

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, do I have any time remaining, as I have two more speakers just for 1 minute each?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. KUSTER. It is regrettable. This is such an important topic for the country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair could entertain requests for 1-minute speeches at this time.

□ 2115

(By unanimous consent, Mr. CICILLINE was allowed to speak out of order.)

FACES OF ADDICTION

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, addiction has many faces, and one of those is my friend from Rhode Island, Tom Coderre, who was elected to the State senate at the age of 25 and also oversaw 40 employees as the director of a local nonprofit.

Already a heavy drinker, Tom soon started using cocaine as a way to cope with the stress of his responsibilities, and when he realized that drugs were taking hold of his life, he tried to quit on his own but was never able to maintain sobriety for more than a month or two.

Eventually, he checked himself into an inpatient treatment at Butler Hospital. There he was able to get help and support and to maintain his sobriety and get his life back on track.

Today, more than 10 years sober, Tom works as the chief of staff for the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. His victory over addiction is an inspiration for all who are struggling today.

It is a reminder for those of us in Congress that we need to do more to provide resources and support for those who need it most. We need a comprehensive approach from the Federal Government that focuses on ensuring that those struggling with addiction get the support and treatment they need. That is particularly important in the area of opiate and heroin abuse.

In 2012, of the 23.1 million Americans who needed treatment for drugs or alcohol, only 2.5 million received it through a specialty facility.

There are millions of Americans who are in need of treatment. We have a responsibility to do all that we can. Heroin use has grown tremendously over the last decade, particularly in New England. It is an epidemic that cuts across all demographic boundaries—Black and White, rich and poor, young and old—and we need to do something about it.

REQUEST FOR ONE-MINUTE SPEECH

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, how much time will we have for our Special Order on the Republican side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Recognition will stop at 10 p.m.

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the 1-minute speech then.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Ms. KUSTER. We have taken our 45 minutes, this is the 45th. We just have one 1-minute. This is a very important topic for the country.

Mr. STUTZMAN. I understand, but we are already at 9:17, and I have quite a few Members here to talk about the issue we have come to the floor to discuss.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

GUN CONTROL AND AMERICANS' SECOND AMENDMENT RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. STUTZMAN) is recognized until 10 p.m. as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the topic of this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today along with quite a few Members to address the issue of gun control and Americans' Second Amendment rights.

Mr. Speaker, I have the honor of representing the Third District of Indiana. In the Hoosier State, we cherish our constitutional right to bear arms. For many years I also had the honor of serving in the Indiana General Assembly, where I was proud to coauthor and get signed into law the lifetime concealed carry permit so that Hoosiers could protect themselves, their families, and their homes.

Starting in 2013, in response to the push for radical gun control legislation from Senate Democrats, we founded the Republican Study Committee's Second Amendment Initiative here in Congress, which serves as a platform for House Republicans to share the most important facts about gun control and the Second Amendment.

Tonight I will be joined on the House floor by many members of the Second

Amendment Initiative and other proud Members who steadfastly defend Americans' gun rights.

Mr. Speaker, we come to the House floor tonight to set the record straight. Yesterday President Obama announced his intentions to unilaterally pursue executive actions on gun control.

Like times past, I wholeheartedly oppose the manner in which the President has chosen to pursue changes to current law. In fact, when reports surfaced this past fall that the President was considering executive actions on guns, I led over 30 of my House colleagues in sending a letter to the White House requesting information on what exactly he planned to do and why.

My colleagues and I had a number of very simple questions. First, if the President is planning on closing the supposed gun show loophole, did the Vice President and his gun control commission recommend this policy for inclusion among the 23 executive actions announced by the White House in January of 2013? If so, why was it excluded from the announcement?

Second, is the White House relying on any new data that was not available when those 2013 actions were announced?

Third, does the White House have any evidence private sellers' transaction volumes and propensity for illegal sales are positively correlated?

Fourth, does the White House believe this new policy would have prevented any of the recent year's major shootings?

Finally, does the White House expect criminals to voluntarily comply with these new rules?

The White House still has not responded to our letter. Tomorrow, the President plans to hold a Q&A town-hall televised on CNN regarding guns in America.

