

her to succeed and be a role model that she planted a seed for our family and her sons and then my father and my uncle. And it just fed the line for success and all of us going to college because of my grandmother. She was the very strong one in the family.

America cannot afford to maintain the status quo. Nearly 70 percent of Americans on or above the brink of poverty are women and the children who depend on them. That is almost 42 million American women and more than 28 million American children living on or at the brink of poverty. Tonight's conversation is about sparking an agenda that will enable women to achieve greater security. This includes raising wages for women and their families and allowing working parents to support and care for their families.

I want to thank the entire Congressional Black Caucus, especially my fellow co-anchor, the gentlewoman from Ohio, Congresswoman BEATTY, who did a fantastic job.

As we recognize Black History Month, we are reminded the Congressional Black Caucus exists to improve communities through policy action that meets the needs of millions of our most vulnerable citizens. It is that spirit that guides us here tonight. When we see millions of women and children on the brink of poverty, we must act. When we see total household incomes being short-changed because of gender biases in wage, we won't stand for it. When women succeed, America succeeds. I will say it again. When women succeed, America succeeds.

I thank my colleagues for caring enough to get involved in this debate.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. I ask unanimous consent that my colleagues have 5 days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MESSER). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. With that, I yield to my co-anchor, Representative BEATTY, for any last words.

Mrs. BEATTY. Let me just say as we close out that it is so important that you understand that our message tonight is certainly about making a difference in the lives of those who live in this wonderful country. So let me end as we started with, when women succeed, America succeeds.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and not to a perceived audience.

A NATION DIVIDED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) for 30 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to address you here on the

floor of the United States House of Representatives and to take up some of the issues that I know are important to you and are important to Americans. I come here tonight to try to put some perspective on this intense debate that we have had.

I would start with this, Mr. Speaker, that over Christmas vacation, I don't know of a time that this Congress hasn't taken a break over Christmas and gone back to celebrate the birth of our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ. That is the foundation of the core of the faith of our Founding Fathers that established this country, built this Capitol, and worshipped in the building.

I do remember a Christmas Eve present that we got from the United States Senate Christmas Eve morning when they passed a version of ObamaCare on a Christmas Eve vote, but I don't remember a President ever criticizing Congress for leaving town to go visit our families over Christmas vacation until this year when our President of the United States, Mr. Speaker, made his trip to his home State of Hawaii and took his Christmas break out there. He took his family with him, and certainly most thinking Americans don't object to such a thing, but I remember a speech that he gave from Hawaii where he criticized Congress for leaving town over Christmas. He said that we should have stayed here in Washington and solved this myriad of problems we have in our Nation, that going home apparently was inappropriate.

Well, I think when they were here, when the Senate was in voting on Christmas Eve morning that morning when they delivered to us ObamaCare, that was the time they should have gone home for Christmas vacation instead and listened to the American people, because the aftermath of that was that there was a huge wave election in 2010, and Republicans in the House of Representatives ended up with 87 freshman Republicans as a result of the American people's rejecting ObamaCare.

Nonetheless, Mr. Speaker, I bring up the point of the President's criticism of Congress for taking Christmas off and point out three other topics that he brought up in that speech. He said he has an agenda for 2014—and this was a preview of his State of the Union address, I might add—and this agenda that the President has for 2014 includes three things: the extension of unemployment benefits, adding weeks on what his number really is—but I know that they have supported 99 weeks, almost 2 years of unemployment—and then the other piece of it was to increase the minimum wage. He is seeking to do that by an executive edict with regard to the Federal employees. And the third piece was he called upon Congress to pass comprehensive immigration reform.

Now, when you are home with your family over Christmas and you hear a

speech like that from the President of the United States, the first thing you think is why in the world would he go before the American people with any kind of a message, let alone one like that? Don't take a Christmas break, and I am going to tell Congress what they ought to do. They ought to pass a minimum wage increase; they should extend unemployment benefits; and they should pass—the President said this to us before—the Senate version of the Gang of 8's comprehensive immigration reform bill.

