

enough food to end hunger now; we just don't have the political will to do so. This effort to cut SNAP—to make hunger worse—must not stand.

I hope my colleagues will join me in restoring these senseless cuts. Should that effort fail, I hope my colleagues will join me in defeating the farm bill when it is considered on the House floor. We can and we must do better.

[From The New York Times, May 20, 2013]

THERE WAS A TIME WHEN ENDING HUNGER WAS A NATIONAL GOAL FOR REPUBLICANS AND DEMOCRATS

(By Dorothy Samuels)

"That hunger and malnutrition should persist in a land such as ours is embarrassing and intolerable." So declared Richard Nixon in May 1969 in his now widely forgotten "Special Message to the Congress Recommending a Program to End Hunger in America." In that document, he summoned the country to a new level of generosity and concern and laid out a series of strong legislative steps and executive actions, including a significant expansion of the food-stamps program.

While campaigning for the White House in 1968, Mr. Nixon did not focus on the existence of a serious hunger problem. His conversion came as public calls to do something about hunger rose—driven, in part, by Senator Robert Kennedy's highly publicized trip to Mississippi in 1967 where he encountered nearly starving children and the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.'s focus on hunger as part of the Poor People's Campaign.

During the '70s, another Republican leader, Senator Bob Dole of Kansas, forged a partnership with George McGovern, the South Dakota Democrat defeated by Mr. Nixon in 1972. They helped pass legislation to improve the accessibility and antifraud provisions of the food-stamps program. For example, it eliminated a requirement that recipients buy food-stamp coupons, a prohibitive burden for the lowest-income Americans.

That kind of dedicated bipartisan commitment to ending hunger was light-years ago in American politics—before President Ronald Reagan and, later, Speaker Newt Gingrich made attacking food stamps a prime Republican obsession, and certainly before moderate Republicans, a disappearing breed, lived in fear of making any move that might provoke a primary challenge from a Tea Party-supported candidate. The modern food-stamps program, built with Republican and Democratic support, succeeded in eliminating the most extreme pockets of hunger in parts of the country.

Today, the program remains an immensely important source of support for low-income families and children living below or near the poverty line. Still, some 50 million Americans live in households that cannot consistently afford enough food, even with the food-stamps program, now formally called the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP.

Come November, temporary increases for food-stamp aid approved in the 2009 economic recovery act are scheduled to expire, which would result in a loss of about \$25 in monthly food stamps for a family of four. If anything, Washington should be allocating more money to address tremendous unmet needs.

Yet, every Republican on the House Agriculture Committee voted to approve an omnibus farm bill containing a \$20 billion cut in food stamps over the next decade in the program's \$800 billion or so 10-year budget. While less devastating than turning the program into a capped block grant to the states,

which the House Republicans have previously endorsed, the cut is nearly five times the reduction approved by the Democratic-controlled Senate Agriculture Committee, which already is too much.

The House bill's cuts would end food-stamp assistance for nearly two million people, with the pain falling mainly on low-income working families with kids and older Americans, according to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. And as many as 210,000 children would lose access to free school lunches and breakfasts because eligibility for those meals is tied to their family's receipt of food-stamp benefits.

"It is just not right," said Representative Jim McGovern, a Massachusetts Democrat (no relation to George McGovern) before his amendment to strike the cut was defeated. Not a single Republican voted to approve it.

A MORE SECURE ENERGY FUTURE IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, again and again we have heard from this President and this administration that we need to embrace an "all-of-the-above" approach when it comes to meeting and supplying our country's energy needs. At the end of the day, this has simply turned into a "none-of-the-above" strategy of failure by this administration.

Mr. Speaker, this is not complicated. Approving construction of the Keystone XL pipeline is the first and easiest step that we can take in order to embrace our energy future immediately, build jobs, and gain economic security.

The application to build the Keystone XL pipeline has been gaining dust at the U.S. State Department for more than 4 years awaiting approval. Each subsequent day that decision isn't made further denies this country greater energy security and the creation of over half a million jobs by 2035.

By the State Department's own calculations, the number of potential jobs through construction alone stands at over 42,000. With the unemployment rate being above 7.5 percent for 4 of the years that the Presidential permit has been pending, this just economically is irresponsible.

