

might I say, civil laws as well. Because in a civil law, there is punishment; under immigration laws, you can be deported, a civil penalty.

So the President has said, in an executive order narrowly confined and reviewed by legal counsel and constitutional experts, supported by 136 scholars, that said that the President is within his rights to stop deportation of store owners and childcare workers and high-tech workers, and particularly the parents of children who are, in fact, citizen children of legal permanent residents.

It is important for the American people to understand, there is no illegality here. There is no runaway Presidency here. There is an understanding that those who have status—not immigration status, not pathway to citizenship, but a temporary reprieve—almost like a pardon, yet it is more temporary, those children who have been deferred, all he did was to say that it should be 3 years and not 2 years. He has asked that the ICE officers be made, if you will, equal to other Federal law enforcement officers. I celebrate that. That is exciting.

Let me quickly say this, Mr. Speaker. I want to travel in the pathway of Reverend Dr. Sharon Stanley-Rea about immigration reform. Her words are, as I paraphrase them: We should choose our values for people over politics, community safety over partisan strategies, family unity and welcome over fear of foreigners, and humanitarian compassion for children and families above rhetoric and rancor.

Let me finally, Mr. Speaker, say that I want to, again, as I move to another topic, thank and compliment the protesters that were peaceful regarding the issue of Ferguson. I ask for people to understand these young people. I went out in Houston in the march and applauded them for the peacefulness of their protests. Now they are asking for us as legislators and policymakers to make a difference in their lives. I publicly say on the floor of the House they will not be forgotten.

I want AJ to know, who is an intern in my office from St. Louis, shot in gang fights, that he will not be forgotten. The work that he is doing will be remembered.

I ask the National Association of Chiefs of Police to join us in a discussion on how we best walk through these concerns. There are many legislative initiatives, but it has to be a combination of law enforcement, policymakers, civil rights leaders.

And to our police unions, let me say there are none of us that have not worked and stood alongside of you.

I want to say in closing, Mr. Speaker, on H.R. 5550, that I hope my colleagues will join me in making sure that funding is not used by local communities through their various traffic stops to fund their communities.

Let's make a difference on Ferguson, Mr. Speaker.

IMMIGRATION

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

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, the issue is no longer whether Congress and the President can agree on immigration policy. The question is: Does a President have the power to alter our Nation's laws without passing new statutes?

Throughout the history of this great country, since the time of our Founding Fathers, the answer to this question has been "no." Yet President Obama struck a blow to the system of checks and balances that has been at the heart of our government and our Constitution for over 200 years.

The constitutionality of the President's actions are in question as the President has said time and time again that he does not have the constitutional authority to change our Nation's immigration laws on his own. From 2008 up to this August, at least 22 times the President has said that he couldn't ignore the laws on the books or create his own immigration laws.

In 2011, the President said: "America is a nation of laws, which means I, as the President, am obligated to enforce the law. I don't have a choice about that. That's part of my job."

"We've got three branches of government. Congress passes the law. The executive branch's job is to enforce and implement those laws. And then the judiciary has to interpret the laws. There are enough laws on the books by Congress that are very clear in terms of how we have to enforce our immigration system that for me to simply, through executive order, ignore those congressional mandates would not conform with my appropriate role as President."

Very well spoken, President Obama, the constitutional scholar that he is.

Mr. Speaker, this is the framework of our Nation's system of checks and balances. The Constitution is clear. It is clear that it is Congress' duty to write the laws, and it is the President's responsibility to enforce them.

While law enforcement agencies do have the inherent power to exercise prosecutorial discretion, the authority as to whether to enforce or not enforce the law against particular individuals, this power must be used judiciously and isn't an invitation to violate or ignore a law in its entirety. By granting amnesty to 5 million illegal immigrants, this administration has crossed the line from any justifiable use of its executive authority to a failure to faithfully execute the laws.

Mr. Speaker, whether you are a Democrat or a Republican, whether you agree or disagree with the President's policy on illegal immigrants and immigration, you cannot agree with the President's actions. No one is vested with the power to be both President and legislator.

