

IN HONOR AND REMEMBRANCE OF
MR. JERRY RUSSELL

(Mr. VEASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor and remembrance of Mr. Jerry Russell, a man dedicated to his family and his community, who passed away on September 5, 2013. Mr. Russell was a generous man who committed his life to the Fort Worth theater community for 35 years.

A Rhode Island native, Mr. Russell made his home in Fort Worth, Texas, in 1973. It was there that he left a well-paying job at National Cash Register to pursue his career and dream. He started Stage West Theater in 1978. Mr. Russell led Stage West by taking risks and never giving up on what became one of the early foundations of the early Fort Worth theatrical community. Now Stage West is a major supporter of local theater performance and the arts in the Dallas-Fort Worth area.

While he did not attend college, he became a theater teacher at my alma mater, Texas Wesleyan University, where he spread his love and passion for theater to his students. He was a major supporter for the development and funding of the arts in Texas schools and communities.

I would be remiss if I didn't mention that in his spare time outside of the theater, he loved rooting for the Texas Rangers. Go Rangers.

He will always be regarded as a true talent and benefactor to not only the Fort Worth community but to the State of Texas. I offer my condolences to his friends and family. In addition to his wife, Suzi McLaughlin, he leaves his five children, Christopher Neal Russell, Joe Russell, Kathy Russell, Jennifer Russell James, and my friend, Texas Senator Wendy Davis. He also leaves his legacy behind with 11 beautiful grandchildren and 10 great grandchildren.

May he rest in peace and his legacy and contributions to the arts never be forgotten.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE
CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 19, 2013.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on September 19, 2013 at 11:39 a.m.:

Appointments:
Public Interest Declassification Board.
With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 687, SOUTHEAST ARIZONA LAND EXCHANGE AND CONSERVATION ACT OF 2013; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1526, RESTORING HEALTHY FORESTS FOR HEALTHY COMMUNITIES ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3102, NUTRITION REFORM AND WORK OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 2013; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 351 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 351

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. 687) to facilitate the efficient extraction of mineral resources in southeast Arizona by authorizing and directing an exchange of Federal and non-Federal land, and for other purposes. 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 part A of 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.

SEC. 2. 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. 1526) to restore em-

ployment and educational opportunities in, and improve the economic stability of, counties containing National Forest System land, while also reducing Forest Service management costs, by ensuring that such counties have a dependable source of revenue from National Forest System land, to provide a temporary extension of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000, and for other purposes. 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. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-21, modified by the amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part C of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each such further 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 further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3102) to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008; and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture; and (2) one motion to recommit.

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

□ 1245

Mr. SESSIONS. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. And congratulations to the Clerk for the long reading of the rule.

For the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Worcester, Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), my dear friend—

and I spent a lot of time with him yesterday—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. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. House Resolution 351 provides for a structured rule for consideration of H.R. 687 and H.R. 1526, and provides a closed rule for consideration of H.R. 3102.

Mr. Speaker, the first of these bills is H.R. 687, the Southeast Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act. This bill permits a land conveyance which will lead to the development of important copper deposits in Arizona that is estimated to create 3,700 jobs and \$60 billion worth of economic opportunity. That is a great reason to be on the floor on behalf of the Republican Party of the United States of America.

We are on the floor today because people in Arizona, on a bipartisan basis, have asked that their elected representatives, on a bipartisan basis, come to the United States Government and ask for swapping lands that will result in 3,700 American jobs—probably about 3,700 jobs in Arizona—and up to \$60 billion worth of economic opportunity. What a great reason for PAUL GOSAR and DOC HASTINGS, the chairman of the Natural Resources Committee, to approach the Rules Committee about getting that bill on the floor today.

We hear over and over and over and over about jobs and job creation for the middle class. Well, let me tell you what, Mr. Speaker, 3,700 jobs for the middle class in Arizona and up to \$60 billion worth of economic opportunity are available to Members of Congress today where they can make a decision about what they want to vote on. I would submit to you the Republican Party is for those 3,700 middle class jobs.

The second bill before us today is H.R. 1526, the Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act. This legislation will improve the health of our Nation's forests by promoting effective forest management while simultaneously strengthening a timber sales revenue-sharing program which is, once again, designed to allow rural communities to benefit from their local natural resources.

I will go back and say it again. The reason why we are on the floor today is that the Republican Party wants local, rural communities to have a part of their cost sharing with the money that would come in to help rural communities to benefit from what sits in their own back yard, their own natural resources, which we as Republicans un-

derstand is best admired and best taken care of when local people take care of their own needs. Point two why the Republican Party is on the floor of the House of Representatives today: for local rural communities.

The final bill considered in this rule is H.R. 3102, the Nutrition Reform and Work Opportunity Act. This vital legislation reforms—and I add the word “reforms” because it needs reform—reforms our Nation's nutrition programs, saving taxpayers about \$40 billion while maintaining critical benefits to helping America's neediest families, seniors, children, and veterans. H.R. 3102 reinforces our country's commitment to those who cannot help themselves while working to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse.

What is the waste, fraud, and abuse? It is many, many people who should not be receiving these needy items—that should be reserved for those who need it the most—people who are able-bodied; and we should not extend those benefits to people who actually can take care of themselves.

So you're going to hear a robust argument today that will take place—it took place for hours yesterday in the Rules Committee as we considered amendments after amendments, ideas after ideas. Each and every person, whether they be Republican or Democrat, were treated with fairness and the opportunity to equally present their ideas with the knowledge that there was a committee, the Rules Committee, on a bipartisan basis, that was available and ready to engage each of those Members on their ideas that are called amendments. That is why we are on the floor of the House of Representatives today.

I urge my colleagues to support the rule—we will talk a little bit more about it—and to support the underlying legislation. And of course we will talk about that more during this hour.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), my friend, the chairman of the committee, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is a sad day in the people's House. Today, the Republican leadership is bringing to the floor one of the most heartless pieces of legislation I have ever seen, a bill to take food away from some of our most vulnerable neighbors.

After a \$20 billion cut was voted down by the House in June, the Republican leadership has decided to double down on the cruelty with a \$40 billion cut. It is terrible policy wrapped in a terrible process.

This is a 109-page bill that would cut the SNAP program, cut billions of dollars and make major changes to the way SNAP works; and there hasn't been a single hearing, not a single markup. It didn't even go through the Agriculture Committee. And today it's

being brought to the floor under a closed rule. It was just cooked up in the majority leader's office as some sort of Heritage Foundation fever dream.

CBO says that the bill would cut 3.8 million low-income people from SNAP in 2014 and millions more in the following years. These are some of America's poorest adults, as well as many low-income children, seniors, and families that work for low wages. Let me say that again, Mr. Speaker, so there's no confusion. People who work but who don't make enough to feed their families will be cut from this program.

The biggest cut affects millions of unemployed, childless adults who live in areas of high unemployment. These are poor people. Many don't have the skills or education they need to find a job. It is a group whose average income is about \$2,500 a year. And for most, SNAP is the only government assistance that they receive.

Now, if that weren't bad enough, 210,000 children in these families would also lose their free school meals; and 170,000 unemployed veterans will lose their SNAP benefits as well. Let me repeat: 170,000 veterans will lose their benefits. These are the people who have served our country. How can you do that?

Mr. Speaker, we are 45 years and a million miles away from the War on Poverty. The Republican leadership has instead launched a war on poor people.

This bill is not about reform. It is not about making SNAP a better, stronger program.

Mr. Speaker, it is not easy to be poor in America. It is not a glamorous life. It is a struggle just to make it through the day. The average SNAP benefit is \$1.50 per meal. Housing costs, transportation costs, childcare costs, they all add up.

You know, fighting hunger used to be a bipartisan issue. Think of people like Bob Dole and Bill Emerson. And I know that a lot of Republicans—moderates and conservatives—are very nervous about this bill. So I would say to them: don't do this. Please don't do this. Don't go along with cutting food benefits to millions of struggling families. Don't make hundreds of thousands of children and seniors and veterans go hungry. Don't put the food banks and church pantries in your districts into an even deeper hole. The people who rely on SNAP to feed their families struggle every single day. Please don't make their lives even harder. It is not too late. We do not need to pass this bill in order to go to conference on the farm bill.

□ 1300

I would urge my colleagues to search their consciences and to vote against this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK), who serves on the Natural Resources Committee and the Budget

Committee, from Oak Grove, California.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I thank the gentleman so much for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, listening to the debate on the other side, I think there's a misunderstanding on the nutrition bill. It doesn't cut people off from food stamps. What it does is simply ask that they either work, look for work, or train for work while they're receiving these benefits.

This is \$80 billion a year. That's about \$760 from the taxes of every average family in America. I think that they have a right as a condition of extending that aid to ask that those on it do everything they can to get off of it.

I am here today to rise particularly in strong support of H.R. 1526 that this rule also brings to the floor, the Healthy Forest Restoration Act.

I represent the communities of the Sierra Nevadas that have just been devastated by the Yosemite Rim fire that has incinerated some 400 square miles of forestland.

Federal environmental regulations have forced an 80 percent drop in timber harvests in this region over the past 30 years, despite urgent warnings from foresters that the excess timber would either be carried out or burned out. As the timber harvests have declined, the acreage burned has increased contemporaneously and proportionately. The great irony, of course, is that there is nothing more environmentally devastating to a forest than a forest fire.

In addition to reporting out H.R. 1526 that restores sound forest management practices in the future that will reduce or prevent such catastrophes in the future, the rule makes in order emergency amendments to deal with the aftermath of this fire.

An estimated 1 billion board feet of dead timber can be salvaged out of the forest if, and only if, we act soon. Within a year, the timber will become unsalvageable.

This measure sets aside the litigation that routinely delays these salvage sales until the timber simple becomes worthless. This will mean a surge of employment in the mountain communities that have been devastated by this fire and a new stream of revenue for the Federal Government that would otherwise be lost.

I want to thank the Rules Committee for acting on this imperative, and I look forward to the debate and passage of the underlying legislation.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON), the ranking member of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. PETERSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this rule and the bill made in order on this rule, H.R. 3102, which is just another example of the Republican majority's misplaced priorities.

I have been working on this farm bill for nearly 4 years. From the beginning, I've said that I think it is possible to find some middle ground and to make reasonable, responsible reforms in nutrition programs. Unfortunately, this bill is neither reasonable nor responsible.

The House failed to pass the Agriculture Committee's bipartisan farm bill because it was hijacked with partisan amendments on the floor, amendments that are included in this bill that we are considering here today. This bill goes even further by eliminating State-requested waivers to exempt able-bodied adults without dependents in high unemployment areas from SNAP's current work requirements.

To be clear, these waivers are granted only at the request of the States. They are under no requirement to apply and may choose to opt out in the future. There is a lot of hypocrisy coming from the other side of the aisle here, because these waivers have been requested by both Republican and Democratic Governors. In fact, a majority of the Republican Governors have asked to waive these current work requirements.

This notion that we have to pass this bill, as Mr. MCGOVERN said, to go to conference is not true. The House passed H.R. 2642, which can be conferenced with the Senate, and there's no reason to pass this bill here today other than to placate some people that want to make a point. This bill isn't going anywhere in the Senate, the President wouldn't sign it, so I don't know what we are doing.

In July, a broad coalition of more than 500 organizations expressed their opposition to splitting this farm bill. Senator Bob Dole expressed his opposition recently to doing it. In a letter to House Members, the American Farm Bureau Federation President Bob Stallman said:

We are quite concerned that without a workable nutrition title, it will prove to be nearly impossible to adopt a bill that can be successfully conferenced with the Senate's version, approved by both the House and Senate, and signed by the President.

All this bill is going to do is make our job harder, if not impossible, to pass a new farm bill.

