

Rushing this process is an easy tactic to try to silence a reasonable opposition, but, based on our country's history of making trade deals that drive up our trade deficit and outsource millions of U.S. jobs, the American people should be alarmed. I and many others are sounding that alarm.

Japan is one of the most significant partners in this agreement, and it is the world's second largest currency manipulator and is one of the leading protectionist markets in the Pacific. They have much to gain from a weak trade agreement.

Japan is the world's third largest automobile market, but 96 percent of that market belongs only to Japanese automobiles. Since 2000, we have been able to sell 183,000 cars there, but guess how many they sold here—16.3 million. That is 89,000 to 1.

There is something wrong with trying to work a deal that rewards a country whose markets are closed. We need a new trade model that creates jobs in America again and that does not reward currency manipulators and protectionist markets.

#### TRIBUTE TO DONALD S. POWERS

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

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a significant Hoosier, Mr. Donald S. Powers, who passed away on April 21, 2015.

I would like to express my gratitude for his community service and economic development efforts in my hometown of Munster, Indiana. Most importantly to me, he was a friend and a mentor who was always ready to provide some guidance. More than that, those who claim northwest Indiana as their home can also rightfully claim the same kind of relationship with Don Powers.

Mr. Powers proudly fought for our Nation during World War II as a Navy fighter pilot and then again in the Korean war. He was a graduate of Indiana's beloved Purdue University where he spent several years as president of the board of trustees.

Mr. Powers went on to develop much of Munster's residential neighborhoods; and, in 1973, Mr. Powers took part in the creation of Community Hospital, which was voted as one of America's 50 best hospitals 7 years in a row. In 1989, he developed the Center for the Visual and Performing Arts, home to the Northwest Indiana Symphony Orchestra and South Shore Arts.

His efforts in developing Munster led to nationwide accolades for the community, even having the town make Forbes Magazine's 25 top suburbs for retirement. Mr. Powers was highly regarded in the community and throughout Indiana for his philanthropic and business endeavors.

Indiana and, indeed, the Nation, Mr. Speaker, lost one of its best leaders

this week, but his legacy will certainly endure in the many lives he positively affected.

#### ENLIST ACT

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

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, I, once again, introduced the ENLIST Act.

The ENLIST Act would give young adults who came here through no fault of their own, who have graduated from our high schools, who can pass a background check, who can speak English, and whom the military is asking for to protect and defend the Nation that they know and love the opportunity to actually sign up for the military, to wear the cloth of our Nation, and put their lives on the line.

At the end of an honorable term, they would be eligible for permanent residence in the United States of America.

This is an act of patriotism. This is an opportunity to create a greater national defense and an opportunity for those kids who know of no other country to call home to actually pledge allegiance and be patriots of this great Nation.

#### FAST TRACK AND MARRIAGE EQUALITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, in just a few months in Washington, I have learned that there is always something going on, and this week is no exception to that rule. In the coming days, two very important actions may change life for many of my constituents and Americans across the country.

Last week, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. RYAN, introduced the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015, legislation that would allow the President to negotiate and to sign trade agreements with limited congressional oversight. The Committee on Ways and Means has reported that legislation out, and I imagine we will be considering it on the floor in short order.

Next week, the U.S. Supreme Court will hear arguments in *Obergefell v. Hodges*, which is a case that has the potential to decide once and for all whether every American, regardless of sexual orientation, should have the right to marry and should have access to all of the legal rights and benefits we afford married couples.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and I plan to address both of these important issues on the floor of the people's House this afternoon. I want to start by talking about the legislation that was reported out by the Ways and Means Committee this week.

If Congress authorizes TPA's fast-track authority, this President and every President elected after him will have the unprecedented authority to negotiate and sign sweeping trade agreements with little opportunity for Congress to intercede on behalf of the many Americans those deals inevitably impact.

In the past, those agreements haven't turned out great for American workers here at home, which is all the more important reason that Congress should be able to retain the ability to fight for what is in the best interests of our constituents. After 6 years of secretive negotiations for the Trans-Pacific Partnership agreement, we haven't been given much motivation to release any of this oversight.

Offering fast-track authority for the TPP means that we press fast-forward on policies that put American families' health at risk on policies that are challenging our chemical safeguards, on policies allowing unregulated and potentially contaminated food products into the United States.

