

be set by supply and demand. Farmers receive help, but not at the expense of workers and consumers.

The sugar program is different. It helps sugar producers by hurting other people, and that's just not right. There are other ways sugar farmers who may need help could receive assistance without embracing an outdated system of strict government controls that cost consumers \$3.5 billion per year in higher prices and over 112,000 lost jobs in the sugar-using industries in the last decade.

During fiscal year 2011, the wholesale price for U.S.-refined beet sugar averaged 55.8 cents per pound. This is considerably higher than the average recorded cost during the 5-year period covered by the 2002 farm bill provisions for FY 2003 through FY 2007, which was 27.6 cents per pound. Last month, the average price for U.S.-refined beet sugar was 26.3 cents per pound, whereas the average world-refined sugar price was 21.9 cents per pound. Historically, our sugar program keeps our markets higher regardless of demand and/or supply compared to world prices for sugar.

The U.S. manufacturers who use sugar as an ingredient to produce processed foods and drinks are having to always pay more domestically than manufacturers overseas. This is the exact reason why candy companies are moving to countries like Canada, Mexico, and other offshore places.

□ 1020

We need an industry that is subject to capital market forces without government intrusion, that places quotas on the amount of sugar that can be grown in the United States, and restricts access to foreign-grown sugar.

The current sugar program benefits 4,714 sugar farmers in the United States, while threatening the jobs of 600,000 workers in sugar-using industries and, thus, imposing a hidden tax on every American consumer. The Pitts-Davis-Goodlatte-Blumenauer amendment would lower the price-support loan rate in accordance to historic levels and reduce taxpayers' liability for keeping prices high, save taxpayers money, allow more sugar imports, and provide the U.S. Department of Agriculture more flexibility to modify domestic marketing allotments.

Making changes to the sugar program will help level the playing field and provide sugar-based manufacturers much-needed resources to keep people employed and modernize their production facilities.

Let's not help the few at the expense of the many. Vote "yes" for the Pitts-Davis-Goodlatte-Blumenauer amendment.

THE FARRM BILL

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, the FARRM Bill is now before us. It's a

measure originating in the House of Representatives, whose majority was elected on a clear mandate to stop wasting money. Yet all this bill does is continue to waste money.

Yes, it tightens up a little on automatic eligibility for food stamps, and that's a good thing. Yet this modest reform is a poor substitute for the complete overhaul that is desperately needed.

The food stamp program, now called SNAP, was originally intended to provide basic commodities to the truly needy. Yet I cannot count the number of constituents who have complained to me over the last several years about standing in a grocery line and watching the person in front of them use SNAP cards to buy luxuries that these hardworking taxpayers could not themselves afford.

But it is the corporate welfare provisions that this bill continues, and in some case expands, that I find the most offensive.

Yes, the bill shifts us away from direct payments to farmers; but it, instead, grossly expands taxpayer-subsidized crop insurance programs, eating up about three-quarters of the savings the supporters purport to achieve. The practical effect is to guarantee profits to farmers, while shifting their losses to taxpayers.

We're told that if the bill fails, these wasteful programs will continue with no reform. Well, actually, many of the most wasteful programs would expire, like the \$150 million to advertise farmers markets.

But the fine point of it is this: If this bill is defeated, the House can take up real reform at any time. If it is passed, we kick that can another 5 years down the road.

To those who say this is a small step in the right direction, I would agree, it is a very small step. It makes tiny and modest changes to an utterly atrocious program. According to the CBO, it would save all of 3.4 percent from the baseline over the next 5 years, hardly a crowning achievement for fiscal reform.

But there's no blinking at the fact that these programs are fundamentally unfair and grossly wasteful, and this bill locks them into law for another 5 years. If the supporters of this bill were actually serious about incremental reform, this would be a 1-year authorization with additional reforms planned next year. It most decidedly is not.

Let me explain clearly what this bill means to an average, hardworking, taxpaying family in my district. That family must struggle and scrimp to keep their shop open. They bear the entire financial risk of failure; and their profits, if there are any, are heavily taxed.

A portion of that family's taxes goes to the agriculture industry for the express purpose of inflating the prices that that family must pay at the grocery store. As a result, when the family goes grocery shopping, it must scrimp

again in order to bear these artificially higher prices that have been forced up by their own high taxes.