Mr. Speaker, I fear after this event, Americans will continue to be left with more questions than answers, like, first and foremost, why does President Obama insist on infringing on Congress' lawmaking authority?

The reason we don't have any answers to the questions about this new gun control policy is because it was crafted in back rooms, out of view of the public, instead of in Congress, where we would have held hearings, committees would have reviewed the policy, and our constituents would have had the opportunity to comment on it.

Mr. Speaker, in the event Congress would have held a hearing on this issue, we probably would have uncovered the glaring reality that there is no gun show loophole. If you were one of the 55,277 federally licensed gun dealers in America in fiscal year 2014, you would have been required, by law, to run background checks on individuals, no matter if you sold a gun at your place of business or at a gun show.

Congress would probably also have come across the Department of Justice's study of inmates from 2001 that

found that less than 1 percent of inmates, when interviewed, actually bought their crime gun at a gun show. In contrast to this, almost 40 percent reported acquiring their guns illegally, such as by theft.

Members of Congress would have also found interesting a December 10 Fact Checker's column in The Washington Post which reported as true the fact that none of the past year's and month's tragic mass shootings would have been prevented by newly proposed gun laws.

Due to the President's insistence on going it alone and pursuing actions that challenge the Constitution, today we introduced H.R. 4321, the Separation of Powers Restoration and Second Amendment Protection Act. Joined by over 60 colleagues in the House, this bill would render any executive action that violates the Second Amendment or infringes on Congress' article I responsibilities as having no force or effect, and to prohibit funds for such actions and established standing for Congress, State, and local governments, and for aggrieved persons to challenge such actions in District Court. This legislation is the House companion bill to Senator RAND PAUL's bill S. 2434.

Mr. Speaker, it is time the White House cut out the distractions. Stop blaming gun owners and start taking threats to Americans' safety seriously. Instead of continuing to blame Congress for not enacting new laws, perhaps the President should look to laws already on the books.

Reports suggest that some Federal prosecutors are choosing not to prosecute straw purchasers as a matter of policy. These are the individuals that purchase guns and illegally give or sell them to individuals they know could not pass a background check. For example, in 2012, the U.S. attorney for Chicago announced a transition to focusing on interstate trafficking and other violations instead of these illegal straw purchases.

On top of this solution, the President could also look to Congress for ideas. For example, States have been expanding concealed carry reciprocity to the point that Federal laws ought to catch up. I have a bill, H.R. 923, the Constitutional Concealed Carry Reciprocity Act, which would do just that.

Mr. Speaker, in the coming months, I look forward to working with House Republican leadership on bold strategies to actually make America safer.

At this time, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA).

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. I thank my friend from Indiana for doing so. It has been a pleasure working with him on this and many other issues.

I have to tell you, my heart breaks for those families who have been impacted by violent crimes. These tragedies, however, do not give President Obama the authority to circumvent the Constitution.

Just yesterday, the President announced unilateral actions to under-

mine the Second Amendment without input from Congress, making good on his vow from an October 2015 speech of his willingness to politicize tragedies to advance his gun control agenda.

The President needs to enforce the laws currently on the books. Criminals who abuse firearms or obtain them illegally should be prosecuted to the fullest extent, and that isn't always the case currently.

I wish President Obama understood what a majority of Americans already know, and especially those of us who have purchased weapons and purchased guns. Those who abuse firearms or obtain them illegally should be prosecuted. However, purchasing a legal gun is not quick or easy.

They also know limiting the rights of law-abiding citizens will not solve this problem. Instead of pursuing his political agenda, the President should join the bipartisan effort to fix our Nation's broken mental health system.

I am a proud cosponsor of Representative TIM MURPHY's Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act. This legislation would overhaul our Nation's inadequate and outdated mental health system so people who need treatment can receive it. Simply throwing more money at this issue without these reforms is like giving the VA more money without demanding better care for our veterans.

According to ABC News, 63 percent of Americans see mass shootings as a reflection of problems identifying and treating people with mental illness and mental health problems rather than adding more restrictive gun laws.

Also, according to The New York Times, not exactly a conservative newspaper, 77 percent of those asked said that they thought that better access to mental health treatment and screening would reduce gun violence.

