

census data just released yesterday, the SNAP program helped lift 4 million people out of poverty in 2012. Additionally, this is a multiplier of 2½ times in our economy.

Unfortunately, it is my understanding that the House of Representatives may soon consider legislation that cuts \$40 billion in funding from SNAP. This is the wrong approach. At a time when many families and communities are still struggling to get back on their feet from the Great Recession, we should be working to strengthen, not undermine, the SNAP program.

□ 1215

CUTTING \$40 BILLION FROM THE NUTRITION PROGRAM

(Ms. KUSTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart because this body will soon consider a bill that will cut 4 million children from their nutrition benefits. Americans will go hungry. In my district and across this country, these are our friends, our neighbors, our fellow parishioners. They are children and veterans and seniors.

One of my constituents wrote to me recently about how Federal nutrition assistance is essential to feeding her family. She is 28 years old, disabled, and an orphan, so she has no family to fall back upon. And she is the mother of a toddler. On top of all that, she's in college, working to get her undergraduate degree, and has a double major, no less. But right now, she depends on the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program to feed her toddler, and that assistance doesn't even go far enough. She still has to rely on our local food bank and other community assistance.

This is who we are talking about when we debate cutting \$40 billion from the nutrition program. We can and should do better.

SNAP AND THE FARM BILL

(Mrs. NEGRETE McLEOD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. NEGRETE McLEOD. Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention to the seriousness of the proposed \$40 billion cut to the nutrition bill. As a member of the House Agriculture Committee, I am gravely concerned with this bill, as it circumvented proper deliberation before the Agriculture Committee. This bill lacks the transparency required by the American people and is outside the custom and practice of all past farm bills this House has passed.

I am ready to vote for a farm bill, but we are no closer to finding a compromise than we were 6 months ago. This issue is about Americans' ability to eat, as our country struggles to

come out of the greatest financial crisis since the Great Depression.

SNAP is a vital tool in empowering Americans in a challenging economy and should not be the sole factor in solving the Nation's long-term fiscal problems. Costs for the program will shrink as the economy improves and people are able to do exactly what Americans want to do: put food on the table.

RAISE THE MINIMUM WAGE

(Ms. WILSON of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we wonder why people need nutrition assistance in the first place. Well, it's because our minimum wage is inadequate, and it's because the government has given up on creating jobs. A parent working full-time at minimum wage will simply not earn enough income to cover basic needs.

SNAP recipients are not lazy. It's this Congress that is lazy.

Mr. Speaker, if you want to cut \$40 billion in nutrition funding, I have a two-part plan for you. Raise the minimum wage so workers can feed themselves, and pass the American Jobs Act so Americans can find work in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, the working poor, seniors, and children are suffering now, and you plan to cut nutrition assistance? Not only will they suffer, but some may die.

It's time for this Congress to address the real issues: raise the minimum wage, and jobs, jobs, jobs.

OPPOSITION TO THE REPUBLICAN NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PLAN

(Mr. PAYNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I'm not one to go on and on about a lot of statistics, but as we debate the nutrition bill, there is one that struck a chord with me. One in four, yes, one in four children go to bed hungry every night. And I'm not talking about in Africa, China, or India. I'm talking about one in four children who live right here in the United States going to sleep without adequate nutrition.

For me and the 1 million New Jerseyans on SNAP, this is a complete and total outrage. We live in the greatest country on Earth, yet 17 million children in this country do not get the nutrition they need.

Last year alone, SNAP lifted 4 million people out of poverty. The bill on the floor this week, which would cut SNAP by nearly \$40 billion, will only ensure that these people are pushed right back into poverty.

That's why I strongly oppose the nutrition assistance bill; and I urge my colleagues to examine their conscience and remember that, when they cast

their vote, they are casting their vote for or against one in four children who still go to bed at night hungry.

THE ATTACK ON POOR, DISADVANTAGED, AND HUNGRY PEOPLE ACT

(Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express strong opposition to H.R. 3102, what I call the Attack on Poor, Disadvantaged, and Hungry People Act. This bill will cut food stamps by \$40 billion; and, as a result of that, at least 4 million low-income individuals will no longer be eligible to receive nutrition assistance.

I say shame on whoever concocted this draconian idea, whoever put this proposal together, and certainly shame on us if we vote for it.

WEIGH OUR OPTIONS BEFORE CUTTING SNAP

(Ms. SEWELL of Alabama asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong opposition to H.R. 3102, calling for a \$40 billion cut in critically needed funding for nutrition assistance programs.

You know, Mr. Speaker, struggling to encourage my Republican colleagues to take a walk in the shoes of those who suffer from food insecurity has become uncomfortably common in this Chamber. In this House, we have moved beyond poor economic doctrine and immoral social policy, and we're now dealing with the very dangerous mindset that the weakest in our society are to blame for their condition.

