

academic, an African American, with a degree from Harvard, who had an abortion. She said:

The lies that brought me to that day and to its sorrowful aftermath are crystal clear in my mind—falsehoods and deceptions that concealed the truth about abortion. Lies planted in my thinking by clever marketing and media campaigns and endless repetition led to a tragic, irreversible decision—the death of my first child.

Ms. Shrewsbury went on to say:

I really didn't understand back then. At age 20, I had no inkling of the mental and emotional darkness I was about to enter. I couldn't have grasped the immense psychological toll it would take for years into the future—unrelenting tears, guilt, shame, and depression. After spending many years in denial, I did eventually find healing.

Linda goes on to say:

When I understood and rejected distortions about fetal development, doublespeak about choice, rights, and planned and wanted children, I understood the reality and victimhood of my aborted child.

She went on and concluded:

I understood the absence of moral basis for choosing to disfigure an innocent human being of life. When I embraced the truth, the truth set me free, and I, finally, gained inner peace.

Some of my colleagues have mentioned the historic vote that we will take tomorrow on the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. This legislation, Mr. Speaker, as you know, is a modest but necessary attempt to at least protect babies who are 20 weeks old and who are pain capable from having to suffer and die from abortion.

I don't know about you, Mr. Speaker, but I, like, I think, most people, avoid pain at almost all costs. When I have surgeries—when anyone has surgeries—I am put locally or generally under anesthesia so that I do not have to feel the pain. The unborn child, when he or she is getting an intervention to help cure a disability or to deal with disease or illness, gets anesthesia because we now know beyond any reasonable doubt that unborn children who are at least at 20-weeks' gestation feel that pain.

When the abortionist commits a D&E abortion or one of the other abortions—D&E is literally a way of dismembering the child—they feel this pain—"they" being the children—and it is excruciating. Children, including children with disabilities, deserve better treatment than pain-filled dismemberment.

I would point out to my colleagues the expert testimony of Dr. Anthony Levatino's before the House Judiciary Committee. He is a former abortionist who has performed hundreds of dismemberment abortions. He described D&E. He said:

The baby can be in any position inside the uterus. Just reach in with a Sopher clamp, and grasp whatever you can.

The former abortionist went on to say:

Pull really hard, and out pops an arm. Reach in again and again, and tear out the spine, intestines, heart, and lungs.

Pull out a severed arm. Tear out the spine, intestines, heart, and lungs. This

is child abuse, Mr. Speaker. Not only is this assault on a child inhumane, it is extremely painful as the child experiences that dismemberment. Again, I say that children, including children with disabilities, deserve better treatment than pain-filled dismemberment.

Again, tomorrow is the March for Life, and there will be tens of thousands of people there who are speaking out for the unborn and equally for their mothers. There will be numbers of women there from the Silent No More Awareness Campaign—all women who have had abortions and who now speak out eloquently and with great compassion to say to women who are post-abortive that there is hope, that there is reconciliation. Face the truth, and that is the beginning to that reconciliation.

We will be there tomorrow, praying, working, of course—even fasting—for that day when every life is cherished as a gift, every life loved despite one's disability, race, sex, color, religion, or condition of dependency, when every life is welcomed no matter the inconvenience.

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

#### CONTRASTING VIEWS OF GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GROTHMAN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. JOLLY) for 30 minutes.

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to address the House and to address the country this afternoon and to do so with colleagues of mine from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE) and from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) to draw a contrast between the view of government represented by our side of the aisle and of that which we heard last night from our President, a President who seemingly ignored the will of the people as expressed by the ballot box in November and who, instead, doubled down on an agenda that we believe on our side of the aisle is the wrong view of government and the wrong direction for our Nation. So I rise with my colleagues today to talk about just a few of the very substantive points and to do so very constructively and to present why we have a different view of government and why we think that is important.