I strongly oppose this rule and the bill and urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I appreciate the gentleman from Minnesota coming down and giving us his thoughts on what we are attempting to do today. The bottom line is that what we are going to do is we are going to make natural and, I believe, reasonable changes to the nutrition program that will help sustain it. Rather than growing and growing and growing and growing the amount of money that's necessary to sustain this, we are going to put it into a perspective where it is available and ready for the neediest of

Americans, which is what the food stamp program really is all about.

In fact, we are here to make sure that when our great chairman of the Agriculture Committee, FRANK LUCAS, goes to a conference with the United States Senate that we give him a full portfolio of the thoughts and ideas about the changes that we would make to the entire agriculture bill. Chairman LUCAS is one of the most awesome members of our conference and who, yesterday, spent a number of hours with us, not just to get us to understand what we are trying to do, but why we are trying to do what we are doing. It means that we will arm him with the available content to go to the conference with the Senate to make the farm bill that includes the nutrition program even better and sustainable.

I think the gentleman, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, said it best, and that is that what we are trying to do is to make sure that the neediest Americans get what they want and need. But it simply and, I believe, carefully says, where you're able-bodied and on food stamps, you have got to be looking for work also. You have to make sure that you're a part of trying to go and better your life, not using the food stamp program as an alternative to the hard work which will help make you and perhaps your family, but certainly your community and your country even stronger. So it becomes an incentive to do exactly that.

Just like what we did in welfare reform in the early nineties where, in welfare reform, jobs became a substitute and really a demand that you needed to go look for a job, millions of people took us up on that and bettered their life, that's what we are trying to do now. There are still jobs available in America. There are still jobs available. They might not be the job that you would want to stay in for the rest of your life, but it means that you need to go and actively participate, because there are those behind, so to speak, the program that are the neediest of most Americans.

I will tell you that I understand some of those people, some of these people that live within the district that I represent in Texas, but I also understand them firsthand in dealing with disabled people and families with disabled children and families with disabled adults. Where a person cannot take care of themselves, we are not putting that at risk at all. Where a person cannot take care of themselves and needs the benefits of the community, in this case a nutrition program, we need to make sure that there is more money that is available to them.

There was a discussion about the average cost not being very much, and I think that's a true statement. We would like to increase the money for more and better food, including fruits and vegetables and other items, in the future, but the only way we can do this is if we are aiming at the people who need it the most.

That's where this great Nation will continue. Not only through their food banks that are available across the country because of local people getting involved, but also the competition that comes from the Federal Government to help work with them to better the lives, the nutrition, of children and seniors and veterans and families that need them the most. That's what this is trying to do to reform that program.

I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, Republican talking points aside, according to CBO, this bill, if passed, will result in 3.8 million people losing their benefits, including 170,000 veterans. That is shameful.

I appreciate the gentleman's concern about the waivers, but I remind him that his Governor of Texas, Rick Perry, has requested waivers on a number of occasions because people haven't been able to find jobs in his State of Texas. So if you've got a problem with the waivers, you ought to talk to your own Governor.

At this point, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD the story of Adam, a disabled man from Ohio, a face of hunger in America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

"There's been days when I have not had a good meal."

Adam has been disabled his entire life. He lives on his own off of Supplemental Security Income (SSI) payments and receives \$136 a month in food stamps.

"Where I live, I don't have a kitchen. I have a toaster oven and a microwave. I try to make them (food stamps) last a month, but it's really hard to do. I would say about three weeks or less, that's about all they last. I do the very best I can to budget, but it's hard. Everything's so expensive in the stores, you really can't gauge how much you're going to spend.

"My mom told me not to work, because my check will get cut. And then if they (Social Security) see me working, and I'm not making enough to live on while I'm working, then I'm pretty much in the hole. And I don't want to put myself in that position. And even though I'm on benefits, it's only about \$8,055 a year.

"I'm really happy for this place because it really helps. At the end of the month when I don't have any food, or I need groceries, I can come at the end of the month and get food. I always buy food first. I don't ever want to run out, but sometimes I do run out of food, and that's why I come here.

"It makes me feel depressed when I don't have anything to eat."

Source: Ohio Association of Food Banks

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. O'ROURKE) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD references to pages 1 through 4

of report S. 2201 from the U.S. Census Bureau showing that 329 Active Duty military families at Fort Bliss and Fort Hood in Texas rely on SNAP benefits to put food on the table.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD the story of Dorothy, a grandmother from a State very near Minnesota—South Dakota—and she represents the face of hunger. Here she is with her family.

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

There was no objection.

"I'm a descendent of Crazy Horse, and I live in a trailer on our ancestral land in Wounded Knee. Life here in the winter is very hard. Our water pump freezes, so we have to haul water from a half-mile away. Cold air comes through the broken windows, and it's hard to heat the trailer. Because we can't afford snow tires to drive over the five-foot snowdrifts, I have to take the little money I have and pay someone \$20 to drive me to the only grocery store on the reservation, 45 minutes away.

"Many people here struggle like I do. There are lots of gangs, violence and alcoholism and almost no jobs here. The moccasin factory closed down. So did the fishhook factory. My husband used to be able to take care of us, but not anymore.

"We are raising 7 grandchildren: 5 from my daughter, who died at 30 of cardiac arrest, and 2 from a daughter-in-law, who just left her kids with us one night and never came back. Because I have the grandkids, I get welfare and food stamps. Otherwise, I couldn't feed my family. Buying food comes first. Then I pay for electricity, so we can cook with the microwave and hot plate and run the space heaters to warm the trailer.

"Food is so expensive on the reservation, and our food stamps only last about two weeks. When they run out, I go out and sell beadwork really cheap, just so I can continue to feed my family. But there aren't many tourists in winter, so we eat lots of crackers (we call them Indian potato chips) because they are filling and we won't be hungry.

"Life on the reservation changed a lot since the buffalo are all but gone. So many people on the reservation have replaced buffalo meat with processed foods, and diabetes has become a big problem. I don't want to have my limbs cut off, so I try to eat healthy. During the growing season, I plant a vegetable garden with things I can store for the winter. I'm learning a lot every year about how to take care of my garden. The only thing I really have a problem with is that I can't stop the grasshoppers from eating everything. This year they didn't eat my squash, so we are eating a whole lot of squash soup.

"It upsets me that so many people on the reservation use their food stamps to buy junk food instead of healthy food. I think that everyone on the reservation should have a small garden to feed themselves and eat healthy. I

also think the government should bring the buffalo back. When our people ate buffalo every day, we were strong."

Source: Mazon

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) for a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the story of Rosemary. She is a grandmother from Little Rock, Arkansas. She is a face of hunger today in the United States of America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Rosemary has full custody of her three grandchildren, whom she has been caring for since her daughter passed away from cancer several years ago. Rosemary used to work full-time in healthcare but has been unable to work in recent years due to illness and family responsibilities. She struggles financially to care for her grandchildren. She sold her home and moved into a smaller apartment to cut expenses but relies on SNAP to help feed her family. "I'm used to working, buying what I need. I'm not used to doing without and I didn't want to accept it." She is very grateful for the assistance. Without SNAP, her grandkids "probably wouldn't have food to eat."

Source: Share Our Strength

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) for a unanimous consent request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

The Chair would advise Members that although a unanimous consent request to insert remarks in debate may comprise a simple, declarative statement of the Member's attitude toward the pending measure. Embellishments beyond that standard constitute debate and can become an imposition on the time of the Member who has yielded for that purpose.

The Chair will entertain as many requests to insert as may be necessary to accommodate Members, but the Chair also must ask Members to cooperate by confining such remarks to the proper form.

The gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD the story of Beatriz, a mother from Camden, New Jersey, a face of hunger. This is her child.

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

There was no objection.

Beatriz is a 24-year-old single mother of one young son. She is from Camden, NJ and is a member of Witnesses to Hunger, a research and advocacy project that is part of the Center for Hunger-Free Communities at Drexel University.

Beatriz struggles to make ends meet while working 40 hours a week at a convenience store. SNAP helps Beatriz make ends meet because even while working full-time she does

not make enough to keep food on the table. Beatriz dreams of earning her surgical technologist certification but the work and cost of school would put more strain on her household.

Source: Drexel University Center for Hunger-Free Communities

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlelady from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD the story of Shellie, an unemployed mother with two children, from Ohio, a face of hunger in America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

"Every single day, I get up and make the most of that day, because that's what moms do."

Shellie is currently living with her two teenage children in a hotel room. They had to move out of the house they were renting after it was condemned because of black mold.

"I feel sorry for my kids because times are harder now than they've ever been. You know, I didn't have to live like this as a child. We didn't live in hotel rooms. We never went without. And you know, my kids are going without. At the end of the month, I have to tell them, 'all I have is dinner food,' because there's nothing to put on the table for breakfast or lunch."

"It's awful, disheartening. I feel like a complete loser right now, to be honest. Because I can't do for my kids like I should be. I can't provide for them like I'm used to providing. I try to look for work, but I can't get hired anywhere. There's no jobs in Vermilion, there's not."

"I know Grace's Kitchen has been a blessing to me. We get a lot of fresh fruit, we get breads. That's a treat, because we don't get fresh fruit at home because it's so expensive. So when we have that the kids are like 'yeah, fruit, this is awesome!'"

"Trust me, America is very concerned about it [cuts to food stamps]. They do something like that, that's saying you don't care about your children. Really? You run the country but you don't care about the kids here? They're our future. They're our next presidents, they're our next nurses, they're our next doctors, they're next. How dare you take from them. It's not right. You've never known hunger, to take something away like that. You've never been hungry."

"If you'd ever been hungry you know you don't take away things like that."

Source: Ohio Association of Food Banks

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlelady from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD the story of Melinda, a cancer survivor and single mother from Texas, a face of hunger.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

I felt like I pulled a muscle in my side. And one morning the pain was just unbearable and I actually went to the hospital. Told my kids,

"It's nothing. We'll be in and out. I'm just going to get some medicine for this."

The breathing was so bad the doctors wanted to make sure that I wasn't actually having a heart attack . . . So they did a scan on me. That's when they told me that I had a tumor and somehow it collapsed my lung. And that's when they told me I had lymphoma.

So I was actually in the hospital for two months.

[Melinda is now recovering and in remission. She lost her job and struggles as a single mom to provide for her family.]

I would see people in the line and I would seem them using the food stamps and I was just like "man I wish that . . . that would help me so much."

[Melinda quickly started receiving SNAP benefits for her family of four.]

It's all I've ever cared about is food on the table for my kids and that's it. And that's exactly what—that's been taken care of. It helps me out so much just knowing that's a cost that I don't have to worry about.

You know when I was paying cash it was just a lot more different junk food and this time around it is a lot more fruits and vegetables. It opened my eyes. You need that you need that assistance if it's really going to help you out and you know you're going to do right with it—go for it. Just don't give up.

I'm Melinda and thank you for feeding America.

Source: Feeding America

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlelady from California (Ms. LEE) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD the story of Steven, a father from San Francisco, California, the face of hunger in America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

For Steven, the most significant benefit he realized was to be able to access TANF, SNAP, and school meals during one trip to the Department of Human Services. For Steven, he was unemployed and looking for work, he was struggling with alcohol and drug addiction, he had experienced some serious family problems and was in sole custody of his daughter, and he was desperate to turn his life around. The benefits he received at this point in his life proved to be one of the major catalysts that allowed him to get back on his feet. Now, he is in the final process of finding a job, he has addressed his issues with drug and alcohol use, and he is very thankful for the support he received (both from SNAP benefits and other forms of support), to have the strength to focus on the things he needed to do to get his life back together and find a job. He couldn't have done this without the simple and efficient process to receive TANF, SNAP, and school meals. If the SNAP cuts go through, a person like Steven would not be able to qualify categorical eligibility.

Source: St. Anthony's (San Francisco)

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlelady from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD the story of Jennifer, a mother

from New Mexico, a face of hunger in America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

"Just as my time in a domestic violence shelter was about up, I got lucky. A spot opened up in a two-year transitional housing program in Santa Fe. It felt like a second chance at life. Within a couple of years of being there, I saved enough money to buy a mobile home. I had a great full-time job at the Boys and Girls Club through AmeriCorps. I was working my way through college to go into juvenile probation. It felt like I'd gotten my independence back. Then the funding for my job was cut and I became unemployed.

