



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 8, 2014

No. 4

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 8, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHN J. DUNCAN, Jr. to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2014, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

THE WAR ON POVERTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, there are so many acts of success of our government that many of us know it is the greatest Nation in the world. Through the years, we have had great leaders who have recognized that government can work on behalf of the American people. Today, we commemorate the 50th year of the war on poverty.

I thank my good friend, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE, who will be hold-

ing a commemoration in recognition not only of Lyndon Baines Johnson, the President who declared war on poverty, but also the many workers and many Presidents since who, in many aspects, helped to build on the Nation's safety net.

Today, however, we find ourselves in a dilemma, not recognizing and accepting success where it is. Poverty has fallen significantly over the last half century. Since the mid-1960s the average incomes among the poorest fifth of Americans have risen significantly. Infant mortality has dropped sharply, and severe child malnutrition has largely disappeared, but it still exists.

In parts of my 18th Congressional District in Texas, we have very high mortality rates. It means that our job is not over. Nearly 50 million Americans, however, were poor in 2012, including 13 million children; 60 million people lived below half of the poverty line; and large racial disparities in the African American community were clear and documented. African Americans have a lower college degree graduate level than White Americans.

So the safety net has to be something for all of us. I borrowed this from my good friend from California, just to show you a line of Americans possibly looking for work. We cannot point out and we cannot know at this point which one of these are near the edge of poverty or living in poverty simply because they cannot find work.

So it is important to note that there are elements that many discard: the earned income tax credit; supplemental nutrition program; the huge job training and educational investment that President Johnson made on the war on poverty; Medicaid and Medicare, huge safety nets, not handouts but safety nets. Maybe the word "welfare" should be changed to something of a transitional living fund, for that is what it is for people to be able to live.

There has been much maligning of the Affordable Care Act. Well, I am

here to announce today that close to 9 million people have now been recipients and victors in getting health care; 3 million young people have been able to stay on their parents' insurance; and we have seen the slowest growth in health care in 50 years, safety net. As well, we have people who will no longer have lifetime caps or preexisting conditions preventing them from getting insurance or those who work as roofers or laborers who, because their work is difficult or dangerous, they cannot get insurance—safety net, part of the overall picture of the war on poverty.

Now we find ourselves in the midst of a debate about a transitional outreach to individuals who are chronically unemployed. Some would argue we should not do it. We should not do it for individuals who have looked for work actively when there are three individuals per job. Some would say we need an offset. I consider it an emergency.

But do you know, Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about the people in my district and across America that are tired of partisan politics. So why not a compromise? Why not a 3-month emergency extension and then a deliberation on the offset? Well, that probably will not be heard.

So what is the offset? Why are we not in the midst of a combined discussion about what would be the most effective for all of the Members to be able to vote on? It is documented that the unemployed are in everyone's district. There are 1.3 million that are chronically unemployed, who are on the brink of poverty, who are not able to secure a safety net.

Let me just make mention of the earned income tax credit that has been a vital lifeline for many around the Nation. Yet, that is looked upon as a potential cut. It is too expensive.

These are lifeline safety nets that President Johnson started. Quite frankly, of all the wealthy nations, we have the lowest safety net and the

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

highest poverty because we are not willing to accept the fact that sometimes an American needs help—even a veteran, even a soldier.

Today, I honor the 50th anniversary of the war on poverty, Mr. Speaker, and I ask us not to give up the fight because the American people are looking to us to win the war.

TURN OUT THE LIGHTS, THE PARTY'S OVER

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is a new year. As the clock struck midnight, Americans throughout the fruited plain celebrated the end of 2013 and the start of a new year.

January 1—out with the old and in with the new—light bulb, so sayeth Uncle Sam. That is right: “turn out the lights, the party’s over” for the incandescent light bulb.

I went to H-E-B last week in Texas and the shelves were bare. Only curly fluorescent light bulbs to be found. That is because the government has now banned 75-, 100-, 60-, and 40-watt light bulbs.

Edison’s light bulb has gone from the endangered species list to near extinction. Some incandescent light bulbs will be allowed, but only if they meet new government standards. What was once the symbol for American innovation is now banned by the almighty government. Isn’t that ironic?

Why? Because it is not energy efficient, so sayeth the government. The government certainly doesn’t want Americans to have a choice with what light bulbs they purchase because the government knows best.

The new fluorescent curly light bulbs, also called CFLs, contain mercury and also are more expensive. Mr. Speaker, I thought mercury was bad for us.

Anyway, nothing gets easier when you use these light bulbs. Do you need to dispose of one of these curly light bulbs? Don’t even think about throwing it in the trash without reading the instructions in the box. Don’t throw them in the wastebasket. You are supposed to take them to a local recycling center. Yeah, right.

If a person decides to take the risk and throw the light bulb out at home, listen closely, because, of course, it is more complicated. The light bulb should be sealed in two plastic bags and then placed in the trash outdoors so as not to pollute landfills if it breaks.

There are more regulations. If a CFL is dropped, well, disaster strikes, in my opinion. You can’t just pick up the pieces and throw them away. The EPA has generously told us in more detailed instructions what we do if one is broken: “Have people and pets leave the room, and don’t let anyone walk through the area.”

So, Mr. Speaker, if I accidentally drop this light bulb here on the House

floor and it breaks, does that mean we have to evacuate the House floor? According to the EPA, at least we should do that.

I give you more: “Open a window”—don’t have any in here—“and leave the room for 15 minutes or more. Shut off the central heating and air-conditioning system. Carefully scoop up glass fragments and powder using stiff paper or cardboard and place them in a glass jar with a metal lid.” Mr. Speaker, I hope you have some of those old mason jars around here.

There is more. The EPA says: “Use sticky tape, such as duct tape, to pick up any remaining small glass fragments and powder. Wipe the area clean with a damp paper towel or disposable wet wipes and place them in the glass jar or plastic bag. Do not use a vacuum or broom.” Next thing you know, we are going to need a HAZMAT crew to come in to someone’s home if they accidentally drop a light bulb.

There is a lot more: “These light bulbs may cause interference to radios, televisions, wireless telephones and remote controls.” Okay, I will be sure to turn off the lights tonight when I watch “Duck Dynasty.” I don’t want to miss it because I have these curly light bulbs.

I forgot to mention—guess where these little spiral light bulbs are made. China. Now isn’t that lovely?

The power of choice has been taken away from the American people, even the choice of a light bulb, because government is controlling our lives and it knows better. The Federal Government should not have the authority to force Americans to buy anything, whether it is health care, a box of donuts, or even CFL light bulbs.

As Willie Nelson has said: “Turn out the lights, the party’s over. They say that all good things must end. Turn out the lights, the party’s over” for at least Thomas Edison’s light bulb.

May it rest in peace, Mr. Speaker. And that’s just the way it is.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WAR ON POVERTY

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, today we mark the 50th anniversary of the war on poverty—a dedicated legislative and policy effort by President Lyndon Johnson to reduce and eventually eliminate poverty in America. Yet, despite the many successes of the war on poverty—and there have been many successes over the past 50 years—there are those in this country and in this House who would destroy the programs that help people in need, those who have replaced the war on poverty with a new war on poor people.

Unfortunately, that is what is happening right now with the farm bill. I am honored to serve on the Agriculture Committee and as a member of the

farm bill conference committee. I want—and America needs—a strong, comprehensive, and forward-thinking bill. I represent farmers and farms, conservationists, and agriculture research institutions, and like every other Member of Congress, I represent people who rely on the nutrition programs in the farm bill to put food on their tables.

That has been my primary focus as a conferee—to support and fight for the hungry in America. I believe the nutrition title—where SNAP, formerly known as food stamps, is authorized—is the most important part of the farm bill. This program provides food to 47 million food-insecure Americans—people who don’t know where their next meal is coming from. Food insecurity, Mr. Speaker, is another way to say hunger. These people are hungry and they get food because they are on SNAP.

We have been told that the House may vote on a farm bill conference report as early as next week. According to some reports, the bill would cut \$8 billion from SNAP. Unlike the cut that took effect on November 1, where all 47 million SNAP beneficiaries saw their benefits cut by an average of \$30 a month for a family of three, this \$8 billion cut is more targeted. That doesn’t mean it is any less harmful.

This cut would change the way SNAP benefits are affected when a beneficiary gets a LIHEAP benefit. Many have described the application of this SNAP/LIHEAP connection—sometimes called “Heat and Eat”—as a loophole, but calling this a loophole avoids the real issue at hand.

The truth is that changing the way that Heat and Eat works—closing this so-called loophole—will reduce an already meager benefit for millions of Americans, a benefit that didn’t last a full month even before the November 1 across-the-board cuts took effect.

□ 1015

Even worse, closing this so-called “loophole” would disproportionately affect poor seniors and the disabled—precisely the kinds of Americans we should be looking out for during difficult economic times. There has to be a better way.

SNAP has been cut twice to pay for other programs—first, to offset programs that help teachers, firefighters and other social services, and a second time to offset improvements in the Child Nutrition Act. Now, these are good programs that deserve to be funded, although not at the expense of the hungry. I am all for compromise when all sides negotiate in good faith, but why does compromise in Washington always mean helping those who are well off at the expense of the poor?

Remember, Mr. Speaker, this cut will reduce the SNAP benefit by about \$90 a month for “heat and eat” households. Three million poor families would see their food assistance cut by an average of \$90 a month. And would these billions of dollars in cuts go back to helping other needy people? No. In a farm

bill that continues to subsidize big agribusiness and special interests and that further subsidizes a crop insurance program that is rife with fraud, waste and abuse, it is just one more cut to a program that helps our most vulnerable neighbors.

Mr. Speaker, the November 1 cuts were devastating for 47 million hungry people. Just ask any food bank director in the country. Adding another \$8 billion cut to another 3 million families will cause even more damage. If my friends insist on changing the LIHEAP provision, then they should at least have the decency to reinvest those savings into SNAP.

Both Democrats and Republicans are talking a lot these days about the issue of income inequality. That is a good thing. So why on Earth would we pass a farm bill that makes the rich get richer and the poor get poorer? We can and must do better.

It is a scandal that in the richest country in the history of the world we have a hunger problem. Members of Congress rush to the microphones to promote tax cuts and ease resolutions on Wall Street. All the while, there are people in this country—men, women and kids—who do not have enough to eat. I will oppose any farm bill that makes hunger worse in America, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

In conclusion, let me say to my colleagues: there are some things worth fighting for. Ending hunger—making sure our fellow citizens have enough to eat—is absolutely worth fighting for.

UKRAINE

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, for the last few years, Ukraine has been working towards the signing of an association agreement with the European Union to increase economic and political ties with the bloc and to solidify democratic values and principles. The association agreement was to have been signed on November 28 through 29 at an Eastern Partnership Summit meeting in Vilnius.

On November 21, the Cabinet of Ministers in Ukraine unilaterally suspended negotiations with the European Union due to excessive pressure from Russia. Outraged by this, Ukrainians began to protest by creating European squares, or Euromaidans, across the country, including the capital of Kiev. In the early morning of November 30, the Ukrainian Government sent special forces to clear the Euromaidan in Kiev by using physical force and tear gas, resulting in many protesters and journalists with traumatic injuries and several still who are unaccounted for.

In response to the unprecedented use of force against peaceful protesters in Ukraine's history, several high-ranking deputies and officials in the governing party defected from the Party of Regions. Since then, protests have contin-

ued with a reported 1 million Ukrainians taking to the streets on December 1. Every Sunday since has brought at least 50,000 to the Euromaidan.

In the early morning of December 11, special forces, using chain saws and metal batons, broke through many makeshift barricades made of park benches and other available materials in order to encircle thousands of peaceful protesters on the Euromaidan in Kiev. In a 9-hour standoff with security forces, peaceful protesters on the Euromaidan stood their ground, singing the national anthem and praying every hour with local churches that were ringing their bells in support of the protesters.

In 2013, violence was used against more than 100 journalists in Ukraine, with almost half of the incidents occurring in December. On December 25, a well-known and respected Ukrainian journalist and civic activist, Tetyana Chornovol, was brutally beaten on her way home. Protest leaders tie her beating to her anti-regime reporting. Her severely bruised face is now used as a symbol of government repression.

The United States calls on the Ukrainian Government to respect Ukrainians' freedom of speech, their right to free assembly; and it calls on them to refrain from using force against peaceful protesters.

SUPERFUND SITES

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, when I saw that the legislative agenda for this week was going to deal with the beleaguered Superfund program, I was encouraged; but when I saw what my Republican colleagues actually proposed, I was saddened and disappointed.

Across America, we are plagued by a variety of severely polluted hotspots known as "Superfund sites." Many are the legacy of past reckless or clueless business behaviors; Government, itself, shares responsibility as well. Local governments failed to properly zone and regulate businesses with toxic by-products. Sometimes government created problems with the way it operated sewer systems, solid waste management, and military operations.

The Superfund law, created in 1980, with a Superfund tax on the petrochemical industry, which caused the problem, would provide cleanup funding. It was reasonable at that time, but it has been frozen in place for almost 20 years. In 1995, the excise tax expired. Neither the program nor the problems have gone away, and having fewer and fewer resources has not helped. Sadly, the proposals the House will be considering this week would actually reduce the overall amount of funding that is available, undercut standards, and slow cleanup.

The Federal Government has created some of these problems, mostly caused

by military operations, which is the largest single source of Superfund sites in the country, but there are also situations like the TVA and its coal ash disaster.

Instead of enhancing the Federal commitment and capacity, this legislative exercise is an illustration of part of the problem. It is an attempt to look like we are doing something, but it has no chance of being enacted into law; and if it did, it would actually make the problem worse.

It is time for us to renew and refine the Federal commitment, not to complicate and undercut it. We should take a performance-based approach to zero in on what will actually accelerate cleanup in a demonstrable fashion and be able to move away from what has too often been a pro forma response.

The Federal Government should, indeed, clean up after itself and not leave the problem behind. The military should place Superfund cleanup as a higher priority in its budgeting. We have seen recent studies about pollution around military bases, like Camp Lejeune, that has had a severe impact on military families and their neighbors, linking contamination to a series of birth defects like spina bifida and to childhood cancers, including leukemia.

We should renew the Superfund tax, which I will be introducing in legislation this month. The Federal budget allocations should commit to cleanup, not passing the buck. We have settled into a program of sue, stall, and study as the inevitable result of a failure to work together to clean up, to protect the public, and to save money in the long run. I hope we will reject the Republican proposal this week and, instead, make a renewed commitment to find ways to make it work better.

TRANSITIONAL ASSISTANCE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on December 26, 2013, President Obama signed into law the 2014 National Defense Authorization Act, which sets policy and funding levels for the U.S. Department of Defense.

In large part, the bill went through regular committee order on the House side, with the consideration of amendments from both Republicans and Democrats. A somewhat similar series of actions was taken by the Senate. Despite a small amount of political theater, both Chambers not only found common ground in and passed this important measure, but in placing good policy before politics, Members overcame differences and acted in the best interests of the country—in this case, to the benefit of our men and women in uniform. Mr. Speaker, this is how the institution is supposed to work.

The measure offers our servicemembers resources to safely fulfill their

missions and the support that they deserve when they return from service. I offered an amendment to the bill, which passed as part of the final agreement. This will help improve the support we offer those who serve as they transition to civilian life, especially those coping with behavioral health injuries.

Under the previous policy, servicemembers and their families could utilize 180 days of health care coverage during the transition from military to civilian life through what is known as TAMP, the Transitional Assistance Management Program. Unfortunately, posttraumatic stress and other behavioral injuries oftentimes do not present symptoms in some cases until 8 to 10 months after leaving the military. Now, this can be overwhelming if not debilitating for an individual seeking to reenter civilian life and start the next path. This amendment extends TAMP coverage by an additional 180 days for all services rendered through telemedicine.

The amendment builds on a bill I introduced in 2011, the STEP Act, now Public Law 112-81, section 713, which expanded Federal exemptions for telehealth consultations across State lines by removing the individual State requirement that health professionals must hold licenses in the State where servicemember care is received. Health care professionals who are credentialed by the Department of Defense are now able to offer these services regardless of the patient's physical location.

In addition, it allows military doctors to reach more patients, and it allows more patients to access care without the stigma often associated with the seeking of treatment for the first time. If desired, such support can now be accessed from the comfort of one's own home, through video teleconference, Skype, and a range of other telemedicine practices. In part due to this commonsense change, in 2012 the Army was able to perform nearly 36,000 teleconsultations, which includes over 31,200 telebehavioral health clinic encounters. The numbers continued to grow in 2013.

For those burdened by physical and psychological injuries as a result of their service in uniform, we must take every action to help them rebuild and become whole. Both of these policy changes are positive steps forward in modernizing how the Department of Defense delivers health care, making widespread telemedicine possible and accessible to those most in need.

Mr. Speaker, Washington remains divided as we begin the second session of the 113th Congress, but I remain hopeful in knowing that bipartisan accomplishments such as this can serve as a guiding light for this institution in the weeks and months to come.

PASS EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge the House to consider and pass emergency unemployment benefits for the 1.3 million long-term unemployed American workers.

On December 28, 82,000 Illinois workers' unemployment insurance expired—38,000 of those workers in Cook County and 5,000 more in DuPage. The Senate has agreed on a bipartisan basis to extend emergency unemployment insurance, and the House should act today to do the same.

Opponents of extending emergency unemployment insurance may say isn't the emergency over? While the economy on the whole has improved, there is still an emergency, a jobs emergency.

There are 2.9 unemployed workers for every available job. Long-term unemployment is still at the highest rate we have seen in this country since World War II. Opponents of extending emergency unemployment insurance criticize the long-term unemployed, belittling their efforts to find work in this economy. For the worker out of a job for 27 weeks or longer, you have just a 12 percent chance of finding a new job within the month. These numbers continue to fall with each passing week. These workers face challenges to their health, to their mental well-being, and they often struggle with family relationships.

I left Chicago yesterday, where Illinois has the fourth highest unemployment rate in the country. Yet I come to Washington to inaction on unemployment insurance and jobs legislation. Instead of blaming workers, let us as Members of Congress look in the mirror. What have we done to address the issue of long-term unemployment?

Last year, we took dozens of votes to repeal the Affordable Care Act, but we have done little to create jobs. We have done nothing to advance immigration reform, which will infuse over \$1 trillion in our economy over the next 20 years and create jobs. We have done little to address the Nation's long-term transportation needs by investing in infrastructure, which will create jobs. We have done little to invest in research and education, which will grow our economy and make us more globally competitive, all of which create jobs.

Instead of playing politics, let us take it upon ourselves to pass meaningful jobs legislation, and let us extend benefits to these workers in their time of need.

HELPING FAMILIES IN MENTAL HEALTH CRISIS ACT

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

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I want to share with you a story today from Liza Long.

A year ago, Liza wrote about the difficulty she faces in raising a son who suffers from serious mental illness:

"I live with a son who is mentally ill. I love my son, but he terrifies me," she said.

A few weeks ago, Michael pulled a knife and threatened to kill me and then himself after I asked him to return his overdue library books. His 7- and 9-year-old siblings knew the safety plan. They ran to the car and locked the doors before I even asked them to. I managed to get the knife from Michael. I then methodically collected all the sharp objects in the house into a single Tupperware container that now travels with me. Through it all, he continued to scream insults at me and threatened to kill or hurt me.

□ 1030

That conflict ended with three burly police officers and a paramedic wrestling my son onto a gurney for an expensive ambulance ride to the local emergency room. The mental hospital didn't have any beds that day, and Michael calmed down nicely in the ER, so they sent us home with a prescription for Zyprexa and a followup visit with a local pediatric psychiatrist.

This problem is too big for me to handle on my own. Sometimes there are no good options. So you just pray for grace and trust that, in hindsight, it will all make sense.

I am sharing this story because I am Adam Lanza's mother. I am Dylan Klebold's and Eric Harris' mother. I am James Holmes' mother. I am Jared Loughner's mother. These boys—and their mothers—need help. In the wake of another horrific national tragedy, it's easy to talk about guns. But it's time to talk about mental illness.

Liza shared her story with my subcommittee last year at a forum of parents of children with severe mental illness.

After studying our Nation's mental health system for the past year as chairman of the Energy and Commerce Oversight Subcommittee, we discovered those families who need help the most are the least likely to get it. And where there is no help, there was no hope.

Federal programs meant to serve the severely mentally ill are failing. The Federal Government sets up barriers that make it increasingly difficult for mothers and fathers to care for a son or daughter coming of age who needs help for mental illness.

Our current policies block or interfere with appropriate treatment. Funds are wasted on ineffective programs, and scientific standards are not used in determining where the moneys go to for grants and treatments. Our current policies have replaced hospital beds with prison cells and homeless shelters as options for the seriously mental ill. That is wrong and that is immoral.

That is why I introduced the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act, H.R. 3717, to deliver care to those with severe mental illness who need better treatment—real treatment—not excuses and not delays.

Today, Liza's son is doing better with the proper diagnosis and medical care.

She wrote about where things stand with reforming mental health this week, 13 months after her initial letter, and discussed the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act. She said:

Considering our limited resources, it just makes sense to help those who are most in need. That was the rationale behind the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act.

She continued to call for what is needed to help our seriously ill children, saying it is:

access to medical care for the 11 million people who suffer from schizophrenia, bipolar disorder, or major depression. The bill seeks to accomplish this goal by empowering parents, increasing acute care beds, and promoting assisted outpatient treatment for as many as 50 percent of schizophrenia sufferers whose symptoms include anosognosia, or lack of awareness of their illness.

The bill also addresses the critical shortage of child psychologists, where there's only one for every 7,000 children in the U.S., with funds for telepsychiatry, and seeks to reform SAMHSA by redirecting funds for community-based care toward evidence-based programs.

The Wall Street Journal praised the bill, noting that SAMHSA, the government agency charged with funding community mental health treatment, has little or no focus on medically driven care, and of its 537 full-time employees, only two are physicians.

Over the past months, I have received an enormous outpouring of support from parents and caregivers of loved ones who have serious mental illness. They know this bill takes mental illness out of the shadows of ignorance, despair, and neglect and into the bright light of hope.

Each week, I will come before the House and share more stories like Liza's. I encourage my colleagues to join me in this endeavor by sponsoring the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act, H.R. 3717. Where there is real help, there is real hope.

SAFE CLIMATE CAUCUS

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

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a member of the Safe Climate Caucus.

After 12 months of the 113th Congress, Republicans continue to push their anticlean energy, antienvironment, climate-denying agenda. Although we have taken very few votes in this Congress over the past year, we have taken more than 100 votes that are antienvironment. Those included:

20 votes that would weaken the Clean Air Act;

20 votes that would prevent Federal efforts to curb greenhouse gas carbon pollution;

51 votes to protect oil and gas special interests;

37 votes to weaken the Clean Water Act;

27 votes to slash funding for clean energy and energy efficiency.

I don't enjoy pointing out that protecting our air and our water has become a partisan issue, but I must point out that Republicans are still sacrificing the climate and our environment for the benefit of a few wealthy special interests.

It is cold outside today in much of the U.S., and some are saying that this is proof that global warming is a hoax. How misinformed that is. The cold wave in the midlatitudes of North America is a result of warm patches in the oceans and the atmosphere diverting the jet stream and driving arctic air southward.

Climate change doesn't mean warmer air everywhere, every day. It means more fluctuations, in other words, droughts, storms, and temperature changes. They are—and will be—greater.

It is going to be warmer tomorrow and the next day and for the next 100 years, on average, until we get serious that this is the most pressing environmental threat on our planet—global climate change.

The way we produce and use energy is the greatest insult to our planet, not only causing injury and death through pollution, but adversely changing the world's climate with very dangerous, deadly results.

We should support the President's climate action plan.

MEDICARE BILL

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, last week, a news report revealed that a hospital in Houston, Texas, my home State, was unable to pay dozens of its employees during the holidays due to a new Medicare payment contractor. Nearly 150 employees, ranging from doctors to nurses to administrators, missed several paychecks because the hospital's Medicare payment facilitator is taking too long to process Medicare claims for reimbursement.

Unfortunately, this is a growing problem plaguing the medical facilities and hardworking employees across the country. That is why my bill, the Medicare Established Provider Act, should come to the House floor for a vote quickly.

H.R. 3168 will help alleviate the reimbursement backlog by creating a trusted provider system. Like this hospital in Texas, there are many established Medicare providers with a proven history of timely, valid claims. They should be rewarded with prompt reimbursements rather than put in limbo for months or years at a time.

Allowing this bill to pass would allow companies and small businesses to expand and would streamline the process for these trusted providers. As the backlog of claims continues to rise, the livelihood of employees and businesses

should not be put at risk. I hope this bill will get serious attention and bring commonsense business principles to this industry.

In God we always trust.

EPIC FAILURE OF FOREIGN POLICY

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

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it was a beautiful September day in 2001 as I was driving to work and I hear that a plane hits the World Trade Center. I was a newly minted private pilot at the time, and I remember thinking, How could a plane fly into a big building? And then I heard that another plane hit the other tower. Eventually, I heard one hit a field in Pennsylvania and the Pentagon not too far from here.

I realized that America was a country under attack. It was under attack by an ideology that believes that anybody that thinks differently than their brand of theology is not just wrong, but that they are worthy of death. In fact, it takes that belief and actually implements it by killing innocent men, women, and children, including folks of their own religious ideology.

Mr. Speaker, as a result of that, America became a generation that went to war to defeat this ideology. I am a veteran of the wars. I spent quite a bit of time in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I heard the other day that al Qaeda, America's number one enemy, raised the black flag over Fallujah, an area that the United States Marines, who fought harder than they have any battle since Vietnam, fought to achieve and take over and bring peace to.

Mr. Speaker, al Qaeda raised the black flag over Fallujah. This is an epic failure of American foreign policy and an epic resurgence of America's chief enemy.

In 2011, President Obama had an opportunity to make a decision about whether America would continue to show its support for a free Iraq, whether America would continue to be the intercessor between difficult back-and-forths and continue to bring people together in Iraq as we did during the surge, which the President opposed and now we are finding out may actually have been for political reasons. Shock-er.

We are finding out, Mr. Speaker, that al Qaeda now has a town very close to Baghdad. This is a failure of American foreign policy.

If you look into Syria, Mr. Speaker, you see a brutal dictator that kills people and has no compunction about killing innocent women and children just to maintain power. In essence, he has become a strong partner to the United States in order to take chemical weapons out of his arsenal.

Yet as another part of Syria, you see not the moderate forces of opposition

to Mr. Assad, but you now see al Qaeda-related forces overpowering moderate opposition to Assad. You see that because of America's foreign policy, which said we supported the Free Syrian Army but, in reality, has not supported the Free Syrian Army.

If you look in Egypt, you see the Egyptian people stand up and say, We don't want to have one dictator replaced by another. We don't want the Muslim Brotherhood to run our country and change our constitution.

But we have no idea where the President is at on this. We have taken a very important ally in the Middle East and basically told them we are not interested in their future.

Look at the instability in Lebanon and the questions with the people of Afghanistan about what is going to happen post-2014, as America committed to defeating al Qaeda and defeating the Taliban. I could go on and on. Look at the deal we have with Iran, basically giving Iran the option of continuing to enrich uranium.

Mr. Speaker, 5 years ago, I could not have written a sadder story about where American foreign policy could be. What I see now in the United States is that our allies no longer trust us and our enemies no longer fear us.

Mr. Speaker, the United States needs to use limited air power in Iraq to push al Qaeda back out of Iraq. We need strong intelligence assets to work with the government of al-Maliki to ensure al Qaeda has no foothold in Iraq again.

It is not too late to reverse the tragic foreign policy consequences and what we have seen in the Middle East. But, Mr. Speaker, this has to be done today. This has to be done now.

Americans have sacrificed blood for a free Iraq and a free Afghanistan, and we cannot let that sacrifice be in vain.

OPPOSITION TO UNESCO FUNDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to and stand in unyielding opposition to the latest push by the administration and some in Congress to subvert U.S. law that prohibits the United States from funding any agency at the United Nations that admits a nonexistent state of Palestine to its membership.

When UNESCO opted to grant Palestine membership to its ranks in October of 2011, it did so knowing full well that U.S. law was obligated to cut off its funding. And they did it anyway.

However, now the Obama administration is making a full-out push to not only restore funding to UNESCO, which will cost the U.S. taxpayer nearly \$80 million a year—think of \$80 million of your hard-earned taxpayer dollars going to this U.N. institution. But it is not only \$80 million this year, it is to pay nearly \$250 million that we owe in arrears because the administration

decided to remain in UNESCO. We could have opted to pull out of that disgraceful body and not have any late fees, but now it is \$80 million to get in and \$250 million for the late fees.

Remember, this is the same U.N. that allows to sit on its human rights committee regimes such as Cuba, China, Venezuela, and Syria—yes, Syria, where the Assad regime has been responsible for the deaths of over 130,000 people during its tenure on the Human Rights Committee. These nations are human rights violators. They do a disservice to UNESCO, whose stated mission of peace through solidarity and the protection of basic freedoms is not being upheld. But what they really do well is push the strong anti-U.S. and anti-Israel agenda at UNESCO.

□ 1045

Let's be honest: that is why they remain in their positions.

Mr. Speaker, we must not equivocate. We must not mince words. We will not sit blithely by while some try to circumvent or undermine these laws to, once again, fund UNESCO. No.

Giving the administration the authority it seeks to fund UNESCO would not only set a dangerous precedent by showing those with an anti-Israel agenda at the U.N. that the U.S. does not have the courage of its convictions, nor the fortitude to enforce our own laws, but it would also give the green light to the rest of the bodies at the U.N. to follow UNESCO's lead, to admit Palestine, thereby granting it de facto recognition to a non-existent state.

This is a way for the PLO and its collaborators at the U.N. to use that body to gain statehood without having to first come to an agreement with Israel over the conflict.

A vote to fund UNESCO in this body is a vote to undermine the peace process and any hope of resolving this issue. To my colleagues, I would say that you must not fall for the latest bamboozle trick that UNESCO is pushing by playing on your soft spots.

What are they going to do?

UNESCO's going to come to some of us and promise to highlight the great buildings in our districts, the monuments in our districts, the cultural sites in our districts, and say they will designate them world heritage sites. We will bestow upon them official UNESCO designation of a heritage site.

Just how gullible does UNESCO think Members of Congress are?

I think we will soon see. They want us to ignore U.S. law so that we can restore funding to UNESCO so that UNESCO can give us some of our own U.S. taxpayer dollars back.

I implore my colleagues, please don't do this. Stand up for American principle. Stand up for U.S. law. Don't waste the hard-earned dollars of your constituents on an anti-American institution.

UNESCO knew what fate awaited it when it admitted Palestine, and now it must reap what it sowed, or it must re-

verse its decision. It is easy. The choice is, as it has always been, UNESCO's to make.

This is not just about principles. This is about convenience. UNESCO's betting that we only stand with Israel when it is convenient.

UNESCO turned its back on Israel and the peace process. All UNESCO wants is our cash, our constituents' cash, and then it will continue to pursue its anti-U.S., anti-Israel agenda.

Do you seriously think that your constituents want millions of their money to go to an agency at the corrupt U.N. that works against everything we try to do, to hurt our closest friend and ally, the democratic Jewish State of Israel?

I don't think so. We are better than that, Mr. Speaker. So I urge my colleagues to stand firm and do the right thing. No waiver, no flexibility, no change to U.S. law, no funding for UNESCO.

CLIMATE CHANGE DENIERS

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, the arctic vortex blast coincides with the return of Congress to Washington, D.C.; wind chills well below zero.

Now, no surprise, a number of my Republican colleagues who are dyed-in-the-wool climate change deniers, and some of the blathering idiots on talk shows said, Whoa, look at this. Arctic vortex proves that there is no climate change; there is no global warming. It is all a hoax.

Well, I would like to begin this new year with a little optimism, and hope Congress will take on big challenges, some of the biggest challenges of our time, including climate change, but the bizarre theories of the climate change deniers, and the excuses they will use, probably preclude that.

Now, given the overwhelming scientific consensus that climate change will spur more extreme weather events, yes, including record cold and arctic vortexes, with shifts in the jet stream, and droughts and a whole host of other things—we had about the driest year on record in the Western U.S. this year, in Oregon and California.

This is a serious challenge. Unfortunately, as I said earlier, this Congress, because of denial, is pretty much incapable of dealing with this challenge.

Luckily, we do have an alternative, and that is the President's Climate Action Plan, and the fact that the EPA has been found to have the authority by the Supreme Court of the United States to regulate carbon emissions as pollution. Following through on the President's Climate Action Plan is critical to show the rest of the world that the United States can again lead on this issue, and we are serious about it, and use that leverage to bring other countries into line.

Now, the EU and others are dealing with it, but there is total denial in

China. Back in 2005, the U.S. and China emitted about the same amount of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere, about 7 million metric tons. Five years later, the U.S. is down a little bit. China is up to 10 million and growing every day. China must be part of this.

Now, how are we going to get countries like China and others lined up on this? Well, I think we have got a strong tool. We can demand reductions. We can demand that trade agreements with these nations will level the playing field in many ways.

We have ignored labor and the environment in many of these trade agreements. We can't put U.S. manufacturers at a disadvantage when they are dealing with climate change issues and carbon dioxide emissions and the Chinese aren't, because we live, unfortunately, on the same planet as the Chinese, and they are destroying the world's climate very, very quickly.

So, even if we take strong measures here, we have got to force those measures on other countries.

Now, I think that the trade agreements are an ideal place to do this. Unfortunately, the Obama administration is of two minds on this issue. I have been acting very forcefully to protect the President's authority to regulate carbon emissions and encourage the EPA to go ahead with strong measures. The Republicans are attempting to overturn and preempt that authority, but it does exist.

Unfortunately, in the Office of the Special Trade Representative, appointed by the President of the United States, they are busily undermining the President's climate change agenda. Yes, they are acting at complete odds with the Environmental Protection Agency.

The European Union has adopted measures to reduce the global greenhouse gas emissions from all fuels and transportation fuels included by 10 percent within a relatively short period of time. One of those provisions would score the dirtiest sources of fuels as the way they should be, for emitting more carbon. That would mean there would be a penalty against oil, gasoline, diesel extracted from tar sands—the dirtiest, most polluting way to obtain oil that anyone knows of.

Now, the European Union is moving ahead, but now the President's Special Trade Representative, appointed by the President, somehow is saying that the EU shouldn't do this; the U.S. objects to that, and they are in league with Canada in attempting to overturn these steps by the European Union.

The President needs to rein in his Special Trade Representative, and we need to protect and encourage the President to deal with this very serious issue.

NATIONAL HUMAN TRAFFICKING AWARENESS DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from

Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, the crime of human trafficking is complex and it is destructive. It shatters the lives of its victims and their loved ones. In an effort to bring attention to this modern-day form of slavery, we recognize January 11, 2014, as National Human Trafficking Awareness Day.

This multibillion dollar criminal industry exists in every State. The statistics are stunning, and it is essential this national awareness day shed light on a human rights tragedy which occurs in every region across our Nation.

Though the impact of this crime affects men, women, and children, approximately 80 percent of all human trafficking victims are women, and nearly half are minors. Overall, there are 21 million individuals who are victims of forced labor in a \$32 billion industry that is only second to drug trafficking as the most profitable form of international crime.

Combating human trafficking requires commitment and cooperation at all levels of government and among agencies and among nonprofits. I see this collaboration taking root in my district in Pennsylvania.

I was pleased to attend a meeting at Calvary Church in Souderton, teaming up with local nonprofit, Worthwhile Wear, poised to address the issues of shelter and homelessness as they relate to human trafficking prevention and recovery.

The county-wide Bucks Coalition Against Trafficking created a local resource to raise public awareness and help end this horrendous crime through community education, victim identification, and legislative change. The Coalition has commemorated their 1-year anniversary, and their outstanding achievements have been recognized by the county of Bucks.

As the Federal Representative for Pennsylvania's Eighth Congressional District and a member of the Victims Rights Caucus, I am working to support and pass Federal laws to end this heinous crime through the introduction of bipartisan legislation that reflects the interests, rights, and the needs of victims.

January 11, 2014 is National Human Trafficking Awareness Day, but every day we must work together, forming a united front against human traffickers, and together we can raise public consciousness, prevent violence, protect the vulnerable, support survivors, and punish the offenders who perpetrate these crimes.

I appreciate the time on the floor this morning, Mr. Speaker.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 56 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

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

We pause now in Your presence and acknowledge our dependence on You.

We ask Your blessing upon the men and women of this, the people's House, who have returned to their stations here on Capitol Hill.

As the new session begins, help them, and indeed help us all, to obey Your law, to do Your will, and to walk in Your way. Grant that they might be good in thought, gracious in word, generous in deed, and great in spirit.

Many of their fellow citizens continue to struggle through a difficult economic stretch and look to them for helpful leadership. Grant them the resolve to fashion solutions that might benefit those who are in need.

Make this a glorious day in which all are glad to be alive and ready to serve You.

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

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. 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. Will the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HAHN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. HAHN 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

OPPOSITION TO UNESCO FUNDING

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, there are congressional and administration attempts to circumvent and undermine decades-old laws that prohibit the United States from funding

any agency at the United Nations that admits a nonexistent Palestinian state.