I point out, also, Mr. Speaker, that America now understands that comprehensive immigration reform—CIR, for short—really is three words that encompass one word, and that is “amnesty.”

One would wonder why the President chose those three topics and gave that speech at that time. I would give this answer, Mr. Speaker: no one should really wonder. A President of one party that has the same party that rules in the United States Senate and controls the agenda over there, who is opposed by Republicans in the House of Representatives, is going to do this predictably, because tactically it is what you do in this business if you are not a uniter but a divider, and that is pick the topics that unify your party and divide the opposing party.

So he picked three topics that just essentially and almost universally—I will say, virtually—unify the Democrat Party and are designed to split and divide the Republican Party—minimum wage, for example. Now, I can go back quite a ways on how far back the minimum wage goes. But I can say, Mr. Speaker, that every time that Congress has raised the minimum wage, somebody has lost a job. It has cost jobs every time. We lose more and more of those entry-level job opportunities when the minimum wage goes up because the employers can't afford to train unskilled workers and put them in the workforce and take on all of the risk, the regulation, the recordkeeping, the liability, and sometimes the benefits package that is required. They can't afford to pay all of that and bring somebody into the workforce that has maybe no skills.

The reason that there are entry-level wages is so that people can get started in a job and you can afford as an employer to hire them and keep them there and upgrade their job skills, and hopefully in the same company you can move them right on up through the chain and bring them up through the system, and their wages and their benefit package, or at least their wages, go up with that consistently.

I happen to know how that works. We have never—I founded and have operated a construction company for 28 years. In those 28 years, we have never paid minimum wage. We have always paid over that. But when we brought somebody in at a skill level, we identified their skills, paid them what we thought we could afford to pay them,

trained them, watched to see how they developed, and gave them raises in proportion to the skill level and the production that they gave because, after all, when they come to work, they would say, What is my job? And I said, Well, your job is to help me make money. If you do that, then I want you to stay here, and we are going to do our best to take care of you.

Mr. Speaker, I recall walking into my construction office in one of those years, perhaps in the early nineties, and my secretary had decorated the Christmas tree in the entryway of our office. I looked at the tree. It looked nice, and it had decorations on it. I don't usually pay much attention to those things, and I walked on.

She said to me, Well, did you notice the tree? And I said, Yes, I did.

And isn't it pretty? was her question. Sure, the tree was pretty. She said, Go back and look at it a little more closely.

I went back and looked at that tree more closely, and it was symmetrical, symmetrically decorated. It didn't have any lights on it, and it didn't have any tinsel on it. All it had on it for decorations were gold Christmas emblems that were a thin piece of something thicker than foil but that kind of a texture, gold. And it would be, oh, a snowflake, a star, a baby Jesus and different pieces from the nativity scene all over that tree. Then I looked at that, and I said, Yeah, those are nice. She said, Look a little closer. She turned one of the decorations around on the back side, and on the back side there was engraved the name of one of our employees. And you look at another, and it would be their spouse. And you look at another, it would be one of our employees' children.

By the time I had looked at those decorations on that tree, it occurred to me that the decisions that I was making that were designed to help the company make money also impacted the lives of not just the people that we were writing the paycheck to, but their spouse, their children, and their family members, and that the responsibility of those decisions impacted all of the names on that tree directly.

It is quite a thing to walk in and understand that, Mr. Speaker, and see how that is. But all of those people on that tree benefited from the decisions I made, hopefully; and we benefited, all of us together, from the work we did together.

That is the way companies are supposed to be—good companies especially. Small companies operate like families. Good companies today, large companies, talk about the culture of the workplace. They want that culture to be a culture that brings people back again, people that look forward to going to work every day. They want people to look forward to working with their colleagues and their coworkers, and they compete for good labor.

