

that this will not eviscerate, this will not evaporate, that it is not going to go away. It is going to become part of the protest movement.

I also want to note that what happened with the Rams players was a seminal moment, and I want to legitimize what they did. I have already said that I will have flags flown over the Capitol of the United States of America in each person's name.

Somebody is going to say, well, what about the people who may have committed a crime? Washington wasn't perfect, but we honored him. Jefferson wasn't perfect; we honor him. I am going to honor them for what they did at that seminal moment, just as I believe John Carlos and Tommie Smith should be honored for what they did when they held their hands up, indicating that they were protesting at the Olympics in '68.

So I, Mr. Speaker, am honored to have this opportunity today to indicate to the world, finally, that Dr. King was right when he said the truest measure of the person is not where the person stands in times of comfort and convenience, when everybody is patting you on the back, when everybody loves you, all your bills are paid, when things couldn't be better. The truest measure of the person is not where you stand in times of comfort and convenience. The truest measure of the person is where do you stand in times of challenge and controversy, when people are throwing the slings and arrows of life at you because you took a simple stand against injustice.

And it was injustice. I can explain it. I regret that I wasn't invited on the program to give my point of view. So I had to take to the floor of the House of Representatives to give what I would have given, if given the opportunity.

God bless you, Mr. Speaker.

THE 2015 NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the 2015 National Defense Authorization Act this House will consider later this week.

I am very proud to represent Fort Hood, the largest military base in the world. On November 5, 2009, 5 years ago, our community suffered an unthinkable tragedy when a radicalized Islamic extremist named Nidal Hassan opened fire on Fort Hood and fatally shot 15 men and women and 1 unborn child.

□ 1045

More than 30 others were wounded that day. Hasan's radicalization was well known to the FBI and the DOD as early as 2005. Hasan plotted with the known terrorist Anwar al-Awlaki, and he expressed his radical views to his classmates. This administration dismissed these concerns in the name of political correctness.

Five years ago the President promised to take care of the victims of this shooting, but shortly thereafter, he turned his back on them and declared the attack to be workplace violence. These victims and their families are still waiting for justice. Our communities have suffered long enough in the name of political correctness.

I am very proud that my colleagues in the House and Senator CORNYN and Senator CRUZ have not dropped the ball. We have stood for the Fort Hood community and the victims of this terrorist act even as the President failed to act. The House and Senate have agreed on this legislation that will allow these heroes to receive Purple Hearts and make them eligible for the benefits they deserve. The victims and their families will soon receive justice and closure. I am proud to support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Texas, ROGER WILLIAMS, my strong partner in this effort.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, Congressman JOHN CARTER, for his words, but, more importantly, for the many years of hard work he has put forth to care for the soldiers at Fort Hood.

Mr. Speaker, the 2009 terrorist attack at Fort Hood was an unthinkable tragedy. At that time it was the only story the news reported for days. Who was this murderer? Why did he do it? Could there be more like him? Are our other military installations at increased risk of this type of attack too? How did we not see this coming?

After the attacks on September 11 we asked these same questions. That is the difference between workplace violence and a terrorist attack. The Fort Hood shooter was not a disgruntled employee who took his anger out on his colleagues. He was a hate-filled, vengeful Islamic extremist who intentionally planned the horrendous terrorist attack and carried it out with no remorse.

Islamic extremists like him want us to fear them every single day. They want to hit us where it hurts—by taking innocent American lives and waging war on our military members. They have zero regard for human life—not even their own. That is why our response to terrorist attacks on American soil must be consistently tough, precise, and without hesitation.

At the memorial service honoring the lives of 13 Americans and one unborn, President Obama pledged to take care of those who were injured and the families of those killed. Yet 5 years later he has completely neglected them. Because President Obama designated the attack workplace violence, these men and women are not eligible to receive the benefits, treatment, and compensation that combat troops killed and injured in combat zones receive.

