

the delta, put it in a canal into Old River to the pumps, 3,000. The remaining water would be taken out of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta when it is available, when the delta smelt and other fish are not at the pumps, and turn the pumps on, sending that water south to be stored or used in the aquifers stored in new surface storage reservoirs along the way. Of course, north of the delta, you would have the surface storage reservoir at Sites and perhaps the enlargement of Shasta, then the ability to use it.

So why don't we do it? For the \$15 billion that the Governor wants to spend on digging two tunnels that do not create 1 gallon of new water, but do create an existential threat to the largest estuary on the West Coast of the Western Hemisphere. Don't waste your money. Don't spend \$15 billion on a \$5 billion benefit—and that is over 50 years.

Why would you ever make that investment when you could do something that creates water, creates perhaps as much as 5 million acre-feet of new water for California's future, water that would be available from recycling and storage in southern California aquifers, available from storage north of the delta, the replenishment of the aquifers in the great Central Valley of California, and the creation of new storage surface reservoirs along the way? And most important, conservation—we have to conserve. It is mandated now. It is part of our future.

This is a water plan for all California. These ideas are not new. I didn't dream them up, although I put them together. And interestingly enough, 3½ years ago, when I made this first proposal, about a year later the Governor and the Department of Water Resources put forth a paper called a Water Action Plan for California, and it is exactly the same—without the tunnels.

Their Water Action Plan didn't speak to the tunnels. It did speak to storage north of the delta; it did speak to conservation; it did speak to the aquifers; it did speak to desalinization and recycling—all of those things that have been in the water plan for California for about 30 years.

This is not new. I have been involved in these issues since the 1970s, and I know that if we were to back away from the twin tunnel proposal, which is so destructive of the delta, and went to the little sip/big gulp strategy, using all of the various mechanisms available to California, we could create maybe 5 million acre-feet of new water. We could address the future drought that California will have again some day in the future.

Now, what about today's drought? I want to deal with that.

The people of California last November passed a \$7 billion water bond. That water bond allows for conservation, replenishment of the aquifers, surface storage—perhaps Sites Reservoir, yet to be determined—and recycling, re-

plenishment of the aquifers and, most important for now, today, money for those communities that are out of water and have no water at all so they can drill their wells deeper or bring in surface water from nearby rivers or communities that may be available.

That is a particular problem here in this area of the San Joaquin Valley and a few of the communities up here in the Sacramento Valley and up in the foothills. We need to provide that immediate relief for those areas, and we need to get on with conservation and some of the money that is necessary in order to do that. The water bond is available. That money is going to be coming out over the next 18 months or so as the State of California moves projects forward.

Immediately, and this is what I hope would be in the legislation that we should pass here in Washington is that we would use those Federal programs that exist today—and there are a multitude of Federal programs that already exist in Federal law, money that is already appropriated but not focused on the drought, not only in California, but throughout the West. And what I would suggest as we move legislation forward—perhaps this will be in Senator FEINSTEIN's bill. I would hope so. And if not there, as we hopefully all work together on solving the problem of drought in the West, particularly in California, that we focus our attention on the immediate opportunities that the Federal Government can presently present to solve problems.

The Environmental Protection Agency has the clean water grant programs. The Department of the Interior, the Bureau of Reclamation, has the WaterSMART program, which is conservation and recycling. We know that the Army Corps of Engineers has programs. There are other programs spread throughout the Federal Government that, if they were focused immediately on the needs of California and other States, that money could move to solve the community problems.

The clean water grant program could be used to provide water programs for those communities that are out of water—the recycling, conservation programs. All of those have money that is presently already appropriated but not focused; and if they focus that money so that it was in coordination, augmented, and supplemented and ahead of the California water bond programs, you could advance the water bond programs by as much as 18 months. It will take that long for California to move that money out of the bond.

So move the Federal Government in conjunction, in alignment with the programs that the State of California already is planning to do but doesn't yet have the money available. Put the Federal money there. Do the planning, the engineering, the environmental reviews, if necessary, and you advance so that today's drought can be dealt with. Now that is beginning to make sense.