We lose our chance to question policies that would allow foreign corporations to skirt our courts and demand taxpayer compensation when they feel they have been violated by U.S. laws.

Our constituents are relying on us to stand up for their interests on TPP and on every future trade agreement to come down the line. We cannot pass the buck on this, and I know that our first speaker today agrees with me.

I want to talk a little bit about the State of New Jersey because the State of New Jersey has seen what can happen when trade deals go bad: factories close, employees are laid off, and cities that have previously made things that have been bought by consumers around the world are suddenly faced with stunted economies and surges in unemployment.

My capital district—"Trenton makes, the World Takes"—is an illustration of what was a great economy in that locale. That is why it is so important that this body ensures we only sign these agreements when we are sure they will help, not hurt, working families.

I yield now to another Member who is deeply familiar with the issues in New Jersey, my friend and my fellow freshman from New Jersey (Mr. NORCROSS).

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition of what is being called fast-track authority.

The legislation would allow a deal, a deal that, regardless of its impact on American jobs, would go into effect with just a simple up-or-down vote. We have no other avenue for input, and I think we are seriously misguided. The best indication of that is history, where we have been.

I started my career as an electrician, working up and down the Delaware River, in different plants that manufactured products for not only the United States, but around the world. Now, I go through what is now my congressional district, and I can see the empty boxes which used to be manufacturing, which used to put men and women to work.

Since NAFTA, I have been involved in trying to educate the people of not only my area, but, certainly, of the rest of the country, that this is seriously misguided and that the rhetoric that we heard at the time ended up being the exact opposite.

In my district alone, there have been 19,500 jobs lost and 59 employers who are no longer there. Those empty buildings that we used to call home, that used to pay for college educations, those are dreams erased. I was sent to Congress to create a climate for jobs here in America, and that is my focus. That is why I am so passionate about this issue.

When we look around the country, we are just now coming out of the worst economic times since I have been alive—the worst times. Now, what we are seeing and what we are being asked to do is to grant authority to take those jobs—the ones that will take care of our families—and ship them overseas.

They did it before, and it is going to happen again. Our job is to help create jobs here in America for all of the people, not just for the few who make and own the companies.

I urge my colleagues in the strongest way I can to say “no” to fast track and to say “yes” to American jobs.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, our constituents are really relying upon us here to stand up for their interests on TPP because every future trade agreement that comes down the line has an impact on our quality of life and on our opportunities.

I know that the speaker that we are getting ready to hear from knows very well how this trade agreement and how these negotiations are going to impact the communities and the economy of our United States of America. It is my honor to yield to someone who has been fighting furiously for her constituents, who has been adamant about giving a voice to the voiceless, and who has been educating our Caucus on a routine basis.

I yield now to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURU).

Ms. DELAURU. Let me say thank you to my colleague from New Jersey. I appreciate her kind words, but it is also true that she has been a strong, strong supporter of what this trade agreement might do to working families in the United States because where her heart and soul and where her values are, are going to strengthen the middle class in this country, not take the jobs away, not lower their wages, but make sure they can take care of themselves and their families.

I was so pleased to see another colleague from New Jersey here as well, and I am proud to join this effort.

□ 1245

On Monday, the beginning of this week, I went to Ansonia, Connecticut, which is in my district. I went to a place called the Ansonia Copper and Brass Company. There I was with the gentleman, John Barto, who was formerly the vice president of Ansonia Copper and Brass. John used to work there alongside of hundreds of others. He made specialty metal products, products that were used by U.S. industry and our military. Not so long ago the company employed thousands. Today this site lies vacant. All of those jobs have gone. What closed this plant? Unfair competition from overseas, exacerbated by bad trade deals.

Just don't listen to me on this. These are the words of a gentleman that I stood with in a hollowed-out building where the rain was coming through the roof on Monday because it is vacant and it is becoming just derelict. They are now taking the steel out of there to see what they can do to sell it in order to see what kind of revenue can be raised.

This is what he says: “These trade agreements are always promised to bring money and jobs and prosperity to our country, but they've done the exact opposite. We were a supplier to the United States Navy for over 70 years for a very critical part. Now that part is no longer made in this country, and that's terrible.”

