

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.

It will give President Obama a blank check to sign a really bad deal with the largest state sponsor of terror in the world. The mullahs will be allowed to enrich uranium and to continue to build their missile program.

It is unconscionable for Congress to grant such sweeping power to President Obama, allowing him to lift sanctions on Iran, no matter the cost to our national security, the security of Israel, and the entire world.

Even worse, the House is willing to do this today without having even one hearing, one amendment, a grand total of 40 minutes of debate about how we might actually reduce the risk to the world by constraining the President and the agreement he intends to sign. The House is giving this to the President without even trying. I can't be part of that.

We can't even use the excuse of timing. The President says we have until at least June 30 before any deal can be struck. On this immensely important issue, an issue that my colleagues tell me is one of the most important facing our Nation—and I certainly agree with that—we will give too short a shrift and move too quickly without doing all that we can.

For 35 years, since our Embassy in Tehran was taken over for 444 days by the Iranians, they have been killing Americans. They have killed my friends with IEDs in Iraq by the hundreds. Today, Shia militias run rampant through that country. They talk of Baghdad as an extension of the caliphate.

Even today, as I walked here, I watched on the news as the Iranians were firing on cargo ships off the coast of Yemen. They have tried to kill an Ambassador to the United States in this very town; yet we are about to strike an agreement that will grant them the capacity to build a nuclear weapon. This body is not doing all that it can.

I urge my fellow Members to oppose this bill and work toward a real solution that has the opportunity to keep Iran from getting that nuclear arsenal.

TPP—GET IT RIGHT

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

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, the Trans-Pacific Partnership trade agreement is the biggest trade deal our country has seen since NAFTA. With 12 participating countries, it encompasses 40 percent of the world's gross domestic product, so we have to get it right.

Working men and women in our communities are counting on us to get it right, not just fast, and that is why I oppose granting fast-track authority. You can see the impact of fast-tracked trade agreements in communities across the country, in the loss of hundreds of thousands of jobs, factory jobs, middle class jobs, and lower wages for hard-working Americans.

In fact, the Economic Policy Institute estimates that since NAFTA, the U.S. has lost more than 700,000 jobs as production has moved to Mexico. The communities I represent in south central Wisconsin bear the scars of past trade agreements which have not lived up to what the supporters say for fast track.

Take Janesville, Wisconsin. Parker Pen has been in Janesville, Wisconsin, and employed at one time over 1,000 workers. Thanks to bad trade deals, in 2009, the remaining 150 jobs were shipped to Mexico. We are not just talking the last few years. We are talking the last few months.

In Darlington, Wisconsin, the Merkle-Korff Industries plant in Darlington, a town of 2,400 people, announced they are closing. Thirty-six family-supporting jobs are leaving that community. If that were proportional in Madison, Wisconsin, that would be like losing 3,600 jobs in a community that size.

Every time an American job is shipped out of the country, it pushes wages down for workers here.

Now, fast-track authority means that the American people, through their elected Representatives, will lose their voice in Congress by limiting the ability of Congress to debate and to amend the trade agreement.

Due to limited debate, because of the fast-track process, each Member would have a little over 2 minutes to debate that trade deal. Members would have no opportunity to offer amendments on an agreement that has 29 chapters, that covers everything from food safety to environmental standards, labor rights, intellectual property, and more.

It would give Congress' constitutional authority to the President for 6 years. That means this President, the next President, and potentially, the next President; and all Congress would be left with is a yes-or-no vote.

Before Congress grants fast-track authority, we need to get the Trans-Pacific Partnership right. What does it mean to get it right? Well, one, it means having strong enforcement language to protect American workers and our environment, which we don't currently have in the current deal.

On several occasions, I have reviewed the labor and environmental chapters of the law. While, in some instances, the language is marginally better, it still lacks enforcement.

With the Colombia free trade agreement, we can see exactly what happened. While language has been implemented in the law to protect labor rights, there has been absolutely no implementation of that language. In fact, in the 4 years since the Colombia free trade agreement has passed, 105 union organizers have been killed—murdered—in that country. The environmental chapter, I would argue, is arguably worse and still lacks the same enforcement capacity to protect our country.

Getting TPP means scrapping the investor state dispute settlement provi-

sions that put corporate interests ahead of American sovereignty.

The ISDS provisions are unique. They create a tribunal run by the same corporate trade lawyers who, on Monday, represent the multinational corporations; on Tuesday, are supposed to be the fair arbitrators of the law; and on Wednesday, are back on the corporate payroll.

These provisions are only for multinational corporations and not for American small businesses or labor or environmental violations.

Getting the Trans-Pacific Partnership right means having other important provisions included, like currency manipulation, protections against human trafficking, and protections for human rights for LGBT individuals and for single mothers in countries that have implemented sharia law.

Getting the Trans-Pacific Partnership right means having open and transparent negotiations because there is still too much the American people don't know about this secretive agreement. After all, only about 600 people have been involved in drafting this agreement, largely corporate CEOs, but not you and not me.

The bottom line is that this will cost jobs and wages. Another bad trade deal will cost more American jobs and lower our wages.

We have seen how free trade agreements like NAFTA, CAFTA, and the U.S.-Korea Free Trade Agreement passed using the same fast-track process have turned out to be a bad deal for American workers.

We need to get this right, not just fast. Congress must say "no" to the fast-track process.

PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS CAUCUS

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

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to highlight and address, hopefully, an issue that needs to be held in check here in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Speaker, our office has been contacted numerous times from individuals across the Nation about attacks on private property rights by Big Government. Big Government continues to increasingly address and impact private property rights day in and day out.

We have heard stories of family farmers, people like Neil Vitale in my district, in western New York, who has been farming his land on the Pennsylvania border for years and years and years. Just yesterday, our Governor in the great State of New York banned the development of natural gas by banning hydraulic fracturing across the State of New York.

How does that impact Mr. Vitale? Mr. Vitale was going to use the resources of the property rights represented in the natural gas mineral rights to the farm that he has taken