In October 2011, UNESCO chose to welcome Palestine to its membership. It did so, knowing full well that this would trigger U.S. laws that prohibit us from funding any entity at the U.N. that grants membership to the PLO or any other organization that doesn't meet the internationally recognized attributes of statehood.

We must not grant a waiver to UNESCO nor approve any backdoor congressional attempt to provide U.S. funding to UNESCO until it reverses its decision regarding the Palestinian Authority.

We are in an economic tailspin, Mr. Speaker. So why waste \$250 million in U.S. taxpayer money by giving it—wasting it—to UNESCO? It is madness.

ACA SUCCESS STORY

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of over a million Americans who saw their unemployment benefits disappear on December 28. With our economy still struggling and unemployment remaining unacceptably high, now is not the time to take more money out of the pockets of those who are struggling to simply get by.

This week, Republicans would rather continue debating the Affordable Care Act instead of working to get our economy back on track by helping to raise the standard of living for the poorest Americans and provide assistance to the unemployed.

Democrats in the House and the Senate are working to offer solutions here in Washington and back in our districts. In the district I represent, I am helping constituents find jobs by hosting a job fair on January 24. The constituents I serve will have the opportunity to apply for jobs on site, network with employers, and attend professional development workshops.

Mr. Speaker, we need to address the job crisis in America, and Republicans need to get back to the business of fixing our economy.

OBAMACARE PROBLEMS

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, just last week I received the following letter from a constituent:

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN FOXX: On December 10, I applied for a Silver level plan and received confirmation the same day that my application was completed. Since then, I've waited for my invoice so I could pay for the insurance. I called on December 23 and waited close to 5 hours on the phone for the next available rep, only to be put on hold for another one and a half hours and finally be told that they had no idea when my invoice would be sent out. As of January 2, 2013, I have not been billed for my new insurance. I have six prescriptions that need to be filled

at the end of the month. When will the program be fixed and operational?

Mr. Speaker, it is a good question and the American people deserve an answer.

UNEMPLOYMENT EXTENSION COMPENSATION

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, it has been 11 days now since 1.3 million Americans have been cut off from their unemployment benefits, an important safety net, and this House has yet to address this crisis. Instead of offering a solution to extend emergency unemployment benefits, House Republicans keep moving the goal posts and changing their position.

What on Earth are we waiting for? Every week that goes by, more and more Rhode Islanders lose their emergency unemployment benefits. The longer we wait to fix this problem, the more serious it becomes for the long-term unemployed.

Fifty years ago today, President Johnson announced his war on poverty. To commemorate that anniversary, this Congress is willing to write off and forget about 1.3 million Americans who are struggling to find work.

What kind of public servants have we become when we take away the last safety net for struggling families 3 days before Christmas? This is shameful.

Mr. Speaker, I urge you to bring a bill to the floor to extend emergency unemployment benefits; 1.3 million Americans can't wait another day, another week, or another month for this Congress to act. Let's do the right thing and end this nightmare for those we serve.

HOUSE-PASSED PRO-GROWTH JOBS BILLS

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, a new year brings new perspective and, for many, a fresh start. Many of my hard-working constituents hope this year will bring a healthy economy with increased opportunities.

My House colleagues and I didn't need a new year to make this our goal. Last year, we passed dozens of bills, making job creation and expanding opportunity our central focus. This included bills to make energy more affordable, to repeal ObamaCare and to expand education for students and job-seekers. If the Senate would only act on these measures, we could offer more opportunities for our constituents today: bills like the Energy Consumers Relief Act, halting major new regulations that increase prices and hurt the economy; the Northern Route Approval Act, to finally approve the Keystone pipeline and immediately create thou-

sands of good-paying jobs; or the SKILLS Act, to eliminate and streamline dozens of overlapping Federal programs and to help connect job-seekers with the skills they need.

I look forward, Mr. Speaker, to continued work with my colleagues, supporting additional measures to strengthen our economy, to provide more opportunity for all, and to put Americans back to work.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

(Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker and House Republicans, happy new year. You look great, but we have failed to address the issues of the people who are unemployed. I call upon all of us today to remember that many people, as we sit here, are facing fiscal devastation.

The social safety net is used to purchase very basic necessities, such as food and rent; and many Americans are treading now, just staying above the water. There were 1.3 million Americans who were without unemployment insurance as of December 28. In another few weeks, 1.9 million more will join them, and 174,000 of them are from Texas.

I know that we have not really thought about this seriously. I know that so much time was spent in attempting to overturn the Affordable Care Act that we forgot that there are people we have failed to provide jobs for who are now unemployed and whom we cannot forget.

This is not just their problem. This is our problem. Please join me in making sure that we restore their safety net.

THE QUALIFIED MORTGAGE RULE

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

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I stand regarding the qualified mortgage rule that will go into effect this Friday. This rule is going to have a devastating effect on the housing industry.

Once again, the long hand of the Federal Government goes out to dictate policy to the financial industry on whom they should make loans to. Once again, we face another crisis in the housing industry. The Federal Government, frankly, was one of the major culprits in the housing demise that we have just gone through, making easy credit for borrowers. Now they are telling financial institutions clearly the wrong direction in which to go. We need the markets to work. The Federal Government has proven also that they sure cannot handle health care through ObamaCare.

Why do we think that the government knows best when it comes to telling community banks and others who

they should make their loans to? Fifty percent of the loans made in 2013 will not be made for 2014 with these guidelines.

Mr. Speaker, we call for this rule to be delayed for a year to allow Congress to improve it.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

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

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, last month, many of us stood here and pleaded with Speaker BOEHNER to act to extend unemployment insurance for 1.3 million hurting Americans, including over 213,000 in California alone.

Everyday Americans, people like Vincent, who have lost their jobs through no fault of their own, will be devastated if we do not right this wrong. Vincent is 57 and worked at Bank of America in my home State of California. He says that he has interviewed with other organizations since being laid off but that he has not found a job. He has not given up, but Vincent worries that he may have to start sleeping in his car and going to food pantries since losing his unemployment benefits on December 28.

Mr. Speaker, we have the ability to help these people. Congress has extended unemployment insurance time and time again with wide bipartisan support because it was the right thing to do. As human beings and as legislators, we must do that again.

Earlier, many of us stood with President Johnson's daughter Lynda Johnson Robb as we marked the 50th anniversary of President Johnson's declaration of an unconditional war on poverty; and in this ongoing war on poverty, extending unemployment benefits to Americans who have lost their jobs is one of our greatest weapons.

CONGRATULATIONS, MAYOR PIKE AND MAYOR DAN

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

Mr. STEWART. To my fellow Members and my fellow Americans, I wish you all a successful and blessed new year.

Mr. Speaker, before we begin the political battles of the year, I would like to take a moment to congratulate the newly elected officials in Utah's Second Congressional District, specifically Jon Pike, the new mayor of St. George in Washington County. I look forward to working with Mayor Pike to continue to grow the economy and to create new jobs.

I also want to take a moment to specifically thank Mayor Dan McArthur, who tirelessly served the people of St. George for more than 20 years. Under his tenure, the population nearly tripled in size, and the city had an expansion and the creation of many new

businesses, great new infrastructure, a beautiful new airport, and the transformation of Dixie State College into a 4-year university.

Mayor Dan is a true representative of the Dixie spirit. His volunteerism was shown in 2005 when they had severe flooding along the Virgin River. He and other city council members joined other citizens in sandbagging the river to prevent severe damage and more flooding.

I am pleased to call Mayor Dan a friend, and I am grateful for his fine example and for his many years of service. I wish him and his family the very best in their future endeavors.

□ 1215

ENDING POVERTY TODAY

(Mrs. BEATTY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, during President Lyndon Baines Johnson's State of the Union address 50 years ago, he declared a war on poverty to create an opportunity for families and Americans to have stability in economic development, health care, and education. Fifty years later, I stand on this House floor with his daughter, Lynda Johnson Robb.

There are 46 million families living in poverty and 16.5 million of them children. I say today: Let's end this war on poverty. Let's support \$40 billion for SNAP. Let's make a difference in the lives of Americans. We deserve to provide them the opportunity to have that opportunity that President Lyndon Baines Johnson talked about.

Thank you to his daughter for reminding us of his legacy. Thank you to the Congressional Black Caucus and Congresswoman BARBARA LEE for leading our charge in making a difference.

I ask all Democrats and Republicans to join me today to pledge that we will take care of those children and families living in poverty as we move forward.

START WORKING FOR WORKING AMERICANS

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

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of talk today about the importance of unemployment benefits. The truth is that too many Americans are out of work. But my constituents don't just need jobs; they need good-paying jobs.

The President touts the job gains in our economy. Unfortunately, many of the jobs gained over the past several years aren't the kind needed to get Hoosiers back on their feet. They are the kind that require long hours of work for little pay, with few or no benefits. They are the kind whose paychecks don't go as far as they used to because necessities like gas, food, edu-

cation, and health care cost more and more. They are the kind where people work harder but fall farther behind. That is not the America I grew up in.

My America—our America—is one where those who work hard and play by the rules can afford the basic necessities of life and then have a little left over for wants, not just needs.

It is time for Congress to spend more time working for these hardworking Americans and less worrying about those who either don't need government or already have a government that works for them.

WAR ON POVERTY

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, today is the 50th anniversary of President Lyndon Johnson's historic war on poverty, but lately it seems more like a war on the poor.

Earlier today, at a meeting organized by Congresswoman LEE, President Johnson's daughter, Lynda Johnson Robb, said that she accompanied her father on his historic tour of Appalachia. She said:

When Daddy came to this town and was sworn in as President, the poverty level of our country was at 20 percent. When Daddy left this town, it was at 12 percent of the population.

He made a big difference working with this body in a bipartisan way—and we can do it again.

Mr. Speaker, let's pass a jobs plan, raise the minimum wage, restore nutrition assistance and affordable housing assistance, and extend unemployment benefits to help those families get by while they are looking for work.

As Lyndon Johnson did five decades ago, let us again declare an "all-out war on human poverty and unemployment in these United States."

PROTECTING AMERICANS' PERSONAL INFORMATION

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this week the House will consider a bill offered by Representative PITTS that would require the Obama administration to notify Americans who had their personal information stolen after signing up for health insurance through ObamaCare.

As someone who has made protecting Social Security numbers a priority, I am deeply concerned about an increase of identity theft through the flawed ObamaCare Web site. Social Security numbers are the key to identity theft. Yet CMS, which is the same agency that runs health care, has failed to protect seniors' identity by refusing to remove Social Security numbers from Medicare cards.

That is why Mr. PITTS' bill, along with H.R. 781, the Medicare Identity Theft Prevention Act, which I introduced with my Democrat colleague, LLOYD DOGGETT, are two simple yet effective ways we can protect Americans and keep their private information just that—private.

I urge my colleagues to join our efforts. We must do what is right for Americans.

EXTEND EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

(Ms. MCCOLLUM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, as Congress begins a new session, House Republican leadership must not ignore last year's urgent, unfinished business.

Right after Christmas, 1.3 million Americans had their unemployment benefits terminated. The Republican refusal to extend unemployment insurance has created a state of emergency for struggling families across this Nation, including thousands in Minnesota.

Earned unemployment benefits are a lifeline for Americans seeking work. Extending this critical safety net will help our neighbors meet basic needs: paying rent, buying food, and providing warmth in this very frigid winter.

Long-term unemployment is at a record high. There are three job seekers for every job available. It is wrong for this Republican majority to turn their back on unemployed Americans.

Fifty years ago, President Lyndon Johnson launched a war on poverty. Today, this fight means extending emergency unemployment insurance and preventing more Americans and their children from falling into poverty.

LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES FOR 2014

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, in 2013, we witnessed the disastrous impacts of Big Government. From the administration's failed roll-out of ObamaCare—destroying jobs—to the undermining of our national security by military sequestration, we know this harms our families, our economy, and our safety.

Last week, I had the opportunity to travel across South Carolina's Second Congressional District to unveil legislative priorities for 2014. My constituents shared my concerns that Congress must focus on legislation to create jobs through economic growth.

We must also reduce our spending so that our children and grandchildren will not be faced with the burden of out-of-control debt. Encouraging energy dependence through the completion of the Keystone XL pipeline will

also create jobs at Michelin and MTU in South Carolina.

Additionally, promoting our brave men and women in uniform, military families, and veterans must remain at the top of our priority list. We must protect our heroes who risk their lives to protect us.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

WAR ON POVERTY

(Ms. LEE of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, as cochair of the Congressional Black Caucus' Taskforce on Poverty and the Economy and chair of the Democratic whip's Task Force on Poverty, Income Inequality, and Opportunity, I join my colleagues today in marking President Lyndon Baines Johnson's 1964 State of the Union address.

Fifty years ago, President Johnson boldly declared an unconditional war on poverty. For the next 50 days, Members will be giving 50 speeches on the floor in continuing this war for economic justice.

I am so pleased and honored that President and Lady Bird Johnson's eldest daughter, Mrs. Lynda Johnson Robb, accepted our invitation to join us here today. She is here in the gallery. I just want to say to her that she exemplifies President and Mrs. Johnson's commitment and the leadership required to fight poverty and build a great society. She visited Appalachia with her daddy, as she told us earlier, and reminded us today that this was a bipartisan and bicameral effort requiring leadership from the White House.

President Johnson's war on poverty created critical antipoverty programs such as Head Start, Job Corps, food stamps, Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security.

As President Johnson said 50 years ago:

It will not be a short or easy struggle, no single weapon or strategy will suffice, but we shall not rest until the war is won.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). Members are reminded not to refer to attendees in the gallery.

CONGRATULATING WEBER STATE UNIVERSITY ON ITS 125TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, yesterday marked the 125th anniversary of one of Utah's premier academic institutions, Weber State University.

Originally Weber State Academy, a religious school with 200 students, today it is a full university with over 25,000 students. It is a great addition to its home city of Ogden, as well as its satellite campus in Davis County.

I am very proud of my association with Weber State University. My father-in-law played football there. My wife and daughter are graduates. Even one of our colleagues, Representative JENKINS of Kansas, is a graduate of Weber State. My son worked for the administration, as well.

Its first president was a renaissance immigrant from Germany, Louis Moench, who composed my favorite hymn. Its second principal, David O. McKay, became a leader of my church. The most recent president, Dr. Millner, was the first female leader of the university in the State of Utah. Under its current leadership with President Wight, I expect another 125 years of great research, innovation, and education taking place at Weber State.

Everyone in Utah wore purple yesterday in honor of this event. As cold as it was here, I am also proud to say I was wearing a Weber State hoodie and sweats all night long—obviously, in honor of Weber State and to try to stay warm back here in Washington.

WAR ON POVERTY

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to acknowledge the leadership of President Lyndon Baines Johnson, represented by his wonderful family: his late wife; Luci Baines Johnson; and our dear friend here in Washington, the former first lady of Virginia, Lynda Johnson Robb.

They understand the words that our President gave us. Unfortunately, many Americans live on the outskirts of hope, and some on the outskirts of health.

I join my colleague, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE, to say to you that the war on poverty is not over. As we look at the red on this paper, every single State has someone living in poverty. Those individuals are represented in 16 million children, and 20,000 military veterans are also included in those 1.3 million Americans who are not getting unemployment benefits.

So as we look at those who need Head Start, a program that was a generational result of President Johnson's effort, we must fight to extend unemployment insurance, and we must ensure the war on poverty remains our cause, our hope. It is important to give hope to Americans.

OVERSIGHT ON OBAMACARE SECURITY RISKS

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

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, during a recent Homeland Security Oversight Committee hearing, we learned just how deeply flawed the ObamaCare Web site was upon its launch. The problems with this Web site went well beyond

error messages and Americans being unable to successfully purchase insurance. We have learned that security risks to the ObamaCare Web site were “limitless” long before the Web site’s official launch.

Worse, the Obama administration knew of these risks before the October 1 planned launch. Rather than fixing the problem, they consciously allowed Americans to put their personal information at risk by using this deeply flawed Web site.

As someone who has worked in the technology sector, I know that if a private company launched a Web site with these kinds of issues, the company might have gone under, or at least people would have been fired.

The administration’s failure to secure this Web site in advance of its launch is wholly unacceptable. That is why I am proud to support the Health Exchange Security and Transparency Act, which requires HHS to notify Americans if their personal information has been stolen or unlawfully accessed through an ObamaCare exchange.

The American people deserve to know if the ObamaCare Web site jeopardized their privacy. I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in support of this bill.

□ 1230

THE CONTINUING WAR ON POVERTY

(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, I rise today to join my colleagues in marking the 50th anniversary of President Johnson’s declaration of a war on poverty. This war was being won for 16 years, but since President Reagan’s election 34 years ago, the free-marketeters and their Republican Party proponents have pressed the war on the war on poverty. The results are heart-wrenching. The rich are getting richer, while millions of middle-income families have been thrown into poverty.

In my State of Georgia alone, almost 17 percent of households are food insecure, according to the Half in Ten Education Fund. Eighteen percent of people in Georgia earn less than \$23,492 for a family of four.

Republicans blame the poor for being poor, and even worse, Mr. Speaker, they blame the 27.2 percent of children, Mr. Speaker, who are living below the poverty line in Georgia.

Republicans who ignore the desperate pleas to extend SNAP and unemployment insurance programs are hurting the people I represent in Georgia and millions more throughout this great Nation. It is a shame.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF SERGEANT GALE STAUFFER

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

Mr. NUNNELEE. Mr. Speaker, on December 23, in my hometown of Tupelo, Mississippi, two of our police officers, Sergeant Gale Stauffer and Patrol Officer Joseph Maher, were shot while attempting to apprehend a bank robber.

Thankfully, Officer Maher survived very serious wounds, and he is currently recovering.

Tragically, Sergeant Stauffer died of those wounds. Gale, as he was known to his friends and family, spent his entire adult life in service to his country. He joined the U.S. military and bravely served his tour of duty in Iraq as a Sergeant in the Louisiana Army National Guard.

After returning home, he settled with his family in Tupelo, where he is known for his Cajun cooking, his love of the outdoors, and his passionate support for LSU Tiger football.

Above all, those who knew Sergeant Stauffer knew him as a man completely devoted to his wife and two children.

I will be submitting letters of support for both of these brave men’s nomination for the Congressional Badge of Bravery.

Ronald Reagan once said: “Those who say that we are in a time where there are no heroes, they just don’t know where to look.”

By their actions, Sergeant Stauffer and Officer Maher have showed there are still heroes among us.

EXTEND EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

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

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call on Speaker BOEHNER to allow the House to vote to extend emergency unemployment compensation, a program that is critical to thousands of my constituents in Ventura County struggling to find work.

We also need to extend unemployment insurance for the more than 20,000 veterans who were cut off while they make their transition to the civilian work force. We need to extend unemployment insurance for the nearly 2 million children whose families need it for food, clothing, and shelter.

Mr. Speaker, it is also an economic imperative. Extending unemployment insurance to nearly 214,000 unemployed Californians who will use it to buy groceries, put gas in their cars, or keep the lights on, would save over 46,000 jobs in my State.

Mr. Speaker, it is both a moral and economic imperative that we extend unemployment insurance, and that we do so without delay.

NEW YEAR’S RESOLUTIONS FOR CONGRESS

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

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, as Americans are making their New Year’s resolutions, I think it is time that Congress makes a few New Year’s resolutions of its own.

Congress will resolve itself to stop asking for money and higher taxes from the American people to pay for more bureaucracy and more bloated Federal programs.

Congress will actually try to balance its budget, something the rest of the American people have to do.

Congress will resolve itself to stop the onslaught of rules, regulations, and mandates on our constituents that slow down the economy and kill jobs.

Congress will focus more on programs that create jobs and less on programs that create government dependency.

Congress will stop allowing the Federal Government to spy and read the emails of innocent Americans.

Congress will resolve itself to live under the same laws it passes for everyone else with no special health care or retirement benefits.

Lastly, Congress will resolve itself to spend more time listening to the American people and working together, Republicans and Democrats, to solve the problems our Nation faces.

Mr. Speaker, these are a few New Year’s resolutions for Congress that we would be well-served to follow.

HIPPOCRATIC OATH FOR CONGRESS

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

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, if there were a Hippocratic oath of legislating, it would prescribe that we, above all else, should do no harm, but we have a habit of violating that foundational precept.

We have allowed unemployment insurance to 1.3 million Americans to expire, and that will not help our economy and will cost 200,000 jobs.

In 1 month we face the recurring hostage-taking ritual that has become raising the debt limit. These debt limit showdowns have a real cost to our economy.

The Government Accountability Office found that delayed action in 2011 resulted in \$1.3 billion in higher borrowing costs. We can avoid that cost by enacting permanent reforms to the process like the ones employed in the recent debt limit adjustments.

I introduced last year H.R. 233, which would permanently shift the role of Congress to disapproving debt ceiling increases instead of approving them and allows the debt limit to be raised

unless a supermajority of Congress votes to block the increase.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in pursuing these permanent and necessary reforms. Avoid the replay of the hostage-taking and brinksmanship of last year, and take the steps to avoid doing any more unnecessary harm to American families.

AMERICA'S WAR ON POVERTY

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

Mr. SOUTHERLAND. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 50th anniversary of America's war on poverty. While this war may have been launched with the best of intentions, it is clear we are engaged in a battle of attrition that has left more Americans in poverty than at any point in America's history by number.

That fact is staggering, considering the \$15 trillion and counting that has been spent on fighting this War on Poverty. The status quo simply isn't working. In fact, it is hurting many, many vulnerable families.

We have a moral obligation to do better for the people of Florida's Second Congressional District and across this great Nation, and for the 46.5 million Americans overall who are living in poverty.

As chairman of the Republican Study Committee's Anti-Poverty Initiative, I look forward to working on things going forward, on new, forward-thinking solutions that do several things: strengthen two-parent families; improve effective educational opportunities; create long-lasting job growth, producing fulfilling careers; and restore people's God-given opportunity for earned success.

THE WAR ON POVERTY

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago today President Johnson launched the war on poverty, giving rise to some of the most successful antipoverty programs in our history, including Medicare, Medicaid, food assistance, and Head Start.

Five decades later, eradicating poverty remains a moral imperative. It encompasses health and well-being, education, employment, and access to opportunity.

We have made progress. In 1967, nearly 26 percent of Americans lived in poverty. Today that number is 16 percent. Programs such as the Earned Income Tax Credit, which gives working Americans a ladder into the middle class, have helped us make that progress.

Today, in Congress, our commitment to ending poverty is in question. Because of Republican opposition, more than 18,000 Kentuckians and 1.3 million Americans are without a critical safety

net as they continue to search for work. As a result, our economy lost \$400 million last week alone.

Unemployment insurance is one of the most effective ways to transition those who lost jobs back into the workforce. In 2012, it helped 2.5 million Americans work their way out of poverty.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues today to recommit themselves to eradicating poverty and support an immediate extension of unemployment insurance.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

(Mrs. CAPPS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to give voice to the many out-of-work Americans whose unemployment insurance was allowed to expire.

James, from Santa Maria, California, wrote the following:

I started working at the age of 16 because our father had died. I had, up until April 2012, gone to work every day. I am no slouch. I am a citizen, a taxpayer, a U.S. Army veteran.

But now, his unemployment insurance benefit is gone. For James and for millions of Americans like him, we must act.

Unfortunately, House leadership has ignored this plight and, in doing so, these hardworking Americans will lose the means to keep job searching.

We must extend this lifeline for the long-term unemployed, their children, for our local economies, which gain \$3 of economic benefits for every \$2 invested in the program. The Senate is on the verge of doing just that. With bipartisan support, we must follow their lead.

James signed his letter to me in bold, capital letters: "PLEASE HELP." I urge House leadership and my colleagues to do just that.

EXTENDING UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

(Mrs. DAVIS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, last year, as many have said, ended on a somber note. Over 1 million of our fellow Americans lost a vital economic lifeline, the temporary insurance that helps them get by while searching for a new job.

Louise, a constituent of mine from San Diego, recently wrote me to explain what losing such benefits means to her. She is 60 years old, and she has been looking for work since she was laid off a year ago from a stable job that she had held just for about 15 years.

And as she mentioned:

It is very scary to think that effectively, on January 1, I won't have any income. So what am I to do? I will have a roof over my

head for a short time, but I won't have the funds to pay for utilities.

And she went on to say:

By cutting extended unemployment, all that will be accomplished is more people being on welfare or living on the streets homeless. And that, that helps us? How?

Her story reminds us of our duty to lend a hand to those in need. Any of us could be in her shoes.

Extending unemployment benefits is not only the right thing, but it is also good for our economy.

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.

□ 1245

CLEAN AIR ACT AMENDMENT

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 724) to amend the Clean Air Act to remove the requirement for dealer certification of new light-duty motor vehicles.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 724

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

SECTION 1. REMOVAL OF REQUIREMENT FOR DEALER CERTIFICATION OF NEW LIGHT-DUTY MOTOR VEHICLES.

Section 207(h) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7541(h)) is amended—

- (1) by striking paragraph (1); and
- (2) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (1) and (2), respectively.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials into the RECORD on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be the lead sponsor of H.R. 724, along with my colleague, Congressman GARY PETERS of Michigan. This bipartisan bill, which has 106 cosponsors, repeals an obsolete regulatory requirement that no longer

makes sense. This legislation is fully supported by the auto industry, and I have a letter that I would like to submit for the RECORD from the five leading automotive trade associations, including the National Automobile Dealers Association, highlighting their support.

Since 1981, automobile dealers who deliver a new vehicle for sale have been required to provide a certificate to the purchaser, indicating the vehicle conforms to Clean Air Act emissions requirements. However, modern technology and standard vehicle warranties have rendered this paperwork requirement unnecessary and redundant for a number of reasons.

First, every new vehicle must comply with Clean Air Act requirements before it can enter the stream of commerce. Second, information certifying a vehicle is Clean Air Act compliant can already be found in a number of other locations, including under the hood of a vehicle, in a vehicle's manual, or on the EPA's Web site. And, finally, many new sale warranties range from tens of thousands or hundreds of thousands of miles or a number of years which far exceed the protections provided for in the regulatory requirement.

During recent years, we have seen an unprecedented amount of Federal regulation proposed and enacted. This bureaucratic creep not only threatens the scope of entrepreneurial freedom but also comes at a heavy cost which, by some estimations, is approximately \$1.7 trillion annually. In my district, when I am out visiting with the small businesses community and hard-working American taxpayers, the number one concern I hear about is the burdensome regulations and the need to pare back Federal Government interference.

H.R. 724 is simple, direct, and sends a clear message that small business owners, and specifically auto dealers, should not be burdened with redundant regulatory requirements. This legislation will make the car-buying process a little simpler and let auto dealers spend less time complying with obsolete regulatory requirements and more time developing their businesses, investing in local communities, and creating jobs.

I look forward to continuing to find ways that reduce unnecessary red tape on the small business community. As H.R. 724 represents, this is not only a policy goal both sides of the aisle can agree on, but it is a policy goal that can actually get done. I urge support from my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

AMERICAN INTERNATIONAL AUTOMOBILE DEALERS, NADA, NAMAD, AUTO ALLIANCE, AND GLOBAL AUTOMAKERS,

January 7, 2014.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: We, the undersigned automotive trade associations, are writing regarding our strong support for H.R. 724, a bipartisan bill that would repeal an outdated paperwork mandate on franchised automobile dealers requiring dealer certifi-

cation of a new vehicle's emission system. This legislation was introduced on February 14, 2013 by Reps. Bob Latta (R-OH) and Gary Peters (D-MI) and currently has 105 bipartisan cosponsors. H.R. 724 was reported out of the House Energy and Commerce Committee on December 11, 2013 by voice vote. This bill is scheduled to be considered by the House of Representatives on January 8, 2014.

For over 30 years, automobile dealers who sell a new vehicle have been required to provide customers with a certificate which states that the vehicle conforms to Clean Air Act (CAA) emissions requirements. However, subsequently passed laws and dealer contractual obligations have rendered this statutory mandate redundant and obsolete.

Currently, every new vehicle must comply with CAA requirements before entering the stream of commerce, making it unnecessary for a dealer to also provide a customer with written notification that the vehicle is CAA compliant. Next, information can be found under the hood of the vehicle certifying that the vehicle is CAA compliant, making another form given by the dealer to the customer duplicative. Finally, other information contained in the form is either no longer relevant or can be found in the owner's manual and supplements provided by the manufacturer.

H.R. 724 is narrowly drafted to eliminate this one statutory mandate only. The bill does not amend or impact other provisions of the Clean Air Act.

This legislation is an excellent example of Congress working on a bipartisan basis to repeal an outdated law that no longer benefits the public. We urge you to vote "Yes" on H.R. 724 to end this unnecessary requirement. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

PETER K. WELCH,
*President, National
Automobile Dealers
Association.*

MITCH BAINWOL,
*President and CEO,
Alliance of Auto-
mobile Manufacturers.*

DAMON LESTER,
*President, National
Association of Minority
Automobile Dealers.*

CODY LUSK,
*President, American
International Auto-
mobile Dealers Association.*

MICHAEL J. STANTON,
*President and CEO,
Association of Global
Automakers, Inc.*

Mr. PETERS of Michigan. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 724; and I would like to start off by thanking the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA) for his leadership on this issue and for his willingness to work with me in writing this bill.

This legislation is simple and straightforward. It cuts red tape for small businesses and allows auto dealers to focus on selling cars and creating jobs, not unnecessary paperwork. This bill also benefits consumers. It is one less piece of paper when buying a car, so consumers can focus on what is really important to them, and that is their purchase.

When I came to Congress in 2009, it was a very dark period for our entire

economy but particularly for the auto industry. I will never forget the meeting I had during that time with Chrysler's CEO and his management team. They told me that they were not only weeks away from bankruptcy, but that without access to government loans, they would not have the resources to reorganize and would have been forced to liquidate the company. A liquidation of any of the major auto manufacturers would have wreaked havoc on the supply chain and dragged the entire industry down with it, eliminating millions of good-paying U.S. jobs.

My State of Michigan has helped build our Nation's middle class. Our history is proof that you cannot have a strong middle class without a strong manufacturing sector, and you cannot have a strong manufacturing sector without a thriving auto industry. That is why I was proud to fight for Michigan workers and middle class families and our auto industry to secure the loans that they needed to weather this economic storm.

Fast forward to today. Our auto industry is now driving our economic recovery and paving the way to rebuilding our middle class. Vehicle sales are at the highest point they have been since May of 2007; and vehicle manufacturers and suppliers are ramping up production, hiring more workers, and investing in innovation. That is why it is critical that Congress continue to support our auto industry and our middle class.

I am glad to work with the gentleman from Ohio, Congressman LATTA, on a commonsense solution to eliminate outdated and unnecessary burdens on small businesses. Auto dealers should not have to provide additional paperwork confirming that a vehicle complies with the Clean Air Act since every new vehicle entering the market already meets that standard. Compliance with the Clean Air Act is certainly very important, but redundant paperwork just slows down our small businesses and our consumers.

Auto dealers are upstanding community citizens. They sponsor Little League teams, scholarships, and volunteer their time to help others. Dealers provide significant value and expertise when consumers want to purchase a new car or truck and work to make financing a vehicle affordable.

Today's new vehicles feature innovations ranging from safety technology that makes our roads safer for all of us to infotainment packages that provide convenience and an enhanced riding experience, features that knowledgeable dealers play a very important role in educating the car-buying public about.

So I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 724 to end this outdated burden on the small businesses that can be found in every community in our country.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am actually a new car dealer and have been a new car dealer for many, many years, since 1970, at a store my dad started in 1953 after coming back from the war. So I have got to tell you, it used to be so easy to deliver a car to a customer, and the excitement about getting that new car was just one of the biggest things a family could do. They would come into the showroom, and they were so excited about taking delivery of a new car, being able to drive off that lot, drive around America, do whatever they wanted to do.

And the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) referred to dealers in the community. I can tell you, if you really want to know the significance of new car dealers, go to any town anywhere in this country and look at the outfield fence where Little Leagues play. Open up any program to any high school performance and see who the sponsors are. Look at any of the fundraising opportunities that take place in each community, and you will find that it is the automobile dealers who are there first and foremost and are always there. That is just what we do.

In addition to providing good transportation, we support our communities. We hire people. We allow people to work in our communities. They do great things in our communities.

Now, when we talk about H.R. 724, the question becomes then, Why do we continue to layer time after time, paper after paper on somebody just trying to take delivery of a new car? In a recent survey, the number one thing that consumers don't like about buying a car is the paperwork. It is endless.

When I first started in 1969 selling cars, all you had to do was sign the retail order form and sign the temporary registration and send it in. Well, now we have volumes of papers that must be signed. They not only have to sign that they agree to something; they have to sign that they agree not to do something, and that it was offered to somebody else and to them also. So this full declaration has gotten crazy.

And when it comes to the Clean Air Act, I can take anybody out in the lot. In fact, we can go out in the street right now. Open the hood of your car. There is a sticker underneath that says exactly what that vehicle performs like, and how does it meet the requirements of the Clean Air Act. It is there. On the manufacturer's statement of origin, when customers take delivery of a car, they sign that certificate.

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

Mr. LATTA. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. This just makes so much sense. At a time when America looks at this institution and says why don't you just work together to get rid of some of this overregulation, this overburdensome, adding cost to almost everything that we do, we can do it.

I appreciate what Mr. LATTA has done and what Mr. PETERS has done. There are over 105 of us that sit right here in this room that agree it needs to be done right now. So let's not hold that up. Let's make sure that we simplify it and make it easier for people to go ahead and take delivery of their new car. It takes away cost, and adds that money which we don't spend back into the communities. It could go back into building our businesses. It could go back into rebuilding America.

Mr. PETERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY) for his comments and certainly for his support of what I think is a very practical, commonsense bill that deals with an issue that we need to address. And I think it is very encouraging to see us come together in a bipartisan way to deal with this issue in a very commonsense approach.

With that, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, it appears that I, too, have no further requests for time on my side, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 724.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

POISON CENTER NETWORK ACT

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3527) to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the poison center national toll-free number, national media campaign, and grant program, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3527

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Poison Center Network Act".

SEC. 2. REAUTHORIZATION OF POISON CONTROL CENTERS NATIONAL TOLL-FREE NUMBER.

Section 1271 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d-71) is amended by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

"(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, \$700,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2019 for the maintenance of the nationwide toll free phone number under subsection (a)."

SEC. 3. REAUTHORIZATION OF NATIONWIDE MEDIA CAMPAIGN TO PROMOTE POISON CONTROL CENTER UTILIZATION.

Section 1272 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d-72) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)(2), by striking the comma after "Congress"; and

(2) by striking subsection (d) and inserting the following:

"(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, \$800,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2019."

SEC. 4. REAUTHORIZATION OF THE POISON CONTROL CENTER GRANT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1273 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d-73) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking "certified" and inserting "accredited"; and

(B) by striking "certification" and inserting "accreditation";

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking "establish" and inserting "research, establish, implement,";

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (4) through (7) as paragraphs (5) through (8);

(C) by inserting after paragraph (3), the following:

"(4) to research, improve, and enhance the communications and response capability and capacity of the nation's network of poison control centers to facilitate increased access to the Centers through the integration and modernization of the current poison control centers communications and data system, including enhancing the network's telephony, Internet, data and social networking technologies;"

(D) in paragraph (6) (as so redesignated), by striking "paragraph (4)" and inserting "paragraph (5)"; and

(E) in paragraph (8) (as so redesignated), by striking "and respond" and inserting "and Internet communications, and to sustain and enhance the poison control center's network capability to respond";

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking "CERTIFICATION" and inserting "ACCREDITATION";

(B) by striking "certified" each place that such term appears and inserting "accredited"; and

(C) by striking "certification" each place that such term appears and inserting "accreditation";

(4) in subsection (d)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking "CERTIFICATION" and inserting "ACCREDITATION";

(B) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking "the certification" and inserting "the accreditation";

(ii) by striking "a noncertified" and inserting "a nonaccredited"; and

(iii) by striking "a certification" and inserting "an accreditation"; and

(C) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by striking the last sentence; and

(ii) by striking "exceed 5 years." and inserting the following "exceed—

"(A) 5 years; or

"(B) in the case of a nonaccredited poison control center operating pursuant to a waiver under this subsection as of October 1, 2014, 6 years.";

(5) in subsection (f), by striking "for activities of the center" and inserting "for its activities"; and

(6) by striking subsection (g) and inserting the following:

"(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, \$28,600,000 for each of

fiscal years 2015 through 2019. The Secretary may utilize an amount not to exceed 6 percent of the amount appropriated under this preceding sentence in each fiscal year for coordination, dissemination, technical assistance, program evaluation, data activities, and other program administration functions, which are determined by the Secretary to be appropriate for carrying out the program under this section.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply to grants made on or after October 1, 2014.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials in the RECORD on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3527, the Poison Center Network Act, introduced by Representative LEE TERRY of Nebraska, reauthorizes important activities related to poison control centers. Specifically, the bill reauthorizes the National Poison Center toll-free number, the Poison Center's national media campaign, and the State grant program which funds 56 poison control centers around the United States.