As that family stands in the checkout line with their ground chuck for the barbecue tonight, they watch SNAP cards used by others to pay for premium steaks that family can't afford for itself, but paid for by that family's own high taxes.

If the economy sours, that family bears its own losses, while it also pays to cover the losses of the same agricultural interests responsible for their pain at the grocery store.

The bill before us continues this travesty for another 5 years, with soothing assurances from its supporters to cheer up, things could be worse. Well, actually, things couldn't be much worse, and they could be a whole lot better.

This bill, for example, could be defeated and replaced with genuine reform. The government could be withdrawn from its corrupt interventions in agricultural markets. The food stamp program could be restored to its original purpose, to provide basic commodities to the truly needy, and individual consumers could be free to determine the price of their groceries by the decisions that they make every day over what to spend at the grocery store, and not on the basis of what deals were cut in Congress.

The Roman writer Phaedrus summed up this bill rather neatly 20 centuries ago. He said:

A mountain was in labor, sending forth dreadful groans, and there was in the region the highest expectation. After all that, it brought forth a mouse.

THE IMPACTS OF CONGRESSIONAL DYSFUNCTION

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

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the damage from Congress' inability to do its job and pass a budget, and the unreasonable lengths that folks have to go to cover for the reckless policy of sequestration.

As I said the very first time I spoke in this Chamber, Congress should be doing all it can to replace the across-the-board cuts caused by sequestration with a balanced, bipartisan, long-term budget. Cutting across the board is not a strategy. In fact, it's anti-strategic.

Unfortunately, this Congress has been stuck in "park" when it comes to working toward a long-term budget. In fact, Congress has only passed 13 bills in 6 months, none of them dealing with jobs, and none of them working to replace these nonstrategic cuts.

Congress needs to understand the impacts of its dysfunction. In my district, we see those consequences every day.

I'm a member of the House Armed Services Committee, and I'm proud to represent several military installations, including Naval Base Kitsap and

Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, and I represent many men and women who work at Joint Base Lewis-McChord. The Navy, in fact, is the largest employer in my district.

I'm frequently copied on emails from civilian Navy workers who are resigning because of the disarray caused by Congress, the threat of furloughs, and the loss of cost-of-living adjustments. Workers often choose those jobs, despite lower salaries, because they love their country and they want to protect it. Also, government offers stability that the private industry often can't.

But these workers no longer feel valued; and thanks to Congress, working at the shipyard doesn't even offer stability anymore. It's affecting the morale of our workers and the ability of our shipyard to execute its mission.

Here's a direct quote from a manager who contacted me. He wrote:

We will have problems retaining professionals if this fiscal environment continues. We will have trouble accomplishing our current workload, let alone providing any level of increased engineering support.

Mr. Speaker, this will only cost us more in the long run. This dysfunction in Congress is directly responsible for good workers walking away and is threatening the mission of the United States Navy.

It also affects the local contractors and small businesses in my district that support these missions. They're already facing sweeping layoffs and tremendous uncertainty.

Here's another example: Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, in my district, while mostly spared from furloughs under sequestration, still is limited in its ability to fill jobs made vacant by attrition. The hiring freeze went into effect right as they were planning on adding 600 workers.

The shipyard has the work. Our region needs the jobs. They've only recently announced that they can slowly hire to cover for some attrition.

□ 1030

Because of these constraints, Puget Sound Naval Shipyard has resorted to asking anyone—upper level staff, anybody who has carried a tool bag or used a wrench—to help deliver three submarines and an aircraft carrier back to the fleet. That's a testament to the lengths people are going to to cover for such an insane policy like sequestration.

We have seen the same thing at Joint Base Lewis-McChord, where 10,000 civilian employees have received notice of furloughs. We have seen it affect military training where we've seen rotations to the National Training Center cancelled. General Brown at Joint Base Lewis-McChord told our paper:

It's a huge impact on training. Where is the fine line where you go from being the best in the world to second best?

It's not right that Congress doesn't have their backs on this. We have got to stop this policy. From my perspective and from the perspective of the

folks who have to deal with this damaging policy every day, it doesn't matter who's to blame for the idea of sequestration. All that matters is that both parties work together to stop it.

