

material, equipment (including reactors), and components for nuclear research and nuclear power production. Norway has no nuclear power program, and no current plans for establishing one, but the proposed Agreement would facilitate cooperation on such a program if Norway's plans change in the future. Norway does have an active nuclear research program and the focus of cooperation under the proposed Agreement, as under the previous agreement, is expected to be in the area of nuclear research. The proposed Agreement would not permit transfers of Restricted Data, sensitive nuclear technology, sensitive nuclear facilities or major critical components of such facilities.

The proposed Agreement would provide advance, long-term (programmatic) consent to Norway for the retransfer for storage or reprocessing of irradiated nuclear material (spent fuel) subject to the Agreement to France, the United Kingdom, or other countries or destinations as may be agreed upon in writing. The United States has given similar advance consent to various other partners, including to Norway under the previous U.S.-Norway Peaceful Nuclear Cooperation Agreement that was in force from 1984 to 2014. The proposed Agreement would give the United States the option to revoke the advance consent if it considers that it cannot be continued without a significant increase of the risk of proliferation or without jeopardizing national security.

The proposed Agreement will have a term of 30 years from the date of its entry into force, unless terminated by either party on 1 year's advance written notice. In the event of termination or expiration of the proposed Agreement, key nonproliferation conditions and controls will continue in effect as long as any material, equipment, or component subject to the proposed Agreement remains in the territory of the party concerned or under its jurisdiction or control anywhere, or until such time as the parties agree that such items are no longer usable for any nuclear activity relevant from the point of view of safeguards.

Norway is a non-nuclear-weapon State party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). Norway has concluded a safeguards agreement and additional protocol with the International Atomic Energy Agency. Norway is a party to the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material, which establishes international standards of physical protection for the use, storage, and transport of nuclear material. It is also a member of the Nuclear Suppliers Group, whose non-legally binding guidelines set forth standards for the responsible export of nuclear commodities for peaceful use. A more detailed discussion of Norway's domestic civil nuclear activities and its nuclear non-proliferation policies and practices is provided in the NPAS and the NPAS

classified annex submitted to the Congress separately.

I have considered the views and recommendations of the interested departments and agencies in reviewing the proposed Agreement and have determined that its performance will promote, and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to, the common defense and security. Accordingly, I have approved the proposed Agreement and authorized its execution and urge that the Congress give it favorable consideration.

This transmission shall constitute a submittal for purposes of both sections 123 b. and 123 d. of the Act. My Administration is prepared to begin immediately consultations with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House Foreign Affairs Committee as provided in section 123 b. Upon completion of the 30 days of continuous session review provided for in section 123 b., the 60 days of continuous session review provided for in section 123 d. shall commence.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 14, 2016.

□ 1730

GOVERNMENT OVERREACH ON SMALL BUSINESSES

(Mr. CRAMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, in the last few months more than 175 Members of Congress from both parties and both Chambers have expressed concerns about the FCC's proposed set-top box rules. Even the Small Business Administration has weighed in with concerns about how these rules could burden small operators.

Last month, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SCHRADER) and I authored a bipartisan letter signed by 59 of our colleagues that says, in part: "the proposal threatens the economic welfare of small pay-TV companies providing both vital communications services to rural areas and competitive alternatives to consumers in urban markets."

Mr. Speaker, if continued innovation in the video industry is the goal, then this proposed rule is the wrong direction. In fact, it is estimated that this rule could cost up to a million dollars or more per system. Now, a million dollars may not be a lot to a big company, but to most of the companies in rural North Dakota, it could be the difference between staying in business or going out of business.

I also have strong concerns that the proposed rules are outside the Commission's legal authority. Instead of getting into another lengthy legal battle with Congress, I urge Chairman Wheeler and the FCC to drop these proposed rules because of the harm it could inflict on small rural operators.

NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE YOUTH TOUR

(Mr. ROKITA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize more than 1,800 youth from 47 States across America visiting our Nation's Capital this week as part of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Youth Tour. This trip is a tradition that has continued for over 50 years.

Mr. Speaker, the goal of the tour is to bring together students from all walks of life to attend meetings with their Senators and Representatives to ask us questions and witness the legislative process firsthand. I just came from a meeting with those from Indiana, and they had excellent questions of me, and we had a great discussion.

These students are all sponsored by a local electric cooperative in which the student is a member or an associate member. This year, 34 of Indiana's 38 electric cooperatives have sponsored a total of 82 students for the trip. I am proud that many of them reside in my district.

