United States
*of* America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

*Vol. 161* WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, OCTOBER 27, 2015 *No. 158*

# *House of Representatives*

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. VALADAO).

## DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
*October 27, 2015.*

I hereby appoint the Honorable DAVID G. VALADAO to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

## MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

## THE SPEAKER'S RACE

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

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, between 2000 and 2014, in the 16 to 65 age bracket, although the American economy created 5.6 million net new jobs, American-born citizens lost 127,000 jobs. All job gains in America—and more—went to people born in foreign countries.

In 2012, 51 percent of households headed by immigrants relied on welfare compared to 30 percent of households headed by someone born in America, thus driving up America's deficits and driving down America's ability to pay for safety nets for Americans.

This week I vote on PAUL RYAN's bid for House Speaker. While PAUL RYAN has excellent communication skills, is charismatic, understands the economic risk of out-of-control deficits, and the like, PAUL RYAN and I have a major disagreement on border security.

Last week, on October 22, PAUL RYAN, I, and others met about his candidacy. Border security was discussed. Thereafter, I hand-delivered to PAUL RYAN, on the House floor, at, roughly, 4 p.m., a letter that states:

''Paul: Struggling American families have lost more than 8 million job opportunities to illegal aliens. All lower and middle income American workers have suffered from suppressed wages caused by the surge in both illegal alien and lawful immigrant labor supply.

''Your past record and current stance on immigration conflicts with the values of the Americans I represent and causes great concern to me and the Americans I represent.

''Yesterday during discussions about the Speaker race, you made two representations about immigration that stood out. They are:

''1. It is unwise or unproductive to bring up any immigration legislation so long as Barack Obama is President.

''2. As Speaker, you will not allow any immigration bill to reach the House Floor for a vote unless the immigration bill is 'supported by a majority of the majority' of Republican House Members.

''Although you talk faster than I can write your words down, I believe the above statements properly reflect what you said. I send this letter to confirm that I accurately portray your remarks and that I may rely on them when the House Floor Vote for Speaker occurs next week.

''If my portrayal of your words errs in any respect, please deliver to me (before the GOP Conference meeting next week in which we are to conduct Speaker elections) a written communication correcting my errors.

''If I do not receive such a communication from you, then I will infer that you concur that my portrayal of your remarks is accurate and that I, and the rest of the GOP Conference, and the American people, may rely on your words as I have written them.

''I need your assurance that you will not use the Speaker's position to advance your immigration policies, except when in accord with the two above statements, because there is a huge gap between your immigration position and the wishes of the American citizens I represent. Your words yesterday constitute the needed assurance.

''If your assurances as I have portrayed them are accurate, then I am much more comfortable voting for you for Speaker on the House Floor (and will do so, absent something startling coming to my attention between now and the election, which I don't anticipate).

''If, however, you would use the Speaker's chair to advance an immigration belief system that is unacceptable to the Americans I represent, it will be very difficult for me to vote for you for Speaker on the House Floor.

''To be clear, I intend to publicly share this letter and your responding letter, if any, to help explain to my constituents why I voted as I did on the House Floor in the Speaker's election.

''Thank you for considering the contents of this letter.''

At roughly 5:20 p.m., PAUL RYAN called me and stated that my letter accurately portrayed his immigration representations. PAUL RYAN confirmed that he meant what he said and would keep his word.

Based on PAUL RYAN's representations and my trust that PAUL RYAN is a man of his word, I will vote for PAUL RYAN for House Speaker on the House floor if he is the Republican nominee.

Mr. Speaker, I submit this letter for the RECORD.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, DC, October 22, 2015.*

Hand-delivered on House Floor to Paul Ryan at approx. 4 p.m., 10/22/15

Paul Ryan called Mo and confirmed accuracy of letter via phone at 5:20 p.m. (during staff meeting)

Re: Immigration Positions & Speaker Race.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
*Chairman, Ways and Means Committee.*

PAUL: Struggling American families have lost more than 8 million job opportunities to illegal aliens. All lower and middle income American workers have suffered from suppressed wages caused by the surge in both illegal alien and lawful immigrant labor supply.

Your past record and current stance on immigration conflicts with the values of the Americans I represent and causes great concern to me and the Americans I represent.

Yesterday during discussions about the Speaker race, you made two representations about immigration that stood out. They are:

1. It is unwise or unproductive to bring up any immigration legislation so long as Barack Obama is President.

2. As Speaker, you will not allow any immigration bill to reach the House Floor for a vote unless the immigration bill is ''supported by a majority of the majority'' of Republican House Members.

Although you talk faster than I can write your words down, I believe the above statements properly reflect what you said. I send this letter to confirm that I accurately portray your remarks and that I may rely on them when the House Floor Vote for Speaker occurs next week.

If my portrayal of your words errs in any respect, please deliver to me (before the GOP Conference meeting next week in which we are to conduct Speaker elections) a written communication correcting my errors.

