has a multiplier effect of \$1.79. These programs have helped keep generations of families out of poverty even while income inequality is growing worse.

A recent report shows that nearly half of the Nation's schoolchildren now qualify for free and reduced lunches. Those children, who come from low-income homes, account for more than half of all of the students in 17 States, mostly in Republican districts in the South and the West, I might add. A decade ago, just four States reported a majority of their schoolchildren eligible for free and reduced school lunches.

While I and many of my colleagues remain hopeful that the House will extend these vital supports, we are disheartened to see that the very first legislative action scheduled by the House majority in this new year is a return to the cynical attack on the Affordable Care Act. Ironically, just this week, the actuaries for Medicare and Medicaid released a report showing that in the 4 years since the adoption of the Affordable Care Act, for the first time ever, national health care expenditures have grown at the slowest rate since the government began collecting that data 50 years ago. The growth for insurance premiums in particular has slowed more than 60 percent, which equates to real savings for real workers, real families, and for our govern-

I want to work with my Republican colleagues to ensure proper oversight and accountability for the Affordable Care Act, but let's hang up this tired routine of trying to chip away or outright repeal these essential benefits and protections for families.

One of our Republican colleagues was quoted in the paper this week as saying, "A lot of Republicans think the big, bipartisan deal was the budget agreement" last year. Working together in a bipartisan fashion is not a limited exercise. It is what our citizens expect of us each and every day.

IT IS TIME TO RAISE THE WAGE

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

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker and friends, it is no coincidence that President Johnson declared a war on poverty within 6 months after Dr. King gave his "I Have a Dream" speech on the Mall in Washington. Whether by accident or whether by design, Dr. King and President Johnson worked in tandem with each other. They had something in common: they were both intelligent in their own right.

But intelligence without courage can be intelligence wasted. They both understood the politics of their time, but understanding the politics of your time without courage can be an understanding wasted. It was courage that made the difference in the lives of people for decades after they each did what they had to do. I thank God that Dr. King and President Johnson acted

in tandem and that they both had courage.

The marchers on Washington had 10 demands. Number 8 on that list of 10 demands was a demand to raise the wage to an amount that people could make a living off of, \$2 an hour. That \$2 an hour, adjusted for inflation today, would be \$13.39, more than \$13 an hour. Mr. Speaker and friends, it is time to raise the wage.

A UC Berkeley Labor Center report in 2013 connoted, denoted, and showed that families working in the fast food industry are subsidized to the tune of about \$7 billion. It is time to raise the wage. That same report showed that 63 percent of all families receiving subsidies had a working member. It is time to raise the wage.

Corporate welfare, corporations paying poverty wages, are indirectly subsidized with tax dollars when tax dollars provide food stamps, SNAP, Medicaid, and other assistance to workers. Indirect corporate subsidies will diminish and tax dollars will be saved when we raise the wage.

Do you like trickle-down economics? If so, you ought to want to raise the wage because by raising the wage, we can assure that the earned trickle will get down to the worker that has earned it. It is time to raise the wage.

Do you think people should pull themselves up by their bootstraps? Then raise the wage, and people will be able to pull themselves up out of poverty with their economic bootstraps.

Can we afford to raise the wage? Mr. Speaker and friends, yes, we can. On February 13, 2013, The Washington Post reported that the United States has one of the lowest minimum wages among developed countries, even though we are among the richest countries in the world. One out of every 60 persons is a millionaire. One out of every 11 households is worth \$1 million. According to the AFL-CIO, CEO pay has gone from \$42 for every \$1 a worker made in 1982 to \$354 for every dollar a worker made in 2012. It is time to raise the wage.

□ 1100

According to Forbes, the top 25 CEOs of hedge funds—the top 25 earners at hedge funds—earn more than all 500 of the top CEOs in the Fortune 500 combined. It is time to raise the wage.

In 2007, one CEO made \$3 billion; \$3 billion is \$400 a second. It would take a minimum-wage worker working full-time 198,000 years. Some things bear repeating: it would take a minimum-wage worker 198,000 years to make what that CEO made in 1 year. It is time to raise the wage.

If we can pay CEOs \$400 a second, we can raise the wage. If we can pay corporate CEOs 354 times what workers are making, we can raise the wage to \$13 an hour.

