

I can tell you I do. I'm a physician. It's called the Born-Alive Infants Protection Act, a Federal law that was enacted in 2002, that extends legal protections to any infant born alive during an attempted abortion. There shouldn't be any doubt or any question about what to do with that baby. It is a life that is to be preserved.

Remember, Planned Parenthood is the largest provider of abortions in this country. So if a Planned Parenthood representative in Florida thinks it's okay for the family to decide to let the child die, is there really any doubt that there are many more cases like Kermit Gosnell?

Beyond cases of infanticide, badly injured women, and even women who have died during abortions, there has been an increase in the number of reports of dangerous and filthy conditions at abortion clinics. State officials in Delaware are investigating Planned Parenthood of Delaware for unsafe and unsanitary conditions.

□ 1730

In Virginia, again, elaboration here, there are many different examples of problems. In Virginia, an abortion clinic closed this month because it didn't want to operate under new safety standards and proper inspections that have been long overdue in the Commonwealth. Virginia's State Legislature and the State's Board of Health overwhelmingly saw the need for commonsense rules, like making sure doorways are wide enough for an emergency gurney to pass through so a patient can be taken to an ambulance in case of an emergency.

Sadly, the abortion industry, with its focus on bottom-line profits—and remember Kermit Gosnell. He ran a pill mill during the day and performed late-term abortions at night. We know what he was all about. It was not elevated principles. It was not women's health. It was all about the almighty dollar.

What the Gosnell case and these others have helped to expose is the sad truth that some States simply look the other way while abortion clinics run amuck and the health and lives of women are endangered. Let's be clear: there's no such thing as a safe abortion. Not only does the pregnant woman face emotional and physical risks, up to and including death, but each abortion is the ending of an innocent human life.

So, how is it that we have a Humane Society for animals but we don't have a humane society for the most vulnerable and innocent humans, babies? Why is it that the media and many Americans go crazy over the treatment of wild and domesticated animals, yet seem to turn a deaf ear to the silent screams emanating from inside the womb of millions of young women.

Mr. Speaker, what can be done about such alleged murderers as Gosnell? How many more Gosnells are out there damaging wombs and killing babies? If

we wait on the media and State health care officials to find them, we may have to wait many years while many deaths occur.

Therefore, I call on State legislatures and Governors to write ironclad laws and regulations to protect mothers and infants from these heinous acts, State regulators to ensure that abortion clinics and abortionists are adhering completely to every rule and law now in place and the many more that will be established in the future, we hope. And, I call on prosecutors and judges to make sure that abortionists and abortion clinics that break the law and that defy the Born-Alive Act face the full measure of law.

Finally, we stand today with our national conscience stirred by the Gosnell trial to stop and look again at life in the womb. Kermit Gosnell was killing babies who could otherwise survive had they been given the chance. But his trial is merely scratching the surface of the greater reality that medical technology has been showing us now for more than a decade: the life that is developing in the womb is a baby. It is a growing and developing child that feels pain, we know scientifically, as early as 20 weeks gestation, midpregnancy, and maybe even earlier. And destroying that life is extremely painful to the baby and should not—that is, abortion—be an option.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### END HUNGER NOW

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

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, next Wednesday the House Agriculture Committee is expected to mark up the farm bill. The farm bill is an important bill for many reasons, but chief among them is the reauthorization of our Nation's antihunger safety net programs. The largest and arguably most important is the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP.

As I continue to remind my colleagues through my series of End Hunger Now speeches, it is important to acknowledge that hunger is a real problem in America. Even as we slowly come out of this recession and as Americans struggle to get back on their feet, there are still nearly 50 million hungry people living in this country. Nearly 17 million are kids. The hungry, labeled by some as food insecure because they don't know where their next meal is coming from, aren't like those who starve in Third World countries. They don't have sunken eyes and swollen bellies, and that's primarily because of SNAP and other antihunger safety net programs.

SNAP has prevented millions of people from going without food when they desperately need it. The population served by SNAP is not the rich. They

aren't living in mansions or driving expensive cars or eating in five-star restaurants. No, Mr. Speaker, they are primarily low-income families who are trying to make ends meet. They are trying to provide healthy food for their families while they try to keep a roof over their head and pay the bills to keep utilities running. And that's why the farm bill is so important.

Every 5 years, we have an opportunity to look at SNAP and other programs that make up the farm bill. We have an opportunity to look at what is and what isn't working. We have an opportunity to make the program run better, at least that's what we should be doing. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, as we move to the markup of this farm bill, we haven't had a single hearing, not a single hearing this year, on the SNAP program.