I would start by suggesting this. If we think about what the President said last night, in his words, the President declared from the rostrum that no challenge poses a greater threat to future generations than climate change. Now, I understand the sympathetic position on climate change. I am from a coastal State, and, frankly, I am a member of the Republican Party who believes that, indeed, the climate is changing, but I do not believe that the greatest challenge facing our future generations is that of climate change.

In fact, you can harken back to the words of Thomas Jefferson. He had a

very different opinion than our President had last night. He said that public debt is the greatest of dangers for our Nation to fear. I would suggest that Jefferson was right, that the greatest threat to our future generations is actually economic security and domestic security. I would like to speak for just a couple of moments about that and allow my colleagues to talk about other portions of the President's remarks.

Let's first talk about the long-term threat to our economic security—our national debt—a topic that was completely ignored in the President's address to the Nation last night.

Understand the significance of where we sit historically when it comes to the national debt. When this President took office, our national debt was just over \$10 trillion, meaning it had taken 220 years for our Republic—220 years—to accumulate just over \$10 trillion in debt, a number already far too high. In the 8 years of this administration, an additional \$10 trillion will be added under this President's watch. When he leaves his office, our debt will be over \$20 trillion.

Mr. Speaker, that is a threat to our national security. The greatest threat, perhaps, to our national security, arguably, could be unwatched, out-of-control spending and debt that ultimately collapses our economic system and ensures that we are no longer the world's greatest superpower. In fact, George Washington, himself, admonished that we have a moral obligation to pay off our debts during the life of the majority, during our lifetimes.

Rather than hearing from a President who doubled down on a very progressive agenda and who suggested with the rare audacity, as he did, that our Nation is fine in that conflicts and wars are over, in that our economy has returned, in that we have faster job growth than European nations—and yet the President suggested last night that he wants to grow our government in the very same manner that these European nations have today—and rather than tell us how to grow a government we already can't afford, I would ask the President to present a plan to pay for the government we already have.

The greatest threat to future generations is not climate change. It is our economic security, and it is also our homeland security. Many on this side of the aisle have grave reservations about the President's current plan to combat the war against ISIS, or ISIL—against radical extremists-terrorists who intend to bring harm to the United States. That is a threat. That is a real threat.

The President called for something last night that I strongly agree with. I think this body should have a robust debate about an authorization to use military force. We owe it to the American people, who sent us here, to represent them on this very critical issue

of what is our national policy to protect our homeland, to protect American lives.

In fact, what is the current plan to arm Syrian rebels, and what is the likelihood that that will actually be successful when we have seen a lack of success in areas like Iraq?

Despite the declarations of last night, I would challenge that we are not as safe as, perhaps, the President suggested. From the Middle East, to Africa, to Paris, to Yemen, to our very own border, what is that plan?

House Republicans passed a border security bill that reflected the will of the people last July, yet we heard nothing last night—not a single comment—about how to secure our border. It is a sharp contrast. We heard about negotiating with Iran. We heard about releasing prisoners from GTMO. We heard nothing about securing our borders and securing our homeland, so we have taken this time today to present a constructive contrast between the President's view of government and our view of government and what we believe are the right priorities of our government.

I am pleased to be joined by my colleagues today, and I would yield now to my colleague from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Thank you to my good friend and colleague from Florida, and thank you to my good friend and colleague from Alabama for joining us, Mr. BYRNE.

Mr. Speaker, this is a great opportunity to talk about what we heard in this Chamber, just slightly less than 24 hours ago, from this President, who is from my home State of Illinois. We heard a lot of ideas and a lot of talk and a lot of promises, but if it is anything like the State of the Union Addresses that I have had an opportunity to sit on in this Chamber over the last 2 years, we are not going to see a lot of action.

There was a lot of talk about the economy. The economy is getting better. Frankly, it can't have gotten much worse when you compare it to a few years ago. Of course, it is going to get better, but the reality is there are still 8.7 million Americans who are out of work, and 7 million Americans are in part-time jobs but are looking for full-time jobs.