With over 15,500 pages already produced in its National Environmental Policy Act review over the past 4½ years, under the President's schedule, we must still wait for yet another report and even more pages to determine whether construction of the pipeline would be in the "national interest."

At any moment, the President could step in and immediately order approval of the pipeline, yet he continues to sit idly by while more and more people, including a majority of the general public and even members of his own party, come out in support of the XL pipeline.

Mr. Speaker, it is beyond a reasonable doubt that creating thousands of jobs and providing the American people more sources of oil by approving this

infrastructure project that costs the American taxpayers no money is definitely in the national interest. So what are we waiting for?

Today, the House of Representatives will take up H.R. 3, the Northern Route Approval Act, which will approve the Keystone XL construction application without a Presidential permit and let the American people know that we will not wait around any longer. At the end of the day, this crude will find its way to foreign markets one way or another, and construction of this pipeline will guarantee our access to it and help secure energy independence in North America.

Today, the average price for a gallon of gas in America is around \$3.60, which is nearly \$2 more than when President Obama first took office. As the summer driving season approaches, that historically threatens to bring even higher gas prices for American families and businesses. Ensuring that every environmentally safe source of oil is available in order to maintain an adequate domestic supply is absolutely vital.

Because the President, yet again, refuses to act on an issue of such great importance for the Nation, this Congress will lead by sending a clear message to the families of this great Nation that we stand with you, we stand with jobs, and we stand for a more secure energy future here in America.

MEMORIAL DAY

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, this week-end throughout America, in cemeteries across the land, we will celebrate and memorialize those men and women who have served, who are serving, and those who have made the ultimate sacrifice in giving their lives to protect our Nation's freedoms embodied in our Constitution and our Bill of Rights that we hold most dear. While Memorial Day is a time when family and friends gather to be together, we know it is much more than that.

This Memorial Day, we should all give thanks to the sacrifices that our men and women have made who have served in our Nation's military. We should say thanks to our family members, to our neighbors, to all those who have served, and we must always, always remember those who are no longer with us. We in our country, I believe, can never say thank you enough, for this great country we live in is made dear for all of those who have made those sacrifices over 238 years.

So this weekend, as we gather across the land to be with our families and friends, let us pay thanks, let us take evidence of what it means to be an American, knowing that at the end of the day the bonds that we share in common as American citizens are much stronger than whatever differences we may have.

God bless those who are serving and those that have served and those who

are no longer with us. God bless our country.

CLIMATE CHANGE

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, last month, two scientists from Oregon State University, Shawn Marcott and Alan Mix, published a peer-reviewed study in collaboration with scientists at Harvard reviewing 11,300 years of global temperatures. They found that the range of temperature change in the last 100 years is equivalent to the temperature change over the previous 100 centuries.

Climate change is real, it is devastating, and it is accelerating. Most focus is on the terrestrial effects. Other research points to rapid and devastating changes in our oceans—again, a study done by Oregon State University.

Burke Hales, an OSU chemical oceanographer, coauthor with Alan Barton, who works at the Whiskey Creek Shellfish Hatchery, looked into the fact that oysters were failing at an incredible rate to spawn and reproduce. Their study linked the production failures to the CO₂ levels in the water. That has incredible implications for the future of not only the shellfish industry, an important industry in the Northwest and other parts of the country, but also for the whole ocean food chain.

The ocean chemistry is also threatening something called pteropods, who are tiny sea snails, and they're very much at risk. They happen to be a food source for zooplankton, whales, and of course our salmon, who already have a host of problems in terms of their future.

Then from the Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme, the Arctic seas are becoming rapidly more acidified. It turns out that cold water is especially susceptible, and as the sea ice in the summer recedes, more and more of the Arctic Ocean is exposed to the increased levels of carbon dioxide, and it is rapidly acidifying, in addition to which the melting of the ice in Greenland and elsewhere is adding fresh water, which further degrades the capabilities of the oceans to deal with the carbon dioxide.

Finally, research in the Northeast shows that the surface temperatures in the northeast Continental Shelf in 2012 were the highest recorded in 150 years of record-keeping. They found that over the last four decades many species of fish stocks have been moving north to escape the warming waters, but there are many species that cannot move or evolve that rapidly, which portends for more disasters.

