

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1547

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 473 I was unavoidably detained and missed the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea"

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 687, SOUTHEAST ARIZONA LAND EXCHANGE AND CONSERVATION ACT OF 2013; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1256, 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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 351) providing 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; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1526) to restore employment 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; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3102) to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008; and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 231, nays 193, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 474]

YEAS—231

Aderholt	Bishop (UT)	Calvert
Alexander	Black	Camp
Amash	Blackburn	Campbell
Amodei	Boustany	Cantor
Bachmann	Brady (TX)	Capito
Bachus	Bridenstine	Carter
Barletta	Brooks (AL)	Cassidy
Barr	Brooks (IN)	Chabot
Barton	Broun (GA)	Chaffetz
Benishkek	Buchanan	Coble
Bentivolio	Bucshon	Coffman
Bilirakis	Burgess	Cole

Collins (GA)	Johnson, Sam	Roby
Collins (NY)	Jordan	Roe (TN)
Conaway	Joyce	Rogers (AL)
Cook	Kelly (PA)	Rogers (KY)
Cotton	King (IA)	Rogers (MI)
Cramer	King (NY)	Rohrabacher
Crawford	Kingston	Rokita
Crenshaw	Kinzinger (IL)	Rooney
Culberson	Kline	Ros-Lehtinen
Daines	Labrador	Roskam
Davis, Rodney	LaMalfa	Ross
DeFazio	Lamborn	Rothfus
Denham	Lance	Royce
Dent	Lankford	Runyan
DeSantis	Latham	Ryan (WI)
DesJarlais	Latta	Salmon
Diaz-Balart	LoBiondo	Sanford
Duffy	Long	Scalise
Duncan (SC)	Lucas	Schock
Duncan (TN)	Luetkemeyer	Schrader
Ellmers	Lummis	Schweikert
Farenthold	Marchant	Scott, Austin
Fincher	Marino	Sensenbrenner
Fitzpatrick	Massie	Sessions
Fleischmann	McCarthy (CA)	Shimkus
Fleming	McCaul	Shuster
Flores	McClintock	Simpson
Forbes	McHenry	Smith (MO)
Fortenberry	McKeon	Smith (NE)
Fox	McKinley	Smith (NJ)
Franks (AZ)	McMorris	Smith (TX)
Frelinghuysen	Rodgers	Southerland
Gardner	Meadows	Stewart
Garrett	Meehan	Stivers
Gerlach	Messer	Stockman
Gibbs	Mica	Stutzman
Gibson	Miller (FL)	Terry
Gingrey (GA)	Miller (MI)	Thompson (PA)
Goodlatte	Miller, Gary	Thornberry
Gosar	Mullin	Tiberi
Gowdy	Mulvaney	Tipton
Granger	Murphy (PA)	Turner
Graves (GA)	Neugebauer	Upton
Graves (MO)	Noem	Valadao
Griffin (AR)	Noem	Wagner
Griffith (VA)	Nugent	Walberg
Grimm	Nunes	Walden
Guthrie	Nunnelee	Walorski
Hall	Olson	Weber (TX)
Hanna	Palazzo	Webster (FL)
Harper	Paulsen	Wenstrup
Harris	Pearce	Westmoreland
Hartzler	Perry	Whitfield
Hastings (WA)	Petri	Williams
Heck (NV)	Pittenger	Wilson (SC)
Hensarling	Pitts	Wittman
Holding	Poe (TX)	Wolf
Hudson	Pompeo	Womack
Huelskamp	Price (GA)	Woodall
Huizenga (MI)	Radel	Yoder
Hultgren	Reed	Yoho
Hunter	Reichert	Young (AK)
Hurt	Renacci	Young (FL)
Issa	Ribble	Young (IN)
Jenkins	Rice (SC)	
Johnson (OH)	Rigell	