I think we can do this. We need to push aside all of the fighting we have

had over these many, many years. Don't take water from somebody, but work on programs to expand the water potential for all California. Don't push aside the environmental laws, because it is, in fact, the environmental laws that protect this largest estuary on the West Coast of the Western Hemisphere—San Francisco Bay and the fishing industry up and down the coast, all the way to the Columbia River between Oregon and Washington.

Don't put us in a situation where we are destined to fight, but rather put us in a situation where we can work together. That is my plea to my Republican colleagues who pushed that bill through here basically on a party-line vote and now headed to the Senate. I ask Senator FEINSTEIN to work with those of us that represent the delta and that have worked for generations and decades on how to protect the delta.

There is a solution. I call it a little sip/big gulp. You can put any name you want to on it. In fact, the Natural Resources Defense Council came up with a similar program that they called a portfolio approach: conservation; recycling; desalinization, aquifers; storage systems, both large and small, surface and aquifer. It is all there. This is not new. This is working together to solve a major challenge to the largest economy in the United States, the seventh largest economy in the world, the largest population—35 million people. This is a challenge, but this is a challenge we can do.

So my plea to anybody that cares to work on water is to work with us. There are ways we can solve and mitigate the current drought and solve the problem for the future drought. It is there. It is not going to be any more expensive than the massive tunnel programs that the Governor is proposing.

In fact, if you took that \$15 billion and you were to spend it on building Sites Reservoir, expanding reservoirs to the south, putting in the systems for the underground aquifer replenishment and recycling programs in southern California, how much progress could we make? Well, we could solve the problems for the next drought, and we could mitigate and reduce the harm of the current drought. That is what it is all about: working together, taking the best ideas of one group or another.

Mr. Speaker, I think I have covered this issue, hopefully making some sense of what is a very complex problem for California and, therefore, for the Nation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

NATIONAL SECURITY, THE RULE OF LAW, AND PLANNED PARENTHOOD VIDEOS

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to be able to address you

here on the floor of the House of Representatives and to speak some words here that hopefully will be picked up by the rest of the country that causes us to think a little more, think a little deeper, and think about the destiny of this country, Mr. Speaker.

I come to the floor to talk to you this evening about a couple of topics. One is national security, and the other is the rule of law. I will say the third thing that threads into that is the Planned Parenthood videos. We have now seen three of them, as they penetrate into our conscience.

Let me address first the Planned Parenthood videos. It has been now several weeks since the first video came out that showed the supposed doctor that worked for Planned Parenthood cavalierly discussing how to harvest the organs of innocent little unborn—aborted, though—babies, and the cavalier approach to that: sitting there over dinner, chatting away as if they were talking about a soccer game or maybe talking about spending the weekend with their family, having a glass of wine and talking about taking organs out of innocent little creatures that are created in God's image, as we all are, Mr. Speaker. That was video number one.

It should have shocked us to our core to see the attitude, but it didn't confirm decisively what was actually going on. It implied—and it was fairly strong evidence—but it didn't confirm.

The second video was the older lady sitting in a different restaurant, chatting along about how a transaction would be to harvest kidneys and lungs and livers and hearts and brains and body parts from innocent babies who just wanted a chance to live and love and laugh and learn; to worship, to grow, to enjoy life—to enjoy that first right, that right to life that comes before the right to liberty, which comes before the right to the pursuit of happiness, as our Founding Fathers prioritized those rights in the Declaration of Independence, Mr. Speaker.

□ 1915

That lady, in the second video, wanted enough out of that, that she—I will use that word again—"cavalierly" said: I want a Lamborghini.

I am sure she would say to us: I was just joking.

Well, to joke about that topic in a setting like that, that told me it wasn't just a casual conversation. There was attention being paid to the business deal that was being negotiated, and it didn't seem like it was conclusive, but there was a direction and a course for that conversation.

Now, today, we see a third video, a video interviewing a young woman who has worked in a Planned Parenthood center whose task was to harvest the organs of little babies. The video shows the separation of that, shows the little feet, the little arms, the little hands.

It shows the kidneys; it shows the brain. It shows the pieces of that little

baby that was perfect in every way until it was torn apart by the abortionist, using a technique, a methodology that is designed to preserve the most valuable organs so that they can be sold on the market to laboratories and for medical experiments, Mr. Speaker.