□ 1040

Back in 1973, there was a science fiction movie called "Soylent Green," sort of a mystery movie, but it was about an overpopulated and polluted

world, and the final devastating blow was that the oceans were dying. Now we have evidence that our oceans are very, very much at risk from CO₂ and climate change.

The House Republicans are using their leadership here to stymie efforts to even research and document climate change, let alone just totally denying that it's a problem. Time and time again, they voted to know nothing and do nothing about climate change. They voted to block action on climate change no fewer than 50 times in the last Congress.

Mr. Speaker, it's time to listen to the scientists and get serious about climate change. The evidence is in. The only question now is whether Congress will listen and act.

JOBS AND SEQUESTRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM) for 5 minutes.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about jobs.

I've served almost 5 months in the Republican-controlled House of Representatives, and I've heard a lot of my colleagues talk about jobs, but we've had little opportunity to actually vote on legislation that would create American jobs.

Just this week, the Albuquerque Journal reported on the unbelievable difficulty that many New Mexicans are having in finding a job. The headline says it all. According to the article, when the Downs Racetrack and Casino in Albuquerque held a job fair last week to fill 400 openings, 6,400 job seekers showed up.

One young man interviewed said, "I've put in 60 applications in the year I've been unemployed and haven't had a single callback."

Another job seeker noted, "This is the first time in my life, in 49 years, I've been without a job. You read about it, you think about it, and then when it happens it's a real awakening."

But instead of creating an environment that would foster economic growth, Congress has done the exact opposite by allowing the indiscriminate, across-the-board budget cuts, known as "sequestration," to take effect. According to the Director of the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, sequestration could result in a loss of 750,000 American jobs this year alone.

If there is one State that cannot afford to lose any more jobs, it's New Mexico. Our State's economy has been barely crawling along since the Great Recession of 2008. Last week, however, we finally got some good news. New Mexico's Department of Workforce Solutions reported that our State's employment growth in April was the best it has been in 5 years. A Department of Workforce Solutions official said, in fact, "The economic recovery in New

Mexico may be gathering momentum as we start a sustained recovery."

Now, just as New Mexico finally appears to be on the way to the economic recovery our families and businesses so desperately need, the sequester threatens all of this progress; and this week, New Mexico got some really bad news. The Department of Defense announced plans Tuesday to furlough about 680,000 of its civilian employees, including 7,000 New Mexicans, for 11 days through the end of this fiscal year. Some might think that 11 days doesn't sound like much, but let's take a closer look at what 11 days without pay means to individual families.

When furlough notices begin going out at the end of this month, 7,000 hardworking New Mexicans will find out that they will be losing about 20 percent of their salaries for the rest of the fiscal year. Now, these families are trying to pay their mortgages, make their car payments, and put their kids through college. Families are already living paycheck to paycheck and are struggling just to get by. Can you imagine what losing 20 percent of a paycheck means to them? It's devastating. Although New Mexicans may feel the worst of the consequences of the sequester this year, sequester is not just a 1-year problem. It will negatively impact our Nation's economy for the next 9 fiscal years.

We all agree we need to reduce our long-term deficit, but we need a balanced approach that will create jobs. On May 14, the CBO released new projections that the deficit will fall by an extra \$200 billion this year than previously expected. The CBO now forecasts that the deficit will shrink to 2.1 percent of the GDP by 2015 from a high of 10 percent of GDP in 2009. The International Monetary Fund has called the pace of deficit reduction "overly strong," arguing that Washington should focus on job creation in the short term and develop a long-term strategy for future deficit reduction. The IMF added that this year's \$85 billion in sequester-mandated cuts will negatively impact growth this year and beyond.

It's true that you can't tax your way to prosperity, but you can't cut your way to prosperity either, and draconian, across-the-board budget cuts aren't going to create jobs. I agree with those who say we need to get our fiscal house in order, but to do that we first need to solve the unemployment problem that is plaguing small towns and big cities throughout the Nation. More than half of the deficit stems from a sluggish economy and an unemployment rate that is above 7 percent.

Mr. Speaker, we need more Americans to get back to work. We need more Americans to get back to work so that fewer Americans will need to rely on social safety net programs in order to survive. We need more Americans to get back to work so that they will have more money to spend on goods and services, which will create even more jobs.