

binding Accord on Fire and Building Safety.

Nazma said she would have died if she had waited 10 more minutes to jump. She saw the manager locking the gate to the second set of stairs and grabbed him by the collar to stop him, but he ignored her. She cut her arms while trying to get through a window to reach the bamboo scaffolding. She broke her backbone. She can't carry anything or do housework. She has three children. Her stipend went to medical care and to her children's education. Her 14-year-old son has had to leave school to try to find work.

I am grateful that these women had the courage to tell me their stories.

There is widespread agreement that if the Tazreen fire and the Rana Plaza collapse workers had had the right to refuse unsafe work, they would be alive today. Nobody, not even the factory, denied that that's the case; but for too long, the Bangladesh Government has blocked new unions. Only now, in facing the potential loss of trade preferences, the government has opened the door a crack. Twenty-seven new unions have been registered recently, reversing the trend in which only one union per year was registered, and there are 5,000 factories.

I met the leaders of some of these newly formed unions—young and serious workers—but only time will tell if the government lives up to its promise of union rights. In addition, the Obama administration will soon conclude its review of Bangladesh's trade benefits under the Generalized System of Preferences. In my view, these preferences should be suspended.

The one message I have for the American holdouts who won't agree to these safety accords is: listen to the women from Bangladesh.

IN TRIBUTE TO DALE BONE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, across this country, there are great men and women who answer the call to serve their communities. These folks are blessed with remarkable talents and success and share their success with their communities to improve the places that we all call home.

In North Carolina's 13th Congressional District, that man was Dale Bone. Dale was a man who exemplified the character, commitment, and charity of our district and who left behind a legacy of improving all things that he touched.

Born and raised in rural Nash County, Dale was a proud graduate of NC State University with degrees in agronomy and agricultural economy. After several years farming in his home community, Dale founded Nash Produce in 1977 and, within a decade, had grown it into the largest cucumber producer in the country.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Bone was a man of constant and restless energy. He served on countless State and national boards, committees and commissions, including his service as president of the National Council of Agricultural Employers. Dale also delved into his local community with characteristic resolve. He served as a trustee for Barton College, as a board member for the Salvation Army, and on the Arts Council of Wilson, North Carolina.

In addition to all of his honors and activism, Dale was also able to make a direct, personal impact in the lives of his employees and their children. Dale cared deeply for the well-being of all of his employees, many of whom were migrant workers, by providing them with the financial support necessary for them to learn English at the local community college.

Dale and his beloved wife, Genia, were also committed to improving the lives of local children. Dale and Genia endowed the Bone Scholars program at NC State University, which continues to offer significant scholarships to the children of migrant workers. In his later years, Dale was particularly proud of the involvement he and his wife had in creating and promoting Wilson Youth United, which offers direction and guidance to help local youths in the community.

Dale was a man of great ability and, as a result, of great means. He recognized the fact that our country is only as strong as its communities and that the best solutions to our problems usually come from the most local sources.

Across the Nation, members of the agricultural community sent thanks to Dale for his decades of untiring work on their behalf. In equal measure, Dale educated and prepared those around him to face the challenges of their futures. Dale was in all things a humble man, but I do believe that he would take great pride in the legacy that he leaves behind.

Mr. Speaker, America was built by people like Dale Bone; and it's that spirit, not what we do here in Washington, that will rebuild our economy.

□ 1010

END HUNGER NOW

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, this is my 13th End Hunger Now speech this year. Thirteen times I've stood on this floor and talked about hunger in America; 13 times I've come here and defended the anti-hunger safety net, the Federal programs that provide food to 50 million Americans; 13 times I've stood here and talked about hunger as a health issue; 13 times I've said we need to set a goal to end hunger now.

People ask me all the time: Is it even possible to end hunger in America? Mr. Speaker, the answer is a definitive "yes."

The truth is we've done this before. That's right, Mr. Speaker, we nearly eradicated hunger in the 1970s. It wasn't easy, but the concept was simple. The political leadership in Washington made a commitment to end hunger in this country.

In the 1970s, Congress and the President expanded the food stamp program, created the WIC program, and expanded the school meals programs. They found the political courage to do what's right because they believed that it was unacceptable that anyone in America went hungry.

Yet that effort was lost when these programs were slashed in the 1980s. Hunger came back with a vengeance. The number of hungry people skyrocketed. In fact, it's been rising steadily since the Reagan Presidency. These programs weren't just cut; they were demonized. Food assistance became a pejorative to some, and we see the results of those years of demonizing those programs today.