□ 1700

The President's solution to many of the issues that were brought up was to tax more American families—to tax American families who have been saving for their children's college education to pay for a grandiose idea he has yet to give us the details on.

The President also talked about helping our heroes: our veterans. This one is personal to me because just a few weeks ago, the day we got sworn in for the 114th Congress, Mr. Speaker, we were able to unanimously pass a bill called the Hire More Heroes Act, which I sponsored. This wasn't an idea that

came from Washington. It was an idea that came from Illinois. Brad Lavite, the superintendent of the Madison County, Illinois, Veterans Assistance Commission, came to me during the last Congress and said, Why is it that veterans who are getting their health care through TRICARE and through the Department of Defense count towards the ObamaCare 50-employee limit in the employer mandate?

I came here, took his idea, and garnered hundreds of cosponsors to put this on the floor of the House. It passed in the last Congress, but it got held up in the Senate. It passed unanimously in this Congress on day one, and that bill should go through the Senate and get to the President's desk. If he wants to help veterans get jobs, I hope the President signs that immediately when it hits his desk, hopefully, in no more than a few weeks.

These are the types of solutions that are bipartisan solutions that the President told us he wanted to put forth, but he talked to us in a manner that I didn't think was bipartisan at all. Most of his speech talked about what he was going to do. I would have rather heard the President talk about what we are going to do together because, frankly, that is what my constituents in Illinois want us to do. They want us to come here and govern together.

That is why I am so glad to be here and be a part of this Special Order with my good friend, Mr. JOLLY. Hopefully, we can begin a good banter about discussing what our thoughts are on where America needs to go to move forward and work with this President but do it in a way that is a lot less confrontational than what we heard last night.

Mr. JOLLY. With that, I yield to a real leader in this institution, a colleague of ours from the great State of Alabama, Mr. BRADLEY BYRNE.

Mr. BYRNE. I thank the gentlemen from Florida and Illinois. Those were eloquent words spoken from the heart, because I know both of these gentlemen mean everything they just said.

Last night was an interesting moment for me. One of the President's big plays is this proposal regarding community colleges.

Let me tell you a little bit about myself. I am the first person in my family to go to college. Both of my parents grew up during the Depression. There wasn't any money for college, but I was privileged to go to college. During the time that I went, my parents were not doing well financially. Like very many other people, I was a financial aid student.

We didn't have Pell grants back then. You got Federal student loans and maybe a Federal student work-study job. Lots and lots of people in my generation did that. I don't ever complain about that because that is the best money I ever borrowed and the best work I ever did because it gave me the opportunity to do what I have done in life. But it also taught me how impor-

tant it is to give people an opportunity for a real education so that they can move up in their lives.

This May, the last of my four children will finish college. We have had somebody in college in my family since 2003. I have been writing those tuition checks, fees, et cetera. So I look at this also from the point of view of someone who has had to be there writing those checks, sending their young people to college. But I am also the former chancellor of post-secondary education for the State of Alabama. It was my job to be the CEO of Alabama's 2-year college system, the community colleges for the State of Alabama. And so I bring a certain level of experience and expertise to this issue that may be a little different from others in this body.

When the President first proposed this, his office just gave us a heads up. It didn't check and say, Do you think this is a good idea? Given your background, do you think this is something we can do? He said, This is what we're going to do.

Our first question we asked was, How much will it cost? The initial answer we got from the White House was, We don't know how much it's going to cost. Now that should cause us all to ask a question about how serious this proposal is when, in the very first instance that they decide that they are going to propose it, they can't even tell us how much it costs. Even after they decided how much they think it is going to cost—\$60 billion—they couldn't tell us how they were going to pay for it.

So it led me to ask this question: Is this a serious idea? Because, you see, over a third of our community college students in America are already on Federal Pell grants, which cover all—or virtually all—of their tuition and fee costs when they go to community college. And for the people that don't have the eligibility to get Pell grants, there are a combination of other things that they can get.

