

like Amazon and Kayak, Web sites where consumers are able to go shop for products, and if they find a product that they like, then and only then do they have to put in their personal information—their date of birth, their credit card, their full name and address.

Healthcare.gov doesn't work that way. Before Americans can shop for products on healthcare.gov, they have to put all of their information—their address, their date of birth, their Social Security number—into a Web site that isn't secure.

I am introducing the BROWSE Act to make sure that Americans have an opportunity to search the Web site, look at products, and only if they find a product that they like, only then do they have to put in their personal information. Healthcare.gov should work like the rest of the Internet and the marketplace.

WAR ON POVERTY

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 50th anniversary of President Johnson's announcement of the war on poverty.

I recently had the opportunity to visit the Lyndon B. Johnson Presidential Library and Museum in Austin, Texas, and I was astonished by just how much he and the Congress were able to accomplish during his time in office. Since 1967, poverty has declined by more than a third. Still, 49.7 million Americans live in poverty, including 13.4 million children, but the war on poverty and the programs really worked. Here are some of them:

Medicare, Medicaid, food stamps, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Head Start, school lunch, child nutrition, migrant assistance, Job Corps, legal assistance, small business and rural loans, and Indian reservation programs.

All of those were put into effect and really worked.

Dana Milbank had an article today in *The Washington Post* where he said, "And what is the response to the 50th anniversary? It is the Republicans declaring war on the war on poverty, as they have for the last 50 years."

It is time for us to work together and continue to end poverty.

□ 1645

HONORING SERGEANT JACOB HESS

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

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, it is with a very heavy heart that I rise today to honor the life of Sergeant Jacob Hess.

Jacob is a 22-year-old American hero—the embodiment of the greatness

that gave birth to the country he so deeply loved. Raised in a military family, after graduating from North Central High School in Spokane, Washington, he joined the United States Marine Corps to serve and defend this country.

Jacob lost his life just a few days ago, New Year's Day, while supporting Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan. He lost his life in the name of American freedom. He lost his life to protect all of ours.

He leaves behind a community that admired him, a country that pays him homage, and a family that has been forever changed by him. He was a son, a brother, and a husband. He says goodbye to the family that got the call they hoped they never would.

May God bless Sergeant Jacob Hess; his mother, Keirsten Lyons; his father, Mike Hess; his brother, Cameron; and his wife, Bridget. May God bless his family and all the brave men and women who have answered America's call to freedom.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WAR ON POVERTY

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

Mr. ENYART. Mr. Speaker, it is the 50th anniversary of the war on poverty. Although in many ways it has been a success, economic opportunity is still too often a stacked deck. Yesterday, *The Wall Street Journal* stated that J.P. Morgan, the giant Wall Street bank, last year paid out nearly \$22 billion due to misdeeds and misrepresentations.

The stock market sets new records every day. Wall Street has recovered. When will Main Street?

While this is happening, 41 percent of the unemployed people in my district have been out of work for more than 26 weeks. They have run out of unemployment because Congress failed to act. The income difference between the wealthy and workers is greater than any time since the 1920s.

Mr. Speaker, when will a nation that proclaims itself a bastion of freedom, both economic and personal, free the poor from the shackles of poverty?

CONGRATULATING THE TOP THREE AWARD WINNERS FOR THE 2013 PENN STATE UNIVERSITY CIVIC ENGAGEMENT PUBLIC SPEAKING CONTEST

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the top three award winners for the 2013 Penn State University Civic Engagement Public Speaking Contest.

Students for the competition are nominated by their classmates in recognition

of their speaking performances throughout the semester. In total, 1,500 students vie in the competition. Their speeches are what Aristotle, who wrote about rhetoric, would classify as "deliberative," meaning their work is intended to spark public dialogue on matters of social or cultural importance.

The contest is judged by representatives from Pearson, *The New York Times*, Penn State, and the State College community.

For this year's competition, Amanda Hofstaedter of Chalfont, Pennsylvania, won first prize for her piece titled, "Mandatory GMO Labeling: A Win-Win for Companies and Consumers."

Sarah Bastian of State College, Pennsylvania, took second place for her work titled, "Driving Down Demand: An Answer for Domestic Minor Sex Trafficking."

And finally, Prithvi Nilkant of Mars, Pennsylvania, took third place for her work entitled, "Creating a Safer Society for All."

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate these winners, along with all the competing students, for not only their hard work, but also for their creativity and for their passion for public engagement.

NEXT STEP IN WAR ON POVERTY

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

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, in 1964, when President Johnson declared war on poverty, this, the richest Nation in the world, had a poverty rate of 19 percent. By 1973, 9 years later, that rate had been brought down to 11 percent. We were definitely winning the war on poverty.

Unfortunately, too many politicians found success running down the achievements of the war on poverty. Scapegoating "welfare queens" furthered a narrative that the war on poverty was not worth fighting. But nothing could be further from the truth.

For example, Medicare and Medicaid, two poverty programs, made a difference, a tremendous difference, in the health security of older Americans. These two antipoverty programs have reduced the poverty rate of our senior citizens from over 30 percent to less than 10 percent.

The Congressional Black Caucus' 10-20-30 initiative targets communities of need with effective infrastructure investments. This proven approach was pioneered in the Recovery Act of 2009. Expanding this effective poverty fighter should be our next step in the long march of the war on poverty.

CONGRATULATING GRANDFALLS-ROYALTY

(Mr. GALLEG0 asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, I couldn't let the first week in Congress go by without taking a moment to congratulate Grandfalls-Royalty.

