

atrocities perpetrated by radical Islamists have done more to test Christian neutrality than the use of chemical weapons and war crimes by the Assad regime.

Ending the Civil War through a negotiated solution represents the best prospect for peace, and the international community must insist that any agreement reached at the upcoming peace talks in Geneva or thereafter will guarantee the safety of Syria's minority populations.

In the meantime, America can do more to help those seeking refuge. That is why I have been working for much of the past year to convince the administration to allow humanitarian parole for the nearly 6,000 Syrians with approved immigrant petitions to the United States.

As hundreds of millions around the world prepare to celebrate the most joyful day of the Christian calendar, the international community must intensify its efforts to end this terrible war, and also to protect Syria's Christians and ensure the continued vitality of this 2,000-year-old community.

AMAZON PRIME AIR

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the innovativeness of American enterprise flies off the radar.

According to Amazon CEO Jeff Bezos, the company is fixing to deliver packages to its customers via drones. It is called "Amazon Prime Air."

That's right. In just a few years, Bezos said people will be able to order something online and have it in their hands within 30 minutes by the use of drones. It sounds like something out of the Jetsons, doesn't it? Gone will be the days of the neighborhood mail carriers. Soon there will be a drone to replace them. According to Amazon, these drones can deliver packages up to 5 pounds, which makes up 90 percent of their deliveries.

Mr. Speaker, thousands of Americans use Amazon every year, especially around the holiday season. Amazon, unlike the glitch-ridden government Web sites, can efficiently use online Internet services that get a timely product to market. Think of how many drones could soon be flying around the sky. Here a drone, there a drone, everywhere a drone in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, Amazon is just one of many companies that will be looking to take advantage of this cost-effective drone technology in the coming years. And good for Amazon. I congratulate them.

The FAA is charged with the responsibility of coming up with ways to regulate drones for safety reasons, but who is watching out for the privacy of American citizens? Congress has the responsibility and the duty to set clear regulation for all drones in domestic use. Absent legislation to prevent sur-

veillance of Americans, companies could use drones not only for delivery, but other ways that, in my opinion, violate the constitutional right of privacy.

The issue of concern, Mr. Speaker, is surveillance, not the delivery of packages. That includes surveillance of someone's backyard, snooping around with a drone, checking out a person's patio to see if that individual needs new patio furniture from the company.

□ 1015

Photographing swing sets, pools, or the people that are in the pools, or even looking into windows, all of that could be done with the use of drones under corporate America or by individuals. This would all be possible. So Congress must ensure that the expanded use of drones in the coming years does not come at the expense of the individual right to privacy.

After all, this is a right guaranteed to all Americans under the Fourth Amendment. That's why I have, along with Representative ZOE LOFGREN (Calif), introduced the bipartisan Preserving American Privacy Act. Our bill would deal with several things, and, once again, Mr. Speaker, we're talking about regulating surveillance and setting guidelines for the expectation of privacy for citizens.

It would, first of all, deal with the government. It would prohibit the government from using drones for targeted surveillance of an individual or their property without a search warrant. The Fourth Amendment applies to the use of drones when the government is involved. It would also prohibit individuals or companies from using drones to take photographs or audio recordings of private individuals without their consent.

This is private surveillance, or spying, or snooping, whatever you want to call it. It would restrict private individuals and law enforcement agencies from arming drones, which can be done.

As we enter this uncharted world of drone technology, Congress must be proactive and establish boundaries for drone use that safeguard the constitutional rights of Americans and not leave this up to the FAA.

Individuals are somewhat concerned that these new eyes in the skies may threaten their privacy, so Congress can and should immediately balance this high-tech development with our constitutional right of privacy.

Boundaries are needed before drones flood the skies of America. Just because Big Brother or individuals or companies can look into someone's backyard or through a window of a house doesn't mean it should be allowed. As the innovativeness of American enterprise flies off the radar, we should be mindful that technology may change, but the Constitution does not.

And that's just the way it is.

