

Please join me in remembering Demi and in thanking the Cuccias for their commitment to ending dating violence.

#### SUMMER MEALS

(Ms. DUCKWORTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, more than 21 million children nationwide and 825,000 in Illinois rely on free or reduced-price meals during the school year. Unfortunately, we often forget that these children can go hungry in the summer months, when they are not in school.

Recently, I visited the Share Our Strength Summer Meal Site in Palatine, Illinois. They provide summer meals to students who normally receive reduced-price breakfasts and lunches during the school year. As someone who was on the school breakfast and school lunch program myself, I know that it is imperative we work to reduce poverty in Illinois and that no child should have to miss their meal.

But our local communities cannot fight hunger on their own. That is why I will be cosponsoring the bipartisan Summer Meals Act, which will expand the USDA Summer Nutrition Program to help more children access quality meals during the summer months.

I believe that in the wealthiest nation in the world, no American child should go hungry, and no parent should have to make the difficult decision between paying rent or paying for groceries. Let's work together to stand up for our children by supporting summer food nutrition programs.

#### THE GREAT WAR—100 YEARS AGO

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it was called the "war to end all wars." It began on July 28, 1914, 100 years ago today. It concluded in 1918, only after millions had died. It was just the first of many wars in the last century.

It was at a stalemate in the bloody, deadly trenches of Europe in 1917 when tenacious American Doughboys entered the battle. It was World War I.

Over 100,000 young American warriors never returned. One was President Teddy Roosevelt's son, Quentin. Thousands more died from the Spanish flu that they contracted.

The last American survivor was Frank Buckles, Jr., who lived to be 110. I got to know Buckles, as did many other Members of Congress. His dying wish was that a memorial be erected on the Mall to honor all the Americans who fought in the Great War: those that returned, those that returned with the wounds of war, and those that did not return.

It is unfortunate and tragic that a memorial has not been erected because, as it has been said, the worst casualty of war is to be forgotten.

And that is just the way it is.

#### THE ENGLISH LEARNING AND INNOVATION ACT

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

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of improving educational opportunities for a group of students that our education system has left behind, English language learners, or ELLs. Even though English language learners are the fastest-growing student population in the United States, they score far behind their English-speaking peers and, more likely than others, lack the resources needed to succeed in our schools.

That is why I am introducing the English Learning and Innovation Act, which will create two grant programs to enable schools to better provide a high-quality education to students working to learn English.

As someone who grew up in Miami, I recognize the value of students who don't yet speak English who are building a vibrant community together.

This bill has the support of a number of organizations, including the NEA, NCLR, and the National Association for Bilingual Education. I urge my colleagues to join me in taking action to strengthen English language education.

#### ISRAEL

(Mr. DESANTIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in defense of Israel and their defensive war against Hamas. Hamas is a terrorist organization. It is an arm of the Muslim Brotherhood. Its reason for existence is to destroy Israel. And Hamas desires a second Holocaust, although they won't acknowledge that the first happened. Hamas uses human shields to protect their weapons of terror.

They are not protesting occupation. Israel pulled completely out of the Gaza Strip, including uprooting more than 10,000 of their own citizens from their homes nearly 10 years ago.

Hamas has used the last decade to build a complex terrorist infrastructure, including tunnels designed solely to kill as many Israelis as possible. The U.S. should not be pressuring Israel to give Hamas breathing room. The complete defeat of Hamas and the dismantling of their terrorist infrastructure will be good for Israel's security and will be a decisive blow against international terrorism and the global jihad, which is good for our national security. We need to stand with Israel at this critical juncture.

#### RECOGNIZING MILITARY CHAPLAINS AND CAPTAIN MIKE CERULA

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to ad-

dress the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize our Nation's military chaplains. It was 239 years ago this week, at the behest of George Washington, that the Army Chaplain Corps was created by the Continental Congress. These brave men and women, who serve in each branch of the military and are from all faiths and denominations, have served in every one of our Nation's wars.

Today I would like to acknowledge one of our Nation's military chaplains, Captain Mike Cerula, who is from Waterford, Erie County, Pennsylvania, and is currently serving with the 82nd Airborne at Fort Bragg.

Chaplain Cerula deployed to Iraq in 2011 and was previously acting brigade chaplain for the 411th Engineer Brigade. Military chaplains, like Chaplain Cerula, represent some of the best this country has to offer.

A favorite Bible verse of Chaplain Cerula's is from James 5:16, and I quote: "The effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much."

We thank you, Chaplain Cerula, along with all of our military chaplains, for your service, your sacrifice, and most importantly, your work to support the spiritual strength and wellness of those who serve in uniform.

#### CONGRATULATING COACH RON REAM

(Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my old high school football coach, Ron Ream, who was recently voted into the Florida Athletic Coaches Association Hall of Fame. I can't think of a man more deserving of this recognition.

Coach Ream is going on his 38th season as the head coach of the Benjamin Buccaneers, my alma mater, making him the longest-tenured coach in Palm Beach County.

The true measure of his legacy though is not in the record books, in championship games, or in winning seasons, but in the values and lessons he imparts on the young men that go through his football program.

With his guidance, I was able to go on to play tight end at Syracuse University and then at Washington and Jefferson College.

Coach Ream not only helped me succeed on the field, but he showed me the traits of a great leader and the value of hard work, which helped me succeed professionally well into my adulthood. I know that I wouldn't be where I am today if it wasn't for Coach Ream.

Congratulations, Coach. And go Bucs.

#### CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WILLIAMS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES)

is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor and my privilege to coanchor today's CBC Special Order, along with my good friend and distinguished colleague from the Silver State, Representative STEVEN HORSFORD.

Every Monday when Congress is in session, we have an opportunity to speak directly to the American people for 60 minutes, the so-called CBC Hour of Power, where we get a chance to discuss an issue of relevance to this great country.

Today, the members of the Congressional Black Caucus are here to talk about halting the GOP march toward impeachment. We are going to address the troubling fact that the GOP appears to want to move forward this week with a lawsuit challenging the President's authority.