My experience as somebody who ran a community college system was that covering tuition and fees was usually not the real problem most community college students face. Most of them face a more difficult problem, and that is they are not adequately academically prepared or they have other problems in their lives, whether it is from their homes or jobs or whatever. It is hard for them to stay in college and stay up with the work that they have got to do. And so they need a lot of extra help. And the President doesn't talk about that.

Now here is the worst thing about this proposal. We heard a lot last night from the President of the United States that he was all about the middle class. Let me tell you one of the taxes that he is going to raise that is going to pay for these proposals. He is going to tax 529 plans.

For people that don't know what those are, 529 plans are savings accounts, essentially, that moms and

dads and grandmoms and granddads put money in over time and they use that money that they saved over time to put their young people through college. And the good thing about that is while they pay taxes on the money that they make before they put it into the plans, if, when they take the money out of those plans, there has been some appreciation—it has gone from being this much money to that much money—they don't have to pay taxes on it.

It is an incentive for them. It is a way for middle class people to save for college for their young people. It is the only way middle class people in this country have a real savings plan for the young people. And this President, who stood up right behind me last night and talked about being for the middle class, wants to tax those middle class savings plans and take them away from people. Twelve million people use those plans in this country, 12 million people like my parents, like my wife and me, and like many, many other people in America. They shouldn't have their plans taxed.

So I say to my colleagues from Florida and Illinois, if you look at just that one part of what he proposed, it is hard to say he was serious. Because if he really cares about higher education in America, he would think about the other needs of these community college students. But most importantly, he would think about those 12 million parents that are saving for their young people, middle class people whom he is trying to take money away from with this proposed tax.

I think that sort of gives you a flavor of my appreciation of that one part of what he said last night.

Mr. JOLLY. You bring much education experience as a layperson but also somebody with very specific political convictions. The President talked about free community college. And as an example, he used two local areas that now provide it. Well, I think that is the point of departure for our view of government.

If a local community decides that they want to provide education through whatever tax levy that the residents there might support, that is a great opportunity. But to suggest that somehow Washington, which so often fails in orchestrating through the heavy hand of government a new type of education economics, is going to work better than those two communities that he cited last night is exactly where the view of government between our side of the aisle and his begins to depart.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOLLY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. I would like to know how many community colleges the administration contacted to talk about whether or not this was a good idea. The example that I have heard since this idea was put forth was that Tennessee is going to do

it. Well, great for Tennessee, because they are probably going to use their lottery funds, from what I have read, to pay for it.

Let me give you an example in Illinois, where I live, the President's home State. Unless we are going to get a brand new crop of lotto players, if the lotto is going to fund it, then you know what? That money would be robbed from our K through 12 system to create what is tantamount to grades 13 and 14 in our community colleges, which may not have the faculty or may not have the facilities to handle the influx—and then to top it off by taxing savings plans that many middle class Americans have been using to be able to send their children to college at a time when the cost to go to any college is rising exponentially much faster than the inflation rate.

I don't know if this is a conflict of interest or not because this is just a proposal from the White House, but I have a 529 plan. We have been saving for my three kids to go to college. And to be taxed now, after investing since they were very young—my daughter is now 17—I can tell you from the standpoint as a dad that I can empathize with many families who aren't in the financial position that we are able to be in because we are blessed enough to serve our districts in this institution.

It is flabbergasting to me to be able to hear the President talk about these great ideas. Frankly, I just don't know how many of us sat in this room last night and believed that it was going to get beyond the idea stage. And I don't know how much effort he is going to put in to try and pass this plan, but I would urge our colleagues to take a good, hard look at this and also never forget the possible impact it is going to have on our 4-year institutions, both private and public. I serve nine of those in my district in Illinois. What kind of impact is it going to have on those institutions when you take a good percentage of students that will now go, if his plan is implemented, to the community colleges, which provide a great education?