So we don't need a Federal Government that gets in between an employer

and an employee. This system of entry-level wages that gets people started in a job where they can learn a skill, learn customer relations, learn responsibility, learn to look people in the eye, learn to provide service, learn to smile and hustle and act like you like it, if you can do that, you are not going to be working for minimum wage very long.

But the President and the Democrats want to divide that and put that minimum wage out of reach of a lot of employers, which means a lot of especially young people with no skills aren't going to get the opportunity. Divide, unify—virtually unify the Democrats—and divide the Republicans with minimum wage.

The next thing, extending unemployment benefits to 99 weeks, Mr. Speaker? How can we possibly afford paying people not to work for 99 weeks? The long tradition in this country has been 26 weeks, a half a year.

Now, a lot of times it is not people's fault when they get laid off. It might be seasonal; it might be the company folds; it might be the company downsizes. But that unemployment that is there is to give them a bridge to find another job, whatever they need to do to find that other job. And if this government decides, this Congress decides that we are going to borrow money, borrow money from the American people to run this government, borrow money from the Saudis, borrow money from the Chinese—\$1.3 trillion borrowed from the Chinese—so that we can extend unemployment benefits and sometimes provide early retirement for people that decide, "Well, I can qualify for 99 weeks of unemployment. I will be 65 by then. I can qualify then for Medicare, Social Security, and my pension plan. There is no reason for me to find a job at age 63 because this Federal Government has managed to add on to 99 weeks of unemployment," it is not a wise thing to do. It is a bad policy for our economy, and it causes our workforce skills to atrophy, Mr. Speaker.

□ 2130

So, having dispatched minimum wage and having dispatched extending unemployment benefits, now we are down to the third thing. In each case, unemployment benefits and extending unemployment benefits also, it is borrowed money to fund those projects that unify Democrats and divide Republicans. Part of the Republicans are going to say I am going to go along with that because I don't want to take the political heat, and inside they are going to think it is not a good thing for this country. They do the same thing on the minimum wage, increasing the minimum wage. So the President is dividing Republicans and he is unifying Democrats against Republicans.

The third thing is this: the proposal that this Congress pass comprehensive immigration reform, CIR/amnesty, that is the big one of the three divisive agenda items that the President rolled

out after he criticized Congress for taking Christmas off to visit our families.

Some of the result has been the pressure felt by some of the leadership in this Congress to produce a document that is called "Standards for Immigration Reform." So I received this document Thursday afternoon about 4:15 and I looked through this. These are principles on immigration, Mr. Speaker. I looked through this, and it has a preamble that starts out: "Our Nation's immigration system is broken." Well, that is the first half of the first sentence, and already I disagree.

Mr. Speaker, our immigration system is not broken. We have a system of laws and a system set up for enforcement. It is not the system that is broken; it is the President of the United States who has prohibited his law enforcement officers from actually following the law. When the law expressly dictates that when encountered, they need to place people who are unlawfully in the United States in removal proceedings, and the President has prohibited ICE, for example, and the Border Patrol, from carrying out the law, it is not the system that is broken; it is the President who has taken an oath of office that includes that he take care that the laws be faithfully executed, and I would close quote there, and that includes that the President is instead taking care that the law is not being faithfully executed, and there are at least five different violations of his constitutional limitations with regard to immigration. There are multiple others, Mr. Speaker.

The Constitution is at great risk because of the—I wanted to say "cavalier," but instead I would say because of the willful—disregard and disrespect for the Constitution that we have seen as the President has gone down the line and violated this Constitution multiple times.

For example, the President has suspended Welfare to Work. When that legislation was written back in the middle 1990s, and I know the author of that legislation, it was carefully and specifically written so that the President couldn't waive the work component of TANF, Temporary Assistance to Needy Families. Even though the language is specific and the language is as tight as they could think to write it at the time, the President has decided we are going to provide TANF benefits, but there is not going to be a work component.

Of the 80 different means-tested welfare programs we have in the United States, at least 80 of them, only one required work. All of the hubbub on the floor of the House of Representatives in the 1990s about Welfare to Work, there was going to be welfare reform and people were going to be transitioning from welfare to work, all of that hubbub resulted in one policy, one program that required work: Temporary Assistance to Needy Families. The President suspended the work component.

