

liberated by the United States Army. Inspired by the work of the United States Army who saved him, he enlisted and became a member of the U.S. Army's 8th Cavalry Regiment, 1st Cavalry Division, on February 13, 1950, and he was soon deployed to Korea.

Despite facing religious discrimination from his sergeant, who sent him on the most dangerous missions in South Korea's Pusan Perimeter and who withheld his commendation, he fought valiantly. Corporal Rubin enabled the complete withdrawal of his comrades by solely defending a hill under an overwhelming assault by North Korean troops.

He inflicted a staggering number of casualties on the attacking force during his personal 24-hour battle and helped capture several hundred North Korean soldiers. During a massive nighttime assault, he manned a .30-caliber machine gun and slowed the pace of the enemy advance.

On a later assignment, Corporal Rubin was severely wounded, and he was captured. He disregarded his own personal safety and immediately began sneaking out of the camp at night in search of food for his comrades.

Risking certain torture or death if he was caught, he provided food to the starving soldiers, and he provided desperately needed medical care for the wounded in the prisoner of war camp. He used improvised medical techniques to save his fellow soldiers and provided critical moral support. His brave, selfless efforts were directly attributed to saving the lives of as many as 40 of his fellow prisoners.

Corporal Rubin's gallant actions in close contact with the enemy and unyielding courage and bravery while a prisoner of war are in the highest traditions of military service and reflect great credit upon himself and the United States Army.

Corporal Rubin states: "I always wanted to become a citizen of the United States, and when I became a citizen, it was one of the happiest days in my life. I think about the United States, and I am a lucky person to live here. When I came to America, it was the first time I was free. It was one of the reasons I joined the U.S. Army, because I wanted to show my appreciation. It is the best country in the world, and I am part of it now. I do not have to worry about the gestapo knocking on my door tonight. I have shalom, peace. People die for it."

HAS LAST CHRISTIAN LEFT IRAQI CITY OF MOSUL AFTER 2,000 YEARS?

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I want to read the following piece that was posted on nbcnews.com yesterday. The headline was: "Has Last Christian Left Iraqi City of Mosul After 2,000 Years?"

Samer Kamil Yacub was alone when four Islamist militants carrying AK-47s arrived

at his front door and ordered him to leave the city. The 70-year-old Christian had failed to comply with a decree issued by the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria, ISIS.

Yacub's hometown of Mosul had boasted a Christian community for almost 2,000 years. But then the al Qaeda-inspired fighters who overran the city last month gave Christians an ultimatum. They could stay and pay a tax or convert to Islam—or be killed.

Yacub, 70, was one of the few Christians remaining beyond last Saturday's noon deadline. He may have even been the last to leave alive. "A fighter said, 'I have orders to kill you now,'" Yacub said just hours after the Sunni extremists tried to force their way into his home at 11 a.m. on Monday. "All of the people in my neighborhood were Muslim. They came to help me—about 20 people—at the door in front of my house. They tried to convince ISIS not to kill me."

The rebels spared Yacub but threw him out of the city where he had spent his entire life. They also took his Iraqi ID card before informing him that elderly women would be given his house.

Mr. Speaker, this is but one example of what is unfolding in Iraq right before our eyes. The end of Christianity, as we now know it, is taking place in Iraq. This is the fifth time I have come to the floor over the last week to try to raise awareness of what is happening, to talk about the genocide.

It is genocide that is taking place. Yes, genocide: the systematic extermination of a people of faith by violent extremists seizing power in a region. Churches and monasteries have been seized. Many of them have been burned down.

Last week, it was widely reported that ISIS had blown up the tomb of the prophet Jonah.

Christians, threatened with their lives if they do not leave the region, are being robbed as they leave a land they have lived on for more than 2,000 years.

With the exception of Israel, the Bible contains more references to the cities, regions, and nations of ancient Iraq than any other country. The patriarch Abraham lived in the city of Ur. Isaac's bride, Rebekah, came from northwest Iraq. Jacob spent 20 years in Iraq, and his sons—the 12 tribes of Israel—were born in northwest Iraq. The events of the book of Esther took place in Iraq, as did the account of Daniel in the lion's den.

