

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.

AMERICA'S SMALL BUSINESSES NEED THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

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

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, today I have a simple ask: let the Export-Import Bank answer the call. 2,655—2,655—that is how many small businesses called the Export-Import Bank last year and asked for their assistance in selling American-made goods and services around the globe. That is how many businesses the Export-Import Bank said yes to, without any impact on taxpayers—no cost to taxpayers whatsoever—in order to help those 2,655 businesses be competitive in a global market.

The truth is, in each district—Democratic districts, Republican districts, urban, rural, coastal, interior—each district is rich with businesses large and small. Every Member has small businesses that are the result of hard work, families pulling together to build something of value and worth that can be assisted by the Export-Import Bank—brand-new business as well, not just those that are intergenerational. These are the businesses that create jobs and employ millions of our loved ones and our neighbors and our family. When they want to export their goods and services, who do they call? They call the Export-Import Bank.

Alliance Rubber Company is just one of the 2,655 small businesses that made that call. Alliance is the largest manufacturer of rubberbands in America. It is a women-owned small business located in Hot Springs, Arkansas. They employ a whole 156 employees. Alliance plans to add 15 employees within the next year, but without exports, they will be cutting 10 jobs—our family members, our neighbors. Add 15 or cut 10? It seems like the choice is obvious to me.

Here is what another company said: “Thanks to credit insurance available through the Ex-Im, we have hired a salesman dedicated to growing international sales. Growing our traffic and safety business internationally will mean more jobs in our Fife facility and more business for our local vendors.”

That is in my district, Fife, Washington. The company is Pexco, another one of the 2,655 businesses. There are Pexcos in Republican districts and in Democratic districts all over this country. There are Alliance Rubber companies in Republican Districts and Democratic districts. And if you listen to these business leaders, it makes sense to help them do what they are doing.

Who will answer the call after June 30? Well, unfortunately, not local banks or even the big banks. If you don't believe me, ask them. They are the ones that usually refer the businesses to the Export-Import Bank.

We have 10 days left, 10 legislative days to act before the help on the other end of the line is gone. Companies have 15 business days to make the call and see how they can sell their goods and

expand their exports to foreign customers. If you are a small business looking to export, call 1-800-565-EXIM, 1-800-565-3949. That is why the Bank is there. That is why it should remain.

As a matter of fact, Chairman HENSARLING's own witness—I couldn't make this stuff up—who testified against the Bank as a small-business owner last week told her hometown newspaper this later: “The fact is that there are a lot of small businesses and large businesses that need the Bank right now, and to pull that rug out from under them would be devastating.” I couldn't make this up.

Hold a vote, Mr. Speaker. Hold a vote. Give your colleagues the opportunity to vote for our small businesses and the jobs they provide. They are the backbone of this community and this economy and this Nation; 2,655 of them and counting. Let the Export-Import Bank answer the call.

AMERICANS DESERVE TO KNOW WHO RAISED THEIR FOOD

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

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, Americans want to know: Where does their food come from? Parents want to know before they give it to their children: How was this food raised? Where did it come from? Moms want to know, dads want to know, and today they can; but if proposed legislation passes this body this week, we won't have that information necessary to make those decisions for our family and our family's health.

What legislation am I talking about? I am talking about the country of origin labeling. In other words, right now, if you buy food and it comes from a foreign country, it must be labeled. If you buy pork, you buy beef, you buy chicken, wouldn't you want to know where that food came from?

Why would you want to know? Well, different countries have different rules and different cultures. If you remember back in 2007, we had some pet food that came from a foreign country that killed a lot of pets. It was enhanced with melamine to up the protein readings in it, and it was unsafe for pets. A lot of pets died as a result. Well, it came from a different country that has different ethics. I think Americans deserve to know who raised their food, which country did it come from. But the legislation that is in front of us this week will repeal that requirement to label beef, poultry, and pork.

Now, why are we doing this? Why are we in such a rush? Because we have been told that the World Trade Organization requires it.

What is the World Trade Organization, and who are they to tell Congress what laws we have to pass? These judges weren't appointed by the President. They weren't confirmed by the Senate. These are not judges from our Constitution. These are extra-constitutional judges, yet they are telling us

here in Congress you have got to do this or there will be repercussions.

I think our Founding Fathers would be appalled at this notion, that we have given up our sovereignty. I don't accept the premise that we have to make laws here based on what some world court agrees to, but I suppose somebody made a trade agreement in some Congress previous that bound us to decisions of this court.

Now, even if you accept the premise that we have to abide by the World Trade Organization, and because they have ruled that we can no longer label pork and beef as from foreign countries to inform our consumers, then you have got to ask the question: Why did we add chicken to this bill? The World Trade Organization is silent on the subject of chicken, yet it is in the bill.

We are going to remove the labeling requirements for chicken. I think it is a bad idea. I think it is probably motivated by some large meat packing companies; but they are represented here in Congress, and the American consumer and small livestock farmers are not.

□ 1100

I proposed voluntary country of origin labeling last night in the Rules Committee. I had an amendment. It said: Okay. Maybe we shouldn't mandate. Maybe we shouldn't force the foreigners to label their meat when it comes into the country; but how about voluntarily letting American producers put that proud stamp and know that it is the seal of approval that most consumers want so they know that beef, that pork, was raised in this country?

I was shot down in the Rules Committee. It was just a voluntary program. In fact, it was proposed 10 years ago by this Speaker of the House, by the former chair of the Ag Committee, by the current chair of the Ag Committee, and by the current chair of the Rules Committee; yet they wouldn't allow my amendment for a vote in the Rules Committee. All I sought to do was let American farmers proclaim that their beef is raised in the United States.

Today, Mr. Speaker, that is why I am here. I am here today to say that we need to assert our sovereignty, the sovereignty of this body. We all took an oath to the Constitution. We didn't take an oath to the World Trade Organization. We need to assert our sovereignty, and we need to uphold our commitment to the Americans who sent us here.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the repeal of the country of origin labeling bill later today.

ISRAEL

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, our Commander in Chief admitted that, in the fight against the Islamic State, the U.S. does not have “a complete strategy.”