The truth is SNAP works. Food assistance works. People on food assistance are able to feed themselves and their families. They're able to use money they might have had to use for food for other purposes like rent, utilities, medical costs, school supplies for their kids, and transportation costs—just to name a few—in order to be able to buy nutritious food. They didn't have to make the choice between food or rent.

But that's not all. The money spent on food from these programs is spent on food which is produced by our farmers. It is spent in grocery stores. In fact, a recent report showed that approximately \$70 billion was spent in grocery stores just from SNAP alone during our economic downturn. That's a lot of money going to our economy when our economy was damaged and needed the help.

These programs work, Mr. Speaker. But what's the response from the Republican-controlled House? Are they strengthening a program that is already among the least fraudulent and most efficient and effective in terms of our Federal Government? No.

In 2 weeks, this House will consider a farm bill that will cut \$20.5 billion from SNAP. It will take food away from 2 million Americans. It is a bill that will take 210,000 poor kids off free school meal programs. It is a bill that would reduce the monthly SNAP benefit by \$90 for another 850,000 people. And that's on top of the automatic across-the-board cuts to SNAP that will take place in November even if we cut nothing else. That's not only wrong. It is quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, beneath this great country of ours.

I will fight these cuts, and I urge all my colleagues—Democrats and Republicans alike—to stand with me in pushing back on these cuts.

We should be praising this program for keeping people from starving. We should be strengthening it and making it work better, not neutering it and

taking food away from millions of poor families.

SNAP works, but don't take my word for it. Listen to the words of Trish Thomas Henley, someone who had to rely on SNAP to make ends meet. She says:

In 1993, I was a single parent with a 3-year-old and an 18-month-old. Even though I was working full time making \$8.50 an hour as an administrative assistant, I could not afford to pay for food, housing, and day care. I went on food stamps. I remember the shame I felt every time I stood at the register while other shoppers waited for me to count out my food stamps.

The only way out of the cycle of poverty and off aid was to go to college. I applied and, at the age of 25, began my undergraduate career. I had to give up my full-time job to go to school. Instead, I worked three part-time jobs.

I would never, ever have been able to get through school without food stamps, Pell Grants, and student loans. It took a village and government aid. I was not a victim. I did not feel entitled. I, then as now, felt immensely grateful that I lived at a moment when my government chose to invest in me. It has been a smart investment. I am grateful that because of this investment I am now able to contribute and live up to my full potential.

Today, Trish is a professor at the University of Cincinnati. You see, Mr. Speaker, a little investment goes a long way.

SNAP works. It worked in the 1970s as the food stamp program, it worked for Trish in the 1990s, and it's working now. This is not the time to cut SNAP. We should be strengthening the ladders of opportunity that help people succeed. We should, with the help of the White House, develop a plan to end hunger now. We should not be supporting a farm bill that will make hunger worse. Now is the time to renew our efforts and pledge to end hunger now.

[From Cincinnati.com, May 31, 2013]

FOOD STAMPS DO WORK

My name is Trish Thomas Henley, and I'm an assistant professor of early modern literature and culture at the University of Cincinnati. I received my B.A. and M.A. from the University of Idaho and hold a PhD. from Florida State University. My first book was published in 2012. I'm also a volunteer with Big Brothers Big Sisters of Greater Cincinnati and a mother of four boys.

My current life—as a teacher, volunteer, published author, homeowner and middle-class taxpayer—would not have been possible without government aid. In 1993, I was a single parent with a 3-year-old and an 18-month-old. Even though I was working full-time, making \$8.50 an hour as an administrative assistant, I could not afford to pay for food, housing and day care. I went on food stamps. I remember the shame I felt every time I stood at the register while other shoppers waited for me to count out my food stamps.

The only way out of the cycle of poverty and off of aid was to go to college. I applied and, at the age of 25, began my undergraduate career. I had to give up my full-time job to go to school. Instead, I worked three part-time jobs.

I would never, ever have been able to get through school without food stamps, Pell Grants and student loans. It took a village

and government aid. I was not a victim. I did not feel entitled. I, then as now, felt immensely grateful that I lived at a moment when my government chose to invest in me. It has been a smart investment. I am grateful that because of this investment I am now able to contribute and live up to my full potential.

