where the Supreme Leader will see what is happening in Cuba and says: Hey, we can get away with that as well.

Both have serious consequences for our national security as other nations see that we lack the courage of our convictions, and they will be willing to test us. In fact, Nicolas Maduro after the prisoner exchange said, ''We will exchange Leopoldo Lopez,'' a human rights activist whom Nicolas Maduro has imprisoned in Venezuela, for one of the criminals in prison here in the United States. They want to test us; they want to see what they can get for holding innocents in prison.

Just look at the appeasements that this administration has made to Russia, to Iran, to North Korea. These rogue regimes will continue to act with impunity, and our allies have turned away from us because, instead of working with our allies, we have been appeasing our enemies.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like for this Congress to take a close look at that list of 53 prisoners and remember that even if that were a true list, which it is not, it is not about 53. It is about freedom for all political prisoners, some of whose names we will never know.

WE NEED A NEW AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, we are now in our 6th month of war against ISIS, and make no mistake about it, we are at war in Iraq, though I do not recall a debate or a vote in this Chamber authorizing that.

I would respectfully remind the President, who is well-versed in constitutional law, of something he already knows but appears unwilling to address: the executive is not permitted under the articles of the Constitution to unilaterally authorize military action in a situation that does not constitute an imminent threat.

There is no doubt that ISIS is a depraved and repugnant organization, but our intelligence community has repeatedly said it does not imminently threaten the United States. Even if that assessment were to change following the horror we witnessed in Paris, we would still need a clear authorization and a serious debate about yet another American war in Iraq.

I and several of my colleagues in both Chambers have been calling for such a debate since last August. In November, the President said he intended to work with the Congress to craft a new Authorization for Use of Military Force, or an AUMF, in the anti-ISIS campaign.

Before it adjourned last year, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations drafted and passed a new, if vague, AUMF against the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant.

Mr. Speaker, the 113th Congress abrogated its responsibility to acknowledge that the ongoing military campaign in Iraq and Syria cannot be sustained on the back of war powers notifications of two outdated AUMFs.

The start of this new Congress is a perfect time to actually do something about this urgent need by debating and voting on something required of us 6 months ago. Over 3,000 American troops have been deployed to retrain Iraqi Army brigades that will allegedly be the new and improved force to take over against ISIS.

The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff declined to say over the weekend how long this training would take, so the Prime Minister of Iraq volunteered a guess: 3 years. In 3 years, which seems awfully optimistic, Iraq may be able to rebuild and restructure its military.

Does this mean 3 more years of coalition airstrikes, if we even have a coalition by then? Does that mean 3 more years of military advisers to train forces that will never be ready? Does that mean 3 more years of American troops sent out to reoccupy those decrepit bases that served as a stark reminder of the last time—more than 10 years ago—we went to war in Iraq without a strategy?

Mr. Speaker, apparently, the reading of the Constitution on the House floor last week was gratuitous, since the Congress has no intention of following a key section of the Constitution. When it comes to war and peace, Mr. Speaker, the authority remains firmly with the Congress; yet we have sent our country's sons and daughters to war without a new bill, a serious debate, or a proper vote.

Where is our sense of priority, reading the Constitution or obeying it? Where is our sense of responsibility? We have already had 6 months of unilateral war against ISIS. Another 3 years is intolerable.

Mr. Speaker, it is up to you to invite the President to come up here and address this House, all 535 Members of Congress, to tell us what he needs and what he has decided is worth the sacrifice. It cannot be done, it should not be done, without an authorization from this Congress. To fail to do that is eroding to the very Constitution that we say we support in this House.

We have a civilian control of the military, not by one man, but by 535 Members of Congress. That is the way it is supposed to work. We need to have this debate now.

HELP FOR SMALL BUSINESSES

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

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, we were sent to Washington by our constituents to work together to encourage accountability, transparency, and limited government. Bigger government does not necessarily mean more responsive government, but it has come to mean more costly government.

