



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 4, 2015

No. 37

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 4, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable EARL L. "BUDDY" CARTER 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 6, 2015, 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.

DHS FUNDING AND IMMIGRATION

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

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the Speaker and the Republican majority for coming to their senses and allowing the House of Representatives to pass a bill funding the Department of Homeland Security for the rest of the fiscal year.

It seems odd that I would have to come to this well to congratulate the majority for funding one of the largest and most important departments in the U.S. Government. I cannot con-

gratulate the majority alone because the bill funding the Department of Homeland Security was passed largely on the strength—yes—of Democratic votes.

The vote was strong, 257–167, but 182 of those votes came from Democrats. In fact, every Democrat who voted voted to keep the Department of Homeland Security open and protecting America until the end of the fiscal year, 100 percent. Only 75 Republicans supported paying our border security and airport security professionals.

Mr. Speaker, it should never have come to this. On the one hand, it should never have come to this because Members of Congress should never play around with the paychecks of our fellow government employees and threaten them with furloughs in order to score cheap partisan political points.

The real people with real lives who work at O'Hare and Midway and at ports, airports, and border crossings, the real people with mortgages, car notes, and tuition bills who provide the security our democracy depends on do not deserve the way they are treated by this Congress. Lurching from funding crisis to shutdown showdown to last-minute votes is no way to run the greatest democracy the world has ever known.

We know there is a sensible, bipartisan majority that is willing to compromise and do what has to be done to keep the basic functions of government operating. That group voted yesterday, and the leadership should find a way to let that sensible majority govern, despite those who take every opportunity to make governing next to impossible in this body.

Secondly, it should never have come to this because the premise on which this funding and shutdown crisis rested was never logical or necessary.

Those who opposed the President exercising powers granted to him by the Congress have filed a lawsuit in Fed-

eral court. They picked a sympathetic judge and have won a temporary injunction on the implementation of the executive actions the President announced last November.

If they really believe in the strength of their case, this threat of a partial government shutdown was unnecessary. Clearly, they agree with me that their case is weak and that the courts will eventually overturn the temporary injunction.

But the logic was always sideways. The very Presidential actions that some in the Republican Party object to are not even funded by the appropriations made by Congress. The criminal background checks and the adjudication of each person's application is paid for in full by fees of \$465 for each immigrant, so this was never a logical funding matter.

With or without funding for the Department of Homeland Security, the premise that Congress could force the President to deport low-priority deportees who grew up in the United States or who are the parents of U.S. citizens never held water.

Even if people cannot come forward to apply and pass a criminal background check and get to the back of the deportation line, the basic way the President and the Secretary of Homeland Security prioritized deporting criminals, drug dealers, and drunk drivers over moms, dads, and DREAMers, that would not change.

Think about it. It is as if the Republicans were saying they are so upset about their obsession with border security and their conviction that the President is not doing enough about border security that they were willing to defund border security in order to make their point. Jon Stewart can't write stuff that good, and he doesn't have to.

Here is the biggest reason why it didn't have to come to a shutdown showdown. Republicans in the House

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.

could have taken action last year to fix our broken immigration system so that we don't have to continue this fiction about deporting 11 million undocumented workers.

They could have had a vote to reform our immigration system so that people can apply for visas and come legally in the first place rather than being forced into the black market where there are smugglers. They could have allowed a vote that put E-Verify in place, put serious sanctions and jail time for employers in place, and targeted our enforcement resources on felons, not families.

I stood here nearly every week last year and said: If the Republicans failed to act, the President would be forced to act within the limits of current law to rescue American families and target our enforcement resources on criminals. I was right, and for the record, I told you so, using a countdown right here on the House floor.

The coalition to pass reform, which is made up of almost all of the Democrats and about a third or more of the Republicans—the same coalition that enacted the bill to fund the Department of Homeland Security in yesterday's vote—existed then, and it exists today, if our leaders are willing to work together to address immigration reform.

It is not too late, and I predict that the Republican Party will continue boxing itself into a corner until it addresses this important American priority.

HOUSE HUNGER CAUCUS

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

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, later this morning, I will be joined by my Republican colleague Congresswoman LYNN JENKINS of Kansas at D.C. Central Kitchen to officially relaunch the House Hunger Caucus.

I couldn't be happier that we are continuing this important bipartisan caucus in the 114th Congress. I am thrilled to have her partnership in this caucus, and I look forward to working with her.

Mr. Speaker, several years ago, my good friend and former Republican colleague from Missouri Jo Ann Emerson and I founded the House Hunger Caucus as a forum for Members to discuss, advance, engage, and work on issues related to domestic and international hunger and food insecurity.

