

Let me applaud the Department of Justice because I sent a letter January 14, 2016, to ask the Department of Justice to immediately investigate the actions of State officials in Michigan. They are actively engaged. The FBI is actively engaged, and their work is not for naught.

Let me give you an example, Madam Speaker, very quickly. The Governor was asked to release his e-mails. Part of what he released was this black, redacted pages of information.

He released some other materials that I think are telling. Here we are: "We need Treasury to work with Dan in Flint on a clear side by side comparison of the health benefits and costs of GLWA [Great Lakes Water Authority] vs. a more optimized Flint system."

But here's the real key: "Also, we need to look at what financing mechanisms are available to Flint to pay for any higher cost actions."

Madam Speaker, the Governor of the State of Michigan is sitting on \$1 billion. Yet, he is asking a city that is near bankruptcy, controlled by an emergency manager under a State law that was rejected by the people of Michigan, to find out how they can pay for better water. They have no money to pay for better water.

But let me tell you what they did. Instead of helping Flint pay for better water, helping them have a plan for anticorrosion, they paid an emergency manager under a law that was rejected by the voters of Michigan.

This individual led the Detroit's Public Schools as an emergency manager. I am told that that was literally brought to collapse. He was paid \$180,000. Well, he didn't do that well enough that they wanted to give him \$221,000.

Let me say this. The emergency manager payment for the city of Flint—let me correct that—was \$180,000. When he did it for Detroit's Public Schools, that came to near collapse. It was \$221,000.

From my perspective, there is much here that warrants a criminal investigation.

Let me add to the point. On April 25, 2014, the city switches its water supply. Let me be very clear. The city leaders—I served on city council—had no authority because the emergency manager was in place.

Did the emergency manager have an anticorrosion plan? No.

Did they test the water when they opted to go cheap and save \$5 million and go into the Flint River? No.

The city switches its water supply, because of money, from a Detroit system that works. The switch was made as a cost-saving measure for the struggling majority-Black city of Flint.

Soon after, residents began to complain about the water's color, taste, odor, and to report rashes and concerns about bacteria.

In August and September 2014, city officials suggested that they boil the water, the complete wrong thing to do.

They did not have a plan for anticorrosion. They did not follow the

Federal law that indicated that you had to put phosphate, an anticorrosive element, into the water. So it continued to deteriorate and deteriorate.

Guess what, Madam Speaker, and my colleagues. The emergency manager was never a scientist. It was not someone who said: Let me test the water before I order citizens to drink the water.

That sounds to me like there is culpability and criminal culpability because lives have been endangered. And so I am looking forward to the attorney general of Michigan coming in, just as the Governor should, and looking forward to a thorough investigation, Madam Speaker, that will find some relief.

My final point, Madam Speaker, is to say that the Governor is culpable. The Governor right now needs to go into his rainy day fund and provide the full funding requested by Mr. KILDEE and all others to fix the Flint water system.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of my neighbors in Flint, Michigan, who are facing one of the greatest disasters in American history. We cannot erase their pain. But I know that I stand with my colleagues in saying we will do everything in our power to help them recover and help make sure it never happens again.

The sort of regulatory neglect that has brought Flint to its knees has a well-known disparate impact on urban, low-income, and minority communities. Residents who cannot afford to move to suburbs and wealthier neighborhoods, or who do not want to leave their longtime communities, are treated as second-class citizens. Here in Michigan, the twofold combination of negligent environmental protection and underinvestment in infrastructure is forcing those in underserved communities to pay with their health and lives.

We see this in places like Detroit, where 8% of children have elevated blood levels—16 times the national average according to the Centers for Disease Control. We see it in places like Flint, where an unelected emergency manager switched the city's water to an unsafe, untreated source, which has exposed tens of thousands of residents to toxic lead levels.

Exposure to lead—a potent neurotoxin—carries lifelong consequences. Flint parents must now raise children who face lifelong developmental and behavioral challenges, cover economic costs their city cannot afford, and confront mounting medical bills that cannot undo the harm they have suffered. Our thoughts and prayers are with them. But they need more than that—they need action.

It has become an all too common tale that whenever an urban or low-income community's water or air quality is in question, risks to the health and safety of its residents are ignored. This must stop. Underserved communities generally face so-called "acceptable" risks that no other community or suburb would ever accept—or be asked to accept. This must stop. In Flint, the decision was made by someone they never voted for and approved by someone who did not care that it might lead to toxic exposure for city's residents. This must stop.

