

Perry	Ruppersberger	Trott
Peters	Russell	Tsongas
Peterson	Ryan (OH)	Turner
Pittenger	Salmon	Upton
Pitts	Sanchez, Loretta	Valadao
Poe (TX)	Sanford	Veasey
Poliquin	Scalise	Vela
Pompeo	Schrader	Wagner
Posey	Schweikert	Walberg
Price, Tom	Scott, Austin	Walden
Ratcliffe	Scott, David	Walker
Reed	Sensenbrenner	Walorski
Reichert	Sessions	Walters, Mimi
Renacci	Shimkus	Walz
Ribble	Shuster	Weber (TX)
Rice (NY)	Simpson	Webster (FL)
Rice (SC)	Sinema	Wenstrup
Rigell	Smith (MO)	Westerman
Roby	Smith (NE)	Westmoreland
Roe (TN)	Smith (NJ)	Williams
Rogers (AL)	Smith (TX)	Wilson (SC)
Rogers (KY)	Speier	Wittman
Rohrabacher	Stefanik	Womack
Rokita	Stewart	Woodall
Rooney (FL)	Stivers	Yoder
Ros-Lehtinen	Stutzman	Yoho
Roskam	Thompson (CA)	Young (AK)
Ross	Thompson (PA)	Young (IA)
Rouzer	Thornberry	Young (IN)
Rouzer	Tiberi	Zeldin
Royce	Tipton	Zinke
Ruiz	Titus	

## NAYS—116

Adams	Foster	Pascarell
Bass	Frankel (FL)	Payne
Beatty	Fudge	Pelosi
Becerra	Gallego	Perlmutter
Beyer	Grijalva	Pingree
Blumenauer	Gutiérrez	Pocan
Bonamici	Hastings	Polis
Brady (PA)	Higgins	Price (NC)
Brown (FL)	Honda	Quigley
Butterfield	Hoyer	Rangel
Capps	Huffman	Richmond
Capuano	Jackson Lee	Roybal-Allard
Cárdenas	Jeffries	Sánchez, Linda
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	T.
Cartwright	Johnson, E. B.	Sarbanes
Castor (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Schakowsky
Chu, Judy	Kildee	Schiff
Clark (MA)	Larsen (WA)	Scott (VA)
Clarke (NY)	Lawrence	Serrano
Clay	Lee	Sewell (AL)
Cleaver	Levin	Sherman
Clyburn	Lewis	Sires
Cohen	Lieu, Ted	Slaughter
Connolly	Lofgren	Smith (WA)
Conyers	Lowey	Swalwell (CA)
Crowley	Lynch	Takano
Cummings	Maloney,	Thompson (MS)
Davis, Danny	Carolyn	Tonko
DeGette	Matsui	Torres
DelBene	McCollum	Van Hollen
DeSaulnier	McDermott	Vargas
Deutch	McGovern	Velázquez
Dingell	Meeks	Visclosky
Doyle, Michael	Meng	Wasserman
F.	Moore	Schultz
Edwards	Nadler	Waters, Maxine
Ellison	Napolitano	Watson Coleman
Engel	Nolan	Welch
Eshoo	Norcross	Wilson (FL)
Farr	Pallone	Yarmuth

## NOT VOTING—5

DesJarlais	Johnson, Sam	Rush
Fincher	Palazzo	

## □ 1811

So the bill is passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3765

Mr. RANGEL. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my name from H.R. 3765, the ADA Education and Reform Act of 2015.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. MCSALLY). Is there objection to the re-

quest of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

## HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

## RECOGNIZING CHASE BUSBY

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the courageous Chase Busby from St. Simons Island, Georgia—a 3-year-old battling leukemia.

After Chase showed symptoms of a fairly common cold for about a month, his parents, Chris and Cassie, took him to the doctor for tests. Unfortunately, those tests showed that he had an acute type of childhood cancer found in bone marrow.

Since that time, Chase has gone through many more tests, medicines, and painful procedures, including chemotherapy. He is set to complete his treatment in 2018.

In true south Georgia fashion, I am proud to say that Chase's local community is rallying behind him. In his honor, on September 23, Redfern Village in St. Simons is hosting a block party called "Redfern Goes Gold," and the proceeds will go to funding childhood cancer research.

With September being National Childhood Cancer Awareness Month, I rise today to wish Chase Busby all the best in fighting this disease. Chase, we are here to support you every step of the way.

## □ 1815

## CELEBRATING MS. MAE CORA PETERSON'S 100TH BIRTHDAY

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

Mr. VEASEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the 100th birthday of Ms. Mae Cora Peterson, a resident of Fort Worth, Texas, in the Stop Six, Carver Heights community.