Now, I think most legal scholars will come to the conclusion that the House GOP lawsuit is baseless, it is frivolous, it is without merit. But the American people should pay attention to what is going to take place this week because the lawsuit is part of a continuing effort to delegitimize the President of the United States of America.

Now, I recognize, unfortunately, that there are some folks in this Chamber who believe that the President exceeded his authority on January 20, 2009, when he took the oath of office. And they have continued to accuse him of Presidential lawlessness ever since.

So during this Special Order hour, we are going to discuss the alleged lawlessness that has taken place, and I think we will be able to dismiss these allegations as nothing more than political broadsides leveled against a President who was elected by the people of this great country and reelected by the people of this great country.

And then we are also going to deal with the fact that there are so many other things that we, as a Congress, could be doing other than wasting taxpayer money related to a lawsuit that is sure to be thrown out of court. It is going to be thrown out because there is no congressional standing to sue the President. The Supreme Court has said this over and over again. There must be a particularized injury in order for one to get standing in Federal court, and Members of Congress lack it. That is what the Supreme Court has concluded.

There is also the issue of the political question doctrine: disputes between the two branches of government, the executive branch and the congressional legislative branch, are not to be resolved by the article III courts. They are to be

resolved by the normal governmental processes put in place by our Constitution.

We are joined today by the distinguished chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, who has been a tremendous leader of our CBC over the 113th Congress. It is now my honor to yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio, Congresswoman MARCIA FUDGE.

Ms. FUDGE. Thank you very, very much for yielding. I, again, want to thank my colleagues Congressmen JEFFRIES and HORSFORD for, again, leading the Congressional Black Caucus Special Order hour on an issue that should never have made it to this House floor. We shouldn't even have to consider halting the Republican leadership's irreverent and irresponsible march toward impeachment of the President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, since his election, the Republican leadership has shown nothing short of outright disrespect and disdain for the current President of the United States. In an effort to prevent the President from getting anything done during his first term or his second, the Republican leadership has completely ignored the democratic process. They prefer the obstruction and destruction of our Federal Government over working towards what is best for the American people.

Now Speaker BOEHNER and the Republicans are posed to waste millions of taxpayer dollars on a lawsuit arguing against something they asked him to do. They are claiming to take issue with the President because he instructed the delay of the Affordable Care Act's employer mandate.

If I remember correctly, Mr. Speaker, House Republicans wanted to do away with that provision, not to mention the entire ACA. The President delayed the employer mandate from taking effect for 1 year in an effort to hear and act on Republicans' more reasonable concerns. And now they are trying to punish him for it. This makes absolutely no sense. Instead of focusing on the many issues facing our Nation, the Republican leadership is choosing to pull another political stunt that wastes our time and our tax dollars.

Through consistent obstruction, dysfunction, and a steadfast unwillingness to serve the American people, the Republican leadership continues to abuse their power while they demean and disgrace this House. When will they recognize that by attempting to damage the President's leadership and his legacy, they are only hurting the people that we are all sworn to serve?

□ 1930

When will they wake up and realize that this job is not about political gamesmanship? It is about doing the work we are asked to do by our constituents, and that work is to propose and pass legislation that creates opportunity for the American people, not to distract them with the silliness that Republicans have stirred up since day one of this administration.

Their inaction and petty behavior has caused this to be the least productive Congress in the history of this Nation. The President should sue the Congress for not doing their job. Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve so much more than Republican leadership has given them. It is time to stop these ridiculous games and get to work on the real and serious business of this House.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the distinguished chairlady of the CBC. The people of America deserve a Congress that does the business of the people and that deals with real issues that impact working families, the middle class, senior citizens, the poor, the sick, and the afflicted.

Instead, we get an agenda from the majority in the House of Representatives that is all about delay, destruction, and delegitimization of the President of the United States of America. This is a frivolous lawsuit that lacks any basis in law or in fact, and we need to get beyond the political gamesmanship and get back to doing the business of the people.

I am pleased that we have been joined by the gentlewoman from the Badger State, Representative GWEN MOORE, a distinguished member of the Budget Committee. I am honored to serve with her, a champion for working families, the poor, and the middle class.

Ms. MOORE. Thank you so much, Representative JEFFRIES. I was wondering if I could ask you some questions. You certainly are an officer of the court, you are an attorney, and so I wanted to ask you to expand a little bit on your contention that constitutional experts and legal scholars have commented that the lawsuit will fail for the lack of standing, that there is no injury here that anyone could point to, and to explain that to me a little bit more.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Chief Justice Rehnquist, in an opinion in 1997, *Raines v. Byrd*, made the point that individual Members of Congress do not have standing to bring lawsuits in court if they cannot point to a particularized or personal injury, which the GOP in this case will not be able to do because the injury that is being claimed relates to policy disputes, such as the ACA and the employer mandate, such as DACA, and such as the welfare work requirements. These are broad policy disputes, not particularized injuries.

The Court went on to point out that, if one of the Members of Congress were to retire tomorrow, he would no longer have a general claim. The claim would be possessed by his successor instead.

The claimed injury—referring to policy disputes—attaches to the Member's seat, a seat which the Member holds as trustee for his constituents, not as a prerogative of personal power. In other words, there is no standing for Members of Congress to bring a lawsuit against the President in the context of a policy dispute.

Ms. MOORE. Well, thank you so much for that clarification, Mr. JEFFRIES. So this doesn't pass a constitutional test, it doesn't pass a legal test, and it doesn't even pass the laugh test because I can tell you, for folks who have pursued repeal of the Affordable Care Act for over 50 times, not wanting to implement the employer mandate, to turn around and say, we have been injured because the President delayed it, does not pass the laugh test.

I tell you I have been elected to and served as a public servant since 1988, and I can tell you that Republicans have continuously chastised Democrats for their frivolous lawsuits.

Republicans have continuously claimed that people who have been injured by products—consumer products—should have a cap on their claims, and yet, this frivolous lawsuit will cost hundreds of millions of dollars. So, while it may not have any standing, Mr. JEFFRIES, it certainly will cost hundreds of millions of dollars before that ruling will be made.