Over the years, the House Hunger Caucus has hosted a number of briefings on topics ranging from introductions to the major domestic and international hunger programs, to food deserts in rural and urban America, to global agriculture and farmer-to-farmer initiatives, to international school feeding and child nutrition programs, just to name a few.

The caucus doesn't just look at existing programs. It also gets involved in

emergency responses as they are unfolding. In 2011, during one of the worst droughts in recent memory, the House Hunger Caucus held timely briefings on the U.S. response to the famine in the Horn of Africa. Members and staff were able to hear directly from those on the ground providing assistance to deal with this unprecedented crisis.

One of the most important objectives of the House Hunger Caucus is to foster better communication among antihunger advocates by bringing together stakeholders from Federal agencies, State and local governments, nonprofits, faith-based organizations, academia, and business to discuss long-term strategies for ending hunger. The caucus also serves as a vehicle for antihunger organizations to communicate directly to Congress about hunger and food insecurity issues.

One of my top priorities for the House Hunger Caucus this year is to make sure we hear directly from those who have experienced hunger and poverty firsthand. We need to make sure that their voices are heard in the discussions here in Washington.

One of the greatest assets of the House Hunger Caucus is that it is bipartisan—Republicans and Democrats. It is a way for Members to come together to work to end hunger.

Mr. Speaker, there is not a congressional district in the United States of America that is hunger-free, not a single one. According to the USDA, more than 17.5 million American households were food insecure in 2013, meaning that their access to adequate food was limited by a lack of money or other resources; 5.6 percent of households were considered to have very low food security. In other words, those households were hungry.

Hunger disproportionately affects the most vulnerable among us: children, seniors, and the disabled. Last year, 16 million children, or one in five, experienced hunger, and increasingly, veterans and military families are experiencing hunger.

On the international side, about 805 million people in the world, or one in nine, suffer from hunger, according to the most recent U.N. reports. This is a decrease of 100 million over the past decade and 209 million since the early 1990s.

The U.S. can be proud of its leadership in reducing global hunger and addressing the root causes of food insecurity. Through partnerships with other nations, international organizations, our own farmers, NGOs, and private sector communities, we are advancing agricultural development; increasing child nutrition; reducing malnutrition among infants and children; empowering small farmers around the globe, especially women; and providing nutritious meals in school settings. While the journey is long, we now have a proven and coordinated set of programs that effectively address global hunger.

Mr. Speaker, as we reestablish the House Hunger Caucus, I can't think of

a better location to launch it at than D.C. Central Kitchen, a unique antihunger organization that prepares 5,000 meals a day for more than 80 local nonprofit partners, helping those going through tough times.

One of D.C. Central Kitchen's greatest strengths is its culinary jobs training program, where men and women who have faced the most difficult of situations—homelessness, addiction, or incarceration—participate in a rigorous job training program to prepare for culinary careers.

As part of our kickoff this week, the House Hunger Caucus will host a briefing for House staff entitled "Domestic Hunger 101" tomorrow at 1 p.m. The briefing will be given by CRS experts and is intended to present a broad overview of the major domestic Federal antihunger programs.

I look forward to continuing this important work of the House Hunger Caucus with the gentlewoman from Kansas, Congresswoman JENKINS. I encourage my House colleagues to join the House Hunger Caucus.

As Members, we don't have to agree on everything to agree on something, and ending hunger should be something we all can agree on.

DODD-FRANK AND OTHER FINANCIAL SERVICES BILLS

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

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to discuss the negative consequences of the Dodd-Frank law, as well as reforms to the law that would represent much-needed solutions for middle class families in Kentucky and across the country.

When this act was signed into law nearly 5 years ago, its supporters made many promises. President Obama claimed it would "lift the economy" and that it would help protect Main Street, not Wall Street. In both of these instances, the opposite has proven true.

While the President is claiming victory on the economy, many Kentucky families and families across America are still hurting. Last year, the U.S. economy grew at an anemic 2.4 percent, the ninth year in a row of growth below the postwar average of about 3 percent.

President Reagan also inherited a very difficult economic situation; however, if this recovery had progressed at the same rate as the Reagan recovery of the 1980s, the economy would be about \$2 trillion larger, which works out to be about \$1,500 more per family per year.

This is hardly the boom that the President talks about. Growth this low for this long is simply not fast enough to lift incomes for most Americans.

A primary cause of the weakness of this recovery is the avalanche of red tape coming out of the Obama administration, including the nearly 400 new