When I saw that video today and I saw each of the other two videos when they came out, the first day that one was available, and then I saw one, and I saw the second video as a preview before it came out to the public.

Either one of those, when I was listening to the verbiage, certainly told me that there is an evil, evil element within Planned Parenthood, a cavalier attitude, a "this is the business we do" attitude; not a human compassion was exposed in either one of those first two videos.

I have been in a lot of debates about abortion. I have read a lot of material about it. I have listened to a lot of testimony about it. Sitting on the Judiciary Committee, we moved legislation that put an end to partial-birth abortion or at least attempted to, and so we have had a lot of life-and-death debates in the Judiciary Committee here in the House of Representatives.

When I saw the video of the young woman talking about the task that she was given, pick up these forceps and begin to separate these organs and sort them out, and these are good, and the lab will take that, and essentially, These will bring good money, let's make sure we protect them, it sickened me.

It caused my gut to knot up, Mr. Speaker, in a way that reminded me of the first time I walked into a funeral home to see the dead body of a loved one. That is an experience in anybody's lifetime that you remember. Seeing this video is an experience that I will remember.

As I watch this Congress and I think how Congress is reacting, I am glad that there are investigations going on. I am glad that the Speaker has spoken up on this issue. I am glad that there is a pro-life movement in this country.

I am glad that there are people that are protesting and there are people that are making their positions known to the Supreme Court, to the United States Congress, to the President of the United States.

However intransigent the President will be on this, this is a subject that should have the immediate attention of the Department of Justice. This would be something that Loretta Lynch should be on now, should be conducting an investigation now, should be bringing about the evidence and preparing a prosecution against the people that have, essentially, admitted in the videos that they have committed a crime, perhaps multiple crimes.

This isn't about there is a piece or there is an argument on one side versus an argument on the other side.

Planned Parenthood says: Well, we don't do it for a profit. We just do this

to get our money back out of the costs we have to preserve these organs and pass them along. After all, this poor mother is just making a contribution to science, and so we should appreciate that.

That is not what the Congress thought when they passed the laws against trading in little, unborn baby body parts, Mr. Speaker. It is about the law, and the law says thou shall not do such a thing.

No amount of excusing away; no amount of trying to explain that it was with a positive motive, instead of a profit motive; no amount of saying that, Well, that is just our costs, and we are recovering our cost; no amount of saying that the money that comes from the taxpayer into the pockets of Planned Parenthood doesn't ever go to abortion because it will be said now, hundreds of times, Mr. Speaker, in fact, thousands of times, it will be said: Money is fungible. Money is fungible. Money is fungible.

If you dump a half a billion dollars into Planned Parenthood's coffers—that is out of the pockets of the taxpayers. We hand them the debt, borrow the money from the Chinese, hand it over to Planned Parenthood, and Planned Parenthood then uses that to run their operation to free up some of their other operations that end up being what they call an operation, which is an abortion, that is snuffing out the lives—we are closing in on 60 million little babies since *Roe v. Wade* in 1973, closing in on 60 million.

At the same time, we have people that are arguing that we need to open up our borders and let an unlimited number of people come into America because our birthrate is not high enough to replace the people that are dying off as they reach the end of their life.

Rather than to say let's bring every one of these babies to birth, give them an opportunity to fill their lungs full of free air, give them an opportunity to live, to love, to learn, to laugh, give them an opportunity to contribute to this country, to this society, rather than do that, we abort the babies and bring in people from another culture and think we are making America a better place, when we have the sin of up to 60 million abortions on our country, on our heads, on our conscience, on our Supreme Court, Mr. Speaker, and on this Congress, to a degree, the House and Senate, and certainly on the President of the United States, who said he—and I will leave his family out of it, Mr. Speaker, but I think some know the thought that crossed my mind.

It is time for this Congress to step up to defund Planned Parenthood. I won't be satisfied with just a moratorium of waiting around for a year while we study this situation and put together maybe a select committee that can look at it for a while longer and hold some hearings in Congress. They are going to look at the videos and listen to the testimony on both sides.