The President suspended No Child Left Behind. The President supported

and his minions carried out the Morton memos, which reversed immigration law, made up new immigration law, and ordered that they not enforce immigration law against people that apparently didn't make the President feel politically vulnerable.

So that is just part of this. That takes us also, Mr. Speaker, down to ObamaCare. In ObamaCare there have been multiple times that the President has violated the law that carries his name and his signature. The first and the most egregious—excuse me, not the first, the most egregious, was when the President announced some time last year that he was going to delay the implementation of the employer mandate.

Now, the law, Mr. Speaker, the ObamaCare law says that the employer mandate shall commence in each month after December of 2013. That means it starts in January, a month ago. We are into February now. The President has announced he is going to delay it for a year. He has no authority, he has no constitutional authority to delay the implementation of ObamaCare. None. Yet, he extended the individual mandate, delayed the employer mandate.

When the conscience protection was being violated in the rules that were written by the Department of Human Services, he decided every large employer, large employers had to provide contraceptives, abortifacients, and sterilizations as part of their health insurance policies, and religious organizations and individuals objected. They said I am not going to be violating my conscience. The law cannot compel me, because of my religious beliefs, to violate my religious beliefs. That is a First Amendment right, the protection of the freedom of religion. But the President insisted even the Catholic Church would have to comply.

For 2 weeks of national hubbub, the President held his ground. Until noon on a Friday, and a lot of these things happen, Mr. Speaker, around noon on a Friday, the President stepped out to the podium and said, I have heard this discussion that religious organizations don't want to provide contraceptives, abortifacients, and sterilizations—and abortifacients, Mr. Speaker, are abortion-causing pills. The religious organizations don't want to do this, and so now I am going to make an accommodation to the religious organizations. An accommodation, and the accommodation he made is, he said, I am now going to require the insurance companies to provide these things for free, and he repeated himself, provide these things for free.

So I thought okay, if there is going to be a change in policy, I bet I will see it come back before the floor of the House of Representatives, and I will have an opportunity to debate, perhaps offer an amendment, and vote on this change. Well, Mr. Speaker, I didn't really think that, I just knew that is what the Constitution would require

before there could be a change in the law, but there actually was a rule. So I checked the rule. Did they propose a rule change? Did they publish it? Did they go through the administrative procedures requirements in order to get a rule change?

The first thing you do is you go back and read the rule. Did anything change in the rule that compelled the churches to provide contraceptives, abortifacients, and sterilizations, as compared to the insurance companies, as the President said in his press conference. No, Mr. Speaker, there was no change in the regulations. The only thing that changed was the President gave a speech, and in that speech, he said religious organizations, you don't have to do this any more. Insurance companies, you have to do this now.

What a reach. What a constitutional overreach for a President to believe that because he spoke, millions would line up and swoon at the very words of a President of the United States who again is going beyond the bounds of the authority vested in him, limited by the Constitution of the United States. That just gives a sample of some of some of the things that are going on, Mr. Speaker.

I bring this up because the President said to Congress: Pass comprehensive immigration reform. He also said if he is not satisfied with the results, if Congress doesn't move fast enough, he has an ink pen and he has a cell phone, and he will just run the government by signing executive orders. That was part of the promise that he made behind me, Mr. Speaker, in his State of the Union address last week.

Well, so some in this Congress think if we try to catch up with the President, we can get along with him, and that's why you see this language here in the preamble of the Standards for Immigration Reform that says our immigration system is broken. Well, it is not broken. What is broken is the trust between the American people and the bond that is required when the President gives his oath of office to take care that the laws be faithfully executed, to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, not take it apart by executive action that we can't catch up with through litigation.