Ms. Peterson was born on September 13, 1916, in Orangeburg, South Carolina, during the Jim Crow era. Understanding the value of education during the time of racial segregation, she attended and graduated from South Carolina State University. She went on to earn her master's degree from the University of Michigan. After graduation, she volunteered with the YWCA and was offered a full-time job in the city

of her choice. She took on the position of executive director at a segregated branch in Fort Worth.

She continued her passion to serve youth and later served as the dean of girls and vice principal at Dunbar High School, where she worked for 27 years. In addition to her civic duties, Ms. Peterson is also the oldest active living member of the Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc.

Madam Speaker, I rise to give tribute to my good friend, Ms. Mae Cora Peterson.

## NO LAMEDUCK VOTE ON TPP

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, I rise today to call on Congress to rule out an end-of-the-year lameduck end-run vote on the Trans-Pacific Partnership.

No other time in the Congress is less accountable to the people who entrust us to represent their interests than the period between election and the swearing in of a new Congress in January. That is why it is called lameduck.

Retiring Members or those who lost elections still have a say. And whose interests are they more likely to represent?

Sometimes corporate interests weigh in with tantalizing offers of high-dollar remuneration on their retirement. Or for those fresh off an election, a lameduck can present pressures from donors who funded their campaigns.

In 2000, I watched this scenario play out when the permanent normal trade relations with China, unfortunately, passed. For China's PNTR vote, look at Texas. The President secured at least five Members' votes by promising an environmental cleanup of a military factory, a study on job losses due to imports, and finalized an EPA study for a pipeline.

And what happened to those promises?

Nothing. In fact, the factory closed with the district losing 5,000 jobs.

Madam Speaker, we have been told time and again that free trade deals create jobs, but they outsource our jobs instead. Americans deserve a vote from accountable, elected Representatives. No lameduck TPP vote.

## AMERICAN FREEDOMS

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

Mr. GIBSON. Madam Speaker, this evening I will be joined with three other veterans, and among the four of us are three airborne Ranger-qualified veterans and one Navy SEAL. We will be talking about our freedoms and this exceptional way of life.

Madam Speaker, earlier this year, on the Fourth of July, we celebrated 240

years of our independence, celebrating our freedoms.

Earlier this week in a series of somber memorials, I was in some of my towns across the 11 counties of the 19th Congressional District of New York, and we marked the 15th year since the 11th of September of 2001.

Madam Speaker, it has often been the case in the human experience that in adversity, character is revealed. I would submit that the character of the American soul was revealed on that day. Courage in the face of danger.

At the World Trade Center, when so many Americans were working their way down the stairs, our first responders were on their way up to make sure that no one was left behind. Remarkable courage in the face of danger.

And I think about what it must have been like on United Airlines Flight 93 when they had that revelation that the country was under attack and that their plane, which had been hijacked, was destined for some target, likely in the National Capital Region, and how they summoned up the courage to attack. Ordinary Americans doing extraordinary things. Courage in the face of danger. Part of the American soul, part of our character. Also, I would add, unity, unity of our country.

Very often we celebrate the diversity in this country. And, in fact, we are very proud of the fact that we have freedom of thought, freedom of expression, and we celebrate that diversity. But, Madam Speaker, we also at the same time honor our unity, and that was clearly on display on the 11th of September and all the days after.

Then, finally, what I would add is courage in the face of danger, unity, love, and support. I saw that firsthand again this week throughout my district at these memorials. It certainly was the case on the 11th of September.

When you think about what it means to be an American and the freedoms that we hold dear, this is a way of life worth defending, and that is why I am excited to be with my colleagues here this evening to talk about that. Because oftentimes we don't think about this, it is no less true.

What we did in the 18th century was truly radical. We changed the trajectory of history with our Revolution. Think about those summoning words in the Declaration of Independence:

"WE hold these Truths to be self-evident, that all Men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness—That to secure these Rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just Powers from the Consent of the Governed."

We have a tendency to look back on that and say, Well, of course. That was utterly radical. The 18th century was the era of the divine right of kings and queens and aristocracies. The heads of state of Europe, they gave us no chance. They never thought this would

work. They scoffed at us. They believed that, ultimately, chaos would unfold and that we would beg for the monarchy to come back. And, Madam Speaker, we showed the world a humble nation, mostly farmers at the time; and we showed the world that we could not only survive, that we could thrive and flourish and really go on to be, as many have said, the greatest hope for mankind.

Madam Speaker, that is why we are here tonight. We all believe passionately in this. We took an oath that said we were ready to give our life for that, and we are still fighting for that now, as we serve in the United States Congress.

And when we consider the kind of government that we brought forward, this was a government of the people, by the people, for the people, a self-governing people. Philosophers had written about it. We had some forms of that in republics over the centuries. But really what many had theorized, we were really the first to put in full practice.