I want to thank America's electric cooperatives, and specifically those from Indiana, for working with the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association to support and sponsor this opportunity for the next generation of young leaders.

EQUAL RIGHTS FOR ALL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the leadership on both sides of the aisle for extending the time tonight. I am very grateful to the staffs who have helped us with the preparation for this evening's activities.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to be here this evening for many reasons. One of the reasons has to do with today being a very special day. Today is Flag Day. Flag Day is a day for us to honor the flag of the United States of America, which is one of the reasons I am wearing my flag tie. I want people to know that I am proud to be an American, and I am proud to honor the flag and to salute the flag. Flag Day is a date that we honor the flag for its adoption back on June 14, 1777.

I say the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag, and I say it proudly. I say it proudly because it means something to me—each word means something to me—to pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

"With liberty and justice for all" are words of great importance tonight, and

they are important because of some circumstances that have occurred in other parts of our country. We have had some tragic circumstances to befall some persons in Florida. I was reared in Florida. I went to Florida A&M University. I went to elementary school and high school in Florida.

Florida means something to me, but the people there are most important, because the people of Florida are people of goodwill, people who mean well, people who enjoy themselves. Florida is a vacation spot, if you will. Because so many people come there to vacation, it is expected that they would have the opportunity to enjoy themselves, to go out and be a part of the nightlife. We have Disney World in Florida, many attractions to attract people from around the country to Florida.

Unfortunately, some things have happened there recently that are going to cause us to pause for a moment as we, tonight, will celebrate, to a certain extent, commemorate, LGBT Pride Month. LGBT Pride Month, celebrate and commemorate this month. But we will also memorialize some of the things that have happened in terms of lives that have been lost.

I am proud tonight to note that there will be a Member joining me who has had some circumstances occur in his State that he will call to our attention that will have to be memorialized, and persons will have to be remembered for the services that they have given, but also because they lost their lives.

I am proud to ask my colleague to come over now, the Honorable JIM CLYBURN, and ask him to give his comments. He is a leader in this Congress. He is a person who stands for justice for all, as is indicated in the flag, "liberty and justice for all." He stands for this.

After the incident that took place in Mr. CLYBURN's State, I remember a lady who lost her child indicating at the probable cause hearing, "I forgive you. I forgive you," speaking to the person who had committed this deed. "I forgive you." She lost her child, but she forgave. But I believe that people who forgive still have an expectation that things will be done. Mr. CLYBURN, I am proud to say, is one who has legislation that can be of benefit to all. Not to some, but to all.

I am proud to yield the floor now to our leader, the Honorable JIM CLYBURN.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. GREEN for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, on Friday, June 17, we will commemorate the first anniversary of what I like to refer to as the Charleston 12. Nine people lost their lives that night at the Emanuel AME Church, but three people survived: two by playing dead and a third because the murderer went over to her and said: I am going to spare you so you can carry the message.

This young man who perpetrated this act did so after doing some significant research. We know that he went on the Internet, and he found the historic

church that he thought would be the proper place to start, in his words, a race war. This young man was able to purchase a weapon that he did not qualify to purchase.

Under our laws, he was to be subjected to a background check, and he was; except that our law has created a loophole that says, though there is a 3-day waiting period that the background check should take place, if at the expiration of the 3 days the background check is not completed, then you can purchase the weapon.

Well, 3 days after he started the purchase, the background check was not completed. Why? Somebody keyed in or gave the wrong information.

Let's just think about this for a moment. A person knowing what the law is could very well give erroneous information knowing that it might take more than the 3 days for anybody to find the error. They found the error, but 3 days had expired. I have no idea whether or not this young man did this or whether or not the seller entered the wrong information.

There are two cities that border one river with a short bridge between the two: West Columbia and Columbia. This gun was purchased in West Columbia, but, as I understand it, the seller keyed in Columbia, and so the error was not found until too late.

I have proposed legislation here to close what has become known as the Charleston loophole by saying the purchase cannot be completed until the background check is completed. If it takes 3 days, fine. If it takes 1 day, that is fine. But it may take 4 or 5 days or may even be 10 days if the wrong information is keyed in.

So I don't understand why this commonsense piece of legislation cannot be brought to this floor so we can vote to close that loophole or attempt to close the loophole. I think it is time for us to go on record.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I grew up in South Carolina. I was a part of the movement that started back in the late 1950s and early 1960s that a lot of people have called the student movement. I was a part, along with JOHN LEWIS, a Member of this body, of the first and second organizing meetings of what became known as the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee.