The Department of Health and Human Services estimates that in any given year, there will be between 3 million and 5 million poison exposures. Sixty percent of these exposures will involve children under the age of 6 who are exposed to toxins in their homes.

Poisoning is the second-most common form of unintentional death in the United States and accounts for 285,000 hospitalizations a year. According to a report from the Institute of Medicine, every \$1 spent on Poison Control Center services saves \$7 in medical spending.

I would urge all my colleagues to support this bipartisan bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 3527, the Poison Center Network Act.

□ 1300

Mr. Speaker, this important legislation, which passed the Energy and Commerce Committee by unanimous consent in December, reauthorizes the national toll-free phone number, media campaign, and grant program which have helped make poison centers an incredibly successful program.

First passed in 2000, national poison center legislation was championed by

our current Energy and Commerce Committee chairman, Mr. UPTON, and our former colleague, Ed Towns. Since then, the national poison center legislation has been reauthorized twice, and I am proud to say it remains a very bipartisan product.

Chairman TERRY, thank you for your leadership on this issue over the years and your hard work on this reauthorization. This is a good, bipartisan bill, and I am pleased to have had the opportunity to work on it with you.

Poison exposure is a leading cause of unintentional injuries in the United States, and it was the second leading cause of unintentional injury deaths in 2010. According to a recent Lewin Group report, poisonings accounted for over 2.1 million emergency room visits and 438,000 hospitalizations in the year 2009 alone. I think most of us with children remember either having a magnet on our refrigerator or a sticker on our phone providing the contact information for the poison center in our area.

The experts that staff our Nation's network of 56 poison centers are available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year. In 2012, poison centers handled, on average, 9,200 cases per day for a total of almost 3.4 million cases over the course of the year. Over 90 percent of calls into poison centers were due to a poison exposure in someone's home, and approximately half of all cases involved children under the age of 6 who were exposed to toxins in their home.

In my home State of New York, we have two poison centers that, between the two of them, field over 164,000 calls per year. The New York City poison center found that 88 percent of all exposures to a dangerous substance occurred within someone's own residence. Many of these calls were related to the accidental ingestion of various cleaning products or detergents, but in 2012, the New York City poison center also fielded over 2,000 calls regarding prescription painkillers.

For the upstate New York poison center in 2012, 85 percent of calls were related to unintentional poisonings, 62 percent involved children under the age of 5, and, most importantly, 82 percent of cases could be managed over the phone and did not require a visit to a doctor or a hospital if hospitalization is necessary.

In 2011, poison centers helped avoid an estimated 1.7 million unnecessary health care visits and have been shown to decrease the amount of time an individual spends in the hospital. While a visit to the emergency room can cost hundreds of dollars, and a hospitalization can cost thousands, a phone call to a poison center only costs around \$30, which shows poison centers continue to be a smart public health investment.

I think it is also important to note that poison centers are an incredibly valuable resource to health care providers. Poison centers provide access to board-certified medical toxicologists

which can assist with the triage, diagnosis, and treatment of patients with known or suspected poisoning.

Poison centers are a true partnership between Federal, State, and local governments, as well as in the private sector. In 2011, poison centers obtained only 13 percent of their funding from Federal grants, while 62 percent came from State and local government and 25 percent from private funders like hospitals and insurers. Adequate funding from all sources is important in order to continue to provide high-quality experts and services in the name of poison prevention for our constituents.

Mr. Speaker, by all accounts, poison centers have been an incredible success and a program that we should all be proud to be a part of. In addition to my gratitude towards Mr. TERRY, I would also again like to thank Chairman UPTON for his leadership on this issue, as well as Ranking Member WAXMAN, Chairman PITTS, and Ranking Member PALLONE for their assistance in bringing this bill, first, before the Energy and Commerce Committee and to the floor today.

As the lead Democrat on this bipartisan legislation, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), the distinguished chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friends, Mr. ENGEL, the lead Democratic cosponsor of this bipartisan legislation, as well as Mr. TERRY, who has helped champion this, not only in this Congress, but for the last number of years, as well.

This bill needs to get done. H.R. 3527 is really good legislation, and it's bipartisan. It funds more than 50 poison control centers across the country. In 2012, almost 4 million calls were managed by our Nation's poison control centers. These centers and the physicians, the nurses, the pharmacists, and toxicology specialists who staff them save lives by providing free and confidential health services regarding potential exposure to harmful toxins 24/7 and in 150 different languages.

So let me tell you about Michigan. The Michigan Regional Poison Control Center at DMC Children's Hospital in Detroit is one of the largest and busiest poison centers in the country, offering leadership in new data collection processes and identification of new trends in poisonings. The center provides assessment, triage, management, and continued monitoring of more than 90,000 poison exposures in Michigan every year at no direct cost to the patient, the practitioner, or the health care institution.

Poison centers like this save money, as many of these crisis calls avert an expensive trip to the emergency room. In fact, a 2012 report by the independent Lewin Group determined that the Nation's poison centers save more

than \$1.19 billion in avoided medical utilization and reduced hospital length of stay every year. In addition, every \$1 of funding saves about \$13 in unnecessary health care costs and lost productivity in the country.

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

Mr. PITTS. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. UPTON. Our Nation's poison centers exemplify successful public-private partnerships, with Federal funds providing only 18 percent of the poison center budget. That partnership saves the Federal Government a lot of money while also delivering access to critical services for Americans across the country, let alone the lives that we save. So I would ask every one of my colleagues to support this very important, bipartisan legislation.

Again, I want to commend the leadership of Mr. TERRY and Mr. ENGEL for their continued effort on this to "git-r-done."

Mr. ENGEL. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY), the prime sponsor of the bill.

Mr. TERRY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for recognizing me, and I thank the gentleman from New York, my good friend. We have worked on several bills together, but the poison control bill is certainly one of those that we've been active on several years now. Thank you for your involvement and your staff's involvement. They have done a great job.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bipartisan and a bicameral bill. Not only were we in negotiations and just working together in a bipartisan way in the House, but our team in the House, ELIOT ENGEL and myself, have been working with the Senate, and they have an identical bill to this.

This bill reauthorizes the national Poison Control Centers' toll-free number, the Poison Centers' nationwide media campaign, and the grant program which provides funds for over 50 poison centers nationwide, including the one in Omaha, Nebraska, that I recently visited.

Currently, 56 poison centers serve all 50 States and its territories 24 hours a day, 7 days a week—yes, even Christmas. These centers provide professional advice from doctors, nurses, pharmacists, and toxicology specialists to people calling in with questions or concerns regarding potential exposure to harmful toxins.

Nebraska's poison control center has a direct relationship with our medical center, and you will find that very common in many communities and States.

In 2010 alone, the annual report of the poison control centers reported over 3 million calls received and served by the

centers. In 2012, more than 3.9 million calls were managed by our Nation's poison control centers.

Our national poison center network also serves as an ideal example of private-public partnership that saves the Federal Government money—billions of dollars each year—in avoided emergency room expenses while delivering access to critical services. Eighty percent of the poison centers' operating budget comes from non-Federal sources. In 2012, an independent analysis found a large portion of the savings provided by poison centers saved SCHIP, Medicare, and Medicaid funds more than \$700 million a year just for those programs. America's utilization of the Nation's poison control center information and case triage services results in avoiding more than 1.7 million unnecessary visits to health care facilities.

Now I am encouraging every Member of Congress to visit their State's poison center where they will see great professionals work with frightened people on the other side of that call in a remarkable way. And I also encourage them to support this bill.

Mr. ENGEL. I have no further speakers, Mr. Speaker, so I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, we have no other speakers.

I would urge all Members to support this bill, H.R. 3527, in order to save lives. It's a bipartisan, good bill that deserves every Member's support.

And with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill before us: H.R. 3527, the Poison Center Network Act.

This bill reauthorizes the Poison Control Program. I have been a strong supporter of poison control centers over the years and co-sponsored the 2000 legislation first authorizing the program.

There is currently a nationwide network of poison control centers—due in large part to federal support for these centers. Poison control centers play a crucial role in reducing injuries and deaths caused by poison exposure, such as from household products, chemicals in the workplace, and medicine. Studies have shown that these poison control centers reduce the severity of illness and death caused by poison exposure—a leading cause of unintentional injury death—and save money by reducing the number of unnecessary trips to the emergency room.

In California alone, the poison control system has managed millions of cases since its inception in 1997. The system consults on hundreds of thousands of cases each year. And in just one year, the work of the California system is estimated to save \$70 million in health care costs and avert more than 60,000 emergency room visits.

H.R. 3527 reauthorizes and makes enhancements to the "Poison Center Support, Enhancement, and Awareness Act of 2008." The bill extends State grants to establish and operate poison centers; maintains a national toll-free number to ensure access to poison center services by connecting callers to the poison center serving their area; and supports

a national media campaign to educate the public and health care providers about poison prevention, poison center services, and the toll-free number.

I am glad we were able to work in a bipartisan manner to move this important public health measure through our Committee and bring it to the House floor today. I'd like to commend Energy and Commerce Members, Representatives ELIOT ENGEL and LEE TERRY, for their leadership on this bill.

I support this measure, and I urge my colleagues to join me in voting in support of H.R. 3527.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3527, the Poison Center Network Act.

This bipartisan legislation will continue the important grants to our nation's 56 poison centers. These centers provide critical public health support to every state and are responsible for helping to reduce the number of deaths and the severity of illness caused by poisoning. They offer critical poison treatment advice and, in some cases, function as direct-service providers.

Poison exposure is a leading cause of unintentional injury in the United States. In fact, poison centers field approximately 3.6 million calls every year, including 2.3 million calls about exposures to poisons and adverse reactions to prescription drugs. By playing a role within the health care infrastructure, poison control centers reduce the cost burden on our health system. Annually, of all the calls to a poison control centers about a potential poisoning, nearly 90 percent of the calls are managed on-site and outside of a health care facility. This means that a caller gets the help they need over the phone without having to go to a doctor or the hospital. Both of which would be much more costly to the system. In addition, these services are available 24 hours a day, seven days a week at no direct cost to the people who call.

The poison control centers also help provide education and surveillance through operation of their toll-free national poison help line. In fact, poison centers are often the first to identify emerging public health threats. In the past few years, they were credited with identifying key health issues, for example regarding, energy drinks. They also were able to track the incidence of numerous food-borne illnesses.

Today's bill will continue these grants to support the work of these critical poison control centers. The return on federal investment is substantial and the work of the centers is proven to be valuable and effective.

Thank you to our Energy and Commerce Committee Members, Mr. ENGEL and Mr. TERRY, for their leadership on this bill. I urge all Members to support its passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3527, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1451

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) at 2 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.

TRANSPORTATION REPORTS
ELIMINATION ACT OF 2013

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3628) to eliminate certain unnecessary reporting requirements and consolidate or modify others, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3628

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Transportation Reports Elimination Act of 2013".

SEC. 2. ELIMINATION OF CERTAIN REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION.—
(1) AIR TRAFFIC SERVICES COMMITTEE REPORTS.—Section 106(p)(7) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking subparagraph (H); and
(B) by redesignating subparagraph (I) as subparagraph (H).

(2) ANNUAL SUMMARIES OF FINANCIAL REPORTS.—Subsection (k) of section 47107 of title 49, United States Code, is repealed.

(3) PIPELINE SAFETY INFORMATION GRANTS TO COMMUNITIES ANNUAL REPORT.—Section 60130 of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (c); and
(B) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (c).

(4) PILOT PROGRAM FOR INNOVATIVE FINANCING OF AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL EQUIPMENT ANNUAL REPORT.—Section 182 of the Vision 100—Century of Aviation Reauthorization Act (49 U.S.C. 44502 note) is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (e); and
(B) by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (e).

(5) JUSTIFICATION FOR AIR DEFENSE IDENTIFICATION ZONE.—Section 602 of the Vision 100—Century of Aviation Reauthorization Act (Public Law 108-176; 117 Stat. 2563), and the item relating to that section in the table of contents in section 1(b) of that Act, are repealed.

(6) STANDARDS FOR AIRCRAFT AND AIRCRAFT ENGINES TO REDUCE NOISE LEVELS ANNUAL REPORT.—Section 726 of the Wendell H. Ford Aviation Investment and Reform Act for the 21st Century (49 U.S.C. 47508 note) is amended by striking subsection (c).

(b) ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY.—
(1) GREAT LAKES MANAGEMENT COMPREHENSIVE REPORT.—Section 118(c) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1268(c)) is amended—

(A) by striking paragraph (10); and
(B) by redesignating paragraphs (11), (12), and (13) as paragraphs (10), (11), and (12), respectively.

(2) GENERAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Indian Environmental General Assistance Program Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 4368b) is amended by striking subsection (1).

(3) RESEARCH PROGRAM RESPECTING OCEAN DUMPING AND OTHER METHODS OF WASTE DISPOSAL REPORT BY ADMINISTRATOR.—Section 204 of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972 (33 U.S.C. 1444) is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (b); and
(B) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (b).

SEC. 3. CONSOLIDATION OR MODIFICATION OF CERTAIN REPORTS.

(a) MARINE SAFETY REPORT TO CONGRESS.—
(1) CONSOLIDATION.—Section 2116(d)(2)(B) of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking "under subsection (b); and" and inserting "under subsection (b), which shall include an identification of—

"(i) the number of civilian and military Coast Guard personnel assigned to marine safety positions; and

"(ii) marine safety positions that are understaffed for purposes of facilitating the strategy and achieving the goals described in subsection (a); and".

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 57 of title 14, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (e); and
(B) by redesignating subsections (f), (g), and (h) as subsections (e), (f), and (g), respectively.

(b) MARITIME TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ANNUAL REPORT.—

(1) CONSOLIDATION.—Section 70103 of title 46, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(f) ANNUAL REPORT.—On the date on which the President submits to Congress a budget pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report that includes—

"(1) with respect to the last full fiscal year preceding the report—

"(A) a summary of—
"(i) security standards established pursuant to this section; and

"(ii) the level of compliance and steps taken to ensure compliance by ports, terminals, vessel operators, and shippers with respect to security standards established pursuant to this section; and

"(B) a statement of the number of—

"(i) security zones established for vessels containing especially hazardous cargo; and

"(ii) vessels containing especially hazardous cargo provided a waterborne security escort, subdivided by Federal, State, local, or private security provider; and

"(2) an assessment of any additional vessels, personnel, infrastructure, or other resources that may be necessary to provide waterborne escorts to vessels containing especially hazardous cargo for which a security zone is established.".

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) ESPECIALLY HAZARDOUS CARGO.—Section 70103(e) of title 46, United States Code, is amended by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

"(2) ESPECIALLY HAZARDOUS CARGO DEFINED.—In this subsection and subsection (f), the term 'especially hazardous cargo' means anhydrous ammonia, ammonium nitrate, chlorine, liquefied natural gas, liquefied petroleum gas, and any other substance, material, or group or class of material, in a particular amount and form that the Secretary determines by regulation poses a significant

risk of creating a transportation security incident while being transported in maritime commerce.".

(B) VESSEL AND INTERMODAL SECURITY REPORTS.—Section 809 of the Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2004 (46 U.S.C. 70101 note) is amended—

(i) in subsection (a) by striking "and (j)" and inserting "and (i)";

(ii) by striking subsection (i); and

(iii) by redesignating subsections (j) and (k) as subsections (i) and (j), respectively.

(c) MODIFICATIONS.—

(1) INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT NEEDS REPORT.—Section 503(b)(8)(A) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking "July 31, 2013, and July 31" and inserting "July 31, 2014, and July 31".

(2) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—Section 609 of title 23, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (a) by striking "June 1, 2012," and inserting "June 1, 2014,"; and

(B) in subsection (b)(1) by striking "December 1, 2012," and inserting "December 1, 2014,".

(3) PUBLIC MASS TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS REPORT.—Section 308(e)(1) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking "March 1998, and in March" and inserting "July 2014, and in July".

(4) EVALUATION AND AUDIT OF NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD.—Section 1138(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking "at least annually, but may be conducted".

(5) BRIEFINGS.—Section 20017(b)(6) of MAP-21 (49 U.S.C. 5324 note; 126 Stat. 706) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A) by inserting after "the Senate" the following: "and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives"; and

(B) in subparagraph (B) by inserting after "the Senate" the following: "and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives".

SEC. 4. PAPERLESS REPORTS.

(a) RAILWAY-HIGHWAY CROSSINGS ANNUAL REPORT.—Section 130(g) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking the third sentence and inserting the following: "The Secretary shall make available to the public on the Web site of the Department of Transportation, not later than April 1, 2014, and every 2 years thereafter, a report on the progress being made by the State in implementing projects to improve railway-highway crossings.".

(b) NATIONAL BRIDGE AND TUNNEL INVENTORY REPORT.—Section 144(d)(1)(B) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking "submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate" and inserting "make available to the public on the Web site of the Department of Transportation".

(c) SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROJECT DELIVERY PROGRAM REPORT.—Section 327 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (i) and inserting the following:

"(i) REPORT.—The Secretary shall make available to the public on the Web site of the Department of Transportation an annual report that describes the administration of the program.".

(d) HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAMS BIENNIAL REPORT.—Section 402(n) of title 23, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking "TO CONGRESS" in the subsection heading; and

(2) in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking "submit a report to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate” and inserting “make available to the public on the Web site of the Department of Transportation a report”.

(e) IN-VEHICLE ALCOHOL DETECTION DEVICE RESEARCH REPORTS.—Section 403(h)(4) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking “submit an annual report to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives, and Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives” and inserting “make available to the public on the Web site of the Department of Transportation an annual report”.

(f) NATIONAL ITS PROGRAM PLAN REPORTING.—Section 512(b) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking “submitted” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting “made available to the public, and updated biennially, on the Web site of the Department of Transportation.”.

(g) ADVISORY COMMITTEE REPORT.—Section 515(h)(4) of title 23, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “of each year after the date of enactment of the Transportation Research and Innovative Technology Act of 2012,” and inserting “, 2014, and biennially thereafter.”;

(2) by striking “submit to Congress” and inserting “make available to the public on the Web site of the Department of Transportation”; and

(3) in subparagraph (A) by striking “calendar year” and inserting “2 calendar years”.

(h) NATIONAL FERRY DATABASE UPDATE REPORT.—Section 1801(e)(3) of SAFETEA-LU (23 U.S.C. 129 note) is amended by inserting “and shall make any such modified report available to the public on the Web site of the Department” before the period at the end.

(i) HIGH-RISK RURAL ROADS BEST PRACTICES REPORT.—Section 1112(b)(2)(A) of MAP-21 (23 U.S.C. 148 note) is amended by striking “submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives” and inserting “make available to the public on the Web site of the Department”.

(j) COMPLETION TIME ASSESSMENT REPORT.—Section 1323(a)(2) of MAP-21 (126 Stat. 553) is amended by striking “submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate” and inserting “make available to the public on the Web site of the Department”.

(k) ADDITIONAL REPORT.—Section 1323(b) of MAP-21 (126 Stat. 554) is amended by striking “submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate” and inserting “make available to the public on the Web site of the Department”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam 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 H.R. 3628.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 3628 eliminates, consolidates, and modifies 27 congressionally mandated reporting requirements of the executive branch agencies that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

This bill does not reduce the congressional oversight of the affected agencies. Instead, it rids the agencies of outdated reporting requirements that are no longer utilized or have been replaced by different methods of information collected, thus enabling the agencies to concentrate on more pressing aspects of their mission.

This legislation also consolidates and modifies certain existing reporting requirements, bringing consistency across law and regulation, eliminating duplicative and wasteful efforts, making technical corrections, and improving the ability of Congress to conduct effective oversight.

This legislation makes several reporting requirements digital, resulting in reduced production and delivery cost, expedited delivery, and more useful and interactive formats. Additionally, the reports will now be made publicly available, enhancing transparency. According to the CBO this legislation could reduce the administrative costs of these agencies.

This legislation is a basic, good-government, fiscally sound bill that just makes sense. I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ESTY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise here today in strong support of H.R. 3628, the Transportation Reports Elimination Act of 2013. The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure unanimously reported this bill by voice vote last month.

The Government Performance and Results Modernization Act of 2010 requires the Office of Management and Budget, OMB, to publish a list of congressionally mandated plans and reports that it considers outdated or duplicative. On January 8, 2013, OMB published a list of 376 reports that it proposed for elimination or consolidation.

The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure reviewed a list of reports this fall within the committee's jurisdiction and agreed that some of these reports are indeed outdated or duplicative. H.R. 3628 is a bipartisan bill that eliminates, consolidates, and modifies 27 congressionally mandated reports.

Madam Speaker, this bill will save taxpayer dollars while improving government proficiency and performance. The bill eliminates several reporting requirements that are outdated or duplicative, freeing up valuable staff resources for the affected agency to per-

form more important oversight activities. The bill also consolidates and modifies certain existing reporting requirements to create greater consistency across statutes and regulations.

Finally, the bill allows several reports to be posted on the agency's Web site and not formally submitted to Congress, saving time and taxpayer dollars. This process will further save taxpayer dollars by reducing production and delivery of weighty government reports. Additionally, taxpayers will also benefit from information posted in a more timely and interactive format, increasing transparency and ease of access.

This is a bipartisan bill for smarter, cheaper, more transparent government. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 3628, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Speaker, again, I appreciate my colleague's support on this, and, as mentioned, this was reported out of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure unanimously.

But I also want to point out a couple of these reports just to drive home the point of how unnecessary some of these reports are, and were, and that's why we were eliminating them.

For instance, in the Department of Transportation, the Air Traffic Services Committee Report. The Air Traffic Services Committee has not met for more than 2 years. As such, no report has been submitted to Congress in that time. Additionally, since its creation in 2003, many other committees and boards have created the report and it is no longer needed. That, for instance, is one.

The Pipeline Safety Information Grants to Communities Annual Report, sounds important, is important, but we recommended the elimination by OMB. This information is online, so it is more timely for Americans to be able to get online and review this type of report.

The Pilot Program for Innovative Financing of Air Traffic Control Equipment Annual Report, the report was required to supplement innovative air traffic control systems being tested 9 years ago. The tests have long since been completed, and, therefore, there is no report that is required.

Again, the list goes on and on. The Standards for Aircraft—aircraft engines to reduce noise levels—Annual Report requires an annual report in the implementation of new technologies to decrease aircraft noise levels. Since then, the FAA has updated noise requirements to meet stage 4 standards; therefore, again, this report is no longer required.

Again, we go through, and there are 27 in total that we have eliminated. We haven't been quantified as to how much savings, but there certainly is going to be hundreds of thousands—if not millions—of dollars saved by eliminating these reports. As I said, many of these reports you can get online now

and see them quickly and efficiently and the most up-to-date reporting.

And with that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ESTY. Madam Speaker, again, this is one of those ultrarare instances where we have bipartisan support, where we can save money, improve efficiency, and have greater transparency and accessibility to taxpayers.

I wanted to flag just a couple of other items that illustrate this point.

We are going to be taking up the surface transportation bill, a very important bill coming up later this year. Well, some of the reports related to that bill have to do with the infrastructure investment need. That report has always come at the wrong time. It has come after we have already looked at the highway transportation bill. So this bill, among other things, aligns the reports to be available and ready for Congress, ready for stakeholders, ready for the public to evaluate at the time we are considering important legislation on behalf of the American people.

So, again, this is an important initiative. I would urge not only support for what we have done under Chairman SHUSTER's excellent leadership, but for other committees in Congress to join us in reviewing what the GAO has provided at our request, to review those lists of agency reports and to find other ways that we can save money, expedite delivery of important information, both to Congress to facilitate our oversight as well as to make it available to the public so they can oversee what we are doing and ensure that we are spending taxpayer dollars in the most effective way possible.

□ 1500

Again, I want to thank the chairman for his leadership on this and many other initiatives. It is a wonderful committee. We have important work to do, and this will help us get that work done.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlelady from Connecticut for her kind words and for all of her hard work on the committee. We have been working very hard in a bipartisan manner. There aren't many things in this Congress that really bring people together; but when it comes to transportation and infrastructure, that is certainly one of them. We will continue to work together.

Again, this bill is a good-government bill. I urge all of my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 3628, which again eliminates and consolidates 27 congressionally mandated reports. It is good government, saves money, and increases transparency.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3628.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 724, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 3527, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 3628, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

CLEAN AIR ACT AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 724) to amend the Clean Air Act to remove the requirement for dealer certification of new light-duty motor vehicles, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 405, nays 0, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 2]

YEAS—405

Aderholt	Burgess	Conyers
Amash	Bustos	Cook
Andrews	Butterfield	Cooper
Bachmann	Calvert	Costa
Bachus	Camp	Cotton
Barber	Campbell	Courtney
Barletta	Cantor	Cramer
Barr	Capito	Crawford
Barrow (GA)	Capps	Crenshaw
Bass	Capuano	Cuellar
Beatty	Cárdenas	Culberson
Becerra	Carney	Cummings
Benishiek	Carson (IN)	Daines
Bentivolio	Carter	Davis (CA)
Bera (CA)	Cartwright	Davis, Danny
Bilirakis	Cassidy	Davis, Rodney
Bishop (GA)	Castor (FL)	DeFazio
Bishop (NY)	Castro (TX)	DeGette
Bishop (UT)	Chabot	Delaney
Black	Chaffetz	DeLauro
Blackburn	Chu	DelBene
Blumenauer	Ciциlline	Denham
Bonamici	Clark (MA)	Dent
Boustany	Clarke (NY)	DeSantis
Brady (PA)	Clyburn	DesJarlais
Brady (TX)	Coble	Deutch
Braley (IA)	Coffman	Diaz-Balart
Bridenstine	Cohen	Dingell
Brooks (AL)	Cole	Doggett
Brooks (IN)	Collins (GA)	Doyle
Broun (GA)	Collins (NY)	Duckworth
Brown (FL)	Conaway	Duffy
Brownley (CA)	Connolly	Duncan (SC)
Buchanan		Duncan (TN)

Edwards	Lamborn	Quigley
Ellison	Lance	Radel
Ellmers	Lankford	Rahall
Engel	Larson (CT)	Rangel
Enyart	Latham	Reed
Eshoo	Latta	Reichert
Esty	Lee (CA)	Renacci
Farenthold	Levin	Rice (SC)
Fattah	Lewis	Richmond
Fincher	Lipinski	Rigell
Fitzpatrick	LoBiondo	Roby
Fleischmann	Loebsock	Roe (TN)
Fleming	Lofgren	Rogers (AL)
Flores	Long	Rogers (KY)
Forbes	Lowenthal	Rogers (MI)
Fortenberry	Lowe	Rohrabacher
Foster	Lucas	Rooney
Fox	Luetkemeyer	Ros-Lehtinen
Franks (AZ)	Lujan Grisham	Roskam
Frelinghuysen	(NM)	Ross
Fudge	Luján, Ben Ray	Rothfus
Gallego	(NM)	Roybal-Allard
Garamendi	Lummis	Royce
Garcia	Lynch	Ruiz
Gardner	Maffei	Runyan
Garrett	Maloney,	Ryan (OH)
Gerlach	Carolyn	Ryan (WI)
Gibbs	Maloney, Sean	Salmon
Gibson	Marchant	Sanchez, Loretta
Gingrey (GA)	Marino	Sanford
Gohmert	Massie	Sarbanes
Goodlatte	Matheson	Scalise
Gosar	Matsu	Schakowsky
Gowdy	McAllister	Schiff
Granger	McCarthy (CA)	Schneider
Graves (GA)	McCauley	Schock
Graves (MO)	McClintock	Schrader
Grayson	McCollum	Schweikert
Green, Al	McDermott	Scott (VA)
Green, Gene	McGovern	Scott, Austin
Griffin (AR)	McHenry	Scott, David
Griffith (VA)	McIntyre	Sensenbrenner
Grijalva	McKeon	Serrano
Grimm	McKinley	Sessions
Gutiérrez	McMorris	Sewell (AL)
Hahn	Rodgers	Shea-Porter
Hall	McNerney	Sherman
Hanabusa	Meadows	Shimkus
Hanna	Meehan	Shuster
Harper	Meng	Simpson
Harris	Messer	Sinema
Hartzler	Mica	Sires
Hastings (FL)	Michaud	Slaughter
Hastings (WA)	Miller (FL)	Smith (MO)
Heck (WA)	Miller (MI)	Smith (NE)
Hensarling	Miller, George	Smith (NJ)
Herrera Beutler	Moore	Smith (TX)
Higgins	Moran	Smith (WA)
Himes	Mullin	Southerland
Hinojosa	Mulvaney	Speier
Holding	Murphy (FL)	Stewart
Holt	Murphy (PA)	Stivers
Honda	Nadler	Stockman
Horsford	Napolitano	Stutzman
Hoyer	Neal	Swalwell (CA)
Hudson	Negrete McLeod	Takano
Huelskamp	Neugebauer	Terry
Huffman	Noem	Thompson (CA)
Huizenga (MI)	Nolan	Thompson (MS)
Hunter	Nugent	Thompson (PA)
Hurt	Nunes	Thornberry
Israel	Nunnelee	Tiberi
Issa	O'Rourke	Tierney
Jackson Lee	Olson	Tipton
Jeffries	Owens	Titus
Jenkins	Palazzo	Tonko
Johnson (GA)	Pallone	Tsongas
Johnson (OH)	Pascrell	Turner
Johnson, E. B.	Pastor (AZ)	Upton
Johnson, Sam	Paulsen	Valadao
Jordan	Payne	Van Hollen
Joyce	Pearce	Vargas
Kaptur	Pelosi	Veasey
Keating	Perlmutter	Vela
Kelly (IL)	Perry	Visclosky
Kelly (PA)	Peters (CA)	Wagner
Kennedy	Peters (MI)	Walden
Kildee	Peterson	Walorski
Kilmer	Petri	Walz
Kind	Pingree (ME)	Wasserman
King (IA)	Pittenger	Schultz
King (NY)	Pitts	Waters
Kingston	Pocan	Waxman
Kinzinger (IL)	Poe (TX)	Weber (TX)
Kirkpatrick	Polis	Webster (FL)
Kline	Pompeo	Welch
Kuster	Posey	Westrup
Labrador	Price (GA)	Westmoreland
LaMalfa	Price (NC)	Whitfield

Williams	Womack	Yoho
Wilson (SC)	Woodall	Young (AK)
Wittman	Yarmuth	Young (IN)
Wolf	Yoder	

NOT VOTING—26

Amodei	Heck (NV)	Rokita
Barton	Hultgren	Ruppersberger
Bucshon	Jones	Rush
Cleaver	Langevin	Sánchez, Linda
Crowley	Larsen (WA)	T.
Farr	McCarthy (NY)	Schwartz
Frankel (FL)	Meeks	Velázquez
Gabbard	Miller, Gary	Walberg
Guthrie	Ribble	Wilson (FL)

□ 1530

Messrs. LATHAM and CUELLAR changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote No. 2, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 2, on Wednesday, January 8, I was unavoidably detained and missed a rollcall vote. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall 2, in support of a bill I cosponsored, H.R. 724, to amend the Clean Air Act to remove the requirement for dealer certification of new light-duty motor vehicles.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE
CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 6, 2014.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington,
DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a copy of the Certificate of Election received from the Honorable Robert Bentley, Governor of Alabama and the Honorable Jim Bennett, Secretary of State of Alabama, indicating that, at the Special Election held on December 17, 2013, the Honorable Bradley Byrne was duly elected Representative in Congress for the First Congressional District, State of Alabama.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk.

Enclosure.

STATE OF ALABAMA
CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION TO FILL THE
UNEXPIRED TERM

To the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States:

This is to certify that on the 17th day of December, 2013, the following individual was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the First Congressional district of the State of Alabama as member of the House of Representatives of the United States to represent said State and district for the unexpired term: Bradley Byrne.

In Testimony Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Great Seal of the State of Alabama to be affixed by the Secretary of State, at the Capitol, in the city of

Montgomery on this 27th day of December, in the year of our Lord 2013.

ROBERT BENTLEY,
Governor.
JIM BENNETT,
Secretary of State.

[State Seal Affixed]

SWEARING IN OF THE HONORABLE
BRADLEY BYRNE, OF ALABAMA,
AS A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. Will the Representative-elect and the members of the Alabama delegation present themselves in the well.

All Members will rise and the Representative-elect will please raise his right hand.

Mr. BYRNE appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter, so help you God.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations, you are now a Member of the 113th Congress.

WELCOMING THE HONORABLE
BRADLEY BYRNE TO THE HOUSE
OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, we welcome BRADLEY BYRNE as the newest member of the Alabama delegation. We also welcome his wife, Rebecca, who is in the balcony with his four children: Patrick, Colin, Kathleen, and Laura.

BRADLEY asked me—and I think all of the Members will identify with him—do you ever get over the thrill of walking in this Chamber?

And the answer is, No, you never do.

Let me say this: we like BRADLEY, the delegation, and I think you know how important that is. He has a wonderful wife. We are very excited about his being here. He brings a wealth of understanding. He comes from an area with natural resources—very important in Armed Services. He served as chancellor of our 2-year college system. He can bring some insight to educational reform.

He succeeds one of our closest friends—of all of us on both sides—Jo Bonner. Although we miss Jo, we welcome BRADLEY. That makes up for some of the loss of Jo, and I think you are going to get to where you know and appreciate this gentleman who has joined us today.

At this time, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL).

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my Alabama colleagues in welcoming newly elected Representative BRADLEY BYRNE to the 113th Congress.

As a lawyer, as a former Alabama State Senator, and as a former chancellor of Alabama's 2-year college system, BRADLEY has a proven record as a principled servant leader.

I know BRADLEY as a man of strong character, who has dedicated his public life to strengthening his community and improving our State. I believe BRADLEY will ably follow in the tradition of his predecessors Sonny Calhoun and Jo Bonner in proudly representing Alabama's First Congressional District.

I look forward to working with you, BRADLEY, especially on our shared constituents in Clarke County.

Recently, a local reporter asked the delegation to give BRADLEY some advice.

The best advice that I could give you as you embark upon this special journey is to always put your constituents first. The oath you took today is a very sacred one. You join a body that has an awesome responsibility, and that responsibility is neither Republican nor Democrat. The issues that we talk about are for all Americans. I look forward to working with you, and I know that given your record of hard work and your willingness to work across the aisle that you will be an amazing addition to the Alabama delegation, and I welcome you.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, it is my great privilege to represent the good and hardworking people of southwest Alabama.

To my family—my wife of 33 years, Rebecca, and my children Patrick, Kathleen, Laura, and Colin—I thank you for your love and your support.

To the people of the First District of Alabama, I promise that I will work hard every day to serve you and build upon the trust that you have placed in me to represent you in our Nation's Capital.

To the Members of this House, I am ready to roll up my shirt sleeves and work with you as a problem-solver, not a problem-maker; as a workhorse, not a show horse.

This is a great country, Mr. Speaker; but over the past several years, we have failed to live up to that greatness. I come to this House ready to work together with each of you, to find solutions that will make this country truly great again.

I ask God's blessings and wisdom as I embark on this new endeavor in this House for the people of my district.

Thank you again, Mr. Speaker, for the opportunity to make these brief remarks. Now it is time for me to get to work.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the administration of the oath to the gentleman from Alabama, the whole number of the House is 433.

