

Field, of Indian Head, Quantico, the folks in North Carolina that Mr. JONES represents, the folks in Maryland that I represent, the folks in Connecticut that Mr. COURTNEY represents, the folks in Massachusetts that my good friend, the ranking member—almost ranking member on the Rules Committee represents, and the gentleman from Illinois represents. They and I will continue, in both parties, to act, to act on a balanced, rational, reasonable alternative that brings the deficit down but maintains our national security and the morale of the people who every day work to protect our great land.

#### AFGHANISTAN

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

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I must say that it is very disappointing that the last time the House of Representatives officially remembered the men and women who have died in Afghanistan was February of this year. Since then, we've lost a total of 79 members of our Armed Forces: 15 were killed in March, 14 were killed in April, 22 killed in May, and 18 killed in June.

Why do we continue to send our young men and women to risk their life and limb in a country that will never change?

In addition to this tragic waste of life, I am amazed at the lack of oversight of the taxpayers' money. After listening to the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction speak on the C-SPAN program, Washington Journal, on Monday, I will give you two examples of fraud and abuse that particularly stood out to me.

We have countless buildings in Afghanistan constructed with taxpayers' dollars that remain unused or, even worse, falling apart. Mr. John Sopko, the Inspector General, referenced one building made of brick that he said is literally melting due to poor construction. How in the world can we continue to fund these programs in Afghanistan with very little oversight and, quite frankly, a waste of the taxpayers' money?

Mr. Sopko further stated that we have \$20 billion in the pipeline to be spent in Afghanistan while we are dealing with the ill effects of sequestration that Mr. HOYER just spoke about, and cutting crucial programs for our military personnel right here at home.

In particular, our mental health programs for our veterans are suffering because we are furloughing the civilian workers who help our veterans who are suffering from PTSD and TBI. Those people that are the professionals that help them are being cut. This is why this waste of money in Afghanistan is absolutely, Mr. Speaker, unacceptable.

Congress is not listening to the American taxpayer. The taxpayer is fed up and tired of wasting money and life

and limb in Afghanistan. History has said no nation has ever changed Afghanistan and no nation will ever change Afghanistan. We need to listen to the American people and stop this spending. And more importantly than the spending is the waste of life in Afghanistan.

I ask my colleagues on both sides to come together and work together. Let's start reducing the amount of money that we are spending in Afghanistan, and let's also reduce the number of troops that have to go back and forth to Afghanistan.

Sequestration and furloughs are creating one of the worst situations for our military that they have faced in many, many years. And again, we are looking at furloughing the professional doctors and nurses and mental health providers.

Mr. Speaker, beside me is really what I say speaks better than my words. It is a photograph of a full-dressed Army contingency walking behind a caisson. Apparently, the wife of the soldier in the caisson is standing there with her little girl holding the mother's hand, and the little girl is wondering: Why is daddy in that flag-draped coffin?

That is what's missing here in Congress, quite frankly, is there is no debate on the waste of life and the waste of money in Afghanistan. I ask the American people to put pressure on Members of Congress to stop this waste of life and money in Afghanistan.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I will close by asking God to please bless our men and women in uniform, to please bless the families of our men and women in uniform, and in His arms, to hold the families who have given a child dying for freedom in Afghanistan and Iraq.

And I ask God to bless the House and Senate, that we will do what is right in the eyes of God for God's people. And I will ask God to please give strength and courage to the President of the United States, that he will do what is right in the eyes of God for God's people. And three times: God, please, God, please, God, please continue to bless America.

#### YOU'VE GOT TO BE CAREFULLY TAUGHT

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that anyone is born with an inclination to hate, but sometimes, even in the year 2013, it's easy to forget.

Not one of us begins this life hating that which is different. Not one of us begins this life fearing those who are different from ourselves. As children, we recognize differences; we wonder about them and question why. But as children, we don't hate or fear. People must learn to hate. You've got to be taught to hate and fear, carefully taught.

In the second act of the great musical "South Pacific," Lieutenant Joe

Cable sings a song about racial prejudice, entitled, "You've Got to Be Carefully Taught." The lyrics of the song confront prejudice at its core, explaining the simple truth that discrimination is not inherent; it's imposed—imposed by others who once had it imposed upon them in the vicious cycle of prejudice and fear.

