

President, the U.S. increased its spending on food stamps by more than \$19 billion. That's a "b." The source? The U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Here's fact number two. Under the food stamp President, the number of people using the food stamp program increased by 11 million people. The source? The USDA.

Here's fact number three. Even the amount of the benefit has increased under the food stamp President. The amount per benefit increased \$27.38 per recipient. Not much you would say, \$27. Guess what? The \$27 increase per benefit is the largest increase that's occurred under any President in the last 30 years. Pretty dramatic, huh? What's the source of that? The USDA.

Now, let's just review for everybody again. Republicans and Democrats, let's all get together and review that the numbers don't lie. Under the Food Stamp President, spending increased by more than \$19 billion; the number of people using the program increased by 11 million people; and the amount of the benefit increased by a historic amount not seen in the last 30 years.

We may not like the facts, but sometimes the truth just hurts.

Here we have him, the food stamp President of the United States. Yes, George W. Bush is the Food Stamp President of the United States. Under the food stamp President, George Bush, we spent more, had more recipients, and gave each recipient more money for food.

Now, I know that some of you are saying, LUIS, you aren't being fair. Aren't there some other food stamp Presidents out there? Okay. You're right.

Yet, under another food stamp President, spending increased by more than \$9 billion, the number of recipients increased by 7 million, and the amount of the benefit increased by \$17. Yes, it's showing who it is. Here it is. George Herbert Walker Bush was also the food stamp President. See, it runs in the family. Food stamp President, senior, and food stamp President, junior. It's hereditary. A rampant family disease that makes them just want to feed hungry poor people.

Now, I have to confess and make a confession today. I support the food stamp program. I think that SNAP—the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, to call it by its actual name and not something that Newt Gingrich thinks is politically punchy—serves an important purpose. The purpose is largely to prevent children and old people from going hungry. SNAP doesn't provide them with some fancy perk from some out-of-control free spending program. It provides kids and old people with food. You can't redeem food stamps at Tiffany, which might be another reason why Newt Gingrich thinks it's so bad.

But I think that Americans want their people not to go hungry. Just in case I'm wrong, if Newt Gingrich met a food stamp President other than the

one named George Bush, I want to thank Barack Obama today because he's also invested in SNAP. He's invested in nutrition for America's most vulnerable.

Here's another fact, the last one I'll make today, Mr. Speaker, and this one is for Newt Gingrich. Just in case his food stamp President name-calling was designed to make a political point that he wasn't quite so willing to come right out and say of the recipients whose race we know, 22 percent of SNAP recipients are black, 34 percent are white, because hunger knows no race or religion or age or political party. Hunger is color-blind, Mr. Gingrich.

REGULATIONS PREVENT JOBS

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago during a district work period, I had the privilege to catch up with many of my constituents back in Michigan's Seventh District.

Business owners graciously invited me into their facilities eager to talk about the economic climate as well as what can be done to promote growth. These conversations continued in coffeehouses and town halls across the district where citizens packed into rooms eager to exchange their ideas, triumphs, and concerns with me.

But whether I was being given a tour by the owner of a manufacturing plant or having a cup of coffee with an engineer, a similar theme kept cropping up: People are worried about excessive, Big Government regulations, in particular how they impose unreasonable costs on businesses, create uncertainty and, in turn, affect job growth.

This time, many of my constituents expressed outrage over a new youth agricultural labor rule program. The Department of Labor proposed regulations to restrict the types of activities young people can participate in. While the rule includes an exemption of children on nonincorporated farms owned by their parents, it could prevent kids from working on incorporated farms owned by their parents, grandparents, aunts, and uncles, and close neighbors.

Even on such extended family farms, children under the age of 16 may be banned from working with animals or in specified farm situations while those under the age of 18 would be prohibited from any job "involving farm product raw materials." That could come to mean any job involving grain elevators, grain bins, silos, feed lots, stockyards, livestock exchanges, and livestock auctions. If carried any further, the rule may end up barring kids from selling animals at their local 4-H fairs. This is nanny statism to the absurd.