Every day that this Congress doesn't work on coming together on a balanced, long-term budget is another day that folks around the country have to cover for Congress' dysfunction. Democrats and Republicans need to work together on this. This doesn't make sense for the folks in my district who face losing up to 20 percent of their pay or for the folks in my district who can't apply for an open job because of our budget uncertainty.

It doesn't make sense for the kids in Head Start programs who are hurt by sequestration. We should stop these across-the-board cuts for them, too.

The right solution is for Congress to replace these cuts altogether with a balanced, long-term budget. I am ready to work with both parties to get this done for our national security, for our economy, and for the American people who deserve better.

150 REASONS TO LOVE WEST VIRGINIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, a couple of weeks ago, we began the "150 Reasons to Love West Virginia" project to honor our State's 150th birthday, which is tomorrow. We asked West Virginians to send us what they love about the Mountain State, and they delivered.

Many people cited West Virginia's strong heritage and rich history as reasons to love our State. We all know that West Virginia is rooted in the values of hard work and the respect of our neighbors. I love how West Virginia friends are for a lifetime. My family's history is deeply rooted in the State of West Virginia, and I love that. I love the State's nicknames, "Wild and Wonderful" and "Almost Heaven."

David J. Stoffel said:

We are a collection of communities joined by a common trust, respect, love, and willingness to help our neighbor. Once you are a Mountaineer, you will always be a Mountaineer.

Anita Keaton wrote that small, quaint towns throughout West Virginia like Thomas and Thurmond are the "heart and soul of our great State."

It all began in June in 1861, when a group of pro-Union Virginians met in Wheeling, West Virginia. Together, they created the Restored Government of Virginia, which sought to rebuild ties with the Union. On April 20, West Virginia became the only State in the Union to acquire its sovereignty by proclamation of the President of the United States, and that President was Abraham Lincoln. And on June 20, 1863, 150 years ago tomorrow, we formally joined the Union.

As a community flourishes, it gives birth to local myths and legends. We

tell stories to our children so they can someday tell those stories to their children. West Virginia has its fair share of true stories and legends. We have Mothman, and we also have a tale of the Hatfield and McCoy feud, which is a story of family honor, justice, and vengeance. We have very well respected West Virginians who are here today with us: Chuck Yeager, Jerry West, Mary Lou Retton, Jessica Lynch, Jennifer Garner, and a gentleman who shares my hometown, a very small town of West Virginia, Glen Dale, Mr. Brad Paisley.

"Pioneer stories" like the Hatfields and McCoys have been passed down from generation to generation, as noted by Deb Walizer. These legends bring the people of West Virginia together. They allow us to put aside our differences and share a common bond in our heritage.

That strong-knit community is also built through events like the one I've attended many times—and one time with President Bush—the Fourth of July celebration parade in Ripley, West Virginia. As Tracy Wolford Kelley mentioned, she loves the parade in Ripley, Symphony Sundays or the Forest Festival or attending a Mountaineer football game on a crisp fall evening. All victory is welcome.

West Virginia is not only rich in history, but it is rich in natural beauty. From "trout fishing the Cranberry and Williams River," as Jo Belcher noted, or West Virginia's "beautiful vistas of tree-covered mountain," as mentioned by Emmett Pepper of Charleston, there are many reasons to love and enjoy our State's scenic beauty. West Virginia is a peaceful place.

These images and places make the changes in season particularly beautiful, which Robin Barnette says looks like "God's coloring book." They also bring families and friends together, as Connie Sherman of Moorefield, West Virginia, mentioned talking about the Trough River.

Whether it's simple things like West Virginia pepperoni rolls or the coal fields and natural gas that power our economy, there is so much to love about the State we call home. For 150 years, its country roads have provided the men and women who have traveled them with a sense of comfort and pride.

And no matter where we are in the country or around the world, we all do like to sing the John Denver song "Almost Heaven, West Virginia," which, by the way, my granddaughter can sing from front to back.

While these anecdotes about why we love West Virginia only touch on what makes our State so great, I want to thank you and the folks of West Virginia for celebrating with me. There will be celebrations all throughout the State over the next several days.

I love West Virginia, and I'm honored to serve the citizens of an outstanding State. So from me to you, happy 150th birthday, West Virginia.