For months, I couldn't find a full-time job. I was willing to take anything. I can lay cement and wait tables. I found enough part-time work to pay the rent on the mobile home lot—that was my priority so we wouldn't be evicted—but I didn't earn enough part-time to pay for anything else. I don't know why the utilities weren't cut off—I didn't pay those bills for months. Thank goodness I get food stamps. Otherwise, we wouldn't eat.

I use my food stamps to buy things that I know will fill my kids up. We drink a lot of milk and eat a lot of bread and buy a few cases of ramen every month. I find 'buy one get one free' sales so we can buy some meat, throw it into a pot with cream of mushroom soup, and get three days of meals out of it. My son gets a backpack snack sent home with him once a week from school. That's really good.

By the last week of the month, we run out of food. That's when I worry where our next meal is coming from. What am I supposed to do? I do what I have got to do to feed my kids and have had to do things I'm not proud of. There have been times where I've gone to the grocery store and put a block of cheese or beans in my purse and gone through the check out line paying only for eggs and a loaf of bread. If I didn't do that, my kids would go to bed hungry and I'd never let that happen. I remember when people used to send their kids to bed without dinner, out of punishment, and that has stayed with me. I can't knowingly let any child go without heat, go without food. I've taken homeless children into the house and given them my son's bed. I've put food in a Tupperware and shared it with others.

I don't know how I made it through the months, but I did. I recently got a full-time job in retail, but every day is a climb. Food is still a struggle. Paying for gas to get to work is a struggle. Having a little cash so my son can have socks or we can have laundry soap is a struggle. I know a lot of people that are struggling just like us. I get so upset when I see the TV commercials asking us to help people overseas—everywhere else, but here. Doesn't everybody realize we have starving children in America? Shouldn't we take care of Americans first?"

Source: Mazon

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the story of Stephanie, a mother from Roanoke, Virginia, a face of hunger in America.

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

There was no objection.

Raising two young girls on her own after leaving a domestic violence situation and spending six months in a shelter with her two young daughters, 41-year-old Stephanie currently works full-time in a medical office while her girls are in daycare/pre-school. She wants her kids to understand the importance of hard work. She lives frugally, adhering to a strict budget, using no credit cards. She also looks for fun things to do that will not cost her a lot of money so her daughters can enjoy life as much as possible. When they can afford to go out to eat as a treat, she goes to Denny's because they have a deal where 2 kids eat free with 1 parent. She was really grateful for that. SNAP is essential for her to feed herself and her children and be able to cover (barely) monthly expenses. This month was particularly hard because a window in their home broke during a storm and they don't have extra money for unexpected expenses. When things like that happen she has to scramble to find the money. She has relied on the program on and off for years, and believes without SNAP she and her daughters would be back in a shelter. She wants elected officials to understand that SNAP helps working families.

I worry about everything, I worry about my daughter growing up stable. I especially worry about her getting the supplemental food program at school, that helps a lot too. If it wasn't for these programs I don't know what I would do. [I get] \$300 a month in food stamps, it tremendously.

Source: Share Our Strength

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD the story of Naquila, a mother from Little Rock, Arkansas, just west of Memphis, a face of hunger in America.

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

There was no objection.

Naquila has struggled most of her adult life to support her children. She has 12-year-old twins and a 4-year-old boy. When her twins were younger, she worked two jobs to support her family but barely got by. (She did not qualify for any benefits at the time.) There were times that her utilities/electricity was cut off because she failed to pay the bills on time. She would skip breakfast and lunch and just eat a small dinner to ensure there was enough food for her kids, but even then, they had to improvise to make what little food supplies they had last the week. Things finally started to look up when she got a job, but she did not qualify for maternity leave when she had her third child, so received SNAP benefits during her six week maternity leave. Naquila worked two jobs to try and support her family; referring to a time in her life when she did not benefit from SNAP or any other form of assistance.

"I was making too much to get food stamps but I wasn't making enough to keep a sufficient amount of food in my home when it was me with my two kids. It was hard. It was really hard. We survived off of things like grilled

cheese, and noodles, things that I could afford to buy for less than \$1.

"Sometimes water would be turned off. We would have to go stay with my mom until I got the money up to pay the water bill. Sometimes the lights would get turned off and I would have the money to pay it but I didn't have the time to pay it, because I was working."

"I found somewhere where I could work from 8–4:30 and make it home in time enough to cook a good meal. I would go and get family packs of chicken or family packs of ground beef and cook that, cook large enough amounts so we could eat on it for two days, or three days, or however long it lasted. Before that we ate things like hot dogs, bologna sandwiches, crackers and cheese. It wasn't really stuff with substance. I knew one of my supervisors had her own garden, so she would bring squash and things like that out of her garden that she had too much of and we ate that, so that was good."

"There were days when I would go and not even take lunch. I would do things like I would fix them a peanut butter and jelly sandwich but I would make it on 1 piece of bread and fold it. I would do the little cans of beanie babies and cut hot dogs up for them, and maybe I would only have the hot dog. I would give them spaghetti and corn, and I might only eat corn, or whatever it was that I would have to do to make it so that they could have more."

"There were a lot of nights that I came home and just cried. It was a lot of times when I did not know where I was getting the strength to keep going, but I knew that I had to."

Source: Share Our Strength

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD the story of Nathan, a veteran from Rapid City, South Dakota, a face of hunger in America.

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

There was no objection.

"I joined the Army because it allowed us to pay our bills above and beyond. There was comfort knowing that we had a savings account and if something came up we could fix it. That's no longer the case.

I did a one-year tour in Iraq. I trained as a medic and dreamed of becoming a doctor. But when I got injured, my dreams were slammed into the ground. I always liked cooking, so the Veterans' Administration sent me to the New England Culinary School in Vermont to become a classically trained chef. I figured that by going to a pretty prestigious school, people would fly out the doors to hire me. But in this horrible economy, the only jobs I've been offered pay the same as McDonald's. But I can't support my family on that. So when my wife was offered part-time work, we decided that she should take it so I could continue looking for a position as a fine dining chef.

Now I'm Mr. Mom. It's taxing on my pride, but even more taxing on my pocketbook. My wife only makes about 75% of what we need to make ends meet. To help us make up the difference, my mother-in-law has gone back to work. And instead of using her retirement funds on herself, she's putting them into our family.

It's horrible to think that I was protecting a country that can't provide its citizens with good-paying jobs so they can afford their own food. Our food stamps don't cover what we need, but if we didn't get them, we'd be—for lack of a better word—screwed. We couldn't pay the mortgage or our car payment; if our car broke down, we couldn't afford to fix it. When I shop for food now, I buy what's on sale rather than what I want. I can either buy one red pepper at \$1.69 for one person's fajita or 6 boxes of macaroni at \$1.69 that feeds the whole family 6 times.

Macaroni is not what we'd like to give our kids, but for now, it's about getting enough to eat rather than eating well. I know that what they're ingesting today is going to cause them health problems down the road. The kids have already gained weight by eating more processed foods, which is kind of funny when you're talking about a lack of food.

I dream of making enough money so I can buy fresh, quality produce with cash at the farmers market instead of buying Hamburger Helper with food stamps. When I pull out the food stamp card, I think that everyone looks at you funny. Well, I am not really sure that most people know what the food stamp card looks like, but I do. Taking out the food stamp card makes me feel poor."

Source: Mazon

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD the story of Lorraine, a mother from Sarasota, Florida, and Gwendolyn Friedman, a senior citizen from Tampa, Florida, faces of hunger in America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

I was at the supermarket checkout line when the cashier asked me if I wanted to make a donation for the needy.

I would have liked to, but instead, I flashed my food stamps card and shook my head, saying: "I can't. This time, I'm the needy."

The poor guy blushed and mumbled an apology. I suppose he must have felt bad for me.

"It's okay," I said. "I'm glad to have the help."

That day, almost three years ago now, I realized that I didn't look like the type of person the cashier would have expected to be on food stamps. On other trips to the grocery store I had begun to notice that I was not alone. Well-dressed women ahead of me at the checkout would try to swipe their EBT (Electronic Benefits Transfer) card inconspicuously, but I immediately recognized it. I wanted so badly to tell them not to be embarrassed. We were among the additional 20 million Americans who have had to go on Food Stamps since the recession. And my girls were among the 17 million children in this country who could be labeled as "food insecure," meaning they do not know when or where their next meal will come.

RECESSION HITS HOME

I was a middle class hard-working professional, until my marriage ended around the same time as the recession hit. The publications I wrote for closed down or ran out of

funding. I suddenly became the unemployed single mami of two girls, ages 4 and 7.

I moved out of our 4-bedroom family home with a pool to a small rental apartment, with my kids. My ex-husband also had been out of work and we'd gone through our savings. I had little income and a lot of debt. In order to pay the bills and buy groceries while I job-hunted, I had to resort to selling my jewelry, including family heirlooms, my wedding band, and gifts that my girls received when they were born. That was difficult and emotional. I held back the tears as the jeweler appraised my belongings, while my 4-year-old entertained herself admiring the sparkly gems in the store, unaware of what was happening.

SELLING OFF PRIZED POSSESSIONS

I sold my brand-name handbags, shoes, and clothes on eBay. Then I discovered direct sales. I peddled everything from jewelry to cosmetics, but it seemed these were difficult times for many. I couldn't make enough income to cover the basics. I kept hoping I would soon find work again as a writer and that things would get better.

But nothing changed despite my best job-seeking efforts. Newspapers, which had been my bread and butter since arriving in the U.S. in 2004, kept laying off staff. The recession was in full swing. I was forced to accept hand-outs from friends and family. Around that time, I noticed that my neighbor, a mom of three boys, kept inviting my kids over for dinner. One day I discovered that it was because my girls had mentioned that our fridge was always empty. I was running out of options. I needed to feed my children.

A close friend suggested I apply for food stamps. His family had used them when they arrived in the U.S. from Cuba a few years back, until they got on their feet. At first I was appalled. I always imagined food stamps were only for the poor and the homeless. I couldn't conceive that someone like me could qualify. Then I realized: I was poor! That night, thinking of my girls, I piggybacked off of the neighbors' wireless signal and Googled "how to apply for food stamps."

A few weeks later, it was a huge relief to trudge up the stairs to my apartment with my happy kids, carrying bags of fresh groceries. It felt better than Christmas.

These are tough times, and I learned the hard way that pride doesn't put a warm meal on the table, but that The United States Supplemental Nutritional Assistance Program (SNAP) does.

Source: MomsRising

□ 1315

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD the story of Marvin, a disabled man from Atlanta, Georgia—a face of hunger in America.

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

There was no objection.

My name is Marvin and I live in Atlanta.

You should never let your disabilities get in the way.

[Marvin is partially deaf and blind. He supports himself by cleaning windows for local businesses.]

Give me a cheap roll of paper towels and tell me how much you want to pay me to do them—those windows will be spotless.

[Marvin was struck by a car while walking home from work.]

I thought my life was over with.

I had a lot of fear, but I had a lot of faith at the same time.

[He is unable to work as he recovers from the accident.]

I got on food stamps.

I don't know about everybody else but I did feel embarrassed about it—having food stamps.

I had no choice. I . . . no choice at all. But once I tried it and I'm not embarrassed anymore because I'm able to eat everything like everyone else.

Well I'm going to keep going or give up. I refuse . . . It's not in me. I can't give up.

Once I go back to work I'll be happy.

I think we're all blessed in many ways.

Source: Feeding America

Mr. MCGOVERN. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, my party and I do understand that our country has for 5 years gone through very difficult times. Our party and the American people, through various ways, have been asking this administration and the Democratic Party to please allow us to have an opportunity with more jobs being available in the United States of America. The Democratic Party, up to and including the President of the United States, is more interested in an out-of-balance environmental policy that is placing a demand on the consumers to pay double the prices that they did before the President came into office for gasoline and double the prices of food and the availability of jobs.