I would love to hear more about what you think and the impact it might have on the community college systems that you are so familiar with, Mr. BYRNE.

Mr. BYRNE. That is an important point because when you look at education, there are different parts of it. Each part serves its own special need. The 4-year colleges are different from the 2-year colleges, and they are different from high schools, et cetera. So there is a role that each of them play, but sometimes we start fuzzing them together and we miss the importance of each one of them.

I think there will be some negative effects on 4-year colleges. I already heard from some 4-year college people about that. They don't want to pick on the 2-year colleges because they don't want to be seen to do that, but they understand there could be some negative effects.

But the point you and the gentleman from Florida were making that is even more important to this, these are mainly local and State decisions. The Federal Government is inserting itself in things that traditionally, under our Federal understanding of government, the Federal Government didn't get involved in.

I talked to our colleagues in this House from the State of Tennessee, Democrat and Republican, and said, What do you think about us taking your Tennessee plan and nationalizing it? They said, We think it's a bad idea. We are proud of our Tennessee plan. We think it's a good plan. We're proud that our State is doing it.

It is one thing to talk about it from a State level—I understand they have one in Chicago at the local level—but it is different when you blow it up to be a national thing.

So the President wants to take this good idea from a single State or a single city and blow it up into a national thing, and we are not really stoked here to do that. We don't really understand how to do that.

Here is what happens now: we send the money out. And what happens after we send the money? Rules and regulations and mandates come flowing down after it, and Washington starts telling Tennessee and Illinois and Florida and Alabama how to run our colleges. And that, my friends, is a very bad idea. I don't think anybody in higher education wants the heavy hand of the Federal Government telling us how to run our institutions of higher education.

Let me end on this one point. America is known as having the best institutions of higher education in the world. And the reason we do is because each one of our institutions is different from one another. They specialize in who they are and they focus on quality. And if we start robbing that from them by trying to stamp some one-size-fits-all concept of higher education, which the President is trying to do right now with this rating system he wants to put on higher education, then we may start losing in an area in which we are the preeminent leader in the world. And I don't think the people of Alabama sent me here to let the Federal Government do that to the fine institutions of higher education we have in the State of Alabama.

Mr. JOLLY. In our remaining time, I would like to revisit another topic—it is one on which I think the solutions on our side of the aisle reflect the will of the people that we saw at the ballot box in November—and that is border security.

□ 1715

We need to reclaim this issue, as conservatives. We need to redefine this national conversation. The President likes to continually say that if Congress would just send him a bill, then all would be okay, and it is usually followed by suggesting that if we send a

bill that we pass, he will veto it. What he means is we have to send him his bill.

I just want to point out something because we do have solutions on this side of this aisle, and we have acted responsibly on behalf of that. In July, we passed a border security bill that put facilities closer to the border to keep those who enter illegally closer to the border.

We changed the policy to “last in, first out,” so if you get in, you don’t get to linger for years before you are returned if you don’t have a humanitarian claim that merits staying.

We also increased funding for judges, created tele-courtrooms so that we could more expeditiously process those who come here illegally—and rightfully so—and we should do so very responsibly. We are a loving nation made better for immigration, but we should show everybody the rule of law and how you responsibly immigrate here.

Mind you, we also passed a bill that provided for the health care of those who come here and while they are detained here, but I want to point out something very specific. In the coming weeks, this Congress is going to offer another bill—because that one was never accepted by the Senate or went to the President—to require operational control of our border.

That is a great urgency, to have operational control of our border, not to just address the traditional border security issue, but to address what we know is a growing concern about our domestic and homeland security.

We have seen the threats around the globe. Most certainly, that has to be an area where we can reach agreement with the White House, and I hope we can take up the President on his offer to put a bill on his desk and ask him to sign it, just as he has pledged to do so.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOLLY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Thank you to the gentleman for yielding, and you bring up a great point. This isn’t just a border security issue because of an immigration issue. This is a border security issue because of a homeland security issue.