Many of Iraq's Christians still speak Aramaic, the language of Jesus. The Pope has spoken out. His Beatitude Ignatius Ephrem Joseph III Younan, the overseer of Syriac Catholics around the globe, has spoken out.

□ 1030

His Grace Bishop Angaelos, general bishop of the Coptic Orthodox Church in the United Kingdom, has spoken out. Archbishop Justin Welby, the archbishop of Canterbury and leader of the world's 80 million Anglicans, has spoken out. Russell Moore, a key leader in the Southern Baptist Convention, has spoken out.

Despite these Christian leaders speaking out about the systematic ex-

termination of Christians in Iraq, the silence in this town, in Washington, is deafening. Does Washington even care? Where is the Obama administration? The President has failed. Where is the Congress? The Congress has failed.

Time is running out. The Christians and other religious minorities in Iraq are being targeted for extinction. They need our help. Literally, during our time, we will see the end of Christianity in the place it began.

INSTITUTIONAL LITIGATION IS UNPRECEDENTED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as many of my colleagues know, I spent 30 years in a courtroom, one-half of those as a judge, including 2 years on the North Carolina Supreme Court. I have taken particular interest in House Resolution 676, and I have spent considerable time researching the standing of the House to initiate litigation against a President or Department heads or Federal agencies to seek "appropriate relief for failure to act in a manner consistent with the duties of the executive branch."

Never before, Mr. Speaker, in the history of the Congress, has there been "institutional litigation" between two coequal branches of government—never. There have been prior cases involving individual Members of Congress who have alleged that their vote had been nullified by Presidential action, but none of them succeeded.

This bill will clearly authorize institutional litigation between the legislative and executive branches—unprecedented, Mr. Speaker.

The Republicans have chosen to proceed with a one-Chamber resolution. The Affordable Care Act, I remind you, was a two-Chamber enactment. The House, as an institution, as a subset of the Congress, Mr. Speaker, cannot by itself enforce a legislative enactment. It must be bicameral.

This misguided and politically-motivated resolution will establish a precedent that is unknown in our jurisprudence. It is an abuse of power on the part of House Republicans.

If this bill passes and this Republican-controlled House initiates a lawsuit without Senate authorization, it will threaten the separation of powers principle and the checks and balances that we have long cherished in our country.

I ask my colleagues: Do you want the judiciary to become the arbiter of disputes between the Congress and the President? Do you really want to cede to the courts the authority to resolve disputes between the branches?

If you set this precedent, then, in the future, the House or the Senate, acting alone, could simply allege a constitutional violation against the President and get its day in court.

Well, what happens if a President is unhappy with the House or with the Senate? Could she just allege a constitutional violation and have the courts settle the dispute? If this precedent is established, will the House be able to sue the Senate or the Senate sue the House? Where does this end?

I call on my Republican friends to talk to objective legal scholars and read the literature and prior court decisions, protect the integrity of our Federal system, and reject this resolution.

Finally, I ask the proponents of this legislation to tell me two things:

Tell me, what relief are you asking the court to impose? I suppose your answer would be, well, we want the court to tell President Obama that he lacked authority to extend the employer mandate.

Why are you upset about that? I thought you didn't like the employer mandate.

Well, tell me, how do you plan to pay for this frivolous litigation? Under this resolution, Mr. Speaker, the Speaker of the House will have unbridled discretion to pay legal costs and expert costs. I did not know that the House of Representatives has the authority to pass a bill that will require unbudgeted spending that will add to the deficit that you constantly bemoan. How much will this litigation cost the taxpayers?

Mr. Speaker, this is a very sad day in this House. I know what you are doing, and the American people know what you are doing. You are using this legislation in your constant effort to discredit President Obama and set the stage for a despicable impeachment proceeding should you hold the majority in the House and gain the majority in the Senate.

Shame on House Republicans. Shame on you for this type of politics.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind the Members that remarks in debate must be addressed to the Chair and not to others in the second person.

HOUSE PASSAGE OF ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT BILLS

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this week, the House will be advancing solutions to some significant issues that are facing this Nation.

Among those, I rise today to discuss one of those, a piece of legislation set for consideration by the House later this week, H.R. 4315, the Endangered Species Transparency and Reasonableness Act. It is a package of reform bills that will modernize and improve the Endangered Species Act.

