

have the same free speech rights as people, allowing corporations to use their treasuries to finance campaigns. I can't think of anything that would be more corrosive to campaigns than to see a plethora of corporate and union money coming in with no controls and controlling the message.

In fact, just this year, the Republicans in the House and the Senate passed legislation that increases the total that an individual American citizen can contribute to political parties almost by a factor of 10, going from \$35,000 to \$300,000, so an individual can donate \$300,000 to a political campaign; yet there is significant public support for taking money out of politics.

According to a June 2015 New York Times-CBS poll, 84 percent of Americans say money has too much influence in politics, and 85 percent of those surveyed said that the campaign financing system should be either completely rebuilt or fundamentally changed.

The growth of money in politics represents a threat to our cherished democratic institutions that were built by our Founding Fathers. This is not what the American people want for our democracy. It is critical to inform the American public about what is happening and what can be done about the problem. There are reform options of two kinds.

The first kind is legislative reform actions, and there are three or four types of those. The first and most important is disclosure and transparency, and then there are constitutional amendments. Constitutional amendments are very hard to pass, but they are not subject to be overturned by the Supreme Court. I have a proposed constitutional amendment, H.J. Res. 31, which will do away with PACs and super-PACs.

I hope the American public will examine those alternatives and decide what they want to see because our system is in desperate need of change.

ABOVE THE LAW

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate so much the comments of my friend Mr. RUSSELL, a neighbor from an adjoining State. He is right. The American people have made clear that they did not want the TPA passed. They certainly don't want the TAA passed.

How ironic that we are told that TPA's passage will create a massive number of jobs; yet the people who have really looked at it on the Democratic side say, "Huh-uh, this is going to cost a lot of jobs so that we have got to have more unemployment benefits and more government help for people who are going to lose their jobs," which is what the TAA basically does, "or we can't vote for the TPA"—how ironic.

Also how ironic that President Obama seems to have worked harder on

this bill than he has on anything since ObamaCare—he has come to the Hill; he went to the baseball game. He is really pushing people to join him. It is rather ironic because it is just hard to believe that he would be working this hard to limit his own powers. He has never done that before. He has never worked to limit his own powers.

It also strikes me as a bit interesting that some of the same people who pushed so hard to pass TARP, the Wall Street bailout, are also pushing for this. There was a former FDIC Chairman named Isaac, who came to the Hill with the support of many economists, saying: "Please, don't get into this socialist activity where government partners with private business. Don't do that and certainly not for \$700 billion. There is no justification."

Look, we clearly have more than that, that American individuals and American businesses have overseas in banks that they will never bring into the United States. They have already paid a massive amount of tax on it overseas.

A far better, free market approach would be to just pass a bill and say, "If you want to shore up any asset or any entity, like Goldman Sachs"—you could have saved Lehman Brothers, AIG, Chrysler, GM; you could have saved any of them if you had just said: "Bring that money in from overseas, no tax."

We could have made it very attractive to do that, and then we wouldn't have had to have given the government \$700 billion with basically no limits on how the Secretary of the Treasury could spend his money.

He couldn't prop up a central bank of a foreign government, but I read the bill. I couldn't believe we were going to give that kind of power to one person. We have not done that since the Constitution passed.

It also should be noted, I think, that, if we had not passed that \$700 billion Wall Street bailout—that giveaway—then President Obama would never have gotten \$900 billion. He would never have been able to push so much more for bigger government and had gotten it.

We would have been able to have stood stronger against that, which could have prevented ObamaCare from even coming up or passing. It had terribly damaging effects. Some of the same people who wanted TARP are now wanting TPA and TAA. It is a bad idea.

I just want to just finish, Mr. Speaker, by noting that we have the Supreme Court taking up an issue—it is supposedly going to come out with an opinion before the end of the month—and ruling in a case involving same-sex marriage.

Neither the Constitution nor the Bill of Rights provides any power for the Federal Government to get involved in the issue of marriage. That has always been a State issue. It should be under the 10th Amendment; yet we have the Supreme Court potentially going to weigh in and take over that power.

We also know that the law is very clear: 28 U.S. Code, section 455, says that any justice, judge, or magistrate judge of the United States shall disqualify himself in any proceeding in which his impartiality might reasonably be questioned.

Two Justices have made clear how they feel. They have presided over same-sex marriage ceremonies. If they do not disqualify themselves and if they rule on this case, they have shown a total contempt for the law. That should lead to impeachment, but America would have to rise up to make that known.