All that does, Mr. Speaker, is give Planned Parenthood an opportunity to spend some of those millions of dollars, some percentage of the half a billion dollars that we send to them out of the taxpayers' pocket, borrowed from the Chinese, and indebted onto the children that are born, to lobby this Congress to tell us: Well, there is really some good there at Planned Parenthood after all, and so we should continue to fund them.

That is what we are faced with, Mr. Speaker.

The object is this: Shut off all funding to Planned Parenthood; they should not receive one dime of taxpayer dollars further.

There has been a strong movement on this over the years since the time I have been here, and the States want to move, too, Mr. Speaker. The States want to shut off funding to Planned Parenthood.

They are afraid that Congress, or the President of the United States, through one of his executive edicts, will order that the funding going to a State that would cut off the funding to Planned Parenthood would be cut off itself, that their Medicaid money might be stopped by this administration if a State would deign to cut off funding and no longer subsidize Planned Parenthood.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress needs to deal with this. We need to give the States all authority to cut off any funds, in the discretion of their own legislature and Governors, any funds that go to any organization that provides abortion. They will call it services or counseling.

If we do that, then we can restore a component of the culture of life in this country. If we do that, we begin to respect and appreciate innocent, unborn human life, we will see families that will grow. We will see children that are cherished. We will see more and more foundation of education and faith and wholesomeness in our country.

If we turn our backs on those innocent, unborn, little babies that are being systematically aborted, while we are subsidizing Planned Parenthood with borrowed tax dollars, under the guise of somehow they do some good, this is evil, Mr. Speaker. What is happening to these innocent babies and what is happening to the mothers is evil, and it is evil for profit. It is on video, and we have seen three of these videos, Mr. Speaker. We are not done yet.

This Congress should not just pledge to study this for a year. This Congress—and we go forward with funding for the fiscal year, next fiscal year, we have got the witching hour, September 30, at midnight.

It is likely to come as a continuing resolution. That continuing resolution has to have in it the language that will cut off the funding to Planned Parenthood. I will cut it off to any organization that provides abortion, as they say, services or counseling.

That subject is on the front of my mind, Mr. Speaker, and I wanted to get that off of my chest.

NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. KING of Iowa. The next piece that I want to talk about is our national security. As we are watching presidential debates unfold—and our 16 or so candidates that are announced for President of the United States, I am grateful for every one of them.

I have never seen such a field of candidates that step up and want to serve this country from the Oval Office, the high quality of the character and the integrity that they have, the varied experience, and the success that they have demonstrated in their lives. There have been a lot of easier times to win the Republican nomination than there is now, Mr. Speaker.

As I look at the candidates that are out there—and I have been tuning my ear, encouraging them—I have yet to hear any of the candidates deliver a compact, inclusive approach to how to defeat Islamic jihad.

I listen to them speak, and I like the components that I hear from them. One of them says: We win; they lose.

I like that; but how are we going to do that? We need a strategy.

One of them says: If you attack us, we will kill you.

Okay. Well, let's kill them first. That is fine with me. They have declared war on us.

ISIS, for example, has established a caliphate. They declare it to be a caliphate. It is a caliphate. In northern Syria and in north and western Iraq, that real estate that they control is a caliphate, and they threaten all of the rest of the region, and they threaten us. They say that their black flag is going to fly over the White House. Well, some would say that will be a cold day, Mr. Speaker.

We have seen some dramatic changes in history over the last few years. I would say to the United States: We need to step up to this. We need to recognize our enemy. We need to defeat our enemies.

Our enemies are Islamic jihad, and Islamic jihad is comprised of the element within Islam that believes that their path to salvation is in killing us and that they can bring out some kind of worldwide revolution where, in the end, it will just be the purest of the pure of Islamists that are left on the planet. They will have killed everybody else; and all, whoever is left, must knuckle down to sharia law.

We need to defeat the ideology, Mr. Speaker, and when I say defeat the ideology, and I am speaking to a group of people, I will often see that look on their face, such as: Why do you think you can defeat an ideology? You can't defeat an ideology. You can't change a culture. You can't defeat ideology.

I recall one of those rebuttals that came to me, and I said, tell that to the Japanese. In fact, in World War II, in a 3½ year period of time, this country, with our allies, very powerfully, this

country defeated three ideologies: the ideology of Japanese imperialism, the ideology of Italian fascism, and the ideology of German nazism.