Further: “I think we already know that this is going to be like NAFTA (the North American Free Trade Agreement). There's something undeniably suspicious about an agreement when you're not able to see it”—to read it, to understand what is in it.

Finally, I will just say that his words and he did strike a chord when he talked about:

We've long understood that currency manipulation is the driving force behind jobs existing in this country. It hasn't changed. That's an issue. We talk about NAFTA, we talk about CAFTA, most recently the Korea free trade agreement, and they are going to change things, bring jobs, help manufacturing. It has done nothing short of the exact opposite. I am living, breathing proof . . . This was a vibrant company. There were 300 people-plus working here . . . Now there are zero jobs, zero revenues . . . Hundreds upon hundreds of employees, thousands worked here over time . . . generations of families were supported by this company, and it's with great sadness that we find ourselves

here today. The fact is the enemy is ourselves . . . We have got to get our Senators and all of our elected representatives to understand what we're up against is currency manipulation. I don't for a second believe that we need to take this deal, negotiate it in the back room. Our elected officials cannot see it. That squashes democracy. It reeks of impropriety. What is going on here where we cannot see this agreement?

These are not my words. I didn't work at Ansonia Copper and Brass. But today, John Barto, a former vice president, is trying to find another job for himself and for his family. That is the story that this free trade agreement is all about.

What has gone on here and what is happening in our manufacturing sector is that problems are leaving people struggling to find middle class jobs. American manufacturing jobs are being lost; foreign products are being subsidized, and those are coming in, and it is about these bad trade agreements.

The United States is poised to sign the biggest trade agreement of them all, the Trans-Pacific Partnership, and it is a very dangerous prospect for our economy, for our working families. It forces Americans to compete with low-paid workers in developing countries like Vietnam, where the minimum wage is 56 cents an hour. It hazards the health of our families by opening up our borders still wider to dangerous, unregulated food, toxic seafood from Malaysia and from Vietnam. It empowers foreign companies to challenge all kinds of U.S. laws, without ever stepping foot inside an American courtroom. It promotes corporate special interests. It relegates labor rights and environmental protections to the sidelines. It does nothing to confront the currency cheats whose abuses have already cost Connecticut over 32,000 jobs.

Now the administration wants us to give it a rubberstamp to say: You go ahead and complete the negotiations that they have been engaged in for the last 5 years without any congressional input so that they can complete the deal without us knowing what is in this Trans-Pacific Partnership agreement.

What is fast track? What does it mean? No public scrutiny; limited debate in the House of Representatives; and no ability by Members of Congress, who have the constitutional authority to review free trade agreements, it gives us no opportunity to amend the process. If we wanted to change it, we can't change it once you have given fast track.

We have been here before. The administration sought fast-track authority last year. It failed. They produced another bill that came out of a committee in the United States Senate; and in the House it is exactly the same, almost exactly the same as it was last year. Our view is it is dead on arrival this time as well.

On that issue of currency which Mr. Barto spoke so poignantly about, which, currency manipulation, when a country devalues its currency, it makes their goods cheaper than our goods. The administration has refused

to put a currency chapter in the free trade agreement, and they have said that. They wrote a letter to the United States Senators. That is the biggest link in losing jobs and depressing wages.

I will finish up on this. What is the economic challenge that we face today? People in our country are in jobs that just don't pay them enough money to pay their bills. Middle class families are struggling. Wages are stagnant today. Why would we want to support a free trade agreement that will only exacerbate this problem? It will not create jobs and, further, it will depress wages.

We counter, say "no" to fast track and that we are not going to stand by. We are going to exercise our constitutional authority as Members of the House of Representatives. Read this piece of legislation, and it has to reflect not our ideas, but what our constituents believe is the right thing to do on their behalf.

I can't thank you enough for organizing this effort today. You can be sure that every single day we are going to be up on our feet and finding the votes to say "no" to fast track and "yes" to the American people and to working families in this country. I thank the gentlelady.

**Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.** I thank the gentlelady for having taken this issue and just gone forward with it and having been such an educator of us, of the ones that are new and the ones that have been here and that have taken the time to really speak to the constituents about the impact of this trade agreement and the potential that it has a negative impact on our economy, our safety, our security, our worker protections. I thank you very much.