When our small businesses and entrepreneurs, the backbone of our economy, are forced to divert resources to costly new mandates, it means less capital for growing their business, less capital to hire more employees, less money to raise employee wages.

Two statistics, to me, jump out. First, 64 percent of the new jobs created in this country in the past 15 years have been through small businesses. Last year alone, new regulations cost our economy $67 billion.

We are going to be dealing with several regulatory reform measures this week, bipartisan pieces of legislation that will modernize the Federal rulemaking process and put more power back in the hands of job creators.

We need to help those who are too often squeezed by regulation the most: small businesses. We need to give them a larger voice in the process. We need to be a country that continues to welcome new ideas and innovation, not a nation that overregulates from Washington and inhibits our full economic potential.

I look forward to forthcoming regulatory reform measures to help streamline our government, get Washington out of the way, bring stability and certainty to small businesses, and help grow our economy.

□ 1015

END HUNGER NOW

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I have come to the floor today to give a voice to those who are hungry, to share their struggles, and to challenge my House colleagues to take meaningful action to end hunger now.

Last week the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities released a troubling new report estimating that roughly 1 million unemployed Americans will be cut off from SNAP benefits over the course of 2016. The report anticipates that those affected will lose between $150 and $200 per person per month in food benefits—cuts that will cause serious hardship. Mr. Speaker, this is shameful, and it deserves our attention. We should be working to end hunger now, not making it worse.

The 1996 welfare law limits individuals aged 18 to 50 who are not disabled or caring for young children to 3 months of SNAP benefits in any 36-month period if they aren't employed or in a work training program for 20 hours or more a week. That sounds reasonable, but when jobs and job training are not available, it isn't so reasonable.

During times of high unemployment, Governors can request a waiver to the 3-month time limit for their State.

During the Great Recession, Governors, both Republicans and Democrats, in 46 States have requested and have been granted some type of waiver from the 3-month time limit. This enabled unemployed adults to continue to look for a job in a tough job market without going hungry.

Mr. Speaker, our economy continues to improve and unemployment rates across the country are falling, but we are not out of the woods yet. The most vulnerable among us—those with limited education and skills—continue to struggle to find work.

In October 2014, the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities estimated there were two unemployed workers for every available position. By that measure, even if every available job were filled by an unemployed individual, there still would not be enough jobs for everyone who needed one.

When the current 3-month time limit waivers expire, the problem is that most States offer few, if any, job training programs. They aren't required to do so. And in States that do offer work programs, the number of individuals who need them far outnumbers the available slots. Come 2016, an unemployed adult actively looking for work, no matter how many job postings they respond to or how many resumes they send out, will arbitrarily be cut off from receiving food benefits through no fault of their own.

The 3-month time limit as it is drafted is a severe penalty that hurts an already vulnerable population. According to USDA data, those who would be affected have an average monthly income of only 19 percent of the poverty line. They often do not qualify for any other types of assistance.

Mr. Speaker, it is unconscionable that 1 million of the poorest Americans would be cut off from food benefits because their State does not offer job training programs or does not have the capacity to meet the demand for those who need help improving their skills. These individuals would be left on their own at an already difficult time. They may be forced to choose between food and rent or other necessities.

Mr. Speaker, we need to adequately fund our job training programs, which this Congress has consistently failed to do, and we need to ensure that unemployed adults who are diligently searching for a job do not go hungry while they look for work.

I am concerned—deeply concerned—about reports that Republican leaders want to launch yet another assault against SNAP. They want to cut the program even more. That would be a mistake and a disservice to one of the most efficiently and effectively run Federal programs. Even more important, it would be a disservice to so many of our citizens who are struggling in poverty.

Mr. Speaker, I am also concerned about a Republican majority that is more interested in adhering to a political sound bite than in pursuing sound policy. Let's focus on ending hunger and ending poverty. Let's bring to an end the nasty, cruel, and negative rhetoric that has been used to demagogue SNAP and those who rely on the benefit that was so evident in the last Congress.