HONORING ANDREW JACOBS, JR., UNITED STATES MARINE

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

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, a fellow Hoosier, fellow marine and fellow patriot died on December 28 in his 81st year. I didn't know Andrew Jacobs, Jr., a gentleman who for 30 years represented the Indianapolis area in the House of Representatives with great distinction. But I am familiar with the qualities of a decent, honorable public servant; and Andy Jacobs deserves to be remembered, honored, and even emulated by those of us who now serve in this body or bother to keep watch on its proceedings.

He was born February 24, 1932, in Indianapolis. After high school, Jacobs joined the United States Marine Corps. He was a plucky marine. His country called him to serve in the Korean war. He responded to the call of duty, fought bravely, and was wounded in action.

When Jacobs returned home to Indiana, he enrolled in Indiana University, graduating in 1955, and 3 years later he graduated from IU's law school.

Jacobs had a passion for public service. So after completing his studies in 1958, the marine kept fighting—fighting for a better America first as a sheriff's deputy, then as a lawyer, then as a State legislator, and then, beginning in 1965, as a Member of Congress.

In Congress, Andy Jacobs was a member of the House Ways and Means Committee where he fought to balance the Federal budget and simplify the Tax Code. He also fought, in the memorable words of journalist Colman McCarthy, to "oppose wars that he believed couldn't be won, explained or afforded."

Jacobs is survived by countless admirers, a beloved wife of 25 years, two sons and two sisters. May each of us honor this fallen marine's memory—and his constancy of purpose—by picking up his rifle and doing our part to fight for a better America.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WAR ON POVERTY

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

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to continue with our 50 floor speeches marking the 50th anniversary of the war on poverty.

Now, yesterday, we were joined by President Lyndon Baines Johnson and Lady Bird Johnson's eldest daughter, Lynda Johnson Robb, to mark the 50th anniversary of her father's State of the Union speech in which he declared an unconditional war on poverty. She reminded us that this was a bipartisan and bicameral effort led by the White

Now, I have shared my own story, reluctantly, in the past of the time in my

life when I depended on our vital social safety net programs during some very difficult times; but my testimony is only one of millions of other Americans. Many of you may be familiar with the Campaign to Cut Poverty in Half in Ten Years, a project of the Center for American Progress, the Coalition on Human Needs, and the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights. Now, they are doing phenomenal work gathering American stories of those who are living in poverty and have been lifted out of poverty, including our own Congressman Pocan's constituent, Amy Treptow's story.

Amy is here today, and I look forward to hearing Congressman Pocan read her story later on this House floor. Her story, though, is a true representation of the legacy of the war on poverty and the promise of the American Dream fulfilled. Her story is not unlike one of my constituents in Oakland who visited my office here in D.C. last month. After becoming a single mother. Jennifer was forced to stop attending her college courses and take a job making minimum wage as a caregiver. She relied on CalWIC and food stamps to feed her daughters, and her family and friends supported her with her housing and other basic needs.

Today, two of her daughters are graduates of the Head Start program, which prepared them to start elementary school where they are currently doing very well. And Jennifer was able to finish school and is now working to advocate on behalf of other families like hers who had to turn to the American people in her time of need. Also, I am reminded that one of my former district directors was a graduate of the Head Start program. He is doing phenomenal work raising a family and living the American Dream.

These are stories of resilience. They are the stories of millions of Americans who are facing homelessness, hunger and unemployment, if it weren't for a safety net. In my home State of California, 6.3 million people—17 percent—lived in poverty in 2012. And in my district in Oakland, California, 18 percent of the residents live below the Federal poverty level, including one in four children.

While the richest segments of our population continue to prosper nationally, income inequality traps millions of the working poor in poverty. Many low-wage workers must rely on food stamps and Medicaid just to survive—which our colleague Congressman AL GREEN just brilliantly laid out—just to survive while CEOs are making megabillions with government subsidies.

As a recent study by the National Poverty Center at the University of Michigan showed, in any given month, 1.7 million households live on a cash income of less than \$2 per day. Now that is comparable to many living in the developing world. Yes, \$2. I said \$2 per day. Now, that is here in America, the richest Nation on this Earth.

In an economy that, despite recent gains, there are three unemployed for every one job opening, it is really a shame and a disgrace that 1.3 million people lost their lifeline as Republicans continue to refuse to extend emergency unemployment compensation. Now, these individuals' checks should arrive or should have arrived this week. Unfortunately, they did not. What in the world are people going to do now? This is heartless, it is mean-spirited, and, of course, to add insult to injury, many of these people lost about \$35 in food stamp benefits last November.