END HUNGER NOW

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to welcome all of my colleagues back from their Thanksgiving holiday, and I trust that, like me, everybody had a great Thanksgiving along with a wonderful meal. But I'm here today to remind my colleagues, so that they don't forget, that for millions of our fellow citizens, they were without a Thanksgiving dinner. In fact, for millions of our fellow citizens, they go without meals on a regular basis. Men, women, and children, close to 50 million Americans, go hungry in our country, the richest country in the history of the world. It is a national scandal, and it is something that we need to do something about.

Mr. Speaker, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, otherwise known as SNAP, helps struggling families put food on the table. It's a good program that, sadly, has come under attack by some—not all—but by some of my Republican friends, and for the life of me, I can't understand why.

The average SNAP benefit is about \$1.40 per meal. The No Kid Hungry campaign, launched by the group Share Our Strength, recently did a chart which shows that the average cost of one Thanksgiving dinner is about \$49.04. That's equal to about 35 SNAP meals.

The fact is that our food banks are at capacity. I went to a Thanksgiving dinner sponsored by my bishop that was filled with people looking for food. That same group run by the Catholic Charities delivered well over 1,000 meals to people in my community on that one Thanksgiving Day. But the notion that somehow charity can do it all, or that food banks can do it all, or that churches or synagogues or mosques can do it all, is just wrong.

I would urge my colleagues to visit a food bank, to visit a food pantry, talk to the people who run those organizations and let them inform you of who is showing up at their doorsteps. Talk to the people who go to these food banks. These are average people. Many of them are working families who earn so little that they still qualify for the SNAP benefit.

The White House released a report over the Thanksgiving holiday talking about the importance of the nutrition assistance program. The report highlights, among other things, that in 2012 SNAP kept nearly 5 million people out of poverty, including 2.2 million children. SNAP reduced child poverty by 3 percentage points in 2012, the largest child poverty impact of any safety net program other than refundable tax credits.

The program's benefits are targeted to those most in need and designed to support work. The large majority of SNAP participants are children, the elderly, or people with disabilities, and

about 95 percent of Federal spending on SNAP goes directly to subsidizing the food purchases of eligible households. It is one of the most efficiently run Federal programs. I wish the Department of Defense was run as efficiently as this. Our deficit would be much lower. Among SNAP households with at least one working age non-disabled adult, more than half work—more than half work—and more than 80 percent worked in the year before or after receiving SNAP.

Now, the legislation that the House Republican leadership rammed through this Congress and is now part of a negotiation on the farm bill would cut the program by close to \$40 billion. That would result in nearly 4 million Americans losing access to SNAP next year, including working families with children, seniors, and veterans. Nearly 170,000 veterans would lose their benefits. In addition, 210,000 children and these families would also lose free school meals. These cuts would come on top of the significant benefit reduction already experienced by all SNAP recipients as a result of the American Recovery Act moneys running out.

I would say to my colleagues that what that cut that went into effect on November 1 means is that the average family of four would see a reduction of about \$36 per month in their SNAP benefit. We're talking about food. We're talking about making sure in the richest country in the history of the world that nobody goes hungry.

I know that these are tough budgetary times, but if you want to find ways to save money, I would suggest we listen to my colleague, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, and get the hell out of Afghanistan. Stop supporting one of the most corrupt regimes on this planet today, the Karzai regime. Take those millions and those billions and reinvest it here at home. Reinvest it in a way that we end hunger now.

Mr. Speaker, for millions of our citizens who are hungry, what they worry about and what they fear is not halfway around the world. It is halfway down the block. We ought to make sure we get a farm bill that does not make hunger worse in this country, and if we have a farm bill that cuts SNAP significantly, I would urge all my colleagues to not only vote against it but fight against it. We can do better. Let's get a farm bill, but let's not make hunger worse.

UKRAINE

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to condemn the recent actions taken by the Ukrainian Government on its own citizens. A couple weeks ago, I stood here hopeful, urging their government to look westward as they entered the Eastern Partnership Summit in Vilnius. While Georgia and Moldova

have moved forward in signing association agreements with the European Union, the Government of Ukraine failed to sign this agreement. This move is disappointing and even more so for the Ukrainian citizens who long for closer ties with Europe.