INJUSTICE ANYWHERE IS A THREAT TO JUSTICE EVERYWHERE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to say thank you to the many persons who serve in law enforcement. They have difficult jobs, and they do their jobs well. I salute them.

I also salute the many persons who have been engaged in peaceful protests. What they have been attempting to do, I support. A peaceful protest is the best protest. Peaceful protests can make a difference in the lives of people. I know, because I stand here today because of peaceful protests.

I would like to continue what I started on yesterday, when I indicated that I would give a response today to a query that was made on Morning Joe. And I want my colleagues to know that I don't believe the query was made with malice aforethought. I think it was a genuine expression of concern. While intonations and expressions may connote otherwise to some, I believe that this is a question that should have been asked and that needs to be answered.

The question was: What is wrong with these people?—meaning three Members of Congress. What is wrong with these people that they would come to the well of the House of Representatives and they would hold their hands up? What is wrong with them?

Here is the answer, my dear brother: the same thing that was wrong with the Pilgrims and caused them to come to Plymouth Rock; the same thing that caused persons to throw tea into the Boston Harbor; the same thing that caused farmers to traverse the country on tractors and come to the United States Capitol to protest; the same thing that caused Rosa Parks to take a seat on a bus against the law; the same thing that caused Dr. King to march from Selma to Montgomery; the same thing that caused them to cross the Edmund Pettus Bridge on what is known as Bloody Sunday.

What is wrong with these people? They refuse to accept injustice. I refuse to accept injustice. What happened in Ferguson was an injustice. I refuse to accept injustice. Injustice anywhere is still a threat to justice everywhere. Dr. King was right. Injustice in Ferguson is a threat to justice in Houston, a threat to justice in Boston. Injustice anywhere is still a threat to justice everywhere.

And so I will continue to hold my hands up. I will continue to support those who engage in peaceful protest. Because holding one's hands up is an indication that you don't have anything that will be harmful, an indication that you are willing to move freely and give an opinion about something that you believe to be important. I think that this will symbolize a movement that will metamorphose far beyond the initial reason for it being developed. I am absolutely convinced

that this will not eviscerate, this will not evaporate, that it is not going to go away. It is going to become part of the protest movement.

I also want to note that what happened with the Rams players was a seminal moment, and I want to legitimize what they did. I have already said that I will have flags flown over the Capitol of the United States of America in each person's name.

Somebody is going to say, well, what about the people who may have committed a crime? Washington wasn't perfect, but we honored him. Jefferson wasn't perfect; we honor him. I am going to honor them for what they did at that seminal moment, just as I believe John Carlos and Tommie Smith should be honored for what they did when they held their hands up, indicating that they were protesting at the Olympics in '68.

So I, Mr. Speaker, am honored to have this opportunity today to indicate to the world, finally, that Dr. King was right when he said the truest measure of the person is not where the person stands in times of comfort and convenience, when everybody is patting you on the back, when everybody loves you, all your bills are paid, when things couldn't be better. The truest measure of the person is not where you stand in times of comfort and convenience. The truest measure of the person is where do you stand in times of challenge and controversy, when people are throwing the slings and arrows of life at you because you took a simple stand against injustice.

And it was injustice. I can explain it. I regret that I wasn't invited on the program to give my point of view. So I had to take to the floor of the House of Representatives to give what I would have given, if given the opportunity.

God bless you, Mr. Speaker.

THE 2015 NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the 2015 National Defense Authorization Act this House will consider later this week.

I am very proud to represent Fort Hood, the largest military base in the world. On November 5, 2009, 5 years ago, our community suffered an unthinkable tragedy when a radicalized Islamic extremist named Nidal Hassan opened fire on Fort Hood and fatally shot 15 men and women and 1 unborn child.

□ 1045

More than 30 others were wounded that day. Hasan's radicalization was well known to the FBI and the DOD as early as 2005. Hasan plotted with the known terrorist Anwar al-Awlaki, and he expressed his radical views to his classmates. This administration dismissed these concerns in the name of political correctness.