Just as we are here to talk about, in Arizona, 3,700 new jobs, we've tried to do this with the XL pipeline, which would extend across a number of States. I don't know if some of the faces of hunger were included in those that could be hired as a result of the XL pipeline, but, every day, there are Americans who are losing their jobs and who are losing careers because of the policies of our President, Barack Obama, and the Democrats—elected Members of Congress—who insist on having rules and regulations, up to and including a government-run health care plan, which is diminishing careers and opportunities for people to have health care and full-time jobs.

If it weren't true, someone would say it was just a cruel joke; but the bottom line is that the business community all across America is now changing the rules of employment from 40-hour workweeks to 30 or even 20. This is happening directly as a result of the policies of the people who complain most about the middle class not having jobs. It is perpetrated exactly on a partisan basis—with zero Republicans participating—to have rules, regulations, and a government-run health care system that is unemploying America, only

to turn around later to find out: so we've got to spend more money to take care of people who don't have jobs.

Mr. Speaker, there are divides in our country. There are divides between the parties, but, today, the Republican Party is on the floor trying to say that we need to change the law so that local communities that have forests in their backyards can share in the money, that Washington can't have it only—you've got to share with them. We are here to say that we are for a land swap that people in Arizona completely agree with. They sent their elected Representatives here on an elected citizenry basis to come and say: we'd like 3,700 more jobs in Arizona, \$60 billion worth of economic activity; and we are here today to say: because we have such expanding roles of people who are hungry in America and who are filing to get food stamps, we need to be able to set a mark, and that mark is: as long as you're looking for a job and you're able-bodied, then we understand, but the neediest of Americans need what we're doing, and that we are not going to give up on.

So the Republican Party is here with an open ear, a strong voice and a kind heart; but what we are saying back is: Mr. President and Democrat Party, you need to help us grow jobs in America. You need to let loose the Keystone pipeline, which has been studied to death for the last 5 or 6 years. You need to be with us today on the 3,700 more jobs in Arizona. You need to be with us today because we're the ones who are talking about jobs in healthy forests, with timber, back home in rural areas because rural people deserve a chance to have a job and to be taken care of, too.

The Republican Party is quite consistent in our behavior—we want jobs; we want job creation; and we put legislation on the floor that accomplishes just that. That's why we're here today. We are a party that cares about people, and we are trying to make life better for the middle class and for all Americans in this country.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, my Republican friends don't like the President. We hear it every day. I get it.

While you debate his policies, don't take it out on poor people. The CBO says 3.8 million people will be thrown off this benefit, and 170,000 veterans will lose their benefits.

This bill is not a thoughtful bill—it is a thoughtless bill—because it hasn't even gone through committee. This is more a political statement than it is sound policy or even bad policy. It's just plain politics. It's red meat for, I guess, the extreme right-wing base. I'm hoping there are people on your side who will see through this and who will stand with us and do the right thing, because it has been a bipartisan tradition in this Congress to support efforts to prevent hunger.

At this point, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to protest this rule and these deep and disastrous cuts to food stamps.

This \$40 billion in cuts goes against decades of bipartisan support for the fight against hunger in the United States. It will hurt our economy, and it is, in a word, immoral.

If this cruel legislation were to become law, at least 4 million of the Nation's poorest citizens would lose access to the food that they need. We are talking about people on the edge: families whose breadwinners just got laid off; veterans returning from service who are looking for jobs, 170,000 of them; seniors struggling to make ends meet after a lifetime of work and who will be forced to make the choice between food and medicine; and millions of low-income children whose futures will be irreparably harmed by these reckless cuts.

Don't take my word for it:

In working with Census data, the Center for Budget and Policy Priorities projects that, roughly, 170,000 veterans could lose access to food stamps under the provisions of this bill;

The AARP called these efforts to cut antihunger programs an "abandonment of the Nation's commitment to ensuring essential nutrition access for many U.S. households";

Two former Senate majority leaders, Republican and Democrat—Bob Dole and Tom Daschle—have called this bill an "about-face on our progress fighting hunger."

Senator Dole is right—the majority's leadership has lost its way on this issue. For decades, there has been bipartisan support for food stamps, our Nation's most important antihunger program.

They help over 47 million Americans—nearly half of them are children—escape the scourge of hunger. Nearly all food stamp recipients live below 130 percent of the poverty line, and 75 percent of food stamp households include a child, a senior citizen, or a disabled person. It also boasts one of the lowest error rates of any government program.

Economists agree that food stamps have a powerful, positive impact on the health of not just families but of the entire economy, and they get money into the hands of people who spend it on the food that they need. Cutting antihunger funding like this is not just immoral; it makes no economic sense.

I might add that it makes no economic sense either to cut \$40 billion from food stamps for the poor while preserving \$90 billion in crop insurance for the wealthy, including that of 26 farmers, who made over \$1 million from the Federal Government. These are 26 wealthy farm owners whom we are prevented from identifying. They won't tell us who they are. They are protected. It is just plain wrong.

If the majority's leadership is serious about wanting to lower the number of

Americans on food stamps, increase the minimum wage. Taking food out of the mouths of the hungry is not the answer.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman who served in the United States Air Force, from Gainesville, Georgia (Mr. COLLINS), who serves on the Foreign Affairs Committee, the Judiciary Committee, and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the time.

Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor, and I am getting ready to speak on an issue that is very close on this rule. I support all of the rules combined here, and I support the underlying legislation, but I have to stop for just a moment and discuss some things that I've heard.

I agree with my gentlemen friends across the aisle in that it is about political choices, that it is about political decisions that we make on where we're going to spend money and how we're going to do that and what we believe in with regard to jobs and how jobs are being created. The Republican majority has been doing that. The Republican majority is focused on jobs. The Republican majority is focused on getting regulatory burdens off of businesses.

I just spent the last month and a half in my district, and the word that I could use to describe everything was "uncertainty." There is uncertainty by the business owners—the ones who write on the front of the checks—when they're saying, I want to be able to employ other people and I want to be able to help others, but, right now, I do not know if I can because I don't know. With the expanding regulation and the upcoming health care law, I don't know if I can do that.

It is about political choices, and the Republican majority is making it in favor of the working class, in favor of the middle class and of those who are hurting in our country. We have the ear because we want to grow jobs, and we want to get out of the way so those jobs can be created.

Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in support of this rule for these reasons. Because you know something? I have noticed something as a freshman in here in Washington. There is one thing I've noticed that I don't see in Georgia. I see a lot of condos going up here in D.C. I see a lot of new government buildings, and I see a lot of new government jobs. But do you know what I say? That's great for inside the beltway. I'm happy for those up here, but that doesn't translate in Georgia. In Georgia, we're still recovering, and we're still needing help, and we're still needing an economy that gets its budget balanced and that gets its tax priorities in order so that we can have job creation. That's where we need to have it all across the country, not here in the wonderful land of government.

In this Chamber, we often hear talk about more fully developing renewable

resources. In fact, I hear it almost every night on this floor. I believe that timber is the original renewable resource and that we need to do a better job of managing it. While much of the conversations today are related to western forests, I want to speak a little bit about what the bill means for the eastern portion of the country, specifically north Georgia.

The Chattahoochee National Forest covers almost 500,000 acres of land in the Ninth District of Georgia, timber that was used for cabins long before the national forest system existed. Much of the privately owned forest nearby is actively managed and provides high-quality timber for many uses. In fact, forestry is a \$25 billion industry in Georgia.

Unfortunately, like the Western States, bureaucracy and red tape have made it nearly impossible to harvest timber in the national forest. In a country that is blessed with abundant natural resources and healthy forests, we owe it to our ancestors and our descendants to be responsible stewards of this valuable commodity. While we have not had the catastrophic forest fires in Georgia that many of the Western States have suffered through, we have dealt with cycles of extreme drought, which put the forests in a dangerous position. Understanding that many wildfires are caused by poor management is a good first step, but we need to take a bigger step. By returning these forests to active management, we will not only grow our forests, but we can grow our economy as well.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. H.R. 1526 also includes a reform to the supporting rural schools program. This is a program that clearly needs to be reformed but in a thoughtful way that recognizes the unique position that our rural schools are in. We can't continue to send Federal dollars towards local schools through a system that can't pay for itself. This bill provides funding sources for local schools that have missed out on the revenue through federally owned forests. This bill gives schools that have grown dependent on these funds a chance to transition into a new system, one that is sustainable and one that promotes investment in our natural resources and our forest resources.

As I said earlier, this bill is good for the economy, and I will stop where I started: the Republican majority is about jobs. The Republican majority is about having an upward lift for all in our economy, not just for the ones we want to focus on through political choice.

□ 1330

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 seconds to remind the gentleman who just spoke that there are

36,000 households in his district in Georgia who rely on SNAP. I think they're counting on him to vote a different way.

At this point, I yield 1 minute and 15 seconds to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD).

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Thank you very much, Mr. MCGOVERN, for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) who just spoke, has finally acknowledged what so many other Republicans refuse to acknowledge: that they have made a political choice. They've made a political choice to defund the SNAP program. I'm glad that he publicly acknowledged that.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose H.R. 3102. The Republicans are determined to defund this program, a program that provides food assistance to low-income families and to more than 20 percent of my congressional district.

The Agriculture Committee reported a bill that cut \$16 billion from nutrition. The Speaker wouldn't schedule a vote. Why? Because the Tea Party said "not enough cuts." The Republicans then increased nutrition cuts to \$20.5 billion, and the Speaker crossed his fingers and hoped for passage. It went down on this floor in defeat. Not a single Democrat voted for it. Many Republicans said the cuts were not enough.

Now here we are again today. The Republicans, driven by the irrational Tea Party, bring us another nutrition title that now cuts \$40 billion from nutrition.

My friends, I know that cutting the deficit is important to all of us, but do not reduce the deficit by depriving more than 3 million good Americans of the opportunity to eat. That's not who we are as a Nation.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Hood River, Oregon (Mr. WALDEN), who is the chairman of the Communications and Technology Subcommittee for Energy and Commerce.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his good work on this legislation, and I want to thank my colleagues for what I hope will be their support of passage of this legislation, specifically the parts related to the Federal forest land. Federal forest land across the Nation is rotting, it's dying, and it's burning because the Federal Government has failed to manage our forests.

When we actively managed our forests and selectively logged our lands, we had vibrant ecosystems and we had vibrant and healthy economies. Now the forests are overstocked, they're diseased and infested, and they go up in smoke. Communities are literally dying. Counties are literally on the edge of bankruptcy. In my State, some of those counties have 50 percent to 70 percent of the landmass in Federal forest lands or grasslands.

Most forests are overstocked and disease infested, communities are dying,

mills are closing. You're talking about children living in poverty? Misguided Federal policy on forest land management puts children in my district into poverty and their parents out of work. Local communities struggle to provide even basic services like law enforcement and schools.

H.R. 1526, the Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act, returns more active management to our Federal forest lands. This proposal has been crafted with input from Federal foresters, industry representatives, and, most importantly, the residents of these local communities who are living in poverty, subject to choking, catastrophic, and sometimes deadly wildfires, and the choking smoke that fills our valleys now every summer.

H.R. 1526 also includes a balanced and bipartisan plan for unique Oregon forests. Oregonians have been managing forests since the times of the Oregon Trail most likely, and we're proud of our Oregon Forest Practices Act and its commitment not only to the economy but to the ecology and to the environment, with protections for water, for streams, and for regeneration of our forests for future generations.

Unfortunately, yesterday, we got word that the White House has issued a veto threat on this urgently needed and balanced bill. The President and his team clearly have no idea—none—on what's happening in our rural communities with Federal forest lands surrounding them in the West. Counties are literally going broke. Folks are facing double-digit unemployment and double-digit poverty. Citizens call 911 for emergency help and are told literally, "Sorry, we can't help you. There's no one to send."