We have to make our border secure. We are going to have what our vision for border security is in this institution pass now to the Senate, and the President will get his wish. We will put a bill on his desk. It may not be the bill he wants, but my message to the administration—to the White House—is: come work with us.

In my first 2 years here, I just haven’t seen that happen on a wide variety of issues. It seems like every idea that we come up with in this institution, even some that passed by huge bipartisan majorities, they threaten a veto. Well, that is okay, but that is not conducive to working together to find solutions, and that is what I think we are here for.

I think we, on this side, there are many of us who are out here to find solutions to the Nation’s problems, not to create more problems, and that is exactly the message I hope to send to the American people tonight, that we are willing to work with the President on border security, on education, on a wide variety of issues, but we also have to have some response back, and that is what I think we are lacking.

Mr. BYRNE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOLLY. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BYRNE. I am on the Armed Services Committee, and I look at border security as national security.

Let me give you a story from a trip that several of us on the Armed Services Committee took to the Middle East back in August and September. We visited several countries over there. As you know, it is a very dangerous part of the world, clearly.

One of the countries we went to is Morocco. Morocco, if you think about where it is, should have lots of problems, but you don’t really hear much about Morocco having terrorist incidents. When we were over there, we asked a lot of questions. How is that so?

It is because they take their border security very seriously. They use a lot of the military aid that America provides to Morocco for their border security, and they keep the bad guys out, and so you don’t hear in this country that is in some of the most troubled parts of the world, you don’t hear about the problems there because they control their borders. They understand that their internal and national security is dependent upon that.

We had two brothers, the Tsarnaev brothers, who grew up in Boston. One of them was allowed to go back to where they were from and one of the satellite countries from Russia—obviously was trained by terrorists.

We allowed him to come back into this country, after we were warned by the Russians where he had gone, and he and his brother tragically ignited those bombs at the Boston Marathon, seriously wounding a lot of people and killing some.

Well, what sort of a security situation do we have that we allowed him back into this country? What sort of security situation do we have today?

This is not just about the southern border; it is about the northern border. It is about our security of the entire Nation, and if we will start looking at border security as national security, which is the way we on this side of the aisle understand this issue, then we can protect the American people.

It definitely does take us working with the President because he runs the Department of Homeland Security through his appointee to that Secretary’s position, and it is his policies through that Department that determine whether or not we are going to be protected, and protecting our borders

is a part of protecting Americans from international terrorism, including international Islamic terrorism.

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. DAVIS, any more comments this evening?

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. If the gentleman would inquire how much time we have left.

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOLLY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. I am just excited to be able to talk about what happened at the State of the Union last night, our perspective. In closing, it kind of frustrates me that we didn’t see real solutions to the exploding cost of higher education.

If the solution is what the President laid out, which is going to actually put more of a burden on middle class families by taxing their savings plans that they have been saving for—for sometimes decades—that is a wrong approach to bringing down the cost of higher education to making Pell grants go further.

The President also mentioned another point last night about equal pay. Well, it would have been nice to have the President and the White House actually do that in the White House, where women make an average of 18 percent less than men, so it is not just enough to talk about it here in this Chamber. Do it when you have control over the opportunity to make things happen.

That is why I hope it is not just rhetoric on many issues, but I want to see action.

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this time. I hope what the American people have seen and our colleagues have seen is a Congress with solutions.

We will be passing through this House border security solutions, a homeland security solution. Frankly, addressing the constitutional overreach we saw from the President, we will be passing energy independence solutions, education solutions, tax reform solutions. We are committed to doing that on behalf of the American people.

I look forward to working with our colleagues, and frankly, we remain hopeful that we will have the opportunity to work with the President on this as well.

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

#### WHY WE ARE REALLY HERE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) for 30 minutes.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is January 22, 2015. It