Mr. Speaker, it is tough to be poor in America. It is hard work. We in Congress should be part of the solution, not part of the problem. We can do better. We can and we should do more to end hunger now.

IN THE LINE OF DUTY

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 am proud to say that I stand at the podium today to thank two Members of Congress who last week took the lead on LEAD. LEAD is Law Enforcement Appreciation Day. I want to thank Congresspersons JOLLY and REICHERT for what they did on last Friday in paying a special tribute, if you will, to the 900,000-plus who serve us as peace officers in the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to say that in my family I had an uncle who was a peace officer, and he had an influence on my life that literally changed the course of my life and set me on the course that I currently am pursuing. My uncle and I were riding along together, and I was asking a lot of questions. He made a statement that became indelible with me. He said: This boy is asking so many questions, I think he is going to be a lawyer.

I was younger than 10. I don't think I knew what a lawyer was. I am not sure how old I was. I remember I was very young. But I also remember that if my uncle thought that being a lawyer was a good thing for me, then that was a thing that I should do.

This was a peace officer, a police officer, a deputy sheriff that had a lasting impact on my life. I am so grateful for his service to his community and the way he has been an outstanding citizen in his community. His name is Dallas Yates.

I am proud to tell you that when I saw these Congresspersons paying tribute to peace officers, police officers, I concluded that I would have to add to the RECORD some thoughts because there is a phrase that we use quite often when we reference peace officers. It is styled, ''in the line of duty''—''in the line of duty.'' And officers do so many things in the line of duty. Some of these things, quite frankly, are not things that they are expected to do, but they do them anyway.

The Washington Post reported that two officers delivered a baby on Christmas Day in the line of duty. They were on duty when they did it. Officers are not trained to deliver babies, but when called upon, they take the lead to do what needs to be done.

Think of the thousands of people who have been stranded and who were helped by peace officers: flood victims helped by peace officers, persons with something as simple as a flat tire helped by police officers, all in the course and scope of their duty. And then, of course, we have officers who have literally gone into fires to save lives. It has been reported that officers have done this. In fact, the Tulsa World recently reported that an officer saved a life from a fire in the line of duty, in the course and scope of duty.

That phrase means a lot more than simply lending a helping hand. ''In the line of duty'' means sometimes that officers lose their lives. In this country, we had 27 officers die in 2013 as a result of felonious incidents all occurring in the line of duty. We had 49 that died from accidents in the line of duty.

Mr. Speaker, when this term is used now, ''in the line of duty,'' to refer to these officers who make the ultimate sacrifice so that others may have a better life, you have better appreciation for what ''in the line of duty'' means. It is more than mere words. It means sacrifice. Many families have had to mourn the loss of a loved one in the line of duty.

So I am proud to salute the officers—the 900,000-plus—and I thank the Congresspersons who led the discussion celebrating, appreciating, and commemorating those who have served and have gone on to make their transition in the line of duty.

I think it appropriate to close with these words that express some thoughts about how we measure our lives and how the life of a person is measured and appreciated. Ruth Smeltzer reminds us:

Some measure their lives by days and years,
Others by heartthrobs, passion, and tears.
But the surest measure under the sun
Is what in your lifetime for others you have done.

I want to thank the 900,000-plus officers for what they have done for others in their lifetime in the line of duty. God bless you. God bless the United States of America.

THE GAS TAX

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, the momentum for an increase in the Federal gas tax continues to build. This weekend's excellent New York Times editorial made the case why the increase is needed and long overdue. Costs of repair increase dramatically the longer they are delayed. In the meantime, Americans paid billions of dollars for congestion, wasted gas, and repairing damage to their cars, and thousands of lives are lost due to unsafe roads. This followed an editorial in The Washington Post making the same argument, joining USA Today, L.A. Times, and a variety of newspapers across the country.

Recently, we have seen eight Senators from both parties who have been