As a matter of fact, in this do-nothing Congress, we have, in fact, wasted money. It is not only that we wasted time; we are wasting money. Some examples of what we have done so far: we have spent \$79 million so far in over 50 attacks on the Affordable Care Act; we have even shut the government down for 24 billion—that is billion with a B—dollars. So how much is it going to cost us, once again, to promote this frivolous lawsuit?

We are in session—this is the last week of Congress—and are we going to talk about helping young people with unaffordable interest rates on student loans? No. Are we going to talk about extending and reauthorizing the Export-Import Bank to help manufacturers that are in my district? No.

Are we going to talk about providing unemployment compensation for people who are suffering with no income through no fault of their own because of the economy? No. Are we going to talk about raising the minimum wage? Are we going to talk about reauthorizing terrorism risk insurance? No.

Are we going to talk about whether or not we will provide moneys to humanely and adequately discuss the crises on the borders of our country, the influx of children escaping violence in their home country? No. No. No. We are going to sue the President of the United States. This does not pass the legal test, the constitutional test, and it does not pass the laugh test.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from Wisconsin for her very eloquent and sharp observations with respect to the lack of merit to the GOP lawsuit that they are going to proceed with this week.

We now have also been joined by the distinguished gentlewoman from California, Representative BARBARA LEE, another distinguished member of the Budget Committee, someone who is a voice for the voiceless, a champion for

the poor, and a fighter for the district that she represents in Congress.

Ms. LEE of California. Let me thank you, Congressman JEFFRIES, first of all, for your kind words and also for your continued leadership on this issue and so many other issues and especially in helping us, once again, beat the drum on behalf of the American people to make sure that people know exactly what the Republican Tea Party members are engaged in, in this body, so thank you very much to you and Congressman HORSFORD for this.

Also, I just want to say to Congresswoman FUDGE, our chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, I want to thank her for her diligent work as chair and especially in her continuing efforts to fight against the extreme ideology that deters us from the real work our constituents sent us here to do.

Once again, we are calling now tonight on Congress to get back to work putting Americans back to work. Rather than working together to create jobs, my Republican colleagues are pursuing a completely baseless lawsuit against President Obama at the expense of the American taxpayer. Mind you, never before has a sitting President been sued—not once.

This lawsuit is nothing more than a political ploy designed for those who really want impeachment without cost. These Tea Party Republicans are driving the Republican Party to become so extreme and too conservative for the American people.

To provide just one example, instead of voting on bipartisan immigration reform that would keep our families together, grow our economy, and enhance national security, the House has voted more than 50 times to repeal real health care reform that provides 54 million people with vital preventive health services like cancer screening.

We were sent here to Washington to help enhance the quality of life for the American people, not to engage in these lawsuits against the President for no reason.

We were sent to Washington to make America a better place, to create jobs, to grow the economy, to lift up the most vulnerable, and to build ladders of opportunity for the 46.5 million Americans, including 6 million children living in poverty today.

This lawsuit is another example of the unfounded, wasteful, and really unconscionable attacks on our President, who was twice elected by the American people. It does nothing to help the American people.

I tell you it is really troubling to see the extremists in the Republican Party marching down a path that is not based on fact, but, again, it is really nothing more than a political sideshow aimed at building its base, but it is a serious effort, I must say.

Remember when President Obama, Congressman JEFFRIES, when he was first elected, Senator MITCH MCCONNELL said that their goal was to make

President Obama a one-term President?

Well, they didn't accomplish their goal, so now, they are trying something else, and really, it is quite shameful, and the fact is that it is being funded with taxpayer dollars. This is nothing short than a violation of our constituents' trust. It is exactly like \$2.3 million spent to preserve discrimination during the DOMA case.

There is no constitutional or judicial precedent to adjudicate political disputes in the courts. We are ready, willing, and able to have a serious conversation about creating opportunities in the middle class for people who are fighting and aspiring to become part of the middle class, who are living on the edges and on the margins.

We are ready, we have been fighting for this, and we want to have some consensus with the Republicans, so we can move forward on this, rather than filing lawsuits to detract from the real work that the Republicans, once again, refuse to do.

Every day, I hear from my constituents about their real struggles. Too many of our constituents are looking for work. Too many are working full time, and they are still living on the edge in poverty. One in five American children still lives in poverty.

Too many people in my district and throughout the country face real challenges, challenges that Republicans continue to ignore while pursuing an ideologically motivated lawsuit.

It is about time we put these political ploys aside and get back to work. We need to stop this politically motivated, extreme, and disturbing march toward impeachment because that is where this is going, and hopefully, the public understands that, and we need to end the lawsuit. Instead, we need to pass comprehensive immigration reform and fix the broken system that is tearing families apart.

Also, we have got to pass the Voting Rights Act and protect the voting rights of all Americans. We need to put workers back to work and raise the minimum wage. We need to stop wasting taxpayer dollars on lawsuits and roll up our sleeves and get back to work. I believe that the American people are going to see right through this.

So I want to thank the Congressional Black Caucus, Congressmen HORSFORD and JEFFRIES for giving us the chance to really pull back the veil on what is really taking place with regard to this lawsuit.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from California. In the 113th Congress, we have had sequestration, \$85 billion in randomly spread-out cuts across our budget impacting the American economy. We have had a government shutdown that was unnecessary, unreasonable, and reckless; it cost us \$24 billion in lost economic productivity.

We have had a flirtation with the debt ceiling threatening the full faith and credit of the United States of

America. Now, we have got a frivolous lawsuit against the President of the United States, and it leads me to ask the question: Is there such a thing as a four-ring circus?

Let me now yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois, Representative ROBIN KELLY, my good friend and colleague from the freshman class, and a distinguished champion for her district.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Thank you, Congressman JEFFRIES, and I want to thank Congressman HORSFORD and the Congressional Black Caucus for this very, very important special hour.

It is absolutely ridiculous what Speaker BOEHNER and his party want to do. It is a waste of time, as many of us have said, a waste of time, a waste of taxpayers' money, and it looks like nothing but a sideshow.