The American people are correct. These people who have been polled on this are absolutely correct. Responsible gun ownership is not the problem. The House must remain vigilant to protect the American people from an ever-encroaching Obama administration that is more interested in creating a political issue than a solution.

As a responsible gun owner myself, I am committed to being an advocate for Second Amendment rights, the constitutional legislation that will actually help prevent gun violence across America, and those who have been impacted by its violence.

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON).

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, first and foremost, I want to voice my strongest opposition to the Obama administration's continued assaults on our Second Amendment rights.

After seeing his gun control agenda fail in the Democrat-controlled Senate, President Obama is once again trying to go around the will of the American people and unilaterally take action through executive fiat.

This latest effort to unconstitutionally restrict one of our most fundamental rights has nothing to do with safety and security and has everything to do with government control. This is neither what the American people want nor deserve.

In fact, the executive action the President announced yesterday would not have prevented the recent tragedies our Nation has experienced, including the San Bernardino attack. Instead, it would trample the rights of law-abiding citizens. It could actually have a chilling effect on people seeking help for mental illness.

Nobody wants to see guns in the hands of someone who is dangerous because of mental incapacity, but we really need to look at the consequences of this type of action. It is just common sense. If folks believe that they could potentially lose their rights for simply seeking mental health, it is going to be a deterrent to folks actually seeking that help.

Let me give you an example. In our country, we have an absolute tragedy of veteran suicide. If one veteran who returns home from the conflict doesn't seek help for issues that may have arisen from that service, then shame on the President for this action. If they are afraid that if they go seek help, that one day they could lose their gun rights the rest of their life, what a deterrent effect that might have on a population that desperately needs help.

□ 2130

We will never regulate people's actions by regulating their freedoms. If that were the case, then the streets of Chicago would be some of the safest streets in America, because they have some of our strictest gun control laws.

Rather than infringing on our Second Amendment and governing by executive fiat, this administration should work with Congress on commonsense reforms that would actually reduce gun violence, like confronting our mental health crisis and preventing criminals and terrorists from actually entering our country in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, like many of my constituents back home in North Carolina, I am a responsible, law-abiding gun owner who cherishes our Second Amendment freedom. This right to keep and bear arms is a freedom by which we protect all of our other freedoms as a fundamental first freedom. For that reason, I encourage my colleagues in the House to stand with me against the President's proposed executive actions.

I want to thank the gentleman from Indiana for organizing this tonight and bringing us together for this very important discussion.

Mr. STUTZMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE).

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, the President's plan to once again bypass Congress and unilaterally implement gun control measures represents yet another, sadly, all too familiar assault

on our Constitution. This time, the President is doubling down with a two-for-one special by proposing executive orders which violate our Second Amendment rights, while at the same time abusing the separation of powers written in our Constitution. In the process, the President claims that the overwhelming majority of Americans, including gun owners, support his executive actions.

Mr. Speaker, I can assure him that when it comes to the Texans that I represent, the President is dead wrong. This isn't the first time I have had to fight the President's radical agenda on gun control—and just like before, I won't back down.

So today, I stand in support and as a cosponsor of the Separation of Powers and Second Amendment Protection Act, a critical bill that we now, unfortunately, need to put a stop to any action by this President to weaken our Second Amendment rights.

I refuse to let this President use these unconstitutional executive orders as a way to distract the American people from his epic foreign policy failures, to turn our focus away from his failure to keep Americans safe not from the Second Amendment, but from ISIS-inspired terrorists in our own homeland. San Bernardino was not, as the President called it, "an act of violence." It was terrorism.

Mr. STUTZMAN, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO).

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, Mr. STUTZMAN, for putting this important Special Order together.

Yesterday, President Obama moved unilaterally, via executive order, in a misguided attempt to curb gun violence in America. He stated he had to take unilateral action because the Congress refused to support his initiatives. That is true, somewhat, but not because this Nation wishes to curb gun violence that has fallen upon innocent victims of America—victims like Kathryn Stienle.

This young lady was murdered in San Francisco by a person here illegally—a person that had been deported over four times and should have been deported once again, but instead was allowed to stay in this country illegally because of this President's policies and the policies promoted by sanctuary cities like San Francisco.