I think it is quite illuminating for people to understand that no one is opposed to trade. We are just opposed to unequal trade. No one is opposed to exporting or importing. We are opposed to not knowing what is in this trade agreement. We are opposed to not having a say in this trade agreement, and we are opposed to anything that creates greater unequal opportunities for the workers of this country to have decent jobs and good wages that are being paid. So I thank you very much.

The notion of giving this President, whom we love, and any President that we are going to love in the future the authority to do that without our involvement is not what was expected by creating these three coequal branches of government.

As I said to you in the beginning, there are two very important issues that our constituents are concerned about, Mr. Speaker, that we are going to speak out today because they are occupying the minds of many of our colleagues over the next few weeks. It is not only this major issue that will be on the minds of American people, but next week, just next week, the U.S. Supreme Court will take up a case that has the potential to fulfill the prin-

ciples of equality and justice that this country stands for. When the court hears arguments in this case, they will have the opportunity to ensure that every American, regardless of whom they love, has access to the legal rights and benefits we give on the Federal and State level to married couples.

More than 60 percent of Americans already agree that same-sex couples deserve the same recognition that we give heterosexual couples; and just as public opposition has crumbled, so have many of the arguments we have made against giving these couples the same protections we give their heterosexual peers. I am proud to be a member of the LGBT Caucus and to join my colleagues today on the floor this evening as we urge the court to rule in support of equal rights and in favor of marriage equality.

It is my pleasure now to yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO), a leader in the fight for marriage equality and equality in general for all people. I now ask Mr. TAKANO from the great State of California to share his remarks with us.

**Mr. TAKANO.** Well, I thank the gentlelady from New Jersey for yielding to me during this Special Order, and I want to give time for us to get set up with our graphics.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation is on the cusp of correcting a longstanding injustice, an injustice that has been embedded into our national psyche and, frankly, our laws for more than 200 years. It is an injustice that says LGBT Americans shouldn't receive the same rights as everyone else. It is an injustice that the law in many States still says it doesn't matter how committed LGBT relationships are or how much in love they are. It is an injustice in the law that says LGBT Americans cannot and should not be able to get married.

The law could not be more wrong, Mr. Speaker. Our Constitution says that no person shall be denied equal protection of the laws, and that should include LGBT Americans. To say that it doesn't matter how committed same-sex relationships are is an insult to the thousands of same-sex relationships that have been going strong for 30, 40, even 50 years. Gender and sexual orientation should not matter when it comes to the right to marry. What should matter is what is in one's heart.

Now the Supreme Court can correct this injustice next week, as it is set to hear oral arguments in a case that could make marriage equality the law of the land. Now, I have never been one to count my chickens before they hatch, but I believe that the Supreme Court will rule on the right side of history.

Our Nation has been moving toward marriage equality at a breakneck speed. Ten years ago, only one State had marriage equality; and as you can see here, things have changed, as 36 States and the District of Columbia now have marriage equality.

As we prepare for the Court's ruling, let us not forget that there are more

battles to be fought. As it stands in 28 States, someone can be fired because of their sexual orientation or gender identity. This puts individuals who live in certain States in a difficult position. I just want to take a moment to point out, this here is a map of where those 28 States are in our country with employment discrimination in the United States.

I want to tell you the story of Lonnie Billard of South Carolina, a high school teacher for more than a decade. Lonnie couldn't wait to marry his long-time partner when marriage equality came to South Carolina in late 2014. Like so many Americans do, he posted the news of his marriage on Facebook.

□ 1300

Several days later, he received a call from his assistant principal, and he was fired from his job.

Marriage equality is coming, Mr. Speaker, but what does it say about our Nation when people cannot share the happiest day of their life for fear of losing their job?

For Americans who live in States with marriage equality and legalized discrimination, we are telling them that they can have the same rights as everyone else, but it is best that they don't tell anyone about it.

What we have is an incomplete patchwork map of rights for LGBT Americans. If you look at the marriage equality map, there are 36 States with marriage equality. But if you look at the employment discrimination map, LGBT Americans can be fired in 28 States simply for being who they are.

That means that in 14 States—like Indiana, Alabama, and Pennsylvania—an LGBT American can get married to their partner, but then get fired because of it.