There are so many things we should be working on, things like immigration reform, pay equality, helping to stop the gun violence in our urban areas, and unemployment insurance that people so desperately need.

Again, Speaker BOEHNER has shown that he does not pay attention to what the public wants and cares about. Ninety percent of the public thinks we should expand background checks.

Seventy-four percent of NRA members think we should expand background checks, but he is not bringing that bill to the floor, but he is going to bring this bill to the floor when there is not even the public appetite for a lawsuit.

□ 1945

Many Americans, quite frankly, don't feel the President has abused his power. Because we don't listen and we do things like this, it is no wonder only 8 percent of the public thinks that Congress is doing a good job.

From day one, there has been a great disrespect for this President like no other in history. Some of my colleagues are shocked that he won the first time and can't seem to get over that he won again the second time. Well, we need to get over it, and you need to get over it because there are so many issues we can be working on. We should be trying to improve the quality of life of our constituents, our country, and, frankly, of the world.

As a freshman, this is not what I came to Congress to vote on. I came to Congress, like I assume most of us did, to make a difference, to have a public agenda and not a personal agenda and not an attacking agenda, and an agenda where, even though we disagree, we still show respect for each other.

So I again applaud you, Congressman, for holding this Special Order. This is extremely important. I hope the public is truly paying attention because this is shameful and, as I said in the beginning, ridiculous.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Let me now yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE). Al-

though he does not have on one of his signature ties, he is the informal chair of the "bowtie caucus" and someone who has been a champion for the district he represents in New Jersey.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, to my colleagues, the gentleman from Nevada and the gentleman from New York who have done an outstanding job of managing these Special Orders, I would just like to thank them for the opportunity to come out and speak on this matter, this issue, this frivolous issue of where we find our Nation, a lack of respect for a man who won an election, as we have had elections throughout this Nation's history.

But we come to a point in history now where there is something wrong with this President. Something about him is illegitimate. Something about him just isn't right. Something about him has Members of this institution disrespecting him on a daily basis. He is the President of the United States of America, the greatest Nation in the world, the most powerful man in the world, and deserves the respect that we have given every other President that has held that office.

While millions of Americans are still out of work, my Republican colleagues are wasting time and money again. This time it is on a partisan lawsuit waged against the President and talk of impeachment. These actions are frivolous and shameful, and they pander to the most extreme wing of the Republican Party.

Every serious constitutional scholar sees the Republican lawsuit against the President for what it is: a desperate political stunt. And they have tried many times, as it was stated by colleagues prior to me, 50 times trying to repeal the law of the Nation, the Affordable Care Act—50 times. They will not stop at anything in order to have this President defeated and look as if he is a failure.

When has that been our history in this Nation? When has it come to that? This great democracy that we have has been a battle over ideas and a coming together in a bipartisan manner. You are over here, I am over there, but we come together on common issues to come to what is in the best interest of all Americans.

Why should a President have to have Members of this body or the Senate stand in front of him and say that "I can't even stand to look at you."

Where? Where in this Nation, the home of the free, the land of the brave, we hold these truths to be self-evident. Are they self-evident these days? Are they? The humanitarian issue we have at our border, I remember somewhere it saying, "give us your tired, your poor, your huddled masses." Now we say, "Stop the bus at the border and go back."

Where is this Nation going? It is a sad time in this country that we find ourselves at this point: Okay. This didn't work. We couldn't get him on that. His birth certificate, he showed

up with that. Okay. Scratch that. I know what. Let's repeal the Affordable Care Act. Try 50 times. Okay. That didn't work. Hey, I have a new one. Let's just sue him.

Ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Speaker, just because Republicans disagree with the President's policies or political persuasion doesn't give them the right to sue him. Even the Nation's most conservative Supreme Court Justices have said that the Congress cannot sue the President in these circumstances. Meanwhile, millions of Americans are out of work, including nearly 300,000 people in my home State of New Jersey. Instead of working together to create jobs, New Jerseyans are learning that the Republicans are at it again, wasting taxpayer time and money on frivolous lawsuits.

My constituents are outraged. But just because Republicans won't do their job, the President and Democrats in Congress will. I can remember prior to coming to Congress President Obama extending his hand on numerous occasions to work with the Congress, to work with the other side of the aisle, and he was just rebuffed.

Now that he says he will use executive privilege, executive order, now there is a problem once again. If you can't work with them, then he is going to have to go it alone and do what he has to do to make sure that this Nation has the things, the laws, to be, to continue to be the great Nation that it is. Democrats have a real jobs plan, the Make It In America plan, to put America back to work, to bring jobs back to our shores, to build roads and bridges, to create a better education system, and to lead the world in innovation.

My bill, the Green Jobs Act, is part of that plan and will expand access to capital for small businesses to create good-paying jobs in low-income communities.

We are ready to work. We are ready to work with this President. I think it is high time that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle say: Okay. We tried everything. There is one more thing to try—working with this President to move this Nation forward.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) for those very poignant observations.

I think, as you have pointed out, we are in a divided government context, and we understand there are going to be policy disagreements, but the objective should be to work toward finding common ground to improve the lives of those we were sent here to Washington to represent. Instead, we are in the midst of a campaign to continue to try to delegitimize the President.

It is over. The battle has been lost. The President was elected in 2008. He was reelected in 2012. It is time to put aside the political gamesmanship and figure out where we might be able to find common ground to advance an agenda that makes sense for the American people.

We said earlier that this lawsuit was a frivolous one, and I quoted Chief Justice Rehnquist, a leading conservative former Supreme Court Justice, as it relates to his position with respect to congressional standing. I now want to quote another Justice of the Supreme Court who said in an opinion he wrote just last year, *United States v. Windsor*:

Our Constitution rejects a system in which Congress and the Executive can pop immediately into court whenever the President implements a law in a manner that is not to Congress' liking.

That was an opinion, and that wasn't written by Ruth Bader Ginsburg. That wasn't an opinion written by Justice Sotomayor, although I have great respect for those two Justices from the great State of New York. Those words were written by Anton Scalia, one of the most conservative Justices in the history of the Supreme Court. You can't just pop into court because you have a policy disagreement with the President.