I still remember my first meeting with Martin Luther King, Jr., October 1960, the same weekend that I met JOHN LEWIS for the first time. I spent that evening that I met Dr. King, I was with him until around 4, 4:30 the next morning. I started reading and studying everything I possibly could about Dr. King. I believe, of all of his speeches, of all of his writings, the one thing that stands out to me more than any other is his letter from the Birmingham City Jail.

□ 1745

It is an iconic document; a timely document, in my opinion. Dr. King wrote his letter from that jail in re-

sponse to a letter that he had received from 8 White clergymen who called upon him to leave Birmingham because they thought his being there was disruptive.

In the letter to Dr. King, they said to him: We want you to understand, Dr. King, we believe that your cause is right, but your timing is wrong.

In responding to them, Dr. King said: Time is neutral. Time is never right; time is never wrong. Time is always what we make it.

Dr. King continued that thought by saying he was coming to the conclusion that the people of ill will in our society make a much better use of time than the people of good will. He closed that particular thought by saying that we are going to be made to repent not just for the vitriolic words and deeds of bad people, but for the appalling silence of good people.

We are suffering today because some real good people in this House are remaining silent when events cry out for our attention. We should not be ignoring these issues that lead to incidents like the one that occurred at Emanuel AME Church. We should not be silent after things like Sandy Hook. And we should not be silent today, after experiencing what we have earlier this week in Orlando, Florida.

I think that the more we look into this, we see that this is not about ISIS or any foreign terrorists. All of that, it seems to me, from what I have read, is to camouflage something else. And that is, in my opinion, this was, in fact, a hate crime. It certainly shows from the evidence that this young man who perpetrated this act hated a lot of the people he was around, and maybe even himself.

So I believe that the time has come for us to break our silence in this House. The LGBT community cries out for our involvement. This incident highlights what we ought to be doing to show our respect for that community as well as our respect for the rule of law.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. CLYBURN, before you step away, with reference to the letter from the Birmingham jail, which I agree with you, is one of the greatest literary works that I have had an opportunity to read, it becomes especially important when you understand how Dr. King actually produced it. He did not have a library. He did not have persons to assist him. It is my understanding that he was able to slip notes out to people who would come and visit him, and they compiled these notes into the letter.

I want to mention this. Those clergy people that you talk about, in that letter that they wrote, if you read it first, you will see a line of logic that many people abide with, that many people of that time and this time would find very reasonable. It is after you get into Dr. King's message where he dissects each and every point that they make one by one by one that you realize that there is something not only special

about Dr. King—and there is something very special about him—but that this was a seminal moment in time.

It was a seminal moment in time in that Dr. King was educating all of us in the eons to come about the evils of bigotry and hatred. Those warnings that he gave us and the lessons, he takes us back into Biblical Scriptures about those who, at that time in the biblical days, were considered outside educators. No one is an outside educator if you come for righteous reasons.

So I am mentioning this to you because I have a great appreciation for that letter as well, and I am pleased that you brought it up.

As you know, tonight our theme is: You are not alone. I greatly appreciate what you have said about the LGBTQ community, because we want them to know they are not alone. We are allies, we are friends. We are people on whom they depend. And we do so because of a debt we owe, to a certain extent. We didn't get here by ourselves. Someone suffered and sacrificed so that we could have this opportunity to stand in the Congress of the United States of America, and indeed to breathe the breath of freedom we have because of others. And they are not alone. I appreciate what you have said about the LGBTQ community. If you have additional commentary, I would welcome it.

Mr. CLYBURN. I appreciate that. I do have something I would like to say on that. Dr. King was sitting in jail in Birmingham, Alabama, because he found some injustices there. In fact, in the letter, he said—in responding to those ministers—that a threat to justice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere. And I think that Dr. King, if he were here today, would be speaking out about the threat to justice that the LGBTQ community is now experiencing. I do want the people of that community to know that they are not alone. I do believe that we should all respect human beings.

If I may? I thought as you were speaking, Dr. King, in his letter, talked about those who carried the gospel and how they were vilified. I thought about, I believe it is the 11th chapter in the Book of Second Corinthians, Paul, in his writings, talked about all that he had endured—the beatings, the jailings that he had endured—trying to spread the gospel.

I thought about those badges of honor—the jailings that Dr. King, JOHN LEWIS, and many others endured. I had a few sentences myself, but I thought about that, and these are, in fact, badges of honor.

So I want the people of the LGBTQ community to know that they are not alone in their trials and tribulations, and that at some point in, hopefully, the not too distant future, the good people in this body will rise up and break their silence.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. I will add to what you have just said, Mr. CLYBURN. When you are not alone and you have some people to show up, it means

something. But there are people who believe that everybody has to show up for something significant to occur. This would take us to the eighth chapter of the Book of Judges and a man named Gideon.

