

Cook	Holding	Mullin
Cooper	Holt	Mulvaney
Costa	Honda	Murphy (FL)
Cotton	Horsford	Murphy (PA)
Courtney	Hoyer	Nadler
Cramer	Hudson	Napolitano
Crawford	Huelskamp	Neal
Crenshaw	Huffman	Negrete McLeod
Crowley	Huizenga (MI)	Neugebauer
Cuellar	Hultgren	Noem
Culberson	Hurt	Nolan
Cummings	Israel	Nugent
Daines	Issa	Nunes
Davis	Jackson Lee	Nunnelee
Davis, Danny	Jeffries	O'Rourke
Davis, Rodney	Jenkins	Olson
DeFazio	Johnson (GA)	Owens
DeGette	Johnson (OH)	Palazzo
Delaney	Johnson, E. B.	Pallone
DeLauro	Johnson, Sam	Pastor (AZ)
DelBene	Jones	Paulsen
Denham	Jordan	Payne
Dent	Joyce	Pearce
DeSantis	Kaptur	Pelosi
DesJarlais	Keating	Perlmutter
Deutch	Kelly (IL)	Perry
Diaz-Balart	Kelly (PA)	Peters (CA)
Dingell	Kennedy	Peters (MI)
Doggett	Kildee	Peterson
Doyle	Kilmer	Petri
Duckworth	Kind	Pingree (ME)
Duffy	King (IA)	Pittenger
Duncan (SC)	King (NY)	Pitts
Duncan (TN)	Kingston	Pocan
Edwards	Kinzinger (IL)	Poe (TX)
Ellison	Kirkpatrick	Polis
Ellmers	Kline	Pompeo
Engel	Kuster	Posey
Enyart	Labrador	Price (GA)
Eshoo	LaMalfa	Price (NC)
Esty	Lamborn	Quigley
Farenthold	Lance	Radel
Farr	Langevin	Rahall
Fattah	Lankford	Rangel
Fincher	Larson (CT)	Reed
Fitzpatrick	Latham	Reichert
Fleischmann	Latta	Renacci
Fleming	Lee (CA)	Ribble
Flores	Levin	Rice (SC)
Forbes	Lewis	Richmond
Fortenberry	Lipinski	Rigell
Foster	LoBiondo	Roby
Fox	Loeb	Roe (TN)
Frankel (FL)	Lofgren	Rogers (AL)
Franks (AZ)	Long	Rogers (MI)
Frelinghuysen	Lowenthal	Rohrabacher
Fudge	Lowe	Rokita
Gabbard	Lucas	Rooney
Galleo	Luetkemeyer	Ros-Lehtinen
Garamendi	Lujan Grisham	Roskam
Garcia	(NM)	Ross
Gardner	Lujan, Ben Ray	Rothfus
Garrett	(NM)	Roybal-Allard
Gerlach	Lummis	Royce
Gibbs	Lynch	Ruiz
Gibson	Maffei	Runyan
Gingrey (GA)	Maloney,	Ruppersberger
Gohmert	Carolyn	Rush
Goodlatte	Maloney, Sean	Ryan (OH)
Gosar	Marchant	Ryan (WI)
Gowdy	Marino	Salmon
Granger	Massie	Sanchez, Linda
Graves (GA)	Matheson	T.
Graves (MO)	Matsui	Sanchez, Loretta
Grayson	McCarthy (CA)	Sanford
Green, Al	McCaul	Sarbanes
Green, Gene	McClintock	Scalise
Griffin (AR)	McCollum	Schakowsky
Griffith (VA)	McDermott	Schiff
Grijalva	McGovern	Schneider
Grimm	McHenry	Schock
Guthrie	McIntyre	Schrader
Gutierrez	McKeon	Schwartz
Hahn	McKinley	Schweikert
Hall	McMorris	Scott (VA)
Hanabusa	Rodgers	Scott, Austin
Hanna	McNerney	Scott, David
Harper	Meadows	Sensenbrenner
Harris	Meehan	Serrano
Hartzer	Meeks	Sessions
Hastings (FL)	Meng	Sewell (AL)
Hastings (WA)	Messer	Shea-Porter
Heck (NV)	Mica	Sherman
Heck (WA)	Michaud	Shimkus
Hensarling	Miller (FL)	Shuster
Herrera Beutler	Miller (MI)	Simpson
Higgins	Miller, Gary	Sinema
Himes	Moore	Sires
Hinojosa	Moran	Slaughter

Smith (MO)	Titus	Waxman
Smith (NE)	Tonko	Weber (TX)
Smith (NJ)	Tsongas	Webster (FL)
Smith (TX)	Turner	Welch
Smith (WA)	Upton	Wenstrup
Southerland	Valadao	Westmoreland
Speier	Van Hollen	Whitfield
Stewart	Vargas	Williams
Stivers	Veasey	Wilson (FL)
Stockman	Vela	Wilson (SC)
Stutzman	Velázquez	Wittman
Swalwell (CA)	Visclosky	Wolf
Takano	Wagner	Womack
Terry	Walberg	Woodall
Thompson (CA)	Walden	Yoder
Thompson (MS)	Walorski	Yoho
Thompson (PA)	Walz	Young (AK)
Thornberry	Wasserman	Young (FL)
Tiberi	Schultz	Young (IN)
Tierney	Waters	
Tipton	Watt	

NOT VOTING—10

Bonner	Mark	Rogers (KY)
Campbell	McCarthy (NY)	Yarmuth
Hunter	Miller, George	
Larsen (WA)	Pascarell	

□ 1524

Mrs. NAPOLITANO changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL AGRICULTURE REFORM AND RISK MANAGEMENT ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. AMODEI). Pursuant to House Resolution 266 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1947.

The Chair appoints the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1528

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1947) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes, with Mrs. MILLER of Michigan in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1947, the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013.

□ 1530

This bipartisan bill is 4 years in the making, and I could not have had a

better partner than my friend from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON).

He began this process 4 years ago when he led us into the countryside to have eight field hearings across this great Nation. We followed up those field hearings with a series of 11 audit hearings on every single policy under the jurisdiction of the House Committee on Agriculture.

In all, we held 40 hearings on every aspect of this FARRM Bill. The result is legislation that calls for reduced spending, smaller government, and commonsense reform.

The committee has held two markups of this essential bill, the first, last Congress, and one last month. Both of those markups lasted for more than 12 hours each. We considered over 200 amendments in total. In the end, we achieved a large bipartisan margin of support. The vote tally this year was 36–10, with 23 out of 25 Republicans and 13 out of 21 Democrats supporting it.

Some of my colleagues were amazed by the duration of the markup; but I came to Congress to legislate, and an important part of the legislative process is an open and fair debate. The Speaker shares that sentiment, and I hope during the debate of the amendments to the FARRM Act, we'll let the body work its will, then we'll vote for final passage.

The FARRM Act is different for many reasons. There is a reason that we put reform in the title. This is the most reform-minded bill in decades. It repeals outdated policies, while reforming, streamlining, and consolidating over 100 government programs.

It reforms the SNAP Act, also known as the food stamp program, for the first time since the welfare reforms of 1996; and it makes tremendous reforms to the farm programs.

The Agriculture Committee and the agriculture community have voluntarily worked together to make these reforms and to contribute to deficit reduction. Every part of this bill is a part of the solution to Washington's spending problems. We save the American taxpayer nearly \$40 billion, which is almost seven times the amount of cuts to these programs under sequestration.

Regarding reforms to traditional farm programs, first of all, we eliminate direct payments. They cost taxpayers \$5 billion a year. They were payments that people received every year, regardless of the market conditions and whether or not they farmed.

Instead, we take a more market-oriented approach to policy, where there is no support when market prices are high. We encourage responsible risk management where farmers are able to plan for catastrophic events.