NAYS—193

Andrews	Connolly	Garamendi
Barber	Conyers	Garcia
Barrow (GA)	Cooper	Grayson
Bass	Costa	Green, Al
Beatty	Courtney	Green, Gene
Becerra	Crowley	Grijalva
Bera (CA)	Cuellar	Gutiérrez
Bishop (GA)	Cummings	Hahn
Bishop (NY)	Davis (CA)	Hanabusa
Bonamici	Davis, Danny	Hastings (FL)
Brady (PA)	DeGette	Heck (WA)
Braley (IA)	Delaney	Higgins
Brown (FL)	DeLauro	Himes
Brownley (CA)	DelBene	Hinojosa
Bustos	Deutch	Holt
Butterfield	Dingell	Honda
Capps	Doggett	Horsford
Capuano	Doyle	Hoyer
Cárdenas	Duckworth	Huffman
Carney	Edwards	Israel
Carson (IN)	Ellison	Jackson Lee
Cartwright	Enyart	Jeffries
Castor (FL)	Eshoo	Johnson (GA)
Castro (TX)	Esty	Johnson, E. B.
Chu	Farr	Jones
Cicilline	Fattah	Kaptur
Clarke	Poster	Keating
Clay	Frankel (FL)	Kelly (IL)
Cleaver	Fudge	Kennedy
Clyburn	Gabbard	Kildee
Cohen	Gallego	Kilmer

Kind	Moran	Schneider
Kirkpatrick	Murphy (FL)	Schwartz
Kuster	Nadler	Scott (VA)
Langevin	Napolitano	Scott, David
Larsen (WA)	Neal	Serrano
Larson (CT)	Negrete McLeod	Sewell (AL)
Lee (CA)	Nolan	Shea-Porter
Levin	O'Rourke	Sherman
Lewis	Owens	Sinema
Lipinski	Pallone	Sires
Loeb	Pascarell	Slaughter
Lofgren	Pastor (AZ)	Smith (WA)
Lowenthal	Payne	Speier
Lowe	Pelosi	Swalwell (CA)
Lujan Grisham	Perlmutter	Takano
(NM)	Peters (CA)	Thompson (CA)
Lujan, Ben Ray	Peters (MI)	Thompson (MS)
(NM)	Peterson	Tierney
Lynch	Pingree (ME)	Titus
Maffei	Pocan	Tonko
Maloney	Price (NC)	Tsongas
Carolyn	Quigley	Van Hollen
Maloney, Sean	Rahall	Vargas
Matheson	Rangel	Veasey
Matsui	Richmond	Vela
McCollum	Roybal-Allard	Velázquez
McDermott	Ruiz	Visclosky
McGovern	Ruppersberger	Walz
McIntyre	Ryan (OH)	Wasserman
McNerney	Sánchez, Linda	Schultz
Meeks	T.	Watt
Meng	Sanchez, Loretta	Waxman
Michaud	Sarbanes	Welch
Miller, George	Schakowsky	Wilson (FL)
Moore	Schiff	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—8

Blumenauer	Herrera Beutler	Rush
Engel	McCarthy (NY)	Waters
Gohmert	Polis	

□ 1554

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 527. An act to amend the Helium Act to complete the privatization of the Federal helium reserve in a competitive market fashion that ensures stability in the helium markets while protecting the interests of American taxpayers, and for other purposes.

NUTRITION REFORM AND WORK OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 2013

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 351, I call up the bill (H.R. 3102) to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 351, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3102

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Nutrition Reform and Work Opportunity Act of 2013".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is the following:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

- Sec. 101. Preventing payment of cash to recipients of supplemental nutrition assistance benefits for the return of empty bottles and cans used to contain food purchased with benefits provided under the program.
- Sec. 102. Retailers.
- Sec. 103. Enhancing services to elderly and disabled supplemental nutrition assistance program participants.
- Sec. 104. Food distribution program on Indian reservations.
- Sec. 105. Updating program eligibility.
- Sec. 106. Exclusion of medical marijuana from excess medical expense deduction.
- Sec. 107. Standard utility allowances based on the receipt of energy assistance payments.
- Sec. 108. Eligibility disqualifications.
- Sec. 109. Repeal of State work program waiver authority.
- Sec. 110. Ending supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits for lottery or gambling winners.
- Sec. 111. Improving security of food assistance.
- Sec. 112. Demonstration projects on acceptance of benefits of mobile transactions.
- Sec. 113. Use of benefits for purchase of community-supported agriculture share.
- Sec. 114. Restaurant meals program.
- Sec. 115. Mandating State immigration verification.
- Sec. 116. Data exchange standardization for improved interoperability.
- Sec. 117. Pilot projects to improve Federal-State cooperation in identifying and reducing fraud in the supplemental nutrition assistance program.
- Sec. 118. Prohibiting Government-sponsored recruitment activities.
- Sec. 119. Repeal of bonus program.
- Sec. 120. Funding of employment and training programs.
- Sec. 121. Monitoring employment and training programs.
- Sec. 122. Cooperation with program research and evaluation.
- Sec. 123. Pilot projects to reduce dependency and increase work effort in the supplemental nutrition assistance program.
- Sec. 124. Authorization of appropriations.
- Sec. 125. Limitation on use of block grant to Puerto Rico.
- Sec. 126. Assistance for community food projects.
- Sec. 127. Emergency food assistance.
- Sec. 128. Nutrition education.
- Sec. 129. Retailer trafficking.
- Sec. 130. Technical and conforming amendments.
- Sec. 131. Tolerance level for excluding small errors.
- Sec. 132. Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands pilot program.
- Sec. 133. Annual State report on verification of SNAP participation.
- Sec. 134. Termination of existing agreement.
- Sec. 135. Service of traditional foods in public facilities.
- Sec. 136. Testing applicants for unlawful use of controlled substances.
- Sec. 137. Eligibility disqualifications for certain convicted felons.
- Sec. 138. Expungement of unused supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits.
- Sec. 139. Pilot projects to promote work and increase State accountability in the supplemental nutrition assistance program.

