

the martial strength and national will that will certainly be needed in the years ahead.

First, I believe the President is correct to order selected air strikes in tactical support of resistance forces where they are actively engaged against the IS. Where we can turn the tide of battle in these engagements, we must. And the immediate destruction of oil fields under IS control is vital to reduce the resources that it is currently converting to cash.

Second, it is appropriate to take immediate, significant, and focused retaliatory strikes against the Islamic State in response to specific acts that it commits against American interests. This is the Reagan model in Libya, and it worked.

Third, the direct threat posed to the United States by the IS is not on Syrian or Iraqi soil, but on American soil. The Islamic State has been explicit in declaring its intention to insert a Fifth Column within our borders and wage jihad on Americans. For far too long we have ignored the threat posed by a wide open southern border, lax enforcement on the northern border, and non-enforcement of visa overstay. And this neglect needs to stop now. We must secure our borders, enforce the time limits on visas, and change the law to revoke the passports of any American who takes up arms for the Islamic State.

Fourth, we must recognize that the improving world situation that justified reducing military spending in recent years has now reversed, and so must our priorities. The world is now becoming more dangerous and unstable, and our military budget must be adjusted to meet that growing danger. Our Nation's weakened fiscal condition requires a comprehensive review of our spending priorities as a matter of vital national security.

Fifth, we must assure that our only reliable ally in the Middle East, Israel, has all the equipment and supplies and assistance it may need in coming years, and that it will have the unqualified support of the United States when it must take action for its own security.

Mr. Speaker, Islamic fascism is now advancing into a vacuum that many past blunders have created, the worst of them being to underestimate the terrible demands that war requires. These are mistakes we can no longer afford to make. Confronting the rise of European fascism in the 1930s, Churchill counseled measured resistance where possible, while undertaking utmost martial preparation. That advice lights our path that we must take today.

ANYTHING FOR FOOTBALL

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

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, "anything for football." It is a phrase I have

heard a lot recently, that we should ignore what happens off the field for the sake of the sport.

This creed used to mean something positive. Vince Lombardi, the namesake of the Super Bowl trophy, said he viewed his players as "neither black nor white, but Packer green." "Anything for football" meant he had to fight racism and homophobia off the field to coach the best football team possible.

Recently, "anything for football" has been used to justify an organization that perpetuates violence and sexism rather than teamwork, family, and sport. Instead of fighting injustice off the field for the sake of the sport, the NFL chooses deafening silence. We are told to ignore what happens on the sidelines, in disciplinary boardrooms, or behind elevator doors, all for the sport. Well, I refuse to ignore what is happening.

The NFL thinks they can play by their own rules. As we saw in the Ray Rice case, these decisions go all the way to the top. Commissioner Roger Goodell is judge and jury, yet he is also the one who stands to profit by seeing these cases hushed and unpunished.

Since he took over the NFL in 2006, there have been 56 arrests of players for domestic violence. The NFL has been inconsistent in its response, ranging from counseling, to single game suspensions, to conditional fines, to nothing at all.

After a player is arrested, more often than not they continue to play, even if there is clear evidence for their violent crime. When a police officer is being investigated for domestic violence, they are suspended with pay until the investigation ends. If the NFL is serious about zero tolerance, why shouldn't it play by the same rules?

Of the 56 football players arrested for domestic violence, they only saw a combined 13 games suspended. The NFL would rather see these players on the field than take a stance against violence. After all, "anything for football." I say, "Bench them."

Ray McDonald of the San Francisco 49ers was arrested at a party after his fiancée, who was 10 weeks pregnant, showed police bruises on her neck and arms. He has played the last 2 weeks. Why hasn't he been benched? "Anything for football." I am an avid 49er fan, but this is disgusting. I expect more from my 49ers.

Greg Hardy of the Carolina Panthers was arrested and convicted for assaulting his former girlfriend. The woman said Hardy picked her up, choked her, threw her on a couch covered in assault rifles and shotguns, and bragged to her that they were loaded. He is appealing his case and still playing. Why hasn't he been benched? "Anything for football."

Ray Rice of the Baltimore Ravens, who was indicted in March with assaulting his then-fiancée, has finally received a punishment befitting his crime, but only after a video of the ac-

tual event was released. After he was indicted, his coach, John Harbaugh, said, "He will be part of our team. Support the person without condoning the action." Why wasn't he benched from the start? "Anything for football."

The list goes on and on. Like the military and universities, the NFL thinks they can enforce their own justice internally. They have failed. The NFL should change their policies so that these players stay on the bench while they are investigated.

This week I will send a letter to Commissioner Goodell and team owners, calling on them to immediately change their domestic violence policy. When a player is arrested for domestic violence, the NFL should immediately suspend the player and continue to pay them until a preponderance of the evidence determines their guilt or innocence. This suspension should continue until the end of court proceedings, when the NFL can then apply its player policy. It is what we do with police officers. This is what zero tolerance looks like.

Two-thirds of all Americans watch the NFL. Let us work together to put an end to the NFL's inaction. Lombardi didn't just think we could fight racism through football. He said, "People who work together will win, whether it be against complex football defenses or the problems of modern society."

It may be difficult, but we deserve sports that show the best in our society. After all, "anything for football."

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 4194. An act to provide for the elimination or modification of Federal reporting requirements.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1214. An act to require the purchase of domestically made flags of the United States of America for use by the Federal Government.

S. 2117. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to change the default investment fund under the Thrift Savings Plan, and for other purposes.

S. 2440. An act to expand and extend the program to improve permit coordination by the Bureau of Land Management, and for other purposes.

S. 2511. An act to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to clarify the definition of substantial cessation of operations.