Lately we're hearing a lot about food stamps, now called the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, as Congress debates the farm bill. We could see anywhere from \$4 billion to \$20 billion in cuts to SNAP, based on the Senate and House bills, respectively. I am not able to stand by and watch silently while Congress votes to allow people to go hungry while simultaneously subsidizing agribusiness.

SNAP helps lift 50 million Americans out of poverty and puts food on families' tables—on our neighbors' tables.

I am telling my personal story because someone needs to talk back to food stamp stereotypes and myths. Somehow, the myths persist and are used to defend the drastic cuts that have been proposed in the farm bill. If we want to save SNAP and other anti-hunger programs, it's time for a reality check.

Myth: SNAP recipients are inner-city minorities.

Fact: Food insecurity is neither an urban issue nor an ethnic issue. Nearly one in six people faces food insecurity, and they live in every county in the nation. In addition, 76 percent of SNAP households include a child, an elderly person or a disabled person.

Myth: People on SNAP are lazy and sign up for the program so they don't have to work.

Fact: Eighty-five percent of households with a food-insecure child have at least one working adult. The SNAP benefit formula provides a strong work incentive—for every additional dollar a SNAP participant earns, their benefits decline by about 24 cents to 36 cents, not a full dollar. Participants have a strong incentive to find work, work longer hours or seek better-paying employment.

Myth: SNAP is rife with fraud and abuse.

Fact: Despite steady growth of the program over the past decade, fraud and abuse have been reduced significantly. A 2010 report from the USDA found the national rate of food stamp trafficking (the practice of trading food stamps for cash) declined from about 3.8 cents per dollar of benefits redeemed in 1993 to about 1 cent per dollar.

Myth: SNAP recipients use their benefits to buy alcohol, cigarettes or lottery tickets.

Fact: It is illegal to buy any of these things with SNAP benefits.

Myth: SNAP is an inefficient government giveaway.

Fact: SNAP benefits drive economic growth in every community. Every \$1 in new SNAP benefits generates up to \$1.80 of economic activity.

These benefits are investments to help struggling families realize brighter futures. My fellow SNAP alumni brothers and sisters are evidence that these investments can pay off over the long run.

I am living proof SNAP can provide the boost a struggling child or family needs to realize the American dream. This program works, and we should all speak up together to protect it.

Please write and call your representatives in Congress and urge them to vote against any cuts to SNAP. These are not just numbers. These are people—people who will go hungry. If we allow Congress to do this, we are responsible for that. You and me.

STOPPING UNAUTHORIZED APPROPRIATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from

California (Mr. McCLINTOCK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the House leadership for its continuing commitment to restore the open appropriations process of the House.

That process is absolutely essential if the House is to meet its constitutional responsibility to superintend the Nation's finances. It assures that the people's elected Representatives can provide the maximum scrutiny of every public expenditure.

In the recent past, this process has given way to continuing resolutions that simply rubber-stamp past Federal spending, thus abrogating Congress' most fundamental fiscal responsibility. For this reason, I, for one, will not support any continuing resolutions of this nature.

The regular order over the Nation's finances must be reasserted, and the open appropriations process that has begun in the House this week does so. That process, though, is the final step in the procedures established to ensure that our Nation's spending gets careful examination. The first step in that process—and the most important step—is when programs are authorized or reauthorized. Legislation must first be adopted that establishes the programs for which money is subsequently appropriated.

That is an absolutely critical function that ensures Federal programs are constantly being scrutinized and that Congress is asking: Are these programs effective? Are they meeting their goals? Are they worthwhile? Are they worth the money we're paying? Most programs have time limits on them to ensure that these questions are periodically asked.

The legal authorization, then, is the green light to the Appropriations Committee to provide funding for that program. And for that reason, since 1835, the rules of the House have limited appropriations to only those purposes actually authorized by law. Unless and until the program is authorized, the House may not appropriate funds for it under this longstanding rule. Yet this rule is routinely ignored by the Appropriations Committee and by the House.

Last year, the appropriations bills reported out of the committee contained over \$350 billion for programs that had either never been authorized or whose authorizations had lapsed years, and sometimes decades, ago. Many of these are vital programs whose reauthorization should be routine, but many are not. For example, the Community Development Block Grant program that paid for a doggy day care center in Ohio and a day at the circus for Nyack, New York, lapsed 18 years ago; and yet every year we keep funding it lavishly.

Most of the outrageous wastes of taxpayer money that end up in various pork reports stem from these lapsed programs. They're established, then they're forgotten, and the spending keeps on year after year.