Obviously, I cannot speak for her family, but I would venture to say her family would have had a very different holiday this year than the one they experienced had the justice system not failed them and the man who murdered her had been deported. She would be here today if the President and his administration had chosen to simply enforce the laws on the books.

President Obama's executive order will not curb this kind of violence. Only the enforcement of the laws will. And, Mr. President, you know this.

Please abide by article II, section 3 of our Constitution: The executive shall faithfully execute the laws of the land.

Now, I agree with the President that we should appropriate more money to mental health, as has been talked about here tonight. The lack of resources for those seeking mental health in this country is abysmal. Thirty years ago, this Nation had over 500,000 hospital bed facilities for mental health care. Today, there are less than 50,000. This is inexcusable.

I also agree with the President that we should increase the number of ATF inspectors to process background checks more quickly and more efficiently. We can work this out through the legislative process—the way it should be done—and not through, again, executive fiat.

With all due respect, Mr. President, your phone and pen are not a substitute for the other two branches of government.

Aside from sidestepping Congress again, your other initiatives encroach on Americans' personal liberties and freedoms. Take, for example, your plan to revoke gun ownership from folks whose oversight of their finances are turned over to someone else—specifically, those receiving disability through the Social Security Administration or the Department of Veterans Affairs.

For reasons beyond their control, sometimes additional help is needed in managing one's finances. Sometimes they do it voluntarily. This does not mean they are incapable of making sound, moral decisions, and certainly does not mean their Second Amendment rights can and should be infringed upon.

As an aside, I want to highlight how this President's administration allowed for Syrian rebels to receive military grade weapons and they supplied Mexican drug cartels with weapons through the failed Fast and Furious program administered under Attorney General Eric Holder at the time. All of this has been done irresponsibly and without conducting background checks.

This administration's gun policies have killed innocent people. Customs and Border Security Agent Brian Terry was a victim of this. Yet this President's solution to gun violence is to restrict law-abiding American citizens from one of our most basic rights of American freedom and liberty. It simply does not make sense.

The Second Amendment of our Constitution is very clear and concise. Allow me to read it: "A well regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed."

This amendment was not added in the early years of our Nation's founding for hunting or sporting purposes, but for personal protection to fend off an overbearing, tyrannical government. It is very clear and has consistently been upheld by the Supreme Court.

Mr. President, I understand and sympathize with your frustrations, but

please uphold the Constitution and come to Congress. Let's work together on those areas where we agree upon to curb gun violence. And let's preserve the Second Amendment. Let's all respect and revere the Constitution for all Americans.

Mr. STUTZMAN, I thank the gentleman from Florida.

I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JODY B. HICE).

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, I thank my colleague and good friend from Indiana for organizing this Special Order, and I am very pleased to be here this evening to help defend our Second Amendment, which is the amendment giving teeth to all our other amendments and rights.

The Second Amendment is one of the most fundamental principles of our Republic. And yet the Obama administration and the Democratic Party as a whole have now been engaged for years in an attempt to undermine the rights of law-abiding American citizens to keep and bear arms.

President Obama, as has already been discussed this evening, has come before the American people just yesterday announcing his attempt to yet again infringe upon the rights of law-abiding American citizens by unilaterally instituting new restrictions on firearm sales.

The President's blatant disregard for the constitutional role of Congress to write the laws of the land is absolutely astounding to me. This latest move is just yet a larger part of executive abuse that has been going on for quite some time and an overreach.

In 2013, Congress rejected legislation that would have expanded background checks. I fully believe that that would have the same result today. And yet because it was not in accord with the wishes of the President, he now claims that Congress has relinquished its responsibility. Therefore, he somehow has the right to create laws as he sees fit. Well, he is wrong.

As well as being unconstitutional, this moral imperative that the President claims to have regarding gun controls is not even statistically or logically on sound ground. In fact, the President has pointed directly to a string of domestic terror attacks as the reason for his executive action. And yet we all know that his unconstitutional executive order would not have prevented any of these terror attacks.

So the real issue here is that this gun grab by the President is a smokescreen to hide from his own failed policies and his refusal to deal with terrorism and to eliminate it. And it is time for the truth to be told and for us to stand in opposition against this continued assault on the Second Amendment.