All three of those ideologies went down in flames in a 3½ year period of time, in the face of—I will say this, Mr. Speaker—the superior culture.

The Western civilization, a superior culture that has a robust free enterprise, that has people that volunteer to engage in the economy, into the military, that reach out and pull each other up the ladder.

This robust United States of America, coupled with our allies, reaching across the map of Western civilization, rose up, rose up and defeated three ideologies in a 3½ year period of time in the Second World War; and then it took on a fourth ideology, which was the Russian version of communism. That took about 45 years. They were a little more tenacious.

It was not then just a kinetic operation. It wasn't just going up in flames. I am grateful that it wasn't. Instead, it was the economic and then political collapse of the Soviet Union brought about this way.

□ 2030

Ronald Reagan saw this. Margaret Thatcher saw it. Margaret Thatcher went to Ronald Reagan and said: With Mikhail Gorbachev, I have found a man with whom we can do business.

I don't quite understand the motive of Gorbachev, and he seems to have a little bit of revisionist history that comes out of him from time to time.

But I also know that Pope John Paul II traveled throughout areas of Europe and went into Poland and told them do not despair because they could be a free people.

The forces of the ideology of western civilization, western Christendom, as Churchill described it in his speech in Fulton, Missouri, are the forces that stood up against Russian communism.

In about 1984, when Jeane Kirkpatrick stepped down as Ambassador to the United Nations under Reagan, she made a statement upon her departure which was this.

She said: What is going on in this cold war—and that was near the height of the cold war—what is going on is Monopoly and chess on the same board. The United States and the Soviet Union are playing chess and Monopoly on the same board. It is just that the only question is: Will the United States of America bankrupt the Soviet Union economically before the Soviet Union checkmates the United States militarily?

That was the question. It was succinctly put. And I believe that will also show up on her Wikipedia page, but I happened to find it in the Des Moines Register back in that year, 1984.

Jeane Kirkpatrick was right. Five years later the Soviet Union imploded. On November 9 the wall went down in Berlin, and that was a symbol. Actually, I will say literally the Iron Curtain came crashing down throughout

Berlin and the Iron Curtain all across Europe went crashing down.

People flowed freely back and forth. The free world had defeated the ideology of communism that was the Soviet version of it. For a time, freedom echoed all the way across Eastern Europe all the way to the Pacific Ocean. And it can be restored again, Mr. Speaker.

That is the foundation that we have that we work with. We are the people that—because of free enterprise, because we have idea people with good educations and a solid moral foundation and a good work ethic, this country has generated more patents than anybody else, created more inventions than anyone else, but cooperated with especially the western world and with the creativity that we have.

We have been able to rise up against ideology after ideology, defeat three of them during World War II and defeat Soviet communism in a 45-year period of the cold war.

Now we are faced with another ideology that rises up to challenges: Islamic jihad. If you go back to the time of Mohammed, about the last 20 years of his life and for 100 years after his death, there was a conquest going on of—shall I call them religious conversions by the sword? And, as the conquest was going on, Islam was invading and occupying most of the known world at the time.

By 732 AD, Mr. Speaker, the Islamists were outside the city of Tours in France when Charles Martel brought his infantry into the trees to face the cavalry charge of the Islamists.

And cavalries don't operate very well in the forest, Mr. Speaker, and that is how the Charles Martel, Charles The Hammer's infantry defeated them there and chased them out of Tours and across the plains and left their bones scattered a long ways back towards Spain. That was 732 AD.

And you can fast-forward again and again to catch some of the milestones: In 1571, the battle of Lepanto where an Islamist navy was sunk by the Holy League navy that went to meet them in the Aegean Sea.

You can go to 1683, when Vienna was surrounded by Islamists of the time. On July 14, they surrounded Vienna, and for more than 2 months—they besieged Vienna for roughly 2 months.

And then, on September 11, the three German infantries under three German kings and Jan Sobieski, the Polish king, brought his cavalry, they held a service at Kahlenberg Church, which was razed. It was in ruins at the hands of the Islamists.

But they held a service there in the evening of September 11 and prayed for God's deliverance of their battle the next day that it already enjoined on September 11 and the deliverance of Vienna, which happened, as in the famous battle of Vienna, September 11 and 12, 1683.

