

and attended the University of Indiana at Bloomington, married his wife, Ms. Christine Swan, was drafted into the Army, served his time, was honorably discharged, went into the insurance business, worked for Prudential and State Farm insurance companies, and ultimately opened his own company, the Rudolph Clay Insurance Agency, of which he was greatly proud.

Rudy, like many people of his era, became actively involved in the civil rights movement of the sixties and seventies, which led him to electoral politics. He was elected to practically everything that one could be elected to in Lake County, Indiana, from precinct committeeman to mayor of Gary. In 1971, Rudy was elected to become the first African American State senator in the State of Indiana. In the Senate, he was the deciding vote that made it possible for an African American to be elected a Lake County commissioner. He was the first African American to be elected county recorder in the State of Indiana. He was county chairman of the Lake County Democratic Party. He served as a Lake County commissioner. He was the chairman of the Gary precinct committeemen's organization, and mayor of his beloved city. And he played a key role in the Obama victory in Indiana in 2008.

Rudy was a great family man, loved by his neighbors and friends, loved by the members of his church and all of those with whom he came into contact. He was loved by his associates in his lodge. The average person in Gary, Indiana, and any place around it knew Rudy Clay, and loved him for his great work.

I convey condolences to his wife, Mrs. Christine Clay; his son, Rudy, Jr.; his brothers and sisters and other members of his family. When one sums up his presence on Earth, they can simply say of Rudy: a job well done, a life well lived.

We salute you, Mayor Rudolph "Rudy" Clay. I thank you for being my friend. May your soul rest in peace.

#### VOCA: CRIMINALS PAY THE RENT IN THE COURTHOUSE

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, every day throughout the United States, criminals commit crimes against good people. Some of those cases make the news. The news usually spends a lot of time talking about the defendant. There is a trial, justice occurs, and the world moves on.

But many times, unfortunately, in our culture, there is a victim in that crime. And the victim after the trial is just ignored in some cases. Some of those victims are sexual assault victims. Back in the day when I spent 30 years at the courthouse in Houston as a prosecutor and a judge, I saw a lot of them. In fact, I keep up with some of them today. The crime affects them a

lot of ways. Some of them lose their jobs. Some of them are hurt physically and emotionally, and they don't have any money.

And this is not a new concept. Years ago under the Reagan administration, Congress recognized this problem, this issue about the fact that many victims, after the crime and after the trial, they just disappear into lives of quiet desperation, and culture and community doesn't keep up with those people. So during the Reagan administration, Congress decided here's what we're going to do: We're going to make criminals who are convicted in Federal court pay into a fund, and that fund is used to help crime victims. What a great concept—make criminals pay the rent on the courthouse. Make them literally pay for their crime by putting money into a fund that goes to crime victims. And that's the Victims of Crime Act that passed—VOCA as it is called.

And the Federal judges, God bless them, they are nailing those criminals. They are taking a lot of their money away from them and putting in about \$2 billion a year into that fund. Today, we have a situation where the fund is over \$11 billion, money criminals paid to help crime victims.

But here's the problem: that money isn't going to crime victims. Crime victims only get about \$700 million a year out of that fund of \$11 billion, with \$2 billion coming in every year. And then the government gets an 8 percent cut, that makes it even less. And there's a cap, and government sets the cap on that money. Remember, this is not taxpayer money. It doesn't belong to anybody except to the victims of crime. That money is used and offset for other purposes. It goes to other programs in commerce, science and justice—probably good programs.

And now with sequestration, we hear that that fund may be completely cut off this year for crime victims because of some squirrelly math somebody's using saying sequestration should apply to the crime victims' fund. That's nonsense.

Meanwhile, throughout the country, victims organizations, shelters, groups like CASA, who represent kids in the courtroom when their parents are not doing the right thing by their kids, and many programs are barely keeping the lights on because they don't get enough money from VOCA even though money is available and it's just sitting there, or being offset for other programs.

□ 1030

So what needs to happen is this: one, raise the cap every year. Two billion dollars is coming in every year. We ought to at least allow the victims to have a billion of that, maybe \$2 billion of it because it keeps coming in.