Instead of taking away food stamps, we should be encouraging jobs. That we should be encouraging smaller assistance for those who are in need is not, I think, the way that this policy should go. We should be incentivizing companies to provide a living wage. And I think it's hypocritical for us to value the sanctity of life while neglecting policies that ensure all Americans have a better quality of life.

Mr. Speaker, 54 percent of the households in my district receive SNAP. I think that it's really important that we remember the people that we're sent here to represent.

PANCREATIC CANCER RESEARCH

(Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I have recently met with some constituents from New Mexico whose lives have been impacted by pancreatic cancer,

the deadliest of all major forms of cancer. It's not easy to hear a woman talk about losing her husband, a sister talk about losing her brother, or even a father talk about losing his daughter.

It's not easy to listen to their stories, but it's important, and here's why: pancreatic cancer is the fourth leading cause of cancer deaths in this country; the 5-year survival rate is just 6 percent; and there are still no early detection tools or lifesaving treatments.

Last year, Democrats and Republicans came together to pass the Recalcitrant Cancer Research Act, which requires the National Cancer Institute to develop a scientific framework for combating both pancreatic cancer and lung cancer. Unfortunately, the much-needed progress we stand to make is in serious jeopardy. Largely because of sequestration, the National Cancer Institute's budget has been drastically cut.

This is simply unacceptable, and it's yet another reason why I continue to call for a permanent fix to sequestration. The country deserves it; those constituents I met with deserve it; and everyone who has lost a loved one to pancreatic cancer deserves it.

The SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

(Ms. HANABUSA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, sometimes we use words like "SNAP," and people don't know what it means. SNAP means Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program. It's supplemental to what people receive. Nutrition, that's its main purpose, and it just gives assistance.

What we are proposing to vote on is a bill that would cut \$40 billion from SNAP. What it means—and this is something that's very important for us to recognize—is it means children will lose access to things like free school lunches. For some children, that's the best meal of the day that they have. We know hundreds of thousands will lose that.

Mr. Speaker, 1.7 million people, 850,000 households will be reduced by \$90 a month. Think about your own budgets and think about what \$90 will mean for a family that needs assistance. And in addition, this bill will ask disabled people to work 20 hours a week before they can even qualify for supplemental nutrition assistance.

Mr. Speaker, this is a mean-spirited measure, and Congress should not be defined by that.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 761, NATIONAL STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MINERALS PRODUCTION ACT OF 2013

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 347 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 347

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 761) to require the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to more efficiently develop domestic sources of the minerals and mineral materials of strategic and critical importance to United States economic and national security and manufacturing competitiveness. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Utah is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask that all Members have 5 legislative days in which they may revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for a structured rule for consideration of H.R. 761,

the National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act. It provides one hour of general debate, equally divided between both sides. It provides for five amendments, four of which are Democrat amendments and one is a Republican amendment. So this rule is fair to a fault and it is totally generous, and it will provide a balanced and open debate as long as we, as Members, structure our remarks to the merits of this particular bill and don't go off on tangents.

□ 1230

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to stand before the House and support this rule. It's a good rule.

I also support the underlying bill, H.R. 761, and I want to congratulate the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. AMODEI), as sponsor of this particular piece of legislation, as well as the chairman of the Natural Resources Committee, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS), for his leadership in this particular effort.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation is blessed with an abundance of resources, which has made us a leading world economy and industrial power, and we have only scratched the surface, literally, of what we can potentially develop.

We have energy potential such as coal, oil shale, and natural gas deposits, as well as various critical minerals that we, as a Nation, need and should be developing.

But unfortunately, much of this development of our domestic mineral resources has actually been stymied by a combination of special interest politics, as well as bureaucratic red tape, particularly under this administration. It is a pain we have all seen coming.

Twenty-five years ago, 20 percent of all money that was spent for development and production of critical minerals was spent here in the United States. Today that's down to only 8 percent, as other nations have replaced our efforts, unfortunately.

This has meant an increase in our trade imbalance, dollars going overseas, escalating prices here at home for both energy and commodities. It means job losses here in the United States. And ironically, these jobs that we are losing are some of the highest-paying middle class jobs that are available. Bureaucratic delays are causing this, and they are causing us to see a change, both for manufacturing and defense.

Twenty-five years ago, there were 30 minerals that we actually had to import to this Nation that were considered critical minerals. Today that number has gone from 30 to 61.

Twenty-five years ago, there were 16 minerals that we imported a great majority of. Today that number that has gone to 24.

It affects manufacturing, such as electronics and metal alloys, ceramics, glass, magnets, catalysts, everything. It affects our defense as well, as our Defense Logistics Agency tries to