Sec. 140. Improved wage verification using the National Directory of New Hires.

Sec. 141. Feasibility study for Indian tribes.

TITLE II—COMMODITY DISTRIBUTION PROGRAMS

Sec. 201. Commodity distribution program.

Sec. 202. Commodity supplemental food program.

Sec. 203. Distribution of surplus commodities to special nutrition projects.

Sec. 204. Processing of commodities.

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

Sec. 301. Farmers' market nutrition program.

Sec. 302. Nutrition information and awareness pilot program.

Sec. 303. Fresh fruit and vegetable program.

Sec. 304. Additional authority for purchase of fresh fruits, vegetables, and other specialty food crops.

Sec. 305. Encouraging locally and regionally grown and raised food.

Sec. 306. Review of public health benefits of white potatoes.

Sec. 307. Healthy Food Financing Initiative.

Sec. 308. Review of sole-source contracts in Federal nutrition programs.

Sec. 309. Purchase of Halal and Kosher food for emergency food assistance program.

TITLE I—SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

SEC. 101. PREVENTING PAYMENT OF CASH TO RECIPIENTS OF SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE BENEFITS FOR THE RETURN OF EMPTY BOTTLES AND CANS USED TO CONTAIN FOOD PURCHASED WITH BENEFITS PROVIDED UNDER THE PROGRAM.

Section 3(k)(1) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2012(k)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking “and hot foods” and inserting “hot foods”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following: “and any deposit fee in excess of amount of the State fee reimbursement (if any) required to purchase any food or food product contained in a returnable bottle or can, regardless of whether such fee is included in the shelf price posted for such food or food product.”.

SEC. 102. RETAILERS.

(a) DEFINITION OF RETAIL FOOD STORE.—Section 3(p)(1)(A) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2012(p)(1)(A)) is amended by striking “at least 2” and inserting “at least 3”.

(b) ALTERNATIVE BENEFIT DELIVERY.—Section 7(f) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2016(f)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) IMPOSITION OF COSTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall require participating retailers (including restaurants participating in a State option restaurant program intended to serve the elderly, disabled, and homeless) to pay 100 percent of the costs of acquiring, and arrange for the implementation of, electronic benefit transfer point-of-sale equipment and supplies.

“(B) EXEMPTIONS.—The Secretary may exempt from subparagraph (A)—

“(i) farmers' markets and other direct-to-consumer markets, military commissaries, nonprofit food buying cooperatives, and establishments, organizations, programs, or group living arrangements described in paragraphs (5), (7), and (8) of section 3(k); and

“(ii) establishments described in paragraphs (3), (4), and (9) of section 3(k), other than restaurants participating in a State option restaurant program.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) TERMINATION OF MANUAL VOUCHERS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Effective beginning on the effective date of this paragraph, except as provided in subparagraph (B), no State shall issue manual vouchers to a household that receives supplemental nutrition assistance under this Act or allow retailers to accept manual vouchers as payment, unless the Secretary determines that the manual vouchers are necessary, such as in the event of an electronic benefit transfer system failure or a disaster situation.

“(B) EXEMPTIONS.—The Secretary may exempt categories of retailers or individual retailers from subparagraph (A) based on criteria established by the Secretary.

“(5) UNIQUE IDENTIFICATION NUMBER REQUIRED.—In an effort to enhance the anti-fraud protections of the program, the Secretary shall require all parties providing electronic benefit transfer services to provide for and maintain a unique business identification and a unique terminal identification number information through the supplemental nutrition assistance program electronic benefit transfer transaction routing system. In developing the regulations implementing this paragraph, the Secretary shall consider existing commercial practices for other point-of-sale debit transactions. The Secretary shall issue proposed regulations implementing this paragraph not earlier than 2 years after the date of enactment of this paragraph.”.