Five years ago the President promised to take care of the victims of this shooting, but shortly thereafter, he turned his back on them and declared the attack to be workplace violence. These victims and their families are still waiting for justice. Our communities have suffered long enough in the name of political correctness.

I am very proud that my colleagues in the House and Senator CORNYN and Senator CRUZ have not dropped the ball. We have stood for the Fort Hood community and the victims of this terrorist act even as the President failed to act. The House and Senate have agreed on this legislation that will allow these heroes to receive Purple Hearts and make them eligible for the benefits they deserve. The victims and their families will soon receive justice and closure. I am proud to support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Texas, ROGER WILLIAMS, my strong partner in this effort.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, Congressman JOHN CARTER, for his words, but, more importantly, for the many years of hard work he has put forth to care for the soldiers at Fort Hood.

Mr. Speaker, the 2009 terrorist attack at Fort Hood was an unthinkable tragedy. At that time it was the only story the news reported for days. Who was this murderer? Why did he do it? Could there be more like him? Are our other military installations at increased risk of this type of attack too? How did we not see this coming?

After the attacks on September 11 we asked these same questions. That is the difference between workplace violence and a terrorist attack. The Fort Hood shooter was not a disgruntled employee who took his anger out on his colleagues. He was a hate-filled, vengeful Islamic extremist who intentionally planned the horrendous terrorist attack and carried it out with no remorse.

Islamic extremists like him want us to fear them every single day. They want to hit us where it hurts—by taking innocent American lives and waging war on our military members. They have zero regard for human life—not even their own. That is why our response to terrorist attacks on American soil must be consistently tough, precise, and without hesitation.

At the memorial service honoring the lives of 13 Americans and one unborn, President Obama pledged to take care of those who were injured and the families of those killed. Yet 5 years later he has completely neglected them. Because President Obama designated the attack workplace violence, these men and women are not eligible to receive the benefits, treatment, and compensation that combat troops killed and injured in combat zones receive.

This negligence has caused many injured victims to have to pay their own out-of-pocket expenses for treatment, costing some hundreds of thousands of

dollars. One victim was pulled off Active Duty. Her paycheck went from \$1,400 a month to \$200 a month, and she lost her military health insurance. Others scrape by on disability payments but still have to pay the remainder of their medical bills from their own pocket. My friend Sergeant Alonso Lunsford was shot seven times but was turned away when he tried to check into an Army PTSD clinic due to the fact that he was not injured in combat.

This is not my definition of taking care of our Nation's heroes. However, the National Defense Authorization Act gives the Obama administration yet another opportunity to honor his pledge to provide for these men and women who were victims of terrorism.

This bicameral, bipartisan bill provides authorization for awarding the Purple Heart to members of the Armed Forces killed or wounded in a domestic attack inspired by a foreign terrorist organization. This is a commonsense solution that should have happened immediately following the attack at Fort Hood.

I want to thank Chairman MCKEON and again Congressman CARTER for their tireless work on behalf of their troops, and the many of my Texas colleagues who have joined the fight to restore justice. Just as we united as a country after these senseless attacks, let's once again unite as Americans to fight for the truth and honor of our fallen and demand justice for the victims of terrorism. In God we trust.

WAR POWERS OF CONGRESS AND THE PRESIDENT

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by associating myself with the remarks of my colleague, Mr. MCGOVERN.

It is difficult to fathom the daunting array of foreign policy challenges President Obama has had to weather since the start of his administration, challenges which are not the result of any misjudgment on his part.

Few modern leaders have had to contend with such an assortment of diverse global challenges, and the President deserves immense credit, which he rarely receives, for confronting them judiciously.

At nearly every turn, the 44th President has boldly promoted a global vision of peace and security defined by negotiation with allies and adversaries alike. The President's tenacious pursuit of a diplomatic solution to the Iranian nuclear program is the hallmark of that doctrine. Moreover, he has held fast to these principles in the face of Republican and even some Democrat charges of weakness, arrogance, and treachery.

I admire the President and appreciate what an unenviable position he is faced with in Iraq. However, like Mr.