Personally, my defense of the Second Amendment is firm and unwavering. I will never support any measure that infringes upon the rights of law-abiding American citizens to purchase, use, and keep firearms and ammunition. I believe that any law that restricts these

rights is unconstitutional and should be steadfastly opposed.

So, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time to share this tonight. And I am just reminded of Thomas Jefferson's statement: "No freeman shall ever be debarred the use of arms."

This is an issue upon which our liberties rest.

Mr. STUTZMAN. I thank the gentleman for the reminder from one of our Founding Fathers, and I appreciate your service to the citizens in Georgia.

I yield to another Member from the great State of Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK).

Mr. LOUDERMILK. I thank my colleague from Indiana for reserving this time and for giving me a few minutes to speak on this very important and critical issue.

Mr. Speaker, as I am standing here, I see the word "liberty" engraved at the base of the rostrum. One of the great principles of this Nation is one of the principles of which our Founding Fathers sought to take on in the field of battle the most powerful military force in the history of the world for an idea, a principle of liberty.

One of the great influencers on our Founding Fathers was Charles Montesquieu, an 18th century philosopher and judge. He said that when the legislative and the executive power is vested in one person or one body, there can be no liberty.

Many of my colleagues that stood here before I came this evening have testified to the role that the President has taken upon himself to become both the legislator and the executive in this matter. In fact, in his statement on the White House Web site, he said that he was going to have to take action, even though some of the gaps in our gun laws could only be fixed by legislative action by Congress. But because Congress failed to act, he is going to have to take action.

Clearly, he is admitting to stepping into the constitutional role of this body and the body on the other side of this building. When that happens, there can be no liberty.

Now, the President has said he must take this action because Congress has failed to act. No, Congress did act. But Congress did not act in the way that he wanted us to. And because we didn't act in the way that he specifically wanted, now he has to take action. And the action he says that he must take is to make America safe.

Many have talked about the constitutional issues. Clearly, he is taking an unconstitutional approach in this decision that he has made and in this action. But I want to highlight the ultimate hypocrisy of his statement that his actions are to make America safe.

This body has taken actions which he has ignored that would truly make America safe. Back in February, as a member of the Committee on Homeland Security, I traveled to our open and porous southern border, and I traveled side-by-side with Border Patrol

agents, the Coast Guard, and local law enforcement who have committed their time and their lives. It is their mission to secure that border. We saw that the border is controlled by illegal cartels that smuggle human traffic. They smuggle narcotics and they smuggle drugs across the border into this country.

Now, if guns just arbitrarily kill people, then maybe the action the President is taking would have some effect. But I have been around guns all my life and I have yet to have a gun jump up and just arbitrarily start shooting anyone. Guns don't kill people. People kill people.

□ 2145

Bad people that use guns come into this country, and often those guns are smuggled in through the southern border.

Now, as a result of being on the border, we realized that the only way to secure that border is we have to have a combination of physical barriers, of technology, but, most importantly, boots on the ground.

We have talked about building fences and building walls. Well, I had one Border Patrol agent say that those are really ineffective unless you have boots on the ground. You build a 12-foot wall. The cartels buy 13-foot ladders.

The cartels use high technology. They use engineers to build tunnels. They use aircraft to drop contraband on our side of the border and smuggle people, many people who are intent to do ill to people in this Nation, as we saw in San Francisco earlier this year.

But the President has basically ignored Congress' call to secure the border. Instead of putting more Border Patrol agents on the border to secure the border, he wants to bring 200 more ATF agents to investigate American citizens.

Just a few weeks ago, we dealt with the threat of ISIS and al Qaeda that says they are going to exploit our refugee resettlement program to get operatives into this Nation to conduct terrorist attacks against this Nation.

This Congress, out of this body, passed a bill to pause that program until we could fully vet every person. The President decided he would ignore the call of Congress, and he pursued on with the refugee program.

As a member of the Homeland Security Committee, I was able to question the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Director of the FBI, saying: If we do bring these refugees in, how are you going to monitor them?

The FBI said: We don't have the resources to monitor 10,000 new refugees coming into this Nation.

But, yet, in his executive order, the President wants to hire 230 administrators, administrative personnel, to conduct background checks instead of providing us with more FBI agents to investigate terrorist activities. You tell me who is wanting to make America safe.