The evidence has shown us—you and I, Mr. CLYBURN—that there are times when you can have too many people to get a job done. You don't have to have everybody to have the genesis of a movement. You don't have to have every person in Congress to sign onto something to have that become the genesis of the movement.

If you get enough people to sign on, what you have can be heard in this Congress. And that is called a discharge petition. There are some pieces of legislation right now that are pending with discharge possibilities.

What we have to do is take a few people, just as Gideon did; make enough noise, as he did; have a righteous cause, as he did; have a means of weeding out some of the people who may not be ready for the work that has to be done, and then work with those who are ready to work.

I believe that we can do great things in this Congress, understanding that we don't have to have everyone on board to have the genesis of a great movement.

Mr. CLYBURN. I agree. Of course, having served as the majority whip in this body, all it takes is 218. I do believe that there are 218 good people in this body who will vote for these—especially these three pieces of legislation dealing with what I call commonsense, good gun policy.

The fact of the matter is that all of us believe in the Constitution of these United States. It is the glue that holds us together as a country, as a people. The fact of the matter is the Constitution—our right to the Constitution—is not unbridled.

I am often amused to hear people talk about our First Amendment rights to free speech and to peaceably assemble. Those of us back in the sixties lived and died advocating the First Amendment, but the fact of the matter is our rights under the First Amendment are not unbridled. The Supreme Court has spoken to that with the famous phrase: your First Amendment rights will not give you the right to yell “fire” in a crowded theater.

That means that the First Amendment is not unbridled.

Why is it, then, that we can't look at the fact that the Second Amendment rights that we have to bear arms, we are not taking that right away when we say the background check should be completed?

Maybe we will turn up that you are mentally incompetent to have a weapon. Maybe we will find that you at one time, if not another, are on this no-fly list.

One piece of legislation we have here deals with it. No fly, no buy. Anyone on the no-fly list, to me, ought not be able to get a firearm. If you are sus-

picious enough as to pose a threat and be on that list, I don't think you ought to be getting a firearm. If you have been convicted of a hate crime, which is another piece of legislation here, you ought not to be able to buy a gun.

Those are commonsense policies that ought to be put into law. And for us to lay prone at the altar of the NRA and not allow just simple, good faith bills to come to this floor, I don't quite understand that. I don't think that the American people will continue to be kind to us if we do not step up and do what is necessary to protect them.

Those 49 people who lost their lives in that nightclub in Orlando are deserving of a Congress that will protect them. Also, those nine lives at the Emanuel AME Church. If we had stepped up and not put that loophole in this law, they would have been protected. I am convinced from all that I have seen that those people would still be alive today if that loophole were not in the law.

□ 1800

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the bill that you speak of, Mr. CLYBURN, H.R. 4063, that is Mr. CICILLINE's bill, the Hate Crimes Prevention Act; and that merely says, if you have been convicted of vandalizing a place of worship or assaulting someone based on their race, their religion, their gender, their sexual orientation, their gender identity or disability, then you ought not be able to buy a weapon.

Who believes that persons who have been convicted of these offenses ought to be able to buy weapons? If you believe that they should, then I am going to respect your opinion, but we ought to be able to debate those opinions on the floor of the United States Congress.

We don't have to win the vote. The people of this country expect us to at least do that, however. They expect us to vote. And what Mr. CLYBURN is saying, and what many others have been saying, the clarion call, the hue and cry, is let's have a vote and let's have a debate. Let the debate precede the vote. Let us make some comments about these bills, and let's let the American people have an opportunity to judge why each of us holds a position with reference to this kind of legislation. That is not asking too much.

I respect my friends who have opinions different from mine. I don't, in any way, badger people who have opinions that are different from my opinions. But I do respect people even more when they are willing to stand in the well of the Congress of the United States of America and state their position and allow others to state theirs. And then, afterwards, have that vote, and let's let the American people know where the Congress stands, based upon empirical evidence and based upon arguments that have been presented, so that people can get a greater understanding and get greater clarity.

Another of the bills is the one that you have, Mr. CLYBURN, H.R. 3051, the

Background Check Completion Act. "Completion," that is the operative word. Completion Act. Let the background check be completed before a person buys a firearm.

Now, if you differ with this, okay. Then let's bring this to the floor, state your difference, and let the American people know how we stand, where we stand, and then have a vote. That will make a difference for everybody in this country because people will know that the Congress of the United States is functional. There are many who believe that we are not functioning right now.