This negligence has caused many injured victims to have to pay their own out-of-pocket expenses for treatment, costing some hundreds of thousands of

dollars. One victim was pulled off Active Duty. Her paycheck went from \$1,400 a month to \$200 a month, and she lost her military health insurance. Others scrape by on disability payments but still have to pay the remainder of their medical bills from their own pocket. My friend Sergeant Alonso Lunsford was shot seven times but was turned away when he tried to check into an Army PTSD clinic due to the fact that he was not injured in combat.

This is not my definition of taking care of our Nation's heroes. However, the National Defense Authorization Act gives the Obama administration yet another opportunity to honor his pledge to provide for these men and women who were victims of terrorism.

This bicameral, bipartisan bill provides authorization for awarding the Purple Heart to members of the Armed Forces killed or wounded in a domestic attack inspired by a foreign terrorist organization. This is a commonsense solution that should have happened immediately following the attack at Fort Hood.

I want to thank Chairman MCKEON and again Congressman CARTER for their tireless work on behalf of their troops, and the many of my Texas colleagues who have joined the fight to restore justice. Just as we united as a country after these senseless attacks, let's once again unite as Americans to fight for the truth and honor of our fallen and demand justice for the victims of terrorism. In God we trust.

WAR POWERS OF CONGRESS AND THE PRESIDENT

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by associating myself with the remarks of my colleague, Mr. MCGOVERN.

It is difficult to fathom the daunting array of foreign policy challenges President Obama has had to weather since the start of his administration, challenges which are not the result of any misjudgment on his part.

Few modern leaders have had to contend with such an assortment of diverse global challenges, and the President deserves immense credit, which he rarely receives, for confronting them judiciously.

At nearly every turn, the 44th President has boldly promoted a global vision of peace and security defined by negotiation with allies and adversaries alike. The President's tenacious pursuit of a diplomatic solution to the Iranian nuclear program is the hallmark of that doctrine. Moreover, he has held fast to these principles in the face of Republican and even some Democrat charges of weakness, arrogance, and treachery.

I admire the President and appreciate what an unenviable position he is faced with in Iraq. However, like Mr.

McGOVERN, I am alarmed by the recent developments in what is becoming, in my mind, a full-fledged military campaign in Iraq. The situation in Iraq may be difficult, but that excuse does not merit the President's overreliance on war powers and the two outdated authorizations for use of force. When it comes to war and peace, the authority remains firmly with this body, the United States Congress.

Last month we heard that the White House planned to double the number of troops in Iraq, bringing the total to 3,000, despite the President's own promise not to put U.S. troops on the ground. On Monday another 250 paratroopers were called up from the 82nd Airborne for service in Iraq, and Congress is poised to give the President his \$5.6 billion request to combat ISIS with virtually no debate scheduled on this House floor.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to implore the President to come to Congress and explain his strategy for this new campaign in Iraq. Even the last President, who was far less sensible, sought congressional authority. It is in President Obama's best interest to address not just those relevant committees apt to grant him the legal leeway the White House weakly asserts but all 435 Members who have congressional authority and constitutional authority to send our Nation's sons and daughters to war.

The President must tread carefully going forward, and not just because our recent military history in Iraq is poor but also because he now faces a Republican Congress. Those recklessly clamoring for greater military involvement against ISIS would like nothing more than to blame what could easily become a wider conflict, likely doomed to fail, squarely on the President's head. I trust this President, and I have faith that he will make the decisions in the best interest of the American people, as he understands them.

Let me be clear: it is in the American people's best interest for the President to ask the people's representatives—us in the House of Representatives—for a proper authorization for the use of military force. Then JOHN BOEHNER should lead the debate on such an authorization—a debate at great length and with complete transparency, not behind closed doors, not in committees, not somewhere in conference reports, but out here on the floor in front of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, we have wandered down this road in Iraq before with a far less thoughtful President. What our goal was in Iraq is long since lost. Whatever President Bush said it was, it never turned out to be what we were there about. And here we are doing the same thing again, unfortunately. It is time we learned from our mistakes and that we, as Members of Congress, take responsibility for sending our people over there to die. There will be deaths, make no mistake about it. Generals have already said if we go over there a

little bit, we are going to be there for the next 2 years. It is time for us to vote on this issue after a lengthy debate.