But next week, the House Agriculture Committee will mark up a farm bill that we're told, if reports are to be trusted, that will cut \$20 billion from SNAP. That's \$20 billion that could go to feed hungry Americans. That's a \$20 billion cut that will literally take food out of the mouths of hungry Americans. In short, it's a bill that will make hunger in America worse, not better.

SNAP is among the most effective and efficient, if not the most effective and efficient, federally run program. Error rates are at an all-time low. In fact, when it comes to error rates, more SNAP benefits are underpaid rather than overpaid. That means that a SNAP error will likely result in a beneficiary receiving a smaller benefit than they are eligible for rather than a higher benefit. Waste and abuse is almost negligible, and USDA continues to crack down on fraud. People who defraud SNAP, those who break the law, are being arrested and they're going to jail.

The program is working, Mr. Speaker, and I defy anyone to show me any other Federal program that is as effective and as efficient as SNAP. Yet some Republicans are hell-bent on cutting the program. I should say, obliterating the program, and I simply do not understand why. What do they have against poor people? Why do they think that it's okay to hold back a helping hand. SNAP isn't a get-rich scheme. People use SNAP to put food on their table during difficult times. The way to reduce the number of people on SNAP is by creating jobs, by helping to get this economy going again. The more people go back to work, the less people need to rely on SNAP.

But what some in this House are proposing is that we arbitrarily and indiscriminately cut the help that people need. A \$20 billion cut will do real damage. It will be harder for some to get SNAP. For others, they will see their SNAP benefit cut, meaning they'll have to buy the same amount of food with less money. And we'll see, at a minimum, several hundred thousand

poor kids lose their free school meals. Yes, Mr. Speaker, this bill will take food away from poor kids.

For the life of me, I cannot understand why anyone—I don't care what your political party is—would want to do this. Cutting SNAP is a bad policy. Cutting SNAP in the name of fiscal responsibility is not just a misnomer, it is a falsehood that must be debunked.

There are many other programs in the farm bill that have higher rates of fraud, waste, and abuse—programs like direct payments and crop insurance, just to name two. These programs must be reined in rather than going after programs that help poor people struggle to feed their families during difficult times.

Mr. Speaker, I continue to believe that we can end hunger now if we muster the political will to do so.

□ 1740

But cutting SNAP, passing a farm bill that cuts \$20 billion from this program will not end hunger now. It will make hunger worse. It is the wrong thing to do at the wrong time in our history.

I'd like to believe that my Republican colleagues on the Agriculture Committee would realize this before they embrace a bill that would have such a Draconian cut, that would have a \$20 billion cut in SNAP.

And, Mr. Speaker, I'm urging my Democratic colleagues on the Agriculture Committee to join me in rejecting these cuts. And if these cuts prevail, then we should vote against this farm bill. I think it is simply wrong to send a bill to the House floor, or if it passes the House floor, over to the United States Senate that decimates this important program. It is just wrong.

And for some reason, it has become fashionable in this House to not worry about the poor and to not worry about the vulnerable. Every time we need to find a cut, you go after programs that benefit the most vulnerable. It is wrong. It is outrageous. It goes against everything we're supposed to be doing in this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, rejecting these cuts is the right thing to do, especially if we want to end hunger now.

Mr. Speaker, I would remind my colleagues that hunger is a political condition. Hunger is a political condition. We have the resources, we have the means, we have the infrastructure to end it; but we don't have the political will.

We have the political will when it comes to going to war. We have the political will when it comes to giving tax breaks to wealthy people. We have the political will when it comes to protecting special interest subsidies to Big Oil.

But when it comes to ending hunger, the political will is not here. It is not here. And what a shame, Mr. Speaker.

I would also remind my colleagues that there was a cost to hunger. When

people say to me, oh, we can't afford to help these people; we can't afford to expand these programs because this is a tough budgetary time that we find ourselves in, I remind my colleagues that there is a cost here.

There's a cost in avoidable health care cost, for example. People who do not eat on a regular basis, children who do not eat on a regular basis, who are denied food, who are hungry, you know, their immune systems are compromised. They get common colds, and it ends up turning into something worse, and they end up going into emergency rooms and staying for several days. There's a cost to this.

Senior citizens who can't afford their food and their medicine, they take their medicine on an empty stomach, they end up getting sick. They go into the hospital, they stay for several days, sometimes weeks. There is a cost to that.

There's a cost to hunger in terms of lost productivity in the workplace. Workers aren't as productive.

And, oh, let me just remind my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, when people think that SNAP is only a program for those who are unemployed, millions and millions and millions of people on this program work for a living. They work, but they don't earn enough to not qualify for this benefit.

If you want to do something to help more people get off SNAP, increase the minimum wage, invest in this economy, get more people back to work. But there are millions of working people who rely on this program to feed their families. So there's a cost, Mr. Speaker.