The time when apologies and resignations would suffice has passed. The disregard for the health and safety of our neighbors in Flint will mean massive, heartbreaking consequences for those affected and their city. Anything less than a transformative, lasting shift in the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality and Michigan's other regulatory bodies—from panderers to guardians—simply adds insult to injury. We are not dealing with isolated events of negligence. There is a pattern and practice of disregard for the quality of our air and water that has become intolerable, and we will not settle for mere assurances to do better.

Unfortunately, it appears those responsible for Flint are more focused on surviving the scandal than fixing the problem. Governor Snyder has said he is sorry but he's only offering half measures: free water that they cannot drink anyway, a fraction of what is needed to fix Flint's plumbing, and resources that cannot possibly overcome the health impacts of lead exposure. It appears the only time he thinks Michigan, the City of Flint, and the federal government should work together is when it is time to apportion blame, or when it is time to do everything he says on his terms.

But we know how that story ends. It is time for those of us in Congress who care about a safe environment more than the business environment to act. That means directing federal resources to help Flint recover and rebuild, figuring out exactly what went wrong, and ensuring that this never happens again.

Fixing this problem starts with providing government services that will actually help these people heal. Especially the children so they can succeed in life—which means a proper education, comprehensive healthcare, and access to everything a child in a wealthy community would have if they were similarly exposed. It means repairing the infrastructure, so that they can have clean water again.

Preventing this from happening in the future starts with strengthening—not cutting—our enforcement capacity. It means eliminating emergency management programs that cut government regardless of the cost and strip citizens of their democratic rights. It means stopping with the idea that a small government is a good government, and it means stopping efforts to undermine our government by cutting its budgets to the bone.

CONGRATULATING ABIT MASSEY FOR RECEIVING THE UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA PRESIDENT'S MEDAL

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Abit Massey on receiving the prestigious University of Georgia President's Award in recognition of his extraordinary service to UGA and the State of Georgia.

Abit is an institution in Georgia. He has served as the head of the Georgia Department of Commerce, the UGA Alumni Association, and on the board of the Georgia Research Foundation,

among numerous other prestigious positions.

In my part of the world, Abit is better known as the dean of the poultry industry due to his tireless commitment to and advocacy on behalf of the industry. Abit served as the executive director of the Georgia Poultry Federation for almost 50 years and now serves as its president emeritus.

One of the most amazing things about Abit is that not only does everyone know him, but everyone respects him. He is the dean of the State lobbyists at the Georgia Capitol, but he still makes time to say hello to everyone he meets and often greets them by name because his memory never forgets anyone.

Abit's service to Georgia and commitment to the State is obvious, but I am glad to see UGA recognize that service through bestowing him the President's Award. I am honored to recognize this great Georgian and hope he continues to work to improve future generations of Georgians.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE UNITY ACT

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 997, the English Language Unity Act, introduced by my friend, Mr. KING, from Iowa. I am a proud cosponsor of this important and commonsense bill.

The English Language Unity Act establishes English as the official language of the United States, requires all official functions of the United States to be conducted in English, and establishes a uniform language requirement for naturalization.

□ 1815

A common language creates a shared bond. It strengthens our shared cultural fabric and identity. English as the official language does not mean other languages cannot be spoken. It simply recognizes that officially. We speak the language already spoken and shared by the vast majority of the country.

Failure to have a national language can create costly and burdensome translation requirements and create legal confusion. It can also hinder new citizens from assimilating quickly.

The diversity of the United States is one of our strengths. We should continue to celebrate the many cultures that make up our melting pot. This great country gives us the freedom to share our differences. But at the end of the day, we are one Nation and one people. And as one Nation, we should speak with one tongue when conducting official business.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the English Language Unity Act.

HONORING DAN SUMMER OF GAINESVILLE, GEORGIA

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise to pay honor to a friend and a colleague, Mr. Dan Summer. Dan was an attorney in Gainesville. As a young attorney just getting started, he was one

of the people that I could turn to and ask questions of. He was somebody who listened. He was somebody who cared.

Dan and his wife, Chandelle, ran a firm. Everyone in Gainesville knew that if you went to them, you are going to get treated like family and have somebody that takes not only the fight for your justice and for your fairness, but makes it very personal.

When Dan passed away recently, he fought all the way to the end. ALS took him from us, but his memory is strong.

What he has meant to Georgia and the legal community will go on for many generations. He is one that stood up for rights. Many times when others may have disagreed, Dan always stood up for the rights of others. Dan was always making it his business to be the protector of those in need. Dan Summer is who make Gainesville, Georgia. It is people like Dan Summer; his character, his loving kindness, and his smile.