The final of the three that the gentleman mentioned is H.R. 1076. This is denying firearms and explosives to dangerous terrorists. Now, this is a bill that is being sponsored by the Honorable PETER KING. He is a Republican.

So the point to be made is that we have bipartisan legislation that can't get to the floor for a debate and then a vote. That is what we believe ought to happen. There ought to be a debate and a vote on these pieces of legislation that deal with what we believe to be legislation that can save some lives. It won't save all lives, no legislation will, but it can save some lives.

Well, someone would say that is not enough. One life is enough, to be quite honest with you. One life is enough. And to lose any life because we haven't acted is to lose too many.

At the end of the day, after having lost 49 lives in Orlando, do we want it said that after all was said and done, more was said than done? Or nothing was done and all was said? Is that what we want our legacy to be, that we did not act on pending legislation that could have made a difference for the people of the Nation?

Surely, asking for a vote, asking for debate, asking for an opportunity to be heard is not asking too much.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN) if he has further commentary.

Mr. CLYBURN. Well, I think the gentleman has summarized this adequately and, I think, appropriately.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am so honored tonight to mention again that this is a resolution that we have on the floor, H. Res. 772. This is the LGBTQ Pride Month legislation, and I am honored that it is on this day, which is Flag Day, because the flag speaks to liberty and justice for all—not liberty and justice for some, not liberty and justice for some of a certain hue, not liberty and justice for some of a certain religion, but, rather, liberty and justice for all, regardless of your race, your creed, your color, your sexuality, liberty and justice for all, regardless of your religious affiliation—liberty and justice for all.

I assure you that the American people expect no less than what we pledge allegiance to, the flag of the United States of America. So I am honored tonight that we have this resolution.

This resolution is one that speaks to the accomplishments and the successes

of the LGBTQ community. And there are accomplishments and successes that we should mention, notwithstanding the circumstance that we are, unfortunately, having to deal with at this time. There are these accomplishments and these successes. Let me just name a few of them as we move along.

First, I would like to mention the passage of the Matthew Shepard and James Byrd Jr. Hate Crimes Prevention Act, a significant piece of legislation, a great success for America. However, the beneficiaries are persons who are discriminated against, who are harmed because of who they are.

People do that in this country. We have people who will hurt you and take your life, as has been evidenced recently, because of who you are.

This Congress took action and passed this law to say that, if you do this, whatever the punishment was, we will enhance it. We will make this punishment greater because you ought not target people because of who they are.

Someone would say, well, why would we want to enhance the punishment for this reason?

Here is the response. Here is the report. Because we do it if you are a person in a blue uniform. You hurt a peace officer in the State of Texas, because he or she is a peace officer, your punishment is going to be enhanced.

There is nothing wrong with that. I celebrate that. That is why I celebrate the passage of this piece of legislation, the Matthew Shepherd and James Byrd Hate Crime Prevention Act. This is an accomplishment that the LGBTQ community as well as other communities and all should celebrate.

Of course, there is Don't Ask, Don't Tell. Can you imagine, as a heterosexual person, having to hide who you are every day of your life, having to be incognito in a sense, under an assumed identity, cannot be authentic, cannot be yourself? Can you imagine what that would be like?

That's what Don't Ask, Don't Tell was all about, asking people to hide your identity. Don't tell anybody who you are. And if you don't tell anybody who you are, we will let you die for the country. We will let you go into harm's way and die as long as you won't tell people who you are.

And I thank President Obama. When we eliminated Don't Ask, Don't Tell, we liberated a lot of people. One in particular that I am sure felt liberation was the Honorable Eric Fanning, because he now is the first openly gay Secretary of the Army.

Can you imagine how many persons with talents that could have benefited our country were overlooked as a result of Don't Ask, Don't Tell?

Some people refused to participate in that kind of system. So I am proud that this country has stepped away from this, because every person ought to be allowed to be himself or herself.

Every person was created by the same Creator. We know the Creator by many names, but by any name, the

Creator is the one that created all that is and ever shall be. And each one of us is a creation of the Creator of the universe, and we all should be proud of who we are because we all owe allegiance to the same Creator.

I am proud to announce that 2012 was the first year that all 50 States had at least one LGBTQ elected official.

I remember many years ago, as an African American, how proud I was when I could read annually that we had persons who were getting elected across the country to various positions who were of African ancestry. I was so proud that they were getting elected because I knew that we were making progress; I knew that there was a certain amount of acceptance taking place.