It goes on. Then September 11 became the date that lived in infamy for

the people who attacked us on September 11, 2001—New York, Pentagon, and Pennsylvania—and then again on September 11, 2012, Benghazi.

That date means something to them. It ought to mean something to us. They have been fighting western civilization for 1,400 years, and they have been adapting themselves to the technology that is created in the western world, creating very little themselves, but borrowing our technology, Mr. Speaker.

And some of that technology that is now being borrowed is the Internet, the Internet that is being used to inspire and to recruit and to direct the Islamists that are attacking Americans and attacking people that are not in alignment with ISIS and with Islamic jihad.

That is the effort that is coming and the ability that they have to use the Internet to coordinate and communicate. They will say as high as 100,000 tweets and emails and communications a day are coming out of ISIS and Islamic jihad in the broader definition of it. As high as 100,000 a day.

We need to bring about warfare against them. And it means not just defensive warfare to protect ourselves, but offensive warfare to attack them through the same medium that they are using to attack us.

So here is the list. It is not just a kinetic war against them, which they have declared against us, the kinetic war.

We need to do cyber warfare, financial warfare, educational warfare against them. We need to build a strong alliance with especially the moderate Muslim countries in the Middle East, those who should be our allies but for being a—let's say given the short end of the stick from our State Department during this administration.

And I am speaking of countries like Egypt; the United Arab Emirates, for example; Jordan, to a lesser degree. But they are natural allies to the United States. They are natural allies. In fact, they are allies to Israel today. They have been attacking our Islamist enemies in that part of the world.

The Egyptians allowed for planes to fly out of there, to fly into Yemen. And the Emirates sent some of their Air Force there. You have seen the Saudis do the same thing.

We can build an alliance in the Middle East with Saudi Arabia, whom I have got slightly less confidence in than I do in Egypt, and in the United Arab Emirates, with Jordan, and, also, working in cooperation with Israel.

When President el-Sisi of Egypt says to me that his relationship with Prime Minister Netanyahu is stronger with Egypt and Israel and President el-Sisi and Prime Minister Netanyahu stronger than it is with the United States, we should be troubled by that, Mr. Speaker.

We should be troubled by a foreign policy that has alienated the Egypt-

tians, that has caused the UAE to wonder: What is America doing? Why are we paving the road to Damascus for our enemies? Why would we consider doing such a thing?

So this strategy, a strategy that I have put into an op-ed in the National Review, which was just published here in the last couple of days, Mr. Speaker, lays out a strategy to conduct cyber warfare, both offensive and defensive, and economic warfare to shut off the funds that are flowing to Islamic jihad wherever they might be flowing from, wherever they might be flowing through, whoever might be doing business with them and thinking they are going to profit.

We have got to turn that the other way. And then we need to shut down and shut off, if we can—and this is the most difficult component of the task—the educational system out there that is teaching this kind of hatred into the next generation. Build alliances with the moderate Muslim countries, as I have said, encourage them.

We need to be arming the Kurds with everything that we can get to the Kurds, everything the Kurds can use. And that doesn't mean send it through Baghdad to get the Baghdad stamp of approval. It means directly to the Kurds along with special operation forces that could be on the ground with the Kurds and call in airstrikes and support the Kurds as one jaw of the vice that will squeeze ISIS in Iraq and in Syria.

The other jaw of the vice is a natural. It is already there. It is Assad. And when those two jaws of the vice to come together and crush ISIS, by that point, we can take a look at Assad and decide how to approach the power that may be left in Syria at that point in time.

This is just a quick list, Mr. Speaker, of a strategy to defeat the ideology of Islamic jihad. The time has come for us to do that.

I want to see a Presidential candidate—or 16 of them, I hope—who can articulate a vision to bring about the defeat of this enemy that has been bringing battle against western civilization for 1,400 years, that targets the United States of America as the great Satan and the center of their efforts. They would like to destroy all of the United States of America.

And while this is going on, we have got a treaty proposal from the President of the United States with Iran. In the spring or summer of 2008, as a candidate, he said to Iran: Mr. Ahmadinejad, if you will unclench your fist, we will extend our hand. I would remind the public of that, Mr. Speaker.