POISON CENTER NETWORK ACT

The SPEAKER. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3527) to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the poison center national toll-free number, national media campaign, and grant program, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 388, nays 18, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 3]

YEAS—388

Aderholt	Cook	Green, Al
Andrews	Cooper	Green, Gene
Bachmann	Costa	Griffin (AR)
Bachus	Cotton	Griffith (VA)
Barber	Courtney	Grijalva
Barletta	Cramer	Grimm
Barr	Crawford	Gutiérrez
Barrow (GA)	Crenshaw	Hahn
Bass	Cuellar	Hall
Beatty	Culberson	Hanabusa
Becerra	Cummings	Hanna
Benishek	Daines	Harper
Bentivolio	Davis (CA)	Harris
Bera (CA)	Davis, Danny	Hartzler
Bilirakis	Davis, Rodney	Hastings (FL)
Bishop (GA)	DeFazio	Hastings (WA)
Bishop (NY)	DeGette	Heck (WA)
Bishop (UT)	Delaney	Hensarling
Black	DeLauro	Herrera Beutler
Blackburn	DelBene	Higgins
Blumenauer	Denham	Himes
Bonamici	Dent	Hinojosa
Boustany	DeSantis	Holding
Brady (PA)	DesJarlais	Holt
Brady (TX)	Deuth	Honda
Braley (IA)	Horsford	Diaz-Balart
Brooks (AL)	Dingell	Hoyer
Brooks (IN)	Doggett	Hudson
Brown (FL)	Doyle	Huelskamp
Brownley (CA)	Duckworth	Huffman
Buchanan	Duffy	Huizenga (MI)
Bustos	Duncan (SC)	Hurt
Butterfield	Edwards	Israel
Byrne	Ellison	Issa
Calvert	Ellmers	Jackson Lee
Camp	Engel	Jeffries
Campbell	Enyart	Jenkins
Cantor	Eshoo	Johnson (GA)
Capito	Esty	Johnson (OH)
Capps	Farenthold	Johnson, E. B.
Capuano	Fattah	Johnson, Sam
Cárdenas	Fincher	Joyce
Carney	Fitzpatrick	Kaptur
Carson (IN)	Fleischmann	Keating
Carter	Fleming	Kelly (IL)
Cartwright	Flores	Kelly (PA)
Cassidy	Forbes	Kennedy
Castor (FL)	Fortenberry	Kildee
Castro (TX)	Foster	Kilmer
Chabot	Frelinghuysen	Kind
Chaffetz	Fudge	King (IA)
Chu	Gallego	King (NY)
Ciilline	Garamendi	Kinzinger (IL)
Clark (MA)	Garcia	Kirkpatrick
Clarke (NY)	Gardner	Kline
Clay	Garrett	Kuster
Clyburn	Gerlach	Labrador
Coble	Gibbs	LaMalfa
Coffman	Gibson	Lamborn
Cohen	Goodlatte	Lance
Cole	Gosar	Langevin
Collins (GA)	Gowdy	Larson (CT)
Collins (NY)	Granger	Latham
Conaway	Graves (GA)	Latta
Connolly	Graves (MO)	Lee (CA)
Conyers	Grayson	Levin

Lewis	Palazzo	Serrano
Lipinski	Pallone	Sessions
LoBiondo	Pascrell	Sewell (AL)
Loeb	Pastor (AZ)	Shea-Porter
Loeb	Paulsen	Sherman
Lofgren	Payne	Shimkus
Long	Pearce	Shuster
Lowenthal	Pelosi	Simpson
Lowe	Perlmutter	Sinema
Lucas	Perry	Sires
Luetkemeyer	Peters (CA)	Slaughter
Lujan Grisham	Peters (MI)	Smith (MO)
(NM)	Peterson	Smith (NE)
Lujan, Ben Ray	Petri	Smith (NJ)
(NM)	Pingree (ME)	Smith (TX)
Lummis	Pittenger	Smith (WA)
Lynch	Pitts	Southerland
Maffei	Pocan	Speier
Maloney,	Poe (TX)	Stewart
Carolyn	Polis	Stivers
Maloney, Sean	Pompeo	Swalwell (CA)
Marchant	Marino	Takano
Marino	Price (GA)	Posey
Matheson	Price (NC)	Terry
Matsui	Quigley	Thompson (CA)
McAllister	Radel	Thompson (MS)
McCarthy (CA)	Rahall	Thompson (PA)
McCauley	Rangel	Thornberry
McClintock	Reed	Tiberi
McCollum	Reed	Tierney
McDermott	Reichert	Tipton
McGovern	Renacci	Titus
McHenry	Rice (SC)	Tonko
McIntyre	Richmond	Tsongas
McKeon	Rigell	Turner
McKinley	Roby	Upton
McMorris	Roe (TN)	Valadao
Rodgers	Rogers (AL)	Van Hollen
McNerney	Rogers (KY)	Vargas
Meadows	Rogers (MI)	Veasey
Meehan	Rohrabacher	Vela
Meng	Rooney	Visclosky
Messer	Ros-Lehtinen	Wagner
Mica	Roskam	Walberg
Michaud	Ross	Walden
Miller (FL)	Rothfus	Walorski
Miller (MI)	Roybal-Allard	Walz
Miller, George	Royce	Wasserman
Moore	Ruiz	Schultz
Moran	Runyan	Waters
Mulvaney	Ryan (OH)	Waxman
Murphy (FL)	Ryan (WI)	Webster (FL)
Murphy (PA)	Salmon	Welch
Nadler	Sanchez, Loretta	Wenstrup
Napolitano	Sanford	Westmoreland
Near	Sarbanes	Whitfield
Negrete McLeod	Scalise	Williams
Neugebauer	Schakowsky	Wilson (SC)
Noem	Schiff	Wittman
Nolan	Schneider	Wolf
Nugent	Schock	Womack
Nunes	Schrader	Yarmuth
Nunnelee	Schweikert	Yoder
O'Rourke	Scott (VA)	Yoho
Olson	Scott, Austin	Young (AK)
Owens	Scott, David	Young (IN)

NAYS—18

Amash	Gohmert	Mullin
Bridenstine	Hunter	Sensenbrenner
Broun (GA)	Jordan	Stockman
Duncan (TN)	Kingston	Stutzman
Foxx	Lankford	Weber (TX)
Franks (AZ)	Massie	Woodall

NOT VOTING—26

Amodei	Gingrey (GA)	Ribble
Barton	Guthrie	Rokita
Bucshon	Heck (NV)	Ruppersberger
Burgess	Hultgren	Rush
Cleaver	Jones	Sánchez, Linda
Crowley	Larsen (WA)	T.
Farr	McCarthy (NY)	Schwartz
Frankel (FL)	Meeks	Velázquez
Gabbard	Miller, Gary	Wilson (FL)

□ 1547

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOMENT OF SILENCE ON ANNI-VERSARY OF SHOOTING VICTIMS IN TUCSON, ARIZONA

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

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, I stand here with my colleagues from the Arizona delegation, both Senate and House, and with very close friends of Congresswoman Gabrielle Giffords to remember a tragic event that took place 3 years ago today.

On January 8, 2011, 10:10 a.m., in just 19.6 seconds, 19 people, including Congresswoman Giffords and myself, were shot during a Congress on Your Corner in Tucson, Arizona. This event was democracy in action; a Member of this body, the people's House, was meeting one-on-one with her constituents. Six wonderful people died that day, including my friend, Gabe Zimmerman, my go-to guy on the Congresswoman's staff.

Tucson and southern Arizona have definitely not been defined by that terrible act. Instead, we are defined by how our community responded. The compassion, love, prayers, and goodwill that poured out has helped all of us heal our broken hearts and bring some good out of that horrific day. Organizations have been established to address the educational needs of children, to prevent bullying, and to reduce the stigma of mental illness and improve those services.

Congresswoman Giffords continues her remarkable recovery. Her perseverance and determination give hope to others. She is a true inspiration to the country and the world. You might have noted that, earlier today, she jumped out of an airplane and took a tandem dive—her second skydive. This woman's resilience has no bounds.

Sadly, in the last 3 years, other communities have been struck by similar senseless acts of violence. The most fitting memorial would be to take action to prevent another such tragedy. As a shooting survivor, a grandfather, and a Member of Congress, I am determined to do so. I know that many others in this body and in the Senate have the same aspiration.

Let us never forget the 6 people that died that fateful day: 9-year-old Christina-Taylor Green; Dorothy Morris; U.S. District Court Judge John Roll; Phyllis Schneck; Dorwan Stoddard; and my friend and colleague, Gabe Zimmerman.

Mr. Speaker, I would now ask that the House observe a moment of silence in remembrance of these good people.

The SPEAKER. Members will rise and observe a moment of silence.

TRANSPORTATION REPORTS ELIMINATION ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R.

3628) to eliminate certain unnecessary reporting requirements and consolidate or modify others, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 406, nays 0, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 4]

YEAS—406

Aderholt	Crenshaw	Harris
Amash	Cuellar	Hartzler
Andrews	Culberson	Hastings (FL)
Bachmann	Cummings	Hastings (WA)
Bachus	Daines	Heck (WA)
Barber	Davis (CA)	Hensarling
Barletta	Davis, Danny	Herrera Beutler
Barr	Davis, Rodney	Higgins
Barrow (GA)	DeFazio	Himes
Bass	DeGette	Hinojosa
Beatty	Delaney	Holding
Becerra	DeLauro	Holt
Benishek	DelBene	Honda
Bentivolio	Denham	Horsford
Bera (CA)	Dent	Hoyer
Bilirakis	DeSantis	Hudson
Bishop (GA)	DesJarlais	Huelskamp
Bishop (NY)	Deutch	Huffman
Bishop (UT)	Diaz-Balart	Huizenga (MI)
Black	Dingell	Hunter
Blackburn	Doggett	Hurt
Blumenauer	Doyle	Israel
Bonamici	Duckworth	Issa
Boustany	Duffy	Jackson Lee
Brady (PA)	Duncan (SC)	Jeffries
Brady (TX)	Duncan (TN)	Jenkins
Braley (IA)	Edwards	Johnson (GA)
Bridenstine	Ellison	Johnson (OH)
Brooks (IN)	Elmers	Johnson, E. B.
Broun (GA)	Engel	Johnson, Sam
Brown (FL)	Enyart	Jordan
Brownley (CA)	Eshoo	Joyce
Buchanan	Esty	Kaptur
Burgess	Farenthold	Keating
Bustos	Fattah	Kelly (IL)
Butterfield	Fincher	Kelly (PA)
Byrne	Fitzpatrick	Kennedy
Calvert	Fleischmann	Kildee
Camp	Fleming	Kilmer
Campbell	Flores	Kind
Cantor	Forbes	King (IA)
Capito	Fortenberry	King (NY)
Capps	Foster	Kingston
Capuano	Fox	Kinzinger (IL)
Cárdenas	Franks (AZ)	Kirkpatrick
Carney	Frelinghuysen	Kline
Carson (IN)	Fudge	Kuster
Carter	Gallego	Labrador
Cartwright	Garamendi	LaMalfa
Cassidy	Garcia	Lamborn
Castor (FL)	Gardner	Lance
Castro (TX)	Garrett	Langevin
Chabot	Gerlach	Lankford
Chaffetz	Gibbs	Larson (CT)
Chu	Gibson	Latham
Cicilline	Gingrey (GA)	Latta
Clark (MA)	Gohmert	Lee (CA)
Clarke (NY)	Goodlatte	Levin
Clay	Gosar	Lewis
Clyburn	Gowdy	Lipinski
Coble	Granger	LoBiondo
Coffman	Graves (GA)	Loebsack
Cohen	Graves (MO)	Lofgren
Cole	Grayson	Long
Collins (GA)	Green, Al	Lowenthal
Collins (NY)	Green, Gene	Lowe
Conaway	Griffin (AR)	Lucas
Connolly	Griffith (VA)	Luetkemeyer
Conyers	Grijalva	Lujan Grisham
Cook	Grimm	(NM)
Cooper	Gutiérrez	Luján, Ben Ray
Costa	Hahn	(NM)
Cotton	Hall	Lummis
Courtney	Hanabusa	Lynch
Cramer	Hanna	Maffei
Crawford	Harper	

Maloney,	Petri	Sires
Carolyn	Pingree (ME)	Slaughter
Maloney, Sean	Pittenger	Smith (MO)
Marchant	Pitts	Smith (NE)
Marino	Pocan	Smith (NJ)
Massie	Poe (TX)	Smith (TX)
Matheson	Polis	Smith (WA)
Matsui	Pompeo	Southerland
McAllister	Posey	Speier
McCarthy (CA)	Price (GA)	Stewart
McCaul	Price (NC)	Stivers
McClintock	Quigley	Stockman
McCollum	Radel	Stutzman
McDermott	Rahall	Swalwell (CA)
McGovern	Rangel	Takano
McHenry	Reed	Terry
McIntyre	Reichert	Thompson (CA)
McKeon	Renacci	Thompson (MS)
McKinley	Richmond	Thompson (PA)
McMorris	Rigell	Thornberry
Rodgers	Roby	Tiberi
McNerney	Roe (TN)	Tierney
Meadows	Rogers (AL)	Tipton
Meehan	Rogers (KY)	Titus
Meng	Rogers (MI)	Tonko
Messer	Rohrabacher	Tsongas
Mica	Rokita	Turner
Michaud	Rooney	Upton
Heck (WA)	Ros-Lehtinen	Valadao
Miller (FL)	Roskam	Van Hollen
Miller (MI)	Ross	Vargas
Miller, George	Rothfus	Veasey
Moore	Roybal-Allard	Vela
Moran	Royce	Visclosky
Mullin	Ruiz	Wagner
Mulvaney	Runyan	Walberg
Murphy (FL)	Ryan (OH)	Walden
Murphy (PA)	Ryan (WI)	Walorski
Nadler	Salmon	Walz
Napolitano	Sanchez, Loretta	Wasserman
Negrete McLeod	Sanford	Schultz
Neugebauer	Sarbanes	Waters
Noem	Scalise	Waxman
Nolan	Schakowsky	Weber (TX)
Nugent	Schiff	Webster (FL)
Nunes	Schneider	Welch
Nunnelee	Schock	Wenstrup
O'Rourke	Schrader	Westmoreland
Duffy	Schweikert	Whitfield
Owens	Scott (VA)	Williams
Palazzo	Scott, Austin	Wilson (SC)
Pallone	Scott, David	Wittman
Pascarell	Scott, David	Wolf
Pastor (AZ)	Sensenbrenner	Womack
Pastor (AZ)	Serrano	Woodall
Paulsen	Sessions	Yarmuth
Payne	Sewell (AL)	Yoder
Pearce	Shea-Porter	Yoho
Pelosi	Sherman	Young (AK)
Perlmutter	Shimkus	Young (IN)
Perry	Shuster	
Peters (CA)	Simpson	
Peters (MI)	Sinema	
Peterson		

NOT VOTING—26

Amodei	Guthrie	Ribble
Barton	Heck (NV)	Rice (SC)
Brooks (AL)	Hultgren	Ruppersberger
Bucshon	Jones	Rush
Cleaver	Larsen (WA)	Sánchez, Linda
Crowley	McCarthy (NY)	T.
Farr	Meeks	Schwartz
Frankel (FL)	Miller, Gary	Velázquez
Gabbard	Neal	Wilson (FL)

□ 1600

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Numbers 2, 3, and 4, I was not present because my flight was canceled due to the extreme weather over the past few days. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" for all three votes.

ELECTING A MEMBER TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the House Republican Conference, I send to the desk a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 453

Resolved, That the following named Member be, and is hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES—Mr. Byrne.

COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES—Mr. Byrne.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTING A MEMBER TO A CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 454

Resolved, That the following named Member be and is hereby elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES.—Ms. Clark of Massachusetts.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNICATION FROM MEMBER OF THE COMMISSION OF THE OFFICE OF CONGRESSIONAL ETHICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WILLIAMS) laid before the House the following communication from Bill Frenzel, Member of the Commission of the Office of Congressional Ethics:

THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION,

Washington, DC, January 7, 2014.

Hon. Speaker JOHN BOEHNER and Hon. Minority Leader NANCY PELOSI,

House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER AND MADAM MINORITY LEADER, I hereby tender my resignation from the Commission of the Office of Congressional Ethics. My own advanced age, and the health of Mrs. Frenzel and myself, are reason enough, but there is also a real need to refresh the Commission on a continuing basis.

It has been a pleasure and privilege to serve the House, and to work with the Chairmen and other members of the Commission, and with its staff. I did not need another job, but I was, and am, convinced that the OCE has made a positive contribution to the House's ethics processes.

I thank you both for your service to the Republic, and wish you continued success.

BILL FRENZEL,

Guest Scholar.

COMMUNICATION FROM MEMBER
OF THE COMMISSION OF THE OF-
FICE OF CONGRESSIONAL ETH-
ICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid be-
fore the House the following commu-
nication from Yvonne B. Burke, Mem-
ber of the Commission of the Office of
Congressional Ethics:

YVONNE B. BURKE,
ATTORNEY AT LAW,
January 8, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker,
Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Leader,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER AND MADAM MINORITY
LEADER: I am serving notice today of my in-
tention to resign from the OCE. It is with
great regrets and only because I accepted a
position as a member of the Board of AM-
TRAK that I am asking to be relieved. The
additional travel to the District for two
meetings has become extremely difficult par-
ticularly because of my other responsibil-
ities.

I have really enjoyed working with the
Members of the OCE and the staff. I feel very
proud of the accomplishments of the OCE
and its positive contribution to the House of
Representatives.

I have been honored to have had this op-
portunity to serve.

Best wishes,

Yours truly,

YVONNE B. BURKE.

APPOINTMENT OF INDIVIDUALS
TO SERVE ON THE GOVERNING
BOARD OF THE OFFICE OF CON-
GRESSIONAL ETHICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The
Chair announces the Speaker's ap-
pointment, pursuant to section 4(d) of
House Resolution 5, 113th Congress, and
the order of the House of January 3,
2013, of the following individuals to
serve on the Governing Board of the Of-
fice of Congressional Ethics.

Nominated by the Speaker with the
concurrence of the minority leader:

Ms. Judy Biggert, Illinois, Alternate,
for the remainder of the term of Mr.
Bill Frenzel

Nominated by the minority leader
with the concurrence of the Speaker:

Brigadier General (retired) Belinda
Pinckney, Virginia, for the remainder
of the term of Mrs. Yvonne Brathwaite
Burke

CONGRATULATING EDEN PRAIRIE
WRESTLING COACH SCOT DAVIS
ON HIS 1,000TH COACHING VIC-
TORY

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given
permission to address the House for 1
minute and to revise and extend his re-
marks.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise
today to congratulate Eden Prairie
Wrestling Coach Scot Davis on his
1,000th coaching victory as his Eagles
squad defeated Columbia Heights by a
score of 58-17 last month at Eden Prai-
rie High School. Davis' 1,000th victory

gives him the most wins of any high
school wrestling coach in the United
States.

While this is Davis' first year coach-
ing at Eden Prairie, he has coached 35
different seasons of prep wrestling, in-
cluding 20 years at Owatonna High
School, where he coached two state
championship teams.

With a group of his friends attending
the match at Eden Prairie, he admitted
to feeling a little bit more pressure
than usual, but the Eden Prairie team
easily delivered the milestone victory.
While Coach Davis said he never set a
specific goal for victories, he did say
that reaching the 1,000th victory was a
special accomplishment.

So again, congratulations to Coach
Davis for accomplishing this impres-
sive feat, and also, thank you for con-
tinuing to dedicate yourself to helping
student athletes with your time and
your talent.

EXTENDING EMERGENCY
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

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

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise
today to speak on behalf of the thou-
sands of my constituents who have had
an essential safety net pulled out from
under them because Congress has failed
to take action to extend emergency un-
employment insurance.

On December 28, 1.3 million nation-
wide, and over 80,000 in my home State
of Illinois, lost unemployment insur-
ance. Our economy is still recovering
from the worst recession since the
Great Depression, and now is not the
time to cut off this important safety
net.

I have heard from hundreds of my
constituents about this, including
Yvonne, a mother of five from Aurora,
Illinois. While she has worked all of her
life, she is now unemployed. Without
unemployment insurance, she will no
longer have a car or any of the re-
sources she needs to look for work and
to get her career back on track.

Unemployment insurance is not a
handout; it is a hand up. Unemploy-
ment insurance is for workers who
have lost their job, through no fault of
their own, and who need a lifeline
while they look for work.

In addition to leaving families with-
out a safety net, failing to extend un-
employment insurance is simply bad
economic policy.

SNAP CUTS AND FARM
MANAGEMENT LOOPHOLE

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given
permission to address the House for 1
minute and to revise and extend her re-
marks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to
voice my objection to the misguided
priorities that are taking shape in the
conference farm bill. More and more,
and despite payment reforms that were

included in both the House and Senate
legislation, it sounds like this farm bill
plans to steal food from the poor to
help pay crop subsidies to the rich.

Unbelievably, on the 50th anniver-
sary of the war on poverty, it is being
reported that the farm bill currently
being negotiated in conference will in-
clude cuts of roughly \$8.5 billion to
food stamps, denying critical food aid
to over 800,000 households.

Some of the same conferees who sup-
port these cuts are looking to strip out
payment limits that are designed to
stop the subsidizing of millionaire and
billionaire farmers, a loophole they are
reopening that was closed already.

They are going to take food from the
hungry: children, seniors, veterans, and
workers. They are going to go out of
their way to ensure that the wealthiest
agribusinesses in America are getting
handouts.

Allowing poor Americans to starve so
that we can subsidize rich corporations
is not why we are here. It is cruel, it is
corrupt, it is immoral, and we have to
do better for the people that we rep-
resent.

WAR ON POVERTY

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

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, 50
years ago today, President Johnson de-
clared a war on poverty. Since that
day, our country has fought to increase
access to resources for those struggling
to make ends meet.

Poverty has declined by more than
one-third since 1967. That is because,
historically, we have had strong bipar-
tisan support for programs like Social
Security and Medicare and tax policies
like the Earned Income Tax Credit.

But the war on poverty is not over.
In 2012 there were 49.7 million Ameri-
cans living in poverty, including 13.4
million of our children.

We cannot break our promise to fight
poverty. That is why this Congress
needs to do everything to strengthen
these programs and lift people out of
poverty.

Tax credits for struggling families
reduced the poverty rate in 2012 by 3
points. SNAP helped to reduce poverty
by 3 points. Unemployment insurance
reduces poverty as well, and it is why
we need to extend it.

Our commitment to these programs
must not waver. Let us work together
to really end poverty now.

UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

(Ms. KUSTER asked and was given
permission to address the House for 1
minute and to revise and extend her re-
marks.)

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, today, I
rise in strong support for renewing the
Emergency Unemployment Compensation
program.

Because Congress failed to act, this
vital program expired on December 28

of last year. Just 3 days after Christmas, 1.3 million Americans, including over 1,000 Granite Staters, were cut off from their benefits. Each week of congressional inaction, as many as 150 additional Granite Staters will lose access to benefits.

This compensation provides a critical lifeline to Granite Staters and other Americans who are struggling to find work.

This includes my constituent Lois Little, a teacher who wrote to me from Colebrook, New Hampshire. At the end of the last school year, Lois lost her job after teaching for 29 years because of falling enrollment in her rural school district. Over the last few months, she has applied to over 100 jobs, without any luck.

Her savings have been exhausted, unemployment benefits are now her only source of income, and she is worried about whether she can keep her home.

Let's come together and give Lois a chance. Let's renew Emergency Unemployment Compensation today.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WAR ON POVERTY

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the success and legacy of the war on poverty. The war on poverty, proposed 50 years ago today in this Chamber by then-President and fellow Texan, Lyndon Johnson, paved the way towards the enactment of many of our Nation's most popular and significant Federal programs, including Medicare, Medicaid, food stamps, Head Start.

These programs, along with Social Security, unemployment insurance, and now the Affordable Care Act, form America's social safety net, which has protected millions of our Nation's children, working adults and elderly from falling into poverty.

Less than 2 weeks ago, through the inaction of this House, 1.3 million Americans, including 65,000 Texans, saw their unemployment insurance disappear. This number will grow to over 3 million in the coming months if action is not taken. This vital lifeline is essential for millions of our fellow Americans who are out of work and struggling to make ends meet.

The 50th anniversary of President Johnson's speech is the perfect opportunity for Congress to show its support for those less fortunate, and I call on this Chamber to bring the legislation to renew Emergency Unemployment today.

□ 1615

PASS UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE NOW

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

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, when Lyndon Baines Johnson came before this House and this Nation to say that the United States, the richest country in the history of the world, should not have people living in squalor and in poverty, shouldn't have seniors eating dog food, shouldn't have poor kids living with no chance of a better life, he did what this Nation really is all about. He really lived up to the true meaning of "liberty and justice for all," and he made those words real when, for so many years, they had not been real.

And yet those programs which lifted millions of Americans out of poverty, that war on poverty which lifted so many out and gave so many people a chance, after about 10 years, there became a war on the war on poverty.

Now the latest battle in the war on the war on poverty, what took place on December 28, 2013, this House refused to extend unemployment insurance for 1.3 million Americans. This is no way to uphold the great legacy of the war on poverty. Let's pass unemployment insurance. Let's do it now.

CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with many Members to mark President Lyndon Baines Johnson's 1964 State of the Union Address.

Let me first take a moment to thank Leader PELOSI; our whip, STENY HOYER; and the chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, Congresswoman MARCIA FUDGE, for their tremendous leadership in leading our agenda for economic justice and for jobs.

This is truly a historic day in our fight to provide every American with a pathway out of poverty. This morning, we were joined here at the Capitol by Linda Johnson Robb, President Lyndon Baines Johnson and Lady Bird Johnson's eldest daughter, to mark the 50th anniversary of her father's State of the Union speech in which he declared an unconditional war on poverty. At the time of his speech, the Nation's supplemental poverty rate was approximately 26 percent; 36 percent of low-income households struggled with food insecurity; and more than a third of American seniors were living in poverty.

And let me tell you, President Johnson got it. He recognized in his speech that poverty is a national problem requiring national organization and support. He knew that in a great society it is absolutely essential that we prioritize investments that lift millions out of poverty. As a result of his vision, his daughter reminded us this morning of the bipartisan and bicameral effort that followed, benchmark antipoverty legislation passed during the Johnson administration, in-

cluding—and I want to remind everyone of these major initiatives that have significantly changed the lives of millions of Americans—the Civil Rights Act, the Urban Mass Transportation Act, the Criminal Justice Act, the Food Stamp Act, the Older Americans Act, Social Security amendments, the Voting Rights Act, the Housing and Urban Development Act, the Public Works and Economic Development Act, the Department of Housing and Urban Development Act, the Amendment to the Immigration and Nationality Act, the Higher Education Act, the Child Nutrition Act, the Child Protection Act, and the National School Lunch Act, in addition to Head Start, Job Corps, of course food stamps, now known as SNAP, Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security.

The result of these policies and programs are undeniable. The poverty rate was cut nearly in half by the mid-1970s. They even had a personal impact on many of us here, a personal impact on me, providing a critical bridge over troubled waters when I was a single mother in the seventies, trying to raise two boys and go to college. And I am forever grateful to the American people for being there for me when I needed them.

And we know that today, 50 years later, these critical antipoverty programs continue to provide that support for vulnerable Americans and people living on the edge. Today, the Nation's supplemental poverty rate is now 16 percent, well below what it was in 1964. The programs put in place after the war on poverty, they work. They create economic security, return people to their dignity, and provide opportunities for Americans to lift themselves out of poverty.

According to a report released by the Center for American Progress yesterday, without the safety net initiated as a part of the war on poverty, "poverty rates today would be nearly double what they currently are." And I will now insert that report into the RECORD.

[From americanprogress.org, Jan. 7, 2014]

KEY FINDINGS FROM OUR NEW NATIONAL POLL

One-quarter to one-third of Americans, and even higher percentages of Millennials and people of color, continue to experience direct economic hardship. Sixty-one percent of Americans say their family's income is falling behind the cost of living, compared to just 8 percent who feel they are getting ahead and 29 percent who feel they are staying even. Twenty-five percent to 34 percent of Americans report serious problems falling behind in rent, mortgage, or utilities payments or being unable to buy enough food, afford necessary medical care, or keep up with minimum credit card payments. While these numbers have somewhat retreated over the last five years, they are still shockingly high, and the disparities across demographic groups underscore how uneven the current recovery has been.

A majority of Americans have a direct personal connection to poverty. Fifty-four percent of Americans say that someone in their immediate or extended families is poor, a figure that has actually increased 2 points

since we conducted our first poll in. Nearly two in three African Americans (65 percent) report a direct connection to poverty, while 59 percent of Hispanics say the same.

Americans vastly overestimate the annual income necessary to be officially considered poor. Perhaps expressing a more realistic understanding of the economy than official government measures currently capture, Americans on average estimate that it takes just over \$30,000 in annual income for a family of four to be considered officially in poverty—about \$7,000 more than the government's poverty line. Most respondents in the focus groups were shocked to hear that the official poverty line was as low as it is; many suggested that it represents a disconnect with the reality of rising prices over the last few years. Americans on average also report that it would take more than \$55,000 in annual income to be considered out of poverty and safely in the middle class.

Americans now believe that nearly 40 percent of their fellow citizens are living in poverty. When we conducted our 2008 poll, 13.2 percent of Americans were living below the federal poverty line, but our survey found that Americans guessed the number to be 29 percent. Today, with unemployment at pre-financial crisis levels and a recovery ostensibly underway for several years, government statistics tell us that 15 percent of Americans live below the poverty level. The public, however, believes that number is now 39 percent—a stunning 10-point increase that flies in the face of economic indicators such as the unemployment rate, consumer confidence, the financial markets, and gross domestic product, or GDP.

Americans strongly believe that poverty is primarily the result of a failed economy rather than the result of personal decisions and lack of effort. In a forced choice test of ideas, nearly two in three Americans (64 percent) agree more with a structural argument about the causes of poverty—“Most people who live in poverty are poor because their jobs don't pay enough, they lack good health care and education, and things cost too much for them to save and get ahead,” underscoring the current economy's failings in the areas of wages, health care, education, and cost of living. In contrast, only 25 percent of Americans agree more with a personal cause—“Most people who live in poverty are poor because they make bad decisions or act irresponsibly in their own lives.” Even white conservatives and libertarians prefer the structural vision of a failed economy over personal reasons for poverty by a wide margin (63 percent to 29 percent).

Retrospective evaluations of the “war on poverty” are mixed, but Americans across ideological and partisan lines believe the government has a responsibility to use its resources to fight poverty. Americans do not generally have a favorable impression of the term “the war on poverty” without additional context about the programs and goals associated with the larger project. But after introducing information to describe the war on poverty and its impact, an overwhelming percentage of Americans—86 percent—agrees that the government has a responsibility to use some of its resources to combat poverty. Moreover, a majority (61 percent) feels that the war on poverty has made a difference, albeit not a major difference, in achieving its goals (41 percent say war on poverty has made a “minor difference”; 20 percent say it has made a “major difference”). Retrospective evaluations of the war on poverty, however, are heavily divided by ideology, partisanship, and race. Nearly 7 in 10 (69 percent) white liberals and progressives believe the war on poverty has worked, and more than 6 in 10 (64 percent) white conservatives and libertarians believe the opposite.

Despite mixed feelings about the original war on poverty, there is strong support for a more realistic goal of reducing poverty by half over the next 10 years. Asked whether they would support or oppose “the President and Congress setting a national goal to cut poverty in the United States in half within ten years,” 7 in 10 Americans said they would support such a goal—40 percent of the public would strongly support the goal—and only 22 percent would oppose it. This figure is quite similar to the 74 percent of support reported in the first study in 2008. Support for a national goal of cutting poverty in half is very strong among African Americans (87 percent support, 58 percent strongly) and reaches roughly 80 percent among both Millennials (79 percent) and Latinos (79 percent). Sixty-five percent of whites support this goal as do a majority of Democrats (89 percent), Independents (66 percent), and Republicans (54 percent).

The public is clear about its priorities for reducing poverty—jobs, wages, and education. Asked which two areas they believe are most important for new investments, 40 percent of Americans choose “creating jobs and increasing wages”; 30 percent choose “job training and workplace preparation”; 25 percent choose “elementary and secondary education”; 23 percent choose “college access and affordability”; and 21 percent choose “early childhood education.”

Americans also express very strong support for a number of policies to help reduce poverty rates with particular intensity around jobs, wages, and education but also on more traditional safety net items. Of the 11 policy ideas tested, five proposals received 80 percent or higher total support and 50 percent or higher strong support from Americans. These five policy proposals are: help low wage workers afford quality child care (86 percent total support, 52 percent strong support); expand nutrition assistance to provide families with healthy food and enough to eat (85 percent total support, 50 percent strong support); make universal pre-kindergarten available for all children (84 percent total support, 59 percent strong support); expand publicly funded scholarships to help more families afford college (84 percent total support, 54 percent strong support); and increase the minimum wage and make sure it rises with inflation (80 percent total support, 58 percent strong support). A second tier of anti-poverty proposals with roughly three-quarters total support and more than 40 percent strong support includes ideas for expanded tax credits like the Earned Income Tax Credit and Child Tax Credit and access to affordable health coverage, as well as proposals for a new national jobs program and more refinancing of mortgages.

Policymakers should feel confident that the American public will support efforts to expand economic opportunity, increase access to good jobs and wages, and maintain a robust social safety net. Harsh negative attitudes about the poor that seemingly defined political discussions throughout the 1980s and 1990s have given way to public recognition that many Americans—poor and middle class alike—are facing many pressures trying to stay afloat and get ahead in the difficult economic environment. Supporters of anti-poverty efforts should not be complacent in their efforts, however, and should recognize that although Americans back government action to reduce poverty, questions remain about the structure and scope of these efforts and how effective they have been over time.

Let me give you an example. SNAP lifted 5 million people out of poverty in 2012 alone; and according to a new report by the White House, released yes-

terday, unemployment benefits reduced poverty by nearly 1 percent in 2012 alone.

Without Social Security, nearly half of our Nation's seniors would live in poverty; and since 2008, unemployment insurance has kept 11 million people out of poverty, including 2.5 million children and adults in 2012.

We are going to talk about not only the history this evening but also about the challenges ahead.

I will now yield to Congresswoman YVETTE CLARKE from New York to speak about many of the challenges which remain, in addition to a historical perspective on the war on poverty.

Ms. CLARKE of New York. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, five decades after President Johnson declared a war on poverty, economic inequality is pervasive in our society; and our work to reduce substantial disparities in income and wealth must continue. But we must not forget that the war on poverty has and will continue to improve the lives of millions of Americans.

For who among us would tell a senior citizen that Medicare was a failure? Or tell the parents of a child who attends preschool under Head Start that that program doesn't work? Who among us would tell the families who have had access to desperately needed—and often lifesaving—health care as a result of Medicaid that that program was not worth the cost?

Mr. Speaker, our work has not yet been completed. In December, we returned home to share the holiday season with our families, to gather at the dinner table, and to exchange gifts. However, millions of Americans were not as fortunate because Congress returned home without extending unemployment benefits to 1.3 million Americans, not including the millions of people who rely on them and their families.

If unemployment benefits are not extended, approximately 5 million Americans are expected to lose emergency unemployment benefits over the next 12 months; and of that number, 383,000 are New Yorkers. Additionally, the lapse in unemployment benefits is likely to result in an increase in demand for the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, known as SNAP.

This is occurring at a time when the Republicans are contemplating making \$40 billion in cuts to nutrition assistance. Already, 3,185,000 New Yorkers are dealing with the impacts of the SNAP benefit cut that happened this past November due to an expiration of funding made available under the American Recovery Act.

This is unfair. This is unjust. It makes no sense and, more importantly, it does not help Americans regain their economic footing. But we have the ability to correct this mistake by extending unemployment benefits and preventing further cuts to SNAP.

Congress can affirm the common priorities that we share as a Nation and

work together to make them a reality. We, as a Congress, must continue to work together to end poverty in America. Having said that, I yield back to the gentlelady in remembrance of President Johnson's 50-year war on poverty. We need to take up the battle once again.

Ms. LEE of California. I now yield to the gentleman from North Carolina, Congressman G.K. BUTTERFIELD.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for yielding and also for her passion and her extraordinary work on the issue of poverty and related causes.

Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago, President Lyndon B. Johnson made a very bold pronouncement. He declared a national war on poverty. President Johnson helped pave the way for so many low-income families, and I am proud today to recognize his immeasurable contributions to the battle against poverty.

I understand that President Johnson's daughter is still on Capitol Hill. She visited with the Congressional Black Caucus today, and I just wanted to publicly thank her and thank the Johnson family for their contributions to America.

Just last year, we commemorated the 50th anniversaries of the March on Washington and Dr. Martin Luther King's historic speech, imploring all Americans to aspire towards a society of equality and acceptance. Dr. King's speech illustrated the racial realities faced by people of color since before even the Civil War.

In 1964, President Johnson delivered a historic State of the Union Address right in this Chamber that exposed the tough racial inequalities present in the 1960s. He gave voice to the poor by contrasting the stark economic differences between the wealthy and the poor, and inspired a series of transformative laws, including the Civil Rights Act and the Economic Opportunity Act. Those laws, Mr. Speaker, established the first Federal framework to combat the racial and economic and educational and even employment inequities that were pervasive in our society. The landmark legislation enacted during the Johnson administration built upon the principles of the Declaration of Independence, the Emancipation Proclamation, the New Deal, and the civil rights movement.

The work began by President Johnson more than a half a century ago continues today with no less urgency. While national poverty metrics have improved since the war on poverty began, income inequality is still a major problem today, and pockets of persistent poverty remain all across our country. In my congressional district, one in four people that I represent, including 36 percent of our children, live at or below the poverty level.

Income inequality in America is getting worse. I want to say that again for emphasis: income inequality in America is getting worse, not better. And

the gap between the haves and the have-nots continues to widen. The poverty rate now is the highest it has been since 1994; and in some parts of my district, median household incomes have dropped—have dropped since the year 2000.

This is a fitting week to recognize the anniversary of the war on poverty, as the Senate considers extending the emergency unemployment insurance for 3 months or more. More than 170,000 unemployed North Carolinians are considered long-term unemployed and have been searching for work for more than 26 weeks.

Last year, North Carolina Governor Pat McCrory dealt a devastating blow to the long-term unemployed by reducing State unemployment benefits, which caused the Federal Emergency Unemployment Compensation program to dissolve in our State. The Governor made this decision knowing its harmful impacts, making North Carolina the only State in the country to end emergency jobless benefits for its citizens. That decision forfeited \$780 million in urgently needed Federal benefits for long-term unemployed North Carolinians and cost our State \$1.5 billion in economic activity.

We must stand up against those like Governor McCrory who seek to disenfranchise the less fortunate by continuing President Johnson's work, by extending the emergency unemployment insurance and other critical programs that help families through difficult times. We cannot afford to turn a blind eye to those who are most in need. We are not that type of country.