In addition to eliminating direct payments, we repeal the ACRE Act, the disaster program for crops, and the countercyclical program. My philosophy from the beginning of the FARRM Bill process has been that these programs had to be based on market economies. They had to work for

all crops in all regions of the country. Our bill achieves this, while also saving \$23 billion, which is a record 36 percent spending reduction.

In conservation, a subject near and dear to my heart, we streamline the delivery of these incredibly important programs. During our hearings, we learned that conservation programs had grown in number and complication, often acting as a deterrent for the adoption of these voluntary, incentive-based programs. Therefore, the FARRM Act eliminates and consolidates 23 duplicative and overlapping programs into 13, which saves nearly \$7 billion.

We authorize and strengthen and fully pay for livestock disaster assistance that is incredibly important to our livestock producers during devastating droughts, such as the ones we're experiencing recently.

The bill invests in core specialty crop initiatives like Specialty Block Grants, Plant Pest and Disease Management programs; and the FARRM Act also maintains our investment in agricultural research.

You know, my friends, I've had a lot of my colleagues ask me, FRANK, why do you get so excited about these issues? Why do you get so stirred up? You're usually a pretty calm, laid-back fellow.

Well, let me tell you, I come from a part of the country that was the abyss of the Great Depression and the drought of the 1930s. Some of you may have seen Mr. Burns' documentary about the Dust Bowl. Those are my constituents. Those were my relatives in Roger Mills County, as well as the panhandle.

I was raised by a generation, my grandparents, who were young men and women during the Great Depression, who lived through that drought. They were scarred forever.

My maternal grandfather cosigned my first farm lease, cosigned my note at the bank so that I could start farming. But he was convinced, till the day he died, just as my other grandfather was, the Great Depression was coming back; it was coming back.

My parents were young men and women in the fifties, and they went through the drought of the fifties, far worse than the drought of the thirties. To the day he died, my father was convinced that it would never rain again.

And I came home from college in 1982 just in time to observe the collapse in agricultural land prices. I was raised by the generation that suffered through the thirties and the fifties.

I came home to watch the Vietnam generation be destroyed, farmers be destroyed by things beyond their control in the early 1980s. That's why I get so worked up on this policy.

The misery of the thirties, the misery of the eighties, economically, was not an accident. It was policy mistakes in the twenties and thirties that led to that agony. It was policy mistakes in the seventies and eighties that led to that agony.

Now, you say, FRANK, you're excited, you're getting worked up. Look at the 1930 census for Roger Mills County. There were 14,000 people living in my home county. By the 1940 census there were 7,000 people living in my home county. And we've just now made it back to the mid-3,000s.

You don't have that kind of economic devastation, depopulation, suffering by accident. And that's why I'm here; that's why I'm working with my colleague, the ranking member, Mr. PETERSON. That's why I've worked with Republicans, Democrats alike for years now to get to this point. That's why I want to work with all of you.

I cannot make it rain. There may be people in this town who say they can make it rain, but I cannot make it rain. But in my tenure as chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, I can make sure we pass a comprehensive FARRM Bill that does not repeat the mistakes of the 1920s and -30s, does not repeat the mistakes of the 1970s and -80s.

I will not be a part of inflicting on future generations what was inflicted on what I call that generation of Vietnam veterans who came home to farm and, instead, went to the bankruptcy auctions, or my grandparents' generation, whose young men and women were wiped out in the 1930s. I will not be a part of that.

So I will work with all of you to try and improve this draft that attempts to produce a safety net that is workable, that is efficient, both for rural America and producers, but also for consumers.

I ask you to work with me in that regard. I ask you to do the right thing. I ask you to avoid the mistakes of the past. I ask you to look at the language, to study the language, and be good, responsible legislators.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PETERSON. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to associate myself with the comments of the chairman, who, by the way, has done an outstanding job putting this bill together. And with the exception of maybe some differences on the SNAP title of the bill, I have to say that if I was still chairman, I wouldn't have a bill that's much different than what the chairman and I have put together. And maybe one of the reasons for that is that my family has a similar background to Mr. LUCAS' family. My grandfather went through the Depression.

□ 1540

My father almost got bankrupted by Ezra Taft Benson and some of the nonsense that went on during that period of time. So the chairman is right. Policy makes a big difference in agriculture, and I stand with him in never going back to a time where we don't give our farmers and ranchers the safety net they need to operate in a very

risky and now capital intensive business.

So today we're debating a new 5-year farm bill. As the chairman said, the process has gone on long enough. We started the debate on this when I was still chairman, and it's time for us to pass a bill.

This farm bill gives farmers and ranchers the necessary tools to provide American consumers with the safest, most abundant and most affordable food supply in the world. The bill includes farm, conservation, trade, nutrition, credit, rural development, research, forestry, energy and specialty crop programs.

With roughly 16 million American jobs tied to agriculture, the farm bill is a jobs bill. The rural economy remained strong during our Nation's financial crisis, and in my part of the world it was agriculture that kind of kept us going through that process. This is why the farm bill is so important. Failing to pass a new 5-year farm bill could potentially devastate our rural economy. Why would we jeopardize the one part of our economy that has been, and continues to be, working?

I often tell people that the Agriculture Committee is probably the least partisan of all the committees in Congress. And that doesn't happen by accident. We listen to each other, we try to understand each other, work together, and at the end of the day, have the best interests of our constituents in mind.

The bill before us today is a compromise that reflects that tradition. It's a compromise between commodities and regions, urban and rural Members. I didn't get everything I wanted; Chairman LUCAS didn't get everything he wanted, but that's how the legislative process is supposed to work.

The bill makes major reforms to farm programs. Repealing direct payments saves taxpayers nearly \$40 billion a year, and it ensures that farmers won't get a government subsidy for doing nothing. Instead, producers are given the choice between two countercyclical farm safety programs, addressing either price declines or revenue losses, which only support farmers during difficult times. The bill also sets new income requirements so individual millionaires won't receive farm payments and continues the no-cost sugar program.

H.R. 1947 also makes significant reforms to dairy programs, the result of more than 4 years of work that we've done on the committee and compromise within the dairy industry. The new dairy safety net will address the volatility of the dairy market, help consumers by making all milk prices more stable and hopefully eliminate the price spikes that have been normal in today's marketplace.

The 2008 farm bill was the first farm bill to address the growing demand for fresh fruits and vegetables, local foods and organics. The 2013 FARRM Bill

continues this investment by increasing funding for specialty crop block grants, providing support for the Farmers Market and Local Food Promotion programs and authorizing the very first organic check-off for research and promotion.

We also recognize the challenges facing many beginning farmers by including support for outreach and education to beginning, socially disadvantaged and military veteran farmers and ranchers. The bill also streamlines and reforms current conservation programs, better targeting resources to allow farmers and ranchers to continue to preserve our valuable natural resources.

Now, a lot of attention has been given to the bill's cuts to nutrition programs, more than \$20 billion over 10 years in this bill. Personally, I would have preferred that we updated the income and asset limits in the current SNAP program so that we would have treated everybody in the country the same. We've looked at that, we weren't able to come to consensus, so we didn't move in that direction.

So we have cuts to nutrition spending in this bill, and they've received most of the attention in this regard, but we also like to point out that there's additional support for TEFAP, increased funding for Community Food Projects with a focus on low-income communities, and it provides more resources to help USDA's anti-trafficking efforts.

So, while I think it's ridiculous to cut hundreds of billions of dollars out of nutrition programs, as some Members have called for, I also don't think it's realistic to say that we can't cut one penny from these programs because clearly there isn't a government program that couldn't stand some reductions. So I think what we've done here at the end of the day is responsible reform that's a middle ground that will allow us to continue and to complete the work on this bill.

So I know we're going to have a lot of amendments I guess starting tomorrow, but it's my opinion, and it's the chairman's opinion, that in order for us to get a bill conferenced, we need to go through this process and stick together on the committee so we can have a bill that can be conferenced and get this bill signed before September 30 when the current law expires.