I remember one of the last times that I saw Dan, it was a little bit ago. He was walking across the Square in Gainesville. I pulled up, and I saw him walking across. I yelled: Hello, and the first thing he did was turn around. And I saw that smile. It is Dan's smile, his concern, and his life that will be remembered.

Mr. Speaker, I would encourage all of us to strive for what is better in us. Dan Summer is one of those people that meant the world to me. His family will experience this loss, but I know they will continue to relish the love that he gave to not only his family but to his community. With that, I remember Dan Summer.

LIFE, LIBERTY, AND THE PURSUIT OF HAPPINESS

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Life. Liberty. The pursuit of happiness. Mr. Speaker, in the United States Constitution, our Founders cast their vision for our Nation whose members would enjoy unparalleled freedom because of these basic truths.

Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Unfortunately, today, many have lost the pursuit of happiness in favor of the guarantee of happiness. They are mistaking what we have as a guarantee in that pursuit of happiness. These Founding Fathers believed in individual worth and individual rights. While the challenging realities faced by citizens of nations that prey on individual and economic liberties sometimes remind us of the particular blessings we enjoy, we take these rights so often for granted.

I believe one of the things that is beginning to pervade our society today, Mr. Speaker, is a society that does not value life or liberty or the pursuit of happiness. In fact, I believe there is an anti-life culture that is developing, one that does not value the personhood that comes at conception and ends at natural death, the one that says that we are made by God in His image, and we have infinite value not based on who we are, but based on the fact that

He breathed life into us. It is an abortion culture, an ending culture, that we are being strangled with in the United States.

Abortion is literally killing generations of promise in our country. But yet we have some who really just want to turn their back. They believe it is a choice.

I am so glad, Mr. Speaker, that your family didn't view it that way and my family didn't view it that way. Because when you look at life, you take life as God has given it to us. And it is only up to Him, who gives life, the Maker and Creator of life, that determines the potential and the possibilities. Whatever path we go on, He has given us that hope.

In my own family, this became very real for me. I have had many years of pastoring, but it happened back in 1992. You see, there was a young youth minister and his wife excited about the news that they were going to be parents. Everything was great. Everything was moving along. They were working. They were doing everything that they thought that they were supposed to be doing, until one day my bride called me and said: Let's do an ultrasound. We have one last ultrasound. The doctor wants to do one last ultrasound.

I came running back. I was off on a business trip. I got back just in time to get there. They were doing the ultrasound. Ultrasounds are amazing because they show life—not a fetus, not a blob—they show a life in the womb. It starts when God breathes it in. If you don't believe me, just take a look.

Even back then when they started to go around, I could see my child whom I had not had a chance to meet yet. Then a little bit later, the nurse stopped. She said: I need to go get the doctor. At that point my wife looked at me, and she said: Something is wrong. Tears started coming down her face.

I said: Sweetheart, they are just going to get the doctor. He is just going to look at it. It is all good. She said: No, something is wrong.

It came back. The doctor looked and said: I need to show you something.

On a little spot, a little white spot that I could have not told the difference of, the doctor told us the words that have now rung for me for almost 23 years. He said: Doug, Lisa, your baby has spinal bifida. He actually used a big term called myelomeningocele. All I knew was something was wrong.

We spent the next few days in sort of disbelief. We knew this was not a mistake. We knew this was not anything except we were supposed to have a child, and, undoubtedly, this was just going to be a little different. We talked to doctors, and we found out it just continued on.

Then one day, Lisa went back to school after it had become known that we were having an issue and the pregnancy was now going to be high risk. One of the teachers came up to Lisa and said: You know you have a choice. Lisa looked at her and said: Well, we

are going to Atlanta, and we are going to have the baby in Atlanta. She said: No, no, no. You have a choice. You don't have to keep going.

At that point, it clicked. This teacher was telling my wife that she could kill my baby. Lisa realized it real quickly. Lisa said: You realize you are talking about my child.

When I hear of Planned Parenthood cavalierly talking about a choice to kill a baby, it is horrifying.

In this body, the reconciliation is addressed that we are going to continue to because there was a choice made this week. You had a chance to vote for life, and if you voted "no," you voted against life. Don't try to make it any other thing.

The country has a choice coming up this year. It can take a culture of life from conception to death, natural death, or it can continue to value life, as man does, as throwaway, as maybe not good. You see, prioritizing and saying this is what we believe is what makes this life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness worth pursuing.

They told us that Jordan would have trouble. I actually had somebody one time in a town hall say: Well, her quality of life may not be good. You may have done her a disservice. I choked back my angry tears, and I said: You don't know my daughter.

You see, it is that time of the year when elections come around. My daughter just got back home from her job skills training. She is looking for a job. She is 23 years old. She is back home. She is going out to find where she can make a place in this world. She has a smile that will light up a room. Her little chair whips around faster than you can imagine.