There's also a cost in terms of kids going to school hungry who can't learn. I mean, if you're hungry, you can't focus.

If I had my way, Mr. Speaker, I would require universal school breakfast for everyone who goes to school in this country at the bell, because the bottom line is that meal, that nutrition is every bit as important to a young child, in terms of learning, as that textbook is because that textbook doesn't do a kid any good if he or she is hungry, if all they're worried about is where they're going to get their next meal. And there are too many kids, as I said, 17 million children in this country that are hungry.

Mr. Speaker, we are supposed to be a political body here that is dedicated to solving problems. That's what our job is supposed to be. We're supposed to try to help people and solve problems, not ignore them or make them worse.

There are millions of vulnerable people in this country who need our attention and who need our help. They don't want a handout; they want a hand up. They want to enter the job market; they want to enter into a secure economy. They're looking for some help to get them to the point they could survive long enough to be able to see this economy get back on its feet.

Hunger in America is a real problem. This is an issue. No one talks about it

here, but it is an issue. You don't see the leadership of this House, the Republican leadership of this House, paying any attention to this. They never even mention the word hunger. They never mention the word poverty when they speak.

But this is a real problem. This is a real problem, and I would urge my colleagues who are about to embrace a \$20 billion cut in SNAP to get out of Washington or, better yet, just leave the Capitol Grounds and go out and meet some people who are struggling on this benefit. Meet some people who don't have enough to eat, who end up going to food banks even when they get the SNAP benefits because it's not enough. This is not a get-rich scheme.

And here's the other thing that my colleagues need to understand. Even if we did nothing in the farm bill, even if we protected everything, as it is, I mean, and didn't make any cuts in the farm bill next week, guess what? The average benefit, the average food stamp benefit, the average SNAP benefit, is going to go down anyway because we have dipped into SNAP to pay for other programs. It has been our ATM machine to pay for a lot of other programs, and so the benefit already is going to go down for people. People are already going to feel it even if we were to do nothing.

But to pile on \$20 billion worth of cuts—and my friends will say, oh, well, you know, it's this categorical eligibility, or it's this, you know, we don't like the way this State does it or that State does it—

Here's a point I want to make. If people were truly interested in making this program run better, then we would be doing hearing after hearing after hearing, not only here in Washington, but out in the field, listening to people who are beneficiaries, listening to the food banks, listening to the anti-hunger advocacy groups, listening to the mayors, listening to the Governors, listening to people; and we would figure out how to do this in a way that made sense.

And by the way, I think any savings we find in SNAP we ought to put back into programs to combat hunger and to promote nutrition, you know, not take this money and help pay for a subsidy to some big agri-business or continue to fund some cockamamie crop insurance scheme. We ought to put this, we ought to put any savings we find and any reforms back into these programs.

Let's do this right. But my friends who want to cut this program don't want to do it right. They're not interested in helping this work better. All they're interested in is taking this money so they don't have to take it away from the special interests that fund political campaigns around here. And I find that outrageous.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues, both Republicans and Democrats, don't turn your backs on the poor. Don't turn your backs on the hungry in this country.

As Members of the United States Congress, we should be ashamed, we should be ashamed that there are 50 million people in the United States of America that are hungry, that 17 million of them are children. It is outrageous.

We're the richest, most powerful country in the world. There shouldn't be any hunger here. There shouldn't be anybody who has to worry about whether or not they're going to be able to put good, nutritious food on the table.

So I urge my colleagues, Democrats, Republicans, please do not fall for this notion that cutting \$20 billion won't make any difference to anybody, that we're just kind of tightening the program up. Don't fall for that line, because it's just not true. It's just not true.

\$20 billion in cuts from this program will mean that people today, who today are getting food tomorrow will not. And, again, if people qualify for this program, their kids automatically qualify for the free breakfast or lunch program at school. You cut these families off this program, those kids will no longer be eligible for that.

How that serves our natural interest, how that helps anything in this country, how that even deals with our deficit, our debt problem is beyond me because we're creating a whole slew of new problems.

□ 1750

We are so much better than that. We are so much better than that.

Let me just close with this, Mr. Speaker. Some people have said to me, well, hunger has been around for a long time. There's nothing we can do about it. Those people are wrong, Mr. Speaker. They're wrong. In 1968, there was a documentary on television on ABC that documented for the entire Nation to see the hunger problem in America. And in the aftermath of that documentary, in a bipartisan way, people like Senator George McGovern of South Dakota, Senator Robert Dole of Kansas, Senator Jake Javits of New York and Senator Hubert Humphrey of Minnesota, in a bipartisan way came together and helped put together an effort to end hunger.