We need to keep this a bipartisan bill and not stray too far from what was approved in committee. I know that compromise is rare around here, but it's what is needed to finally get a new 5-year farm bill completed, and that is our objective.

So, Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time and yield back.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Chair, I'd like to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of the farm bill. The American people want Congress to cut wasteful spending

and red tape. And I honestly believe the American people also want to have their food grown right here in America. It's my opinion this farm bill accomplishes both those goals. This farm bill also cuts spending for agriculture programs by over \$40 billion—that's billion with a B.

The bill eliminates or consolidates more than 100 programs administered by USDA. It also ends the often criticized direct payments for farmers. The farm bill also cuts \$20 billion in mandatory spending on food stamps over the next 10 years.

Many opponents of the bill have characterized this legislation as a bill to support the expansion of the food stamps. That couldn't be further from the truth. Like many of my colleagues here, I believe the food stamp program is wasteful and open to fraud. Food stamp spending has doubled since 2008, and it's tripled since 2002. Without reform, food stamp spending will continue to increase through loopholes the Obama administration has used to expand the program.

That's why we should pass this farm bill. I agree it's not perfect. But passage allows the House to join with the Senate in conference to pursue further reforms that are one step closer to signing this into law.

With that, Madam Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the farm bill.

Mr. PETERSON. Madam Chair, I'm pleased to yield 2 minutes to the second-ranking member of the House Agriculture Committee, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCINTYRE.)

Mr. MCINTYRE. Madam Chairman, for decades, Congress has worked in a bipartisan fashion to craft farm bills that protect and support our farmers, strengthen rural economic development, encourage conservation and provide nutritional support for the most vulnerable in society. These bills have generally received wide bipartisan support.

This year I was pleased to, once again, work with my colleagues on the Agriculture Committee to advance a strong, reform-minded, fiscally responsible and bipartisan farm bill. This bill preserves the farm safety net and provides regional equity while consolidating over 100 programs and making targeted cuts to rein in Federal spending and move toward a balanced budget.

These reforms will save almost \$40 billion. In fact, do you realize that less than 1 percent of our entire Federal budget is agriculture? Yet, by God's grace, it feeds us all.

The farm bill is critical not only to our Nation. I know in North Carolina agribusiness and farming are the number one industry. Each year, agribusiness brings millions of dollars in revenue to our State, supporting countless families. When we talk about economic opportunity for families in rural America, we are talking about the farm bill.

Last Congress, we brought a broad, bipartisan bill, but the committee was never able to get a vote on the floor. Now is our chance. Now is the critical time for rural America. People in our rural communities do count, and they ought to have the opportunity to have a farm bill voted upon. Now is the time that our farmers need to be able to plan for the future, and now we must have that opportunity to give them the chance to plan to help feed all of us.

This is the place, now is the time, now we have that opportunity to do something about it. Delay is serious, not only for our farmers, but for all of us. Short-term extensions only provide a band-aid. Uncertainty diminishes agriculture's ability to face the challenges associated with a growing population in our country and indeed a growing world population.

Yes, rural Americans are willing to do their part to cut the deficit and rein in spending, but we should not disproportionately put the burden upon the backs of families who live in small towns and communities across America. We hope that you will stand together and let's get the farm bill done for all Americans.

□ 1550

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to Subcommittee Chairman CONAWAY from the great State of Texas.

(Mr. CONAWAY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CONAWAY. Madam Chairman, I want to thank Chairman LUCAS as well as Ranking Member PETERSON for the great work they've done in getting us to this point. It's been bipartisan, and it's been an honor to work with both these gentlemen.

This bill wasn't written overnight. This bill that we'll consider today or tomorrow or the next couple of days is the result of 4 years of debate, a 2-year audit of every single policy in the USDA, as well as 40 hearings and the second markup last month and now the floor debate. This landmark bill saves taxpayers billions over the next 10 years while making the greatest reforms in food policy since 1996.

There are many reasons why this balanced, equitable, and market-oriented farm bill is deserving of support. As we consider this legislation, I hope every Member of Congress will really think about how important it is to walk the walk rather than just talk the talk. This is a piece of legislation, not an opportunity for theatrics.

The difference between those who don't support this legislation and those who do is simple: the first group talks about cutting spending, talks about cutting the deficit, talks about making reforms, and talks about reducing the size of government, and the farm bill and its supporters actually do all of those things.

Failure to pass this farm bill means more of the same from Washington—

\$40 billion in additional government spending; 100 programs that we on the committee believe have outlived their usefulness will continue on; and we will continue the runaway, abusive spending programs within the SNAP programs without the reforms that we've put in place for this bill.

Opposing this bill is a vote for the status quo in Washington. A vote against this bill is a vote for the status quo in Washington.

I could go back to my district and tell my constituents that I voted against this bill because I'm a fiscal conservative, knowing full well that what I really did was leave Washington with the spending spigot fully turned on, and I'm not going to do that. I hope my fellow Members won't do it either.

This bill helps to provide food safety for our national security. A nation that produces its own food is more secure.

In addition to the work on the Ag Committee, I also serve on the Armed Services Committee and the House Intelligence Committee, and I see the dangers that our country faces every day. It is not in our Nation's best interest to depend on other countries for our food supply like we do for energy and other areas.

This bill is supported by hundreds of farm associations, agribusinesses, and farmers and ranchers across the country, including more than 80 in my home State of Texas.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill. Let's pass this and move on.

While farmers and ranchers would rather not ask us for this farm bill, it's simple—they don't have a choice.

If they could buy insurance for their crops like you and I can on our home, they would do it in a heartbeat. But they cannot. Without federal crop insurance, farmers and ranchers would have no insurance on a crop that they will spend more money each year to produce than most Americans will spend in a lifetime.

If farmers and ranchers could freely market their crops around the world without foreign governments putting up barriers, high tariffs, and spending billions of dollars to subsidize their farmers and ranchers, they would gladly do it.

But while we are debating cutting farm policy to record low levels, foreign subsidies and tariffs are hitting record highs and just keep rising. There is nothing free market about selling out America's farmers and ranchers to the uncompetitive trade practices of foreign countries.

This farm bill represents a modest response to Mother Nature and foreign subsidies and tariffs. It represents just one-quarter of 1 percent of the total budget. If every committee in Congress and every facet of government contributed to deficit reduction as the Agriculture Committee has, we would have the deficit licked by now.

Great thinkers throughout history have drawn the connection between the people who produce our food and clothing and the good of a nation. We in Congress owe it to the American taxpayer to pass legislation that promotes the safest, most abundant and cheapest food and fiber supply in the world.

I urge my colleagues to pass this farm bill.

Mr. PETERSON. Madam Chair, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to one of our subcommittee ranking members, the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA).

Mr. COSTA. Madam Chairman, I rise today to highlight the important and positive reforms in this year's FARRM Bill, that includes the Dairy subtitle, as we try to improve and save money for the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act, otherwise known as the 2013 FARRM Bill.

I first want to thank Chairman LUCAS and Ranking Member PETERSON for the terrific work that they've done in cobbling together this bipartisan effort. It's never easy.

I can tell you as a grandson of two generations of dairy farmers in California that what American farmers do every day is work as hard as they possibly can to provide the highest value food quality at the most cost-effective level to American consumers, and they've been doing it for generations.

The Dairy Security Act of this bill is the result of 4 years of hard work and compromise by dairy producers and other members of the dairy industry across the country. This program is intended to provide a strong, market-based safety net that will keep dairy producers afloat while providing stable consumer prices.

The dairy industry—and producers especially—has been a victim in recent years because of dramatic price volatility, and so have the consumers. At the same time, producers have been forced to deal with feed costs that have skyrocketed from \$2 a bushel to \$7 a bushel, and that has had a dramatic impact.

Dairy producers across the country have seen their overhead increase as their profits have remained stagnant. Current Federal dairy policy continues to foster outdated support programs which no longer provide a meaningful safety net or ensure any stability for our dairy farmers or our consumers.