And more importantly, what we ought to do is take that money and put it in a lockbox concept. It's a very simple concept; that the criminals pay

into the fund, and the funds should go only to crime victims and crime victims' programs. It shouldn't go to other programs in the Federal Government, even if they're good programs, because it was designed by Congress, approved by the administration, to go to those silent, quiet victims who are still, today, hurting because of crimes that are being committed against them. And it just seems nonsense to me.

We have the money available. It's not taxpayer money. We can help victims of crime get their lives back together, and it's not happening because somebody else wants crime victims' money. So let's put this in a lockbox.

Mr. COSTA from California and I have sponsored legislation to say, look, it's not the government's money. It's victims' money, and it ought to all be spent to help victims and victims' programs throughout the country, groups that are doing a great job to help rescue crime victims because of crimes that have occurred against them in the past.

That is justice. And, Mr. Speaker, justice is what we do in this country.

And that's just the way it is.

#### IMPROVING THE FARRM BILL

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, the House is in the process this week of dealing with the most important bill that almost no one has paid any attention to. I'm talking about the FARRM Bill. It goes far beyond dealing with needs of rural and small town America.

It's going to involve, with all likelihood, given the way the past farm bills have exceeded their budget estimates, it's very likely to be over \$1 trillion.

The FARRM Bill is actually getting better, slowly but surely, but it has a long way to go to get the most value out of this bill for America's farmers and ranchers, for the people who eat and for protection of the environment.

Mr. Speaker, this week I will be offering some amendments that I hope will be made in order that will try and coax more value out of this process. The first and foremost, based on legislation I've introduced, the Balancing Food, Farm, and Environment Act, would strengthen the environmental quality incentives program to have stricter payments, so we're not putting too much money into any one project, and would disallow spending for large factory farms, but provide additional support for farmers who want to transition to production techniques that use fewer pesticides or antibiotics and stretch those conservation dollars further.

I also have an amendment that would reform the Conservation Reserve Program to direct more money to conservation enhancement and continuous conservation reserve subprograms to

target the most environmentally sensitive areas and reenroll higher priority lands, providing more stability for farmers, better results for the tax-payers, and more flexibility at the State level.

Third, and perhaps most important, an amendment I'm cosponsoring, along with Mr. CHAFFETZ, would apply reasonable limits for means testing crop insurance. The crop insurance program needs greater scrutiny by Congress. It is an area where the Federal Government provides huge subsidies to insurance companies to sell and service the policies. It pays most of the indemnities when there are losses and generous subsidies to make the premiums cheaper for farmers.

Today, in The New York Times, there was an article that talks about the fraud and waste in the program that, really, we haven't zeroed in. There are clear areas of abuse that need more attention.

My friend Mr. McGOVERN had an amendment that said before you slash nutrition, at least have the rate of fraud and abuse down to the same level as food stamps. I think that's a good proposal.

The amendment that I have introduced with Mr. CHAFFETZ, it would put a limit of \$750,000, beyond which we would no longer subsidize the crop insurance for the large agribusinesses. It's not that they couldn't have crop insurance; it's just the taxpayer will not be on the hook.

It's important for us to start paying attention to the crop insurance program. As we, theoretically, get rid of direct payments, although we still are going to have direct payments for cotton, and I have an amendment on that as well, it's important to look at the overall structure of this program. We don't want to be in a situation where, actually, we're going to end up paying more for crop insurance than the cost of traditional commodity programs proposed by the House and the Senate, and that there are not incentives to be able to use it efficiently and to root out fraud and abuse.

I would strongly urge my colleagues to look at amendments like I have proposed, and others. Look at how the FARRM Bill, the most important environmental nutrition and economic development for small towns and rural America, can be done better.

It's past time to have a farm bill that is environmentally sound, that is cost effective and targets areas that need the help the most. This ought to be an area where we can follow through on the desire to get more value out of tax dollars while we help more people.