We will see here, in the 800th year anniversary of the Magna Carta, when it was made clear that nobody, not even the King, is above the law, if the Supreme Court will say, 800 years later: "We are the Supreme Court, and we are above the law, and there is nothing you can do about it."

I hope and pray they are not that arrogant in trying to bring down this constitutional Republic. We will see.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Gracious God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

During these busy weeks of House work, we ask Your special blessing upon the Members of this assembly. Issues of national security, trade, and the welfare of our citizens stand in the balance of the deliberations of these days.

May each Member be filled with a surfeit of wisdom, patience, and equanimity that these weeks of appropriations might issue forth in solutions that benefit the Nation.

May all that is done be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I 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.

KING V. BURWELL

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, it seems like the whole of Washington is awaiting the result of a Supreme Court decision in reference to King v. Burwell.

Mr. Speaker, let me give you the simple truth. As I see it, the President broke the law. He broke the law, and people are hurting as a consequence.

Once this ruling comes down, Congress will be required to put in place mechanisms to keep people from being hurt any further, but the fact of the matter remains that premiums have gone up, deductibles are completely out of sight, leaving many families functionally uninsured. We need to address these problems.

Furthermore, power needs to be devolved back to the States. States can do a better job of running their healthcare systems because they are closer to the people that they represent.

The fact of the matter is this healthcare law was a big mistake. It is time that it be fixed, and this will be a first step in the road to do so.

AIRPORT SECURITY ACT

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, our Nation's airports are economic and cultural engines that drive our local, State, and national economy. They are the front door for many of our communities. Unfortunately, they are also a known target for those seeking to incite fear.

Two weeks ago, a man entered the world's busiest airport in Atlanta, Georgia, carrying a loaded AR-15 automatic weapon with an extended capacity 100-round magazine. He did so only to make a point, and that was to show that he was legally able to carry his firearm in the airport.

Mr. Speaker, actions like this, which follow shootings at airports in Los Angeles and Houston, undermine public security in the same way as yelling "fire" in a crowded theater.

Today, I will introduce legislation to prohibit the carrying of loaded weap-

ons in our Nation's airports. The Airport Security Act is a commonsense bill, and I urge my colleagues to join me in keeping the traveling public safe.

DACA ANNIVERSARY

(Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to commemorate the 3-year anniversary of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program, also known as DACA.

Over the past 3 years, DACA has changed the lives of more than 640,000 young undocumented immigrants who were brought to the United States as children, including an impressive intern in my office named Maria. Maria moved to the United States when she was only 6 years old. Now, as a college student with a 4.0 GPA, Maria tutors children and is giving back to the country that has helped her reach her goals.

As we mark DACA's 3-year anniversary and all that it has accomplished to support students like Maria, thousands more DREAMers are waiting for their opportunity to come out of the shadows. Sadly, the court battle over DACA continues.

We must rededicate ourselves to fixing our broken immigration system. Students like Maria deserve the chance to live free of fear and contribute their talents to keep our country vibrant and the envy of the world.

REAUTHORIZE THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, House Republican leadership is, once again, threatening to bring us to the edge of yet another deadline that threatens American jobs and our very economy.

There are just 7 days left for Congress to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank, a critical agency that gives American manufacturers and small businesses the tools and access to capital that they need to sell American-made goods overseas. It is how we grow our economy. Letting the Export-Import Bank expire endangers hundreds of thousands of good-paying jobs in the United States.

In my home State of Michigan alone, 228 exporters with \$11 billion in export value are at risk if Congress fails to reauthorize the Ex-Im Bank. That will all end on June 30—no new support, no new loan guarantees, no new loans to help exporters sell goods across the country and keep Americans at work.

It is reckless and it is irresponsible that we are facing another fiscal cliff. This is a cliff for our own manufacturers and our own economy.

Mr. Speaker, a majority of this House of Representatives supports the

Export-Import Bank. Let's vote this week to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the following enrolled bill was signed by Speaker pro tempore THORNBERRY on Friday, June 12, 2015:

S. 1568, to extend the authorization to carry out the replacement of the existing medical center of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Denver, Colorado, to authorize transfers of amounts to carry out the replacement of such medical center, and for other purposes.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 4 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1600

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LOUDERMILK) at 4 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

J. WATIES WARING JUDICIAL CENTER

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2131) to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 83 Meeting Street in Charleston, South Carolina, as the "J. Waties Waring Judicial Center".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2131

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. J. WATIES WARING FEDERAL BUILDING AND UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The Federal building and United States courthouse located at 83 Meeting Street in Charleston, South Carolina, shall be known and designated as the "J. Waties Waring Judicial Center".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other