In California, my home State, the leading dairy State in the Nation, we have lost 100 dairies as a result of bankruptcy in the last 18 months. Something needs to be done. We need to fix this broken system.

This title provides stability to the producers and benefits the consumers as well. It is time to bring meaningful reform, and this measure does this.

I ask my colleagues to support this effort as we move along this bipartisan compromise.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD).

Mr. CRAWFORD. I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their outstanding work in crafting the 2013 FARRM Bill. I would especially like to thank the farmers and ranchers across rural America for their patience as we work through this long, difficult process.

Madam Chair, the bill before us today is the product of our extensive

outreach to farmers, ranchers, and stakeholders across the entire country.

I believe that the most essential aspect of writing any farm bill is the critical input we receive from our rural constituents. The Agriculture Committee made this possible through holding a series of farm bill field hearings in nearly every region of the country, allowing producers to contribute to the farm bill process by having their voices heard.

Last year, I had the opportunity to host one of those field hearings in my hometown of Jonesboro, where all types of producers from Arkansas and around the Midsouth region had a chance to testify. They shared with the committee the challenges they face in the modern agricultural economy and provided suggestions about how the farm bill can be tailored to reflect their unique risk in the marketplace. This feedback was critical in helping us craft policy that meets the needs of producers not only in Arkansas, but around the country.

After hearing from stakeholders across the Nation, it was remarkable to me to hear time and time again that ag producers are willing to do their part to reduce the deficit. This willingness has allowed the Ag Committee to craft a farm bill that saves nearly \$40 billion. This was no easy task, mind you, and the committee had to make some very tough choices. But I believe we were able to fairly balance the needs of our producers with the need to pay down the debt.

The final product is a bipartisan farm bill that saves taxpayers money, reduces deficit spending, and repeals outdated government programs while reforming, streamlining, and consolidating others. Whether it's through the elimination of direct payments, the consolidation of conservation programs, or eliminating abuse in the food stamp program, every part of this bill contributes fairly to deficit reduction.

I proudly support the 2013 FARRM Bill, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. PETERSON. Madam Chair, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to another subcommittee ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. WALZ).

Mr. WALZ. Madam Chairman, I, too, want to thank the chairman and the ranking member, who not only have worked unwaveringly to craft a great piece of legislation, but collaborating, shepherding this thing through, saving taxpayer money, supporting jobs, streamlining for efficiency, and eliminating burdensome programs. I'd also especially like to say they've done it with dignity, they've done it with grace, and they've done it with the respect and thoughtfulness for this institution. And I'll tell you, the American people need a lot of that.

Last week, we had a poll that showed us at a 10 percent approval rating. The North Koreans are at 17 percent. That ought to tell you something here. It would be funny if it wasn't so dang disappointing. The sacrifices that went

into us doing the basic needs, the American public did not believe we could fulfill the basic needs. Well, you know what, they're wrong on this count because we're going to do it in here with the leadership of these two gentlemen who have spoken before. We need to make sure that this piece of legislation goes through the process, it's amended by the Members of this House in an appropriate manner, and we move it forward.

I can tell you, for those who say we would be better off just doing an extension, that's not what my dairy folks are telling me when they've watched drought, flood, and winter kill. They're struggling day to day to try and feed their herds and facing liquidation. To them, no farm bill means no funding for livestock disaster programs. Tell that to my youth in my district, where the average age of a farmer is 58 years, where we lose all these good programs to put people on the land.

So I urge all my colleagues: take a look at this. Do what you're hearing people say. This is reform. This is savings. This is smart policy. And it also gives the American people food security.

It's a national security issue. We feed 316 million Americans—our farmers do—and billions worldwide. I ask my colleagues, look over our shoulder, in this quote by Daniel Webster. Let us try and develop something worth being remembered for.

I urge passage of this bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the subcommittee chairman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of this FARRM Bill. I, along with many others in this room, have worked on drafting a farm bill that meets the needs of our agricultural producers and consumers.

We've taken part in audit hearings and met with producers, grocers, and consumers. We've debated agricultural policy through two midnight-hour markups on a bill that should pass every 5 years. Through all of this, I have gained knowledge of many unnecessary programs and the fraud and abuse that plagues these programs. I also have a newfound appreciation for the FARRM Bill and its value to American citizens.

My granddad always said the farm bill is for when times are bad, not when they are good.

□ 1600

Several of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle have reasons to vote against the bill. Some say it cuts too much. For others, it doesn't cut enough. Let me be clear. This bill is a good step in the right direction. It will reduce Federal spending. It reduces the fraud, abuse, and waste in many of the government programs that are in the government today.

I would like to share a few facts with you. If we don't pass this bill:

\$40 billion is the amount of money that will be spent on outdated commodity programs that we have cut out of this bill;

11 million is the number of additional acres in conservation programs that would receive a government program that we have cut out of this bill.

We have also reduced SNAP payments for about 2 million people who should not qualify for them anyway.

Some of the reforms to the nutrition title include:

Restrictions in the use of the LIHEAP program;

Eliminating lottery winners from qualifying for SNAP benefits;

And eliminating State performance bonuses and advertising for the program.

As my friend from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) has asked: "Is this a legislative moment or a theater moment?"

Madam Chair, I submit that this is a true legislative moment. During this time, we need to act on the facts. Farmers and families need the certainty of long-term agricultural policies so they can continue to be the cornerstone of our Nation.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. PETERSON. Madam Chair, I am now pleased to yield 2 minutes to an outstanding member of our committee, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Chair, I want to begin by thanking the chairman of the Ag Committee, Mr. LUCAS, and the ranking member, Mr. PETERSON, for their hard work. There have been countless hours on this bill, and so have their staffs. I appreciate their dedication.

I very much want to support a farm bill, so it is with deep regret that I come to the floor to say that I cannot support this farm bill. The main reason is because of the \$20.5 billion cut in the SNAP program. That is too much, that is too harsh. Two million people will lose their benefits. Over 200,000 kids will be knocked out of the free breakfast and lunch program. Those aren't my statistics or a liberal think tank's statistics; that's what CBO says, the Congressional Budget Office. What happens to these 2 million people? Where do they go? Where do they get food? The fact of the matter is food is not a luxury, it is a necessity.

There are some who have said that all we are doing is reforming SNAP and we are dealing with the rising costs. If we were truly reforming SNAP, I would feel better about it if we held at least one hearing on it in the subcommittee.

In terms of dealing with rising costs, the best way to deal with that is to invest in our economy and put people back to work. When more people go to work, the number of people on SNAP goes down. It's countercyclical. That's how you decrease spending on SNAP.

Madam Chair, we have 50 million people in this country who are hungry—17 million are kids. We all should

be ashamed. We ought to be having a discussion on how to end hunger in America. SNAP is one tool in the antihunger toolbox to end hunger. We need to have a broader discussion. But I can say with certainty that cutting SNAP by \$20.5 billion will not alleviate hunger in America. It will cause more pain, more suffering, and more misery.

I want a farm bill that not only helps our farmers but moves us toward a day where we no longer have hunger in America. Unfortunately, this bill as written will make hunger worse.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON), a subcommittee chairman.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of the House Agriculture Committee's 2013 FARRM Bill.

This legislation is a product of 3 years of extensive hearings, research, and fact finding. The bill eliminates outdated farm programs, direct payments, countercyclical payments, the average crop revenue election program, and the supplemental revenue assistance payments, for example. These programs are part of an old system and need to be eliminated.

Regarding SNAP and food stamps, we have made significant reforms. Specifically, we have closed a number of loopholes and have eliminated categorical eligibility. While we have eliminated these loopholes, such as automatic enrollment, the bill still allows for eligibility, based on income, to ensure that those who truly need the assistance continue to have access.

For the second consecutive Congress, I have had the privilege to chair the Subcommittee on Conservation, Energy, and Forestry. At the subcommittee level, we were successful in consolidating and cleaning up a number of programs. The bill consolidates 23 conservation programs down to 13. I believe it achieves this without negatively impacting the effectiveness or the goals of these programs.