And here I am talking explicitly about an independent judiciary. Heretofore, they had been, you know, extensions of the crown, extensions of the executive branch.

James Madison and many of the Founders came forward and they said—and this is what was so revolutionary—we are going to put the individual at the center, the citizen at the center. Before that time, government really was the state, it was the king, it was the queen. And we said we are going to be self-governing.

Madam Speaker, to do that, we brought forward a Constitution. And that was, again, what was really, I think, in the end, pivotal because we had a contemporary.

Less than a decade later, France had a revolution, but, unfortunately, ultimately, they begged for the monarchy to come back. Their revolution did not succeed, but ours did. And it really was the genius design of the Constitution that diffused power, that celebrated liberty, and put the citizen at the center, the separation of powers, the checks and balances, the auxiliary checks that came with it. We are talking about Federalism.

We chose the word "state" on purpose. We could have chose "province." We could have chose any other word. We chose the word "state" because we believed in that cosovereignty. And, of course, undergirding all of that was the idea of an empowered citizen, as I mentioned.

Some historians have said that when you look at all of this, when you look at Federalist Papers, when you look at the Constitution, when you look at the Bill of Rights, it has been argued that these are some of the most summoning words ever penned; and I agree with that. But, Madam Speaker, this was also very real.

What our Founders instantiated in the Bill of Rights, everything they put

there, had happened to us. I mean, King George had abused the colonists. He had abused us. And we said, No more. We said that we shall have liberty.

So when you look at the First Amendment, for example, the king had denied us the ability of freedom of speech. He told us that we could not have freedom of religion. He superimposed his religious views on all of the colonists. He said that we couldn't meet in groups of more than three because he said we would be conspiring against him. It turns out he was actually right about that.

Madam Speaker, he denied us the right to petition our government. We put together petitions. We sent it overseas to the king, anxiously waiting on a response. The king didn't even open them. He wouldn't open these petitions. He said they didn't have the standing, they don't have the right.

Our Founders said that all of our citizens have the right to petition their government; they have the right to assemble; they have the right to freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of religion. We hold these dear, and we are very proud of this.

The Second Amendment. Madam Speaker, we often learn that the Brits marched on our guns; and that, in part, is why the Second Amendment was put there. Well, let's remember this: sure, it was the Brits, but that doesn't even make the point. That was our government. The Brits at the time were essentially our national government, and they marched on our guns. The Founders said, No more. Free citizens who have rights and responsibilities have the right to keep and bear arms.

The Third Amendment. Madam Speaker, the king had quartered troops in our homes. He did that without asking; didn't pay us any money. Our Founders said that is a violation; it is a violation of the citizen; and that the only time that a government can quarter troops in a home is if Congress declares that there is a state of war and if citizens are reimbursed for that.

Madam Speaker, the Fourth Amendment. The king routinely sent his troops into our homes. He didn't need cause. They turned furniture upside down. They could look for anything. Our Founders said that would not happen again. They said that we have the right—as citizens, we have the right to be reasonably secure in ourselves, in our belongings, and that the only way the government could get access to that is if they followed a process, due process where they stood before a judge and they showed probable cause for action. Only then shall warrants be writ, and those warrants shall have specificity in person, place, and thing. Central to liberty.

Madam Speaker, the Fifth through the Eighth Amendments have to do with the rights of the accused. We have the right to hear the charges against us. We have the right to not be locked up, indefinitely detained without

charge. We have the right to counsel. We have the right to not be forced to testify against ourselves. We also won't have double jeopardy. If we are facing a capital crime, it shall first go to a grand jury. We have the right to speedy and public trials by jury, and we have the right to protection from unjust punishment.

□ 1830

Madam Speaker, the Ninth and Tenth Amendments are an affirmation of limited government because the Founders said that anything that wasn't explicitly written in the document would be left for the States or the people.

Madam Speaker, this changed the history of the world. This was an incredible moment when freedom was born. And every generation since, servicemen and -women have had to stand up to protect those freedoms because we believe in the idea of the citizen and we believe in the idea of liberty.

Madam Speaker, I want to be clear. There has been a lot of discussion in this Chamber about the safety and security of our families and our communities. I want to state very clearly that all of us veterans here, we believe deeply in this. We love our families, we love our friends, we love our communities, and we want to assure their safety. That is partly what inspired us to go forward, to deploy, to fight our enemies: to ensure the protection of our loved ones.

We don't believe that by targeting with law-abiding citizens we are going to be safer. We believe in background checks. Of course, we do. We don't want terrorists to get guns. In fact, we endeavor to kill or capture terrorists.