(c) ELECTRONIC BENEFIT TRANSFERS.—Section 7(h)(3)(B) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2016(h)(3)(B)) is amended by striking “is operational—” and all that follows through “(ii) in the case of other participating stores,” and inserting “is operational”.

(d) APPROVAL OF RETAIL FOOD STORES AND WHOLESALE FOOD CONCERNS.—Section 9 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2018) is amended—

(1) in the 2d sentence of subsection (a)(1) by striking “; and (C)” and inserting “; (C) whether the applicant is located in an area with significantly limited access to food; and (D)”;

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(g) EBT SERVICE REQUIREMENT.—An approved retail food store shall provide adequate EBT service as described in section 7(h)(3)(B).”.

SEC. 103. ENHANCING SERVICES TO ELDERLY AND DISABLED SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS.

(a) ENHANCING SERVICES TO ELDERLY AND DISABLED PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS.—Section 3(p) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2012(p)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3) by striking “and” at the end,

(2) in paragraph (4) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”, and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following:

“(5) a governmental or private nonprofit food purchasing and delivery service that—

“(A) purchases food for, and delivers such food to, individuals who are—

“(i) unable to shop for food; and

“(ii) not less than 60 years of age; or

“(B) physically or mentally handicapped or otherwise disabled;

“(B) clearly notifies the participating household at the time such household places a food order—

“(i) of any delivery fee associated with the food purchase and delivery provided to such household by such service; and

“(ii) that a delivery fee cannot be paid with benefits provided under supplemental nutrition assistance program; and

“(C) sells food purchased for such household at the price paid by such service for such food and without any additional cost markup.”.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION.—

(1) ISSUANCE OF RULES.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall issue regulations that—

(A) establish criteria to identify a food purchasing and delivery service referred to in section 3(p)(5) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 as amended by this Act, and

(B) establish procedures to ensure that such service—

(i) does not charge more for a food item than the price paid by the such service for such food item,

(ii) offers food delivery service at no or low cost to households under such Act,

(iii) ensures that benefits provided under the supplemental nutrition assistance program are used only to purchase food, as defined in section 3 of such Act,

(iv) limits the purchase of food, and the delivery of such food, to households eligible to receive services described in section 3(p)(5) of such Act as so amended,

(v) has established adequate safeguards against fraudulent activities, including unauthorized use of electronic benefit cards issued under such Act, and

(vi) such other requirements as the Secretary deems to be appropriate.

(2) LIMITATION.—Before the issuance of rules under paragraph (1), the Secretary of Agriculture may not approve more than 20 food purchasing and delivery services referred to in section 3(p)(5) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 as amended by this Act, to participate as retail food stores under the supplemental nutrition assistance program.

SEC. 104. FOOD DISTRIBUTION PROGRAM ON INDIAN RESERVATIONS.

Section 4(b)(6)(F) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2013(b)(6)(F)) is amended by striking “2012” and inserting “2016”.

SEC. 105. UPDATING PROGRAM ELIGIBILITY.

Section 5 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2014) is amended—

(1) in the 2d sentence of subsection (a) by striking “households in which each member receives benefits” and inserting “households in which each member receives cash assistance”, and

(2) in subsection (j) by striking “or who receives benefits under a State program” and inserting “or who receives cash assistance under a State program”.

SEC. 106. EXCLUSION OF MEDICAL MARIJUANA FROM EXCESS MEDICAL EXPENSE DEDUCTION.

Section 5(e)(5) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2014(e)(5)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(C) EXCLUSION OF MEDICAL MARIJUANA.—The Secretary shall promulgate rules to ensure that medical marijuana is not treated as a medical expense for purposes of this paragraph.”.

SEC. 107. STANDARD UTILITY ALLOWANCES BASED ON THE RECEIPT OF ENERGY ASSISTANCE PAYMENTS.

