation. As a result of the Marcellus, Pennsylvanians and Americans across the country are benefiting from lower heating costs, businesses are able to produce goods more efficiently, and manufacturers are looking to relocate to the United States to create products, support economic expansion, and grow jobs that were previously headed overseas.

But, Mr. Speaker, if we are to sustain the same level of growth and expansion, policymakers must make smart choices for the future so that we support rather than hinder this opportunity. To start, we must continue to expand gas utilization domestically.

The Marcellus shale, for example, has changed where, in the United States, gas is transported and utilized and how it is transported from region to region. This reconfiguration requires new infrastructure, including pipelines for transmission and transport and new processing facilities, and this all requires long-term planning and investment.

Additionally, because the domestic production of natural gas is far surpassing U.S. demand, most economists agree that a modest expansion of natural gas exports would serve to stabilize domestic prices and supply, which is critical to sustaining the rapid growth in the industry that we have witnessed. Furthermore, each gas export terminal is a multibillion-dollar investment that creates construction jobs in addition to the more permanent positions within the natural gas value chain. That means jobs for steelworkers, turbine manufacturers, pipefitters, and others, which will help communities across the country.

Given the situation in Ukraine and events in the Middle East, we are reminded that our energy resources can also provide significant geopolitical benefits. Exporting even a small amount of these plentiful resources overseas to our allies will strengthen not only our domestic economy but our national security. President Obama, Secretary of State Kerry, and leaders of the European Union have clearly stated that additional global supplies

of natural gas will benefit Europe and our strategic partners. For this reason, I am proud to say the House recently passed H.R. 6, the Domestic Prosperity and Global Freedom Act. This bipartisan bill would streamline the permitting process for natural gas exports.

In February 2014, the United States Department of Commerce reported that our national trade deficit for 2013 improved by \$63.1 billion in comparison to 2012. However, despite this improvement, figures for the month of April are now showing that imports are increasing and that exports are decreasing, and as a result, the trade deficit is now at a 2-year high. With the U.S. Department of Commerce having acknowledged that increased petroleum exports are a key factor that can contribute to a lower trade deficit, it makes perfect sense to allow additional LNG exports in order to further reduce the trade deficit. In addition to its economic and international benefits, natural gas has helped to significantly lower our carbon emissions, which decreased by 3.8 percent last year in the United States, down to 1994 levels, according to government data.

The United States needs a smart energy policy that enables the citizens to continue receiving the benefits of abundant, low-cost energy, but also one that utilizes these resources as a tool of strategic leverage to improve our environment and shape international events to the benefit of America and its allies.

Mr. Speaker, we have made a smart and strategic decision in the House with the passage of H.R. 6. Let's continue to advance similar policies to further leverage the many benefits of our domestic energy resources. Let's do it for the good of the American people and our Nation's strategic competitiveness in the world.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Export-Import Bank, the official export credit agency of the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, it is so frustrating to see this normally bipartisan effort to support the American economy get hijacked. I would bet, Mr. Speaker, that this bill could pass on suspension, that two-thirds of this House would be willing to reauthorize the Ex-Im Bank, if we were to put it to a vote on this floor—but no. Instead, we are forced, once again, to yield to a minority of the majority—the Tea Party—which demands the decapitation of an economic development and jobs creator giant—the United States of America's Export-Import Bank.

Why is this? Is it because the Bank doesn't work? No. It is an example of how government effectively could partner with the private sector. The Bank puts U.S. exporters on equal footing

when foreign competitors have foreign export aid, and it bridges the gaps in the private market.

The reality is that, in the global marketplace, our competitors are aggressively using their export banks. Milwaukee, Wisconsin, which is my district, is still very much a manufacturing economy—the second in the Nation relying on this sector. Every day, workers in Milwaukee compete against foreign workers with extensive and aggressive foreign export credit agency backing.

Today, the United States Export-Import Bank supports an estimated 205,000 export-related jobs in the United States. My fellow Republican Wisconsin colleagues—Representative RYAN and Representative SENSENBRENNER—not long ago urged Bank financing because “all steps should be taken to reinvigorate the economy and bring jobs to the United States.” With higher than average unemployment in Milwaukee, the need for the Bank has not changed. Not only does the Bank support jobs, but it makes a profit from its operation and pays funds back to the U.S. taxpayers—\$5 billion since 1990.

Opponents don't acknowledge that. Instead, they call for gimmick accounting, or, as my CPA and tax attorney colleague Representative BRAD SHERMAN calls it, “fairytale value” accounting. Further, opponents claim that the Bank exclusively helps big corporations, yet 90 percent of the Bank's activities help small business, and that number is on the rise. Just ask Apple Steel Rule Die in Milwaukee, a company you have never heard of because it is not a big company. In fact, new reports from The Brookings Institution show that the failure to reauthorize the Bank hurts small and medium-sized businesses the most.

I hear Delta testify against the Ex-Im Bank, and then, hypocritically, turn around and use foreign export credit agencies for their fleet. By the way, Delta would qualify to use more foreign export credit to buy foreign-made Airbus aircraft if Congress does not reauthorize the Export-Import Bank. For real, colleagues, do any of us believe that Delta will turn down foreign support to buy an Airbus plane or a plane from the Chinese? Come on now. I have got a bridge to sell you.

Opponents also say the Bank only supports 2 percent of exports. Exactly. The Bank's mission is limited. It does not compete when private financing is available. The Export-Import Bank's fees are higher than U.S. commercial bank fees. It is not in competition. It works in concert with banks here in the United States. This is further proof that the Bank is working. However, that 2 percent still supports a lot of economic activity in Milwaukee. When I am back in my district, unions and businesses—large and small—are hand in hand, saying reauthorize the Export-Import Bank.