We believe this. We believe that any public policy that is enacted needs to actually solve the problem while at the same time protecting our liberties, assuring us of the freedoms that we fought for.

As we look across, what is evident is that we have issues right now with gangs and narcotraffickers, and so we support action. In fact, we helped pass, in this Chamber, legislation that addressed that. When we addressed the opioid issue, we addressed education, which is so important to cutting down on opioid abuse. We addressed treatment. We also addressed enforcement.

Federalism has many virtues, but it has some challenges, too. There are seams. There are seams that these narcotraffickers and gangs can exploit, and we helped address that.

Madam Speaker, these are constructive actions that can help make us safer. We fought to defend these freedoms. We are still fighting to defend these freedoms.

Madam Speaker, we are now going to hear from a series of speakers. I want to first bring up my friend from Oklahoma, STEVE RUSSELL. He represents the Fifth District in Oklahoma. He served in the United States Army for 21

years. He commanded a battalion. His battalion was actually the main effort that captured Saddam Hussein back in December of 2003 in Iraq. This is an incredible person. He is a warrior. He is a scholar. He is a statesman. He was decorated with the Combat Infantryman Badge. His servicemen and -women were awarded the Valorous Unit Award, and he personally was decorated for valor. He is also a small-business owner, rifle manufacturing business. He was a representative in Oklahoma before he came here. I am very honored to serve with him.

I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL).

Mr. RUSSELL. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague and fellow warrior from New York and my brother warriors who are joining me in this effort today. It is an honor to have a sister warrior who is also sitting in the chair with us here tonight.

The right to keep and bear arms is as fundamental to our freedom as any other inalienable right we enjoy as Americans. This right is God-given—as much as the freedom of religion and to exercise worship, the freedom to assemble and express, the freedom to own property and protect our privacy.

As such, serious-minded individuals must have serious deliberation on any attempt to alter these fundamental rights. In a time where Americans face uncertain threats from terrorists at home and abroad, most Americans clearly understand why we must preserve the right to defend ourselves, our families, and our property.

For those who would refuse their right to defend themselves, they certainly have the freedom to do so. They do not have the freedom to make that decision for others.

In terms of human behavior, our survival instincts are inherent. The Creator of the universe did not make human beings with fangs, claws, quills, odors, or poisons for their self-defense. Instead, he gave them their intelligence and, by extension, their hands to fashion implements to protect their lives.

While the Progressives are certainly welcome to choose not to defend themselves, as is their right, it is not their right to prohibit others from protecting their lives, liberty, and property or the Bill of Rights of the Constitution of the United States.

It was New Year's Eve in Blanchard, Oklahoma. Eighteen-year-old mother Sarah McKinley, who was alone with her 3-month-old son, heard a ruckus at the door. Two men were outside trying to break it down. Grabbing her baby and barricading the door with her sofa, she immediately called 911.

In the frantic and desperate situation, it became clear that law enforcement would not arrive in time to prevent the assault by armed intruders with designs that can only be imagined. She informed the dispatcher that she had a shotgun and asked if it was all right to shoot the intruders if they

made it inside. Wisely, the dispatcher told Sarah: I can't tell you to do that, but you do what you have to do to protect your baby.

Sarah already knew what she had to do and hoped against hope that law enforcement, while responding quickly, would arrive in time. When the armed intruders broke down the door, 24-year-old Justin Martin climbed over the couch and was greeted with a shotgun blast to the chest. While his accomplice ran for his life, Sarah had saved hers and her son's.

A year ago, 88-year-old Arlene Orms was at home in Miami, Florida, when an intruder kicked in her door. Orms responded by retrieving a small .25-caliber pistol and fired at the home invader, prompting the criminal to flee.

Following the incident, Orms' neighbors expressed support for her actions, with one telling a local media outlet: "You have to do something . . . You have to do something to protect yourself."

Americans all across this land understand inherently you have the right to defend yourself, your property, your loved ones, and your liberty.

Progressives can no more rewrite history than they can rewrite the Constitution. From Madison, Hamilton, Jefferson, and Adams, all the way to the Supreme Court decisions with Heller and McDonald, this inalienable right has been affirmed in defense of its articulation in the Bill of Rights.

While the President complains of congressional inaction on the right to keep and bear arms, we can no more take action to deny this right that we could deny a free press, free religious expression, or property rights of individuals. Congress cannot become a vehicle to destroy the Bill of Rights.

Madam Speaker, my fellow warriors and I have nearly lost our lives like you defending this Republic in our Nation's Armed Forces doing very hard things. We stand as brothers in arms to declare that we will stand in the way of any Executive who will not uphold the Constitution of the United States, plain and simple.