In the 1970s, in the mid- to late 1970s, we almost succeeded in ending hunger in this country. We almost succeeded. And then came along a Congress that undid everything, and today we have seen the results of the negligence of Congress and of various White Houses over the years, and that is 50 million Americans—50 million Americans—who are hungry.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we can do better than that, and I believe that we are a much better country than that. I plead with my colleagues here, please don't do this. Please don't do this. The people we're talking about who benefit from this program don't have any big political PACs, and they don't have a lot of high-priced lobbyists here in

Washington. I'm not even sure how many of them are going to vote in the next election. But they're our neighbors. They're our friends. They're part of our community. We're supposed to represent them. We're supposed to help people, not hurt people.

If this farm bill goes forward with a \$20 billion cut in SNAP, we will be hurting people in this country. We will be hurting millions and millions of people in this country.

I hope we don't go down that path. I urge my colleagues, in a bipartisan way, to join with me. End hunger now. Reject these attempts at cutting SNAP by \$20 billion, support a farm bill that supports not only our farmers, but supports good nutrition and supports an effort that will end hunger now.

I thank my colleagues for listening to me, and I yield back the balance of my time.

#### SNAP AND IMMIGRATION REFORM

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, I appreciate the privilege to address you here on the floor of the House of Representatives and also the times that I've had to be here on the floor and listen to the dialogue and the debate that's delivered by Members of both sides, the Republican and the Democrat side of the aisle. I listened with interest as my friend and colleague on the Agriculture Committee, Mr. McGOVERN, talked about the SNAP program and the necessity to maintain the dollars that were there.

I was a little surprised that he didn't ask for more dollars going into the SNAP program as opposed to opposing any reduction in the programmed increase in the SNAP program. We have about \$78 billion a year that are going into food stamps now—\$78 billion, a little more than that. And by next year it will be \$80 billion.

Now, we do calculate our budgets and spending in a 10-year budget window, so that means \$800 billion is the universe of money that he's talking about, and he's pleading with us not to reduce that growth from a little bit more than \$78 billion a year up over \$80 billion a year. So of that \$2 billion a year that's programmed between this year and next year over the period of time of 10 years there would be \$20 billion trimmed off of \$800 billion, which comes to about a 2½ percent decrease in the overall projected expenditures of the food stamp program known as SNAP.

Now, after all of that technical gibberish, the bottom line is a \$20 billion cut is a \$2½ billion cut in the increase. \$20 billion spread out over 10 years is not something that's going to be noticeable. When the gentleman speaks of how we would "literally take food out of the mouths of hungry Americans,"

Mr. Speaker, it's important to point out, literally taking the food out of hungry Americans has never happened as an action of government in the history of the United States. It is very unlikely to ever happen into the future of the United States. And it certainly isn't something that would be the result of a piece of legislation that would come out of this Congress and specifically out of the Agriculture Committee and specifically from the subcommittee which I chair.

No, Mr. Speaker. There is not going to be any literal taking food out of the mouths of hungry Americans, to quote the gentleman from Massachusetts. Literally means "really." It means "actually." It means it physically happens. Now, if you're literally going to take food out of the mouths of hungry Americans, you would have to think in terms of some way to extract it once they have put it in their mouth. That's what the man has said. That's a little bit perhaps over-the-top rhetoric, and I understand he's passionate about the issue.

But even figuratively speaking, it's a little bit of a stretch to argue that a 2½ percent reduction in anticipated expenditures of the food stamp program over a 10-year period of time is going to do something to starve kids when we're addressing the eligibility for the food stamp program. And we are seeing narratives—facts, actually—of people that are using their EBT card—that electronic benefits transfer card, that card that has spawned rap music about its easy accessibility and its marketability on the street—to get tattoos, and using that food stamp EBT card to bail at least one individual out of jail.

There has to be a place where the gentleman from Massachusetts and I would draw the line and say, enough. Enough. We've taxed the taxpayers enough. We've punished the producers enough. We've borrowed enough money from the Chinese and the Saudis. We should not be borrowing money from the Chinese and the Saudis to fund somebody's tattoos, to hold up a tattoo parlor that in the neon sign says, we take EBT cards. No, Mr. Speaker, there has to be a place to draw the line and actually say no. The gentleman from Massachusetts gave me no indication, even though I listened to every word, of where he would say enough is enough, or even an amount being too much.

So I would suggest that I have watched as the numbers of Americans that have signed up for the food stamp program have gone from 19 million people to 49 million people. Think of that. Thirty million new people on the food stamp program, millions of dollars being spent by the U.S. Department of Agriculture to advertise food stamp sign-ups so that we can expand the numbers of people that are on another government program and encourage them to sign up. What for? It grows the empire of dependency which grows the empire of politics of the people on the