We have also included several provisions to promote the health of our Nation's forests. Agriculture is the number one industry in Pennsylvania, and I am pleased to see that we are bringing much-needed reform to the Commonwealth's top sector—dairy. First and foremost, this bill repeals all of the dairy price support system, and replaces that system with a free-market margin program.

Like many of my colleagues, I have significant concern with the supply management portion of the dairy title. However, we can address this matter in the amendment process.

This bill is not perfect. However, it does make significant changes to both farm and nutrition programs, and will save the taxpayer over \$40 billion. Without passage of this bill, none of these reforms will be made, none of the savings will be realized, and we will continue these broken policies or, even worse, revert to the permanent law for the 1930s and the 1940s.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote for this legislation, and I thank both the chairman and ranking member for their leadership.

Mr. PETERSON. Madam Chair, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR), a former member of the committee.

Mr. CUELLAR. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of the importance of passing the new 5-year farm bill into law.

I first want to thank Chairman LUCAS for all the good work that he has done, and my ranking member, Mr. PETERSON—I still call him my ranking member, Mr. PETERSON—for all the work that he and the other members of the Agriculture Committee, in a bipartisan way, have done, including the staff that worked so hard to make sure that we get this farm bill done.

As you know, we did pass an extension, which was not the right thing to do, but we did an extension. We need to provide some sort of continuity with a 5-year program. As you know, this is something that needs to be done in a bipartisan way, and this is what the committee has done after having numerous bill hearings, after making some changes that provide some reform, reform that will save the taxpayers over \$40 billion in funding over the next 10 years through important reforms to our commodity, conservation, and nutrition agencies.

I don't like the cuts to the nutrition, but I do understand this is a process. We have to get into a conference committee and work with the Senate. Therefore, I'm asking the Members to support the process and get this bill to where we can support it as bipartisan.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON).

Mr. HUDSON. Madam Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the farm bill—a product of several years of hard work and patience from Chairman LUCAS, Ranking Member PETERSON, and their staffs at the Agriculture Committee.

Madam Chairman, I would like to call attention to the patience of our farming community across this Nation, the economic engine of rural America, and especially to the farming families in the Eighth District of North Carolina, which I call home. When I go home every weekend and travel across my district, I hear one resounding thing, and that is get a 5-year farm bill done to provide us the certainty we need.

Madam Chairman, this bill is not perfect. In my opinion, it does not contain enough cuts or reforms, but our alternative is the status quo. I would like to see more cuts and will offer and support amendments to do just that. Ultimately, I will support this bill because not supporting it, again, means the status quo. Not supporting this bill means not getting over \$40 billion in mandatory cuts when we had the chance. Not supporting this bill means

not having a 5-year bill to provide certainty that our farmers need.

From the important provisions found in the commodities title to ensuring the critical safety net of crop insurance remains intact to making responsible cuts and reforms to bloated programs, saving the taxpayers' money, this bill is a bill we need to support.

This a bill that provides the tools our farmers need to keep them producing food and fiber for our country and the world.

Like I said, this bill is not perfect and I look forward to the debate we will have in the coming days, and considering the amendments my colleagues and I will offer to make this the best bill we can for the Agriculture Community and the American taxpayer.

On behalf of the farmers and agribusiness community of North Carolina, I am eager to get this bill finished and providing long awaited certainty and reforms.

Mr. PETERSON. Madam Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to a new member of our committee from Illinois (Mr. ENYART).

Mr. ENYART. Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of this important and long overdue legislation.

When I ran for Congress, I pledged to work for southern Illinois' agricultural industry. That's why I voted in committee to advance this bipartisan 5-year bill.

The inability of the House to pass a farm bill was among the biggest failings of the last Congress. This is by no means a perfect bill. It cuts far too deeply to the SNAP program. There are real people in my district and in yours who depend on this program, and while we must reduce the deficit we shouldn't be doing that on the backs of those who can't afford to put food on the table. However, I believe that funding will be bolstered here on the floor of the House and in conference.

□ 1610

Let's look at what the bill does right:

It funds infrastructure upgrades for Midwestern waterways so farmers can get their crops to market;

It increases energy access to rural America, improving efficiency and reducing input costs for farmers and small businesses;

It ensures farmers have the flexibility to grow a wide array of crops without penalty and without fear of losing their insurance;

It saves taxpayer dollars and conserves critical wildlife and hunting habitats while still allowing farmers to manage their lands as they see fit;

It makes the USDA more efficient by streamlining programs and by cutting down on unnecessary paperwork and burdensome regulation for farmers;

It eases access to lines of credit so that farmers who want to expand their businesses have the tools necessary to do so;

It strengthens crop insurance to protect taxpayers while also making sure that farmers don't lose the farm if disaster strikes.

It's time that we do what we were sent here to do. It's time to act on a

bill that, although imperfect, should have been adopted a year ago. It's time to pass a comprehensive farm bill. I stand in support of this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to join with me.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENISHEK).

Mr. BENISHEK. I rise today in support of H.R. 1947, better known to everyone simply as the farm bill.

Over the past 3 years, I've been talking to farmers all over northern Michigan. My district is home to a diverse group of farmers. These family-owned operations are a vital and growing part of northern Michigan's economy, and it has been a privilege getting to know them.

Earlier this month, I visited with farmers in Leelanau County. I spoke to farmers at the Bardenhagen Farm in Suttons Bay, Michigan. Jim Bardenhagen and his family have been working their farm for over a century, so they know a thing or two about agriculture. Their story is like that of a lot of farmers across the First District and this whole country. These farmers have been telling me about the need for a strong farm bill, and I believe that's just what we have here.

Look, I understand this farm bill is not an easy issue for everyone. I can fully understand. I'm a doctor, not a farmer, so I tend to talk and trust those who understand these complicated issues best—the farmers in my district. For those of you who don't have a lot of farmers, don't worry. You sure eat. I'd be happy to give you the numbers of lots of farmers in northern Michigan, and they'd be happy to talk to you.

I look forward to a robust debate.

Mr. PETERSON. Madam Chair, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to another new member of the committee, the gentlelady from Illinois (Mrs. BUSTOS).

Mrs. BUSTOS. I rise today to talk about an issue of critical importance to my district in Illinois, and that is passing a 5-year farm bill.

As anyone can tell as one drives across my district, from Rockford to the Quad Cities to Peoria and everywhere in between, agriculture is our number one industry. My district is home to thousands of farmers and to millions of acres of some of the best farmland in the world. It is also home to Caterpillar and John Deere—among the best farm implement manufacturers in the world. The entire western border of my congressional district is met by the Mississippi River, on which barge transportation of agricultural products is absolutely vital to commerce in the region, in the State, and even in the world.

Whenever I talk with farmers or those employed in the agricultural business, what I hear more than anything else is that they want—and they need—certainty. Unfortunately, last year, Congress failed to pass a 5-year farm bill and, instead, resorted to a short-term extension, which expires at the end of September.

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PETERSON. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mrs. BUSTOS. Thank you, Mr. PETERSON.

As a member of the Agriculture Committee, it was an honor to be part of the farm bill markup last month. Unlike so much else in Washington, the markup was an exercise in bipartisanship. The entire committee was civil and accommodating toward one another. While the bill we passed is not perfect, it contains many worthwhile provisions.

Illinois farmers have endured some of the most extreme weather conditions in recent years, including record floods this year and the worst drought in a generation just a year ago. That is why we need to keep in place a strong and stable crop insurance program so that farmers, always at the mercy of Mother Nature, can continue to provide the food our Nation and our world depend on. The bill also contains an amendment that I sponsored that would help aid improvements to river transportation infrastructure, flood prevention and drought relief, including the aging locks and dam system along the Mississippi and Illinois Rivers.