If the President doesn't respect his oath to the Constitution, and if the President doesn't respect the legitimate congressional authority under article 1 that the Congress has, why would he then respect a decision made by a court, especially a lower court, a circuit court. Maybe, just maybe, public opinion would force him to respect a Supreme Court, but, Mr. Speaker, it is unlikely that we will see a case get to the Supreme Court before this President is finally signing off in his last year of office.

I look at the points on this Standards for Immigration Reform, and there are four different provisions. One is border security and interior enforcement. It

says that must come first. Of course we know that they would legalize everybody first, and then they are going to try to secure our borders. It says secure our borders and verify they are secure. The difficulty with that is, who is going to decide when they are secure? I would hand it over to the Texas border sheriffs, along with New Mexico, Arizona, and California. I would hand it over to the local government people and let them decide. If the States would certify the borders are secure, if the sheriffs would certify that the borders are secure, and if the county supervisors would certify that they are secure, we would have a pretty good answer as to whether they are secure, but we have heard those promises before. Janet Napolitano made it clear that she thought the borders were secure. Of course, I don't believe that.

When I mentioned earlier in a media program that just the children, the unaccompanied children that are being picked up along our southern border are running up to the numbers where for this year it is going to tally 50,000; 50,000 children, some of them little kids, tiny little kids who are being handed over to coyotes to be brought into the United States so they can qualify for the promise of the DREAM Act—50,000 kids. That is not out of me; that is from the president of the Immigration and Customs Enforcement union, Chris Crane, who is a plaintiff in a lawsuit, by the way, that is stalled and sidetracked over to Eric Holder and other places.

Next point is Implement an Exit/Entry Visa Tracking System. Supposedly these are the broken parts of the immigration system. They are going to enforce the border because something is broken and they need to pass a new law. We have the resources to enforce the law. We are spending over \$12 billion on the southern border, and for about \$8 billion, we could build a four-lane interstate all of the way from the Pacific Ocean clear down to Brownsville. But then the Entry-Exit Visa System was passed into law. That is the law. It was passed into law in 1996. We have an entry system but not an exit system, so there is no balance of who is here. By the way, if you get that working, who is going to keep track who is here, at least theoretically, and how are you possibly going to enforce that given that you have sanctuary cities and you have the equivalent of sanctuary States and you have an administration that refuses to allow their own people who are hired to do so to enforce the law? I don't know why this is a new piece; it has been the law since 1996. If we can't get that law enforced, why would a new one be enforced if this one is not?

Item number three, Employer Verification and Workplace Enforcement. That is actually pretty good. That is the E-Verify program, and the language defines it. It says they need a workable electronic employment verification system. Now, if you make that

mandatory, you wonder about the freedom of the American people that now have to prove that they are an American before they can go to work. That is a new burden of proof that we haven't had before. I don't want to speak too strongly against that, Mr. Speaker. I would just say instead that my new IDEA Act is a better idea. What it does is it clarifies that wages and benefits paid to illegals are not deductible for Federal income tax purposes. It allows the IRS to come in and do an audit. In that audit, they can run the names of the employees through E-Verify, and if the employer uses E-Verify, they get safe harbor on any violations of hiring people who can't lawfully work in the United States. The IRS can look at that and say you had a chance for safe harbor, you didn't use E-Verify. These employees can't lawfully work in the United States, and you can't lawfully deduct the wages and benefits you paid to them. It is not a business expense to break the law. So the IRS would deny those business expenses for salary and benefits, and they can attach interest and penalty. So your \$10-an-hour illegal becomes about a \$16-an-hour illegal, and you have voluntary compliance with E-Verify. It is a much better situation. Point number three isn't so bad.

Reforms to the legal immigration system. That is, they want to accelerate legal immigration, Mr. Speaker, and the needs of employers and the desire for those exceptional individuals to help our economy. Well, there is some truth in that, but we are bringing in 1.2 million legal immigrants a year and giving them an opportunity, a path to citizenship; 1.2 million. Now, those folks who want to change all this policy and grant amnesty for everybody that is here, and then open the doors up for an accelerated legal immigration to go on after that, to the tens of millions, and we are not talking about 11 million; we are talking about 11 million times some multiplying factor that is probably closer to three times or more than that say over the next 20 years.