That is not what our Nation is about. Every American is granted a certain set of rights, and they should be able to exercise them as freely and openly as they wish.

Our Nation is becoming a more perfect Union. But until we recognize that LGBT Americans are entitled to all of the same rights and protections as anyone else, full legal equality for LGBT Americans will be incomplete.

There will be a day when both of these maps are combined and show that LGBT Americans are receiving full and equal protection under the law. Until then, we fail to live up to our own Constitution. But even when we reach full legal equality, it may take years until we receive equality in the hearts of all Americans.

I know I will continue the fight for equality in the hearts of all Americans, and I know the gentlewoman from New Jersey will fight as well.

**Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.** Thank you very much to the gentleman from California.

I have to tell you that I am very happy to be able to work with you on this issue. As a State legislator, this

was important to us in the State of New Jersey. And as we grappled with all kinds of configurations of equality in relationships, we recognized that everything but absolute marriage equality was giving individuals stumbling blocks over very important things like simply being able to visit your loved one in the hospital and making medical decisions for them, or being able to enjoy the financial rights that a heterosexual couple can enjoy.

Any area in which there is inequality is a threatened area to every one of us who at one point has been discriminated against or has been identified as part of a protected class.

So I thank you for the work that you are doing here, and I am your partner in this effort.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), our leader in our Caucus on this and so many other issues, a person who stands up each and every day for the rights of the citizens of this great country.

Mr. HOYER. I thank Congresswoman COLEMAN for yielding time, and I thank her for organizing this Special Order and for her leadership on this issue. She is a new Member, but not a new person to public service, not a new person to leadership, not a new person to fighting for the rights of every American, and I thank her very much for her leadership, her commitment, and her courage.

I also want to thank, Mr. Speaker, the LGBT Equality Caucus for its powerful advocacy on this issue.

The Supreme Court next week is hearing more than just an argument about same sex marriage. It is considering a question fundamental to what it means to be an American.

Our Nation, as we say so proudly, was founded on the premise that all people are created equal—not the same, but equal—irrespective of the differences. Our Declaration of Independence, as all of us quote so often, says:

“We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men”—of course, if Jefferson were writing today, it would be either all people or all humankind—“are created equal, that they are endowed by”—not a Congress, not by a Constitution, not by a will of the majority—“their Creator”—by God—“with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.”

That, of course, has not always been America’s performance, notwithstanding it has been its promise.

Next week, the highest Court in our land will be asked to consider whether these words apply to same-sex couples who love one another. Many courts have already said that it does.

Marriage equality provides same-sex households vital legal protections and economic security that we would ask for ourselves. Marriage equality would mean that approximately 250,000 children in America who are being raised in same-sex households will see their parents receive equal treatment.

One of those families is led by—or perhaps his partner would say he leads it—SEAN PATRICK MALONEY, with three beautiful, loving and loved children. I have seen them all together. They are a happy, healthy family.

Study after study has shown that children of same-sex households are doing as well as their peers from opposite sex households academically, psychologically, and socially.

Marriage equality also means spousal benefits for those who share their lives with and care for their same-sex partners. Marriage equality will mean that same-sex couples, Mr. Speaker, can make medical and end-of-life decisions for their loved one.

These are tangible benefits. These, I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, are the pursuit of happiness. They are tangible benefits and ought to be treated equally under the law in every State of our Union—not in 28, not in 48, but in all 50 and the District of Columbia.

Thanks to the extraordinary courage of millions who have come out to their friends and families, which took a lot of courage, and spoken with their neighbors and coworkers, a majority of Americans now agree that every loving couple ought to be treated equally and have their right to marry recognized.

I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, I have three daughters. I have three grandchildren. One of my grandchildren is an adult. All four of those women would say to me: Dad, why is it any of our business who somebody else loves, who somebody else wants to commit to? Why is that our business? Why does it make a difference to us?

What makes a difference to us is how they treat us, whether they obey the law, whether, as Dr. Martin Luther King would say, the content of their character is such that we ought to respect them, not because of the difference of the color of their skin, their gender, their nationality, their religion, or their choice of whom they want to love.