The family farmers I talk with back home in Illinois want the security and the stability of a 5-year farm bill. That is how they can plan for future growth and investments and can continue to provide the world with a stable food supply. Let's give them the certainty by passing a 5-year farm bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes for the purpose of a colloquy to the gentleman from Washington State, Doc HASTINGS.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

As you know, the central Washington growers whom I represent provide a variety of top-quality produce to people across the country and around the world, including the majority of apples, pears, and cherries grown in the United States. There is no question that both consumers and growers want to ensure that we have the safest food supply in the world. However, Mr. Chairman, I have serious concerns with the one-size-fits-all regulations that the Food and Drug Administration has proposed to govern the way that all fruits and vegetables are grown and harvested.

I think that we can all agree that lettuce and apples are grown in completely different ways. For one thing, lettuce is grown in the ground and apples in the trees. That's obvious. It only makes sense that these products should be evaluated based on how susceptible they may be to food safety risks and subjected to regulations that would reflect both the risk level and the way they are grown.

I am concerned that the current regulations, which subject all growers of fresh produce to the same requirements and restrictions, are nearly impossible

to meet for tree fruit growers in my district. There has never been a known food safety problem with fresh apples; and yet if implemented, these regulations risk putting our growers out of business and pushing apple production overseas.

Would the chairman agree that the FDA should evaluate the risks of individual agricultural products based on the best available science and consider the growing methods and conditions of these products when developing regulations under the Food Safety Modernization Act for the safe production, harvesting, handling, and packing of fresh fruits and vegetables?

I yield to the chairman, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS).

Mr. LUCAS. I recognize the gentleman from Washington's concerns about the one-size-fits-all approach of the FDA. In fact, this was among the several concerns we raised during debate in the House when the Food Safety Modernization Act was under consideration.

I share his belief that, if the FDA is going to be given the task of telling farmers how to farm, it should do so after a thorough examination of the risks of the different types of fruits and vegetables and then, based on the best available science, consider the growing methods and the conditions of individual commodities when developing regulations.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LUCAS. I yield myself an additional 30 seconds.

I would encourage the FDA to re-evaluate the proposed regulations, including docket No. FDA-2011-N-0921-0001, and make the necessary revisions to ensure that they meet this purpose. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I would like to thank the chairman for his words and his attention to this issue that is so important to the growers of my central Washington district. I look forward to continuing to work with him to ensure that the new food safety regulations recognize the diverse way that farms across the Nation grow our food and keep them safe for the public.

Mr. PETERSON. I am now pleased to yield 1 minute to another new member of the committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. VARGAS).

Mr. VARGAS. I thank the ranking member for yielding.

Madam Chairman, I would like to thank the chairman and the ranking member of the Agriculture Committee for their leadership and their hard work in bringing a farm bill to the floor this year.

I rise in support of many of the provisions in the FARRM Act, but with grave concerns about the cuts to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, SNAP.

I strongly support the provisions in the FARRM Act that expand funding for the Specialty Crop Block Grants,

that restore funding for the Specialty Crop Research Initiative and that maintain funding for pest and disease control, market access programs and organic agriculture.

While the FARRM Act provides many positive provisions that support a strong agriculture safety net, the \$20.5 billion in cuts to the SNAP program is unconscionable. If the FARRM Act is enacted, the CBO estimates that nearly 2 million low-income people will lose SNAP benefits and that another 1.8 million people live in households that would experience a benefit cut of \$90 per month.

We cannot continue to balance the budget on the backs of our poor, our children, our seniors, and our veterans. I want to support a farm bill, but I cannot support these cuts to SNAP. I do, though, thank them very much for their hard work.

□ 1620

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California, a home of amazingly diverse agriculture, Mr. LAMALFA.

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 1947.

Is this farm bill perfect? No. Would I like for it to have done more? Yes. Is this still a bill that modernizes and moves farm bill reform forward? Yes.

We've made many landmark improvements and modernized many programs within this bill. The farm bill provides logical reforms that would streamline our Federal Government and cut spending and protect our farmers, ranchers, and rural communities.

We indeed are reducing spending in the farm bill by \$40 billion, including \$6 million in sequestration. We're streamlining the conservation programs to the tune of \$13.2 billion by repealing direct payments, also. We are also saving money in the food stamp area by \$20.5 billion.

The farm bill offers the first reforms and savings to the SNAP law since the Clinton-era welfare reforms in 1996, modernizing SNAP programs while eliminating waste, fraud, and abuse.

In the House Agriculture Committee, I'm proud to say we added further reforms to SNAP by preventing the USDA and States from engaging in SNAP recruitment activities and prohibiting the USDA from advertising SNAP on TV, radio, and billboards.

This is a farm bill we need to pass to move in the right direction. I urge a "yes" vote.

Mr. PETERSON. Madam Chair, I'm now pleased to yield 3 minutes to the minority whip, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank him for his work, and I thank Mr. LUCAS for his work.

We struggle in this Congress to try to bring bipartisan legislation to the floor. It's a shame.

I've normally voted for the farm bill for a reason I will express here. First of all, the farm bill is an important piece of legislation. It sets Federal policy in a range of areas that deeply affect the lives of farmers, their communities, and consumers. But it also makes a huge difference in the lives of those who rely on food assistance to avoid hunger, especially children.

It's a shame that we could not consider the farm bill on its merits without undermining its credibility with what we clearly believe are not reforms and not the elimination of waste, fraud, and abuse.

It's so simple to say that. I've heard that for all the time I've been here in Congress. Let's just cut out fraud, waste, and abuse. Everybody wants to cut out fraud, waste, and abuse; but cutting out assistance for hungry people is neither fraud, nor waste nor abuse. Well, it may be abuse.

The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP as it is called, protects over 46 million Americans who are at risk of going without sufficient food. Nearly half of those are children. Are there some reforms that are needed? Perhaps. And the Senate has made those reforms in a moderate, considered way.

The average monthly benefit per participant last year according to the USDA was \$133.41. I challenge any Member of this House to live on \$133.41 for food. That's \$4.45 a day.

At a time when millions remain out of work struggling to support themselves and their family as they seek jobs, it would be irresponsible to make the kinds of cuts that are proposed in this bill. No one in the richest country on the face of the Earth should go hungry in this country.

Yet that's exactly what this bill would do, slashing \$20.5 billion from the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program and putting 2 million of our fellow Americans at risk.

Feed the hungry; clothe the naked; give shelter to the homeless—that's not a political policy. That's a moral policy. Our faiths teach us that.

While we've cut millions in funding in this bill, this Congress has done nothing to advance legislation that will help create jobs or opportunities to help expand our middle class. While it's important that Congress provide certainty to the agricultural community, which I support, this unbalanced bill takes the wrong approach on these cuts to SNAP.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PETERSON. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Chair, I'm disappointed. This ought to be a bipartisan bill. Mr. PETERSON wants it to be a bipartisan bill and many of our people and, as a matter of fact, a majority of our people supported it in committee.

I think the chairman wants it to be a bipartisan bill. I understand he has to

deal within the framework of his caucus like every chairman has to do on either side of the aisle. I understand that. But it is a shame.

A bill that ought to be bringing us together for people who provide this country with food and fiber and, indeed, provide a lot of the world with food and fiber, that we have put this almost poison pill—I don't know whether it's going to be a poison pill—but almost poison pill in it, I regret that. It's not worthy of our country. It's not worthy of the morals of this Nation.

But I thank the chairman and I thank the ranking member for their efforts to try to bring us together. Whether they've done so or not, we'll have to see.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Mrs. NOEM).

Mrs. NOEM. I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their leadership on this issue.

Madam Chairman, today I rise, I stand, and at this point I'd even leap for joy, for a farm bill that's good for agriculture in this country.

This bill that we have today isn't a perfect bill, but it is a good bill. It is bipartisan, it saves nearly \$40 billion, it reforms the food stamp program and farm programs, it eliminates direct payments, it consolidates conservation programs, it saves money, it gives us a safety net, and it is still accountable to taxpayers.