In 1973, the Endangered Species Act was first enacted to protect and recover key domestic species that are under threat of distinction. Although

the ESA was written with the best of intentions, areas of the law hinder, rather than enhance, our ability to effectively manage ecosystems and conserve species as initially intended. Today, the law is failing, failing to achieve its primary purpose of species recovery and has only a 2 percent recovery rate.

In April, the House Natural Resources Committee advanced this package of bills through committee with support from both sides of the aisle.

As a member of the House Endangered Species Act Working Group, which developed the findings and recommendations for these proposals, I encourage my colleagues to support these reforms that promote greater transparency and accountability under the Endangered Species Act, while ensuring the ecological and economic needs of our local communities are being met.

HOUSE REPUBLICANS' SHAMEFUL DIVERSION TECHNIQUES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, 6 years ago, President Obama and the Democratic Congress took office. When they took office in January of 2009, the economy was in free fall, and we were losing 800,000 jobs a month—losing 800,000 jobs a month, but the Congress went to work, and under the guidance of President Obama, we passed the American Recovery Act, we saved the American automobile industry, and within 14 months, we were gaining 250,000 jobs a month. We turned around over 1 million jobs a month, from losing 800,000 to gaining 250,000 in 14 months.

The President knew that that wasn't sufficient to continue the progress, so he proposed the American Jobs Act, and he proposed a major investment in American infrastructure. But the newly-elected Republican Congress—the obstructionist Republican Congress—stopped the American Jobs Act, wouldn't pass the infrastructure bill, and stopped every job initiative the President and Democrats proposed, and we have had a slow recovery from that recession.

We are gaining about 200,000 to 250,000 jobs a month. It is up a little, and that is good, but our economy is about \$2 trillion below its productive capacity, below what it should be because every proposal from the President has been stopped by the Republican Congress, which shouldn't have time for it, but they had time for other things.

We had plenty of time to take 50 votes on repealing the Affordable Care Act at a cost to the taxpayers of about \$79 billion to repeat that vote 50 times. We had time for the Republicans to shut down the government. That cost the economy about \$24 billion.

We had time when the administration knew that the Defense of Marriage

Act could not be defended in court, the House of Representatives wasted \$3.5 billion trying to defend the indefensible in court and lost in front of the Supreme Court. We have had, in that time, no minimum wage increase, no extended unemployment insurance, and no pay equity for women because it costs too much money. This House has passed \$850 billion in unpaid-for tax loopholes for large corporations—unpaid for.

Now, they want to waste more money. The Speaker wants to waste more money on a meritless lawsuit against the President for not taking care that the law be faithfully executed.

What did he do? In implementing the Affordable Care Act—which the Republicans have tried to repeal 50 times—he postponed implementation of one provision by a year—a provision the Republicans opposed, so they now want to waste money to go into court and sue the President to say he had no power to postpone this for a year, even though no one opposed President Bush when he postponed for a year a provision of the Medicare drug act when he was President.

It is well within the discretion of Presidents, in implementing a law, to postpone parts of it in order to get it done right. That has been very clear, and it becomes another question. Let's assume the Republicans went into court and overturned the standing question that Mr. BUTTERFIELD talked about—which they will not—what is the remedy they seek?

By the time it got to court, that provision will have been implemented, so the Republicans want to waste \$5 million or \$6 million of taxpayers' money to go into court and say, Judge, order the President to implement what has been already implemented—totally ridiculous.

So what have we got? We have got a Congress with no highway bill, no minimum wage bill, no unemployment extension bill, no pay equity for women bill, no action on campaign finance reform, no action to reduce the burdens of student loans, no action to make sure that women continue to have access to contraceptive services—despite the Supreme Court's Hobby Lobby decisions—no action on all the emergencies that face the American people, but we are going to waste money on a meritless lawsuit that will go nowhere, but simply will serve the single function of diverting attention from all the real problems the House Republicans want to continue to ignore.

That is not a proper use of the taxpayers' money, more wasted money for political purposes—for shame.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF WALDWICK, NEW JERSEY, POLICE OFFICER CHRISTOPHER GOODELL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from