Grandfalls-Royalty is one of the smallest public schools in Texas, with a student head count of about 27 kids. They had 16 of those guys in uniform not so long ago to play in the State championship six-man football game. I am proud to say that Grandfalls-Royalty defeated Milford 73-28.

Grandfalls-Royalty made their first debut in a State playoff game. It was held in the home of the Dallas Cowboys, the \$1.2 billion home of the Dallas Cowboys. Frankly, it was also called. For the 13th time this season, it was called by the 45-point mercy rule. That meant the game ended with still 6 minutes and 28 seconds to play in the fourth quarter. Quite an accomplishment for a small school, one in west Texas that I am very, very proud of.

Congratulations to Grandfalls-Royalty.

UNCERTAINTY WITH IRAN

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, the United States finds itself in a period of great uncertainty in the face of a new short-term deal with Iran.

The fact that Iran has finally come to the negotiating table is only proof that sanctions are working. The strength of our sanctions has severely devalued Iran's currency, crippled its economy, and forced it to finally consider curbing its nuclear program.

While we are hopeful for a broader deal, it is imperative that the United States and the international community remain vigilant. A nuclear Iran is the most pressing national security threat not only for the United States, but also for our allies in the Middle East, especially Israel.

As talks move forward, our security and the security of our allies in the region must remain our number one priority.

EMPLOYER MANDATE UNDER THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARR). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RICE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on the topic of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, back last summer when the President unilaterally announced that he was going to not enforce the employer mandate under the Affordable Care Act, I was quite surprised because the next day there was a news article in *The New York Times* about it. Democratic Senator TOM HARKIN was quoted in the article. He was one of the architects of the Affordable Care Act. He said, speaking of the President: This was the law. How can he do that? How can the President simply unilaterally choose to ignore the law?

Our Founders, Mr. Speaker, designed a system of government based upon a separation of powers. The legislative branch enacts the laws and the executive branch, the President, enforces those laws. They did that to protect our very, very fragile freedom. We cannot allow those separations to be eroded. One man who can both make the laws and enforce the laws is more a monarch than a President.

Article II, section 3 of the Constitution requires, in part, that the President take care to faithfully execute the Nation's laws. In 1792, when George Washington was faced with enforcing an unpopular whiskey tax, he wrote in a letter that:

It is my duty to see that these laws are executed. To permit them to be trampled upon with impunity would be repugnant to that duty.

President Obama, on the other hand, has, throughout his administration, picked and chosen which laws or parts thereof he wishes to enforce. House Resolution 442 would require the House of Representatives to institute a lawsuit against the President to comply with this article II, section 3 of the Constitution. It lists four specific examples where the President has either failed to enforce the laws or has gone beyond the laws as written:

One is the 1-year delay in the employer mandate under ObamaCare, which I mentioned earlier;

Another is the 1-year extension of the substandard insurance policies, which by my definition is any insurance policy anybody would really want to buy;

One is the waiving of the work requirements under the welfare laws; and One is the granting of deferred removal action to illegal aliens.

Again, one man empowered to both enact the laws and enforce the laws is more a monarch than a President. This is not a Republican issue. This is not a Democrat issue. It is not a Tea Party action. This is not for messaging. H.R. 442 merely recognizes that no American, including the President, is above the law.

What would we say if the next President came in and said, I don't like the Affordable Care Act and, therefore, I am not going to enforce the individual mandate, which would gut the law? What would we say if President Obama or any other President said, I think the

top income tax rate is too high and, therefore, I am not going to enforce it, or I am not going to enforce the lowest income tax rate? What is the difference between those situations and what President Obama is doing right now not enforcing the employer mandate under ObamaCare? After all, the Supreme Court has ruled that the penalties under ObamaCare are a tax.

What would we say if a President said, I am not going to enforce this tax against my friends but I will against my enemies, or I am not going to enforce it against my contributors but I will against everybody else? What is the difference between that situation and what the President has done granting 1,300 unilateral exemptions to different groups under the Affordable Care Act?

If the President is allowed to make the law or to ignore those laws passed by Congress, Congress can just go home; there is no need for the legislative branch. In fact, when Congress, following the President's lead, when the House of Representatives passed a bill that would delay the employer mandate for a year, which the President had already announced he was going to do unilaterally, the President threatened to veto it.

□ 1700

At this time, I yield to Representative MARTHA ROBY from Alabama.

Mrs. ROBY. Thank you so much to my colleague from South Carolina. I just want to tell you that, as I travel throughout Alabama's Second District, the question I get over and over and over again is: What can we do about this executive overreach?

So I rise, Mr. Speaker, today on behalf of the people of Alabama's Second Congressional District to lend my support to Mr. RICE's S.T.O.P. Resolution in order to stop this overreaching Presidency. I appreciate so much the diligent and thorough work of my colleague's on this resolution, and I am proud to sign on as a cosponsor.

In advancing this resolution, we are seeking to finally stop constitutional overreaches by the executive branch and restore the separation of powers by bringing legal action against the Obama administration to compel the judiciary to rein it in. This resolution directs a civil action on behalf of the House of Representatives in Federal court in the District of Columbia, challenging four unilateral Obama administration actions, as have already been explained, that blatantly flout constitutional restraints on the executive branch. I am going to mention them again:

Specifically, these include the lifting of the Affordable Care Act's mandated requirements on the type of insurance providers can offer; the 1-year delay of the health care law's employer mandate; the adoption of a policy against deporting certain illegal immigrants, which is counter to U.S. immigration and naturalization laws; and the decision to waive the "welfare to work" laws.