And so I think we have dealt with the issue of the frivolous nature of this lawsuit, the fact that we are wasting the time and the treasure of the American people on a political joyride that will ultimately crash and burn in an article III court. In the meantime, we are neglecting our constitutional responsibilities here in the House of Representatives to actually deal with issues that impact the American people. And to touch upon what some of those issues could be, let me now yield to the coanchor of this CBC Special Order, the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HORSFORD).

Mr. HORSFORD. Let me thank my good friend and the coanchor for this hour, the gentleman from the Empire State, Mr. JEFFRIES.

Every time we have the opportunity to come to this floor, it is a humbling experience. And to all of my colleagues, led by our chair, the Honorable Representative from the State of Ohio, the chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, MARCIA FUDGE, thank you for your leadership and for demanding that we have an opportunity to be heard in this very important Special Order hour. I want to thank all of my colleagues who have come here tonight.

Tonight, at some level, my heart is heavy because, as many of my colleagues have expressed tonight, we came to Congress to get things done on behalf of the American people and the constituents that we serve.

We understand, as Congressman JEFFRIES just indicated, that this is a divided government. As the minority, we have to work within this honorable institution to try to advance the issues that we feel are important, but what we do not believe is that the majority should be able to unilaterally obstruct a governmental process that is the foundation of our democracy as a nation.

□ 2000

So tonight, this is a very important discussion because later this week, if the Speaker and the majority House Republicans have their way, they will do for the first time in history something that has never been done, which is to sue the American President because they don't agree with him.

This lawsuit, the Speaker Boehner-House Republican lawsuit against the President, has been characterized by many. USA Today's editorial board said "it was a political sideshow." At a time when the American people are urging us to act on a number of important and serious and time-pressing matters, you, Mr. Speaker, and House Republicans are sacrificing precious taxpayer resources and time when we could be tackling a number of important issues that the American public want us to tackle.

Now, I just held a telephone town hall last week in my district. I had over 4,000 people on this telephone town hall. My district covers 52,000 square miles. It is a diverse district. Not everybody agrees with the President or his positions. But not one person on that call asked me to support you, Mr. Speaker, or the House Republicans in suing the President. In fact, many of them said, how is it that you have the authority to unilaterally act to obstruct this process and to deny the important issues that so many of us would like to have come before this body for an up or down vote? We understand that we are in the minority and we may not win, but in this democracy, the minority deserves to be heard.

Now, unfortunately, this body is about to take a 5-week recess. My constituents don't really understand how, after we have really accomplished very little, we can now take a "recess," and the thing that you want to act on this week is to sue the President. Well, that shouldn't be. We shouldn't be going on recess, we shouldn't be wasting taxpayer money or time on frivolous, baseless lawsuits, because we have plenty of work to do.

So my question, Mr. Speaker, is: Whose side are you on? Are you on the side of the majority of Americans who want us to jump-start the middle class, to maybe pass the Make It in America job creation agenda, or the infrastructure bills that are so desperately needed? Whose side are you on, Mr. Speaker, when Americans have demanded a raise so that they can have their wages keep up with the cost of living? Whose side are you on, Mr. Speaker, when you have already denied the extension of unemployment insurance benefits for over 3.5 million Americans since last December—33,800 Nevadans who are struggling, at no fault of their own, who need a bridge just to stay afloat? Whose side are you on? Are we going to honor our veterans and fix a broken VA system? Are we going to pass the reauthorization of the Voting Rights Act to ensure that our most sacred Democrat right, our right to vote, is protected?

I know you want to recess so you can run home and have elections, but people need to vote, and we need to make sure that that right to vote is protected. So we need to pass and reauthorize the Voting Rights Act. Why can't we bring that bill up this week, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker, whose side are you on when, overwhelmingly, the American public has asked us to pass comprehensive immigration reform, to secure our border, to actually put the necessary resources on the border, and to make sure that no other children are torn away from their mothers and their fathers?

So while House Democrats are working on these important issues, and many, many others, the American people just simply don't understand how it is that this week, of all weeks, the majority would decide in this House to spend precious time and resources suing the American President for the first time in history.

Instead of doing any of this, House Republicans are focused once again on partisan stunts that contribute nothing to the well-being of our Nation. Voting to sue the President is an insult to the hardworking American families who need this Congress to act, act on something, on anything, and to let us have an up-or-down vote.

Now, this lawsuit undermines what little remaining respect this House has left. So as new Members, we are pleading: give us our Congress back, let us work with our colleagues who want to work with us. There are Republicans who support some of these bills, but the leadership, the Speaker, and the House Republican leadership, won't let them. That is the truth.

Now, my colleague has talked about the fact that there is very little constitutional basis for this lawsuit. Let me just add a couple to those remarks. Constitutional law experts have weighed in. Laurence Tribe of Harvard University Law School described the lawsuit as a "wholly meritless attempt to invoke the jurisdiction of the Federal judiciary."

Charles Tiefer of the University of Baltimore Law School called the lawsuit an "embarrassing loser."

The whole process leading up to this lawsuit has been tainted by partisan tactics as well. Just last week, Ranking Member Representative LOUISE SLAUGHTER and other members of the Rules Committee introduced 11 amendments during markup of this baseless, unnecessary lawsuit against the President, and their only request was to allow more transparency and accountability if this were to go forward on how much money is being spent—taxpayer money, by the way—in funding this lawsuit.

So whose side are you on, Mr. Speaker, when you talk about fiscal responsibility and you won't even disclose or allow the rules of this vote to have a level of transparency or accountability?

Let me just highlight a few of the amendments that these Democrats proposed:

Requiring the House general counsel to disclose how much has been spent on the lawsuit each week;

Prohibiting the hiring of any law firms or consultants who lobby Congress, because if they lobby Congress for a living, Congress shouldn't also be paying them on the side;

Prohibiting the hiring of any law firm or consultants who lobby on the Affordable Care Act implementation, or who have any financial stake in implementation of the Affordable Care Act;

Requiring disclosure of all contracts with lawyers and consultants 10 days before they are approved, requiring disclosure of where taxpayer money paying for this frivolous lawsuit is coming from, and which programs and offices' budgets are being reduced to pay for it.