Born equal, endowed by God with certain unalienable rights, and among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Is there a happier time in one’s life than when one pledges themselves to another? We all gather, we all celebrate, we all wish them well.

LGBT Americans now have the right to marry and have their families treated equally in 37 States and the District of Columbia. In the remaining States, however, LGBT residents are watching the Supreme Court with great anticipation.

Hopefully, the Court will do as Earl Warren’s Court did in *Brown v. Board of Education*, saying that separate is not equal. Treating people here differently than people here—who love one another—is not equal.

Tens of millions of Americans stand with our friends in the LGBT community in support of marriage equality and believe, as I do, in a ruling in support of the lower courts that have again and again sided with same-sex

couples and have said that the law requires, the Constitution requires, that we do in fact live out our promise of treatment on an equal basis.

We need to bring those words of the Declaration of Independence closer to their full realization, Mr. Speaker. Hopefully, the Court will do that.

Mr. Speaker, I am from the State of Maryland. I was proud to join in sending an amicus brief to the Court in March, arguing that the State bans are unconstitutional.

In my State of Maryland, our legislature carried out what MRS. COLEMAN and I have said: equality means equality. We passed marriage equality.

Mr. Speaker, some folks didn’t agree with that and petitioned it to a referendum. I am very proud of the citizens of Maryland. They were the first State to say in a referendum at the polls, We believe equality means equality, and passed this resolution and confirmed that law.

I thank the gentlewoman from New Jersey, a leader in that State, a leader in our Nation, for leading this Special Order hour.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we will be able to return to this floor over the summer to praise a ruling by the Court that I anticipate will be historic and accurate and one that our Nation can be proud of for generations, indeed, centuries to come.

Our Nation made a promise in our Declaration of Independence. Our Nation has not always met that promise. Indeed, we have struggled to realize the reality of that promise.

In my lifetime, Martin Luther King, Jr., brought that compellingly to America’s attention. In his lifetime, the President whom the majority leader in this House just last week heralded as one of the great figures, great giants in American history, Abraham Lincoln, called the attention of his generation to the gulf between the promise and the practice in America.

It resulted in a war in which we lost more lives in America than any other war in which we have been involved: the Civil War. It is sad that we had to fight. It is sad that we lost lives. But we have redeemed, to some degree, the promise of treating people based upon the content of their character.

□ 1315

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. I thank the gentleman from Maryland, and I appreciate the passions with which you have taken on this issue of right and wrong and equality, as you have taken on other issues. Thank you for your leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I know that these may seem to have been very diverse issues to bring before the floor at the same time, but they are connected in so many different ways, particularly because our constituents care deeply about both of these issues.

If we allow the fast-track authority to move forward, we risk signing up for a trade deal that risks our environment, the health of American families,

while excusing the reprehensible conduct of many of the governments who would become our new partners, all while putting in the same compromise for future agreements.

Meanwhile, if the Supreme Court upholds the tenets of justice and equality that our Nation has always valued, LGBT couples across the country will gain the access to the same rights and protections that heterosexual couples expect and enjoy, and the children of those couples will have the confidence and the security of their family's relationship. I look forward to continuing my work with that.

Mr. Speaker, how much time do we have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman has 19 minutes remaining.

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

#### HONOR THEIR MEMORY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, on April 24, the arc of the moral universe will intersect with the 100th anniversary of the Armenian genocide. Many will bear witness to that intersection, but sadly, official recognition of the genocide by the United States Government will be conspicuously absent.

Let us review the facts. In 1915, more than 1.5 million Armenians were systematically annihilated by Ottoman-era Turkish authorities. Men, women, and children were massacred, deported, and condemned to death marches into the Syrian Desert, where they died of thirst and starvation—no final rights, no burial, an assault on the dignity of a dignified and proud people.

This indisputable tragedy of history has been acknowledged by innumerable scholars and historians, including the International Association of Genocide Scholars, the Elie Wiesel Foundation for Humanity, and no less than 53 Nobel laureates. The European Parliament and Pope Francis recently joined the chorus that honestly labels this horrific chapter of Turkey's history a genocide.

Hopelessly infected by the disease of denial, modern-day Turkish authorities have now made it clear they were never going to acknowledge the 100th anniversary of the genocide with anything approaching candor, honesty, or the most minimal degree of self-reflection.