He also has proposed \$500 million toward mental health care and eventually tie mental health assessments to background checks. I applaud that.

But, at the same time, we have thousands of soldiers coming back from war areas suffering from PTSD that this administration and the Veterans Administration has ultimately abandoned.

Finally, he wants to use taxpayer dollars and resources to research and test smart gun technology. Well, maybe that is a technology in the future that could be applicable.

But, yet, the TSA has postponed time and time again putting in new scanning technology that is desperately needed at our airports to stop contraband and banned items from getting through to our Nation's airlines and into our transportation system. Once again, that has been postponed.

Mr. Speaker, I say that the President and his call that he wants to make America safer is making America more dangerous because he continues to ignore what the will of the people is.

What this Congress is calling for is that we need to close our borders, we need to put more FBI agents investigating terrorist activities, we need to take care of our war veterans, we need to stop the influx of refugees that we know are going to be exploited by our enemies, and we also need to invest in technologies to make our transportation safe and secure.

Mr. STUTZMAN. I thank the gentleman from Georgia and appreciate his comments tremendously. I think he made some very good points.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. I appreciate this opportunity to certainly stand in support of our Second Amendment.

This is an issue that has obviously been around for some time. With the recent very violent events that have stricken various communities around our country, I think that the way the President has chosen to respond is ineffective. I think it is inappropriate, certainly an overreach by the President himself.

I believe that, as the President has chosen to operate without going to Congress or even attempting to work with Congress on many issues, but especially this one, it is disappointing.

We already have laws on the books that need enforcing. Those laws that we have I think can be effective.

Certainly, I don't think anyone will say that someone can just automatically go buy a gun without any effort whatsoever.

But, disappointingly, none of the President's recent unilateral actions targeting law-abiding citizens and restricting gun ownership would have prevented the tragedies that the President himself has referenced.

I would like to highlight one area of the executive order which falls under the jurisdiction of the committee on which I serve, the Ways and Means

Committee, which is the President's proposal to have Social Security beneficiaries with representative payees included in the National Instant Criminal Background Check System.

Now, let me say that the mismanagement of one's finances alone should not mean that an individual would lose their Second Amendment rights. I am concerned not only that this targets law-abiding citizens, but that it would also discourage some beneficiaries from seeking needed assistance for fear of losing their constitutional rights. Many similar views have been shared here earlier this evening.

Also, when the Los Angeles Times first reported consideration of the representative payee issue last summer, I joined the majority of the Ways and Means Committee members in writing to the President opposing this proposal.

Despite the administration's unwillingness so far to change its stance on representative payees, I remain hopeful we can scale back these orders.

Early last year, when the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives proposed banning M855 ammunition, I was one of the 238 House Members who wrote the former ATF Director opposing the proposal, as did more than 80,000 Americans. Now, in response to massive public and congressional opposition, the ATF actually withdrew the proposal.

President Obama has repeatedly disregarded our legislative branch and the American people. The President's job is to respect all constitutional rights, not just the ones he chooses. His executive order sets an incredibly dangerous precedent.

I will continue to stand against this overreach and protect Nebraskans' and, quite frankly, all Americans' constitutional right to bear arms.

I thank the gentleman from Indiana for yielding me the time.

Mr. STUTZMAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN).

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would also like to thank the gentleman from Indiana for leading this Special Order tonight.

Mr. Speaker, the Second Amendment is crystal clear. It ensures that the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed. The founders rebelled against the largest empire in the world. They knew it was crucial to guarantee individuals the right to protect their life, liberty and property. That is the entire point of the Second Amendment.

Unfortunately, we have a President more obsessed with the politics of gun control than living by the oath he twice took to preserve, protect and de-

fend the Constitution of the United States.

The President should work with Congress to solve the problems facing this country, not try to take on the legislative duties of Congress.

Americans have a history of confronting those who wish to take away their rights, and they have said: "No. You can't do that."

The best way to fight against the gross overreach by the Federal Government is for citizens to exercise their Second Amendment rights.

The good news is the people of this country, the responsible people who will exercise their constitutional rights and follow the law, are already doing this. They are flocking to purchase guns and ammunition despite President Obama's best efforts.

