

While it is true the Affordable Care Act incorporated numerous provisions for addressing the workforce shortage, our Nation's current educational infrastructure lacks the capacity to train health care professionals fast enough to fill the projected health workforce shortages. In our country today, we have internationally trained health professionals, residing legally in the United States, who are unable to work in their chosen profession. They currently represent a missed opportunity to address our health care workforce shortages.

The PATH Act helps to address this shortage by providing the over 2 million foreign-trained health professionals legally residing in the United States the guidance that they need to work in employment matching their health professional skills, education, and expertise. This includes internationally trained doctors, nurses, dentists, mental health providers, and pharmacists whose linguistic and cultural skills will also help improve the health needs of our diversifying Nation.

What the PATH Act would do is facilitate counseling and training opportunities to reduce barriers to the health workforce; provide access to accelerated courses in English as a second language; provide assistance in the evaluation of foreign credentials; and help in educating employers about the competency of health professionals trained outside of the U.S.

Mr. Speaker, our health care system is rapidly approaching a crisis due to a lack of qualified health professionals. The PATH Act of 2015 will help prevent this crisis, and I encourage my colleagues to cosponsor this important legislation.

PEACE THROUGH STRENGTH, NOT PEACE THROUGH ENDLESS WAR

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

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago, I spoke to about 200 people at the famous Willard Hotel in Washington in a program put on by the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce. I had been told that this was a group of CEOs and owners of major companies in southern California—obviously, a very upper-income group.

I got to a point in my speech when I said: “It is long past the time we need to stop trying to run the whole world and start putting our own people in our own country first once again.”

Much to my surprise, the audience broke into applause. Middle- and lower-income people have applauded when I have said similar things in my district and around the country. Many upper-income people claim to be moderates, and contrary to popular belief, conservatives lose most very wealthy areas 2-1 or worse. I have spoken to a very wide variety of groups in Washington

and around the country and in my district, and I have gotten an overwhelmingly positive response every time I have said it has been a horrible mistake to spend trillions on unnecessary wars in the Middle East.

When I was a teenager, I remember reading a publication from the Republican National Committee that read: “Democrats start wars. Republicans end them.”

There was a time, until recent years, when the Republican Party could make a legitimate claim to being the Peace Party. I sent my first paycheck as a bag boy at the A&P—\$19 and some cents—as a contribution to the Barry Goldwater campaign. I have worked on Republican campaigns at the national, State, and local levels for over 50 years, and it saddens me to hear almost all of the Republican candidates for President try to outdo each other in their hawkishness. Based on the response I have gotten, I think it is a recipe for defeat if my Republican Party becomes known as the party favoring permanent, forever wars—wars without end.

All of our candidates try to convince people that they are like Ronald Reagan. President Reagan once wrote: “Our troops should be committed to combat abroad only as a last resort—when no other choice is available.”

Reagan was certainly no warmonger Republican or a man eager to go to war.

President Eisenhower, one of our greatest military leaders, was another “peacenik” Republican. He knew of the horrors of war, unlike many modern-day chickenhawks. He famously warned us at the end of his Presidency about the dangers of being controlled by a very powerful military-industrial complex. I think he would be shocked at how far we have gone down the road that he warned us against.

In his book “Ike’s Bluff,” Evan Thomas wrote: “Eisenhower would periodically sigh to Andy Goodpaster, his Chief of Staff: ‘God help the Nation when it has a President who doesn’t know as much about the military as I do.’”

Pat Buchanan wrote on March 20: “In November 1956, President Eisenhower, enraged he had not been forewarned of their invasion of Egypt, ordered the British, French, and Israelis to get out of Suez and Sinai. They did as told. How far we have fallen from the America of Ike.”

Senator Robert Taft, who was sometimes referred to as “Mr. Republican” in the 1940s and 1950s, once said: “No foreign policy can be justified except a policy devoted . . . to the protection of the liberty of the American people, with war only as the last resort and only to preserve that liberty.”