It heaps insult upon injury that they have chosen the genocide anniversary of April 24 to commemorate something wholly different, the 100th anniversary of the landing of British imperial forces at Gallipoli, a landing that actually occurred the next day, on April 25, 1915.

Turkey's treatment of the Armenian genocide is no surprise. It is a condi-

tioned reflex that has been codified into the laws of the state. In Turkey, anyone who uses the word "genocide" to describe the massacre of the Armenians is subject to criminal punishment under article 301 of the Turkish penal code.

Obviously, we should have dramatically higher expectations for our own country. That is the reason that, as a Member of Congress who has long supported a resolution to recognize the Armenian genocide, I have dreaded the prospect that the 100th anniversary would come and go without official recognition from either the United States Congress or the President of the United States.

I share the deep disappointment and sense of betrayal felt by the Armenian people and all who support their cause. It is lamentable that, on Capitol Hill, advocacy for recognition is being undermined every day by Turkey's intense lobbying campaign to block passage of the Armenian genocide resolution.

In the face of this, it is easy to be cynical and angry, but we should remind ourselves and be inspired that, on April 24, hundreds of thousands of Americans will defy the lack of official recognition with their own personal and heartfelt acknowledgment of the Armenian genocide.

In Turkey, there are brave citizens who, at great personal risk, condemn state authorities for their tragic silence. Ultimately, the voices of individual citizens have a special power to move the heart, in this instance, to bless the unmarked graves of 1.5 million Armenians whose own voices and spirits were trampled into the ground 100 years ago.

This year, I will resist the temptation to mark the anniversary of the Armenian genocide with anger and frustration at the lack of official recognition from those who should know better; rather, I will draw strength from the conviction that the arc of the moral universe will ultimately bend toward justice, toward the eternal memory of those who perished in this undeniable tragedy of history.

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

#### STOP THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BUCK) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN).

Mr. JORDAN. I thank the gentleman for this Special Order on an important subject, the Export-Import Bank. I was just going to start with retelling a story I told at an event not too long ago that I think is important.

The scenario that is going to play out, I think, all across the country later this afternoon, there is going to

be a guy who works second shift at the local manufacturing facility. He is going to go out, get in his truck to drive to work.

Now, remember, he is working second shift, which means he has got to miss some of his kids' Little League games, miss some of his children's afterschool activities.

He goes out to get in his truck to go to work, and he looks a couple of houses down, and he sees a guy sitting on the front porch, drinking a cup of coffee, reading the newspaper. He knows the guy can work, but won't work, and is getting his tax dollars.

He gets in his truck to drive to work, and he happens to turn the radio on. It happens to be the news hour. A reporter comes on and talks about the Federal Government's got an \$18 trillion national debt.

They have got this program that gives money to favored and connected corporations. One of these companies went bankrupt and cost the taxpayers a ton of money.

He hears all that, and he remembers what he saw on the front porch of his neighbor's house. Guess what, this guy is ticked off, and he has every right to be.

At the same time he is driving to work, there is a lady driving home from work. She teaches second grade at the local elementary school, and she has busted her tail all day long helping her students.

She views her job as a teacher as a mission field, trying to help her students get the skill set they need to start on their path to achieving the American Dream. She has worked hard all day long.

She is driving home, happens to have her radio on, happens to be tuned in to the same station where the same reporter comes on and talks about the Federal Government with an \$18 trillion national debt, this program that gives money to favored corporations, connected corporations. This one company went bankrupt, cost the taxpayers millions of dollars.

She hears all that as she pulls into her driveway on the same street, sees the same guy sitting on his front porch, drinking coffee, reading the paper. She knows he can work but won't work, and he is getting her tax dollars. Guess what, she is just as mad as the second-shift worker, and she has every right to be.

Now, our job, as Members of Congress, is to remember people like the second-grade teacher and the second-shift worker and fight for things they care about. Here is one: they care about this concept that goes on in this town, where connected companies get special deals with their tax money, and they want that to stop.

We now have a chance to do that, to start the process of stopping the corporate welfare, and that is what Mr. BUCK's Special Order hour is all about, stopping the Export-Import Bank from continuing the corporate connectedness, the corporate cronyism, and the corporate welfare.