Since President Obama was sworn into office, 106 million background checks for gun purchases have been conducted by Federal or State authorities. Only 96 million were conducted in the previous 11 years. Gun makers have doubled their manufacturing output since 2009 as well.

Meanwhile, according to the ATF, the number of privately owned firearms in the U.S. has increased from about 250 million twenty years ago to roughly 350 million today.

President Obama's obsession with killing the Second Amendment has unintentionally become the catalyst for gun ownership in America. The firearms industry's \$43 billion nationwide economic impact has more than doubled since 2009 and is also one of the few bright spots in the Obama economic record.

But there is more good news in all of this. Despite the White House's misleading rhetoric, violent crime rates are consistently down over the last 20 years. According to the FBI's Uniform Crime Report, the number of violent crimes has decreased 35.5 percent over the last 20 years.

There are more guns than people in the United States; yet, the violent crime rate continues to tumble because a criminal knows a well-armed gun owner is a direct threat to a criminal's safety.

And despite President Obama's obsession with undermining the Second Amendment, Federal weapons convictions have dropped 35 percent compared to 2005.

The Obama Department of Justice should focus on enforcing current Federal weapons laws instead of issuing ideological edicts from the executive branch.

Once again, I would like to thank my colleague from Indiana, Mr. STUTZMAN, for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER).

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, the President's executive orders relating to gun control are a major distraction from the real national security issues.

Frankly, I think dealing with ISIS and confronting Iran over their viola-

tions of this administration's agreement with them and securing our borders are of greater importance than pushing gun control measures that will do little to protect us.

Apparently, this administration is more concerned about 4 million senior citizens on Social Security owning a gun than they are about a nuclear-armed Iran or terrorists crossing our unsecured borders.

The fact that millions of Americans have purchased firearms over the weeks following the shootings in San Bernardino is indicative that they have lost confidence in this administration's ability to protect them. They are literally taking personal responsibility for their own safety. It could be argued that these Americans are creating their own homeland security.

Pushing executive orders for more gun control that exceed the President's constitutional authority will not only do little to improve our national security, it will do little to increase the public's confidence in this administration's policies for protecting our homeland.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to oppose this latest abuse and overreach of executive authority and reassert the lawmaking authority of Congress.

I urge all my colleagues in the House to focus our attention on defeating ISIS, on restraining Iran, and on securing our borders in order to protect American citizens right here in our homeland.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Indiana for leading this Special Order for this critical discussion.

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, if I could inquire as to the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate each Member coming down tonight to talk about this. This is a very important issue. I am hearing from my constituents back in northeast Indiana every day on the concern that they have about the President's actions.

I would like to share just a statistic, that we know that national crime rates, violent crime and gun crime, have both dropped over the last 2½ decades. I think that is a positive sign that we should all be encouraged about and that we continue to work together to make sure that violent crime and gun crime is eliminated in this country.

In 2013, the national crime rate was about half of what it was at its height in 1991. Violent crime had fallen by 51 percent since 1991 and property crime by 43 percent.

In 2013, the violent crime rate was the lowest since 1970. Compared with 1993, the peak of U.S. gun homicides, the firearm homicide rate was 49 percent lower in 2010 and there were fewer deaths, even though the Nation's population grew.

The victimization rate for other violent crimes with a firearm, assault, robberies, and sex crimes, was 75 percent lower in 2011 than in 1993.

Violent, nonfatal crime victimization overall, with or without a firearm, also is down markedly, 72 percent over the past two decades.

As one of the former Members mentioned, if you look at the city of Chicago, which has some of the strictest gun laws in the country, it has a huge problem with gun violence in that city.

I would like to just read, in closing, again, what I think is really important for all of us, the Second Amendment: “A well regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed.”

I ask that all of us, as Members of this great body, continue to remember that the Second Amendment is there to protect liberty and freedom.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week.

Mr. PAYNE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mr. RUSH (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of attending to family member’s medical procedure.

PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL

REVISIONS TO THE AGGREGATES AND ALLOCATIONS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2016 BUDGET RESOLUTION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, January 6, 2016.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby submit for printing in the Congressional Record revisions to the budget allocations and aggregates of the Fiscal Year 2016 Concurrent Resolution on the Budget, S. Con. Res. 11. These revisions are designated for Public Law 114-74, the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015, and the Senate amendment to H.R. 3762, the Restoring Americans’ Healthcare Freedom Reconciliation Act of 2015.