I look forward to the debate this week. I hope it is robust, and I do hope that we'll be able to debate the wide range of these issues that would make this FARRM Bill much better.

#### CUTS TO THE SNAP PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from

Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM) for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, this week, the House debates a FARRM Bill that eliminates SNAP benefits for 38,000 Minnesotans and nearly 2 million Americans.

Last week, I hosted a listening session with Congressman ELLISON on how this would impact our State. We heard from faith leaders, service providers, State and county officials, SNAP recipients, young and old.

Evelyn, a senior, told us she was terrified she'd lose her SNAP eligibility under the House bill, and I quote from her: "Without the help from SNAP, I wouldn't be able to buy the healthy foods, fresh fruits and vegetables I need to keep my diabetes in check. Without SNAP," she said, "I don't know what I would do."

For millions of seniors like Evelyn, SNAP is a lifeline. It ensures that they don't have to choose between medicine or buying food. And for America's children, they should be able to attend school and be able to solidly concentrate on their studies because they had something to eat.

I urge my colleagues to reject this immoral cut and to remember the words of Patricia Lull, director of St. Paul Council of Churches: "No more hungry neighbors."

#### THE IMPENDING STUDENT LOAN INTEREST RATE HIKE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED) for 5 minutes.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about an issue I deeply care about, and that issue is the affordability and ability of students across America to get a college degree.

Mr. Speaker, as we face this impending student interest loan cliff on July 1, I want to share with you and with the American public a personal story.

I'm the youngest of 12. I have eight older sisters, three older brothers, and my mother and father made a commitment to each other that each and every one of us would get some sort of college degree or advanced degree.

My father passed when I was 2, and there were six of us left in our household that my mother had to raise on her own. I went to college, went to law school, and I watched in her eyes the fulfillment of that promise that she and my dad made to each and every one of us.

□ 1040

Now, not all of my siblings went to law school. One got a vocational degree cutting hair, who now works in Arizona. I have the law degree, and there's a whole mix in between.

As we deal with the issue of student loan interest, we need to make sure that we stand for the students and that we stand for the next generation, because a college degree and a higher educational pursuit will arm those

young men and women for generations and empower them to control their own destiny in their own hands.

So I come today on my side of the aisle and say to my colleagues, thank you for joining us in passing a bill in the House that would avert the interest rate spike that will be coming up on July 1. I ask my colleagues to join me and to demand that the Senate take action.

As you see, Mr. Speaker, the Senate has failed to pass a piece of legislation in the Senate to avert this fiscal cliff to our students across America. To me, Mr. Speaker, that's just not right. That's just not fair. We need to do better. And what we need to do is to pass a reform out of this body and out of this Congress that takes the student out of this political theater that has become the student loan interest spike every year that we have to deal with.

The proposal in the House, to me, makes sense. It's a commonsense, market-based approach that will lower interest rates on 70 percent of the loans that students receive in going to college and advanced degrees.

I ask the Senate and I ask my colleagues to continue to join us to put pressure on the Senate to say enough is enough. We care about students. Let's address this issue so that they don't see that interest rate spike that is coming over the horizon and say to the White House, Sign this legislation once and for all that removes the students from the political debate that this issue has become.

#### PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION ACT

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

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as the House begins consideration of H.R. 1797, I rise in solidarity with the women of the world. I rise in outrage at yet another attempt to control our bodies and make choices for us instead of allowing women to make their own choice with their doctors and their families.

First of all, it's the woman's body, not yours. She alone bears the burden, the pain and joy that it brings. Please stop trying to regulate our reproductive organs. They belong to us.

To the men who feel so inclined to tell women what to do, I ask: Have you ever had a menstrual period? Have you ever felt unbearable pain in every bone of your body during childbirth? Will you be there for a mother when she needs prenatal care, formula, and diapers? Will you support Head Start programs? Will you focus on creating good public schools? Will you reform foster care and stop greasing the prison pipeline with unwanted children?

There are grandmothers living in trailer parks and public housing single-handedly raising millions of grandchildren. Where are you when Grandma is trying to feed Jerome, Shaquita,