Fires are raging throughout our forests. Enough is enough. The system is broken. This law will change that and fix that, and the White House needs to understand that and be a partner for progress, not an enemy of it.

Today, the House will act to provide relief for citizens in these rural communities, and I urge my colleagues to choose jobs, safety, the health of our rural communities and health of our forests for future generations, to reject poverty and unhealthy forests, because that's what we face today.

So I urge a "yes" vote on the rule, a "yes" vote on the underlying bill because our rural communities have waited too long for this relief.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 seconds.

I just wanted to say to the gentleman from Oregon that there are one in five Oregonians who are on food stamps as we gather here today. In his district, there are nearly 60,000. You talked about trees, but there are a lot of people that will be adversely affected.

Mr. WALDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I have no remaining time to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule and the harmful underlying bill.

Fifteen thousand families in my district on the central coast of California rely every day on the SNAP program to help make ends meet. These are our veterans, our seniors, people with disabilities, hardworking parents, and kids going to school. They don't care if SNAP cuts come from the farm bill or as a stand-alone bill. They do care that the cuts create a gaping hole in our country's most basic safety net.

We should all care because cuts to SNAP have a ripple effect in our local communities and throughout our economy. Every SNAP dollar is nearly doubled in economic impact. It helps pay the local grocery store worker. It helps support truckers who haul the food. It goes to the food producers and farmers who grow the crops.

I urge my colleagues to stop playing politics with our Nation's hungry and those who provide the food we all rely on. Vote "no" on this rule, "no" on the bill, and let's get back to passing a comprehensive, inclusive farm bill.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

(Mr. PRICE of North Carolina asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule and the underlying bill.

You may have noticed Fox News is trying to help the Republicans push this mean-spirited legislation by focusing on a California surfer who abuses the SNAP system. Well, it's time for a reality check. This isn't about surfer dudes.

I'll tell you one group it is about: our Nation's veterans, 50,000 of them to be exact. Let me clarify. These veterans, with an average income of \$2,500, would lose benefits immediately. As the bill's other provisions kick in, as many as 170,000 veterans could lose their SNAP assistance.

In Cumberland County, North Carolina, home of Fort Bragg and of thousands of veterans, our unemployment rate is nearly 11 percent. This bill requires States to terminate the already minimal food aid available to able-bodied but unemployed individuals living in such high-unemployment areas. By the way, Republicans would also subject these veterans to the added indignity of a drug test.

I urge a "no" vote on this rule and the underlying bill. It dishonors our poorest veterans, and it disparages those the Gospel of Matthew calls "the least of these."

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentleman for yielding and rise in opposition to the rule, and say I will be so proud to vote today not to take food away from children and veterans and the disabled and the unemployed. Over half of these who receive these benefits are young children and senior citizens. So this is one of those legislative moments of true clarity between the leadership of both parties.

The Republican leadership's proposal will increase hunger across our country by taking away SNAP benefits from millions of Americans. They claim that restricting SNAP eligibility will encourage those who are receiving benefits to take work. What this fails to recognize is that there are about three unemployed workers for every job that is out there in our country right now. In some places, it's even worse than that. Even if an unemployed person filled every available job, roughly two of every three unemployed individuals would still not have a job because there aren't enough yet to go around in our country. People are struggling.

I just want to say that this is one of those moments when I am so proud to be a Democrat and stand with my colleagues today against these cuts to the most fundamental requirements of a decent life—access to sufficient, nutritious food.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I think we should have a standard of at least being honest about what's in the bill. We are not throwing people off who are disabled. It is an able-bodied standard, and the gentlewoman knows that.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Hood River, Oregon (Mr. WALDEN).

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Texas because I wanted to respond to my friend from Massachusetts, who didn't have any more time to yield or talk about it after he talked about people in my district on food stamps. Indeed they are, and they don't want to be. If you'd support our legislation that's bipartisan on healthy forests, they'd have dignity and a job, and they'd be able to take care of their families, and they would have schools.

I know they have dignity when they're on food stamps. I understand that. I also know they'd feel much better about their role in life if they could go and be productive again as they were. We've seen 300 mills closed, 30,000 people lose their jobs, and there's a solution here that doesn't raid the Federal Treasury and borrow money to pay for it. It's called a job. And we wouldn't spend over half the Forest Service budget fighting fire. Instead, we would replenish our forests, we'd get them healthy again, we wouldn't choke our valleys with smoke in the summer, which is occurring all over the country, because we'd be managing these great Federal forest reserves.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me just suggest to my Republican colleagues that maybe they ought to deal with sequester, maybe they ought to stop threatening to shut the government down, and maybe they ought to bring the President's jobs bill to the floor to put people back to work, and,

in the meantime, they ought not to throw poor people off food assistance.

I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. MCGOVERN, I thank you so much for yielding, and let me say I rise in strong opposition to this rule and the underlying bill.

The \$40 billion cuts to the anti-poverty SNAP program are immoral, they're heartless, and they really are un-American. These cuts do not reflect the compassion of the American people. The so-called "reforms" in this bill will only dramatically reduce access to vital nutrition assistance all across America in rural and urban communities and every single one of our congressional districts. In my own district, over 22,000 households will be impacted and more than 1.6 million homes throughout California. Not only does SNAP help put food on the table for struggling families, it also helps stimulate economic growth.

Mr. Speaker, 76 percent of SNAP recipients are children, seniors, and persons with disabilities. This is a cold-blooded cut. The majority of people on food stamps want to work. I haven't seen the majority bring any bill to the floor that really creates jobs for people, and I just have to say, yes, I was on food stamps during a very difficult period in my life, and I thank the American people for that lifeline as a bridge over troubled waters.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentlewoman from California an additional 15 seconds.

Ms. LEE of California. Let me just conclude by saying that while we're recovering from this devastating recession, we cannot and should not cast the most vulnerable aside.

There are many in the majority who are people of faith. I want to remind you of the Scriptures which require us to feed the hungry. There's something fundamentally wrong when we pray on Sunday and vote to take away food from hungry people on Thursday.

□ 1345

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I have a disabled child at home, a Down Syndrome young man. I understand very well about the need for our country to help and provide assistance to disabled people. It is not true, and it's unfair for someone to characterize this bill as taking someone who is disabled off the SNAP rolls.

And I'm sorry that we have Members who evidently have not read the bill and do not understand what we're doing. But that's a fact; and we should not pass along information that, in fact, is not true. I hope that this body would stay away from that very emotional issue because not only is it not fair, but it's not true.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me just say to my friend from Texas, we

know exactly what you are all doing here. What you are doing is throwing 3.8 million people off of this program who, quite frankly, rely on it to put food on the table.

And I just want to point out for the record, the average length of someone on SNAP is about 9 months. There are people who work, who work full time who are on SNAP because they don't earn enough. People do want to work. People don't want to be on public assistance. But the bottom line is that we have had a Congress here that has blocked every major piece of legislation that might produce jobs. So let's get our facts straight here.

At this point, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this rule and the underlying bill.

My friends on the other side of the aisle like to act like 11 million unemployed Americans are out of work because they want to be out of work. This is a debate between two things, common sense versus no sense. You even offer a jewel to the States. And you say to the States, if you cut more people off your roles, we'll let you keep half the money. And then you can do with it whatever you want. That is immoral. That is totally nonsensical. It doesn't make any sense whatsoever.

We're talking about kids, we are talking about veterans, and we are talking about the disabled. That's what we're talking about. And if you don't think this bill cuts many of those people off the roles, then you, obviously—to use your term—you didn't read the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PASCRELL. Nearly 30,000 households in my current district benefit from this program. I would ask you to examine the bill and examine your conscience before you—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

The Chair would remind Members to avoid references to other Members in the second person.

Mr. SESSIONS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and to this unconscionable legislation. Make no mistake, if you support this bill, you are voting to take food from the mouths of almost 4 million of our fellow citizens next year. Who are these Americans? Nearly half of them are children. They are seniors. They are our veterans. One in every five veterans receives SNAP benefits. Is this the way we thank them for their service?

Mr. Speaker, Congress does not agree on much these days; but I have always assumed that we could at least support

the idea that in this country no child should go hungry. Have we gone so far that we cannot even find bipartisan support for that? If so, then we have truly lost our way.

Is this what my Republican friends call "compassionate conservatism"? I say to my colleagues, the whole Nation is watching. You will be held accountable. Vote "no" on this rule and this shameful underlying bill.

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield myself 30 seconds.

I would like to explain, if I can, "compassionate conservatism." It's called 60 straight months of economic growth, 60 straight months of this country growing stronger because people had jobs under a Republican House, under a Republican President, under a Republican Senate. Sixty straight months of economic growth that made our country stronger and better. And that is compassionate conservatism. That's the Republican Party. We're trying to get back to job growth, job creation, and help the middle class of this country.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I will just remind the gentleman that compassionate conservatism also gave us the Great Recession.

At this point, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. HIMES).

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge the defeat of this rule and of the underlying bill which will throw millions of Americans off of food stamps at a time when they need it. And I urge that on behalf of my constituent Jenenne Smalls, a 37-year-old formerly homeless veteran with three children who my office helped get on food stamps.

I urge it on behalf of a semi-deity to the Republicans, Ronald Reagan, who said, As long as there is one person in the country who is hungry, that is one person too many. And I urge it on behalf of a real deity, Mr. Speaker. Above my head are the words, "In God we trust." In my Christian faith, the notion that we feed the hungry is unimpeachable and nonconditional.

Matthew does not say, Feed the hungry, so long as you can do it with 100 percent efficiency. Mark does not say, Feed the hungry, so long as you pass the XL pipeline. Luke does not say, Feed the hungry, so long as you loosen environmental regulations.

Mr. Speaker, this rule and this bill, which is deeply, deeply flawed, must not pass.

Mr. SESSIONS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this point, it's my privilege to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding the time, and I

want to thank him for devoting his entire political career to the idea of eradicating hunger in American society and around the world, an outstanding record of achievement, an outstanding record of compassion. And then today, it runs into the Republican reality.

I know how you must feel, Mr. MCGOVERN, after all these years of work, to see them cavalierly suggest that they can cut \$40 billion in nutrition benefits to families, to children, to working people, to people searching for work, and that somehow nobody will lose their benefits, that somehow they're not throwing anybody off of the program. It's not that we said, you are throwing people off the program. It's that the Congressional Budget Office said that with the \$40 billion cut, some 3.8 million people would lose their benefits and an average of nearly 3 million people each year over the coming decade. Over the coming decade, those people will lose their benefits.

What does that mean? I specialize in education. I visit schools almost every week. I talk to teachers every day that tell me about the fact that when children come there that they are nutritionally deprived, that they may not have had dinner, that they may not have had breakfast, that they are not attentive in class, that they fall asleep in class, that they're irritable. And we're going to cut the benefits to these children. And yet we want these children to perform at a high level. And they should be able to perform at a high level. We expect them to achieve in school.

But that's not what this program is about. This program is about cutting those benefits to those children in need. It's about cutting those benefits to those families in need. It's just unconscionable that they would think that somehow this is the road to prosperity, that you get to the road to prosperity by attacking the most vulnerable in our society who are in desperate need of these nutritional benefits for their families. Do they not know that one in five children lives in a home that experiences hunger on a regular basis?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Do they not know this? Are they not aware of it? Or do they not care? Somebody has to answer that question. Because when this Nation was shocked that they were going to cut \$20 billion out of these nutritional benefits for these struggling families and individuals, they came back and said, No, we're going to cut \$40 billion out of these benefits. What, because they're angry that the last measure didn't succeed? They're angry about what happened to the Agriculture bill? Is it because of anger that they're striking out at these families?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. It shouldn't be that way in this country, and it shouldn't be that way in this Congress. These families are entitled to better. They are entitled to jobs. They are entitled to provide for their families, but some can't.