Yes, the economy has gotten better for some, but has left millions behind. Fifty years ago, the safety net was put in place just for times such as these. That is why it is so important to share stories like Jennifer's and like Amy's. Vital social safety net programs are still needed. We need to stop this war on the poor. We should have a cease-fire on the war on the poor. We have a moral and we have an economic obligation to make investments in economic opportunity and jobs.

NAFTA AT 20

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, last week marked the 20th anniversary of NAFTA's going into effect. The North American Free Trade Agreement was a hard-fought fight here in this Congress with a very close vote. In 1994, when it narrowly passed under a rule not allowing amendment, called Fast Track, America was promised that NAFTA would be a great jobs boon for our country and our economy. Exactly the reverse has happened.

The NAFTA promises made have all been broken. First, on jobs: the administration at the time promised that NAFTA would initially create 200,000 new jobs. In reality, America has now lost, after 20 years, about 1 million jobs related to NAFTA's impact, and the old sucking sound actually happened. Our jobs were off-shored, sucked away. More than 680,000 American jobs have gone to Mexico alone. Yes, that great sucking sound continues to happen.

About 60 percent of the jobs lost, of the million jobs lost overall, were lost to Mexico in the manufacturing sector. These were middle class jobs that came from places like Cleveland, Toledo, Pittsburgh, Chicago and Buffalo, and the list goes on. They were good paying jobs in our country that had provided living wages, medical benefits, and employer contributions to retirement programs.

America was also promised that NAFTA would fuel dynamic trade in tearing down trade barriers and creating trade surpluses for our country which means that we actually would export more than we imported with jobs created as a result. Well, guess what, the trade barriers that NAFTA was supposed to tear down have actu-

ally created massive trade deficits—red ink—for our country.

If one looks back at the passage of NAFTA, prior to its passage, America actually had a trade surplus with Mexico. That is more U.S. exports out that Mexico imports in. But then with NAFTA's passage, we began to start really going deep into the hole of jobs being off-shored. And then with other trade agreements like free trade with communist China—which isn't free by any measure—we see that America's trade deficits have accumulated annually to historic levels never experienced by this society before.

The cost of this has been huge. Since NAFTA took effect, the annual U.S. trade deficit has increased by 5 times, a 500 percent increase from \$98 billion in the red to \$534 billion in the red. Each billion dollars of trade deficit accounts for anywhere between 5,000 and 10.000 lost jobs depending if it is in the retail sector or the industrial sector. Our cumulative trade deficit over the 20 years due to NAFTA-get ready for this—is \$1.5 trillion. If you want to understand why America has a job deficit and a budget deficit at the Federal level, it is because we have off-shored so many jobs through these trade agreements that are passed under the Fast Track procedure.

The year before NAFTA took effect, America actually had a \$1.6 trillion trade surplus with Mexico; but every year after NAFTA took effect in 1995, that trade surplus with Mexico was turned into a \$15.8 billion trade deficit in the first year. And every single year, it has simply gotten worse. By 2012, our trade deficit with Mexico ballooned to \$61.6 billion. So every year, the hole got deeper. What a failure NAFTA is on the jobs front and on the trade front.

supporters of NAFTA Finally. claimed that NAFTA would open markets for American exports to Mexico. I will tell you one thing Ohio saw. Ohio saw pork production that used to happen in Ohio platformed down near Mexico City where environmental regulations, if they exist at all, are certainly not enforced. And we look at companies like Mr. Coffee that were sucked out of Cleveland and moved to Mexico. We saw suppliers in the automotive industry being relocated from our country to Mexico and Canada with U.S. middle class jobs just vaporized one factory, one farm at a time. It is as though the lights are being shut out from coast to coast in neighborhood after neighborhood.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation that I have introduced, H.R. 191, the NAFTA Accountability Act, basically says that these trade agreements have to work in America's interest, starting with NAFTA; and where these agreements have failed, adjustments must occur in order to stem the off-shoring of any jobs so we can begin re-creating middle class jobs in this country again. The NAFTA trade model must be replaced, fast track must be sidetracked, and jobs in America must be created again to rebuild our middle class.