Still, the administration and progressives press forward with passion and conviction, convincing Americans that the threat is so grievous, the injury so great, that Americans must now act. We are told that mass shootings are on the rise and gun deaths are out of control and the worst possible environment exists among developed nations.

Before America signs up to eliminate one of her inalienable rights, let's deliberate with a sober mind on this issue. The President and his party would report outrage if conservatives suggested that the First Amendment must be scrapped because of outrageous libel, hate speech, religious bigotry, and sit-ins warranted necessary commonsense reforms so that we could take away the first of our enumerated freedoms embodied in the Bill of Rights. There would be outrage

over such a suggestion. Americans recognize that we must face the unpleasantness of its abuse to secure its inviolable status.

Not the same, some may say. We are talking about outrageous loss of life and injury, and it has to stop. Since when did our security become substitute for our liberty? Americans for 240 years have rather sacrificed to secure it.

My brother warriors with me here, Madam Speaker, along with you and your service, we stand in that group of those who have defended and supported the Constitution since we were very young adults.

What about the facts? With more than 33,000 gun homicides last year, the question is asked: Don't you think it is time to do something about gun violence?

Well, here are the facts:

More than 60 percent of these homicides are suicides. While tragic, it is not the same.

Only 8,124 were with firearms of the 11,961 that were murders. That is 8,124, not the 33,000 that you hear.

This is a 9 percent decline in gun murders since 2010. Haven't heard that one, a 20 percent decline in gun murders since 2005. Again, you haven't heard that one. A 50 percent decline in gun murders since 1995.

The laws seem to be working. With shall-issue carry laws and good lawmaking in States, we have seen a 50 percent diminishment in the problem. That is called success. Why on earth would people want to change that?

Here is another one that we see people asking: People are being slaughtered by these assault weapons. Don't you think it is time we ban them?

Assault weapons are fully automatic and unavailable to the public. Semi-automatic rifles make up the majority of rifles owned in the United States. Here is an interesting fact. Of those 8,124 murders with firearms in 2014, the last full statistical year, only 248 were with rifles of any kind—that would be flintlocks; that would be semiautomatic rifles; that could be anything. 8,124—not the 33,000. Of those, 248 were with rifles. Yet people think that: Oh, my goodness. This is the problem. This is what we have to ban. Statistically, the facts are simply not there.

To put that in perspective, of other murders in different categories, 435 people were murdered in 2014 with clubs and hammers; 660 were murdered in 2014 with hands, fists, and feet.

So let's have the deliberative debate, but let's look at the facts. Don't you think a terrorist, if they can't board a plane, they ought not to be able to buy a firearm. News flash: the terrorist watch list has over 1 million names; 99 percent of them are foreigners. As the only firearms manufacturer in Congress, I can assure you in the 18 U.S. Code and in the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms regulations that govern manufacturers and dealers, guess what. They can't purchase a firearm,

not as a nonresident alien. Ain't going to happen. If we were to do that, we would be committing a felony.

Of the less than 1 percent that might be eligible, an even smaller fraction of these are on separate no-fly lists. Yet you don't hear these facts. You are hearing them tonight in the people's House.

□ 1845

All Federal prohibitors would trigger an alert to the FBI on any firearms transfer, even if they were eligible.

What about the gun show loophole? Don't you think businesses should be forced to conduct background checks at gun shows? I have a firearms business. If we were to go to a gun show and set up there, and we were to do a firearms transfer under that license without a NICS check and a 4473, we would be committing a felony.

No firearms licensee can transfer a firearm without a background check, period. If so, a felony is committed with stiff penalties. On-site business or off-site transfer, it doesn't matter. It is irrelevant. These are the facts.

What about Internet gun sales, don't you think there should be a background check on those? Why, you can just go on the Internet and they mail you a firearm.

No licensee will transfer a firearm to another location without sending it to another licensee to make the transfer. When people order our products, we send them out to another Federal firearms licensee. They do the background checks. They do the transfer. If that doesn't happen, nothing is transferred. To do so is to commit a felony otherwise.

Further, no firearm can be transferred through the mail or a shipping service unless by a licensee, and unless—the only exception—it is the owner sending it back to the manufacturer to have some repair made or something of that nature.

And so these are the facts that we see and that we deal with. As we go into this debate, we have to go into it with deliberation. We often hear: Why aren't we having these issues? Why aren't we discussing this issue? Let's have the debate. Let's go after the facts.

Serious people decline to trivialize any right expressly addressed in the Bill of Rights. A government that abrogates any of the Bill of Rights, with or without majority approval, forever acts illegitimately and loses the moral right to govern this Republic. This is the uncompromising understanding reflected in the warning that America's gun owners will not go gently into the utopian woods.