As we debate this bill, though, I don't want to lose sight of a big policy discussion. We decided decades ago that it was important for us to have a farm bill because it was important for us to grow our own food in this country. We didn't want to rely on another country to feed us because we recognized that the instant we did that, we would allow that country to control us.

That's why good farm policy is important to our national security. That's why when we go to the grocery store, we can count on buying safe food. We can know that there will be affordable food there at affordable prices. A farm bill is the reason that we all enjoy these benefits. We can't take our food supply for granted.

I urge my colleagues to pass this bill this week.

Mr. PETERSON. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from the great State of Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER).

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. I thank the chairman, and I rise in support of H.R. 1947, the FARRM Bill.

This is a win-win. This is a win for the American people because they're going to continue to get the safest and cheapest food in the world.

It's a win for farmers and ranchers all across the country because now they will have a 5-year farm bill that will give them policy to make the important decisions they need to make to run their businesses and their farms and ranches.

And more importantly it's a win-win for the American people because this brings \$40 billion worth of savings at a time when we're running trillion-dollar deficits.

There's been a lot of discussion about what this bill does and doesn't do. This bill does bring reform, reforming over 100 different programs. What this bill doesn't do is take one benefit away from a SNAP recipient who's qualified for that.

What we find is there's been some gamesmanship in this program. What we owe the American people is to make sure that the people who are on these benefits that are very timely for some folks, but make sure that they qualify for it. So those people that want to say this takes money away or food away from families, that's just not true.

I urge you to support this reform bill. It's good for the American people.

Mr. PETERSON. Madam Chair, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

□ 1630

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I come to the floor, first, to congratulate this bipartisan effort. I have been through other farm bills I guess a couple of times. I've seen it when we had a Republican chair, a Democrat chair, and a Republican chair. I've seen it as Ranking Member PETERSON worked hard with Republicans 6 years ago. And I've seen it as our chairman, FRANK LUCAS, has worked hard with Ranking Member PETERSON over the last year and a half. This is a very, very difficult balance to pull together.

But here's what we get with this: first of all, the end of direct payments by the agreement of our producers. Whoever, as a recipient of a government check, stepped forward and said: I'll give that up because economically we can do that. And at the same time, we get some reform in the SNAP side of this thing that says we're going to start holding some people accountable without taking a single calorie out of the mouths of those that are needy and those who we want to get those benefits.

And in the middle of all of that, if we don't pass a bill, we revert to the 1949 bill, which would be a calamity. And if we don't address the SNAP version of this, then what we end up with, Madam Chair, is a growing food stamp program. So I urge its adoption.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. DAINES).

Mr. DAINES. Madam Chairman, one of the top requests that I hear from Montanans when I go back every weekend is Congress needs to pass a long-term farm bill.

One in five of Montana jobs rely on agriculture, and it's past time for passage of a 5-year farm bill that protects

and promotes Montana's number one industry. We need a farm bill that supports our rural communities and gives the ag community the certainty needed to plant the crops that feed our country and ensure a stable food supply. We need a farm bill that gives Montana farmers relief from burdensome regulations and encourages young people to remain active in their family farms.

This bill also contains important provisions for our timber community, and for the health of our forests. As we begin fire season, we've already seen the terrible consequences of the lack of active forest management. It's important we give the Forest Service the necessary regulatory relief in order to protect our communities.

In light of our Nation's escalating debt crisis, Congress must look to save taxpayer money wherever possible. I am pleased that the Ag Committee has made substantive, cost-saving changes to a wide variety of programs in the proposed farm bill, including reforms designed to reduce fraud and abuse in the distribution of food stamps. It's important to get the farm bill passed through the House, into conference, and on the President's desk before expiration. It's time to pass the farm bill.

Mr. PETERSON. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY).

Mr. BOUSTANY. Madam Chair, I rise to support this bill, and I certainly appreciate the persistent hard work and leadership of Chairman LUCAS and Ranking Member PETERSON, and I want to thank both for bringing this very important legislation to the floor for a House vote.

In 2012, Louisiana farmers and ranchers produced nearly \$11.4 billion in commodities. It's a vital and growing sector of our State's economy, and we need a new farm bill now to provide the kind of certainty going forward for our farmers. Throughout south Louisiana, the agricultural economy is the lifeblood of our rural communities. This is a bipartisan bill containing truly significant reforms, with savings of up to \$40 billion.

Given the immense diversity of American agriculture, it's important to have price-loss coverage, which is an important option for our Southern farmers, like our rice farmers. This is critical for their future security.

Additionally, an extension of the U.S. sugar program ensures a level playing field with other nations, which continue to heavily subsidize their sugar industry with unfair trade practices. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 1947, the 2013 FARRM Bill. Agriculture is an inherently risky venture. But even in tough times, agriculture re-

mains a bright spot in our economy, and we cannot afford to undermine this success. We should not use the notion of ag producers growing more and wasting less as an excuse to chip away at crop insurance. Thanks to crop insurance design, last year's losses, a result of the worst drought in decades, were not completely borne by taxpayers. Further cuts to this program could mean increased costs to consumers.

This farm bill also provides disaster assistance to livestock producers impacted by severe drought; continues investment into agriculture research, a crucial component of food safety; and builds upon conservation efforts already undertaken by landowners across America.

While this is not a perfect bill, we are here to allow the legislative process to work. I'm hopeful we can pass this bill, go to conference with the Senate, and ensure producers have the opportunity they need to continue to feed the world.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oklahoma has 1 minute remaining, and the gentleman from Minnesota has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Chair, I would note that I am the last speaker and would conclude, and would ask if the gentleman would yield me an extra minute or two.

Mr. PETERSON. Madam Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Minnesota yields 5½ minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma to control.

There was no objection.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, we've heard some very good debate this evening about the merits and the challenges that we face in putting this bipartisan bill together. I'd like to take just a moment to focus on the nutrition title and the spirit and the logic that went into crafting this.

The focus of the committee was that the savings should be achieved across all areas of the farm bill, and that \$40 billion, approximately, we have saved does achieve savings in the commodity title, the conservation title, as well as the nutrition title. Everybody under the jurisdiction of the farm bill contributes to the reforms.

Now, in the nutrition title for just a moment, I just want to stress to my colleagues the committee tried to achieve savings in a way that would not deny an individual who was qualified under present law by income or assets from receiving help. We just simply say in the committee draft that things like automatic food stamps, categorical eligibility, something that's evolved out of the 1996 welfare reform, we simply say everybody needs to show they qualify, and we'll help you.

The LIHEAP program, where States in some cases give as little as \$1 to help

their citizens pay their home heating costs that triggers a whole month's worth of food stamps, we say in the bill: States, you've got to give \$20 to trigger that.

The goal of the committee was never to work hardship on anyone. The goal of the committee, in a time of \$16 trillion national debt, annual trillion-dollar deficits, was to achieve savings across the board. But it requires that the folks who need help come in and demonstrate they qualify. If you don't like the asset level or the income level, that's a different debate. We just simply say if you need the help, show us you qualify and we'll help you. That's a \$20.5 billion savings, according to CBO. Will that be the way it's implemented? I don't know. But we operate by CBO scores, and there's almost \$40 billion in overall savings in all areas of the farm bill.

I would challenge all my friends, if every other committee in every other jurisdiction would achieve these kinds of savings across the board, we'd be in a different situation with our operating annual deficit.

The Ag Committee has done its work, and we've done it in a thoughtful way. Help us over the course of the next few days with the amendment process. Don't, by affection, offer amendments simply to prevent the process from happening. Don't do things that are intended not to make the bill a better piece of legislation, but to prevent it. Be good legislators; be thoughtful legislators. Do what's right, whether it's to help the people raise the food, or that other part of our society that needs help on a month-to-month basis. Do them all right. I have faith in you. I believe through good debate and good discussion on good amendments, perfections will be made. A consensus will be achieved. We'll move forward. I have faith in you, my colleagues.