These were the commonsense amendments that House Democrats on the Rules Committee proposed, and on a party line vote 7-4, the House majority, the Republicans, denied these commonsense transparency and accountability measures to be included.

So what is the rush? It shows that the Rules Committee Republicans are not serious. They are not serious about making this a transparent process because they know it is nothing more than a waste of time and money. This is a stunt, but it is a stunt that has a price, and the American public deserves to know just how much this is going to cost.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the distinguished gentleman for his observations and for pointing out the many issues that we in the House of Representatives could be addressing this week to deal with quality of life concerns of the American people, but instead we have been forced to come to the floor of the House of Representatives this evening to talk about this frivolous lawsuit that, if the majority gets its way, will be authorized later on this week.

I also want to point out that there is this troubling undercurrent that has also taken shape in the House of Representatives and amongst the conservative entertainment complex related to the allegedly unlawful actions of the President in what many of us view as a "march toward impeachment."

Now, some are going to say: Well, this is a Democratic conspiracy to rile up certain parts of the country, that is why we are raising the impeachment question. No, let's just go to the Record.

The distinguished gentleman from the 17th Congressional District in Texas at a town hall meeting in September of 2013:

I look at the President, I think he's violated the Constitution, I think he's violated the law. I think he's abused his power, but at the end of the day you have to say if the House decides to impeach him, if the House had an impeachment vote, it would probably impeach the President.

Those are not my words. Those are the words of the gentleman from the

17th Congressional District of this House.

The distinguished gentleman from the Third Congressional District in Utah:

This is an administration embroiled in a scandal that they created.

I am not clear what the scandal is that is being referenced.

It's a coverup. I'm not saying impeachment is the end game, but it's a possibility, especially if they keep doing little to help us learn more.

I can go on and on, but you have got the distinguished gentleman from Iowa:

"From my standpoint, if the President"—referencing executive actions—"we need to bring impeachment hearings immediately before the House of Representatives."

These aren't our words. These are the words of people elected to the 113th Congress.

So that is why we are here to have a conversation with the American people. Do you think this is the issue that we should be debating and discussing as we are still trying to revive large segments of our economy, still struggling to recover from the aftermath of the Great Recession?

Now, this last statement from a member of the impeachment caucus here in the House of Representatives, the Congressman from Iowa, he referenced "executive actions."

Let's have a discussion about executive actions. This chart illustrates that President Obama actually has been a President in modern history who has been conservative in his approach with respect to executive actions. Upon entering his sixth year in office, President Obama issued 167 executive orders. As the chart illustrates, at this very same point, George W. Bush had issued 198 executive orders.

Where was the outrage when George Bush was engaging in his orgy of executive orders? Where was the outrage? Where was the outrage when President Ronald Reagan issued 381 executive orders, a pace that there is no way President Obama can match? It is just not clear to me where this is all coming from.

Let me now yield to the distinguished gentleman from Nevada and/or the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey for any parting observations.

Mr. HORSFORD. May I inquire to the Speaker how much time we have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 8 minutes remaining.

□ 2015

Mr. HORSFORD. To the gentleman from New York, as you indicated, this frivolous lawsuit really should not be entirely surprising, and we should not underestimate the lengths that the House Republicans are willing to take against this President.

This week, it is a vote to sue. After the recess that we shouldn't be taking, maybe it is impeachment proceedings,

so this is a very serious issue and one that I wish every Member of this body will take seriously because what the Speaker and the House Republicans are asking us to do is a direct affront to our constituents who elected us to do a job.

Republicans can disagree with the President. That is not shocking, nor is it inappropriate. There are plenty of differences that divide many of us here in Washington—many of them, needlessly so—but Republican opposition during this Presidency has hit historic levels.

Many of my colleagues this evening have talked about the obstruction that has occurred from the very day this President was being sworn in by those in the majority in this body who have attempted to block him.

I believe in an America that still can do good things and big things. I believe in an America that honors its institutions and respects them. I believe in the institutions of these offices, even when I may not agree with the person who holds that position, but what I cannot do is stand by as a Member of Congress, someone who is here to serve the 700,000 people from my district who elected me, and to allow the Speaker and House Republicans to tear down this institution. It is too honorable.

The work we are supposed to be doing is too great. It is significant to the lives of the people who are counting on us to do something that is important to their lives.

So, again, I ask, Mr. Speaker: Whose side are you on? Because there is nothing in this lawsuit that is going to create a job, educate a child, help a small business owner, address the issues of health care in this country, fix what is broken with immigration; there is nothing this week that you or the House Republicans are doing with this baseless lawsuit that is going to solve a problem.

In fact, it is going to create new problems—constitutional problems—and it is going to create a debt that this institution and future generations will have to cover.

So we are here, raising our voices against what we believe to be an affront to the integrity of this body as a whole and to bring a focus back to the issues the American people so desperately want this Congress to work on.

So we are here tonight. We will be here working and willing to work. We are willing to cancel our recess to stay here and do the American public's business because that is what they expect us to do.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the distinguished gentleman for those observations.

Under the House majority, the agenda has constituted the following: delay, destroy, defund, and delegitimize.

We just want to tackle issues relevant to the American people. Let's tackle the fact that America needs a raise. Let's tackle equal pay for equal



work. Let's tackle infrastructure funding. Let's tackle our broken immigration system. Let's tackle the fact that we have got a gun violence problem in America.

Let's address the fact that the Supreme Court invalidated portions of section 5 of the historic Voting Rights Act. Let's stop the political gamesmanship.

In the remaining time that we have, let me yield to a championed distinguished member of the Homeland Security Committee, as well as the Judiciary Committee, the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas, Representative SHEILA JACKSON LEE.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I want to thank the gentleman from New York.

I just want to take a moment to compliment both Mr. HORSFORD and Mr. JEFFRIES for this Special Order, among others. I could not imagine, as we end this session, to have a more important statement to the American people. We want to work, and in a few days, we will be voting on an action to sue the President of the United States.

