This brings us to the other argument, the second argument, which is that there is not time. I brought this graphic here to show that, for the last several Presidents, the average approval time was something like 2 months. The current President has some 300 days left in his term.

Take a look at this one: approval time for Justices Alito, Roberts, Breyer, Ginsburg, and Thomas. If you add all of those individual periods of time together, you still don't get the amount of time that the current President has left in his term.

This, of course, brings us to the arguably most laughable argument that we hear lately, which is that some 20-plus years ago, then-Senate Committee on the Judiciary Chairman JOE BIDEN said something along the lines of perhaps then the President shouldn't make an appointment because it was an election year.

□ 1015

I don't need to point out that, as much as I like and respect the Vice President, his words of 25 years ago do not carry constitutional force or the force of law. We shouldn't spend a lot of time on that argument.

So what is really going on here? If those are the best arguments against even extending the courtesy of a senatorial meeting to the President's nominee, an unprecedented action, what is really going on?

Here is what is really going on. It is a government shutdown. We have seen this before. When the rules we read at the opening of every Congress result in an outcome my friends on the other side of the aisle don't like, they simply shut it down. They did that in October 2013.

Between the days of October 1 and October 16, they shut down the Federal Government, an action that Standard & Poor's estimated cost the U.S. economy $24 billion, or fully 0.6 percent of our economic growth is gone because the Republicans wouldn't accept the Affordable Care Act.

Look, I get that. They don't like it. But it has been passed in due course in this House, shown to be constitutional by the Supreme Court, and the answer was: No. We don't like it. We are shutting down the government.

Let's not shut down the government over the Supreme Court.

COLOMBIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of this body the current negotiations taking place in Cuba between the Colombian Government and the FARC, which is a U.S.-designated terrorist organization. That deal is dangerous for Colombia and for our U.S. national security.

Let me explain. As a friend of the Colombian people, I have been a proponent of widening and strengthening our bilateral ties with Colombia by supporting the United States-Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement. This agreement has helped many companies in my congressional district of south Florida strengthen their trade capabilities with Colombia.

I have also supported Plan Colombia, a collaborative effort alongside the Colombian Armed Forces and security forces aimed at improving the security environment. Plan Colombia enjoys wide bipartisan support, resulting in a significant reduction in the cultivation of coca in years past, record dismantling of labs, and drastically reducing kidnappings, which are an important source of revenue for the FARC.

Despite great advances in the conflict during the Uribe administration prior to President Santos, I have expressed serious misgivings about the negotiation initiated by the Colombian Government with the murderous Castro regime as a supposedly impartial mediator.

Mr. Speaker, the Castro brothers run an impressive communist state, with complete disregard for human rights, due process, and a notorious history of supporting nefarious actors throughout the region.

Using Cuba as a mediator in the negotiation is misguided, at best. It is widely known that the Castro brothers have been great supporters of the terrorist group FARC, have allowed the FARC to use Cuba as a safe haven, and have even trained some FARC terrorists in guerilla warfare tactics.

Yet, despite knowing that the Castro regime has internationally voiced strong support for the FARC, even lending materiel and monetary aid to the rebels, we expect the Castros now to be acting as impartial mediators? Absolutely not, Mr. Speaker.

With the Colombian Government negotiating with the FARC and with Cuba as a mediator that is supposedly impartial, the pending agreement includes no jail time for any of the FARC criminals. These criminals have kidnapped and tortured scores of Colombian citizens and have even held American citizens hostage. No jail time.

According to the agreement, if the FARC members admit to their crimes, they would be put in what is the equivalent of house arrest from 2 to 8 years—8 years is the maximum—and they would not serve any jail time and they will not be extradited to the United States to face any charges they have pending here.

You heard that right, Mr. Speaker. This agreement could include a request to drop any arrest warrant and drop any extradition process from the United States that we have filed to prosecute members of the FARC. This is completely unacceptable, Mr. Speaker.

I am also concerned about provisions in the agreement that would allow members of the FARC to run for political office, as they would likely use the massive funds that they have from their illegal narcotics trade to finance their campaigns and further undermine what the Colombian people are trying to achieve by having a safe, secure Colombia again.

Evidence has shown that, since the negotiations began with the FARC in Havana, coca cultivation numbers in Colombia have increased. From 2014 and 2015, we have seen an increase of drugs flowing from Colombia. Who do we think is responsible for that? The FARC. Who is making more money from narcotrafficking? The FARC.

What I find most disturbing, Mr. Speaker, was the call by the Colombian Government to remove the FARC, an organization with American blood on its hands, from the U.S. State Department's Foreign Terrorist Organizations List.

Lastly, there are several unanswered questions about the implementation of this misguided deal. How will the FARC disarm? How will they surrender their weapons? What role will the United Nations play as it oversees the implementation of the process? Will the Obama administration continue its pattern of granting concessions and end up releasing FARC leader Simon Trinidad, who is serving time in our prison?

Mr. Speaker, the United States must reexamine this agreement and urge the Colombian Government to address some of these grave concerns. We have a responsibility to our taxpayers to be good stewards of their funds as well as a moral imperative to support and seek justice for the victims of the FARC, not their perpetrators.

AIRCRAFT NOISE

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

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people of Phoenix, I rise to demand an end to business as usual at the Federal Aviation Administration.

In 2014, the FAA decided, without any input from civic leaders or members of our community, to implement new flight paths for aircraft from Sky Harbor International Airport. The impact of this decision on local residents was swift and severe. Without warning, our communities were suddenly exposed to constant, deafening aircraft noise.

As they run businesses, raise families, and struggle to sleep at night, Phoenix residents must now contend with the incessant roar of planes passing overhead. Simply put, the new flight paths have deprived the Arizonans I represent of the peace and quiet they enjoyed before the FAA intervened.

Unfortunately, the agency has only exacerbated this difficult situation by overlooking the objections of local residents and ignoring clear direction from Congress to reconsider these routes.