This is what is happening with the LGBTQ community by having elected officials in all 50 States who can say "I am proud to be who I am," who can be authentic.

This is what America is all about, liberty and justice for all, pledge of allegiance to the flag, Flag Day. That is what this is all about: this country honoring who you are, letting you succeed on your merits and fail on your demerits, not based upon who you are.

Unfortunately, I will tell you this, there are still some places in this country where members of the LGBTQ community are discriminated against openly and notoriously. Twenty-eight States still allow someone to be fired for being gay—for that alone. Show up and tell, show up and don't pretend, show up with a friend, and you could be fired in 28 States in this country.

I think that, among all of the legislation that we talk about, this is something that the Congress ought to address. No one should be fired because of who you are, because of what God has made you. You ought not be fired for that.

In 30 States, you can be fired for being a transgender person. In 28 States, you don't have protections for sexuality under housing discrimination laws, meaning, if someone believes or concludes or has evidence that you are a part of the LGBTQ community, then you can be discriminated against in housing.

Is that the way a great country that I love, that has the notion of liberty and justice for all in the pledge of allegiance behaves? Do we allow this to continue?

America stands for justice, stands for liberty, and it stands for it for all. It is time for us to extend all of the liberty and justice that I and others might have to the members of the LGBTQ community.

I am an ally of this community, and because I am an ally, I am proud that the Supreme Court decided that marriage between same-sex couples should take place.

The Constitution of the United States of America was not written for heterosexuals only. The 14th Amendment applies to people, not to sexuality. The 14th Amendment and the

Constitution is something that is precious for all of us, and the Supreme Court has so said that these marriages between couples of the same sex have to be recognized and the licenses have to be issued. This is what allies of the LGBTQ community will call to the attention of persons on occasions such as this.

I am also proud to tell you that we who are allies of the LGBTQ community are of the opinion that we can make some of these changes. We know that we can make these changes because we have done so before. We have passed legislation after horrific events in this country. Because we have done it before, we can do it again; because we did it with the Civil Rights Act of 1968. It took us 7 days in the Congress of the United States of America to pass the Civil Rights Act of 1968 after the assassination of Dr. King.

We had 49 people assassinated in Orlando, Florida. Something can be done.

People, some would say: Well, what can be done? That is what we can debate on the floor of the Congress. Let's debate it. Rather than conclude that whatever is said is wrong and you don't deserve a hearing because what you have said is wrong, let's debate it.

We have bills to come before this Congress that we vote up and down on a daily basis. We vote them up or we vote them down. Why not have regular order apply to hate crime legislation? Why not have regular order apply to gun safety legislation? Not gun control—I don't buy into that terminology—gun safety.

But if you think otherwise, then come to the floor, stand in the well, and state your position so that all can hear.

□ 1815

The Gun Control Act of 1968 passed after the assassinations of President Kennedy, Dr. King, and Robert Kennedy. That legislation, I am sure, could have passed at other times, but it didn't. It was after a horrific act, or horrific acts, that it passed.

I think that these lives were important. But the lives of the 49 people who died at Orlando are just as important as these lives that I call to your attention. Every life is precious. We should not allow ourselves to wait until it happens to be somebody that we perceive as being somebody. We ought not have to wait until someone who happens to hold public trust is harmed before we decide we are going to do something.

Every person who is in this country is under the protection of the Constitution of the United States of America. We can debate our issues, but we ought to at least bring them to the floor and let's have a vote on them. I will accept, by the way, the vote. I always do. But I don't accept the notion that you can never have a vote on something because someone else happens to think that it is not worthy of voting on.

I think all opinions have some value, and I think whether bills are presented

by the Democrats or the Republicans, they are bills that have merit and bills that ought to receive consideration. Let them go through regular order. Let them come to this floor, and let's debate them.

Of course, the one that many people will remember is the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act of 1994. This was passed following the shooting of President Ronald Reagan.

By the way, I am pleased that we passed all of these things. I believe that we did the right thing. Someone might argue that we could have passed this without the shooting of President Reagan. Thank God the person who attempted to assassinate him was not successful. I am so grateful that he was able to live and serve out his Presidency. But that shooting, that act alone, allowed this Congress to act. It is a known fact that you cannot have an act of Congress if you don't have a Congress willing to act. I am grateful that the Congress was willing to act after the shooting of a President of the United States.

So, because we have done it before, I am convinced that we can do it again, and I am convinced that we should do it again. I believe that this is a seminal moment in time. We have these seminal moments in time—seminal moments, moments that impact all time.