I was thinking about even my own election, and my wife looked at me the other night, and she said: You know, you realize you got something coming up this year. I said: What's that? She said: Your secret weapon comes home on Friday. She is daddy's girl.

You see, life is what you make it. Life is not what somebody else says your life is.

When we have a culture of life, abortion is an abomination to that culture of life. It is why we need to continue every day to put forward a culture of life on this world, Mr. Speaker. It is why we will continue to put forward a culture of life that says we value all.

When we do that, no one has to ask where DOUG COLLINS stands. DOUG COLLINS stands with life. DOUG COLLINS stands with those of all. Because I am one who believes that no matter who you see in a day, Mr. Speaker, when you look into their eyes, you see someone of infinite worth, of infinite value, not because of anything they have done, but because of the life that was put into them by their Creator.

It is abortion that takes that away. It is why I will continue to come to this floor as many times as I possibly can and stand for life because that is the life, the liberty, and the pursuit of happiness that our Founders spoke of.

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

RESTORING ARTICLE I AUTHORITY OF THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOST). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to be recognized to address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives. I appreciate your attention to these matters that come before the House and the House Members that are in attendance, observing in their office, and all the staff people around.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that we carry these messages out. I come to the floor tonight to raise a topic that is important to all Americans, especially the Americans who take our Constitution seriously, and even more importantly, those Americans who have taken an oath to support and defend the Constitution, and that would include all of our servicemen and -women along with many law enforcement officers and officers of the article III courts, the entire House of Representatives, the entire United States Senate, and, to my knowledge, the entire body of legislators across the country and the State legislators. I have many times—a number of times—taken an oath to support and defend our United States Constitution but, in the State senate, also the constitution of the State of Iowa.

Our Founding Fathers structured our Constitution so that we would have three branches of government, and some say three equal branches of government. I do not completely agree with that assessment, Mr. Speaker. Instead, I contend that the three branches of government were separate, and they are separate. But the judicial branch of government was designed to be the weakest of the three. Our Founding Fathers understood that there would be competition between the branches of government.

So as part of this discussion, I would like to announce into the RECORD here, Mr. Speaker, that our chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Chairman GOODLATTE, has initiated a task force—a task force—that is designed to address the article I overreach of the President of the United States and the executive branch—not only this President, but previous administrations as well.

I appreciate and compliment Chairman GOODLATTE for his insight and foresight for taking this initiative. I thank him for suggesting and then ratifying today that I will be chairing the Task Force on Executive Overreach. It will be comprised of members of the Judiciary Committee, Republicans and Democrats. It will be bipartisan. I had hoped that it would be non-

partisan. Judging from some of the tone in the debate today, there could be a little flavor of partisanship in there, Mr. Speaker. That is fine, because that is how we bring about our disagreements.

In any case, a task force has been set up, and it will function for 6 months. Some time in August its authorization will either expire or it will be reauthorized and extended for another period of time.

The theme is, again, restoring the article I authority of our Congress and to address the executive overreach.

The circumstances that bring us to this point are myriad. The objectives of the task force, as I would design them, and the object of a chair of a committee is to bring out the will of the group.

I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that the object, the plan, and the strategy is this: First, it is my intention to intake all of the input that we get from Democrats and Republicans from the bipartisan side in the committee and to build a rather expansive list of the executive overreach that we have seen from the article II branch of government.

I say it that way so that we bring everything into our consideration. Then once that expansive list is made, then we will pare it down to those things that can be sustained as the authority of this Congress versus the authority of the executive branch of government.

I would point out that the executive overreach isn't only about the unconstitutional overreaches that have taken place, especially recently within this administration, but it is also, Mr. Speaker, about the constitutional overreach when a President will act under authority that maybe has been granted to the executive branch of government by the legislative branch of government, or an authority that has been expanded off of an authority that was granted by the United States Congress.

□ 1830

A big piece of this will be the rules and the regulations that are the authority that we have granted to the executive branch of government over the Administrative Procedures Act.

We know that when the executive branch publishes rules, we have been getting more and more rules that are published. Once they are published for the prescribed amount of time, and the comment periods for the prescribed amount of time are allowed and the American public is allowed to weigh in, at a certain point they have complied with the requirements of the Administrative Procedures Act and then the rules go into effect. Often the rules that are written by the executive branch of government are without the purview of Congress, but they have the full force and effect of law. That is troubling to me.

Our Founding Fathers envisioned this. They gave us the republican form of government and a constitutional Republic. This constitutional Republic is