Ms. LEE of California. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina.

Now I would like to yield to the Democratic whip, STENY HOYER, whose Democratic Whip's Task Force on Poverty, Income Inequality, and Opportunity I am honored and proud to chair. I thank him very much for being here and for his tremendous leadership.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentlelady for taking this time. I thank the gentlelady even more for taking the time and the focus and being indefatigable in making sure that the richest Nation on the face of the Earth focuses on the least of these in our country. I thank her for her leadership. I am proud that she is working on the Task Force on Poverty, Income Inequality, and Opportunity. And in chairing that effort for our caucus, she is doing an extraordinary job.

□ 1630

It is time, however, that all of us continue to do an extraordinary job. When President Johnson stood in this Chamber at that rostrum, Mr. Speaker, on January 8, 1964, he declared an "unconditional war on poverty in America." That has been said so many times today. He launched a legislative agenda that led to the creation of Medicare, Medicaid, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and nutrition assistance for those at risk of going hungry, particularly our children.

Today, thanks to that war on poverty, infant mortality has substantially decreased, childhood malnutrition has fallen significantly, and college graduations have risen.

But that is not to declare victory. There is much yet to be done. The poverty rate for senior citizens in 1959 was 35 percent. Today, it is 9 percent thanks to the New Deal and Great Society programs. Food stamps continue to keep as many as 4 million Americans out of poverty, which is why it is so critical to provide robust SNAP funding in the farm bill, Mr. Speaker.

Fifty years, a half a century after President Johnson launched the war on poverty, as we take stock of the progress we have made, we must be candid in assessing the difficult challenges that remain before us. That is what Congresswoman LEE is bringing to our attention and to the attention of the country.

Following the Great Recession, and with long-term unemployment higher than it was a few years ago, millions of our fellow Americans are today teetering on the edge of poverty while others still have yet to escape its grasp. In 2012, according to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, nearly 50 million people in America were poor in the richest land on the face of the Earth, and more than one in five of those were children.

States and local governments, under pressure from reductions in Federal funding for domestic programs, are struggling to maintain the safety net that, for a generation, have placed a floor under those who have lost a job, fallen ill, or were born into dire circumstances.

As middle class families have strained under the difficult conditions of the recession and its consequences, the lowest-income Americans have been forced to endure a severe lack of opportunities to enter the middle class. We want to promote jobs. We want to make sure the middle class can succeed, support themselves and their families and have the kind of life that we dream of and promise as an American. We also want to make sure that those who are not middle class can get into the middle class.

In his State of the Union address in 1964, President Johnson said this:

Very often, a lack of jobs and money is not the cause of poverty but the symptom. The cause may lie deeper in our failure to give our fellow citizens a fair chance to develop their own capacities, in a lack of education and training, in a lack of medical care and housing, in a lack of decent communities in which to live and bring up their children.

Poverty is the result, not the cause. Central to our ability to sustain the American dream is our responsibility to one another to make upward mobility possible.

Right now, 1.4 million Americans—right now, Mr. Speaker—are worrying about meeting their basic needs since emergency unemployment insurance was cut off on December 28 of last year,

3 days after Christmas, the season of giving, the season of caring, and the season of thinking about those who are in need. Every week that goes by without turning this lifeline back on will see another 72,000 Americans lose their emergency income.

Congress has the ability to restore these benefits right now, and Democrats, proud of our history leading the war on poverty, will continue to push and demand for that extension. Democrats will keep fighting for a strong, secure, and growing middle class by working to raise the minimum wage—and I see my friend from Maryland (Mr. DELANEY) in the back of the Chamber; Congressman DELANEY has been leading an effort in our State to make sure that we raise the minimum wage—and making sure the Affordable Care Act expands access to quality health care as intended.

We must also create a pathway to citizenship and opportunity for undocumented workers who are living in the shadows in poverty as part of comprehensive immigration reform, and we must be vigorous in enforcing our laws that prevent discrimination in housing, hiring, and access to education.

Mr. Speaker, if we are to make serious progress in the war on poverty in the years to come, it will have to be as a result of both parties working together to prioritize economic opportunity and upward mobility.

Mr. Speaker, I will say that there are Republican leaders, and I applaud them for it, who are talking about and focusing on those in poverty, those who have little in our country. I applaud them for talking, but talk is not enough. We must invest in making sure that they can avail themselves of the promise of America, not by telling the most vulnerable Americans that they will have to fend for themselves, that their fellow citizens will not lend a helping hand during their time of need.

I'm glad, Mr. Speaker, that President Obama has chosen to make reducing economic inequality a focus in 2014. This, Mr. Speaker, ought to be our sacred charge: to carry on the work that President Johnson and others began, without pause, until hunger, homelessness, and economic insecurity, in any form, no longer endanger the promise of our Nation.

I thank the gentlelady for her leadership and for yielding.

Ms. LEE of California. Thank you very much for that very powerful message, Mr. HOYER.

Let me now yield to Representative DANNY DAVIS from Illinois who continues to remind us of the formerly incarcerated individuals who have families and children living below the poverty line.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to thank the outstanding gentlewoman from California for yielding.

I am pleased to join with my colleagues to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the war on poverty declared by

President Lyndon Johnson, a historic moment in our Nation's history when he affirmed a national priority to support those in need.

One of the reasons that I got involved and ran for public office was because of the war on poverty and the programs it created. The war on poverty called for citizen involvement and participation to strengthen America. As I got more involved and more engaged, the more aware I became of the difficulties faced by individuals, families, and communities. Ultimately, I decided I would run for public office.

The war on poverty has improved the lives of millions of low-income Americans through the creation of critical safety net programs such as the ESE Act assistance, Medicare, Medicaid, increased Social Security benefits, Head Start, legal assistance, investment in K-12 education, Federal college aid and loans, a permanent food stamp program, expanded housing assistance for low-income people, community health centers, mental health programs, and we could go on and on to talk about the programs.

But the real reality is that we still have not fulfilled the dream of seriously reducing and eradicating poverty. So we must not only remember, we must not only talk, but we must act. And one of the best ways to start is to provide right now—right now—resources for individuals who are unemployed.

I thank the gentlewoman.

Ms. LEE of California. Thank you.

Let me now yield to the gentlelady from California, Congresswoman SUSAN DAVIS, whom I served with in the California Legislature, who continues to remind us that middle-income individuals are worried at this point now of falling into the ranks of the poor. Thank you for being here.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to thank my colleague, Congresswoman LEE, for this opportunity and for, really, the privilege of working with her for so many years.

Today, the 50th anniversary of the war on poverty, reminds us all that more work must be done. And if I could relate on a personal level, I don't believe that I would have had an opportunity to continue my education without having been about to further that at the time of the war on poverty. As someone who wanted to go into social work, it certainly was an opportunity for me to do that and to make a difference in that area.

One of the most important steps that we can take is to make pre-K available to all American children. Today, only 69 percent of American 4-year-olds are enrolled in early childhood education programs—only 69 percent. You might be surprised to learn that that troubling statistic places us near the bottom—near the bottom—in terms of access among our advanced country OECD peers, in the bottom. In our global economy, that means many

American children start behind least when they can afford to. They just cannot make it beyond that.

The stakes to address this issue today have never been higher. Over the last decade, we have learned that early childhood education makes a big difference. We have learned that the achievement gap begins before our kids even reach kindergarten, and we have learned that quality pre-K leads to better life outcomes in school, in careers, and in personal health. The research, indeed, shows that children who attend preschool are more likely to graduate high school, earn higher pay, and live more productive lives.

Sadly, we are just not putting these lessons of the war on poverty when we began to address these issues, we are not putting these lessons into action. The argument for universal pre-K is not just a lofty moral imperative. That sounds good. No. It is good science and it is good economics. By some estimates, the return on investment is nearly seven to one. And that is why most economists agree that pre-K is a great investment; it is not just another expense.

I know that parents throughout San Diego and across our country just want to give their kids the very best start in life, and we should be working together to make that happen, to make sure all our kids get a real chance to succeed. And that, Mr. Speaker, would be one gigantic step to elevate our children out of poverty.

Ms. LEE of California. Thank you very much for your leadership and for being here with us tonight, Congresswoman DAVIS.

I would now like to yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), someone who has been a fighter and a warrior for many, many years and who continues to remind us of our moral obligation, our religious obligation for many, to ensure that we continue this fight in the war on poverty.

Mr. RANGEL. Let me first thank the gentlelady from California for carrying this torch during a time that there seems to be such a lack of sensitivity to the poor. As with Lyndon Johnson, there was a concentration of those people who vote—that is, the middle class—and somehow even now, 50 years later, we have a lot of concerns, and rightly so, about the middle class, but somehow the poor have just been written off. And the gentlelady from California and our minority leader together have reminded us that we have a basic obligation here that if you want to take care of the country and our spiritual needs, the poor cannot be excluded.

So in listening more recently to the words that President Johnson spoke in the joint session in 1964, it was really an act of courage to talk about something that too many people seemed to be embarrassed about, and the fact is that we had a national obligation to take care of the lesser of our brothers and sisters.

Today we can take for granted Medicaid, Medicare, expansion of Social Security, incentives for our children, and earned income tax credits. All of it was done not as Blacks and Whites or northerners and southerners or Democrats and Republicans, but with a spirit that that was a part of the reason that we were sent to Congress, to make this a stronger Nation.

□ 1645

And it is interesting how moved so many people in the world were to hear the breath of fresh air coming from Rome and from the Pope, not a message to Catholics but a message to the world in pointing out that we have a responsibility to God, to thank Him or Her for what has been given to us; but, more importantly, to follow those Biblical guidelines that say that we have an obligation to think in terms of the lesser of our brothers and sisters. And so whether we are seeking warmer clothes or assistance during times of ill health, it seems to me that we have this political and we have this spiritual need.

Finally, I would like to say to the gentlelady and those listening, I think from a patriot's point of view and from an economist's point of view and from a nationalist's point of view and from a national security point of view, this Nation cannot survive with expansion of the poor, the poverty of the middle class, and the wealthy just accumulating wealth by standing by doing nothing.

What made this country great are not the rich and the poor, but those people who can hope to achieve for their children through education and hard work, to achieve anything that is possible for humankind to do, and this is what built that Nation. And today, it is frightening as we see the disparity between the very poor and the very wealthy, to see that even talks about it would have Presidents and Members of Congress to be called socialists and, indeed, even the Pope. But the fact remains that unless we have people who have the ability to purchase, unless we have small businesses that are responsible for most all of the jobs in this country, unless we have people manufacturing and providing goods and services, then we don't have an economy.

And so no matter which way you look at it, from a political or economic point of view, if our Nation is not going to succeed in terms of economic security, it can no longer be concerned with its national security and the leadership position that we hold in the world.

So let me thank the gentlelady for constantly reminding us that this isn't a one-day job that we have to do. This isn't a Kennedy, Lyndon Johnson, Democrat, Republican issue. This is something that the world is watching what we do with our own, and hoping that once we get our act together, perhaps we can do more for the world.

Ms. LEE of California. I want to thank the gentleman for reminding us

tonight of our moral obligation to the most vulnerable in our country. Thank you for being here.

How much time do I have remaining? The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California has 27 minutes remaining.

Ms. LEE of California. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlelady from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), who will speak on behalf of not only her constituents but the entire country. She has come to Congress, hit the ground running, and continues to remind us of our veterans and the sacrifices that they have made, and to ensure their economic security. So many live on food stamps, unfortunately, as we speak. So thank you for being here.

Ms. DUCKWORTH. I thank the gentlelady.

Mr. Speaker, Lynn Richards of Elgin, Illinois, a town in Illinois that is well known for manufacturing everything from Elgin watches all of the way through to the Elgin street sweeper, still in use today, Lynn Richards of Elgin, Illinois, needs her unemployment insurance extended. In April, she lost her manufacturing job of 3 years. She and her husband kept their family afloat with the help of unemployment insurance. And now, 10 months later, she is pregnant with her second child. She said recently:

I have been working since I was 20 years old. I have never had this much trouble getting a job in my life. I have applied to 200 places, and I have gotten less than 10 calls and just a couple of interviews. No employer wants to hire someone who is pregnant.

Lynn is just one of 80,000 Illinoisans who have lost their unemployment insurance. I understand that these families are facing. When I was a teenager, my father, a combat veteran, was in his mid-fifties and had worked since he had enlisted in the Marine Corps at 16. He lost his job. My dad did everything he could to find work, but was turned down again and again. My mother took in sewing, and I took a minimum-wage job to help make ends meet. Eventually my dad got a job, but Federal assistance programs were there to help keep my family afloat. Many Americans want to find work, but simply cannot. Punishing these families by taking away unemployment benefits is a terrible mistake.

The absence of unemployment insurance is jeopardizing the economic progress that we are making. By removing the benefits to 80,000 Illinois families, we are taking more than \$25 million out of our economy every week. Let's put partisanship aside and extend unemployment insurance now for our families and our businesses.

I thank the gentlelady from California again for her leadership on this issue.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) whose subcommittee I serve on, the Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health, and Human Services.

Ms. DELAURO. I thank the gentlelady for her leadership and her indefatigable pursuit of this cause and the focus of not just this caucus but the country on the issue of poverty and of the poor.

Fifty years ago today, President Lyndon Johnson stood right behind where I stand now and urged the Congress to join him in working to end poverty in the United States. He said to this body:

We have in 1964 a unique opportunity and obligation—to prove the success of our system; to disprove those cynics at home and abroad who question our purpose and our competence.

If we fail, if we fritter and fumble away our opportunity in needless, senseless quarrels between Democrats and Republicans, or between the House and Senate, or between Congress and the administration, then history will judge us harshly. But if we succeed, if we can achieve these goals by forging in this country a greater sense of union, then and only then can we take full satisfaction in the State of the Union.

That opportunity and obligation to prove we can work together, and to do everything we can to end poverty in America, remains with us in 2014. And right now, we are failing that solemn obligation to the American people.

For decades, slowly but surely our efforts in fighting poverty have been making a difference. If you include the social safety net that President Johnson and later generations helped to construct, the poverty rate fell from 26 percent in 1967 to 16 percent in 2012.

This was achieved because, in the past, we have always worked to ensure that a rising tide lifts all boats, that the gains of prosperity are felt broadly, and that in tough times, Americans who fall behind have a chance to get back on their feet.

But recently, we have seen this House majority choose to break this long-standing compact, to turn their backs on the most vulnerable Americans. Consider what they are trying to do to food stamps, our most important anti-hunger program. Food stamps help to feed over 47 million Americans, nearly half of whom are children. For decades, Republicans and Democrats have worked together to pass a farm bill that does right by struggling Americans, even while working to support our farmers.

But even though 99 percent of food stamp recipients live below the poverty line, this majority severed food stamps from the farm bill. They tried to cut food stamps by \$40 billion, meaning 4 million Americans would be denied food.

Even the final conference bill will reportedly cut roughly \$8.5 billion from the program and deny critical food aid to over 800,000 households. Cutting this aid means kids can no longer concentrate in school because they are quite literally starving. It means seniors getting sick and going to the hospital because they can no longer afford proper nourishment.

To take another example, look at what is happening with unemployment

insurance. In the past, as far back as the Eisenhower administration, Congress has worked to extend unemployment benefits when the jobless rate was in the 5-7 percent range.

But last month, even though unemployment remains above 7 percent, this House majority refused to work to extend these important benefits. The benefits have expired. What that means is that 1.3 million American men and women have already lost their unemployment insurance, including 26,000 in my State of Connecticut.

Many are people who had jobs. They lost them through no fault of their own, and who in this difficult economy, and even despite education, training, and job experience, still cannot find a job. Even as the stock market is at record levels, we are telling these Americans you are on your own. We are pulling up the ladder on them and closing the hatch. It is wrong. It is not what America is about. Slashing these programs will hurt and derail our economic recovery.

Our top priority in this Congress should be to do everything that we can to create jobs, help workers, help families get back on their feet. That is the moral responsibility of good government.

In the words of Pope Francis, we should all be “working to eliminate the structural causes of poverty, to promote the integral development of the poor. This means education, access to health care, and above all employment.” That is the great and the still unfinished cause that Lyndon Johnson dedicated us to 50 years ago.

This Nation is watching. It is time for all of us to step up, work together and do the right thing.

Again, I thank the gentlelady for your focus on this critical issue.

Ms. LEE of California. I thank you so much for not only talking the talk, but walking the walk each and every day.

I yield now to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. DELANEY) and thank you so much for your tremendous leadership.

Mr. DELANEY. I thank the gentlelady for yielding me this time this afternoon and for her leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, as we all know, today marks that historic day, the 50-year anniversary of President Johnson declaring a formal war on poverty. And on such a day, we must take note of the progress we have made and remind ourselves of the work that has to be done. Across 50 years, if you take into account the effects of programs this government has put in place to target those on poverty, we have significantly reduced the rate of poverty. We have in particular reduced the rate of poverty for our seniors. These facts are first evidence of the notion that the government can make a difference against this problem.

But we also know that more has to be done. Fifty million Americans live in poverty, including about a quarter of

which are our children, our most vulnerable citizens, children who have their whole lives in front of them and are struggling in poverty. We must make a difference against this, and to do that we must do three things.

First, we need to continue to fund the programs that are proven to make a difference in the lives of those living in poverty like food stamps, like funding Head Start.

Second, we need to raise the minimum wage in this country. Right now in 2014, in the wealthiest country in the world, in many States if you work 40 hours a week and earn the minimum wage, you live below the poverty line. That just doesn't pass the look-yourself-in-the-mirror test. The minimum wage for decades has significantly trailed the growth in our economy. We need to raise the minimum wage. That will make a meaningful and impactful difference in the lives of those struggling in poverty.

And, finally, we need to create jobs. Jobs are the most direct way to lift people out of poverty; and through a job, people have personal dignity. To make a difference in the jobs crisis in this country, we need to invest in education across the long term. That will make a disproportionate difference in terms of the number of people living in poverty. But in the short term, we need to do things to get people to work now, like investing in our infrastructure. This is very important work for us to do, Mr. Speaker.

I will close by reflecting on some of the words of President Johnson. He said this fight would not be short and easy, and he was right. We have been at this for 50 years.

He also said no single weapon would suffice, and he was right about that as well. We need to be raising the minimum wage. We need to be investing in jobs. We need to be funding critical programs like food stamps and Head Start.

And then he said that we must not rest until this war is done. And to honor the tens of millions of people who have lived unfortunately in poverty over the last 50 years and the tremendous number of people who have fought this battle, and to live up to the standard of our maker, we must recommit ourselves to this battle.

Ms. LEE of California. Thank you very much.

Let me now yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), my good friend who constantly throughout his life has been waging this war on poverty. Thank you for being with us.

□ 1700

Mr. KILDEE. I thank the gentlelady from California (Ms. LEE) for her leadership and her stewardship of this important obligation that we are here to commemorate.

Mr. Speaker, it was 50 years ago today that President Johnson stood at that podium right in front of us. I can still conjure the images of that speech.

Of course, these are images of black and white recordings of President Johnson standing there. It reminds me of the special obligation that we are called to and that he articulated so well half a century ago. I was 5 years old when he gave that speech. But like many I know here, I was sort of a precocious kid, and I was really, really interested in our government and in politics, and I followed it from a very young age—even that tender age of 5.

I remember as a kid in the 1960s and early 1970s going through school thinking that the great struggles—the civil rights struggle, the women's rights movement, this war on poverty—were the big fights of our generation. In some ways, I almost felt at that point in time a moment had passed me by never imagining that when the time came so many years later and I would have an opportunity to serve in Congress that we are actually still fighting those same fights, that we are still engaged in that same struggle.

Fifty years later, after President Johnson's speech, in the wealthiest society ever imagined, we are still fighting this war on poverty. In fact, we are seeing recently growing disparity, growing inequality in our society. We have not eradicated poverty. In fact, we haven't yet gotten to the point where we can say we are close.

We do continue that battle. The battle over unemployment insurance, for example, is a part of that same fight. Some in this body would choose to continue their crusade to cut that important program. We have to remind ourselves that just since 2008, 11 million Americans have been saved from poverty because they were able to have that unemployment insurance available to keep them whole until they could find new meaningful, rewarding work.

So instead of cutting these important programs—Head Start, our nutrition programs, the programs that actually change the trajectory of the lives of those who are struggling to find their way in our society—we ought to be doubling those investments, we ought to be making sure that no American ever has to wonder if they will fall below that common floor of decency that we all would agree should be part of any civilized society.

We should have a minimum wage in this country that guarantees that people who work full time don't live in poverty. Fifty years later, we have got a lot of work to do.

I heard the other day—I will close by saying this—I heard the other day a Member of the other body make a comment that perhaps we ought to simply acknowledge that in this Nation we have lost the war on poverty, when 50 years ago a quarter of our society was living in poverty and today that number is 16 percent. While we know we have a long way to go, we know that these programs actually do work. We have to ask ourselves what kind of country, what kind of society do we

want to be? I think if we answer the question right we will live up to the challenge that President Johnson laid down 50 years ago.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, how much time do we have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California has 17 minutes remaining.

Ms. LEE of California. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We have many Members who still would like to speak, which really let's us know the importance of this issue.

I yield to Congresswoman GRACE MENG from New York, a freshman from New York who has hit the ground running, is representing her constituents in a bold and brilliant way. Thank you for being with us.

Ms. MENG. Thank you. I again also want to thank the gentlelady from California for her tremendous efforts in speaking up and advocating for so many people who are voiceless.

Mr. Speaker, I come before you today to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the war on poverty. Our Nation has had many successes over the last 50 years. Medicaid, Medicare, SNAP, and Pell Grants are incredible programs that help our entire country. However, even with these successful programs which deserve our recognition, this is not a time for celebration.

After five decades, many would think that our congressional leaders were still committed to fighting poverty and reducing the gap between the haves and have-nots. I would still think that we are committed to helping hardworking Americans who have fallen on rough times through no fault of their own.

The war on poverty is far from over. Instead of pressing the issue, we are retreating from it. 1.3 million Americans just lost their unemployment insurance and are suffering from long-term joblessness. If we don't renew the program, 383,000 New Yorkers will lose access to benefits over the next 12 months. We would also be responsible for preventing an increase of GDP by 0.2 percent and the blocking of 200,000 jobs.

For me, and I know for many in this Chamber, inflicting avoidable pain on this country is unacceptable. With no political gimmicks, we must vote to renew unemployment insurance now.

Ms. LEE of California. Thank you very much.

Let me yield now to Congressman PETE DEFAZIO from Oregon, who has some stories he would like to tell about his constituents and what they are going through.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentlelady.

Mr. Speaker, on the 50th anniversary, the Republicans just got it a little bit wrong. The war on poverty, they thought it was the war for poverty as they are dismantling one by one the most important programs that help lift and keep people out of poverty, like extended unemployment insurance.

Let me read a few subjects here.

Roseburg, Oregon. A 61-year-old woman working since she was 14:

I don't know if it is my age, but I am having great difficulty finding a job.

A 62-year-old woman from Coos Bay, Oregon, went back to her former employer and said: "Are you hiring?" He said: "You can't be serious. Not at this time of year. Come back in the spring." Unfortunately, she can't make it until spring.

A Eugene veteran. A two-income family, but she lost her job:

Since I haven't been able to find a job, we are close to losing our house and declaring bankruptcy. I am actively seeking employment every day.

Then we go to Springfield, Oregon, my hometown. We have a woman whose son is in the Army. She says:

I can't find a job. I have been looking. I have to give notice to my landlord and become homeless.

Then Corvallis, Oregon. A 54-year-old man. He had been working his whole life since 17. In his last job, he was there for 13 years, but he can't find a job and he is going to be forced into homelessness.

Then, finally, another gentleman from Springfield, Oregon:

\$330 a week I received wasn't much, but it helped keep me from having to go to food banks and asking for help. We went just before Christmas. The food bank had run out of food. I have to decide now whether to buy medicine or food or heat my house.

That is the legacy of the cruel cuts of these Republicans. These are people, hardworking Americans who lost their jobs through no fault of their own and they want to work. If they fall into poverty, they lose their home, they lose their cell service, their telephone, their car. How are they ever going to get a job? We need to help them now before they fall even more off the cliff. Extend unemployment benefits today as a celebration that we, as the American people, do not tolerate poverty in this country.

Ms. LEE of California. Thank you for that very powerful statement and for sharing those stories. All of us have stories very similar, but thank you for your constituents' testimonies.

I yield to Congresswoman MARCY KAPTUR from Ohio. I am privileged to serve with Congresswoman KAPTUR on the Appropriations Committee, who constantly speaks for the voiceless. Thank you for being here.

Ms. KAPTUR. Congresswoman LEE of Oakland, thank you so much for raising the consciousness of a Nation again.

I rise to join my colleagues tonight in support of raising consciousness about how important the programs have been over the years to reduce poverty in our country since the half-century-old effort of the war on poverty started by Lyndon Johnson, a Democrat, who wanted to replace despair with opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to place into the RECORD an execu-

tive summary of the Council of Economic Advisors, dated January 2014, that summarizes the great progress that has been made: poverty in our country declining by more than a third since 1967 because of important programs that Democrats created—Social Security, Medicare, the earned income tax credit, and unemployment compensation, which is being tested as we speak here today. The speaker from Ohio, where unemployment has just gone up, should bring up that bill to extend unemployment benefits that impacts millions of Americans across our country.

People who understand the value of work, they don't want any subsidy, they want a job—they want a job. The most important work we can do is to create jobs, but when they can't get a job, then to give them their earned benefits.

What is great about this evening is I was thinking back to the 1960s—I was pretty young back then—but there was a book written by Michael Harrington, "The Other America." For whatever reason—maybe it was because President Kennedy was President—that book became almost like a small Bible. People read it and it raised their consciousness. I can remember President Kennedy campaigning in the mines in West Virginia and raising consciousness again about the conditions of miners and what they were enduring.

It is very important that we have that same kind of effort across our country to raise consciousness about how important these programs are for our children, for our seniors, for those who are out of work. By working together we, as a people, really do make a difference.

Congresswoman LEE, I want to thank you tonight for being part of that clarion call to raise consciousness of people who really care. The majority of Americans really do. As they are listening to Wall Street announce bigger and bigger and bigger bonuses, they know that there is a war on the middle class right now. So many Americans are falling out of that middle class. They know something is wrong. They want us to champion jobs here in Washington, D.C., and they want to make sure that that safety net is there for them if they hit the skids.

I just thank you so very much for doing this. I thank all of my colleagues who took the time tonight to be here and to issue a clarion call for consciousness for jobs in this country, for extending unemployment benefits, for maintaining Social Security, for maintaining the earned income tax credit, and making sure that our vigilant efforts continue to eliminate poverty in this country.

[From The Council of Economic Advisers, Jan. 2014]

THE WAR ON POVERTY 50 YEARS LATER: A PROGRESS REPORT EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

"Unfortunately, many Americans live on the outskirts of hope—some because of their

poverty, and some because of their color, and all too many because of both. Our task is to help replace their despair with opportunity. This administration today, here and now, declares unconditional war on poverty in America. I urge this Congress and all Americans to join with me in that effort.”

—President Lyndon B. Johnson,

January 8, 1964

Fifty years ago, in January of 1964, President Lyndon B. Johnson declared a “War on Poverty” and introduced initiatives designed to improve the education, health, skills, jobs, and access to economic resources of those struggling to make ends meet. While there is more work to do, in the ensuing decades we have strengthened and reformed many of these programs and had significant success in reducing poverty. In this report, the Council of Economic Advisers presents evidence of the progress made possible by decades of bipartisan efforts to fight poverty by expanding economic opportunity and rewarding hard work. We also document some of the key steps the Obama Administration has taken to further increase opportunity and economic security by improving key programs while ensuring greater efficiency and integrity. These steps prevented millions of hardworking Americans from slipping into poverty during the worst economic crisis since the Great Depression.

Poverty has declined by more than one-third since 1967.

The percent of the population in poverty when measured to include tax credits and other benefits has declined from 25.8 percent in 1967 to 16.0 percent in 2012.

These figures use new historical estimates of the Census Bureau’s Supplemental Poverty Measure (SPM) anchored to today’s poverty thresholds. The SPM is widely acknowledged to measure poverty more accurately than the official poverty measure, which excludes the value of refundable tax credits and benefits like nutrition assistance and has other limitations.

By anchoring the measure to today’s poverty standards we are able to ask how many people in each year since 1967 would have had inflation-adjusted family resources below the 2012 SPM poverty thresholds.

Despite real progress in the War on Poverty, there is more work to do.

In 2012, there were 49.7 million Americans grappling with the economic and social hardships of living below the poverty line, including 13.4 million children.

While the United States is often seen as the land of economic opportunity, only about half of low-income Americans make it out of the lowest income distribution quintile over a 20-year period. About 40 percent of the differences in parents’ income are reflected in children’s income as they become adults, pointing to strong lingering effects from growing up in poverty.

This significant decline in poverty is largely due to programs that have historically enjoyed bipartisan support and increase economic security and opportunity.

A measure of “market poverty,” that reflects what the poverty rate would be without any tax credits or other benefits, rose from 27.0 percent to 28.7 percent between 1967 and 2012. Countervailing forces of increasing levels of education on the one hand, and inequality, wage stagnation, and a declining minimum wage on the other resulted in “market poverty” increasing slightly over this period. However, poverty measured taking antipoverty and social insurance programs into account fell by more than a third, highlighting the essential role that these programs have played in fighting poverty.

Programs designed to increase economic security and opportunity lifted over 45 million people from poverty in 2012, and led to

an average of 27 million people lifted out of poverty per year for 45 years between 1968 and 2012. Cumulatively these efforts prevented 1.2 billion “person years” of poverty over this period.

Social Security has played a crucial role in lowering poverty among the elderly. Poverty among those aged 65 and older was 35 percent in 1960. Following rapid expansions in Social Security in the 1960s and 1970s, poverty among the elderly fell to 14.8 percent in 2012.

These programs are especially important in mitigating poverty during recessions. Despite an increase in “market poverty” of 4.5 percentage points between 2007 and 2010, the poverty rate, appropriately measured, rose only 0.5 percentage points due to both existing programs and immediate actions taken by President Obama when he took office in response to the worst financial crisis since the Great Depression.

“Deep poverty”—defined as the fraction of individuals living below 50 percent of the poverty line has declined as a result of these programs. Without government tax credits or other benefits, 19.2 percent of the U.S. population would have been in deep poverty in 2012, but only 5.3 percent were in deep poverty when these benefits are included.

Programs that strengthen economic security and increase opportunity continue to be essential in keeping millions of Americans out of poverty and helping them work their way into the middle class.

Social Security benefits reduced the 2012 poverty rate by 8.5 percentage points among all individuals, and by 39.9 percentage points among those aged 65 or older.

Tax credits such as the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) and Child Tax Credit (CTC) reduced the 2012 poverty rate by 3.0 percentage points among all individuals, and by 6.7 percentage points among children.

The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP)—formerly known as the Food Stamp Program—reduced poverty in 2012 by 1.6 percentage points among all individuals, and by 3.0 percentage points among children.

Unemployment Insurance (UI) reduced poverty by 0.8 percentage points in 2012.

Antipoverty programs have been increasingly oriented around rewarding and encouraging work and are an important source of opportunity for low-income working families.

Both the EITC and the partially refundable component of the CTC increase the reward to work, offsetting payroll taxes and providing a supplement to labor market earnings. Research has shown this increases work and earnings, and increases participation in the workforce, particularly for single parents.

Some traditional antipoverty programs have been redesigned to encourage and promote work. The vast majority of Americans receiving nutrition assistance have a job or are either too young to work, are over age 65 or are disabled. Meanwhile, bipartisan welfare reform signed by President Clinton in 1996 strengthened work requirements and put a greater emphasis on employment.

Despite concerns that antipoverty programs may discourage employment, the best research suggests that work disincentive effects are small or nonexistent for most programs.

Programs that help fight poverty and provide economic security touch a wide swath of Americans at some point in their lives.

Programs that fight poverty help a broad range of Americans get back on their feet after economic misfortune. For example, about half of taxpayers with children used the EITC at some point between 1979 and 2006, and over two-thirds of Americans aged 14 to 22 in 1979 received income from SNAP, AFDC/TANF, Supplemental Security Income (SSI) or UI at some point between 1978 and 2010.

Social Security Old Age and Survivors’ Insurance, Social Security Disability Insurance, and UI are available to all Americans with a steady work history. These social insurance programs play an important role in keeping out of poverty those who retire, experience a work-limiting disability, lose a parent or spouse, or lose a job through no fault of their own.

The economic and social benefits from these programs go beyond just helping reduce poverty in the current generation.

Increased access to SNAP for children has been found to lead to better health and greater economic self-sufficiency in adulthood.

Increased family income in childhood from the EITC and CTC leads to higher student achievement.

The long-term effects of Head Start and other high-quality preschool programs include higher educational attainment, employment, and earnings, and lower rates of teen pregnancy and crime, as beneficiary children become teenagers and young adults.

President Obama’s policies to restore economic security and increase opportunity have helped reduce poverty.

The Affordable Care Act ensures all Americans have access to quality, affordable health insurance, by providing the resources and flexibility states need to expand their Medicaid programs to all people who are in or near poverty as well as financial help so hardworking families can find a health plan that fits their needs and their budgets.

The President significantly expanded the refundability of the Child Tax Credit, making it available to millions of working parents who were previously ineligible. He also expanded the EITC for larger families, who face disproportionately high poverty rates, and for low-income married couples. Together these expansions benefit approximately 15 million families by an average of \$800 per year. The President is proposing to make these tax credit improvements permanent and also to raise the minimum wage.

The Administration has advanced investments in early learning and development programs and reforms for coordinated State early learning systems. President Obama has proposed the expansion of voluntary home visiting programs for pregnant women and families with young children; Early Head Start-Child Care Partnerships to improve the quality of care for infants and toddlers; and high-quality preschool for every child.

President Obama has advanced reforms of the nation’s K-12 education system to support higher standards that will prepare students to succeed in college and the workplace; pushed efforts to recruit, prepare, develop, and advance effective teachers and principals; and encouraged a national effort to turn around our lowest-achieving schools. The Administration has also put forward proposals to redesign the Nation’s high schools to better engage students and to connect 99 percent of students to high-speed broadband and digital learning tools within the next five years.

President Obama has proposed Promise Zones where businesses partner with local communities hit hard by the recession to put people back to work and communities can develop and implement their own sustainable plans for a continuum of family and community services and comprehensive education reforms.

President Obama has proposed increased employment and training opportunities for adults who are low-income or long-term unemployed, and summer and year-round opportunities for youth along with reforms to

our unemployment system to make it more of a re-employment system, and community college initiatives to reform our higher education system and support training partnerships with business in high-demand industries.

Other achievements include making college more affordable by reforming student loan programs, raising the maximum Pell Grant, and establishing the American Opportunity Tax Credit which is the first partially refundable tax credit for college; placing 372,000 low-income youth into summer and year-round employment in 2009 and 2010; improving access to school meal programs that help children learn and thrive; and extending minimum wage and overtime protections to nearly all home care workers to help make their jobs more financially rewarding.

The fundamental lesson of the past 50 years is that we have made progress in the War on Poverty largely through bipartisan efforts to strengthen economic security and increase opportunity. As our economy moves forward, rather than cut these programs and risk leaving hardworking Americans behind, we need to build on the progress we have made to strengthen and reform them. Going forward, we can't lose sight of the positive part government can continue to play in reducing economic hardship and ensuring access to economic opportunity for all citizens. At the same time, sustainable improvements are only possible if we create jobs and speed the economic recovery in the short run, raise economic growth in the long run, and work to ensure that the benefits of a growing economy reach all Americans.

Ms. LEE of California. Thank you for that very powerful statement, Congresswoman KAPTUR.

I yield now to our assistant leader, my good friend Congressman CLYBURN from the great State of South Carolina, who constantly and consistently talks about prioritizing and targeting resources to area needs, to the poor and low-income communities. Thank you for being here.

Mr. CLYBURN. I thank the gentlelady for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, when President Johnson stood in this Chamber 50 years ago and declared war on poverty, the richest country in the world had a poverty rate of 19 percent. President Johnson cautioned us on that evening that the war on poverty would be a long one and not an easy one. Yet, 9 years later, in 1973, the poverty rate in this country had dropped to 11 percent. We were most definitely winning the war on poverty.

Unfortunately, after its initial success, many politicians found success running down the achievements the war on poverty had on many Americans. Politicians scapegoating so-called "welfare queens" furthered a narrative that the war on poverty was not worth fighting. Yet, I can show you firsthand examples in my home State of South Carolina where the war on poverty did, in fact, succeed.

For example, Medicare and Medicaid, both war on poverty initiatives, have made a tremendous difference in the health security of older Americans and those of modest means. In fact, at the time of the institution of Medicare, the poverty rate among seniors was over 30 percent. Today, the poverty rate

among seniors has dropped to beneath 10 percent.

□ 1715

It is important to remember that, a year after President Johnson made that speech, we passed the Voting Rights Act of 1965. That, to me, was to empower poor people, to empower people of color to go to the polls, to get registered and to vote to make their own statements as to how to fight the war on poverty.