While liberals and gun control advocates will take such a statement as evidence of their belief in the back-water, violent, untrustworthy nature of the armed American citizen, as gun owners, veterans, combat veterans, defenders of this Republic, we understand that hope, that liberals hold equally strong conviction with theirs about

printing presses, Internet blogs, and television cameras. We get that. It is the same Bill of Rights, inalienable.

The Republic depends on the fervent devotion to all of our rights, not selective rights. This is the oath we take, and no President's tears or progressives' passionate pleas will shake us from the defense of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. GIBSON, Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma. I want to thank him for providing real illumination on important data and also on law. I think too often we can move off quickly without having a firm understanding of what the current law is, and so we really appreciate him bringing clarity to that subject.

And also inherent in the gentleman's talk, this idea, this Bill of Rights, is formed with the basis of a citizen that has rights and responsibilities. We know as citizens that we have a responsibility to follow the law. And if we don't follow the law, we are fully held to account for that. That is another piece I think that is occasionally missing from all this. And certainly what is missing, I believe, is the fact that all of us here tonight and, indeed, Madam Speaker, all of us acknowledge your very distinguished career in the United States military and, in so many ways, how you were a trailblazer and how you really are a role model for everyone. We are so honored to serve with you.

We recognize the fact that for all of us, we believe with every fiber in our body that we are going to stand for these rights, that the policy that we bring forward is going to be based on those rights, and also looking to solve the problem which, as I pointed out, when you actually look at the facts and you listen to the data, you know that where the problems are are these narcotraffickers. You know, we have issues with that, and we need to take action with that. So when we focus our policies in the area that is causing the problem, we will actually begin to see an even more safe and secure environment.

By the way, also the deterrence, along with addressing the issue with narcotraffickers and gangs, is the deterrent value itself of the Second Amendment. So I want to thank Mr. RUSSELL.

At this point, I want to bring up another great American, RYAN ZINKE. He is the at-large representative from Montana. Congressman ZINKE spent 23 years in the United States military. He was a United States Navy SEAL. In fact, he commanded SEAL Team Six. He was the commander of Joint Special Operations Task Force in the Arabian Peninsula, leading over 3,500 special operators in Iraq. He also established the Navy Special Warfare Advanced Training Command and served as the first dean of the Naval Special Warfare graduate school. He earned two Bronze Stars during his service, and his service continues now. His daughter was a former U.S. Navy diver, and she is married to a Navy SEAL.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. ZINKE), my good friend.

Mr. ZINKE. Madam Speaker, when I was a Commander at SEAL Team Six, I can tell you I was never the best jumper, diver, explosives expert, but I always knew who was. I was able to surround myself with, I think, the greatest team that this country could muster.

I feel privileged and honored also in Congress to be able to surround myself with what I think are the greatest team of patriots, both men and women who have served our country and have a great love for our Constitution.

Tonight's discussion is about the Constitution. All of us took an oath to defend and support the Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic; and this time in our government's history, I don't think there is more of an important message to do that today.

Our Constitution is about individual rights granted to us not by the government but by God, secured by the people. What we find ourselves today is not a Republican or Democrat issue. This is an American issue, and it strikes at the very heart of our country.

Across our great land, there is a sense that America has lost her place. There is a sense that tomorrow is not going to be a better day, that America's greatness has passed. I don't share that thought because I believe in the people of America.

What I think has happened is this: We always thought that our President or elected officials would always have our best interests at heart. And America went busy doing the things that are required every day, moms were dropping the kids off to school, we were working, building small businesses, mom-and-pop stores were out there doing commerce, and we always thought, again, that our officials, our elected officials, would always do what is right.

Well, there is a saying in the SEALs that you have to earn your Trident every day. In America, we have to earn our freedoms every day. And earning our freedoms is participating in our elections, and it is holding our elected officials accountable, making sure that this great democracy, which is the light of the world, maintains its place.

John F. Kennedy, in his inaugural address, said that our great Nation would pay any price and bear any burden in the defense of freedom. That sounding call was a call to all men and women worldwide that the United States would be there in the defense of our freedoms. There was a bond, a democracy, and a government by the people and for the people that provided the most opportunity for all of us. At the heart of it is the defense of our individual freedoms—our freedom of speech, religion, and our freedom to bear arms. They are sacred. They are sacred to Americans and the envy of the world.

So tonight, as we think about what is important in our country, I say this: It is time for America to stand. It is time for us to rally. Our country is worth fighting for. Our values are worth defending. Our Nation requires all of us to act. We all rise and fall on the same tide. We all share the same experience of being American.

With that, I am honored to be with you tonight. Thank you, and God bless.