The revisions designated for Public Law 114-74, the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015, are made pursuant to section 1002 of Public Law 114-113, the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2016. Section 1002 of Public Law 114-113 allows for the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget to adjust the applicable levels of the budget resolution to achieve consistency with the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015.

The revisions designated for the Senate amendment to H.R. 3762, the Restoring Americans’ Healthcare Freedom Reconciliation Act of 2015, are made pursuant to section 4502 of S. Con. Res. 11 and are consistent with section 2002(b)(3) of S. Con. Res. 11. Section 4502 of S. Con. Res. 11 permits the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget to adjust the applicable levels of the budget reso-

lution for a measure that promotes real health care reform. Section 2002(b)(3) of S. Con. Res. 11 permits adjustments for a reconciliation measure that is deficit neutral. These revisions will facilitate the consideration of the Senate amendment to H.R. 3762, the Restoring Americans’ Healthcare Freedom Reconciliation Act of 2015.

These revised allocations and aggregates are to be considered as the aggregates and allocations included in the budget resolution, pursuant to S. Con. Res. 11, as adjusted, and will be used for budget enforcement purposes. Pursuant to section 3403 of S. Con. Res. 11, these revisions to the allocations and aggregates shall apply only while the Senate amendment to H.R. 3762 is under consideration or upon its enactment. Corresponding tables are attached.

Sincerely,

TOM PRICE, M.D.,
Chairman,
Committee on the Budget.

TABLE 1—BUDGET AGGREGATES
(On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)

	Fiscal Year	
	2016	2016–2025
Current Aggregates:		
Budget Authority	3,113,623	(1)
Outlays	3,162,793	(1)
Revenues	2,698,104	32,298,936
Adjustment to achieve consistency with the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015:		
Budget Authority	38,012	(1)
Outlays	2,286	(1)
Revenues	269	26,588
Adjustment for SA to HR 3762, Restoring Americans’ Healthcare Freedom Act of 2016:		
Budget Authority	0	(1)
Outlays	0	(1)
Revenues	-52,700	-793,300
Revised Aggregates:		
Budget Authority	3,151,635	(1)
Outlays	3,165,079	(1)
Revenues	2,645,673	31,532,224

¹ Not applicable because annual appropriations acts for fiscal years 2017–2025 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

TABLE 2—ALLOCATION OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
(In millions of dollars)

	2016
Base Discretionary Action:	
BA	1,066,582
OT	1,170,357
Global War on Terrorism:	
BA	73,693
OT	32,079
Program Integrity:	
BA	1,523
OT	1,311
Disaster Relief Spending:	
BA	7,143
OT	388
Total Discretionary Action:	
BA	1,148,941
OT	1,204,135
Current Law Mandatory:	
BA	960,295
OT	952,912

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 7, 2016, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker’s table and referred as follows:

3861. A letter from the Senior Regulations Analyst, FAA, Department of Transpor-

tation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31040; Amdt. No.: 3663] received December 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3862. A letter from the Senior Regulations Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31037; Amdt. No.: 3661] received December 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3863. A letter from the Senior Regulations Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31038; Amdt. No.: 3662] received December 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3864. A letter from the Senior Regulations Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31041; Amdt. No.: 3664] received December 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3865. A letter from the Senior Regulations Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace for the following Missouri towns: Chillicothe, MO; Cuba, MO; Farmington, MO; Lamar, MO; Mountain View, MO; Nevada, MO; and Poplar Bluff, MO [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0842; Airspace Docket No.: 15-ACE-2] received December 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3866. A letter from the Senior Regulations Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace for the following Louisiana towns: Jonesboro, LA and Winnfield, LA [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0843; Airspace Docket No.: 15-ASW-5] received December 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3867. A letter from the Senior Regulations Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Vancouver, WA [Docket No.: FAA-2015-3322; Airspace Docket No.: 15-ANM-16] received December 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3868. A letter from the Senior Regulations Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2015-3940; Directorate Identifier 2015-SW-065-AD; Amendment 39-18300; AD 2015-19-51] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A);