Let me refer you to Justice Antonin Scalia, who has said in *United States v. Windsor*:

Our Constitution rejects a system in which Congress and the executive can pop immediately into court whenever the President implements a law in a manner that is not to Congress' liking.

Former Chief Justice William Rehnquist wrote that while some European countries allow one branch of government to sue another, that is obviously not the regime that our Constitution establishes.

Our Constitution contemplates a more restricted role for article III courts. In fact, our Constitution clearly states the separation of the three branches of the government: the judiciary, the legislature, and, of course, the executive branch of government. That is the way it is supposed to be structured.

Now, we come and find ourselves with the legislature trying to step into leading the executive. The President has made it very clear. What has he done wrong?

We just heard the Speaker of the House tell the President with respect to the unaccompanied children: you can handle it. Well, frankly, I would make the argument that you are right. There are executive powers, and so the basis upon which this lawsuit is about to be projected, to me, evidences that we have lost our way.

As my colleagues have said as I was walking onto the floor, we still have the extension of unemployment insurance, the raising of minimum wage, the implementation of the Affordable Care Act, and the fixing of the veterans health system, which I hope that we will be able to do this week. If not, we should stay here and fix it for our veterans.

The Constitution is clear, and I want to say those branches of government again: the judiciary, legislative, and

executive branches are separate. Scholars and conservative jurists have indicated that there is no reason for us to jump into court on the responsibilities of each particular branch.

Mr. Speaker, I would make the argument that this week is going to be 3 days of wasted time, and I know that there are people who disagree with the Affordable Care Act, immigration reform, the unaccompanied children—not one of those issues is attributable to the malfeasance of the President of the United States.

I don't know whether this is a substitute for impeachment, but I would make the argument that the President has committed nothing equal to impeachment, and this second class citizenship of a lawsuit certainly is inappropriate.

I believe the American people are much more interested in making sure that we follow what is good for them: creating jobs, protecting children, providing for education, and, Mr. Speaker, ending wars and fighting for what is right.

This is not the way the people of the United States value their principles to be misused. The executive, judiciary, and legislature are three separate branches. We are expected to do our separate duties.

I would, again, ask that we adhere to the Constitution by respecting these three separate branches of government. Let's do our job and provide for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to talk briefly about the GOP's march towards impeachment. But first let me make a distinction between impeachment and a lawsuit initiated by the House, qua House of Representatives.

Article II, Section 4 of the United States Constitution states: The President, Vice President and all civil Officers of the United States, shall be removed from Office on Impeachment for and Conviction of, Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors.

In any impeachment inquiry, the Members of this branch of government must confront some preliminary questions to determine whether an impeachment is appropriate in a given situation.

The first of these questions is whether the individual whose conduct is under scrutiny falls within the category of President, Vice President, or "civil Officers of the United States" such that he is vulnerable to impeachment.

One facet of this question in some cases is whether the resignation of the individual under scrutiny forecloses further impeachment proceedings against him.

A second preliminary question is whether the conduct involved constitutes "treason, bribery, or other high crimes or misdemeanors."

Now Mr. Speaker, whether we get to this point where we are actually considering impeachment of the President is a question that only the GOP Majority can answer. It appears that we are heading in that direction—even in the face of doubt from numerous experts as to whether the effort will succeed or not.

Indeed, it is a matter of historical fact that President Bush pushed this nation into a war

that had little to do with apprehending the terrorists of September 11, 2001; and weapons of mass destruction, "WMD's" have yet to be found.

House Democrats refused to impeach President Bush.

Let me state that again: "House Democrats refused to impeach President George W. Bush."

Now I wish to turn to the resolution which the GOP Majority intends to put before this body in a last-ditch effort to stir their base before November.

Former Solicitor General Walter Dellinger testified before the Rules Committee two weeks ago and had this to say about the potential lawsuit:

The House of Representatives lacks authority to bring such a suit. Because neither the Speaker nor even the House of Representatives has a legal concrete, particular and personal stake in the outcome of the proposed lawsuits, federal courts would have no authority to entertain such actions.

Passage of the proposed resolution does nothing to change that. If federal judges were to undertake to entertain suits brought by the legislature against the President or other federal officers for failing to administer statutes as the House desires, the result would be an unprecedented aggrandizement of the political power of the judiciary.

Such a radical liberalization of the role of unelected judges in matters previously entrusted to the elected branches of government should be rejected.

My colleagues on the other side argue that lawsuits by Congress to force the administration to enforce federal laws will prevent the president from exceeding his constitutional authority,

But the Supreme Court has constantly held that the exercise of executive discretion being taken by President Obama is within the president's powers under the Constitution.

The doctrine of standing is a mix of constitutional requirements, derived from the case or controversy provision in Article III, and prudential considerations, which are judicially created and can be modified by Congress.

The constitutionally based elements require that plaintiffs have suffered a personal injury-in-fact, which is actual, imminent, concrete and particularized. The injury must be fairly traceable to the defendant's conduct and likely to be redressed by the relief requested from the court.

#### CONSTITUTIONAL REQUIREMENTS

To satisfy the constitutional standing requirements in Article III, the Supreme Court imposes three requirements.

The plaintiff must first allege a personal injury-in-fact, which is actual or imminent, concrete, and particularized.

Second, the injury must be "fairly traceable to the defendant's allegedly unlawful conduct, and" third, the injury must be "likely to be redressed by the requested relief."

#### PRUDENTIAL REQUIREMENTS

In addition to the constitutional questions posed by the doctrine of standing, federal courts also follow a well-developed set of prudential principles that are relevant to a standing inquiry.

Similar to the constitutional requirements, these limits are "founded in concern about the proper—and properly limited—role of the courts in a democratic society," but are judicially created.

Unlike their constitutional counterparts, prudential standing requirements “can be modified or abrogated by Congress.”

If separation-of-powers principles require anything, it is that each branch must respect its constitutional role.

When a court issues a decision interpreting the Constitution or a federal law, the other branches must abide by the decision.