Those wonderful 60 months stripped trillions of dollars away from these families and middle class families in this country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are advised to heed the gavel.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Once again, the gentleman comes down and evidently is either unwilling or has not read the bill to an understanding where the statement was made about preventing 280,000 children from receiving a free school lunch. Nothing in this bill makes changes to the school lunch program.

The National School Lunch and the School Breakfast Programs automatically qualify students who are enrolled in SNAP for free school meals. The school meals programs are not authorized under this bill nor are eligible for requirements under this committee's jurisdiction.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I need to qualify something here. I want to respond to what the gentleman just said.

The fact of the matter is, when children's parents get cut from SNAP, then children are no longer eligible for free breakfast and lunch in school. That's where we get the number of 270,000 kids who will lose their free breakfast and lunch programs. That's the connection. So it is connected. So I would point that out because it is important. I don't want anyone to be fooled by the fact that somehow this doesn't affect school meals. It does, very directly.

At this point, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule and the draconian cuts to SNAP, a lifeline that millions of Americans rely on. Republicans want to slash nearly \$40 billion from SNAP and take food out of the mouths of nearly 4 million Americans, including 68,000 of my constituents. These drastic cuts will harm children, seniors, veterans, and Americans living in cities like Memphis with chronically high unemployment, all in the name of rooting out fraud.

It's interesting that Republicans see fraud and abuse in the SNAP program sometimes, but they seem to ignore the billions of dollars of fraud and abuse at the Pentagon. According to one estimate, hundreds of defense contractors that defrauded the U.S. military and taxpayers received more than \$1.1 trillion in Pentagon contracts during the past decade. Where is the outrage across the aisle and the demands for better oversight for defense contracting? Instead of fixing problems for

the contractors who might be fraudulently taking billions of taxpayer dollars, they're focusing on making it harder for the families who are struggling to receive a little extra help. We need to be finding ways to reduce poverty in our communities, not cutting programs that work, like SNAP.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the rule and oppose the bill.

Mr. SESSIONS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, this Republican "let them starve" bill would undermine what Professors Miguel Ferguson, Stacey Borasky, and Scott Harding recently described in an article as a "modern antipoverty marvel." SNAP, they report, "improves access to healthy meals for nearly one in three children. It also reduces chronic illness and hospitalizations and significantly reduces poverty and the severity of poverty." It "keeps kids healthier, happier, and better prepared to do their best in school." And SNAP "is one of the most efficient government programs, with a rigorous application process, high rates of payment accuracy, and low rates of misuse (about a 1 cent on the dollar)." The main limitation is not that it helps feed too many people or costs too much but that almost 30 percent of those eligible get nothing.

We cannot snap our fingers and snap away poverty, but this bill will snap a vital lifeline. It must be rejected.

Mr. SESSIONS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I oppose this legislation.

Much has been said this morning about how 4 million people will lose the safety net of food stamps. This is going to derail the effort to pass a farm bill, and America needs a farm bill. But, you know, the bottom line is this is a cynical piece of legislation. It is not about work. Sixty-eight percent of the folks on food stamps are women with kids. It's children. It's elderly. It's disabled. That's number one.

Number two, how is a person going to get into a nonexistent work program? And work is great. It's not as though either side has a monopoly on the desirability of advocating for work. But when there's no work program that a person who is required to get food stamps can enter into, it means they are without food stamps and are denied the opportunity to work, both.

So this is a political statement, not a practical policy that is going to get us to where we need to be. It's going to throw people off food stamps who need it. It creates a cynical, nonexistent work program; and it creates an incentive for States who are going to reap the benefits of lower food stamp rolls, to throw people off even further.

□ 1400

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, it's my privilege to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank my colleague.

Mr. Speaker, here we go again. Social Darwinism, survival of the fittest at its worst. And what's ironic is it's a program that works. Cutting \$40 billion, 3.8 million Americans thrown off supplemental nutritional assistance that works, that gives them a ladder to success, children, the disabled, adults that find themselves in a difficult period for a period of time. The distinguished ranking member of the Rules Committee points out, 9 months is the average.

Don't do this.

In a different Congress at a different time on a different issue, there was a famous lawyer who turned to Joe McCarthy and said, "At long last, sir, have you no decency?"

I ask that of this Congress, on this very important issue, have we no decency?

Mr. Speaker, it was bad enough when the House majority tried to ram through a Farm bill that cut SNAP by \$20 billion and would have kicked 2 million people off nutrition assistance, including more than 200,000 children. Thankfully, a bipartisan group rejected that bill.

Rather than learn from that defeat, House Republicans have decided to double down on this darwinian philosophy. The impact will be devastating. In my district more than 13,000 families are at risk of losing assistance.

Beyond the face of hunger, lost in this debate is a tragic irony. As the majority moves to gut SNAP, Congress once again refuses to end taxpayer handouts to big agribusiness, including some Members of this Chamber.

The American public should be forgiven for smelling the stench of hypocrisy. The very people who repeatedly call on this body to reign in government and cut spending, seem to have no problem collecting tens of thousands of dollars in farm subsidies.

To allay this conflict of ideology I have twice offered an amendment to ensure Members of Congress do not receive farm subsidies. How can elected officials ask taxpayers to cover their risk, and then tell those at risk of hunger they are on their own? Yet the majority refuses a floor vote. The silence is damning.

So I ask you Mr. Speaker, who are the real takers?

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, my colleague just asked the question about have we no decency. Have you no decency?

And these are good friends here. We're colleagues. We come to work for America.

But all who can read, and all who can feel the pain of hunger should ask the question and should beg and plead: don't cut SNAP; \$40 billion, 3.4 billion in meals, and 24 meals a month for a family.

Unless you have the cure for poverty, 46 million Americans, then how dare you come to the floor and eliminate a lifeline. Yes, school breakfasts, but what about the children who are from zero to 3 to 4 who are at home with parents, who are at home with the families, the spouses of Active Duty soldiers who use food stamps?

And then the absolute insult: a State like Texas that is prosperous, you give them the instruction to cut people off of food stamps, and then give them a bonus—a bonus—for hurting people and taking their life away.

This is a shameful act. Vote down this rule and this bill.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The gentleman from Massachusetts has 2½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Could I ask the gentleman how many more speakers he has?

Mr. SESSIONS. I appreciate the gentleman asking. I am down just to the close, and I thank the gentleman for seeking that information.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, before I close, I'd like to insert into the RECORD letters from the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, the United States Conference of Mayors, AARP, and a list of a number of other groups that are opposed to the bill.

And I'd also like to insert into the RECORD a September 4 New York Times story, entitled, "On the Edge of Poverty, at the Center of a Debate on Food Stamps."

COMMITTEE ON DOMESTIC JUSTICE
AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT,
September 11, 2013.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: As the House considers a proposal to address nutrition programs apart from the Farm Bill, I write to urge you to oppose harmful cuts and changes to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP). The House proposal would cut SNAP by \$40 billion and harm hungry children, poor families, vulnerable seniors and workers who are underemployed or unable to find employment.

Adequate and nutritious food is a fundamental human right and a basic need that is integral to protecting the life and dignity of the human person. SNAP is one of the most effective and important federal programs to combat hunger in the nation by helping to feed millions of persons in need every year.

SNAP helps relieve pressure on overwhelmed parishes, charities, food banks, pantries and other emergency food providers across the country that could not begin to meet the need for food assistance if SNAP eligibility or benefits were reduced. The faith community and the private sector are vital in the fight to combat hunger. But government has an indispensable role in safeguarding and promoting the common good of

all. This includes ensuring poor and hungry people have access to adequate and nutritious food.

Struggling people are not seeking a life of government dependency but rightfully deserve decent paying jobs to provide for them and their families. Even with evidence of a modest economic recovery, the economy still has not improved the standard of living for many people, especially for the poor and the working poor. More than four million people have been jobless for over six months, and that does not include the millions more who have simply lost hope. For every available job, there are often five unemployed and underemployed people actively vying for it. SNAP remains an essential tool to help struggling individuals and families avoid hunger and stay out of poverty.

Proposals to eliminate access to SNAP for people who have at some point in their lifetime committed certain crimes are counterproductive and an affront to human dignity. Persons who have paid their debt to society and their families should not be penalized for the sins of the past. A one-size-fits-all approach to state waivers on SNAP work requirements is unreasonable. States should continue to be afforded the flexibility to assess and respond to local needs and economic conditions. Ending state waivers will only harm vulnerable people.

How the House chooses to address our nation's hunger and nutrition programs will have profound human and moral consequences. This is a crucial time for our nation to place a circle of protection around programs that build a more just framework and put poor and hungry people first. I respectfully urge you to reject efforts to reduce or restructure SNAP, and to pursue instead the common good in agriculture and food policy that works from a genuine preferential option for the poor.

Sincerely,

Most Reverend STEPHEN E. BLAIRE,
*Bishop of Stockton,
Chairman, Com-
mittee on Domestic
Justice and Human
Development.*

THE UNITED STATES
CONFERENCE OF MAYORS,
Washington, DC.

To: The Mayor.

From: Tom Cochran, CEO & Executive Director.

The House of Representatives is set to debate its farm bill this week. The bill, "The Nutrition Reform and Work Opportunity Act," contains \$40 billion over ten years in cuts to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), food stamp program, and other nutrition programs. The cuts would eliminate SNAP benefits for millions of needy people, slash food benefits for additional participants, and undercut states' ability to keep SNAP supports for certain jobless people in cities with high unemployment.

In 2010, SNAP lifted nearly 3.9 million people out of poverty, 1.7 of them were children. Over 47 million people received benefits in 2012; the House bill would cut benefits for 2 to 4 million poor and unemployed adults. Nearly half of SNAP enrollees are children, and the program helps feed roughly one in three children in America. Additionally, almost 75 percent of SNAP participants are in households with children, seniors, or a disabled individual.

For more information please contact Assistant Executive Director Crystal Swann.

AARP,

September 17, 2013.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: AARP opposes HR 3102, "The Nutrition Reform and Work Opportunity Act of 2013," especially the cuts to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), and we urge you to vote against it. The new House nutrition bill retains the provisions opposed by AARP and other anti-hunger advocates in earlier House Farm Bill efforts while adding more stringent conditions to discourage participation in SNAP and generate cost savings that will harm millions of documented hungry and food insecure Americans.

Removal of the nutrition title of the Farm Bill represents an abandonment of the nation's commitment to ensuring essential nutrition access for many U.S. households that face a constant struggle against hunger and food insecurity daily, as well as emergency food assistance in times of economic and natural crises or disasters. SNAP helps states and communities struck by disasters like hurricanes, tornadoes, floods and earthquakes gain access to critical food assistance where local supplies have been destroyed or rendered inaccessible. Along with helping low-income persons eat healthier, more nutritious food, the nutrition programs also benefit the economy. For example, every \$5 in new SNAP benefits generates \$9—nearly twice as much—in total community spending.

The recent economic recession is testimony to the importance of the Farm Bill nutrition programs in providing food to assistance for families that would have otherwise gone without food. Indeed, the major criticism of SNAP is that the program is too successful in responding to the increased need for assistance in difficult economic times. Despite SNAP having reduced error rates and fraud to levels that are the envy of every other major federal program, the House of Representatives is now proposing to significantly reduce its commitment to ensuring that food insecure households will have adequate access to food based on objective need. AARP believes any outdated rules that encourage waste or fraud should be addressed, but not at the expense of legitimately hungry families—which disproportionately include children, seniors and persons with disabilities.

Hungry children, seniors and families cannot and should not have to wait on the economic and political sidelines for access to an effective nutrition safety net. The slow economy, higher prices for food and energy, and the impending November 1, 2013 elimination of the SNAP benefit boost from the 2009 American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) have made the situation acute for all concerned. Indeed, the amount provided to feed the typical family is projected to drop from about \$4.50 to less than \$4.00 per meal—a scheduled reduction regardless of the outcome of this legislation. We urge you not to punish food insecure Americans, and to vote against HR 3102.