□ 2145

We need to come to a conclusion as to what is an appropriate number of legal immigrants to come into America. I think 1.2 million is plenty generous. I think then we should start to upgrade those applicants so that they are young, they have education, they have language skills, they have learning capacity, they have an ability to simulate into the American culture and the American civilization and contribute and pay taxes so that they carry their share of the load because the day is going to come that they are not.

Then, Mr. Speaker, I take us down to the lower end of this. First, the DREAM Act gets addressed, and it pretty much embraces DICK DURBIN'S DREAM Act. Of course, I reject that for the sake of this, that, again, it rewards lawbreakers.

But in the final paragraph, the concluding paragraph, it says: "individuals living outside the rule of law." It says, Mr. Speaker: "There will be no special path to citizenship for individuals who broke our Nation's immigration laws." There would be no special path to citizenship.

Well, let me just say that if you put people on a path to citizenship who are in this country illegally while you have 5 million people waiting outside the United States who do respect our laws, then you have given a special path to citizenship. The nonspecial path is for those folks to go back into their home country and line up behind the 5 million who are lined up in their home country today waiting, respecting our laws to come into the United States; otherwise, it is a special path to citizenship.

But they go on and they say: "that would be unfair to those immigrants who have played by the rules and harmful to promoting the rule of law." That is breathtaking in its concept. We are going to provide a special path to citizenship because it would be harmful to promoting the rule of law, except we are going to legalize all of those people that have broken the law. And we are not going to ask them to go back to their home country and get in the back of the line; we are going to let them stay here and it won't matter whether they are in a line or not. They were satisfied to live in the shadows of America—that is what they came here to do—or else they came here on the promise of amnesty like those kids that are coming across our southern border now to line up for the DREAM Act, 50,000 strong in a year.

"Harmful to promoting the rule of law." No. What they are proposing here is destructive to the rule of law.

It goes on further and it says: "from here on, our immigration laws will indeed be enforced." There is another breathtaking statement, Mr. Speaker. Immigration laws from here on would indeed be enforced.

I am very confident, and I have not looked, but I am very confident that I can go into this CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in the House and in the Senate and go back to 1986 and pull the debate out of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and point to you where time after time a Member of Congress, House and Senate, said, We are going to pass this amnesty act, and from here on, indeed, our laws will be enforced; we will restore the rule of law from this point forward, but first we must grant amnesty.

Those are the words from 1986. Those are the words from this document that was released just last Thursday. And those have always been the myopic words of people who believe in open borders more so than they believe and have reverence for our rule of law, which we still have the opportunity to restore, even from the 86th Amnesty Act, the rule of law.

If we fail to do so here and now, if this amnesty is granted, the rule of law

will not be restored within the lifetime of this Republic, Mr. Speaker.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities with regard to the President.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CRENSHAW (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of flight delays.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2860. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that the Inspector General of the Office of Personnel Management may use amounts in the revolving fund of the Office to fund audits, investigations, and oversight activities, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1901—An act to authorize the President to extend the term of the nuclear energy agreement with the Republic of Korea until March 19, 2016.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 4, 2014, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

4629. A letter from the Director, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the annual report from the Office of Financial Research for 2013; to the Committee on Financial Services.

4630. A letter from the Director, Office of Financial Research, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the 2013 Annual Report on Human Capital Planning; to the Committee on Financial Services.

4631. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting Pursuant to Section 27(f) of the Arms Export Control Act and Section 1(f) of Executive Order 11958, Transmittal No. 10-13 informing of an intent to sign the Memorandum of Understanding with the Kingdom of Belgium, Australia, Canada, the Kingdom of Denmark, the Federal Republic of Germany, the Hellenic Republic, the Kingdom of the Netherlands, the Kingdom of Norway, Portugal, the Kingdom of Spain, and