



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MAY 14, 2015

No. 74

## House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING).

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
May 14, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable GEORGE HOLDING to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

### MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

### LOOKING AT THE BIG PICTURE

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, as we are dealing with the defense authorization legislation, we should step back and look at the big picture. Are we taking tough stands dealing with escalating personnel costs, procurement issues, excess facilities? Are we honoring the responsibility of the military to clean up after itself? One of the best examples is a failure to deal with the rightsizing of our military facilities.

It is no secret that our nuclear triad, which includes our land-based missiles, nuclear submarines, and bombers, are wildly in excess of anything we need for deterrence.

The Pentagon's 2013 report on nuclear employment strategy declared that "we can ensure the security of the United States and our allies and maintain a strong and credible strategic deterrence while safely pursuing up to a one-third reduction in deployed nuclear weapons from the level established in the New START Treaty."

Other experts, including a commission chaired by former Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff General James Cartwright, suggest we could go even lower without jeopardizing security.

Yet we are on a trajectory to spend over a trillion dollars in the decades to come on weapons that are largely irrelevant to the challenges of today: ISIS, 9/11-type attacks, military activities in Iraq and Afghanistan, Russian aggression in the Ukraine.

We should be addressing what is an appropriate level for the nuclear deterrence. But until we face up to the fact that we ought to at least know what we are getting into, one simple step would have been to tell Congress what the longer term costs are going to be.

In the last legislation, I had an amendment that was successfully approved to require the CBO to publish every 2 years a 10-year cost estimate of our nuclear modernization. It has already proven extremely valuable to provide a set of numbers we can compare to the Pentagon's estimates. Unfortunately, more and more of these expenses are being pushed outside the 10-year window.

I had an amendment that would have at least required our being able to have a 25-year cost of modernization, an estimate the Pentagon said they can do and one that we already have for the National Nuclear Security Administration.

One other area that was equally puzzling was the failure to allow a bipartisan, fully offset amendment to upgrade our Air National Guard F-15s. The radar they are using dates to the 1970s. In fact, it went out of production 30 years ago. We had a simple, bipartisan, fully offset amendment to allow the Air Guard to at least get 10 planes modernized on an ongoing basis.

It is frustrating. We are failing to tackle the big issues. We are not even given an opportunity to guarantee Congress knows what the longer term costs are, and we are shortchanging small investments that would make a big difference for our Air National Guard.

I hope we are going to have an opportunity as the legislation moves forward for Congress to do a better job balancing our priorities, meeting the needs of our men and women in uniform, and protecting our long-term budget.

### CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF SMITH WILDMAN BROOKHART, III

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

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take some time this morning to celebrate the life of a remarkable American, the late Smith Wildman Brookhart, III.

Mr. Brookhart was born on January 22, 1935, and passed away last month. He is survived by his wife of 56 years, Gail Anderson Brookhart; three sons and their wives; and 10 grandchildren. One of Smith's sons, Tom Brookhart, and his wife, Debra Brookhart, are my constituents and good friends in Tulsa, Oklahoma.

Let me talk for a moment about Smith Brookhart's life. After graduating from East High School in Duluth, Minnesota, Smith attended Iowa State College in Ames, Iowa, receiving

☐ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., ☐ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H2961

his degree in 1957. He served our country in uniform as an ensign in the United States Navy. His service included two Antarctic expeditions. As a Navy pilot myself, I can tell you Antarctic expeditions are not something that are friendly; I will just say that.

Ultimately, Smith moved his family to Branson, Missouri, where he became the CEO of Ozark Mountain Bank. He served in that capacity for over three decades. He was very involved in the development of Branson, Missouri. My family and I have had occasion to visit Branson. It is a very family-friendly town where Christians are very welcome. I know that Smith's Christian faith was very important to him.

At age 69, Smith received a heart transplant and was given a new lease on life.

There is a beautiful line I read in Smith's obituary, which I would like to read:

"Smith would not want to be remembered for the accolades of his efforts, but for a life rich with friendships."

Mr. Speaker, today, I honor Smith Brookhart, a remarkable American, father, grandfather, community leader, patriot, and servant of Christ.

I would like to close with Romans 8:38:

"For I am convinced that neither death nor life, nor angels nor demons, neither the present nor the future, nor any powers, neither height nor depth, nor anything else in all creation will be able to separate us from the love of God that is in Christ Jesus our Lord."

May God bless Mr. Brookhart.

#### LITTLE MOUSE

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

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, later today, the House will consider amendments to the National Defense Authorization Act. That is the bill that tells the military what to do with all the money we give them.