Rosa Parks, when she took that seat, ignited a spark that started a human rights-civil rights movement. That was a seminal moment in time. But there were also people who helped her at that time, which is one of the reasons why we come to the floor tonight, because we are allies of the LGBTQ community.

The African American community at that time had allies. We had people who were willing to stand up for us and stand up with us. When Rosa Parks went to jail, there were people who came to post her bond. The people who bailed Rosa Parks out of jail: Mr. Nixon was African American, but Mr. and Mrs. Durr were not. Mr. and Mrs. Durr were people of goodwill who understood that an injustice was taking place. In fact, Mr. Clifford Durr was a lawyer, and his wife was a noted person in the community. The people who posted the bail to get Rosa Parks out of jail were not all of African ancestry.

So we all have a debt that we owe. I am grateful to Rosa Parks. I wouldn't be here but for the efforts of the Rosa Parks of the world. So I have to repay that debt, and tonight I stand here to give an additional down payment on the debt that I owe that allowed me to be a part of the Congress of the United States of America.

There was the crossing of the Edmund Pettus Bridge on what was known as Bloody Sunday. Many people lost blood at the Edmund Pettus Bridge. If you haven't been to the Edmund Pettus Bridge, I would invite you to go. Every person ought to see the Edmund Pettus Bridge, because if you can see the Edmund Pettus Bridge, you

will understand the level of angst and consternation that persons marching forward had to have as they were going up, knowing that on the other side was the constabulary prepared to do whatever was necessary to force them to go back to their starting point and not to proceed with the march.

Many of the people there with Congressman JOHN LEWIS, who said he thought he was going to die, were not African Americans. There were people of all hues at the Edmund Pettus Bridge there to see that justice was done. I owe a debt to the people who were willing to cross the Edmund Pettus Bridge on that fateful day.

I come to the floor tonight because I understand that I owe this debt. I believe that we owe a debt to those who have made it possible for us to be here, regardless of our hue. And believe me, regardless as to who you are, you owe a debt too. It may be to Patrick Henry: "Give me liberty or give me death." It can be to any number of the Founding Fathers. But you owe a debt to people who made it possible for us to be here in the Congress of the United States of America and to have the liberties and freedoms that we have in this country. We ought to repay the debt so that we can pass on to others what has been passed on to us: a greater sense of freedom and a greater sense of belonging in the greatest country in the world.

I am honored to tell you tonight that this resolution will not pass. I am honored to tell you this, that it will not pass this Congress. But I must be quite candid and tell you that we rarely pass any resolutions in Congress now. So I want to be fair to my friends who are in leadership to let them know that I respect the fact that any resolution, not just this one, would probably get the same results.

But I do believe this: I am honored to tell you that it will pass some Congress. I hope I am here to see it pass. I hope I am here to cast my vote that will have it pass the Congress, that will give it a chance to be heard, and that will let people debate the issues of our time as they relate to this resolution. I hope I am here.

But whether I am here or not, I believe that, at some point, we will look back through the vista of time, and we will reflect upon this time. We will ask ourselves: Who was there? Who was there to stand up for people other than themselves? I want the record to reflect that there were a good many people of goodwill who said to the LGBTQ community: You are not alone. You are not alone. We are with you. We will stand with you, and we will fight injustice with you.

In the end, as Dr. King put it, "though the arc of the moral universe may be long"—the arc of the moral universe may be long—"it bends toward justice." We will bend the arc of the moral universe toward justice. There will be justice for the LGBTQ community.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the comments that I have given tonight, I have

a statement that I will be submitting for the RECORD, a statement that speaks to the tragic circumstances that occurred in Orlando, Florida. I will be submitting this for the RECORD because I want the RECORD to show that I, along with many of my friends, took a stand.

By the way, many of my friends who are taking a stand are Republicans. Many of my friends who are taking a stand are conservatives, and many of my friends who are taking a stand are persons of goodwill who happen to be Muslims.

By the way, the Muslim community in Houston, Texas, took a stand at the iftar that I attended. The Honorable M. J. Khan, former city council member, was loud and clear. He explained that the Muslim community respects the LGBTQ community, supports that community, and wants to fight for the community to have justice.

Also, I would add that Saeed Sheikh Muhammad was there. He too made similar commentary. So there are persons across the spectrum who are supporting the LGBTQ community. I respect all of these persons, and I appreciate them for what they are doing. I want my statement to reflect that there are those of us who came together and said to the LGBTQ community: You are not alone.