Mr. GIBSON. I want to thank the gentleman. I want to thank him for really putting in focus the fact that these natural rights—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—these natural rights come from God, and that governments are instituted among men and women to secure those rights, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

As I mentioned earlier, what really made us different from the rest of the world, this exceptional Nation which many people thought would never work out, I want to thank the gentleman for putting that in focus. I thank him for his service to our Nation, thank him for his leadership.

We are now going to hear from one of our newest Members here in the House, WARREN DAVIDSON, who represents the Eighth District in Ohio. He is no stranger to service. He is certainly no stranger to hard work. He graduated from the United States Military Academy in 1995, and he spent 11 years in the United States Army. He served in some of our most elite units. He served in the 75th Ranger Regiment, the 101st Airborne Division, and right here in Washington, D.C. with the Old Guard.

After 11 years having defended these freedoms, he went back home, and he began to work in his family business. Then later, he branched out on his own and started his own small business in manufacturing, something very important to an independent nation. We are very proud of his service. We are glad he is here with us now, and we know we see great things in his future.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON).

Mr. DAVIDSON. Madam Speaker, it is an honor to be here with my colleagues. It is a different way to support and defend the Constitution than I ever expected to have. I began my service here much like, well, everyone else. We all start the same way. We swear an oath to support and defend the Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic. And that was the first time that I swore it, or any of us here tonight.

In 1988, at the climax of the cold war, I enlisted in the infantry. I was honored to serve in Germany after Ronald Reagan had uttered the famous words, "Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall." I was honored to be there at a time when many people in the world worried that Ronald Reagan, with his intense rhetoric, would somehow cause world war III, that maybe he was pushing too far, too hard, or asking too much.

I was honored to be there when East Germans tore down their own wall.

Word had gotten past the Iron Curtain and penetrated the lies they had been told, and they knew what we had here. They tore down their own wall, and, for once, the oppressor did not stop them.

□ 1900

I was honored that Thanksgiving to meet East Berliners who could not believe what they were seeing. They were seeing stores with goods on the shelves, open at night.

They asked: Is it like this everywhere?

I thought they were talking about how big Berlin was, but they were just in shock because they had not experienced what we had.

And what did we have?

We had the birth of plenty. We had the world's best markets—and still do—for goods, for services, for capital, for intellectual property, for innovation. We are the world's land of opportunity, and they were hungry for it.

Ronald Reagan, much earlier in his career, had a famous speech: "A time for choosing." I would encourage everyone one who has not watched it, to watch it, and everyone who has not watched it in a while, to watch it again. Reagan said—back then, famous words—"Freedom is never more than one generation away from extinction."

Sadly, that is more true today than perhaps at any time since he uttered those words then.

No one knows the divide between freedom and oppression better than servicemen and -women. They fight our Nation's wars. They risk their lives to defend our Constitution. Sadly, the threat to our Constitution is not just from foreign enemies. Sometimes, sadly, it is right here in the Halls of Congress.

In my short 3 months here, I have seen attempted infringements on the First, Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Ninth, and Tenth Amendments. That is hard to believe.

Just this past summer, we had Members of Congress obstructing the people's work here, staging a sit-in on the House floor to subvert our Second Amendment with a radical gun control agenda. It is an agenda that seeks to deprive us of the very rights our Founding Fathers sought to preserve with the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

Anyone could do a plain reading of the Constitution and see that the right to bear arms is named right there, to be applied at the individual level. The rest of the Bill of Rights is certainly talking about rights at the individual level, and the Second Amendment is no exception.

Justice Scalia wrote it in the Heller decision, "Nowhere else in the Constitution does a 'right' attributed to the people refer to anything other than an individual right."

"The people" refers to all members of the political community, not an unspecified subset. We start, therefore, with a strong presumption that the

Second Amendment right is exercised individually and belongs to all Americans.

You see, for more than 100 years, the 14th Amendment has been used to link the rest of the Bill of Rights to the State. Somehow, the same folks that are onboard with applying the First Amendment to States, whether it is free speech, voting rights, or freedom of religion, in some cases, they are reluctant to let the same be true for the Second Amendment.

When they want a uniform view of things that aren't even addressed in our Constitution, like marriage, they are not willing to apply the same logic to our Constitution with something that is very plainly stated: The right to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed.

I take that right very seriously. Those of us who served in the military know all too well what a society looks like when freedoms are squashed. We have seen these places and met the people who have lived under tyranny.

Our Founding Fathers knew the battle between freedom and tyranny too well, many sacrificing their lives in the struggle to establish this Nation. It is not an accident that they enshrine that right to keep and bear arms squarely right after the right to speech and freedoms of religion. It is so essential to stave off oppressors that we cannot be truly free without it.

After these men sacrificed life and limb, let us not besmirch their legacy by subjecting it to an agenda which would seek to attack away this freedom one firearm or one freedom at a time.