If you have any further questions, please feel free to call me, or have your staff contact Ariel Gonzalez or Larry White on our Government Affairs staff at 202-434-3770.

Sincerely,

A. BARRY RAND,
Chief Executive Officer.

GROUPS WITH LETTERS IN OPPOSITION TO HR 3102

AGRICULTURE GROUPS

National Farmers Union, Rural Coalition.

NUTRITION GROUPS

Feeding America, Feed the Children, (Center on Budget Pores and Priorities, Share Our Strength.

EXECUTIVES

U.S. Conference of Mayors.

RELIGIOUS GROUPS

Mazon, Sojourners, National Association of Evangelicals, Presbyterian Church (USA), US Conference of Catholic Bishops, Leadership Conference of Women Religious, Christian Reformed Church, Society of St. Vincent de Paul, American Baptist Churches USA, Bread for the World, United Methodist Church General Board of Church and Society, The Jewish Federations of North America.

HOMELESS ORGANIZATIONS

California Association of Food Banks, Center for Community Change, CSH, Feed The Children, Horizons for Homeless Children, National Alliance to End Homelessness, National Association for the Education of Homeless Children and Youth, National Center for Housing and Child Welfare, National Coalition for the Homeless, National Health Care for the Homeless Council, National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty, National Low Income Housing Coalition, National Network for Youth, National Network to End Domestic Violence, Western Center on Law and Poverty, Western Regional Advocacy Project, Goodwill Industries.

JUSTICE ADVOCATES

American Civil Liberties Union, The Bronx Defenders, Charles Hamilton Houston Institute for Race and Justice at Harvard Law School, Council on American Islamic Relations, Face and Voices of Recovery, FedCURE, Grassroots Leadership, Human Rights Defense Center, Human Rights Watch, International Community Corrections Association, Justice Policy Institute, The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, Legal Action Center, NAACP.

National African American Drug Policy Coalition, National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers, National Association of Social Workers, National Coalition for the Homeless, National Council of La Raza, National Employment Law Project, National HIRE Network, National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty, National Workrights Institute, One Million Americans, Ltd., Oriana House, Inc, Reentry Central, Robert F. Kennedy Children's Action Corps, Juvenile Justice Collaborative, Safer Foundation, The Sentencing Project, StoptheDrugWar.org, Treatment Communities of America, WestCare Foundation, Inc.

SENIORS GROUPS

National Council on Aging, AARP.

HEALTHCARE GROUPS

American Public Health Association, Trust for America's Health.

EDUCATION GROUPS

American Federation of Teachers, National Skills Coalition, National Education Association.

LABOR UNIONS

AFSCME.

TRIBAL GROUPS

Combined letter from National Indian Education Association and National Congress of American Indians, National Indian Child Welfare Association, National Indian Health Board, Affiliated Tribes of Northwest Indians, United South and Eastern Tribes, Inc., Affiliated Tribes of Northwest Indians, Alaska Federation of Natives, the Alaska Inter Tribal Council, the American Indian Higher Education Consortium, Self Governance Communications and Education Tribal Consortium.

[From The New York Times, Sept. 4, 2013]
ON THE EDGE OF POVERTY, AT THE CENTER OF
A DEBATE ON FOOD STAMPS
(By Sheryl Gay Stolberg)

DYERSBURG, TN.—As a self-described “true Southern man”—and reluctant recipient of food stamps—Dustin Rigsby, a struggling mechanic, hunts deer, doves and squirrels to help feed his family. He shops for grocery bargains, cooks budget-stretching stews and limits himself to one meal a day.

Tarnisha Adams, who left her job skinning hogs at a slaughterhouse when she became ill with cancer, gets \$352 a month in food stamps for herself and three college-age sons. She buys discount meat and canned vegetables, cheaper than fresh. Like Mr. Rigsby, she eats once a day—“if I eat,” she said.

When Congress officially returns to Washington next week, the diets of families like the Rigsbys and the Adamses will be caught up in a debate over deficit reduction. Republicans, alarmed by a rise in food stamp enrollment, are pushing to revamp and scale down the program. Democrats are resisting the cuts.

No matter what Congress decides, benefits will be reduced in November, when a provision in the 2009 stimulus bill expires.

Yet as lawmakers cast the fight in terms of spending, nonpartisan budget analysts and hunger relief advocates warn of a spike in “food insecurity” among Americans who, as Mr. Rigsby said recently, “look like we are fine,” but live on the edge of poverty, skipping meals and rationing food.

Surrounded by corn and soybean farms—including one owned by the local Republican congressman, Representative Stephen Fincher—Dyersburg, about 75 miles north of Memphis, provides an eye-opening view into Washington’s food stamp debate. Mr. Fincher, who was elected in 2010 on a Tea Party wave and collected nearly \$3.5 million in farm subsidies from the government from 1999 to 2012, recently voted for a farm bill that omitted food stamps.

“The role of citizens, of Christianity, of humanity, is to take care of each other, not for Washington to steal from those in the country and give to others in the country,” Mr. Fincher, whose office did not respond to interview requests, said after his vote in May. In response to a Democrat who invoked the Bible during the food stamp debate in Congress, Mr. Fincher cited his own biblical phrase. “The one who is unwilling to work shall not eat,” he said.

On Wednesday, the Department of Agriculture released a 2012 survey showing that nearly 49 million Americans were living in “food insecure” households meaning, in the bureaucratic language of the agency, that some family members lacked “consistent access throughout the year to adequate food.” In short, many Americans went hungry. The agency found the figures essentially unchanged since the economic downturn began in 2008, but substantially higher than during the previous decade.

Experts say the problem is particularly acute in rural regions like Dyersburg, a city of 17,000 on the banks of the Forked Deer River in West Tennessee. More than half the counties with the highest concentration of food insecurity are rural, according to an analysis by Feeding America, the nation’s largest network of food banks. In Dyer County, it found, 19.4 percent of residents were “food insecure” in 2011, compared with 16.4 percent nationwide.

Over all, nearly 48 million Americans now receive food stamps, an \$80 billion-a-year program that is increasingly the target of conservatives. Robert Rector, a scholar at the conservative Heritage Foundation, argues that the food stamp program should be

overhauled so that benefits are tied to work, much as welfare was revamped under President Bill Clinton. He advocates mandatory drug testing for food stamp recipients—a position that draws support from Mr. Rigsby, who dreams of becoming a game warden and said it irritated him to see people “mooch off the system.”

But when benefits drop in November, the Rigsbys, who say they receive about \$350 a month, can expect \$29 less.

“People have a lot of misimpressions about hunger in America,” said Maura Daly, a Feeding America spokeswoman. “People think it’s associated with homelessness when, in fact, it is working poor families, it’s kids, it’s the disabled.” Hunger is often invisible, she said, and in rural areas it is even more so.

Hunger was easy to see on a recent morning in Dyersburg. Hundreds of people, many of them food stamp recipients, lined up at the county fairgrounds for boxes of free food—21,000 pounds of meat, potatoes, grains and produce—that had been trucked in from a food bank in Memphis. About 80 volunteers set up an assembly line in a warehouse to distribute the food.

More than 700 families get help each month from the charitable program, *Feed the Need*, which was founded in 2009 by Mark Oakes, the chairman of the local Salvation Army, after a string of nearby factories closed.

“We couldn’t absorb the work force back into our community,” Mr. Oakes said, “and people were hungry.”

Among the first in line at the fairgrounds was Kathy Baucom, 61, a former welder disabled by lupus. She lives alone in a trailer, hunts deer—“last year I bagged seven,” she said—and makes burgers, roasts and jerky out of venison. Her food stamp benefits for \$125 a month were recently reduced to \$117.

“I don’t buy milk because it’s so expensive,” she said. “I don’t buy cheese.”

Officially called the *Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program*, or SNAP, food stamps have long been a cornerstone of the federal safety net. Benefits, adjusted for income, are loaded monthly onto a government-issued debit card. Recipients say the money typically lasts a little more than two weeks.

“We don’t splurge,” Ms. Adams said, “and it doesn’t last.”

She shops at Save-A-Lot and cooks frequently with pasta, because it is filling. One recent evening, she baked a tray of mostaccioli, an Italian pasta, with meat and cheese. Hoping it would last for two meals, she had none herself.

“You hate to tell your child, ‘You can’t eat this, you have to save it for another day,’” she said.

For the Rigsbys, both 20, the priority is three meals a day for their son, Drake, who is 1. Some months they run out of milk. Mr. Rigsby, who is out of work with a knee injury, recently sold his truck for cash; his wife, Christina, works part time as a clerk at J. C. Penney. On the refrigerator in their sparsely furnished apartment is a calendar marked with the date—the 6th—that their card is refreshed. “FOOD!” it declares.

“When we got married, we told each other that we want to be able to sit down at the table and eat as a family,” Mrs. Rigsby said. “But we don’t really get to do that.”

In Washington, House Republicans propose cutting \$40 billion more in food stamps over the next 10 years by imposing work requirements and eliminating waivers for some able-bodied adults. The cuts would push four million to six million low-income people, including millions of “very low-income unemployed parents” who want to work but cannot find jobs, off the rolls, according to the *Center on Budget and Policy Priorities*, a left-leaning research organization.

Even if approved in the House, the cuts would face strong opposition from Democrats in the Senate. But the arguments of Mr. Rector, the Heritage Foundation scholar, are gaining traction with conservatives on Capitol Hill. “I think food stamps have in the Republican mind become the symbol of an out-of-control, means-tested welfare state,” Mr. Rector said.

Here in Tennessee, Mr. Fincher embraces that view. “We have to remember there is not a big printing press in Washington that continually prints money over and over,” he said in May.

Mr. Rigsby said his family would find a way to make do. “The way I was raised,” he said, “it’s, ‘Be thankful for what you’ve got.’ We’re not the worst case out there. But somebody else? How is this going to affect them?”

This article has been revised to reflect the following correction: in earlier version of this article misstated the given name of the 1-year-old son of Dustin and Christina Rigsby. It is Drake, not Blake.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remaining time.

Mr. Speaker, in an era of billion-dollar defense overruns and bank bailouts, the Republican leadership wants to nickel-and-dime poor people. This is a rotten thing to try to do.

But it’s not too late, Mr. Speaker. We can defeat this bill and still go to conference on the farm bill.

We can defeat this bill and make it clear that the United States Congress still has a conscience.

We can defeat this bill and reestablish the long and proud tradition of bipartisanship on this issue. Remember Bob Dole working with George McGovern and Bill Emerson working with Tony Hall.

We can defeat this bill and get back to the work of actually ending hunger in America, rather than making hunger worse by passing a bill that cuts \$40 billion out of this program and throws 3.8 million people off the program.

And to suggest that this bill won’t hurt people, that it will not cut people from SNAP is just plain wrong. Read the bill. Read the bill, the 109-page bill that didn’t go through committee that’s before us under a closed rule. Read the bill.

This will impact not just people who are trying to look for work and can’t find it; it will impact senior citizens; it will impact children; and it will impact veterans. 170,000 veterans will be cut from this program. Shame on us if we do this.

I would say to my colleagues on the Republican side, I know, I know a lot of you believe as I do that it’s important that we maintain a safety net for the most vulnerable. I know you believe that it’s important that we should end hunger in America. I know you believe that it’s wrong to cut \$40 billion from this program. And I urge you—and I would plead with you—stand with us on this. Stand with us and reject this move, this harsh move, this rotten thing to do to poor people. I think you will be proud of standing up against this bill. This is the wrong thing to do.

So I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this bill. Do the right thing. Let’s

do something in a bipartisan fashion that we can be proud of. And defeating a \$40 billion cut to the food stamp program is the right thing to do.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, today we follow the pattern that we did yesterday in talking about the needs of this great Nation, not only men and women who are unemployed, but who also need the benefits of the food stamp program.