One isn't born with an inherent aversion to those of a different skin tone. One has to be taught to fear a young, unarmed black man in a hoodie. One has to be taught to fear minorities voting. You've got to be carefully taught.

I also believe discrimination plays a role in opposition to same-sex marriage. One isn't born thinking gay people should be treated differently than straight people. One has to be taught to fear equality for all. You've got to be carefully taught.

Discrimination has played a role in our immigration policy from the late 19th century to today. But people aren't naturally hostile to those who speak a different language or come from a different place. They had to be taught to fear the dreamers who are American in all but citizenship or their parents who risked their lives to make a better life for their children. You've got to be carefully taught.

When "South Pacific" debuted in 1949, the song "You've Got to Be Carefully Taught" almost didn't make the cut. Rodgers and Hammerstein were told the song was too controversial, too preachy, too inappropriate for the musical stage.

□ 1015

The song was so controversial that some cities in the deep South would not allow the musical to be played on their stages. Lawmakers in Georgia even tried to outlaw such entertainment with one legislator arguing that a song justifying interracial marriage was implicitly a threat to the American way of life. But Rodgers and Hammerstein insisted the song be sung because it told the truth, and nothing combats fear better than the truth. "South Pacific" premiered more than a half century ago, yet its lessons are perhaps even more relevant today.

We have come a long way since the Jim Crow era, but the truth is that discrimination, while perhaps not as blatant, is alive and well. Despite all the progress we have made, we are still taught to be fearful of differences, to discriminate against those of a different race or gender or background or sexual orientation. We tragically, although sometimes unknowingly, allow that discrimination to influence our actions. It is those actions, whether on a street corner in Florida or here on the floor of the House of Representatives, that teach yet another generation to hate and fear.

As lawmakers, we have a responsibility to root out discrimination, to impart upon a new generation a philosophy of tolerance, and to embrace our differences. By confronting discrimination head on, we can finally stop the

vicious cycle of prejudice and fear. Nelson Mandela said it best:

People must learn to hate, and if they can learn to hate, they can be taught to love, for love comes more naturally to the human heart than its opposite.

You have to be carefully taught, Mr. Speaker. The teaching must begin in our hearts and with our children.

#### OBAMACARE

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in May of 2012, the House Ways and Means Committee released a report that expounds upon one of the most problematic provisions included in ObamaCare, the mandate on employers with at least 50 full-time equivalent employees to offer “affordable” and government-approved health insurance plans to their workers beginning in 2014.

Employers with at least 50 full-time equivalent employees who do not offer government-approved coverage must pay \$2,000 in fines annually per employee. After 2014, the fine would be indexed to the average per capita premium for health insurance, as determined by the Health and Human Services Secretary.

Even if employers do offer government-approved health insurance coverage, they would still be fined if Health and Human Services deems the plan “unaffordable” and at least one full-time employee purchases a qualified health plan through an exchange and receives a taxpayer-funded subsidy for their coverage.

Seventy-one Fortune 100 companies that responded to the Ways and Means Committee survey included in the 2012 report estimate that they could save \$28.6 billion in 2014 by eliminating health insurance coverage for their 5.9 million employees and opting to pay the \$2,000 annual fine per employee. This would impact more than 10.2 million employees and dependents on employer-based plans. Under these estimates, from 2014 through 2023, the employers surveyed could save an estimated \$422.4 billion.

The employer mandate provides a perverse incentive for companies to drop their employees from health plans that are otherwise working and are embraced by the employees themselves. This is a stark contrast from the promises made by President Obama, suggesting “First of all, if you’ve got health insurance, you like your doctors, you like your plan, you can keep your doctor, you can keep your plan. Nobody is talking about taking that away from you.”

Mr. Speaker, as we are seeing, that is simply not true. But furthermore, the employer mandate will serve to drive up the costs of ObamaCare as more and more people become a part of the exchanges.