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

□ 1640

The Acting CHAIR (Mrs. ROBY). All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. ROSLEHTINEN) having assumed the chair, Mrs. ROBY, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1947) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 1947.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION ACT

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 266, I call up the bill (H.R. 1797) to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 266, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-15 is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 1797

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SEC. 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act".

SEC. 2. LEGISLATIVE FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY FOR ENACTMENT.

Congress finds and declares the following:

(1) Pain receptors (nociceptors) are present throughout the unborn child's entire body and nerves link these receptors to the brain's thalamus and subcortical plate by no later than 20 weeks after fertilization.

(2) By 8 weeks after fertilization, the unborn child reacts to touch. After 20 weeks, the unborn child reacts to stimuli that would be recognized as painful if applied to an adult human, for example, by recoiling.

(3) In the unborn child, application of such painful stimuli is associated with significant increases in stress hormones known as the stress response.

(4) Subjection to such painful stimuli is associated with long-term harmful neurodevelopmental effects, such as altered pain sensitivity and, possibly, emotional, behavioral, and learning disabilities later in life.

(5) For the purposes of surgery on unborn children, fetal anesthesia is routinely administered and is associated with a decrease in stress hormones compared to their level when painful stimuli are applied without such anesthesia. In the United States, surgery of this type is being performed by 20 weeks after fertilization and earlier in specialized units affiliated with children's hospitals.

(6) The position, asserted by some physicians, that the unborn child is incapable of experiencing pain until a point later in pregnancy than 20 weeks after fertilization predominately rests on the assumption that the ability to experience pain depends on the cerebral cortex and requires nerve connections between the thalamus and the cortex. However, recent medical research and analysis, especially since 2007, provides strong evidence for the conclusion that a functioning cortex is not necessary to experience pain.

(7) Substantial evidence indicates that children born missing the bulk of the cerebral cortex, those with hydranencephaly, nevertheless experience pain.

(8) In adult humans and in animals, stimulation or ablation of the cerebral cortex does not alter pain perception, while stimulation or ablation of the thalamus does.

(9) Substantial evidence indicates that structures used for pain processing in early development differ from those of adults, using different neural elements available at specific times during development, such as the subcortical plate, to fulfill the role of pain processing.

(10) The position, asserted by some commentators, that the unborn child remains in a coma-like sleep state that precludes the unborn child experiencing pain is inconsistent with the documented reaction of unborn children to painful stimuli and with the experience of fetal surgeons who have found it necessary to sedate the unborn child with anesthesia to prevent the unborn child from engaging in vigorous movement in reaction to invasive surgery.

(11) Consequently, there is substantial medical evidence that an unborn child is capable of experiencing pain at least by 20 weeks after fertilization, if not earlier.

(12) It is the purpose of the Congress to assert a compelling governmental interest in protecting the lives of unborn children from the stage at which substantial medical evidence indicates that they are capable of feeling pain.

(13) The compelling governmental interest in protecting the lives of unborn children from the stage at which substantial medical evidence indicates that they are capable of feeling pain is intended to be separate from and independent of the compelling governmental interest in protecting the lives of unborn children from the stage of viability, and neither governmental interest is intended to replace the other.

(14) Congress has authority to extend protection to pain-capable unborn children under the Supreme Court's Commerce Clause precedents and under the Constitution's grants of powers to Congress under the Equal Protection, Due Process, and Enforcement Clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment.

SEC. 3. PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 74 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 1531 the following:

"§ 1532. Pain-capable unborn child protection

"(a) UNLAWFUL CONDUCT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, it shall be unlawful for any person to perform an abortion or attempt to do so, unless in conformity with the requirements set forth in subsection (b).

"(b) REQUIREMENTS FOR ABORTIONS.—

"(1) The physician performing or attempting the abortion shall first make a determination of the probable post-fertilization age of the unborn child or reasonably rely upon such a determination made by another physician. In making such a determination, the physician shall make such inquiries of the pregnant woman and perform or cause to be performed such medical examinations and tests as a reasonably prudent physician, knowledgeable about the case and the medical conditions involved, would consider necessary to make an accurate determination of post-fertilization age.

"(2)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the abortion shall not be performed or attempted, if the probable post-fertilization age, as determined under paragraph (1), of the unborn child is 20 weeks or greater.

"(B) Subject to subparagraph (C), subparagraph (A) does not apply if—

"(i) in reasonable medical judgment, the abortion is necessary to save the life of a pregnant woman whose life is endangered by a physical disorder, physical illness, or physical injury, including a life-endangering physical condition caused by or arising from the pregnancy itself, but not including psychological or emotional conditions; or

"(ii) the pregnancy is the result of rape, or the result of incest against a minor, if the rape has been reported at any time prior to the abortion to an appropriate law enforcement agency, or if the incest against a minor has been reported at any time prior to the abortion to an

appropriate law enforcement agency or to a government agency legally authorized to act on reports of child abuse or neglect.

"(C) Notwithstanding the definitions of 'abortion' and 'attempt an abortion' in this section, a physician terminating or attempting to terminate a pregnancy under an exception provided by subparagraph (B) may do so only in the manner which, in reasonable medical judgment, provides the best opportunity for the unborn child to survive, unless, in reasonable medical judgment, termination of the pregnancy in that manner would pose a greater risk of—

"(i) the death of the pregnant woman; or

"(ii) the substantial and irreversible physical impairment of a major bodily function, not including psychological or emotional conditions, of the pregnant woman;

than would other available methods.

"(c) CRIMINAL PENALTY.—Whoever violates subsection (a) shall be fined under this title or imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both.

"(d) BAR TO PROSECUTION.—A woman upon whom an abortion in violation of subsection (a) is performed or attempted may not be prosecuted under, or for a conspiracy to violate, subsection (a), or for an offense under section 2, 3, or 4 of this title based on such a violation.

"(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section the following definitions apply:

"(1) ABORTION.—The term 'abortion' means the use or prescription of any instrument, medicine, drug, or any other substance or device—

"(A) to intentionally kill the unborn child of a woman known to be pregnant; or

"(B) to intentionally terminate the pregnancy of a woman known to be pregnant, with an intention other than—

"(i) after viability to produce a live birth and preserve the life and health of the child born alive; or

"(ii) to remove a dead unborn child.

"(2) ATTEMPT AN ABORTION.—The term 'attempt', with respect to an abortion, means conduct that, under the circumstances as the actor believes them to be, constitutes a substantial step in a course of conduct planned to culminate in performing an abortion.

"(3) FERTILIZATION.—The term 'fertilization' means the fusion of human spermatozoon with a human ovum.

"(4) PERFORM.—The term 'perform', with respect to an abortion, includes induce an abortion through a medical or chemical intervention including writing a prescription for a drug or device intended to result in an abortion.

"(5) PHYSICIAN.—The term 'physician' means a person licensed to practice medicine and surgery or osteopathic medicine and surgery, or otherwise legally authorized to perform an abortion.

"(6) POST-FERTILIZATION AGE.—The term 'post-fertilization age' means the age of the unborn child as calculated from the fusion of a human spermatozoon with a human ovum.

"(7) PROBABLE POST-FERTILIZATION AGE OF THE UNBORN CHILD.—The term 'probable post-fertilization age of the unborn child' means what, in reasonable medical judgment, will with reasonable probability be the postfertilization age of the unborn child at the time the abortion is planned to be performed or induced.

"(8) REASONABLE MEDICAL JUDGMENT.—The term 'reasonable medical judgment' means a medical judgment that would be made by a reasonably prudent physician, knowledgeable about the case and the treatment possibilities with respect to the medical conditions involved.

"(9) UNBORN CHILD.—The term 'unborn child' means an individual organism of the species *homo sapiens*, beginning at fertilization, until the point of being born alive as defined in section 8(b) of title 1.

"(10) WOMAN.—The term 'woman' means a female human being whether or not she has reached the age of majority."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 74 of title 18,