If I do not receive such a communication from you, then I will infer that you concur that my portrayal of your remarks is accurate and that I, and the rest of the GOP Conference, and the American people, may rely on your words as I have written them.

I need your assurance that you will not use the Speaker's position to advance your immigration policies, except when in accord with the two above statements, because there is a huge gap between your immigration position and the wishes of the American citizens I represent. Your words yesterday constitute the needed assurance.

If your assurances as I have portrayed them are accurate, then I am much more comfortable voting for you for Speaker on the House Floor (and will do so, absence something startling coming to my attention between now and the election, which I don't anticipate).

If, however, you would use the Speaker's chair to advance an immigration belief system that is unacceptable to the Americans I represent, it will be very difficult for me to vote for you for Speaker on the House Floor.

To be clear, I intend to publicly share this letter and your responding letter, if any, to help explain to my constituents why I voted as I did on the House Floor in the Speaker's election.

Thank you for considering the contents of this letter.

Sincerely,
MORRIS J. ''MO'' BROOKS, Jr.,
*M.C., AL–5.*

## A BIPARTISAN MAJORITY—A NEW PRECEDENT FOR SOLVING PROBLEMS

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, for the first time in over a dozen years, an unusual legislative procedure—a discharge petition—has been successfully mounted in the House. This is an extraordinary effort to allow the House to work its will—a mechanism that was part of a package of reform, dating back over a century, to deal with the iron rule of Speaker Joe Cannon. The subject of the petition, the Ex-Im Bank, was almost as obscure as the procedure that brought it to the House.

This is an agency that for over 70 years has provided financing for transactions similar to which all of our competitor nations provide their exporting companies. In this case, American companies will have the credit tools that will enable them to cost-effectively engage in international transactions that other private institutions won't finance because of political or commercial risks.

Even if providing this service meant a modest exposure to the taxpayer, which might occasionally cost money, it was probably worth it to have the businesses support good-paying American jobs and to be able to compete with foreign companies.

Yes, it would be worth it. It is not just a low-risk proposition. The Ex-Im Bank is a service that has made billions of dollars for the United States Treasury. It turns a profit—about $2 million in the last 2 fiscal years.

This is interesting—a service that all of our competitor nations provide their companies. It hasn't cost the taxpayers any money. In fact, it makes money for the Treasury. Why was it allowed to expire?

This is another example of where a minority of the House, for ideological reasons, decided they were going to take over the process. In this case, they were going to kill the Ex-Im Bank. They did so over the objections of the administration, of the business community, of many Members of Congress, of people in organized labor.

It was hard to maintain decorum during last night's debate when the chair of the committee complained that, somehow, by approving the discharge petition and the procedural motions that followed, we were stifling the will of the House. I smiled as people lamented that they would not be able to offer amendments. Members came to the floor, saying they had amendments they wished they could offer and now they were being shut out.

How ironic.

His committee had no intention of allowing the House to participate in the give-and-take of legislation he was lamenting was slipping away. His committee didn't allow this proposal to come to the floor. The committee did not amend and refine the Ex-Im Bank. The committee killed it by having the authorization expire without giving the whole House a chance to be part of that decision.

Now the people who were caught on the wrong side of the majority of the House, with a losing argument and a minority position, were suddenly concerned that the House was being shut out. They had been shutting out the House for the last 2 years. They had denied efforts at reform. Only when their hand was forced did they somehow resort to the most specious of arguments. This is like, as they say, the person who kills his parents and then pleads for mercy from the court because he is an orphan.

There is no reform because they didn't want reform. They were the ones who shut the House out. Now, because of the courageous action by a bipartisan group, led by our Republican colleagues—eloquently and bravely—the House will no longer be shut out. American business will be stronger; and the House has demonstrated that there sometimes will be opportunities for a bipartisan majority to have its interests represented.

We can only hope that this sets a precedent for how we solve other problems, from raising the debt ceiling, to dealing with budgets, to rebuilding and renewing America. Involve the entire House—solutions are possible—and America will be better served.

## THE TRIUMPH OF EVIL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOONEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, President Obama used his veto power for the fifth time since taking office. This time, it was to reject the $612 billion defense authorization bill: H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act.

President Obama vetoed the defense bill on the same day that an American was killed in Iraq. With so much uncertainty and conflict around the world, I would have expected our President to have understood the importance of supporting this bipartisan defense bill. This veto is inexcusable. Not only is this a blatant show of disrespect for our troops, but it is disrespect for our Nation.

The National Defense Authorization Act also contains key provisions that will greatly benefit my State of West Virginia. The provisions include the drug interdiction and counterdrug program, the National Guard State Partnership Program, and $3.9 million in funding for the Charleston, West Virginia, Air National Guard Base.

It is shortsighted and wrong that the President refused to sign this critical defense bill. The bill gives our troops essential resources, but President Obama vetoed it because he wants concessions in other areas of government spending.