And today, the Republican Party, as a result of the work we did in the Rules Committee, is bringing several bills in this rule, two of them talking directly about jobs and job creation.

One, Hood River, Oregon; the gentleman, GREG WALDEN coming to talk about, please, give us a chance to have jobs. Our people want jobs. They don't want to be on food stamps. They want jobs. A narrow, political, shrill agenda, environmentalist agenda, is the reason why we don't have that—the Democrats and Barack Obama.

Secondly, Arizona. Arizona is asking for 3,700 jobs, \$60 billion worth of economic activity right in this bill. They are jobs bills.

We are trying to do the things that the Republican Party talks about; that's the middle class of this country, jobs, and job creation.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule, "yes" for jobs, "yes" for the underlying legislation, "yes" so that we can employ people back at home, rural areas, people who don't have jobs, "yes" for the opportunity for the Republican Party to, once again, stand on this floor and say, we believe the legislation that is here is better for America than the policies that we have today, the policies of unemployment, the policies of less than a 40-hour workweek, now to a 30-hour workweek, the policies of taxes and spending.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in opposition to the rule for H.R. 3102, the Nutrition Reform and Work Opportunity Act.

I am in opposition to this bill for four reasons: hunger is a real problem in the United States; the solution for reducing dependence on government subsidized food programs is full employment, this bill will hurt the poor and most vulnerable in our country and finally the bill is too draconian and pointedly anti Urban.

September has been declared hunger action month—1 in 6 Americans are going without enough food to sustain a healthy life.

The United States is considered to be the world's wealthiest nation but 14.5 percent or almost 49 million Americans do not get enough to eat.

17 million children live in food insecure households. Children with inadequate nutrition are affected by cognitive and behavior development problems.

The majority of SNAP recipients, about 68 percent, do not work; they are children, elderly, disabled or those caring for a disabled fam-

ily member in their home or for a child less than 6 years of age.

To qualify for SNAP benefits in Texas, a person cannot have more than \$2,000 in a bank account and they can make more than \$14,079 annually.

The annual income limitations increase by nearly \$5,000 for each additional person living in the household.

To qualify for SNAP benefits, the combined income for a family of four cannot exceed \$28,665.

According to a report released Wednesday by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Texas has the third-highest rate of food insecurity in the nation—18.5 percent of households struggled to acquire enough healthy food in 2011. 14.7 percent of U.S. households had difficulty affording healthy food at some point in 2011.

More than 3 million Americans, including 302,800 Texans, will lose food stamp benefits in 2013 if the U.S. Congress approves proposed federal cuts to the SNAP, according to the federal Office of Management and Budget. About 8.5 percent of Texans were enrolled in the program as of June 2012.

Based on the estimates from the OMB, the Texas Food Bank Network calculated the number of Texans that would lose food stamp benefits in 2013 by county.

2 million rural households experience food insecurity. The counties in the United States with the highest disproportionately high rates of food insecurity are rural not urban or suburban.

WE SHOULD PASS THE AMERICAN JOBS ACT

Prior to the financial crisis, 26.3 million individuals a month on average received SNAP benefits, getting an average of \$96 per month in benefits. Over the course of the "Great Recession" SNAP spending has increased from \$33.2 billion for fiscal year 2007 to \$78.4 billion for fiscal year 2012. The Congressional Budget Office says the economy is the cause of the nearly 65 percent increase in SNAP spending between 2007 and 2011.

The Congressional Budget Office said in its May 2013 baseline update estimate that SNAP participation would begin to decline as the economy continued to recover, falling to an average of \$34.4 million per month.

SNAP benefits also help those who earn 130 percent of the federal poverty guideline. 83 percent of SNAP households have gross income at or below 100 percent of the poverty guideline. This translates into incomes of \$19,530 for a family of 3 in 2013. These households receive about 91 percent of all benefits.

Unemployment remains at 7.3 percent with about 11.3 million people unemployed. There are 6 million long term unemployed people who have been searching for work 27 weeks or longer.

In July, unemployment percentages by state: Texas 6.5 percent, California 8.7 percent, Nevada 9.5 percent, North Carolina 8.9 percent, South Carolina 8.1 percent, Rhode Island 8.9 percent, Tennessee 8.5 percent, Michigan 8.8 percent, Arizona 8.0 percent, and Arkansas 7.4 percent.

In August 2013, there were still 2 million fewer jobs than when the "Great Recession" began in 2007. There are still 3 unemployed people for every new job created by the private sector. 60 percent of the jobs lost were mid-wage occupations—people who did not need Federal or State food assistance or housing assistance programs.

Mid-wage good paying jobs make up only 22 percent of the new jobs created during the recovery. Low-wage jobs represented 21 percent of the jobs lost but now make up 58 percent of the new jobs.

The need for SNAP is greater because the recovery is not as strong as it should be nor reaching the people it should reach.

Over the last decade the number of households that were working or had no income while receiving SNAP more than tripled, from 2 million in 2000 to about 6.4 million in 2011.

THIS BILL WILL HURT THE MOST VULNERABLE

Having SNAP funds does not guarantee access to nutritious food. The Department of Agriculture says that food deserts make it difficult for urban, suburban and rural poor to find nutritious food.

A food desert according to the Department of Agriculture is a "low-access community," where at least 500 people and/or at least 33 percent of the census tract's population live more than one mile from a supermarket or large grocery store.

The USDA defines a food desert for rural communities exists where the distance to a grocery store is more than 10 miles.

In Harris County, Texas, 149 out of 920 households or 20 percent of residents do not have automobiles and live more than one-half mile from a grocery store.

Hunger is silent—most victims of hunger are ashamed and will not ask for help, they work to hide their situation from everyone.

In 2009–2010 the Houston, Sugar Land and Baytown area had 27.6 percent of households with children experiencing food hardship.

In households without children food hardship was experienced by 16.5. Houston, Sugar Land and Baytown rank 22 among the areas surveyed.

THE BILL IS TOO DRACONIAN AND POINTEDLY ANTI-URBAN

The bill creates a nationwide "pilot program" that directs states could impose new work requirements on SNAP recipients, including on parents of young children. The bill authorizes states to conduct drug testing of SNAP applicants as a condition of receiving benefits.

The bill is blatantly anti-urban in calling for a pilot program to reduce retailer fraud be conducted in a large urban area that administers its own SNAP program.

The bill requires that SNAP recipients receive at least \$20 or more in aid from the state through the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) before they could receive an increase in SNAP benefits.

The bill before prohibits states from telling someone about SNAP food programs. The bill defines this type of communication as recruiting SNAP participants by advertising the SNAP program.

The bill eliminates states' ability to waive work requirements. In addition the bill would impose new work requirements on parents of young children.

The bill would restrict "categorical eligibility" this would impact people who qualify for other low-income aid.

The bill requires that SNAP benefits be used by beneficiaries within 60 days of being posted to an account. If they have the benefits then the benefits should be there when the opportunity to go to a store is available to them—which may be more than a 2 to 4 week period.

People who are poor are not criminals and we should stop trying to treat them as if they

committed a crime. This bill is right out of the 47 percent playbook that was defeated last year during the Presidential Election and this bill needs to be defeated as well.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that the bill would reduce net SNAP spending by 39 billion over 10 years and that 2.8 million people on average would lose their benefits while 850,000 would see benefits cut.

SNAP benefits help the disabled, which include men and women who have served our nation during times of war. It is reported that nearly \$53 million in food stamps had been cashed in by people eligible to shop in base commissaries, including disabled veterans. The use of food stamps in commissaries increased 9 percent from 2012 to 2013. Military commissaries sold about \$31 million under the Women, Infants and Children program in 2012 and nearly \$15 million by June of this year.

Food is not an option—it is a right that all people living in this Nation must have to exist and to prosper.

Next year if this bill become law the nearly \$40 billion cuts in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Programs also known as SNAP that is proposed by this bill 4 million Americans would fall though our Nation's food safety net.

In 2011, according to Feeding America: 46.2 million people were in poverty, 9.5 million families were in poverty, 26.5 million of people ages 18–64 were in poverty, 16.1 million children under the age of 18 were in poverty, 3.6 million (9.0 percent) seniors 65 and older were in poverty.

In the State of Texas: 34% of children live in poverty in Texas, 21% of adults (19–64) live in poverty in Texas, 17% of elderly live in poverty in Texas.

In my city of Houston, Texas the U.S. census reports that over the last 12 months 442,881 incomes were below the poverty level.

In 2011: 50.1 million Americans lived in food insecure households, 33.5 million adults and 16.7 million children. Households with children reported food insecurity at a significantly higher rate than those without children, 20.6 percent compared to 12.2 percent.

MORE FACTS ON CHILD HUNGER

According to the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), 16.7 million children under 18 in the United States live in households where they are unable to consistently access enough nutritious food for a healthy life.

FOOD INSECURITY

16.7 million children lived in food insecure households in 2011. 20% or more of the child population in 37 states and D.C. lived in food insecure households in 2011. In 2011, the top five states with the highest rate of food insecure children under 18 were New Mexico, the District of Columbia, Arizona, Oregon, and Georgia.

EMERGENCY FOOD ASSISTANCE

Nearly 14 million children are estimated to be served by Feeding America, over 3 million of which are ages 5 and under. 54 percent of client households with children under the age of 3 participated in the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC).

POVERTY

In 2011, 16.1 million or approximately 22 percent of children in the U.S. lived in poverty.

PARTICIPATION IN FEDERAL NUTRITION PROGRAMS

In fiscal year 2011, 47 percent of all SNAP households contained children. During the 2011 federal fiscal year, more than 31 million low-income children received free or reduced-price meals through the National School Lunch Program. Unfortunately, just 2.3 million children participated in the Summer Food Service Program that same year.

As elected representatives we should see our Nation's vital interest to be to feed hungry children and all hungry Americans.

At the core of our vital interest is a stable and thriving economy, a strong and healthy population that is able to contribute to the economic engine that fuels our economy.

I urge my colleagues to reject this rule and restore fully the food programs to the farm bill.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 59, CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Joint Resolution 59 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 352

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The joint resolution, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution, as amended, and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. It shall be in order at any time from the calendar day of September 26, 2013, through the calendar day of September 29, 2013, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV. The Speaker or his designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or her designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my good friend,

the gentlewoman from Rochester (Ms. SLAUGHTER), 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. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Rules Committee met and reported a rule for consideration of H.J. Res. 59, the Continuing Appropriations Resolution for Fiscal Year 2014.

The rule is a closed rule and provides for the consideration of a short-term continuing resolution, keeping the government funded until December 15, 2013. The rule provides for 1 hour of debate equally divided between the chairman and the ranking member of the Committee of Appropriations.

Additionally, the rule incorporates an amendment by Representative SCALISE, which fully defunds ObamaCare and also ensures that the government prioritizes interest and principal payments on our national debt and Social Security payments in the event that the debt limit is reached. The rule also provides for one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Finally, the rule permits the Speaker to entertain motions to suspend the rules from September 26 to September 29.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my friend, Chairman ROGERS, for bringing a bill to avoid a government shutdown to the Rules Committee. Within the Republican Conference, we've had a very spirited debate on this issue; however, it's led us to a good product.

There are a number of things I like about this bill. First, it extends the funding for operations of all programs until December 15, allowing the Appropriations Committee the needed time to finish its work on the 12 full-year spending bills.

Second, this continuing resolution adheres to the post-sequester caps of the Budget Control Act, maintaining our commitment to reduce the deficit.

Third, this bill fully defunds ObamaCare.

Mr. Speaker, it seems the closer that we get to the implementation of the Affordable Health Care Act, the more unpopular it becomes.

Already, the President has agreed with Congress to make major changes to this legislation on seven different occasions. Additionally, he's delayed major provisions like the employer mandate unilaterally another seven times.

If business is chafing under these mandates and in need of a delay, then surely the American people should be given the same relief. The continuing resolution provides them that relief.