Today, we in the Congressional Black Caucus have been calling for our government to do across the board what we did in our so-called "stimulus bill," and that is to institute a 10–20–30 initiative to direct funds to targeted areas so that 10 percent of all of this money can go into those communities where 20 percent or more of the population have been locked beneath the poverty level for the last 30 years. If we were to begin to target these persistent poverty counties, we would, in fact, eliminate poverty, and we would see all of our people who are living in poverty get beneath the 10 percent that we think will be tolerable over the next 10 years.

Ms. LEE of California. Thank you so much for being here with us and for your leadership, Mr. CLYBURN.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman has 1 minute remaining.

Ms. LEE of California. Let me yield now to the gentlelady from Texas, Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I want to thank the gentlelady from California for her leadership.

Mr. Speaker, simply, we can begin to attack poverty in 2014 by extending the unemployment benefits for 1.3 million Americans.

Thank you, President Johnson, as we honor the fight against the poverty that has encompassed so many Americans. The war on poverty is a war to be won. We thank you for VISTA, the Child Nutrition, the National School Lunch, the Food Stamp program, the Community Action Programs, the Indian Reservation Programs, and Legal Services.

I served on the board of the Gulfcoast Legal Services, and we say to our colleagues: if you would look at the red that is on these sheets, you will know that poverty does not belong to any one Member. It belongs to all Members. All States have individuals who are living below the poverty line. It is time to continue the fight against poverty through unemployment insurance, through job training, through the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, through child care, and Head Start—a vital, vital, vital transition of opportunity for poor children. It is time to continue that fight.

It is our pledge and our commitment, along with legislation that I intend to introduce, to give enhanced training to those who are chronically unemployed,

to keep the dream of President Johnson's alive and to extinguish poverty as we know it in the United States of America.

President Lyndon Johnson:

"... we have the power to strike away the barriers to full participation in our society. Having the power, we have the duty."

It has been 50 years since President Lyndon Johnson declared war on poverty, an initiative to endure the ideals and principles of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, with hopes to rid our nation of the plague and disparity of poverty.

Social programs established by the War on Poverty provide invaluable aid to the elderly, the seriously disabled, members of working households, and children and spouses of deceased workers.

NATIONAL SUCCESSES OF THE WAR ON POVERTY
Major initiatives include: The Social Security Act 1965; Food Stamp Act of 1964; The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964; Job Corps; Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA).

Programs established during the era of President Johnson and those created since as result of his initiative have cut poverty nearly in half.

In 2012, programs kept 45 million people, to include 9 million children, out of poverty according to the Census Bureau's Supplemental Policy Measure (SPM).

If benefits were taken away, the poverty rate in America would be 29 percent under the SPM, but with them, the rate is 16 percent.

Cumulatively, programs developed during the War on Poverty have prevented 1.2 billion "person years" of poverty.

One of the demographics most affected by poverty was the elderly. In 1960, 35 percent of those ages 65 and older lived in poverty. With the implementation of Social Security, poverty among the elderly fell to 14.8 percent in 2012.

PROGRAMS ENCOURAGE WORK AND CREATE REWARDING OPPORTUNITIES FOR LOW-INCOME FAMILIES

The Earned Income Tax Credit and the Child Tax Credit have not only reduced the poverty rate by 3.0 percentage points among all individuals and 6.7 percentage points among children, they reward work by offsetting payroll taxes and providing a supplement to labor market earnings.

Research shows these tax credits increases work and earnings, and increases participation in the workforce, especially for single parents.

DESPITE TREMENDOUS SUCCESS, WE HAVE TO KEEP MOVING

Though substantial progress has been made in the War on Poverty, in 2012 nearly 50 million Americans, including 13.4 million children, remained below the poverty line.

As result of these impoverished conditions, our American youth is subject to substandard housing, homelessness, inadequate food and nutrition, poor childcare, lack of access to health care, and dangerous neighborhoods.

Poorer teenagers and young children are at a significant risk for poor academic achievement, dropping out of school, behavioral problems and delays in development.

The American Opportunity Tax Credit makes college more affordable by being the first partially refundable tax credit for college, placing 372,000 low-income youth into summer and year-round employment in 2009 and 2010.

POVERTY STATISTICS IN TEXAS AND THE 18TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

Eighteen percent of households in the state of Texas from 2009 through 2011 ranked second in the highest rate of food insecurity only the state of Mississippi exceed the ratio of households struggling with hunger.

In the 18th Congressional District and estimated 151,741 families lived in poverty.

INITIATIVES TAKEN TO PREVENT POVERTY IN TEXAS AND THE 18TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

H.R. 3773, Unemployed Jobhunters Protection and Assistance Act of 2013 will reinstate vital benefits for 64,294 Texans and maintain benefits for 4,112 Texans per week slated to lose them.

Unemployment insurance payments provide partial income replacement to unemployed workers who meet the requirements of State law.

The State of Texas requires that the unemployed insurance payments only go to persons who are unemployed at no fault of their own.

Unemployment payments beyond 26 weeks in the state of Texas are made as a direct result of Federal funds sent to the states to extend unemployment insurance payments.

To continue to receive unemployment benefits in the State of Texas an unemployed person must be actively looking for work and provide evidence of their continued job search by reporting where they: submitted an application; had a job interview; or submitted a resume.

According to the White House Council of Economic Advisers and the Department of Labor, Texas will lose 11,766 jobs if unemployment insurance payments are not reinstated.

IN SUMMARY

Throughout the 50-year history on the War on Poverty, great progress has been made largely due to bipartisan efforts to strengthen economic security and increase opportunity.

At this crucial time in our history, it is important to maintain the vision established by President Johnson, to continue to combat poverty with our maximum effort. Cutting programs now will only undermine 50 years of hard-work to better the lives of millions of Americans.

WAR ON POVERTY LEGISLATION AND PROGRAMS

VISTA (Volunteers in Service to America)—Provided an opportunity for individuals, 18 and over, to join the War on Poverty. Volunteers would work with migrant laborers, on Indian reservations in urban and rural community action programs, in slum areas,

hospitals, schools and in institutions for the mentally ill and retarded.

Child Nutrition Act of 1966—This was an anti-hunger program started by President Johnson as part of his "War on Poverty". It created the special milk and school breakfast programs.

National School Lunch Act of 1968—This act extended the school lunch program to include children who participated in "service institutions".

Food Stamp Act of 1964—Made the Food Stamp Program permanent, strengthened the agricultural economy, and provided improved levels of nutrition among low-income households

Community Action Programs of 1965 (CAP)—Under these programs the government was to provide both financial and technical assistance for locally designed and operated programs. Funds could be used for trips for slum children, remedial reading, job counseling, day care services etc.

Migrant Assistance—The act authorized \$35 million for loans and grants in 1965 for development of programs to aid migrant workers in housing, sanitation, education, and day care of children.

Indian Reservation Programs—Health, educational and job training programs are typical components of Indian projects. As a component of the Community Action Program, projects for Indians were established on 31 reservations housing 60,000 for America's Indians during the year of 1965.

Legal Services (1965)—This program provided (1) legal representation for the poor, (2) research into the legal problems of poverty, (3) education of the disadvantaged about legal rights and responsibilities, and (4) advocacy of improvements in the law affecting the poor.

Small Business Loans—Title IV authorized the Director to make 15-year repayable loans to establish or strengthen small businesses and help them to employ the long-term unemployed.

Rural Loans—The Office of Economic Opportunity Director was authorized to make 15-year loans of up to \$2,500 to low-income rural families who could not get credit elsewhere.

Economic Opportunity Act of 1964—Created the Jobs Corps and the Community Action Program

THINGS YOU SHOULD KNOW ABOUT POVERTY IN AMERICA

The number of Americans living in poverty (less than \$22,314 for a family of four) stands at 46 million people or 15.1 percent of population.

The actual number of poor Americans living in poverty nearly increased 20 percent since the publication of *The Other America* in 1962.

Economic growth didn't trickle down: Since 1980, GDP has doubled while poverty rates have remained essentially flat.

Americans in deep poverty: 20.5 million Americans, or 6.7 percent of the population, have an income less than HALF of the poverty line (less than \$11,157 for a family of four). This rate has doubled since 1976.

Children Under Age 18 in poverty: 16.4 million, 22 percent of all children, including 39

percent of African-American children, 35 percent of Latino children, and 12 percent of white children.

People in Single female-headed families (with children) have a poverty rate of 42 percent.

Roughly one in three Americans live at twice the poverty level or less (less than \$44,628 for a family of four): That's more than 103 million people.

Half the jobs in the country now pay less than \$33,000 a year, and a quarter pay less than the poverty line of \$22,000 for a family of four; but public policies including the Earned Income Tax Credit, the Child Tax Credit, Supplemental Security Income, and Social Security, kept 40 million people from falling into poverty in 2010.

Poverty rate among the elderly was reduced by nearly half between 1967 and 1975, and reached a historic low of 8.9 percent in 2009, due in large part to Social Security.

Ms. LEE of California. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I have Congresswoman SCHAKOWSKY and Congressmen GREEN and BISHOP here, who would like to insert their statements into the RECORD. We had an overwhelming number of Members who attended, and they did not have the opportunity to speak tonight.

GENERAL LEAVE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, all Members will have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of this Special Order.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on this day in 1964, President Johnson's called on our nation to launch an 'unconditional war on poverty'. Exactly 50 years later, we can state with confidence two truths.

The programs resulting from Johnson's War on Poverty have improved the lives of Americans of all ages in innumerable ways.

True, the war on poverty has not been won. I submit that now is NOT the time to end our battle.

Today, there are nearly 50 million Americans grappling with the economic and social hardships of living below the poverty line, including 13.4 million children.

In my district in Southwest Georgia alone, more than one in four people and almost one of every two children fall below the poverty line.

And yet without programs such as unemployment insurance, Rural Tax Credits, school lunch programs, affordable housing, Medicare, Medicaid, Job Corps, SNAP, TRIO, and others, where would we be?

In Georgia alone:

Over 29,000 children from low-income families would be without critical early stage developmental resources provided by Head Start and Early Head Start.

Over 1.8 million low-income individuals and families would lose the ability to choose healthy food options through SNAP for themselves and their children.

And so on.

America's War on Poverty has gone beyond just helping reduce our poverty rate. It has educated, fed, housed, and trained millions of Americans, giving them hope and preparing them for a more successful tomorrow.

By many estimates, the reduction in poverty has drastically improved the way of life for many Americans over the past 50 years.

Lastly, and most importantly, we must remember that the label 'poor' means more than a cold numeric value attributed to one's earning potential. We must remember that America's poor have a face. That face exists today!

They are the homeless, freezing in the cold, because their job does not pay enough to cover the rent or because they have no job. They are children who cannot concentrate at school because hunger fills their daytime thoughts. They are uninsured Americans who, before the passage of the Affordable Care Act, could not afford quality health insurance.

They are hard working Americans just striving to make ends meet and, like the majority of us, gripped with the goal of creating a better life for themselves and loved ones.

We cannot turn our back on them now.

We must continue to fight the war on poverty—and we must win!

We must rededicate ourselves to the values that Lyndon Johnson lifted up 50 years ago.

Values that set a moral standard for America and for which we still must strive. Values that were given to us over 2,000 years ago by Jesus in the parable of the Sheep and the Goats found in the 25th Chapter of Matthew.

For when I was hungry and you gave me something to eat, I was thirsty and you gave me something to drink, I was a stranger and you invited me in. I needed clothes and you clothed me, I was sick and you looked after me. And whatever you did for one of the least of these brothers and sisters of mine, you did for me.

President Johnson took that to heart 50 years ago. And we today must do the same.

HOMEOWNER FLOOD INSURANCE AFFORDABILITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MARINO. 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 gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to continue to bring attention to an issue that is devastating the people of Pennsylvania—across the 10th District and other districts in Pennsylvania—and across this country. It is the implementation of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012.

It has unintentionally burdened lower- and middle class homeowners and small businesses. Rates have increased astronomically. Biggert-Waters had the best of intentions. However, FEMA's methodology is severely flawed, and FEMA failed to warn Congress.

This afternoon, I am joined by a bipartisan group of my colleagues from across the country; and while the de-

tails of a proposed solution may vary, I believe we are unified behind the goal of protecting the livelihoods and investments of hardworking Americans.

Our homes are often our most valuable assets in that they allow us to retire; they allow us to send our children to college; they allow us to leave something behind for our children and our grandchildren for a better life. These homes form the backbone of riverside and coastal working-class communities. The downfall of these residential real estate markets will be catastrophic. Homeowners will lose their total investments in their properties. Small businesses will lose their customers, not to mention their real estate. Small banks will go out of business because people are not able to pay the insurance that the mortgages call for. The communities left behind will no longer have an adequate tax base to fund basic services.

I believe the best solution right now is to repeal Biggert-Waters in its entirety and to start again from square one. Authors of the law on the House Financial Services Committee intended to stabilize the National Flood Insurance Program, but this law has disproportionately affected low- and middle class homeowners who cannot afford these premiums.

Although we here in Congress tend to think in abstract terms, I want to share some of the stories I have heard from my neighbors back home in the 10th Congressional District of Pennsylvania.

Jeff and Erica Waldman purchased a house in Muncy, Pennsylvania. Their flood insurance premium was initially \$900 per year. Now they are being told to pay by the end of last year—the 31st, a few days ago—\$9,000 a year for flood insurance—up front. Jeff and Erica are frustrated about the lack of information they were given and are days away from losing their home as we speak. We cannot solely place this burden on people like Jeff and Erica.

Laurie and Michael Portanova purchased three historic properties in Jersey Shore, Pennsylvania, last year, hoping that their new business would rejuvenate the Main Street feel for the borough. Their flood insurance premium per year was \$2,800. They received a notice that they had to pay \$40,000 by the end of the year for flood insurance, by the end of 2013. They are close to walking away from their investments and taking a huge loss. This would also have devastating consequences on other property owners in Jersey Shore, who will have an additional tax burden if homeowners in the area are not able to keep their homes because they are not able to pay the flood insurance.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman THOMPSON.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman for yielding, and I appreciate my good friend from Pennsylvania for

hosting this Special Order on a very serious issue.

Biggert-Waters, I think, was a piece of legislation that we all had great hopes for in terms of the National Flood Insurance Program. As the commercial insurance industry really exited the insuring of flood risk, it was left to the Federal Government; and with the recent flooding, obviously, over the past number of years, that fund has been decimated. Last year, on a bipartisan basis, Congress passed the Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012. The measure included some long overdue reforms that strengthened the financial solvency and administrative efficiency of the National Flood Insurance Program.

The rationale for the 2012 law was the need for the National Flood Insurance Program to more accurately reflect flood risk. Historically, most low-risk States have subsidized higher risk States, mostly coastal. Similarly, low-risk areas within the States have tended to subsidize those areas with a higher risk, more prone to flooding. The linchpin of the 2012 law, however, was to use true actuarial rates in order to prevent very low-risk areas from subsidizing moderate to high-risk areas. The unintended consequences have been drastic premium increases for those plans that were traditionally subsidized by the National Flood Insurance Program.

Under the law, Congress mandated that the Federal Emergency Management Agency complete an affordability study to further evaluate any unintended consequences as a result of the changes. The study was to be completed before the rate increase went into effect. I want to repeat that. The law that was passed in 2012 had a safeguard in there that the administration, through the agency FEMA, was to do affordability studies before rates went up. That is not what happened, Mr. Speaker. That would have been critical to understanding the full scope of the new risk model. FEMA has failed to complete the affordability study that was required under the law. Additionally, there remains a huge concern that FEMA does not have the data that it needs to accurately determine risk under this new policy regime and that it is incapable of creating a new mapping system that truly reflects true actuarial rates.

Now, while 80 percent of the policyholders in this country will not see an increase as a result of the new policy, a small portion of the properties in this country—actually, I think it is a significant portion of properties—are being hit with staggering increases. This is a serious concern for communities and individuals across the country, including many from the Fifth District of Pennsylvania.

Just recently, I have heard from counties, communities and homeowners from Cameron County and Erie County—Clinton, McKean, Crawford, Potter, Huntington, and Centre—and

that is just in recent days. I think we are at risk of creating ghost towns as homes have lost so much value. You may be able to afford the mortgage, but you can't afford the flood insurance. As my good friend said, the number one assets that individuals have in their lives are their properties—their homes, their real estate. When it comes time to be able to sell them, they are not able to liquidate them because there is no one out there who is able to buy. So we are really at risk of creating these ghost towns unless we make the necessary changes, I think, to have the administration comply with the law as it was passed in 2012 in terms of affordability rates.

Colleagues on both sides of the aisle have come together to correct this critically important issue. I am an original cosponsors of the Homeowner Flood Insurance Affordability Act, H.R. 3370. I know my good friend Mr. MARINO has introduced another bill that would completely repeal Biggert-Waters, most recently introduced within the past couple of days.

H.R. 3370 is a bill to terminate the rate increase under the Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012 until 2 years after the Federal Emergency Management completes the rate affordability study originally mandated under the law. The bill also makes structural changes to FEMA to ensure that there are advocates for homeowners when flood maps are drawn or adjusted.

Mr. Speaker, improving the financial viability of the Nation's flood insurance program while ensuring that program protects those it was designed to support is something every Member of this body should support.

I encourage my colleagues to join in this commonsense effort to protect and improve our Nation's flood insurance program but also to make sure that our real estate market remains strong and viable and that that important asset that individuals have remains able to be bought and sold.

I thank the gentleman for hosting this Special Order.

□ 1730

Mr. MARINO. Thank you, Congressman THOMPSON.

I would like to add a true story happening right now in my district due to these increases in rates. Nikki Burrows met her husband, bought their home in Muncy in 2006. Insurance premiums more than doubled from \$862 to \$1,750; but because the Burrows had suffered flood damage from Tropical Storm Lee in 2011, they are subject to an additional 20 percent on their premiums until they max out. Add an annual fee of \$4,000 annually. So, in essence, they went from \$862 a year to \$4,000 a year because they were hit in one of the floods.

These Burrows are trapped. These townships and small towns along the rivers are trapped into a situation where the average mean income is about \$37,000. That's before taxes.

That's before mortgage payment. That's before food for the kids. That's before other insurances. Yet these people are to come up with \$4,000, \$6,000, \$8,000 and \$10,000 up front, per year, for flood insurance because of the unintended consequences of Biggert-Waters.

At this time, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts, Congressman KEATING, my colleague across the aisle and a former prosecutor.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

In an all-too-common occurrence in this Nation today, the Murphy family in Wareham, Massachusetts, has seen flood insurance premiums rise dramatically, from \$500 annually in their instance to \$5,000, a 10-time amount of an increase.

Anthony Frangie who is a Realtor at the South Shore portion of Massachusetts has seen multiple home sales fall through specifically because the flood insurance premiums were too high. This is a real estate industry, not just in my home State, but across the country, that has been reeling as a result of the worst downturn in the housing industry in recent years that our country has ever experienced.

They are beginning to come forward, sales are occurring. One of our most important industries, our housing industry is beginning to drive our economy forward, yet this is going to drive us back. The lending institutions that support this in States like Florida, where the inventory was so high, where they had houses that people walked away from because they couldn't afford and they couldn't sell themselves, now they have experienced improvement. But this is going to set them back, and it is going hurt our economy in the process, not just regionally, but nationally.

Last year, the owners of Haddad's Ocean Cafe in the community I represent of Marshfield renovated their restaurant to reflect the current flood requirements, and they went further. They even went higher when they made these kind of very expensive renovations, going above what was needed. Today, with the new flood maps, they must pay millions of dollars in additional renovations to further raise the building even higher or pay flood insurance premiums far in excess of \$30,000 annually, something that endangers their ability to conduct basic business.

These are just a few of the numerous examples and challenges facing homeowners and businesses that have arisen through the implementation of the new flood insurance changes. FEMA, at hearings that we have had here in answering to this issue about the implementation, has said they perceive their job to overestimate the impact of this. Clearly, there's something wrong with the implementation of this law.

Our office has had individual after individual come forward to us with things that affect their own person and their own homes looking for help. Some of them that can afford it have

moved forward with appeals. Many of those appeals have been successful. Yet they have had to invest and risk thousands of dollars in elevation studies in terms of site reviews just to bring their case forward.

Communities have gone together and brought forth appeals for the entire community. One of those communities in my district went forward; and they were so detailed, I looked at what they said and decided to bring it to the attention and to ask the advice and expertise of one of the Nation's top coastal expert groups. That's the University of Massachusetts School of Marine Science and Technology in Dartmouth, Massachusetts.

What they determined with their review was that the methodology used to determine these maps was faulty. In fact, one of the things they found was the wave structure that results in flooding is the result of storm surges and violent storms in the east and Atlantic coast and responsible for the floods. That wasn't used as the methodology to determine what the impact would be on the maps and what the cost would be for flood insurance on all these homeowners. Indeed, they used the methodology based on the Pacific Ocean, with a longer, slower wave structure; and the scientists and coastal engineers that reviewed this for us said what they did, determined to be the maps, was based on faulty science.

Now individuals are facing enormous burdens, as my colleagues have so aptly demonstrated. In terms of annual payments, that could be the difference between being able to stay in your own home, live in your own home, or not; annual payments that affect many people on fixed income who had never, ever budgeted for this and are throwing them into the most difficult decisions of how they are going to heat their home, how they are going to afford to live, what they are going to do. Even younger people who are using or hoping to use the equity on their home to pay for their kids' college education are finding that, instead of having this go towards that important goal in their life, it is going to pay for flood insurance.

Now, this is an important thing, not only how it affects people on annual payments, but what this also does, this affects and can affect the entire value of their home. In fact, real estate people are finding as they are going to sell the homes, that the homes that were valued one way are now dramatically being reduced because of the cost of annual flood insurance attached to that home.

So what we have really is a taking, as a result of the implementation, a taking of people's assets, of their savings, of the roof over their head, of the number one financial asset they have in their lives. Clearly, this is not the role of government to effectuate this kind of taking, because maybe the math is totally wrong and they shouldn't be included at all or maybe it

is off just 1 foot and it has this kind of devastating financial and personal impact. That's why I have joined my colleagues in being one of the original sponsors of the Homeowner Flood Insurance Affordability Act.

Now this is done in a House that is often challenged in terms of working across the aisle, in terms of working in a bipartisan manner. But in this instance, it is a sterling example of how we have worked together across the aisle in a common interest, realizing how important this is to the people we represent, realizing how important this is to the real estate industry nationally, realizing how important this is to the lending institutions nationally and making sure that government isn't acting in a way that is actually seizing their personal assets and their life savings.

We have an obligation, having worked together so hard and, in my opinion, achieving a very significant majority of the Members of this House of Representatives to pass this kind of delay, to get it right and make sure we are treating people fairly, that it is inherent that this bill be brought to the floor for a vote and be brought to the floor quickly for a vote. We were expecting Senate action in this just in the next few weeks.

It is my hope, it is my plea, it is our obligation as the court of last resort representing these people who have so much in jeopardy right now, to bring it to the floor, to get a vote, to pass it, to get a delay to be able to make sure we go to FEMA and say, You are dealing with people's livelihoods. You have an obligation to get it right and get it done. And when they do, this bill will also allow us here in Congress to review it and make sure the implementation is continued in the correct manner.

Let's move forward on this very important issue as soon as possible. Let's show this as one more example, during these very challenging times politically, of what happens when this House listens to the people in their district and around the country, works together to get something done and does the right thing. It is my fervent hope that we can do this quickly.

Mr. MARINO. Thank you, Congressman KEATING.

I would like to reiterate the devastating effects that these premiums are having on the values of homes, affecting retirement plans, retirement plans for a lot of our seniors in the district. Tom Rishel, Tom is out of a pension. He does not have a retirement plan, so he invested in several properties in Muncy, Pennsylvania, hoping to one day resell the properties. His premium, on just one property, has jumped from \$600 a year to over \$9,500 a year. Tom, who is 70 years old, fears his properties are worthless and his dreams of retirement have been destroyed.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi, Congressman PALAZZO.

Mr. PALAZZO. Thank you, Congressman, and thank you so much for putting this Special Order together this evening for us to talk about the devastating effects the Biggert-Waters Act is going to have on flood insurance premiums just not along coastal areas, but all across America.

For more than 40 years, residents who have lived in flood-prone areas have paid into the National Flood Insurance Program because virtually no private flood insurance market existed. The issues I and my colleagues have spent so much time addressing over the last year affect these 5 million NFIP policyholders.

What many Americans do not realize is that they could be the next flood victim, and they could be the next victim of these drastic flood insurance hikes and flawed FEMA policies.

According to FEMA Director Craig Fugate, 40 percent of the U.S. population lives in counties that border the ocean or the Great Lakes and are directly or indirectly affected by flood risk, and most U.S. counties contain rivers and streams that present flood hazards. Forty percent of the U.S. population—that's more than 126 million Americans—could be affected by these issues in the coming years.

This map shows exactly where you can find NFIP policyholders. We are not just talking about a few people living in coastal areas. This isn't just Mississippi, Louisiana, New York, New Jersey, or Florida's problem. This map hasn't even been updated to include those affected by the recent flooding in Colorado. We are talking about millions of people across America in every single State and just about every single congressional district who will be impacted by these drastic rate increases.

The Biggert-Waters Act of 2012 was passed with the intention of insuring that the program remained solvent for these policyholders to ensure that it is there for the people who have paid into the system when a disaster strikes. It was never intended to make rates so unaffordable that flood insurance is no longer attainable for these policyholders. Yet when you look at what is happening now and the way FEMA is implementing the law, that's exactly what we are seeing.

There are those who have said these people are just a bunch of wealthy waterfront homeowners. That is simply not true. I can tell you that's not the case in my district. I am hearing from teachers, veterans, fishermen, people who work at the shipyards in support of our Navy. These are everyday Americans, some of whom live 50 or 100 miles or more inland. These are folks who have been responsible in maintaining flood insurance policies for years and sunken untold thousands of dollars of their own funds into their community's recovery from Hurricane Katrina.

They built back to higher FEMA standards, many of them invested in mitigation against future risk. They

used every tool at their disposal and went to great lengths and great costs to comply with the law and do their part. Now they are being punished for doing that. They are being hit with astronomical rate increases overnight, or worse, they are unable to get straight answers from FEMA or from their flood insurance agents who are looking to FEMA for answers.

Many are retirement age. One bank in my district has estimated that at least 400 elderly homeowners are facing rate increases that are so drastic that it could force them into foreclosure.

Take Cheryl, a retired special education teacher married to Gerald, a retired aluminum plant worker and a Navy veteran. She says:

Please don't think that we live in a waterfront home. We live in an older neighborhood, miles inland.

She tells me that for 11 months they lived in a camper while working to rebuild, taking "extra precautions" and meeting the demands of inspectors and permits throughout the process.

"We felt proud to be part of the rebuilding of the Mississippi Gulf Coast" she says. But she also tells me, "A large increase could bury us."

Another military retiree couple on fixed incomes writes that their flood insurance rates have been estimated to rise from \$400 a year to at least \$4,000 a year. He says: "Despite doing our 'homework' prior to purchase, putting a considerable down payment on the home, doing due diligence following the storm by repairing our home" that flood map changes and increasing flood insurance rates have put them in the position to possibly lose their home with no fallback.

Linda, a 65-year old single woman, tells me she hopes to retire after 40 years working as a teacher. She says:

Like so many others, I rebuilt my home after Katrina following the guidelines of then current flood maps. If the flood rates go to the proposed levels there's no way I can afford to keep my home. I have worked all of my life, contributed to the community I live in, followed the rules, paid my debts. Now I am faced with losing my home, my retirement, and my sense of security.

□ 1745

These are just a few examples of how these rate increases are affecting everyday Mississippians. Millions more like them are all across the Nation, and some don't even realize the storm that is coming.

We are not just talking about a few folks along the coast. We are not talking about wealthy, waterfront homeowners looking for a taxpayer handout. Anyone who says otherwise is incredibly misinformed or blatantly misleading the American people.

These people, they are the reason we are here today. They are the reason that Republicans and Democrats from every corner of the country are supporting our efforts. We all share the same goal of ensuring flood insurance remains affordable and available to those who need it.

In this body, we have acted to make compassionate reforms, while keeping this program fiscally sound. We have worked to halt rate increases, address unintended consequences, and hold FEMA accountable for questionable methods and flawed implementation.

We will continue this fight for those who have been caught in the cracks through no fault of their own, for hard-working, everyday Americans who have followed all the rules and tried to do everything right. Now, we have a responsibility to make this right, and we will not stop until the job is finished.

Mr. MARINO. Thank you, Congressman PALAZZO. Your map says it all.

After speaking with many constituents during the recess, including five town halls that I held, I believe that many homeowners who have seen their rates increase were not even aware that the National Flood Insurance Program rates were partially subsidized by the Federal Government.

As the Congressman just said, please do not think that this pertains to California coast and the Pacific alone, or New Jersey or New York coastal. This affects people all across the United States.

Just in the State of Pennsylvania alone, we are not on a coast, we are in by several hundred miles, there are several thousand miles of waterways, rivers, creeks, streams.

Just to give you an example, in one of the town meetings, I asked Jeff and his wife—Jeff is from Muncie. Jeff and his wife bought a house, paid it off early, paid their taxes, kept their insurance up. Again, their insurance is going up from about \$600 a year to \$11,000 a year.

I said to Jeff, when you were at your closing, and the realtor is sitting with you, and the lawyer is sitting with you, and the bank is sitting with you, they came out to you and said, okay, now we need a check for the flood insurance because you have a federally-backed loan and you are in a flood area. So he wrote out a check for 6 or 700 bucks.

But I said, at that point, did anyone say to you that two-thirds of the cost of the flood insurance is subsidized by the Federal Government? He said, never.

I said, did anyone say to you that that subsidy could go away some day? Never.

Did anyone tell you that the rates were going up because of that subsidy? Never.

So it is not fair to the American people who are not told ahead of time—this is before recent closings—and they have the rug pulled out from under them.

So we are saying, in essence—and again, this is an unintended consequence of Biggert-Waters—FEMA did not give us the right information. I believe they held information back.

We are saying to the American people who are on \$35,000 a year or \$40,000 a year annual income, who have to pay \$10,000 up front, you know something?

We had a subsidy for you yesterday, but guess what? It is not there today, and it is too bad that you may lose your house.

We cannot let that happen.

Now, it gives me great pleasure to yield to the gentleman from New York, Congressman GRIMM.

Mr. GRIMM. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for the opportunity to speak today, and for his hard work on this important issue.

I rise today to discuss this urgent need for Congress to act as quickly as possible to delay these skyrocketing flood insurance premiums that right now are absolutely crippling homeowners in my district of Staten Island and Brooklyn, as well as across this entire great Nation.

In 2012 we all know that Congress passed the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act, and that was an attempt to stabilize the National Flood Insurance Program. That program does have problems. It finds itself in about \$30 billion of debt.

While well-intentioned, this law has had absolutely devastating effects on homeowners across the country. They are seeing their premiums increased not just by hundreds, but in many cases, by thousands of percent each year, with more increases to come into the future.

In my district alone, I met with hundreds of concerned citizens, homeowners. I have a senior who came to me with her bill for the new flood insurance and her old bill. The premium was \$2,200 a year, and the new bill was \$28,000. She is on a fixed income. She is not in a position to pay \$28,000 a year.

Unfortunately for her, she can't sell the property because the property's value doesn't warrant such an extravagant flood insurance premium, so no one will buy it, so she is trapped.

I had a working-class family come to me and show me a bill for \$37,000. This is a working-class family. That was their flood insurance premium.

Again, what does that mean?

It means they are trapped because they can't sell the house. No one's going to buy a modest home for 2 or \$300,000 with flood insurance of \$37,000 a year.

So this situation cannot be allowed to continue, and it cannot be unaddressed.

Last year, my district and the entire Northeast was devastated by Superstorm Sandy. Tens of thousands of my constituents found themselves actually homeless for the first time in their lives. Their lives were completely turned upside down. They were wondering whether they would rebuild at all, how they were going to move forward.

Many of them literally lost everything they have ever known. Every worldly possession was gone. They knew then, as we do now, it would be years before their lives would return to any form of normalcy.

Many of these people, unfortunately, still have not moved back into their

homes. Many of them are struggling to rebuild, as we speak right now.

So to ask these victims of a natural disaster, who find themselves in an absolutely horrible position, through no fault of their own, to pay upwards of \$15,000 a year or more in flood insurance premiums so soon after a natural disaster took everything from them, amounts to nothing more than them being victimized again.

If these premiums continue to go into effect, many of my constituents will find themselves unable to pay both their mortgage and their flood insurance. Their property will, in best case scenario, lose considerable value, but in the worst case scenario, become completely worthless.

This is unacceptable. To many Americans, their home is the largest asset they can ever own in their lifetime. To essentially destroy the value of those assets through flood insurance premium increases amounts to one of the largest takings of private property in U.S. history.

Thankfully, there is a solution. There is a solution that has been proposed in both Houses of Congress, and which I am very proud to say, I am one of the lead sponsors of, H.R. 3370, the Homeowner Flood Insurance Affordability Act, which would halt these draconian rate increases.

As of today, I can report that this commonsense legislation has over 170 bipartisan cosponsors, and that support is growing every single day.

This legislation simply would delay these rate increases for up to 4 years, giving FEMA time to both complete the affordability study mandated under Biggert-Waters and to propose a framework to Congress to maintain the long-term affordability of flood insurance. That will give Congress the time to consider their proposals.

If long-term affordability of flood insurance is not taken into account when setting future premiums, many Americans are simply going to stop paying for this important coverage. They are just not going to be able to do it.

This will only serve to damage the fiscal soundness of the National Flood Insurance Program over the long term. An expansion in the number of uninsured homes will only increase the direct cost to the Federal Government for future natural disasters.

It is common sense. It is mathematics. If people don't pay in to the program, the cost to the Federal Government will go up the next time there is a natural disaster. It is that simple.

So, in closing, I would like to urge my colleagues to join us in supporting this vital legislation. The sooner that we act to delay these flood insurance rate increases, the sooner we can bring stability, not only to the real estate market, but to our fragile economy, and we will be bringing much-needed relief to extremely nervous homeowners across this entire great Nation.

I thank my friend from Pennsylvania.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YOHO). The gentleman has 25 minutes remaining.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand here a report, a statement from the National Association of Realtors.

Now, a moment ago I quoted realtors being at a closing and lawyers being at a closing and banks being at a closing, small banks. These people are informing me they never were told about these increases. I want to read a small section here from their statement dated November 19, 2013.

There is a subtitle of, Home buyers were not warned. I quote:

Because FEMA delayed, then retroactively applied, the purchase provisions in section 205, many home buyers, specifically, those who bought between the enactment of Biggert-Waters and March 12 of 2013, were not warned of rate increases before purchasing their properties. Flood insurance policies were not labeled as subsidies.

It is not their fault.

Mr. Speaker, at this time it gives me pleasure to yield to the gentleman from Louisiana, Congressman CASSIDY.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the reform the Biggert-Waters Act. Let's first point out that the flood insurance program was reformed under Biggert-Waters with the goal to make it both affordable and accessible. It did indeed make flood insurance accessible, but it is being implemented in such a way as to make it unaffordable.

Now, the question is: Is this, as some people called it, a bailout for vacation homes for the rich people?

Is it going to improve the solvency of the program?

Yet, somehow do we have to see how these reforms play out before we reform once more?

Let's address each of these. This will do absolutely nothing for the solvency of the National Flood Insurance Program. Indeed, it is guaranteed to make it insolvent.

FEMA estimates that for every 10 percent increase in a premium, you have a 1 percent decrease in the number of people purchasing that policy. Do the math. Somebody whose policy is now \$700, if it rises to \$7,000, they have a basically 100 percent chance of dropping their policy.

When that happens, FEMA still has to cover their fixed costs. Those fixed costs are concentrated under fewer and fewer subscribers to the insurance policy, which means that even more people get to the point where they can no longer afford this policy, which means, that, again, that fixed cost is concentrated further. You have entered the death spiral of a program, so the National Flood Insurance Program dies. That will happen, under the assumptions used by CBO for these estimates.

Now, some would say, wait a second. FEMA actually had some good reforms

to work with. That is true, but they are not really implementing them.

FEMA is doing their few flood maps with what is called a no levee analysis. If the Army Corps of Engineers has not certified a flood control structure, FEMA pretends it is not there.

Now, Lafourche Parish in south Louisiana has a levee they built themselves, and they have pictures; on the one side they have floodwaters, and on the other side they have dry land with flowers. Those levees clearly work, but because they are not Army Corps of Engineers certified, Lafourche Parish gets no credit.

Jefferson Parish, a suburb of New Orleans, has big pumps to help reduce floodwaters, and yet FEMA does not include the efficacy of these in their flood maps.

This no levee analysis was not supposed to be part of Biggert-Waters, but that is how the program is being implemented.

□ 1800

Now, is this a bailout for rich people? The people in Louisiana who will benefit from reforming our current process, which is to say suffer under Biggert-Waters, as currently crafted, are working people. They work in the refineries that provide the gasoline for the rest of the Nation. Their homes are \$120,000 to \$220,000. These are not rich people insuring vacation homes. These are folks in their primary residences—in many cases, homes that have never flooded but, in many cases, homes that would suffer under this program.