Most of the Republican Presidential candidates have attacked President Obama for acting in some ways that are unconstitutional, and he has. But where in our Constitution does it give us the authority to run other countries

as we have been doing in Iraq and Afghanistan—even making small business loans and training local police forces?

My Republican Party was always the party of fiscal conservatism. Yet, with a national debt of over \$18 trillion, how can we justify continually spending megabillions in religious civil wars between the Shia and Sunni?

Some people and companies that make money off of an interventionist foreign policy always very quickly fall back on the slur of isolationism, but most conservatives believe in trade and tourism and cultural and educational exchanges with other countries and in helping out during humanitarian crises. We just don’t believe in endless war.

We are told, if we don’t support an interventionist foreign policy, that this means we don’t believe in American exceptionalism, but this Nation did not become exceptional because we got involved in every little war around the globe. It became exceptional because of our great free enterprise system and because we gave our people more individual freedom than any other country.

I have said in thousands of speeches that we are blessed beyond belief to live in this country and that the United States is, without question, the greatest country in the history of the world, but there was much less anti-Americanism around the world when we tried to mind our own business and take care of our own people, and this Nation had more friends when we followed the policy of peace through strength, not one of peace through endless war.

REAUTHORIZE THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) for 5 minutes.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker and Members, I rise this morning to sound the alarm, and I want my colleagues to understand that there are just 10 legislative days remaining for Congress to act before the Export-Import Bank shuts down. It is outrageous that we are here today, in this countdown, as the hands of the clock have become a knife-edge pressed against the future of American businesses and the jobs they create.

The Ex-Im Bank has a proven track record of supporting hundreds of thousands of jobs in every single congressional district across this country, and the fact that anyone would even consider shutting it down is shortsighted, and it is harmful to our economy. Ex-Im supports our businesses and our workers, all while not costing taxpayers a dime. In fact, over the past two decades, the Bank has generated a profit of close to \$7 billion—a true win-win for our taxpayers. Yet, for the ideologues who are committed to chopping away government programs that

support our Nation's students and seniors, exporters, and others, the facts don't really matter. They just see ending the Bank as a conservative litmus test.

Mr. Speaker, it is simply shameful that the extremist, antigovernment wing of the Republican Party has, once again, pushed us to the brink of actively damaging our Nation's businesses and our competitiveness with this standoff. It doesn't have to be this way. A majority of the House of Representatives is already on record in its support of a long-term reauthorization of the Bank. It is time for Speaker BOEHNER to intervene by immediately putting a measure up to keep its doors open for a vote on the House floor.

For 2 years, despite the calls from Democrats and Republicans, Chairman HENSARLING has made it clear that this manufactured crisis is exactly what he has wanted all along. This is not a fight between Democrats and Republicans. It is a fight between ideology and reason in the Republican Party. While the ideologically driven crusade to eliminate the Bank may be a game here in Washington, it certainly isn't a game for the hundreds of thousands of our businesses all over this country.

For example, let's take Michael Boyle, a Republican and a veteran, who recently testified that, thanks to the Bank, he has been able to quadruple his company's revenue and expand his business from just 8 employees to 60 currently.

Mr. Boyle's story is the American story of thousands of businesses, large and small, across this country that rely on the Bank to compete on the global stage. Nevertheless, in the United States Congress, we are talking about shutting down one of the best resources our businesses have—just to make a political statement.

As the deadline for reauthorizing the Bank nears, I have been encouraged to increasingly hear from some of my Republican colleagues who have come out and said, "Enough is enough." As a matter of fact, as I sat in committee, I was very pleased to hear Mr. FINCHER, a Republican, say that his wife told him:

You don't represent and you don't work for the chairman of the committee, Mr. Hensarling. You don't work for the Speaker, Mr. Boehner. You work for the people who elected you to come to Congress.

Mr. FINCHER basically said to his chairman that it is time to stop playing the game, that we have got to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank.