Due to President Yanukovich's lack of action, Ukrainians have taken to the streets in protest and have been met with extreme brutality. I join with the State Department in urging the Ukrainian Government to respect the rights of its people and allow freedom of expression and assembly. Ukraine should not bully or take violent action if they desire to be a peaceful, democratic nation.

I will continue to support the citizens of Ukraine as they pursue democracy and freedom in their country. It is my wish that Ukraine will seek other means of integration with Europe and not fall to demands and pressure from Russia. It is time to look to the future, not to the Soviet-style rule that has plagued their past for countless years.

JPMORGAN CHASE SETTLEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, it has been reported that JPMorgan Chase has agreed to a \$13 billion settlement of the civil suit filed by the United States Department of Justice and the Federal Housing Finance Agency in order to resolve several investigations into their mortgage securities fiasco. JPMorgan and its affiliates knowingly misrepresented the value and quality of the mortgage bonds that it sold to the housing finance agency. Compared to the trillions that Wall Street banks have extracted in home equity from the American people, a \$13 billion settlement with JPMorgan Chase doesn't come close to repaying the American people what they are owed back. More cases need to be filed to mete out justice and recoup what has been wrongly taken.

Of the \$13 billion settlement, \$4 billion will be for the Federal Housing Finance Agency which will go to Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. How that filters down to the street, to the ordinary homeowner, we can't predict. Two billion will be credited through JPMorgan's reduction of principal on mortgages in areas hardest hit by foreclosures like Detroit and cities like Cleveland and Toledo in Ohio.

JPMorgan Chase currently holds—get this—nearly 1 million mortgages: 208,000 mortgages considered seriously delinquent and an excess of 700,000 which are underwater. That's too much power over our marketplace in too few hands.

Five hundred million of the settlement will be credited for the removal of blight from neighborhoods through demolition, reducing interest rates, and offering new loans to low-income borrowers. My goodness, every commu-

nity in America could use some of that. That's very little money for a very big hole.

This settlement may appear like a big step. It's a small step in the right direction. However, let me put these figures on the record. Last year, JPMorgan Chase made \$21.3 billion in profits—and that doesn't count what's in their reserves. A settlement of \$13 billion therefore is barely half of what JPMorgan made in all of last year after expenses. In fact, this settlement of \$13 billion is equal to exactly half of what they had already set aside, \$26 billion, for legal fees since 2010. By the way, they make their money by charging all of us high fees, or paying us nothing on our savings accounts and certificates of deposit.

Moreover, the settlement will also be largely tax deductible for the bank, as well. Although the tax law does not allow fines or penalties paid to the Federal Government to be tax deductible, that only accounts for \$2 billion of the settlement that the bank has to pay in civil penalties to settle their legal claims. That leaves \$7 billion in compensatory damages that the bank could claim, for guess what? In tax deductibles. Imagine that. This greatly reduces the impact this settlement has on correcting their bad behavior and mitigating the damages it has to pay in the lawsuit. Imagine if homeowners were allowed to deduct the damages they have incurred as a result of Wall Street's misbehavior. Now, there's an idea.

Here are some figures to ponder: Over the last couple years, the CEO of JPMorgan has taken home anywhere from \$23 million plus bonuses, plus stock options, on an annual basis. Mary Erdoes, the CEO of their asset management division, last year it was reported was paid \$15 million plus \$5 million in bonuses—bonuses. This is before they have settled all of these mortgages that they hold belonging to the American people.

Matthew Zames, their co-chief CEO, \$17 million plus \$6 million in bonuses, and Daniel Pinto \$17 million in salary alone plus \$8 million in bonuses, not counting all their stock options, cars, you know, all those things that they're given in their privileged positions.

The American people are really sick of this. They really want justice. We need more legal cases filed, and Congress should reinstate the Glass-Steagall Act by passing H.R. 129, the Return to Prudent Banking Act of 2013. This will end what caused the financial crisis—too much power in too few hands, and the power to create money irresponsibly. Our country should never again have to endure this kind of collapse because of the mistakes that they made.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's time for community after community to replicate those legal cases that have been successful in extracting repayment to communities and to harmed families across our country.