And that leads me to the harm to the economy that will occur. The uncertainty of the cost of flood insurance is freezing real estate markets. Homebuilders have no market for the homes that they wish to build. There is a cratering of the bank lending. Indeed, there are reports of people taking their keys into the bank, dropping those keys on a desk, unable to afford the flood insurance, therefore unable to keep their mortgage so walking away from the home that they are attempting to purchase.

The impact upon the rest of the country? Most of the refined gasoline in the rest of the country is refined on the gulf coast, Louisiana, and in Texas. Those workers cannot afford to keep the homes that allow them to work in these refineries. There is an economic impact both locally in the State but it, indeed, goes nationwide. Flood insurance should be accessible. It should be affordable. Biggert-Waters needs to be further reformed in order to allow both.

Mr. MARINO. Thank you, Congressman CASSIDY.

Mr. Speaker, I represent 15 counties in the State of Pennsylvania; and I hold in my hand here a petition signed by over 1,000 people just from my county, Wyoming County, who are faced with this disaster. And most of these people have a combined income—before taxes—of less than \$40,000 a year.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, it is my pleasure to introduce the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman FITZPATRICK.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I thank my colleague from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO) for organizing this Special Order here this evening.

And I know that Representative MARINO, like myself, is hearing from our constituents back home in Pennsylvania. They live, many of them, in areas that are surrounded by properties that are habitually and repetitively flooded. They pay their flood insurance premiums faithfully each and every year, and they are being negatively impacted by FEMA's implementation of the flood insurance reforms that occurred.

Last year, the reforms to the flood insurance program were passed because, since 2006, the Government Accountability Office has warned that the program was putting taxpayers at a high risk because of losses from Katrina back in 2005 and subsequent disasters. And since then, the program has been subsidized by the taxpayers and currently owes the Treasury—we heard earlier this evening perhaps as much as \$30 billion. And as the GAO stated, these risks are the result of structural weaknesses and how the rate structure provides funding to the program itself. As a result of this, the House and the Senate came together, and they reformed the program in some very important ways.

However, just because the National Flood Insurance Program was in desperate need of reform does not mean that we should just simply walk away and consider our jobs to be done. There are families across the country and in my district who are suffering from what they refer to as rate shock. I have heard from homeowners; I have heard from senior citizens who have lived in their homes for decades, trying to sell their homes in retirement. I have heard from young couples, newly married, first-time home buyers who have encountered significant challenges while trying to either sell their homes or purchase their first home. Some families are facing increases of up to 500 percent or more, and we heard about some of those examples tonight.

My office is working with many constituents, including one senior citizen from the section of Bristol Township, a beautiful section, a working-class neighborhood called Croydon, subject to some flooding. This homeowner raised her family, lived in the home for decades and now in her retirement wants to sell the asset she has in retirement, her home. And because the rates have been significantly increased and increased sort of going over a cliff—not over time but all at once—many potential buyers have walked away from her property and just said that they simply can't afford to purchase the property. She can't afford to sell the property. In her senior years,

that dream of retirement, she has been trapped in her home that she wanted to sell and move on into her retirement.

One possible solution is to more gently phase in the rate adjustments. Another would be to just freeze them outright while we work on a longer-term solution. Either way, I look forward to working with my colleagues, including those speaking here this evening. We can find a way to move forward with crucial reforms to a very important program while still protecting the families that we represent from reductions in the values of the homes that may very well be the only asset that they have or were counting on in their retirement.

So with that, Mr. MARINO, I thank you for your interest and concern for our mutual constituents back home in Pennsylvania on this issue.

Mr. MARINO. Thank you, Congressman FITZPATRICK.

Mr. Speaker, I now have the honor of introducing the gentlelady from Florida, Congresswoman ROS-LEHTINEN.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO) for an incredible job of leading this effort.

Flooding is the Nation's number one disaster. Most insurance companies do not offer their own flood insurance, and standard homeowners' insurance policies do not cover flooding. Yet, Mr. Speaker, flood insurance is required to purchase a home in a flood plain in order to receive a federally backed mortgage.

The National Flood Insurance Program, NFIP, was created to help alleviate this dilemma. However, the program is over \$25 billion in debt. While a substantial portion of that debt is directly due to Hurricane Katrina, many elected officials and our constituents from places less familiar with flooding believe the problem is insolvent because of artificially low premiums. However, in my home State of Florida, Mr. Speaker, where nearly 40 percent of all NFIP policies are held, we have learned from devastating disasters, like Hurricane Andrew, and have effective building codes and flood mitigation projects in place. These policies have made our State, Florida, a net donor State to the program, where we pay far more in premiums than we ever receive back in payouts. Nevertheless, when the NFIP was last reauthorized, it contained provisions that would raise rates on all policyholders, sometimes by astronomical amounts.

And while the reauthorization program was vital because there had been a series of devastating program lapses that made it impossible to close on the purchase of a house, FEMA—the agency that administers the NFIP—testified that the rate increases would be nominal to most homeowners. Nominal? That, obviously, was far from the truth, and a mandated affordability study that was supposed to precede any increase was never completed.

These rate hikes are unwarranted. They are unfeasible. For that reason, I

have cosponsored different measures that would work to keep flood insurance rates affordable for my constituents in south Florida.

I have also signed on to a letter to House leadership opposing flood insurance hikes to encourage relief for the millions of homeowners, for the millions of small businesses susceptible to steep rate increases across the country. And I sent a letter to FEMA, asking this agency to use its authority to keep flood insurance rates affordable. I also voted to shield flood insurance policyholders from excessive rate hikes in this year's fiscal year '14 Homeland Security Appropriations Act.

Mr. Speaker, the National Flood Insurance Program is vital for our community; and without affordable rates, south Florida is in grave danger. Halting rate increases will ensure that families and businesses are able to thrive, rather than succumb to this inexcusable bureaucratic storm.

I thank Mr. MARINO of Pennsylvania for yielding and for his leadership on this important issue.

Mr. MARINO. At this time, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana, Congressman SCALISE.

Mr. SCALISE. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his leadership and for yielding time.

Clearly, when you look at the problems with the National Flood Insurance Program, what brought us to this point were a number of things. One was that the program continued to lapse over and over again. Multiple times, Congress had passed many patches and Band-Aids. And ultimately, we would like to see a private marketplace where people could go buy flood insurance. In fact, the Federal Government requires that people in many areas purchase flood insurance, and yet the only place you can go right now is NFIP. You can only go there to buy this, which is a requirement for people purchasing a home in many places.

So if you look at how the implementation by FEMA is adversely affecting millions of people across the country—specifically, some examples we have seen in southeast Louisiana, in my district, point out these glaring inequalities that have to be fixed by this Congress for this program to work properly. In fact, many of the things that we all want to see to get to an actuarially sound program will be undermined if the FEMA implementation goes forward without the reforms that we have been building a bipartisan coalition to implement.

And if you look at this—I will give you a couple of examples, Mr. Speaker, in south Louisiana. In Terrebonne and Lafourche Parishes, right on the front lines of the Gulf of Mexico, we are not talking about people who have multi-million dollar vacation homes or anything like that. These are hardworking taxpayers, people that work in the oil field, helping produce American energy, people that are middle class families that are being faced now with this

rate shock. In many cases, these are people who never flooded.

We have got a levee district that we went and brought some of the FEMA officials out to just a few months ago, the Larose to Golden Meadow Hurricane Protection System in Lafourche Parish. We went out there. This is a levee protection system that was built by local people with local money, not Federal money. This wasn't a levee protection system that was built by the Corps of Engineers which, by the way, the Corps' levees failed during Katrina. These folks down in Lafourche Parish, they built their own levees, and they never flooded in Hurricane Katrina. They never flooded in Hurricanes Rita or Isaac. In fact, this levee protection system was so successful that many of these people never even filed a flood insurance claim. And yet FEMA completely ignores that that levee protection system exists. And some of these people are going to be faced with \$25,000-a-year flood insurance premiums.

Now, some people might say that is an actuarially sound rate, but that is going to be a death sentence to those families. Everybody recognizes if you own a \$200,000 house and then FEMA comes and says, Okay, your annual premium for flood insurance is going to be \$25,000 a year, you are literally forcing that person to walk away from their home. So you are going to lose the money they are already paying into the system; and, again, in many cases, we are talking about people who never even flooded, people who paid their own tax dollars—not Federal money but local money to build a flood protection system that works.

It has worked for all of these storms, and yet FEMA is ignoring the fact that that flood protection system even exists. And ironically, FEMA certified the Corps flood protection systems that failed.

So these are the things that we are trying to address and fix, again, working in a bipartisan way because ultimately we want to see a competitive system. We want to see a system that is actuarially sound. But anybody who thinks that these massive rate increases you would be sending to people who played by the rules and never filed a claim in many cases can pay a \$15,000, \$20,000 a year premium just for flood insurance when it is much more than they are even paying for their own home note, it is just fantasy. So we are going to continue working to get this fixed, to put in place a system that is actuarially sound in a way where people can continue to play by the rules and continue to keep their homes and continue to be good, productive taxpayers and contribute to our society like they are today. So that is what we are going to continue working on.

Again, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his leadership.

Mr. MARINO. Thank you, Congressman SCALISE.

Mr. Speaker, you heard the devastating stories tonight about what the American people are faced with. I have had over the past several weeks numerous conversations with people involved in this legislation, people involved in the agencies, people involved in committees. And to put it quite bluntly, FEMA's methodology is extremely, extremely flawed.

And I asked—I knew the answer to this, but I wanted to hear it from people with whom I spoke—So how many people is this affecting? Well, it is only affecting not quite 3 million people in the United States.

□ 1815

And I said, What do you mean, "only?" Well, we have indications that FEMA knew that there would be a small percentage, a small number of people who would get hit with extremely large bills. And I asked on the telephone when I was talking to several of these people, Are you one of the less than 3 million people? And there was dead silence. I said, Well, you have answered the question. You are not. So obviously this is just being taken for granted.

We have two places to go here. Do we want to create a myriad of ghost towns across this country or do we want to continue to improve cities and towns? I think the latter. I think we need to improve the quality of life for American people. We work, Congress works for the American people. I work for the people of the 10th Congressional District, and we have a responsibility here. We bail out the banks and we bail out the auto industry. And do you know something? My people in the 10th Congressional District—and I'm sure across this country—they do not want to be bailed out. They just want a level playing field.

So, in conclusion, I believe that we need to bring all the available options to the table for a bipartisan solution to the flood insurance rate increase. The colleagues that joined me this evening show how important it is to a wide range of districts throughout the country. We have to continue to be diligent in our work to assist these constituents, and I look forward to participating, along with my colleagues on the Committee on Financial Services, on crafting a solution.

Remember, Mr. Speaker, this is a nationwide problem. And I keep reiterating that many of the people in my district have a combined income of \$40,000 a year before taxes. They simply cannot afford \$10,000 and \$15,000 bills of which they had no anticipation it was coming.

I promise, and as my colleagues, I'm speaking for them, we will do everything in our power to make this right and to make this fair and to put our constituents on a level playing field.

THE CLASS OF 2006 FONDLY PAYS
TRIBUTE TO GABBY GIFFORDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-

uary 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) for 30 minutes.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the colleagues that have joined me today for our 30-minute Special Order, and this is a special Special Order.

This Special Order is particularly relevant because this is the third anniversary of the shooting in Tucson that took six lives and injured 13 people, including our colleague, Gabby Giffords. And when I say "our colleague," it is our colleague of all of us here in the House of Representatives, but as a member of the class of '06 of which Representative Giffords is, we take special significance in this day because she was one of our prized Members. We all loved her, and we all miss her.

The class of '06 is a close class, and we are joined here by one of the presidents of the class of '06, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mr. PERLMUTTER, an active member of the class of '06, and there will be other members here, as well.

We want to express our remembrances of Gabby, and particularly the article that she wrote that is in today's New York Times, an op-ed called "The Lessons of Physical Therapy." It is a very touching article that talks about her recovery and her indomitable spirit where she tells about her exercises every day to get back her strength and to be able to recover speech and physical mobility. Today, in fact, she skydived.

She is a great spirit who has not let the problems that she has experienced limit her in any ways more than they have, and she is trying to overcome these obstacles and teach people that they can overcome obstacles. She left the House after serving 5 years as a great colleague and coming back here on August the 1 of 2011 in what was a very memorable moment on this floor to vote on the debt ceiling, which was a close vote, and came back in case her vote was needed. And on that day, I was out at the airport greeting a very close person in my life and coincidentally was there when she came off the airplane. I saw Gabby and was able to see her for the first time since the January 8 incident.

Then she was on the floor and of course we all got to see her. But she came back and made that effort, and she thought about how can she contribute more. And after Newtown, she knew that she could contribute more by starting an organization with her great husband, Captain Mark Kelly, Responsible Solutions, on firearms and gun laws. She tried to really lead the effort and to make America's laws more sensible, to save other people from the tragedy that she experienced as did the six victims that day that died and the others that were injured, including Congressman BARBER, who led us in a moment of silence earlier today on the floor with the members of the Arizona delegation.

So we wanted to remember that day which is significant. It is a significant

day in congressional history and American history because that was an assault on Congresspeople meeting with their constituents, open government, democratic form of government and meeting and listening. Gabby was engaging in a Congress neighborhood meeting at the grocery there, which our ED PERLMUTTER did a lot of those. I remember him talking about them in the Caucus.

I first would like to yield at this moment to the president of our class. Mr. Hodes isn't with us, but the others, the surviving member of our class, Mr. YARMUTH, from Louisville, Kentucky.

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very, very meaningful day. Like so many other things in our lives, there are certain times, certain events that you always recall where you were when they occurred. And I remember very well that Saturday when I was at lunch with a group of friends and received word that Gabby had been shot. I remember later in the day not too long after that when the reports were actually that she had passed away. I remember the feelings I had then.

Fortunately, she did survive, but the emotions of that day live with me, and, unfortunately, they are reinforced too many times. They have been reinforced at Newtown and in Aurora. And even before the Gabby Giffords shooting in Tucson, they were reinforced in my community of Louisville, Kentucky, where a disgruntled employee shot, with an assault weapon, a number of coworkers in the Standard Gravure printing plant that prints the Courier-Journal. I remember also a mass shooting at Heath High School in Paducah, Kentucky, one of the first school shootings.

Unfortunately, the list continues to grow. Many of these inexplicable shootings are committed with weapons that are designed only to inflict massive casualties. And after Newtown, I spoke out the next day in saying actually that I was sorry that I had not spoken out on a regular basis, that I vowed at that point, as Gabby has vowed every day of her life over the last 3 years, to make it a mission to try and create saner gun laws in this country. Even in my State of Kentucky, with a very, very long and significant gun culture, vast majorities of our citizens believe that we ought to have universal background checks, and yet we have not been able to make any ground in that effort.

I think most people realize that in that Gabrielle Giffords shooting that Jared Loughner, the perpetrator, was actually wrestled to the ground when he had stopped to reload because he did not have a 30-capacity magazine. He had a lesser capacity magazine. And yet we can't deal with, again, these weapons and magazines made to inflict damage on many, many people.

I can't help but think that a lot of the frustration with Congress, with

this government, throughout the country is not a function of our inability or unwillingness to work the will of the American people. As we remember now this tragedy of 3 years ago and also remember the incredible work of Gabby Giffords over these last 3 years in trying to create a saner approach to guns in this country, it is important that we recognize that we do have an obligation to respond to what the American people want us to do. And if we would take simple steps, sane steps and logical steps, like requiring everyone who purchases a weapon in this country to undergo a background check, then maybe our approval rating, maybe the confidence and the credibility of government will improve slightly.

So it is an honor to stand here on the floor and to pay tribute to a friend, a colleague, and a great American who continues to fight for her country and our citizens and to urge all of us to think about what she has stood for over the last 3 years and rededicate our efforts to improving the lives of and the security of the American people.

Mr. COHEN. Thank you, Mr. YARMUTH.

Mr. PERLMUTTER, a member of our class, represents a district that has seen so much tragedy from firearms. I know he has been a leader on this effort in Colorado and in the country, and I appreciate him being here as one of the strong members of our class on this issue and other issues. I yield to Mr. PERLMUTTER.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Well, I thank my friend from Tennessee and my friend from Kentucky. Three years ago today, one of our best friends here, Gabby Giffords, was shot, shot at close range, shot when she was doing her job, Congress on the Corner. She was out in front of a Safeway in Tucson, Arizona, meeting with constituents.

Our job as Members of Congress is to be the voice of our district, to listen to what the people in our districts have to say about a million different subjects and be their voice here in Washington, D.C. She was just that. She was the voice of that district. And she worked hard, she represented them, and she was enthusiastic and energetic and a voice of reason here in Washington, D.C., and she was shot.

But that hasn't stopped her. This woman has such energy, such discipline and such perseverance that she just keeps going. She is dealing with a subject that is very tough to address in the United States of America. On the one hand, we have the Second Amendment, and law-abiding citizens have rights under the Second Amendment to possess weapons. On the other hand, people have the right not to be shot. And she is trying, as part of her work these days, to make sure that people who are criminals, who are domestic abusers, who may have mental health issues aren't in possession of weapons that can hurt people. And as the gentleman from Tennessee said, in my area we have had shootings at Col-

umbine High School and at the Aurora movie theater. Seventy people a year and a half ago, July of 2012, were shot. And in Colorado we have addressed it, but not without some real resistance by some communities.

What we want to make sure here in this country is that people who are law-abiding citizens can have their weapons, but they should undergo a background check to make sure that they are not domestic abusers or criminals or stalkers. We need to make sure of those kinds of things. And Gabby is working hard to make sure that that happens after—she is doing that on top of her rehabilitation. Her work ethic is second to none in doing this.

There is a lot of work to be done to try to minimize gun violence, and there is a lot of work that she is doing to recover. And this woman was doing both of those things when she nearly died from a shot at close quarters. She is tough. She is an American through and through, and she never says die. She is going to continue to work and work for the betterment of her community and of this Nation.

I'm glad that I got a chance to say something, Mr. COHEN, in terms of some kind of tribute to the effort that she is making on behalf of so many of us.

□ 1830

So I would return, or I can lead to one of our other classmates of '06, but I can say we are very proud of Gabby Giffords, both when she was here and now in the service that she provides to our Nation just in her everyday life.

Mr. COHEN. I thank you, Mr. PERLMUTTER. I appreciate your remarks. You are a leader on this issue, and so is Mr. COURTNEY who is so intimately involved with Newtown, another area that suffered from gun violence. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY), another member of the class of '06.

Mr. COURTNEY. I thank you, Mr. COHEN. I want to thank you for organizing this event. The group that is here tonight, the class of '06, was a very tight-knit group. Every Wednesday we would meet in the morning. Gabby was one of the leaders of that group. She was an outstanding Congresswoman. She sat with me on the Armed Services Committee. She had an Air Force base in Arizona, and she was tenacious in terms of the Defense authorization bill markups ever year in terms of making sure that that base was fully protected and represented to the maximum extent.

She also was a huge advocate for the post-9/11 GI Bill. Some of us remember that struggle to expand the GI Bill and to restore the benefit for soldiers and veterans and their families that had deteriorated over time, giving again the full tuition benefit for a 4-year college within the State in which the servicemember resides, and to extend that benefit to spouses and children.

Just a few days ago actually, the Department of Veterans Affairs an-

nounced the 1 millionth enrollee in that program. Again, Gabby was at the absolute beginning of that struggle which again had to overcome active resistance from the then-Bush administration. There were negotiations that finally got that measure passed and through. Again, a million families of servicemembers have benefited from it.

By the way, an interesting parenthetical observation was that when that program went online, it had a huge technological computer malfunction. Secretary Shinseki and the VA had to manually cut checks so that tuition payments were made. Obviously, there are echoes of problems that we are struggling with here today. But again, Gabby's record in terms of restoring that GI Bill benefit and in fact expanding it is one of the great accomplishments of her time in Congress.

As my friend from Colorado said, her record since her injury is really amazing. I remember standing in the back of the Chamber when she cast her final vote as a Member of Congress. It was the budget package that again kept the country from defaulting. When she walked through that door, limping up those steps, it was almost a miraculous moment. Only a small group of people knew she had flown out here to cast that ballot. Again, it showed her patriotism that she felt that her country was in trouble and her country needed her; and despite all of her difficulties and disabilities, she wanted to be here to cast that ballot. Again, it was a capstone to just an extraordinary record of service for her district.

As Mr. COHEN mentioned, I come from the State of Connecticut, which is obviously the State where the Sandy Hook shooting took place slightly over a year ago. Again, a traumatic event. Connecticut is a very small State. Newtown High School, where President Obama came and spoke to the families and the first responders a couple of days after the incident, is about 50 minutes from my house, and I live in the furthest district from the Fifth Congressional District where Newtown, Connecticut, is located. So again, it had reverberations all across the State. We had family members who live in the Second Congressional District who lost loved ones in that horrendous incident.

And, frankly, just before the break, a lot of those families came and visited Washington, D.C. It had been a year since that incident. And as Mr. YARMUTH indicated, the frustration about the fact that this city did not respond to that just absolutely horrific event where 6-year-olds and 7-year-olds lost their lives to an individual who should never have been in possession of high-powered weapons, or weapons of any kind, again has not resulted in any legislative change.

I do think it is important to give the administration credit that a few weeks ago they did issue new rules so that mental health collection of data for the Brady system is going to be strengthened. If you look again at the

series of events that have occurred in communities since Sandy Hook, even just down the road here at the D.C. naval yard, again it was another individual, deranged individual, again who should never have been in a position to possess weapons. And the rules that were issued a few days ago will expand the scope of court findings, whether it is a worker's compensation case or whether it is a probate court case where an individual has been found to be mentally ill to the point where they can't support themselves and should get Social Security disability benefits. That commonsense change is now going to feed into the Brady system so that record checks will at least administratively be strengthened.

But clearly, the gun-shop loophole, the patchwork reporting needs to be strengthened by an act of Congress, and that certainly is what Gabby is calling upon all of us to have the courage to be able to look these families in the eye who came to Washington a few weeks ago and said we understand that that never should have happened and that we are prepared to make changes, commonsense changes, constitutional changes, to the system.

You know, I think it is important to note, as Mr. PERLMUTTER said, if you read the D.C. v. Heller case, which is the hallmark case of an individual right to bear arms, and you read Justice Scalia's decision, he made it crystal clear that the right to own firearms does not extend to criminals, to the mentally ill, and certain classes and categories of weapons, whether it is fully automatic machine guns or other weapons that are not in common need or use, are not protected by the D.C. v. Heller decision. Like any portion of the Bill of Rights, there are balanced restrictions which the courts recognize and give us the latitude to do our job and to make commonsense changes.

So, again, Gabby's injuries, which again took place 3 years ago, it is hard to believe that that much time has gone by. We still have to hold on to that and make sure that her amazing service in the Congress, and also her record of advocacy, is something we live up to that example, that inspiring example, and do what is right for the American people.

I yield back to my friend, Mr. COHEN.

Mr. COHEN. Gabby was a member of the NRA; I don't know if she is now. I passed the right-to-carry bill in Tennessee because I think you can have reasonable laws that allow people to defend themselves, but there is reasonableness. And the problem we have had has been reasonableness, and Gabby's effort with her husband Mark is responsible solutions. It is not banning guns; it is responsible solutions.

Mental health is certainly one of those issues that has been raised, and yet we in our budgets have cut mental health with the budgets that we have had up here. Some have blamed and the response has been about violent games that children might play or be exposed

to. Those weren't around when Charles Joseph Whitman went to the tower in Austin, Texas, and killed 17 people and wounded 32. That wasn't the cause of it. It is something, unfortunately, uniquely American. It is a uniquely American problem. Studies have shown that the U.S. homicide rates are 6.9 times greater than the rates in other high-income countries, and they are driven by firearm homicide rates that are 19.7 times higher.

In the 27 countries that were studied of higher industrialized countries, 80 percent of all firearm deaths occur in the United States, and 86 percent of women killed by firearms were United States women, and 87 percent of the children were United States children.

The gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH), a member of the class of '06 has joined us, and I know he has understandings of these issues, too, and is a responsible and reasonable voice. I yield to him for his comments and thoughts.

Mr. WELCH. Thank you, Mr. COHEN. It is so wonderful to hear about our classmate. We who were elected with Gabby had a special privilege to get to know her personally and to see her grit and her determination and her gracefulness and her effectiveness representing her district, and the incredible job she did on the Armed Services Committee. I remember all of the things that you mentioned, and she had a kind word for everybody. She didn't forget anything. She was totally devoted to her staff and to her constituents. What a pleasure it was. All of us, I think, felt if Congress was filled with folks like Gabby Giffords, the world would be a better place, even Congress.

Since her shooting 3 years ago, America has gotten a glimpse into that person of character and beauty that all of us got to know as a classmate. What an extraordinary person she is. I just want to read a little bit from her op-ed because it kind of captures things. When this happened 3 years ago, she mentions that she was allowed the opportunity for a new life, but she had planned to spend her 40s continuing her public service and starting a family with this wonderful man, her husband, who she married while she was in service here in Congress, Mark Kelly. Remember when we saw Mark Kelly struggling with the question of his wife in the hospital and having to decide whether to continue to command the mission into space, and how he struggled with that, wanting to be doing what he was trained all his life to do, and be also the extraordinary husband that he was, and how Gabby was his biggest supporter that he continue the mission. What a couple they are.

And then to hear her describe what she has had to go through. She was really athletic. She rode horses, and she rode motorcycles. She hiked up and down the Grand Canyon. She was very physically fit and vigorous, an outdoors woman. In that moment when she was shot, the question was whether

she was going to live. She did—a blessing for her, for us, for America, and her family. But her life then required her to face incredible challenges—how to learn things that we now take for granted. She describes:

I spent the last 3 years learning how to talk again, how to walk again. I had to learn to sign my name with my left hand. It is gritty, painful, frustrating work every day. And rehab is endlessly repetitive. It is never easy because once you have mastered some movement or action or word, no matter how small, you move on to the next. You never rest.

What Gabby did, that was the life that was in front of her, and she had to make a decision about whether to engage and plunge forward, knowing how hard that would be, how repetitive that would be, and she did it. Of course, she has been making progress, incredible progress, and she celebrates in this op-ed that she didn't imagine that her stricken, paralyzed arm would ever move again. For so many days it did not, until one day it did.

So she faces life and embraces this new life that is nothing compared to that athletic, horse-riding, motorcycle-riding, and Grand Canyon climbing person that was very easy for her to be.

She had all of that, those personal qualities with this enormous commitment to public life and had a belief that what we did to try to shape public policy mattered. How you treated the person in your life, the ones you love, incredibly important; but how you use that love to try to build laws that create opportunities for a better, less violent, more peaceful society. She had the energy and the heart to do that as well. And she is continuing that with her cause, working side by side with her husband, Mark, for sensible gun legislation.

You know, when I think about what she has done, and, sure, we can have a legitimate debate about what is the right law. I definitely think the background checks, why wouldn't we have that apply to everybody. It doesn't restrict their ability; it just means they go through the check. When I consider that and think, all right, there are legitimate debates on both sides, and the Second Amendment is extremely important and we are all supporters of it, but what is the problem with Congress voting on it. Why is it that we can't summon the will to simply put on the floor for a debate and then a vote where each one of us says "yes" or "no" on that proposed legislation, background check, and let Americans then decide what they think of us, whether they agree with us or they don't.

You know, at a certain point, it is just a question of whether we will do our job, and doing our job is debating the major issues of the time that are of concern to the people of this country, and then standing and voting "yes" or "no."

I say we owe that to Gabby. Gabby wouldn't see it that way. She would say that we owe it to ourselves to take

on the responsibility that we sought when we ran for public office and took on the privilege of representing the people who sent us here.

□ 1845

So I say thank you to Gabby for all she has done, and I challenge us to try to do a little bit of what Gabby would do if she were here to help us today.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, how much time do we have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. COHEN. At this point, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER).

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee, because I want to just talk about something Mr. WELCH said and also something Mr. COURTNEY said.

Mr. COURTNEY said that she had worked on some things involving technology with respect to the VA, and there were some technological problems with whatever it was she was getting. She was a curious, and is a curious, individual. She brought a curiosity about technology. She was one of the first adopters of the iPad as we began using it here. She just had become an expert in it long before any of the rest of us.

She also was strong enough that she worked in her dad's tire store. So here is a woman who brought that energy, brought that enthusiasm, brought that curiosity and brought a real service, a desire for service to this country. Despite terrible wounds, she continues that service today. If we could all do that this Nation would be unbelievable. It is our job to continue to try to provide that service and follow her example. Despite all the obstacles, here is a woman still changing the world. I am very glad to be able to speak for her in this moment today, 3 years after she was shot, but she is still making a difference.

Mr. COHEN. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank all the Members. There were others that would have been here but had certain conflicts at this time.

We all loved Gabby. She was the star of our class. It was before 3 years ago on the 8th of January that she was the star of our class. We all knew it, and we all loved her.

I want to thank each of our colleagues for joining us. I want to thank Gabby for her service and her continued service. She is an American hero.

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

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2279, REDUCING EXCESSIVE DEADLINE OBLIGATIONS ACT OF 2013; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3362, EXCHANGE INFORMATION DISCLOSURE ACT; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3811, HEALTH EXCHANGE SECURITY AND TRANSPARENCY ACT OF 2014

Mr. BURGESS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-322) on the resolution (H. Res. 455) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2279) to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act relating to review of regulations under such act and to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 relating to financial responsibility for classes of facilities; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3362) to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to require transparency in the operation of American health benefit exchanges; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3811) to require notification of individuals of breaches of personally identifiable information through exchanges under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PROTECTING VOLUNTEER FIREFIGHTERS AND EMERGENCY RESPONDERS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA) for 30 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BARLETTA. 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 my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues in the House and I are here today to talk about another unintended consequence of the Affordable Care Act. We understand there is little appetite in this body to provide fixes to a flawed law. However, we believe that an unexpected and previously undetected problem with the law represents special and urgent circumstances.

This really took me by surprise. The fact that the Affordable Care Act could force volunteer fire companies to provide health insurance to their volunteers or pay a fine would burden them with unbearable costs and possibly cause them to reduce the number of volunteers they have or shut their doors altogether.

Simply put, this is a public safety issue. This is a problem today because

the Internal Revenue Service currently treats volunteer firefighters as employees for Federal tax purposes. Under the Affordable Care Act, if they have 50 or more employees and they work 30 hours a week, then the employers have to provide health insurance or pay a fine.

Here is a key point that I want to make. Some fire companies may hear about this and immediately think: well, we only have 25 volunteers so we are safe, we don't have 50. Well, that may not necessarily be the case. Some fire companies are considered part of their local government. That could mean that if you take the number of firefighters paid and unpaid now considered employees by the IRS and add them to the number of other public employees, such as highway workers, police, code enforcement officers, health officers, clerical workers, you can easily reach 50, even in a small town.

This would be a very big deal in my home State of Pennsylvania. Ninety-seven percent of our fire companies are either completely or mostly volunteers. Nationally, 91.7 percent of fire companies use at least some volunteers and 86.2 percent depend on all or mostly volunteers. Those numbers come from the 2012 National Fire Department Census conducted by the United States Fire Administration.

So I wrote a letter to the IRS, just like many of my colleagues here, and asked them for clarification. To this point, as of this afternoon, we have gotten no reply from the Internal Revenue Service. They have said that they are "reviewing" it.

This should be very easy to clear up for the IRS. Just say that volunteer firefighters are just that—volunteers. But we are still waiting.

Let's be clear about this. This wrinkle in the Affordable Care Act will not provide health care to the uninsured; it will only shut down fire companies and cause a severe threat to public safety.

That is why I have introduced H.R. 3685, the Protecting Volunteer Firefighters and Emergency Responders Act. The bill will specifically exempt volunteer firefighters and volunteers providing emergency medical services from the employer mandate provision of the Affordable Care Act.

I was happy to learn that there is a bipartisan Senate bill that is a companion to mine. I hope that we can see bipartisan support for this in both the House and in the Senate and that we can get through this quickly so that the President can sign it.

Mr. Speaker, this problem with the Affordable Care Act represents a clear and present danger to public safety.

I would like to invite my colleagues to offer their thoughts about this problem and how it relates to their own districts.

I would like to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK).

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I thank my friend from Pennsylvania, Mr.

BARLETTA, for organizing this Special Order tonight.

I have to say that I never assumed it would be easy to get an answer quickly from a massive bureaucracy of the Federal Government like the Internal Revenue Service, but I have to admit that I never thought it would be this hard either, especially on a question important to the safety of communities across my district and across our great country.

My question to the previous IRS chief—and more recently the new agency head—has been a simple one: Can you clarify the rules within the President's health care law as they relate to volunteer firefighters? As my colleagues here tonight have noted, confusion exists within the first responder community about the effects of the health care law's mandates and the IRS's definition of an employee, which currently, as we have heard tonight, covers volunteer firefighters.

Yet the question goes unanswered, and I can't offer any information or comfort to the fire departments who would be the one's hurt by the misguided mandate. One way or the other, they just want to know so they can keep on serving their communities.

I would like to read just two emails of many, many emails that I have heard from my district about the importance of this situation.

The first is from Charles Rumble, who is president of the Plumsteadville Fire Company:

We are an all-volunteer fire company that is being penalized for our ability to attract and retain members to protect the community. There is no way that we—or our community that supports us—can bear that cost of offering insurance. We would be forced to shut down and our community forced to seek substantially more costly and diminished fire protection alternatives.

From Frank Farry, who is chief of the Langhorne-Middletown Fire Company, who is also an elected State representative in Pennsylvania:

The administration and the IRS have been aware of this issue for months but yet have not taken any steps to address it. The volunteer fire service already faces many challenges, and if the ACA is applied to it, the volunteer fire departments will have their backs broken.

Mr. Speaker, waiting for an answer isn't good enough, especially for people with jobs as important as our volunteer firefighters. That is why I was proud to join with Congressman BARLETTA and so many others gathered here this evening in introducing the Protecting Volunteer Firefighters and Emergency Responders Act to try to address this problem legislatively.

I know we all remain optimistic that the administration will address our concerns. We hope that the IRS takes action and takes action swiftly. If not, we are prepared to do so in this House.

Mr. BARLETTA. Thank you, Mr. FITZPATRICK.

Now I would like to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

Mr. DENT. Thank you. I would like to also join my colleagues tonight in

support of Representative BARLETTA's very important legislation to help clarify the fact that the volunteer firefighters should not be counted as full-time equivalents under the employer mandate under the health care law, more commonly known as ObamaCare.

It has been very clear to me, after having meetings with many of my friends in Lebanon County, Pennsylvania, where a number of firefighters from different fire companies came to speak to me on this issue, that the potential impact of this idea of counting volunteer firefighters as full-time equivalents will really have a very negative impact on public safety in that particular community, where volunteer firefighters really do provide the bulk of the fire service, as is the case in much of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and throughout the country.

It is clear to me that the health care law is riddled with so many problems. We always knew that this employer mandate was going to be a problem where it says that if you have more than 50 employees you are going to have to provide health care benefits after the first 30 for those working more than 30 hours a week.

I don't think anybody in their wildest imagination would have ever thought that a volunteer fire company would have been impacted by this. It raises a whole host of questions too: Well, are those volunteer firefighters part of the municipal workforce? There are all sorts of questions that we simply don't know the answers to.

It is my hope that we never have to address the Barletta legislation, as important as it is. I am hopeful that the IRS will come to a ruling at some point to clarify the fact that these volunteers are not full-time equivalents for the purpose of the health care law in the employee mandate. That would be the easiest way out. Absent an IRS ruling, well then let's pass this bill. I am proud to be a cosponsor. I am delighted that my good friend and colleague LOU BARLETTA, we share a county, Dauphin County, in the Harrisburg area. We share that county. This is also a very big issue in that part of the State.

It is important that we move forward with this legislation in the event that the IRS fails to do its job and provide the clarity and the guidance that so many of our volunteers depend on. More important than the volunteers is the people they serve. These volunteer firefighters are protecting us and this employer mandate will only make that task that much more difficult and deny fire service, unfortunately, to too many people across the country in the Commonwealth.

With that, I commend my friend, Mr. BARLETTA, for his very important legislation.

□ 1900

Mr. BARLETTA. Thank you, Mr. DENT.

I would like to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEEHAN).

Mr. MEEHAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I want to join the gentleman and my colleagues not just from Pennsylvania but from across the Nation as we challenge this problem that has emerged. Once again, it is symbolic of a number of things—of when we heard the mantra: just pass it, and we will find out what is in it.

We have found out what is in it more and more frequently; and once again, we are beginning to see the implications of a law that was not understood when it was passed and that is now becoming worse as it is being implemented. As my colleagues have stated, it begins here in this particular circumstance with the IRS and the determination that volunteers are going to be considered to be employees of municipalities.

In places like mine, the impact of this is very severe because, if this kind of thing happens in the first place, think of the concept of a volunteer. These are the guys who are getting up at 2:30 or 3 o'clock in the morning on these cold evenings like this and answering the call and going out and putting out the fires in homes in neighborhoods like ours. They are going to be considered to be employees under this law, but that means that the municipalities are going to be fined if they choose not to supply the kinds of medical that will be required under the Affordable Care Act, under ObamaCare. Then, if they do pay for it, what is going to happen in communities like mine is that that cost is going to be passed through.