In the committee of jurisdiction over the military, the Democrats and Republicans whose job it is to examine these issues voted to include two studies of how immigrants are or are not included in military recruitment.

Republicans are in the majority, so on the Republican-led Republican majority committee these two amendments won their votes and were added to the bill. The Gallego and Veasey amendments were included.

But no matter how many times Republican leaders have appeased the hard-liners on the fringes of their right flank—to disastrous consequences, I might add—they have chosen to capitulate one more time and ruled last night that amendments can be stripped from the bill today, these two reasonable amendments.

It is another glaring example of why the Republicans, from their Presidential nominee all the way down to their local government candidates, are

in very, very deep trouble when it comes to the immigration issue.

One amendment simply asked the Secretary of Defense to study the impact of letting immigrants who grew up for years in the United States, who have passed a criminal background check, and who have a legal work permit to be in the United States; it asked the Secretary to study whether including them in military recruitment would help diversify our military. A study.

The second did not call for any action or any study at all. It simply said it is a sense of Congress that the Secretary review whether recipients of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals be allowed to serve in the military. It is kind of telling the top brass: This is what we think you might want to do. That is the program where 700,000 young immigrants came forward, got right with the law, and got a work permit after they passed a criminal background check.

But do you know what the Secretary of Defense "reviewing" something is, when it comes to the hard-liners? Do you know what "studying" something related to immigrants who have deferred action is to the nativists? Do you know what the contingent of hardcore anti-immigration guys in the Republican Conference started shouting? You guessed it? The A word. Amnesty.

I have the language right here:

"It is the sense of the House of Representatives that the Secretary of Defense should review section 504 of title 10."

And they yelled: Amnesty, amnesty, amnesty.

Members of Congress from Alabama to Iowa to Texas began throwing around the amnesty attack. It is a backdoor amnesty, they said. We shouldn't "reward" illegal aliens who want to risk their lives to defend their adopted country when we have red-blooded Americans who want to fight and die.

Breitbart, in one article a couple of days ago, used the word "amnesty" 20 times in less than 1,400 words while ticking off the Members of the House of Representatives who might lose elections to more anti-immigrant candidates if the two studies are allowed to be included in the defense bill.

This all reminds me of the story of the Little Mouse. I used to read it to my grandson, Luisito—the same story you probably read to your kids and grandkids.

It goes like this. If you give a mouse a cookie, he is going to ask you for a glass of milk. And if you give him a glass of milk, he is going to ask for a straw. Anything you give the little mouse is going to lead to a newer and bigger request. That is what it must feel like to Speaker of the House BOEHNER with his nativist wing of his party.

If you give them 30,000 more border patrol guards, Mr. Speaker, they are going to ask you for more deportation. If you give them a record number of de-

portations, they are going to ask the Speaker for a vote to more quickly deport vulnerable children. If you give them the vote for quicker deportation of children, they will demand a vote to deport all DREAMers who have permission to work in the United States legally—700,000. And if you give them a vote on deporting DREAMers, they will ask for a hearing on amending the Constitution to eliminate birthright citizenship.

That is what the mouse will do. He will change the Constitution of the United States. And then at some point they will demand that every single reference to anything related to immigrants without papers, even a research project, be declared an amnesty and stripped from legislation.

If you give a mouse a cookie, he is going to want some milk, Mr. Speaker. And if you give the restrictionists a vote or hearing on every crazy idea they come up with, you will be relegated as a party to being a provincial party with power in the House of Representatives, and maybe from time to time being able to run the Senate, but you will never win the White House and you will never run the Supreme Court.

At some point, I respectfully suggest you cut off the mouse's supply of cookies.

#### IRAN NUCLEAR AGREEMENT REVIEW ACT

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

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Speaker, today, this body will take up the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act. It has the noble intention of reducing the risk that the Iranians will develop a nuclear arsenal. Unfortunately, I think passage of this bill will do just the opposite.

Mr. Speaker, Ben Rhodes, the President's Deputy National Security Adviser, has said that the Iranian nuclear deal is President Obama's second-term ObamaCare. He meant that as a good thing, but we all know what a disaster that law has been for this country. And in reality, the Iranian nuclear deal, as it is being negotiated by this President, is far worse for the American people and for future generations than that healthcare law could ever be.

This much-heralded framework agreement between the P5+1 and Iran that the President has talked about has never been written down. Everyone in this Chamber today knows exactly what the ultimate deal will entail, though. The United States and the international community will release Iran from its crushing sanctions in exchange for nearly nothing.

□ 1015

Let's be blunt. Iran will continue on the path of getting a nuclear weapon if this agreement is ultimately signed; but, instead of asserting congressional authority and constraining the President, the House today is considering a bill that will do just the opposite.