The threats are real. It is hard to imagine. It is not just rhetoric. Those words, "freedom is never more than one generation away from extinction," sound like political rhetoric, but it is just so real and we have to take it very seriously. It is an honor to be here to talk about it.

Mr. GIBSON. Madam Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues, and I really want to express what a privilege it is to serve in this House. I believe in this country and this exceptional way of life. Not that we don't have warts and challenges—we certainly have those—but there is nothing that we can't solve together.

We also need to recognize that what we did in the 18th century that allowed for the most freedom and the opportunity in the history of mankind is not a birth right. It is not a foregone conclusion. Every generation has to defend it. They have to defend it from threats from abroad and also be vigilant for unintentional or perhaps intentional encroachment here at home.

Our colleagues here believe deeply in protecting this exceptional way of life. As I stated earlier, we love our family, we love our friends, we love our communities. We want to ensure that they are safe. We are ready to work with our colleagues on that. As we do, we need to keep forefront this exceptional way

of life which the first generation of Americans fought to provide for us and that every successive generation has fought to preserve and that we also take commonsense approaches that are based on data and that are focused on actually solving the problem.

We identified some of those problems tonight and areas where we think we can find some common ground. I mentioned one of them we already have in terms of the law enforcement and cracking down on the narcotraffickers.

Madam Speaker, we are here tonight because we also wanted to make it very clear that—while there are passions and emotions in every direction, we wanted to make it very clear that what we hold so dear, this exceptional way of life, the liberties, the Bill of Rights, the Constitution, this is something we will defend. We have defended it and we continue to defend it. May God bless this country.

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

#### PROGRESSIVE CAUCUS: TPP

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

Mr. POCAN. Madam Speaker, I am here on behalf of the Progressive Caucus, which is in charge of this hour. We are here today to talk about the Trans-Pacific Partnership and trade.

The people in the Progressive Caucus have been some of the leaders in the movement to make sure that we have trade deals that protect American jobs and lift our wages here in the United States.

We want to make sure that there are environmental protections across the globe. We want to make sure our food is safe and our prescription drugs are affordable. We want to make sure there are human rights in countries that do trade with the United States. And we want to make sure we are addressing issues like currency manipulation. All of those issues are important when you want to advance trade.

No one in this room is against trade. We are all for increasing our ability to have more exports and to have imports into this country, but you have to have trade deals that work on behalf of the American worker. And all too often, past trade deals have cost us jobs here in the United States. They have made our wages continue to be depressed.

That is not a good trade deal, in the minds of the members of the Progressive Caucus. That is why we are here at this hour to talk specifically about what is good trade, why we are skeptical of the Trans-Pacific Partnership, and why we especially don't want to see a vote during the lameduck session after the election in November. With people who are no longer going to be serving in Congress, taking that vote at that time would be an especially bad idea.

Today is a national call-in day of action on the Trans-Pacific Partnership. There are over 90 public interest groups that have been calling our offices. I heard my staff picking up the phone over and over again, responding to people who want to make sure that we have trade deals that take care of all those things that we talked about, all the things that members of the Progressive Caucus have been leaders in this Congress and trying to advocate for.

In conjunction with the tens of thousands of people who have called Congress today to urge their Members not only to not support the Trans-Pacific Partnership, because it is really not a trade deal, there are parts about a trade—this is a rewriting of corporate rules that could have huge ramifications.

Forty percent of the world's gross domestic product is involved in this one large deal. We want to make sure we get it right, not just fast. That is why we are joining with these groups today to make sure that people know what is in the Trans-Pacific Partnership and why it is vitally important that we don't take this up during a lameduck session.

As I said, not only do we have Members who will no longer be serving here who might even be looking for jobs with some of the very industries advocating for the Trans-Pacific Partnership because it will benefit their bottom line, but also we have two Presidential candidates in the main two parties who both oppose the Trans-Pacific Partnership.

This should be something that, with as much enormous respect I have for President Obama, we should allow the next President to be able to address trade, especially when a deal like this has so much controversy and so many questions about it.

So we are here. During the next hour we are going to hear from various members of the Progressive Caucus. It is my honor to yield to one of my colleagues from the great State of California. The 17th District of California is very lucky to have a representative who has been such an outspoken advocate for middle-class families not just in California, but across the country.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA), my colleague from the 17th District of California.

Mr. HONDA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to voice my opposition to TPP, an unfair trade deal that will hurt our Nation's workers, our environment, and give corporations dangerous new rights.

Through an alarming expansion of the Investor-State Dispute Settlement process, the ISDS, TPP will give corporations a legal weapon to enforce their agendas on sovereign nations. Corporations have already used ISDS to bring over 700 lawsuits against more than 100 governments around the world.