My kids were all in 4-H, and some of the best memories we have together are these events. It was always a positive experience for my sons and daugh-

ter as well as every other child I know who got involved. Besides the life lessons learned—responsibility, hard work, and self-sufficiency—children often use the money from the sale of their animals for their college funds. This rule would not only hurt their ability to find a job now but also hurt their future.

In addition to participating in 4-H fairs, my kids also worked on farms where they were asked to drive tractors and run other farm machinery, all under the age of 16. The worst mishaps one of my kids ever had was running over a neighbor's mailbox with his duallies. But even through that experience, he learned responsibility. He not only had to pay for a new one out of his own pocket, but to replace it himself.

Farmers depend upon young people to take on these extra jobs so they can focus on the bigger picture. Parents depend upon their children to work on the family farm, not only to help out but instill a love of farming at a young age to keep their family farm going.

Lastly, young people, themselves, depend on these jobs as a source of income and a way to pay for college. There are often fewer job opportunities in rural areas, and if we impose more rules about what jobs young people can take, what have we gained?

I'll always stand behind regulations that genuinely protect the workers, especially when those workers are children. But when government bureaucrats are regulating in what capacity a young person can work on a farm, then it's clear they've overstepped their boundaries. It's time to fix the flawed and broken regulatory system that allows such rules to slip through the cracks.

Mr. Speaker, related, it's also the time to push back on Big Government's attack on our freedom to choose and our constitutional liberties. The recent assault on our religious rights of conscience and the separation of powers by this administration must be defeated. Kids on the farm and in the city deserve the rich future that our Constitution and Americans' exceptionalism can provide. This will then be a Nation that God can truly continue to bless.

□ 1040

CONGRATULATING THE CITY OF INDIANAPOLIS AS HOST OF SUPER BOWL XLVI

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

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the great city of Indianapolis, my hometown, for doing an outstanding job as the host of Super Bowl XLVI.

On Sunday, two teams played an incredible game; but I believe that the events leading up to kickoff, organized by countless community organizations, good corporate citizens, committed public leaders, and thousands of volunteers, were as impressive as any play

on the field. Over 1 million visitors enjoyed the free festivities of Super Bowl Village, and a record 265,000 fans visited the NFL experience to test their passing and kicking skills and to meet their favorite players. So I was not surprised when Indianapolis received rave reviews for its accessibility, downtown amenities, civic commitment, and famed Hoosier hospitality.

Yet this success, Mr. Speaker, did not stop with the blocks surrounding Lucas Oil Stadium. With Commissioner Goodell and the NFL's assistance, I am confident that the impact of this Super Bowl will last far longer than the memories of that final Hail Mary pass.

Indianapolis embarked on an unprecedented effort to rebuild one of its hardest-hit areas. Even before the recession hit, Indianapolis' Near Eastside, a patchwork of neighborhoods just outside of downtown, led the Nation in foreclosures, and families were too often rattled by violent crime; but today, thanks to relentless efforts by community residents and with the Super Bowl as its springboard, Indianapolis' Near Eastside has been rejuvenated.

It has been given new life through housing developments like the St. Clair Senior Apartments, Commonwealth Apartments, and Building a Living Legacy housing initiative. These new housing options will help seniors and low-income families stay in the community they love and access the services they rely on, like the John Boner Community Center and People's Health and Dental Center. They will help the homeless find a new start and working men and women to locate near their employers.

On Super Bowl weekend, we also saw the grand opening of the Chase Near Eastside Legacy Center, which includes the area's only fitness center now offering low membership rates. This center will be home to the Youth Education Town. It is a facility that will provide classes to students of all ages through great national and local nonprofits.

While other host cities spend Super Bowl weekend breaking ground on projects, Indianapolis spent ours opening doors for these new facilities. Collectively, the Near Eastside redevelopment effort serves as a model, not only for what can be achieved throughout Indianapolis, but across this great Nation. Just a few years ago, the Near Eastside and all of Indianapolis were suffering the worst of the economic downturn. We had some of the Nation's highest unemployment, foreclosure and bankruptcy rates; but today our unemployment rate is near the national average and is getting better. Our critics counted us out many times, but this weekend showed that we are a modern city.