NANNY STATE LUNCHES

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Federal food police are whipping up their latest batch of distasteful government regulations. With a government fist around an iron spatula, the Federal Government has become the new Mr. Bumble from the book "Oliver Twist."

The food police have placed unhealthy and illogical regulations on menus for government school lunches across the fruited plain. This is just more unneeded, unnecessary, and unwarranted Federal Government invasion of what school kids eat. The Federal Government now is trying to raise America's children.

In an effort to control, dictate, and give children a nanny state society, school lunches have gotten watered down to a skimpy new low. After strict portion control and outlandish so-called nutrition standards, school lunches have become as exciting as detention. The food is unappealing and lacking in nutrition.

So what have students done? They have taken their frustrations to Twitter, taking photos of government-dictated school lunches. An Oklahoma school student tweeted a picture of a few chicken nuggets, a half an apple, and a piece of bread, complaining, "Thanks for the fulfilling lunch." More and more students are catching on, saying sarcastically, "I will be full for days," and "Thanks for the delicious lunch, sure was filling."

A parent eating lunch with their child at school was stunned after seeing the lunch portions. And here she took a photograph of the lunch. Here it is. And she said correctly, "This is sad." Here you have a little condiment package. Here you have a bun with a something in between, and then you have a half a fruit over on the other side. Isn't this a lovely lunch? If a parent had anything to do with this, the Federal Government would probably accuse them of child neglect.

There is a 350-calorie limit in place for entrees. So that means taking two packets of ketchup or mayonnaise would put the student over the allowed limit. Kids find themselves in an "Oliver Twist" situation with the workhouse headmaster, Mr. Bumble, and having to fearfully ask, "More please, sir?" And of course just like in the book, the answer is a loud "No."

Kids need the energy to learn, to pay attention, and to focus. That energy comes from food. The cafeteria takeover by the Federal Government is leaving students—believe it or not—hungry.

How can we expect children operating on a lunch of no more than 350

calories to make it through the day? What about athletes and afterschool programs? Whether the student plays football or plays an instrument in the marching band, a dinky lunch just won't cut it.

Meghan Hellrood, a student at D.C. Everest High School in Wisconsin, is protesting the required "healthy" lunches by promising other students unlimited condiments that she herself will bring to school. Now, I wonder if the Federal Government will charge her with smuggling the forbidden condiments. Who knows?

Students all over the United States have started to speak out. Pictures of a lunch with two pieces of cauliflower, some ham, and a piece of cheese have surfaced, or three cherry tomatoes, skim milk, and some cheesy bread. This sounds more like the tasteless gruel Oliver Twist was served in the book "Oliver Twist."

Kids who buy their lunch but opt out of the side of fruits or vegetables are still charged for the whole meal, resulting in wasted food. There has been an 84 percent increase in wasted school lunches that are just thrown in the trash.

These regulations just aren't working. So what is next? Is the government going to force-feed kids who don't eat the government food lunches? The level of Federal Government intrusion is foolish, and it seems to be arrogant.

The time is now to protect schools from Mr. Bumble bureaucrats. Interestingly enough, some of the bureaucrats in Washington making the rules for government schools send their kids to private schools, which are not under the same absurd food regulations.

Mere calorie counting is not a viable healthy option. More physical activities in schools may be needed. In any event, it is the duty and responsibility of parents and local schools to decide what their kids eat in school, not the nanny, Mr. Bumble, and the bureaucrats in Washington.

Parents should raise their kids, not the Federal Government. Federal food police don't belong in a local school cafeteria.

And that is just the way it is.

□ 1100

THE GAS TAX

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago today, I introduced the first gas tax increase in over 20 years. I was joined by a broad coalition in announcing the bill, supported by the AFL-CIO, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, building and construction industries and their unions, local governments, AAA and the truckers, environmentalists, transit, and cyclists. It was gratifying to have that broad base of support. One year later, the only thing that has