The Executive Branch’s ability to fulfill its obligation to comply with judicial decisions should not be hampered by a civil action by Congress pursuant to this bill as my amendment to H.R. 4138, the ENFORCE ACT made clear.

And Mr. Speaker, a basic respect for separation of powers should inform any discussion of a lawsuit from both a Constitutional standpoint and a purely pragmatic one.

In our Constitutional Democracy, taking care that the laws are executed faithfully is a multifaceted notion.

And it is a well-settled principle that our Constitution imposes restrictions on Congress’ legislative authority, so that the faithful execution of the Laws may present occasions where the President declines to enforce a congressionally enacted law, or delays such enforcement, because he must enforce the Constitution—which is the law of the land.

This resolution, like the bill we considered in the Judiciary Committee on which I serve and before this body, the H.R. 4138, The ENFORCE Act, has problems with standing, separation of powers, and allows broad powers of discretion incompatible with notions of due process.

The legislation would permit one House of Congress to file a lawsuit seeking declaratory and other relief to compel the President to faithfully execute the law.

These are critical problems. First, Congress is unlikely to be able to satisfy the requirements of Article III standing, which the Supreme Court has held that the party bringing suit have been personally injured by the challenged conduct.

In the wide array of circumstances incident and related to the Affordable Care Act in which the resolution would authorize a House of Congress to sue the president, that House would not have suffered any personal injury sufficient to satisfy Article III’s standing requirement in the absence of a complete nullification of any legislator’s votes.

Second, the resolution violates separation of powers principles by inappropriately having courts address political questions that are left to the other branches to decide.

And Mr. Speaker, I thought the Supreme Court had put this notion to rest as far back as *Baker v. Carr*, a case that hails from 1962. *Baker* stands for the proposition that courts are not equipped to adjudicate political questions—and that it is impossible to decide such questions without intruding on the ability of agencies to do their job.

Third, the resolution makes one House of Congress a general enforcement body able to direct the entire field of administrative action by bringing cases whenever such House deems a President’s action to constitute a policy of non-enforcement.

This bill attempts to use the notion of separation of powers to justify an unprecedented effort to ensure that the laws are enforced by the president—and I say one of the least creative ideas I have seen in some time.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to deliberate before we are at a bridge too far.

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

#### WHERE WILL THIS PRESIDENT’S LEADERSHIP TAKE US?

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

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, 30 years ago, Soviet Marshal Ogarkov announced that Korean Airlines Flight 7 had been “terminated.” The Soviets had shot down a civilian airliner, killing all 269 passengers aboard.

President Reagan immediately addressed the entire Nation about the tragedy and resolutely called for justice and for action. He then proceeded to accelerate work on America’s missile defense system, worked with Congress on the Reagan defense buildup, building relationships with European allies, and enforced strong sanctions that ultimately bankrupted and brought down the once unshakable Soviet Union.

Last week, Mr. Speaker, another civilian airliner, Flight MH17, with 298 innocent people aboard, was shot down by Russian-backed separatists. On that same day, in which the conflict in Israel also escalated to new heights, The New York Times reported President Barack Obama’s schedule as: “a cheeseburger with fries at the Charcoal Pit in Delaware, a speech about infrastructure, and two splashy fundraisers in New York City.”

Mr. Speaker, where would America be today if we had elected Barack Obama in 1980? Where will this President’s leadership take us tomorrow?

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

#### COPTIC CHRISTIANS IN EGYPT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENTIVOLIO) is recognized for the balance of the time as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, there are not that many people in this country that are aware of the persecution that Christians are facing in the Middle East. Some people have a vague idea, but they can’t identify the specific groups that are being targeted. Today, I want to talk about Coptic Christians in Egypt.

The Copts are the native Christians of Egypt. They trace their origins nearly all the way to the beginning of Christianity. At one point, they were the largest religious group in Egypt, but now represent a minority. However, they are currently the largest religious minority in the region.

I have quite a few Coptic Christians in my district in Michigan, and I al-

ways hear the same thing: their families, friends, and fellow Christians are facing serious persecution and violence, and many have questioned whether or not it is worth staying in Egypt.

They are a group whose history, culture, and language is rooted in Egypt. Over the last couple of years, they have faced an increasingly violent environment. For example, on January 1, 2011, over 20 Coptic Christians were killed when a bomb went off in front of the Church of St. Mark in Alexandria. Such a devastating attack sent shock waves through the Coptic community. The bombing was officially declared the work of a suicide bomber.

After President Morsi was removed from power last year, many had held out hope that life for Coptic Christians under a new regime would bring change, stability, and security. Under President Morsi, they were not treated as equals, and the Muslim Brotherhood was certainly not a friend.

In 2013, there was a wave of violence and destruction following the ousting of President Morsi. Christian churches were attacked and burned. However, the reality for Copts under their newest President isn’t much different.

I think there is a very serious question that needs to be asked: What role should the U.S. play in protecting religious and ethnic minorities in countries to which the United States gives sufficient and significant foreign aid?

The United States gives, on average, more than \$1.5 billion in aid to Egypt annually. The United States Commission on International Religious Freedom has recommended that Egypt be officially recognized as a Tier 1 Country of Particular Concern. However, the State Department has not made that distinction.

Last year, I introduced the Support Democracy in Egypt Act to suspend further delivery of F-16s and Abrams tanks to Egypt until further review, to ensure that they were promoting democracy and stability in the region. Even with a new government, after the coup that ousted President Morsi, there hasn’t been enough progress in Egypt.

I don’t think most Americans would be very appreciative to learn that their tax dollars are being sent to Egypt when that government continues to routinely persecute religious minorities, including Coptic Christians.

In the United States, the right to religious freedom is protected in our Constitution. It would seem to be in conflicts with our morals, values, and beliefs to be so supportive of regimes in Egypt that fail to protect the same rights for their citizens.

□ 2030

If we are helping to provide stability and security for the Egyptian state but not its most oppressed people, then, perhaps, we need to take a long look at our relationship with Egypt. Most Copts want the same things as Americans: the ability to practice their faith