Because that fist is still clenched in Iran. And the President is poised to hand over \$150 billion to the Iranian economy that will juice that economy up.

It will allow them to bring conventional weaponry to bear. It will allow them to fund more Hezbollah. It will allow them to continue to develop the most recent version of centrifuges.

And even if they comply, in 10 years, the situation is set up where, rather than one weapon, it is 100 weapons, ICBMs sticking out of the sand in the Middle East, Mr. Speaker.

There is much to be done for this western civilization. We need to strengthen our culture. We need to believe in who we are. We need to sort the best things out of what we are and strengthen them. We need to cull out the weaknesses that we have. And we need a leader whom God will use to restore the soul of America.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of attending the funeral services for U.S. Navy Petty Officer 2nd Class Randall Smith.

Ms. JACKSON LEE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for July 27 and today on account of official business.

Mr. LEVIN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today after 4:30 p.m. and the balance of the week on account of official business at Trans Pacific Trade Partnership.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 876. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require hospitals to provide certain notifications to individuals classified by such hospitals under observation status rather than admitted as inpatients of such hospitals.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1482. An act to improve and reauthorize provisions relating to the application of the antitrust laws to the award of need-based educational aid.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 29, 2015, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2308. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Depart-

ment of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing Captain John W. Korka to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral (lower half), in accordance with 10 U.S.C. 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2309. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Law and Policy, Legal Division, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, transmitting the Bureau's final rule — 2013 Integrated Mortgage Disclosures Rule Under the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act (Regulation X) and the Truth in Lending Act (Regulation Z) and Amendments; Delay of Effective Date [Docket No.: CFPB-2015-0029] (RIN: 3170-AA48) received July 27, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2310. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility; Maine: Alna, Town of Lincoln County [Docket ID: FEMA-2015-0001] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8387] received July 27, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2311. A letter from the Director, Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Imposition of Special Measure against FBME Bank Ltd., formerly known as the Federal Bank of the Middle East Ltd., as a Financial Institution of Primary Money Laundering Concern (RIN: 1506-AB27) received July 24, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2312. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's direct final rule — Performance Standards for Ionizing Radiation Emitting Products; Fluoroscopic Equipment; Correction; Confirmation of Effective Date [Docket No.: FDA-2015-N-0828] received July 24, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2313. A letter from the General Counsel, Recovery Accountability and Transparency Board, transmitting the Board's final rule — Removal of Recovery Accountability and Transparency Board Regulations received July 27, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2314. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder Fishery; Quota Transfer [Docket No.: 140117052-4402-02] (RIN: 0648-XD985) received July 27, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2315. A letter from the Secretary, Judicial Conference of the United States, transmitting draft legislation entitled "Federal District Judgeship Act of 2015"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2316. A letter from the Acting Director, Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the General Counsel (02REG), Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Update to NFPA Standards, Incorporation by Reference (RIN: 2900-AO90) received July 24, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

2317. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting the Attorney General's Third Quarterly Report of FY 2015 on the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act of 1994, pursuant to the Veterans' Benefits Improvement Act of 2008 (Pub. L. 110-389); jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary and Veterans' Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

(Omitted from the Record of July 27, 2015)

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1656. A bill to provide for additional resources for the Secret Service, and to improve protections for restricted areas; with an amendment (Rept. 114-231). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state or the Union.

(Filed on July 28, 2015)

Mr. MCCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 455. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to conduct a northern border threat analysis, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-232). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MCCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 2786. A bill to require the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to submit a report on cross-border rail security, and for other purposes (Rept. 114-233). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 388. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1994) to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the removal or demotion of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs based on performance or misconduct, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3236) to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, to provide resource flexibility to the Department of Veterans Affairs for health care services, and for other purposes (Rept. 114-234). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CUMMINGS (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Ms. MENG):

H.R. 3231. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to protect unpaid interns in the Federal government from workplace harassment and discrimination, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CUMMINGS (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Ms. MENG):

H.R. 3232. A bill to protect unpaid interns from workplace harassment and discrimination; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CUMMINGS (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Ms. MENG):

H.R. 3233. A bill to amend the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 to protect unpaid interns in the legislative branch from