I want you to know that Mr. HENSARLING and those rightwing conservatives who want to use this as a political point will have you believe, "Oh, this Bank is only for Big Business," but that is absolutely not true. Not only does the Bank support thousands of small businesses, but the suppliers to the big businesses are small businesses all over this country who rely on the Export-Import Bank for their ability to create jobs and have businesses in their districts.

□ 1045

All of the Members on the Democratic side of the aisle support the reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank, and many of the Members on the opposite side of the aisle support the Bank. So I don't know why the Members on the opposite side of the aisle can't rein in their chairman. I don't know why they are afraid of him. I don't know why they don't speak up.

We have 10 more days. Let's get busy and get this bill reauthorized and this Bank. I am asking Speaker BOEHNER to exercise his leadership and get it done.

JOIN ME IN OPPOSING THE INNOVATION ACT

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to alert my colleagues and to alert the American people that a bill is being marked up in the Committee on the Judiciary this coming Thursday, H.R. 9. This bill is a grave threat to the rights of the American people to own the intellectual property rights that they have created with their own hard work and their own innovative skills.

The bill that is being marked up is called, in fact, the Innovation Act. It is one of the worst misnomers that I have seen in my time in Congress. This should be called the "Anti-Innovation Act." This is yet the latest of a decades-long attack on the patent rights of the American people that were placed into the Constitution by our Founding Fathers.

For decades now, large multinational corporations, very powerful economic entities that have influence on government, have been trying to neuter the patent rights of the American people. Why have they been doing this? Why do they want to eliminate or to dramatically reduce the rights of our inventors to control what they have invented? Because these are big guys who don't want to pay the little guys when they steal from them.

The fact is that our Founding Fathers knew it was important for someone who has created something, whether it is a writer or an inventor, to have the right to control his or her creation for a certain period of time. The time period has been 17 years, traditionally, since the time of our Constitution. Our Founding Fathers knew this was important to our country's well-being, not just in terms of the rights of the individual, which we agree with as Americans and which were written into our Constitution as part of the Bill of Rights.

Only one place is the word "right" used in the body of the Constitution, and that is in the section dealing with providing our inventors and, yes, our writers with the right to control what they have created for a certain period of time in order to profit from it.

Our big corporations and these multinational corporations that have no loyalty to the United States, these people who are continually going overseas to China and elsewhere are trying to neuter this so that they can take any new innovation without having to pay the person who has actually been the inventor and created this. That is totally contrary to what our country has been all about.

We have had the strongest patent system in the world—the strongest in the world. What has that given the American people? It has uplifted our standard of living of ordinary people. Yes, these folks in the multinational corporations, they live very well. Well, the American people have lived well because we have had the technology, whether it is agricultural technology or transportation technology or any of the other type of energy technologies that we have. These have uplifted us and created more wealth for our society.

Americans' security, prosperity, and, yes, freedom have been due to our technological advantages. It is not that our people worked harder. It is not that we had such natural resources. There are countries all over the world where people work hard and have natural resources. It is our freedom and our respect for the individual rights of our citizens that have given us prosperity and security and freedom.

Now these powerful multinational corporations have targeted our patent system; and, yes, their motive, as I say, is to steal, let the big guys steal from the little guys. That is what this supposed Innovation Act, which, as I say, should be called the "Anti-Innovation Act," is all about.

In fact, there is a legitimate problem of frivolous lawsuits in our country. There is no doubt about that. It is not just in the area of technology. It is throughout our medicine and everywhere else. But there have been a number of people who have taken patent law and claimed rights that they weren't given by the Patent Office and issued frivolous lawsuits to people to try to get them to pay money to them. They are called patent trolls.

This excuse for changing our patent system is a lame excuse in the sense that we don't need to destroy the patent rights of the little guy in order to cure this problem. Every provision of the Innovation Act—every provision—limits the rights of legitimate patent holders in order to protect their own creation.

Let's not eliminate our freedom to handle those people, those few people, who are abusing it. I ask my colleagues to join me in opposing that and alerting the American people to this challenge to their freedom and their security and their prosperity.