I sat and I asked the mayor—and I have five separate volunteer fire companies just in my own township—and he estimated that it would cost about \$4 million a year to provide that kind of health care coverage to the members of the volunteer fire departments who were there. Now, where do you think that \$4 million is going to come from? It is going to come from the homeowners and the taxpayers in our districts, who are going to see their taxes raised to pay for this service for volunteers. This is how insane it is.

The second part of what is so frustrating is the difficulty of dealing with this bureaucracy because, some 3 months ago, like many of my colleagues, I wrote to the IRS and asked for a simple clarification: Why can't we just have a clear signal sent to these departments which rely on this kind of certainty to be able to make decisions as they move forward on the utilization of their resources? These are the guys who are holding bake sales to be able to find the money to put together the equipment and other kinds of needs that they have, and they have got to worry about whether they are going to be encumbered by this kind of a bill.

So, for so many reasons, we need clarification and we need action. Once again, this is symbolic of the particular problems that are faced by this interpretation, which is affecting communities all across the Nation. When I

say “all across the Nation,” that is 750,000 volunteers in fire departments and some 25,000 fire companies that are volunteers all across this Nation. It is touching every community in America.

I join my colleagues in the hope that we will be able to get some action from the IRS and this administration so we don't have to rely on the passage of the Protecting Volunteer Firefighters and Emergency Responders Act to get the clarification that we need.

I thank my colleague for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. BARLETTA. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, if you could just imagine the bookkeeping nightmare that these volunteer fire departments would face in determining whether or not the volunteer firefighters have worked 30 hours or not in order to be considered a full-time employee or less. Do they count the times that they have their pagers on as hours worked or the time that they are listening to a scanner or the 12- or 24-hour shifts that many of the volunteers would have to work and who would record this? It is the fact that these men and women who are volunteers to protect the communities that they love would be forced into doing things that we just know they wouldn't do. It would simply close firehouses or volunteers would no longer be volunteering their time.

I would like to yield to the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. DAVID JOYCE.

Mr. JOYCE. I would like to thank the gentleman for yielding and thank Mr. BARLETTA for organizing this Special Order on this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, we are here today because it is critical that we protect our local volunteer firefighters from the Affordable Care Act's employer mandate. As we all know, the IRS has a history of treating volunteers as employees for tax purposes; and if the employer mandate is incorrectly implemented, volunteer fire departments may be forced to comply with these requirements, and that could force them to close or to curtail their emergency response services.

In the seven counties I represent in northeastern Ohio, there are over 220 fire departments, many of them with an all-volunteer force. Chief Scott Hildebrand related to me that some of these departments will be forced to double in size due to the mandate, and each one of these extra volunteers will need additional turnout gear at a cost of \$2,500 to \$3,000 per individual.

Before coming to Congress, I was the Geauga County prosecutor for 25 years. During that time, I founded an organization called the Geauga Bluecoats. The Bluecoats is a charitable organization that provides relief and services to the family members of police, fire and emergency responders who have become disabled or who have lost their lives in the line of duty. These men and women are our friends—they are our neighbors—and they have gone above and beyond the call of duty. We owe it

to our local communities to continue to allow these brave men and women to carry out their duties.

This legislation will ensure that those brave men and women are protected from the employer mandate and can continue to serve.

I thank Mr. BARLETTA for his leadership on this, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. BARLETTA. I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

I would like to yield to the gentleman from Kansas, Ms. LYNN JENKINS.

Ms. JENKINS. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for his leadership on this critical issue. I will note that I am a proud cosponsor of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I grew up on a family farm in Holton, Kansas. However, as anyone from a tight-knit community knows, folks see it as a civic duty to pitch in where help is needed. This means that many folks choose to be volunteer firefighters. These volunteers give freely of their time and well-being to help ensure that, when disaster occurs, folks in the community are safe. I know this well because my daddy served as a Kansas State fire marshal for many years.

I have spent significant time on the House floor talking about the unintended consequences of passing the President's health care law, which allows the government to take control of the health care industry. This is another one of those unintended consequences. The President's health care law will penalize volunteer firefighters and EMTs by counting them as full-time employees and possibly subjecting their departments to the employer mandate tax.

Penalizing volunteer fire departments should not be the intent of the President's health care law, and the effects could be disastrous. In Kansas alone, there are 550 volunteer fire departments that are staffed by 13,000 volunteer firefighters. It would be a terrible mistake to jeopardize the status of these departments and the communities they serve by penalizing them under the Affordable Care Act. Given the commonsense nature of this legislation and the bipartisan support of it, I remain committed to ensuring that this gets fixed.

Mr. BARLETTA. I thank the gentleman from Kansas.

I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR).

Mr. BARR. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his leadership on this important issue.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the more we learn about ObamaCare, the more disappointing it becomes. The American people continue to be disappointed that President Obama's health care law is not only wreaking havoc on their families and that it is not only wreaking havoc on small businesses and on our economy but that now it could be endangering our com-

munities that rely on emergency response services provided by volunteer firefighters and EMTs. This is impacting volunteer firefighters in my home State of Kentucky.

Just this morning, despite a wind-chill of negative 5 degrees, firefighters in Anderson County, Kentucky, rushed to the aid of fellow citizens to battle a barn fire that was threatening to spread to a nearby home. As their equipment and even the water froze in the extreme temperatures, these brave firefighters courageously took shifts to protect their community.

It is not unusual for these heroic men and women to routinely perform acts of bravery. It is also not unusual for them to hold pancake breakfasts or chili dinners simply to raise enough money to pay their electricity bills. These volunteer companies are now being asked to provide coverage under ObamaCare's costly employer mandate, which Anderson County Fire Chief Mike Barnes warned could force them to lay off heroic, life-saving personnel and leave communities like Lawrenceburg, Kentucky, in Anderson County, without adequate fire protection.

So, while fire departments work tirelessly to provide essential safety services, we must do everything we can to ensure that our emergency services volunteers are not forced to be counted as full-time employees under ObamaCare. It is a cost they simply cannot absorb.

The project of ObamaCare is the project of the entire Obama Presidency. It is a project to determine whether or not Big Government can solve big problems. It is a project to determine whether or not the Federal Government can micromanage one-sixth of the American economy. With this issue with these volunteer fire departments, we now find out, once again, that ObamaCare and the project that it embodies is an abject failure.

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, may I have a time update, please.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. BARLETTA. I would like to yield at this time to the gentleman from New York (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS of New York. I would like to thank my friend from Pennsylvania for taking up this important and timely issue.

Mr. Speaker, ObamaCare has proven to be the devastating law that many of us predicted. The recent debacle of the online exchange roll-out and the negative impact the law has had on our economy seem to be only the beginning of the problems we face. Every few weeks, we hear about more unintended consequences of the law, which are hurting the very people the President and the Democrats in Congress promised to protect.

The IRS considers volunteer emergency responders, including firefighters, employees for tax purposes. Under this employee designation, large

volunteer fire departments will be subject to the ObamaCare employer mandate. This will force them to provide health insurance to their volunteers or to pay a significant penalty. These unnecessary costs will cripple the strong volunteer fire community that protects western New York and the rest of the country.

In November of last year, I wrote a letter to the Acting Commissioner of the IRS, seeking a specific exemption for volunteer responders, but my office has yet to receive a reply. Since the administration has not corrected this disservice to America's volunteer EMTs and firefighters, we must act legislatively.

I urge the House to take up H.R. 3685 and address this issue as soon as possible. We must protect our volunteer emergency service responders so they can continue to protect us.

Mr. BARLETTA. I thank the gentleman from New York.

I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STIVERS).

Mr. STIVERS. I would like to thank the gentleman for yielding, and I would like to thank him for his strong leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I am a proud cosponsor of H.R. 3685. The health care law could cause many communities to lose fire service because of an unintended consequence of the law that would treat these volunteer firefighters as employees and that would require them to have health insurance.

Volunteer firefighters risk their lives every day to provide our safety. They provide important emergency services in many of our communities. In fact, in Ohio, 70 percent of our fire departments are either fully or partially staffed by over 16,000 volunteer firefighters. Unfortunately, we could risk service in some of our communities if these communities are required to pay either a penalty or provide insurance. My district towns, like McConnelsville, Ohio, use volunteer firefighters, and they raise money. Every year at a dinner, they raise about \$10,000 to help pay for the costs associated with their volunteer firefighters. If they had to pay penalties and insurance on top of that, it could cause them to lose service. I think these families and these communities that are served by volunteer firefighters deserve the same service as other communities and shouldn't lose their services as a result of the health care law.

We don't want to put American families and Ohio families at risk of losing their fire service, which is why I am a proud cosponsor of H.R. 3685.

I would like to thank the gentleman for his leadership, and I hope everyone will support the bill.

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, may I have a time update again.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. BARLETTA. Thank you.

I would like to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS).

Mr. MEADOWS. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for his leadership on this commonsense approach to solving a problem that was unintended.

Mr. Speaker, when it really gets down to it, our firefighters and our first responders deserve our attention and our support. They are the ones who, quite frankly, are missing birthdays, anniversaries, who are called out in the middle of the night to serve their communities. My communities in western North Carolina are served by some of the greatest volunteers that a country could want; and here we are tonight, debating this over something that should be common sense.

I would just urge my colleagues across the aisle to join with many of the fire chiefs whom we talked to today—over 13 of them—from large counties and small counties alike, Democrats and Republicans. Every one of them without exception, Mr. Speaker, said that we need to address this because it will hurt the people that they serve.

□ 1915

I think it is time that we come together in this Chamber and make sure that we correct a wrong that has been done.

Mr. BARLETTA. I thank the gentleman.

I would like to yield to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY).

Mr. MCKINLEY. Thank you, Congressman, for your leadership on this matter.

According to Tom Miller, the West Virginia representative to the National Volunteer Fire Council, 95 percent of all fire departments in West Virginia are staffed by volunteers.

To pay for their training, equipment, and operating costs, these men and women are forced to raise money through bake sales, pancake breakfasts, steak dinners, and standing in the streets, humbly, at the stoplights, holding their boots out and asking people to put money into those boots. And now these financially strapped fire departments have been told that they may have to pay health care costs.

Mr. Miller has projected that the added cost of paying for this health care for these volunteers will force some departments to close their doors, putting families and businesses at risk.

Mr. Speaker, cutting emergency services upon which rural America depends is clearly an unintended consequence of ObamaCare. Therefore, we must exempt our volunteer emergency responders from this additional cost by bringing this bill to the floor as soon as possible.

Mr. BARLETTA. I thank the gentleman from West Virginia.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for sponsoring this. As a 30-year-plus

State-certified volunteer EMT and rescue technician, on behalf of my brother and sister firefighters and rescue workers, EMTs, EMS folks, thank you for your leadership on this.

Just very quickly, our volunteers are not employees. Our volunteers are neighbors helping neighbors. Our volunteers are community servants. They are trained professionals today. They are heroes. They are willing to walk into burning buildings when everyone else is running out. But they are not employees. And it is time for the Obama administration and the IRS to give us that clarification.

Mr. BARLETTA. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota (Mrs. NOEM).

Mrs. NOEM. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise today as a cosponsor of H.R. 3685, the Protecting Volunteer Firefighters and Emergency Responders Act. I am very proud to do so.

In my home State of South Dakota, there are nearly 8,000 volunteer firefighters and over 350 volunteer fire departments. These men and women are on the front lines protecting our families, our homes, and our businesses. Nearly every one of them fulfills that duty while holding down a full-time or part-time job that oftentimes covers their health insurance coverage.

I had one constituent from Rapid City drive home the point to me, talking about the shoestring budget they operate on. Many departments raise money privately at community events and dinners to make ends meet. Requiring them to cover health insurance, as the Affordable Care Act may do, would be extremely detrimental.

Emergency service volunteers are essential to our safety and well-being for South Dakota families and businesses. That is why I am proud to support this bill and proud to speak on its behalf today.

Mr. BARLETTA. I thank the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. Speaker, I had sincerely hoped that we wouldn't have to be here this evening to take up the valuable time of this body, but the flaws in the Affordable Care Act and the deafening silence from the IRS on a question so basic and obvious compels our attention.

Over 1,000 different groups have received waivers from the Affordable Care Act, covering over 3 million people. Don't our volunteer firefighters and the communities they serve and protect deserve at least the same consideration?

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

AN IMPORTANT TIME IN AMERICAN HISTORY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to thank my colleagues for bringing such an important issue to the floor for discussion.

This is an important time in American history for so many reasons. Foreign policy is just in terrible shambles right now. But today is January 8, and it is generally recognized that 50 years ago, on January 8, 1964, President Lyndon Baines Johnson declared a war on poverty.

There is an article today from *The Washington Times* entitled: "That's rich: Poverty level under Obama breaks 50-year record," by Dave Boyer.

It says:

Fifty years after President Johnson started a \$20 trillion taxpayer-funded war on poverty, the overall percentage of impoverished people in the United States has declined only slightly and the poor have lost ground under President Obama.

Aides said Mr. Obama doesn't plan to commemorate the anniversary Wednesday of Johnson's speech in 1964, which gave rise to Medicaid, Head Start, and a broad range of other Federal antipoverty programs. The President's only public event Tuesday was a plea for Congress to approve extended benefits for the long-term unemployed, another reminder of the persistent economic troubles during Mr. Obama's 5 years in office.

"What I think the American people are really looking for in 2014 is just a little bit of stability," Mr. Obama said.

Although the President often rails against income inequality in America, his policies have had little impact overall on poverty. A record 47 million Americans receive food stamps, about 13 million more Americans than when he took office.

The poverty rate has stood at 15 percent for 3 consecutive years, the first time that has happened since the mid-1960s. The poverty rate in 1965 was 17.3 percent; it was 12.5 percent in 2007, before the Great Recession.

About 50 million Americans live below the poverty line, which the Federal Government defined in 2012 as an annual income of \$23,492 for a family of four.

President Obama's antipoverty efforts "are basically to give more people more free stuff," said Robert Rector, a specialist on welfare and poverty at the conservative Heritage Foundation.

"That's exactly the opposite of what Johnson said," Mr. Rector said. "Johnson's goal was to make people prosperous and self-sufficient."

The President's advisers defend his policies by saying they rescued the Nation from the deep recession in 2009, saved the auto industry and reduced the jobless rate to 7 percent from a high of 10 percent 4 years ago.

Further:

The President last month declared the widening gap between the rich and poor as "the defining challenge of our time," and Democratic candidates are expected to pick up that theme on the campaign trail rather than debate deficits or the complications of ObamaCare.

In spite of the administration's antipoverty efforts, however, the government reported this week that poverty, by some measures, has been worse under President Obama than it was under President George W. Bush. The U.S. Census Bureau reported that 31.6 percent of Americans were in poverty for at least 2 months from 2009 to 2011, a 4.5 percentage point increase over the pre-recession period of 2005 to 2007.

Of the 37.6 million people who were poor at the beginning of 2009, 26.4 percent remained

in poverty throughout the next 34 months, the report said. Another 12.6 million people escaped poverty during that time, but 13.5 million more fell into poverty.

Mr. Rector said the war on poverty has been a failure when measured by the overall amount of money spent and the poverty rates that haven't changed significantly since Johnson gave his speech.

"We've spent \$20.7 trillion on means-tested aid since that time, and the poverty rate is pretty much exactly where it was in the mid-1960s," he said.

The liberal Center on Budget and Policy Priorities said in a report that some trends have helped reduce poverty since the 1960s, including more Americans completing high school and more women working outside the home. But the group said other factors have contributed to persistent poverty, including a tripling in the number of households led by single parents.

Mr. Rector said too many government antipoverty programs still discourage marriage, factoring into statistics that show more than 4 in 10 children are born to unmarried parents.

"When the war on poverty started, about 6 percent of children were born outside of marriage, he said. Today, that's 42 percent." A catastrophe.

So it is rather interesting. Fifty years after the war on poverty was declared as an actual war, \$20.7 trillion, according to Mr. Rector, has been spent on means-tested aid since that time, and basically we haven't changed anything except we have got more children being born in broken, single-parent homes.

It is certainly noteworthy that, since the beginning of 2009, we have had 12.6 million people escape poverty, but 13.5 million fall into poverty. That means we have had just under a million people worse off, falling into poverty, than were there when this President started with all the giveaway programs—\$900 billion in so-called stimulus that turned out to be nothing more than crony capitalism, spending money on so-called "green" programs that turned brown rather quickly after millions and hundreds of millions and billions of dollars were spent.

He claims he saved the auto industry. Actually, there was a proposal by many economists, led by an FDIC former Chairman named Isaac, who made a proposal in late 2008, an alternative to TARP, and it could have been used to do a more effective job of getting the auto industry on its feet.

The proposal was, instead of nationalizing Wall Street, having the government buy private assets, which is nationalizing, government takeover, by another means rather than the government nationalizing the auto industry, taking a big hunk of the auto industry, telling dealers which ones had to close their doors without due process of law. They were an unconstitutional taking. And to the embarrassment of this country and the great Justices—those who were great on the Supreme Court and the ones that are great on there now—to their total humiliation, this Court stood by and watched unconstitutional takings and did nothing.

□ 1930

Now, it is true that, during the unconstitutional, illegal turning of the Bankruptcy Code upside down during the so-called saving of the auto industry, Ruth Bader Ginsburg, to her credit, put a 24-hour stay on an auto deal that was proposed, but the stay lapsed and the Court did nothing, which should have been to their incredible embarrassment.

They knew that bankruptcy laws had been completely eviscerated, completely ignored, turned upside down. There were no proposed plans by creditors. Secured creditors were treated as unsecured and, against the law, they were made unsecured. They had their security taken away. The government gave security, illegally, under the law, to unsecured creditors, and the Supreme Court didn't do anything but a 24-hour stay.

I had hope for the Court. I had hoped that they would do the right thing, do the constitutional, the legal thing, and they sat by. Some say it was because they were privately scared by the administration, that if they put longer than a 24-hour stay on the auto bailout, the auto plan, that everybody in any way connected to the auto industry would lose their job, and it would all be the Supreme Court's fault.

So what did they do?

Nothing. They should be humiliated that they did nothing. Violation of the law, violation of the Constitution by unconstitutional takings of dealers, auto dealers, sounded like the bankruptcy court was used, weaponized a bit, as the IRS has been.

We had an auto task force with a czar. What a lovely name, coming from old Russian days of dictators. We had an auto task force czar and an auto task force.

At one time, I believe, as I recall, no one in the auto task force had ever been involved in auto manufacturing, the auto business, and as I recall, it may have been a majority of them, a big majority didn't even own cars.

Regardless of whether they did or didn't, though Congress, some here, asked for transcripts of the meetings, who decided what dealers would lose their dealerships, we were never provided any transcripts, and that should be to the embarrassment of Congress.

We should have demanded, we should have defunded White House activity until they came forward and produced what Federal money that Congress appropriated, had produced. What had they done? We have the power to do that. We should have.

The American people were owed answers, and especially, those car dealers who lost their dealerships.

Save the auto industry.

If we went back to the proposal that Isaacs and other economists made, it was rather interesting. You had a number of us in Congress that thought it was the best idea we had heard proposed; basically, that we knew there was at least \$700 billion, now some say

clearly more than \$1 trillion, owned by American citizens, American companies, that was earned in foreign countries and put in foreign banks.

Taxes were fully paid in those countries where it was earned, where it was banked, but they knew if they brought it into the United States that a greedy Federal Government was going to yank another 30, 40 percent, plus penalty and interest out of them, and they would lose most, much of the money, if not most of the money that they had earned and paid taxes on where it was earned. So the money was sitting on the sidelines in foreign countries.

So basically, the proposal was, instead of nationalizing, socializing, whatever you want to call it when the Federal Government buys private assets and becomes the boss of private industries, instead of doing that, basically, in essence, the proposal was, why don't we have Congress just say, if you bring that money, if you are an American citizen or an American company, and you bring money in a foreign bank that would otherwise never come into the United States, bring it in here and invest, whether it is in Wall Street, whatever Congress decided, or the President suggested was a troubled entity, if you will invest in that troubled industry, particularly the auto industry, then, obviously, you get ownership of stock.

You become a player in that corporation, and the government gets to stay as a referee, not as a player and coach and referee. We would stay as referee, and American citizens would bring their money in and bail out the auto industry. They would also own stock, which means they would change the directors, change the officers, in all probability, and you would get a change of direction in those companies.

If they needed to go through bankruptcy, they would go through legitimately, so that secured creditors remained secured, unsecured creditors were treated as unsecured creditors, contracts that were destroying the automobile industry could be renegotiated in bankruptcy, and we really would have saved the auto industry, far better than this clumsy effort that was done.

Now, I had a Fiat during the 4 years I was in the Army. But why couldn't we have an American manufacturer owned by Americans?

How embarrassing. That is what this administration pushed. Let's turn over, let's push an American auto industry into foreign hands.

Yeah, right. You saved an American auto industry, when, actually, under—we had Democrats in control of the House and Senate when the President took office, and he pretty much got anything he wanted.

I would submit, the auto industry would be a lot stronger today if commonsense solutions like those that former FDIC Chairman Isaacs proposed and other economists—and this economy would be much better on its way.

Then, instead of 12.6 million Americans climbing out of poverty, while another 13.5 million climbed into poverty, fell into poverty, because of this administration's policies, we should have been already on track.

I know this administration loves to brag about how oil and gas production are up, but it is no thanks to them. They have used again, weaponized the EPA, OSHA, Department of Justice, the Interior Department, they have become as big an impediment as they possibly could to the oil and gas industry in America.

What a lot of Americans don't understand, and frankly, I was a little surprised myself to find out that, in the Continental United States, 94 to 95 percent of the oil and gas wells are drilled or operated by independent oil and gas drillers, American companies.

So when the President, for the last 5 years, has talked about how he is going after Big Oil, if you look at his proposals, he wants to eliminate tax deductions, the elimination of which would bankrupt most independent oil and gas operators.

So what would that do?

The 94 to 95 percent of the oil and gas wells in America would either cease, or they would fall into the hands of the big, major oil companies that the President decries.

Well, isn't that strange?

You bash and bad mouth Big Oil, and yet, everything you propose and try to do seems like it is making them richer and getting rid of their competition.

We hear a President call Wall Street executives fat cats, and determined to do something about them, and yet, when you look at the real books and the real story, four out of five gave money to Democrats. About 80 percent of them, of Wall Street executives, donate to Democrats and the President over Republicans.

Well, that's strange. Why would he call them fat cats? I don't know.

Why have they gotten richer and richer and richer and expanded the gap between the ultra-rich and the ultra-poor during this administration's last 5 years?

The distance, as this President has pointed out, has gotten worse. What he has failed to do is say, because of my proposals, the things I have pushed, the things I have done, the poor and the rich have grown further and further apart.

My rich friends, my rich donors have gotten richer than they might have ever dreamed, and we have had more people fall into poverty than were able to climb out.

That, 50 years after Johnson's speech.

If it weren't for the policies in this war on poverty declared 50 years ago, it may well be that I would not have ever run for Congress, because what got me thinking about it first, as a State district judge back in Texas, was seeing more and more young women, single women, coming before me, single moms, charged with welfare fraud

under State law, a felony, so they came before me as a felony judge.

I heard the story over and over and over, how, as a young girl in high school, she was bored with high school, and someone suggested, well, why don't you just drop out of high school and have a baby? Then the government will send you a check, and they will send you a check for every baby you have out of wedlock.

Drop out, have a baby out of wedlock, get the check from the government, and the ones that came before me would normally explain, it wasn't enough. So I thought, well, maybe if I have another baby and get another check it will help me get out of the hole. But it didn't.

One woman had had 15 kids, didn't even know where they all were. That was the most that I ever dealt with.

It began to really eat away with me that, in the sixties, the Federal Government, desiring to help poor moms who were dealing with deadbeat dads that weren't helping, decided, we will help. We will give a check for every child you can have out of wedlock, when the statistics made clear then, and make clear now, and every point in between, that a young man or a young woman has a better chance of a financially successful life if they finish high school.

Normally, kids have a better chance of financial success if they finish college. That was until more recent days, and I am not sure what the statistics on that are now. We know that, clearly, people are better off if they learn to read, they finish high school, have a high school diploma, or at least a GED.

That is why, with most of the women, I didn't send any of those women to prison. I put them on probation. I would normally give them a tremendous amount of, I think it was about 800 hours you could give as community service, and then give 750 hours credit if they got a GED or got a high school diploma, because I knew that was better for society if they finished high school, and if it was better for them, it would be better for society, and they could be more successful.

□ 1945

After Republicans took over the Congress in the 1994 election, sworn in in 1995, one of the things they did was welfare reform, and they started requiring people to work who were on welfare.

And when I was a freshman at Harvard, we were given a presentation—and I was shocked it was at Harvard—which showed that single moms' income since the war on poverty began, when adjusted for inflation from the mid-sixties until 1995, was flat-lined.

That incredibly expensive war on poverty didn't help single moms one iota in the long run. Oh, sure, it helped them buy groceries and things at the time, but look at what happened. They were lured into ruts from which many of them could not extricate themselves

successfully. But after there was a requirement for work that was put in after the Contract With America, it was a contract for America, the graph showed that over the last nearly 10 years, income for single moms had taken a sharp rise upward over that entire period.

And what happened when President Obama came in? He wanted to waive, and did waive, the work requirement. Could he do that? No, not legally. Did he do that? Yes, he did. Could he rewrite immigration law and say, We will legalize these folks meeting these requirements? No, not legally. Did he do it? Yes, he did. And what did Congress do about it? A bunch of us complained. But the Senate was going to protect the President no matter what he did is the way it appeared and the way it continues to appear.

So when the President brags about saving the auto industry, the auto industry would be a whole lot better off today if the bankruptcy had been done in accordance with bankruptcy law and the Constitution and dealers had not had dealerships jerked away from them. For heaven's sake, it is not like the dealerships were costing the manufacturers anything. Dealers have to pay for their own expenses. Yet he cost them royally.

And now we know, because so many people have gotten desperate and have just given up hope of getting employment, we actually have more people not working now than ever. So we have those who are listed as unemployed and those that just have given up hope, and they are not even counted in the unemployed anymore.

The war on poverty has been a disaster. The best thing for Americans is that they have a home that is a nuclear home, and there is at least one or two people in that home who have a job making money.

America has always been about greatness. Give us your tired, your poor—but not so we can put them on welfare and lure them into a hole they can never get out of. It was so that they could get a job and earn a decent living and raise a family; and, instead, we incentivized single homes. So that after the war on poverty began, we went from just over 6 percent—between 6 and 7 percent of all children being born to single moms—to now over 40 percent, continuing to head toward 50 percent.

Why do the children have to suffer for the ignorance and stupidity of the government and those who meant well but just did stupid things? It is tragic. It shouldn't have to be that way. We owe the people of America so much better. Nuclear family homes are a building block of this country that has made it successful; and by the grace of God, I hope and pray we can pass legislation that gets us back to strong homes and jobs and not more government giveaways.

And I keep wondering, Mr. Speaker, wouldn't it have been better in the six-

ties to say, you know what, we realize you are dealing with a dead beat dad. We know you would be better off with a high school education. So instead of giving you a check for every child you can have out of wedlock, how about if we give you some day care for that child so you finish high school and you are on the right track to getting a job. That would have made a difference for more Americans.

And with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. FARR (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of medical reason.

Ms. GABBARD (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for January 8 through January 16.

Mr. RUSH (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for January 7 and the balance of the week on account of attending family acute medical care and hospitalization.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 9, 2014, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

OATH OF OFFICE MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

“I, AB, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.”

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 113th Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25:

BRADLEY BYRNE, First District of Alabama.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

4394. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — 2,5-Furandione, polymer with ethenylbenzene, reaction products with polyethylene-polypropylene glycol 2-aminopropyl Me ether; Tolerance Exemption [EPA-HQ-OPP-2013-0540; FRL-9902-90] received December 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4395. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Amendment to Standards and Practices for All Appropriate Inquiries Under CERCLA [EPA-HQ-SFUND-2013-0513; FRL-9904-52-OSWER] received December 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4396. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Connecticut; Ozone Attainment Demonstration for the Greater Connecticut Area [EPA-R01-OAR-2008-0117-A-1-FRL-9904-45-Region 1] received December 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4397. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana; Disapproval of State Implementation Plan Revision for ArcelorMittal Burns Harbor [EPA-R05-OAR-2009-0965; FRL-9904-71-Region 5] received December 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4398. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Approval of the 2002 Base Year Emissions Inventory for the Liberty-Clairton Nonattainment Area for the 1997 Annual Fine Particulate Matter National Ambient Air Quality Standard and Revisions to Regulations of Allegheny County [EPA-R08-OAR-2011-0854; FRL-9904-50-Region 3] received December 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4399. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report prepared by the Department of State concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4400. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's Performance and Accountability Report for Fiscal Year 2013; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BURGESS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 455. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2279) to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act relating to review of regulations under such Act and to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 relating to financial responsibility for classes of facilities; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3362) to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to require transparency in the operation of American Health Benefit Exchanges; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3811) to require notification of individuals of breaches of personally identifiable information through Exchanges under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Rept. 113-322). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina:

H.R. 3818. A bill to repeal certain amendments to the Energy Policy and Conservation Act with respect to lighting energy efficiency; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. CAPITO (for herself, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, and Mr. MCHENRY):

H.R. 3819. A bill to amend a provision of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 regarding prohibitions on investments in certain funds to clarify that such provision shall not be construed to require the divestiture of certain collateralized debt obligations backed by trust-preferred securities; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida:

H.R. 3820. A bill to encourage benchmarking and disclosure of energy information for commercial buildings; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. CHRISTENSEN:

H.R. 3821. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to assist in the recovery and development of the Virgin Islands by providing for a reduction in the tax imposed on distributions from certain retirement plans' assets which are invested for at least 30 years, subject to defined withdrawals, under a Virgin Islands investment program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico (for himself and Mr. PEARCE):

H.R. 3822. A bill to provide for the implementation of the property division regarding former Fort Wingate Depot Activity in McKinley County, New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS:

H. Res. 453. A resolution electing a Member to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BECERRA:

H. Res. 454. A resolution electing a Member to a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

166. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina, relative to H. 3400 repealing Joint Resolution 775 of 1976 which requested Congress to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

167. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, relative to H. Res. 18-34 requesting that the Congress eliminate Section 2109 of S. 744 and any similar legislation that is currently before both houses of Congress; jointly to the Committees on Natural Resources and the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. TIBERI introduced a bill (H.R. 3823) for the relief of John Cheruiyot Kemboi and Winnie Njeri Kemboi; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina:

H.R. 3818.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution enumerates powers to Congress. The Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 claimed powers not enumerated to Congress, regulating commerce that is not necessarily of an interstate nature, namely the sale of incandescent light bulbs. This legislation repeals that unconstitutional Act, restoring a measure of liberty to the American people instead.

By Mrs. CAPITO:

H.R. 3819.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 1: All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States.

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida:

H.R. 3820.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 and Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mrs. CHRISTENSEN:

H.R. 3821.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

"Article I, Section 7, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States provides that All Bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives and Section 8, Clause 1 grants Congress the Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States."

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico:

H.R. 3822.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The United States Constitution recognizes and respects the sovereignty of Native American Tribes, and, therein, recognizes the treaties, government-to-government rela-

tionship, and trust responsibility the United States government has with indigenous communities.

Mr. TIBERI:

H.R. 3823.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 of the U.S. Constitution

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 24: Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 32: Mr. DESJARLAIS.

H.R. 164: Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. DOYLE, and Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 233: Mr. HOLT and Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 409: Mr. LABRADOR.

H.R. 411: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.

H.R. 449: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 455: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD and Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 485: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 580: Mr. SCALISE.

H.R. 630: Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 728: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 732: Ms. JENKINS.

H.R. 791: Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 863: Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. NADLER, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. MEEKS, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. O'ROURKE, and Mrs. LUMMIS.

H.R. 921: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 951: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 1008: Mr. REICHERT.

H.R. 1010: Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. CARNEY.

H.R. 1012: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 1015: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 1020: Mr. FINCHER.

H.R. 1078: Mr. LANKFORD.

H.R. 1091: Mr. COTTON.

H.R. 1173: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1176: Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 1209: Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. GOODLATTE, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 1252: Mr. DOYLE, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 1317: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 1354: Mr. COHEN and Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 1523: Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 1530: Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 1563: Mr. HALL.

H.R. 1594: Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.

H.R. 1617: Mr. GRAYSON.

H.R. 1666: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 1686: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 1699: Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 1701: Mr. COTTON.

H.R. 1732: Mr. POCAN and Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 1771: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 1795: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 1812: Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 1814: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. DAINES, and Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 1821: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 1832: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 1851: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 1921: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1941: Ms. DELAURO and Ms. SCHKOWSKY.

H.R. 1991: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 2199: Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.

H.R. 2247: Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 2291: Mr. GIBSON, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 2384: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 2415: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. CICILLINE, and Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 2482: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 2500: Mrs. WALORSKI.
 H.R. 2510: Mr. KING of New York.
 H.R. 2638: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. OWENS, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. BILLIRAKIS, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. WOLF.
 H.R. 2692: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD and Mr. HOLT.
 H.R. 2734: Mr. HOLT, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
 H.R. 2810: Mr. LANGEVIN.
 H.R. 2839: Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. HANABUSA, and Mr. KEATING.
 H.R. 2841: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 2852: Ms. SPEIER.
 H.R. 2874: Mrs. BEATTY.
 H.R. 2907: Ms. SCHWARTZ.
 H.R. 2936: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
 H.R. 2959: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. DUFFY, and Mr. BARR.
 H.R. 3034: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
 H.R. 3047: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
 H.R. 3118: Ms. MOORE.
 H.R. 3121: Mr. SCHWEIKERT and Mr. BYRNE.
 H.R. 3125: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
 H.R. 3135: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. O'ROURKE.
 H.R. 3167: Mr. KILMER.
 H.R. 3179: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.
 H.R. 3240: Mr. KILMER.
 H.R. 3243: Mr. PETERS of Michigan and Mr. HOLT.
 H.R. 3299: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
 H.R. 3322: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD and Mrs. BEATTY.
 H.R. 3335: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
 H.R. 3337: Mr. ISRAEL.
 H.R. 3344: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.
 H.R. 3353: Ms. BASS.
 H.R. 3372: Mr. HOLT and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
 H.R. 3374: Mr. HECK of Washington.
 H.R. 3382: Mr. O'ROURKE.
 H.R. 3397: Mr. RANGEL.
 H.R. 3413: Mr. COTTON and Mr. STEWART.
 H.R. 3436: Mr. POE of Texas.
 H.R. 3453: Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 3494: Mr. ROSKAM.
 H.R. 3529: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
 H.R. 3530: Mrs. WAGNER.

H.R. 3536: Mr. CONNOLLY.
 H.R. 3541: Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. WALBERG.
 H.R. 3546: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 3556: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 3571: Mr. SIREAS, Mr. WAXMAN, and Ms. DELBENE.
 H.R. 3594: Mr. O'ROURKE.
 H.R. 3601: Mr. FLEMING and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
 H.R. 3620: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
 H.R. 3633: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
 H.R. 3635: Mr. COLE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. YOHO, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. MEADOWS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BENISHEK, and Mr. KINGSTON.
 H.R. 3657: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
 H.R. 3683: Mr. ISRAEL and Mr. LOBIONDO.
 H.R. 3685: Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. LATTA, Mr. LONG, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. VISCLOSKY, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
 H.R. 3698: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. OWENS, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, and Mrs. LOWEY.
 H.R. 3706: Mr. SCHRADER.
 H.R. 3717: Mr. COLE, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Mr. SHUSTER.
 H.R. 3726: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. RUSH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. VELA.
 H.R. 3788: Mr. SMITH of Missouri and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
 H.R. 3789: Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. PITTENGER, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. LONG, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Mr. BERA of California.
 H.R. 3790: Mr. LONG, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, and Mr. BERA of California.
 H.R. 3793: Mr. WELCH.
 H.R. 3804: Mr. VARGAS and Mr. KILMER.
 H.R. 3807: Mr. FARENTHOLD and Mr. LUTTKEMEYER.

H.R. 3811: Mr. LAMBORN and Mr. POSEY.
 H.J. Res. 56: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. PETERSON.
 H. Con. Res. 64: Mr. CARSON of Indiana and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
 H. Con. Res. 66: Mr. REED.
 H. Res. 72: Mr. CONNOLLY.
 H. Res. 281: Mr. BENTIVOLIO.
 H. Res. 302: Mr. BERA of California.
 H. Res. 313: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
 H. Res. 431: Mr. TIPTON and Mr. WILLIAMS.
 H. Res. 443: Mr. JEFFRIES.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. CAMP

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Ways and Means in H.R. 3362, "Exchange Information Disclosure Act," do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives.

OFFERED BY MR. UPTON

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Energy and Commerce in H.R. 3362 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. UPTON

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Energy and Commerce in H.R. 3811, "Health Exchange Security and Transparency Act of 2014," do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.