S. 2539. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize certain programs relating to traumatic brain injury and to trauma research.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 106-286, the Chair, on behalf of the President of the

Senate, and after consultation with the Majority Leader, reappoints the following Members to serve on the Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China:

The Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) vice the Senator from Montana (Mr. Baucus).

ONLY CONGRESS DECLARES WAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the plan that has been put forward by the President. As you, Mr. Speaker, just noted a few moments ago, it is a small portion of a larger and, what I believe to be, fundamentally flawed plan.

I say that for many different reasons, one of which is the simple reality that body bags from a far off battle or from a far off war don't return to Washington, D.C. They return to congressional districts and States across this country. It is for that very reason that the Founding Fathers believed so strongly in Congress having the authority, and the sole authority, for the declaration of war.

I mean, I think it is important to look to what James Wilson, who happened to be one of the biggest advocates for a strong Presidency, said to his own State delegation back in 1787. He said on the importance of congressional authority with regard to war:

This system will not hurry us into war. It is calculated to guard against it. It will not be in the power of a single man or a single body of men to involve us in such distress, for the important power of declaring war is vested at the legislative level at large.

George Washington said this:

The Constitution vests the power of declaring war in Congress. Therefore, no offensive expedition of importance can be undertaken until after they shall have deliberated upon the subject and authorized such a measure.

James Madison said this:

The power to declare war, including the power of judging the causes of war, is fully and exclusively vested in the legislature. The Executive has no right in any case to decide the question whether there is or is not cause for declaring war.

I think our Founding Fathers had it right, and if we move forward today without stopping and waiting and insisting upon the President's constitutional duty to come before this body and ask for a declaration of war, I think we are making a mistake.

I would say, secondly, that I think we are making a mistake because the news of today is that General Dempsey now says if the plan doesn't work out, he would in fact recommend American ground troops there in this crisis in the Middle East. I think that that is telling. Because if you stop and think about it, is America the only group that is expected to suffer through the ravages of war with regard to boots on the ground in this instant if General Dempsey's call is right?

Think about this. There have been 6,600 American deaths there in that part of the world in recent history. There have been more than 50,000 soldiers that have returned with life-altering wounds. I mean, their lives are changed forever, and yet we can't get a real firm commitment out of allies there in the Middle East as to what they will or won't do with regard to ground troops.

So if it is that big a threat, why is it that allies in that part of the world are not making real and substantial commitments with regard to what they will or won't do with regard to ground troops?

Thirdly, I would say what we are doing is we are signing up for an open-ended commitment, maybe a 5- or a 10- or a 15- or a 20-year commitment, without legal authority to do so. The administration is resting solely on the 2001 authorizing language, which was to President Bush, in the wake of 9/11, for pursuing perpetrators of 9/11.

And yet in this instance what they are saying is, well, no, no, that gives us authority for the next 10, 15, 20 years. That is not the case. Congress authorized for that action. I think it is a misreading of the law to move forward as they have.

Finally, I would make this point. The Bible says, "Be hot, be cold, but don't be lukewarm." And I think this plan is predicated on lukewarm. I have some colleagues who say we need to commit ground troops; we need firmer involvement. I have others who say we don't need to do anything at all. And we are splitting it right down the middle. Let's bomb a bit and let's arm "moderate rebels" and we see how that works.

We have a snapshot of how that works because just this spring 1,000 ISIS soldiers routed two divisions of Iraqis, about 30,000 folks, in no time. Mind you, these are the same folks that American taxpayers spent \$25 billion training and equipping. We equipped about 200,000 of them. It has not worked well.

I think we need to pause, first, for constitutional reasons; second, for legal authority reasons; and third, for a flawed strategy that is based on lukewarm. We have that chance today, and I would beg of my colleagues to do so.

STRENGTHEN THE ECONOMY

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

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, our number one priority should always be strengthening our economy and expanding job growth and opportunity.

That is why I launched the "Brad At Your Business" initiative, to hear firsthand about the opportunities and challenges facing the businesses in my district.

So far I have visited more than 80 companies, speaking with owners, managers, and employees about their aspi-

rations and needs for achieving success. I have spoken with some of the largest companies in our country, but also to small- and medium-sized businesses; second-, third-, and fourth-generation family firms, startups, advanced manufacturing companies, retail, and service firms.

Throughout these visits, I have heard several recurring themes, including concerns about our growing skills gap, our aging infrastructure, the need to reform our broken immigration system, and the need to modernize our Tax Code to successfully compete in a global economy.

These conversations have subsequently led to concrete actions, such as introducing the AMERICA Works Act and the LEARN Act, that will help better match worker training programs to specific employer needs.

If we are to successfully lead a resurgence of the U.S. economy, we need more collaboration between our business owners, workers, and elected officials.

Only by working together can we reignite social mobility, rebuild the ladders of opportunity, and achieve a more inclusive prosperity for all Americans.

MORE DEBATE NEEDED ON WAR VOTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is 10:40, September 17, 2014. And for me, this is an historic event, because I will be able to tell my grandkids and those who would listen that on the eve of the House of Representatives taking a vote that would expand the war powers of the President of the United States, that I stood in the well of the House talking to a House that was void of any Member of the House of Representatives.

I make this point not so much to indicate the importance of anything I might say this morning, but because I really think that the whole country should be concerned about the gravity and importance of the vote that we take today, which in my 44 years I cannot think of any vote that is more important and certainly more historic.

It goes unchallenged that the vote today would expose more members of the military to bodily harm. It is clear that the administration has called this a war on ISIS or ISIL. It is abundantly clear that the threat to our national security is subject to a whole lot of debate. And while I may not have the answer to whether or not there is a threat, to me, I cannot think of anything more important than the 435 Members of the House and the 100 Members of the other body, at least before we vote, to be able to debate this issue.

I intend to vote against the amendment that would include an expansion of our military venture, which means