Mr. Speaker, this weekend, Indianapolis showcased why it is America's best-kept secret. It showed that we are a prime destination for conventions and big events and that we have some

of the best sports facilities anywhere. It is with great pride that I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Indianapolis, Indiana, and all of those who worked so hard to make this event a huge success.

ASSAULT ON OUR RELIGIOUS FREEDOM, THE FIRST AMENDMENT, AND OUR FREEDOM OF CONSCIENCE

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

Mr. CRAVAACK. Mr. Speaker, I will be brief because my message is clear and concise.

I rise today out of grave concern for this most recent assault on our religious freedom, the First Amendment, and our freedom of conscience.

The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services' order requiring every Catholic institution larger than a single church—and even in some cases a single church—to pay for contraceptives, sterilization, and morning-after abortifacients for its employees is directly contrary to the principles of the Catholic faith.

Let us ensure we do not confuse the issue here.

This is a direct attack against religious liberty for all religions—but forcing Catholic schools, hospitals, Catholic charities to comply with a Federal mandate that violates the core moral commitment of protecting the lives of the unborn is unconscionable. This act threatens to sabotage the very foundations of our First Amendment rights and our religious liberties.

Continually chipping away at our basic constitutional freedoms that set the foundation of this great country sends us down a very slippery slope to further government overreach and intrusion into our individual lives.

This must stop, and we as Americans must stop it.

AFGHANISTAN

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

Ms. LEE of California. First, let me thank my colleagues Congressmen MCGOVERN and JONES, Congresswomen WOOLSEY and WATERS, and Congressman HONDA for their efforts to bring the war in Afghanistan to a swift and safe end.

Mr. Speaker, I am here this morning to remind my colleagues that there is no military solution in Afghanistan. It is time to bring our troops home and to make sure that we leave no permanent military bases. While many, and a growing number, of my colleagues have come to this conclusion, there are still those who claim that Afghanistan is going well and that we should stay there indefinitely.

We are gathered here this morning to give some real and important insight

into the reality that nothing could be further from the truth. We are here to discuss very important revelations brought to light by a brave Army officer, Colonel Daniel Davis.

Colonel Davis has honorably served this country for over a quarter century, and has received praise from his commanders for his maturity, determination, and judgment. He recently made the brave decision to release an unclassified account of the war in Afghanistan after witnessing the huge gap between what the American public was being told about the progress in Afghanistan and the dismal situation on the ground. Declassifying the National Intelligence Estimate on Afghanistan is a necessary step so that our policy is based on accurate information.

In an article published this past Sunday in the Armed Forces Journal, Colonel Davis asks:

"How many more men must die in support of a mission that is not succeeding and behind an array of more than 7 years of optimistic statements by United States senior leaders in Afghanistan? No one expects our leaders to always have a successful plan, but we do expect—and the men," and women, I must add, "who do the living, fighting and dying deserve—to have our leaders tell us the truth about what's going on."

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve to know the truth after spending the past decade on failed military strategies which have cost us over \$450 billion in direct funding. The costs, of course, have been even greater in injuries, lives lost, and in the trillions of dollars we will need to spend on long-term care for our veterans, including hospitals, clinics, job training, post-traumatic stress disorder treatment, housing assistance, and homeless services. But we must spend these resources for our veterans.

The American people, though, are sick and tired of these endless wars. Fully two-thirds of Americans support ending combat operations in Afghanistan in 2013, and three out of four Americans favor a speedy withdrawal of all United States troops out of Afghanistan. We are set to spend an additional \$88 billion, mind you, \$88 billion in Afghanistan over the next year while domestic cuts in education, health care, roads, bridges, and other essential priorities are sacrificed.

We cannot afford an indefinite stay in Afghanistan. We need to ask what we have to show for the past decade of war. Instead of a stable democracy, we have a broken state which is completely dependent on foreign countries for its budget, with rampant corruption and widespread violence. For the fifth straight year, civilian casualties rose in Afghanistan. In fact, 2011 was a record year for the number of Afghan civilians killed. There were 3,021 Afghan children, women, and men who were caught in the crossfire between an insurgency and the heavy presence of NATO troops.