Mr. Speaker, you have been more than generous. I greatly appreciate it. I want to thank my colleague who appeared. I want to thank the many colleagues who could not appear because of circumstances associated with an event that is taking place tonight. But I know that their hearts are here, and I know that they will do what they can at an appropriate time to make sure that the LGBTQ community understands and knows that the community is not alone.

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

CELEBRATING THE CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY OF FARM CREDIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KNIGHT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the subject of this Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Farm Credit's 100th anniversary of supporting our rural communities and providing reliable credit to those in the agricultural industry throughout our country.

Throughout this Congress, as the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee's Subcommittee on Commodity Exchanges, Energy, and Credit, I have worked with Farm Credit extensively. These interactions have reaffirmed what I already knew: the Farm Credit system is made up of dedicated Americans who understand the needs and champion the values of rural America.

I am honored to represent Georgia's Eighth Congressional District, most of which is farmland. A good portion of my constituents are farmers themselves or have family and friends who farm. Georgia's Eighth District is home to roughly 15 percent of Farm Credit borrowers in the State of Georgia. I myself come from an agricultural background, as both sets of my grandparents were farmers.

Farm Credit has met the credit needs of many of my constituents and maintains an active presence in south and middle Georgia, where we are leaders in Georgia's agricultural production. For a century, Farm Credit has been providing our farmers, ranchers, and rural communities with the capital they need to build and grow successfully.

The centennial anniversary coincides with a time when our agricultural industry is facing significant economic challenges. In the past few years, our farmers and rural communities have been faced with lower commodity prices, increased input costs, and unstable and inconsistent international markets, all of which are placing strains on our food producers and those who provide essential services to our agricultural industry. This not only affects the producers and manufacturers, but it also has a tremendous effect on the communities in which they live and work.

A strong agricultural economy is essential to the health and vitality of the communities I represent in 24 counties across south and middle Georgia. During times like this, farmers in rural communities depend on Farm Credit, whose mission is focused on helping rural communities and agriculture grow and thrive.

For example, in my home State of Georgia, young, beginning, and small farmers make up 72 percent of AgFirst Farm Credit's customers. While these customers represent the future of the agricultural industry, they have entered into the industry at a difficult economic time.

Our Nation's farmers, young and old, embody the American ideals of hard work and dedication, and their commitment to providing the food and fiber for a growing nation and needy world remain steadfast. Alongside them, Farm Credit's commitment to our agricultural future remains just as important as it was 100 years ago.

Farm Credit is a critical provider of credit, not only to producers but also to the communities they live in. They are dedicated to supporting rural com-

munities' critical infrastructure needs such as access to clean water, efficient energy, sufficient healthcare facilities, and modern telecommunication services. Access to these essential services is critical to a thriving rural America. The future of our rural communities and the agricultural industry depends on a modern infrastructure, which requires access to affordable and reliable financing.

Additionally, I want to thank my colleagues who are here today to offer a few words and to celebrate Farm Credit's centennial. Rural communities in Georgia's Eighth Congressional District as well as the districts across this country are stronger when their infrastructure needs are efficiently and effectively met, and Farm Credit is providing the capital with which this can be achieved.

I want to say a special thank-you to my cohost for tonight's Special Order, the ranking member of the Commodity Exchange, Energy, and Credit Subcommittee, my friend from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT).

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT).

□ 1830

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. SCOTT, whom I affectionately refer to as my cousin from Georgia, and my good, dear friend in addition to that.

This is a remarkable 100-year observance of a truly remarkable organization that provided a great need at a great time. Imagine where we were 100 years ago. In 1916, the world teetering on World War I, boll weevil, a lot of things happening. Just a matter of, perhaps, 50 years, the South recovering from the Civil War. Great devastation.

Enter into this picture of great need comes Farm Credit. When we celebrate this 100-year anniversary, we have to celebrate it right. We have to let people know the importance, and why this organization came into existence. And I say, Mr. Speaker, that particularly in the South, we might not have really made it as quickly in terms of our recovery as we did if it were not for Farm Credit. On this 100th anniversary, we have so much to celebrate, so many fine people. Those who started it are gone, but they built it on a solid foundation that had lasted.

Agriculture is the single most important industry in the world. It is the food we eat, it is the water we drink, it is the clothes we wear, and it is the financial system that we have created. The very commitment that Chairman AUSTIN SCOTT and I share was birthed out of that—the Commodities Exchange. The South didn't have everything it needed, but it had the land and it had the crops. It had commodities. Farm Credit provided the liquidity that our farmers needed. So there is so much to cherish in this time that we are celebrating.

There is something else, too, Mr. Speaker, as we look at this. As Chairman SCOTT said, 72 percent of their