Even Comedy Central’s Jon Stewart, in an interview with Health and Human Services Secretary Kathleen Sebelius this past January, posed the question as to whether or not the employee mandate would cause employers to “dump” employees into the exchanges until it “becomes sort of a back door of government—not a take-over necessarily, but of a government responsibility for the health care, and then suddenly, obviously then, we’re Sweden.”

Mr. Speaker, this week the House will vote to legitimize the administration’s delay of the employer mandate for 1 year. While I support this delay, we must continue to focus efforts on repealing and replacing ObamaCare so that we can begin to reduce the escalating health care costs and the restrictions on access, the attacks on quality innovation in this country and the turnover of health care from a personal decision to the government.

#### DECREASING RATES OF FRAUD, WASTE AND ABUSE IN SNAP

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, 18 times this year I’ve come to this floor and talked about the need to end hunger now. Eighteen times I’ve defended our Nation’s anti-hunger programs, discussed the paradox of hunger and obesity, and talked about hunger among the elderly.

Over the past few weeks, this House has voted on two versions of a farm bill reauthorization. The first was defeated after the Republican leadership overreached, not only by cutting the linchpin of our anti-hunger programs, SNAP—formerly known as food stamps—but also by adding poison pill after poison pill amendment to the bill.

Last week, the Republican leadership responded to the stinging defeat of their farm bill by stripping out the entire nutrition title while, at the same time, expanding subsidies for highly profitable big agribusinesses. Talk about messed up priorities, Mr. Speaker. By the way, the nutrition title not only includes SNAP, it includes as well funding for food banks and senior anti-hunger programs.

Opponents of SNAP like to focus on the idea that SNAP is somehow fraudulent; not just that some SNAP money is being misspent, but that so much is being wasted that we need to drastically rein in the program, regardless of whether SNAP cuts increase hunger in America. We heard these claims time after time during consideration of the two farm bills.

Sadly, those who claim rampant fraud, waste, and abuse in SNAP don’t let facts get in the way of their arguments. That is because SNAP is among the most effective and efficient, if not the most effective and efficient, federally administered programs.

I serve on the House Agriculture Committee, and I took part in an extensive debate over SNAP during both the committee markup and on the House floor. Not one member, Democrat or Republican, on the House Agriculture Committee provided sourced, statistical information on fraud, waste, and abuse in the SNAP program.

On top of that, no hearings were held on the SNAP program at all. In fact, I challenged any member of the committee to find any Federal program that has a lower rate of fraud, waste, and abuse. The truth is no one could answer my challenge.

Mr. Speaker, according to both the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the Office of the Inspector General at USDA, the fraud rates for SNAP are at all-time lows and are going down. On top of that, USDA continues to pursue instances of fraud, waste, and abuse and is prosecuting these cases.

Despite the rapid growth in SNAP participation, primarily due to the historic economic recession we are still recovering from, the error rate for SNAP is also at a record low, according to the latest data available. Specifically, 3 percent of all SNAP benefits represented overpayments, meaning they either went to ineligible households or went to eligible households but in excessive amounts. This means that more than 98 percent of SNAP benefits were issued to eligible households. The combined error rate—the total error rate that includes both under- and overpayments—reached an all-time low in 2011, falling to 3.8 percent.

These statistics show just how well SNAP is truly managed. But there’s even more data to consider. In July, the USDA’s Office of Inspector General issued a report on fraud investigations of USDA programs. It showed that fraud in SNAP is limited primarily to a few bad actors. It also showed cases of fraud are far greater in other USDA programs.

According to this report, 10 cases involving USDA programs were closed in the past 2 months, and only one of them involved fraud on the part of a SNAP recipient. That’s right, only 1 case in 10 had to do with an individual defrauding the SNAP program. In fact, half of those cases dealt with improper use of rural development funds. The remaining four cases all involved SNAP abuse by retailers, not recipients.

While this may seem like an innocuous statistic, it goes to the heart of what opponents claim: that SNAP beneficiaries—poor, hungry working Americans—are lazy and want to steal from the Federal Government. Nothing, and I mean nothing, could be further from the truth.

SNAP provides a lifeline to hungry Americans, whether they are 1, 10, 25, 50, 75 years old or older. In doing so, SNAP is likely the most effective and efficient program administered by the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, of course we can make SNAP better. We can make anything