(a) STANDARD UTILITY ALLOWANCES IN THE SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.—Section 5(e)(6)(C) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2014(e)(6)(C)) is amended—

(1) in clause (i) by inserting “, subject to clause (iv)” after “Secretary”; and

(2) by striking subclause (I) of clause (iv) and inserting the following:

“(I) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subclause (II), if a State agency elects to use a standard utility allowance that reflects heating and cooling costs, the standard utility allowance shall be made available to households that received a payment, or on behalf of which a payment was made, under the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981 (42 U.S.C. 8621 et seq.) or other similar energy assistance program, if in the current month

or in the immediately preceding 12 months, the household either received such payment, or such payment was made on behalf of the household, that was greater than \$20 annually, as determined by the Secretary.”; and

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 2605(f)(2)(A) of the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981 (42 U.S.C. 8624(f)(2)(A)) is amended by inserting before the semicolon the following: “, except that, for purposes of the supplemental nutrition assistance program established under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.), such payments or allowances were greater than \$20 annually, consistent with section 5(e)(6)(C)(iv)(I) of that Act (7 U.S.C. 2014(e)(6)(C)(iv)(I)), as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE AND IMPLEMENTATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), this section and the amendments made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 2013, and shall apply with respect to certification periods that begin after such date.

(2) STATE OPTION TO DELAY IMPLEMENTATION FOR CURRENT RECIPIENTS.—A State may, at the option of the State, implement a policy that eliminates or reduces the effect of the amendments made by this section on households that received a standard utility allowance as of the date of enactment of this Act, for not more than a 180-day period that begins on the date on which such amendments would otherwise apply to the respective household.

SEC. 108. ELIGIBILITY DISQUALIFICATIONS.

Section 6(e)(3)(B) of Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2015(e)(3)(B)) is amended by striking “section;” and inserting the following: “section, subject to the condition that the course or program of study—”

“(i) is part of a program of career and technical education (as defined in section 3 of the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (20 U.S.C. 2302)) that may be completed in not more than 4 years at an institution of higher education (as defined in section 102 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002)); or

“(ii) is limited to remedial courses, basic adult education, literacy, or English as a second language;”.

SEC. 109. REPEAL OF STATE WORK PROGRAM WAIVER AUTHORITY.

Section 6(o) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2015(o)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)(D) by striking “(5), or (6)” and inserting “or (5)”; and

(2) by striking paragraph (4);

(3) in paragraph (6)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)(ii)—

(i) by striking subclause (II);

(ii) in subclause (V) by striking “(5)” and inserting “(4)”; and

(iii) by redesignating subclauses (III), (IV), and (V) as subclauses (II), (III), and (IV), respectively;

(B) in subparagraph (B) by striking “(G)” and inserting “(H)”; and

(C) in subparagraph (D) by striking “and each subsequent fiscal year” and inserting “through fiscal year 2013”; and

(D) in subparagraph (F) by striking “and each subsequent fiscal year” and inserting “through fiscal year 2013”; and

(E) by adding at the end the following:

“(H) FISCAL YEAR 2014 AND THEREAFTER.—Subject to subparagraph (G), for fiscal year 2014 and each subsequent fiscal year, a State agency may provide a number of exemptions such that the average monthly number of the exemptions in effect during the fiscal year does not exceed 15 percent of the number of individuals identified as ‘Nondisabled Adults Age 18-49 in Childless Households’ in

the table ‘B.5 Distribution of Participating Households by Household Composition and by State’ of the report entitled Characteristics of Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Households: Fiscal Year 2011 (Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Report No. SNAP-12-CHAR) prepared for and published by the Office of Research and Analysis of the Food and Nutrition Service of the Department of Agriculture in November 2012.”; and

(4) by redesignating paragraphs (5), (6), and (7) as paragraphs (4), (5), and (6), respectively.

SEC. 110. ENDING SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM BENEFITS FOR LOTTERY OR GAMBLING WINNERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2015) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(r) INELIGIBILITY FOR BENEFITS DUE TO RECEIPT OF SUBSTANTIAL LOTTERY OR GAMBLING WINNINGS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Any household in which a member receives substantial lottery or gambling winnings, as determined by the Secretary, shall lose eligibility for benefits immediately upon receipt of the winnings.

“(2) DURATION OF INELIGIBILITY.—A household described in paragraph (1) shall remain ineligible for participation until the household meets the allowable financial resources and income eligibility requirements under subsections (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), (i), (k), (l), (m), and (n) of section 5.

“(3) AGREEMENTS.—As determined by the Secretary, each State agency, to the maximum extent practicable, shall establish agreements with entities responsible for the regulation or sponsorship of gaming in the State to determine whether individuals participating in the supplemental nutrition assistance program have received substantial lottery or gambling winnings.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 5(a) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2014(a)) is amended in the 2d sentence by striking “sections 6(b), 6(d)(2), and 6(g)” and inserting “subsections (b), (d)(2), (g), and (r) of section 6”.

SEC. 111. IMPROVING SECURITY OF FOOD ASSISTANCE.

Section 7(h)(8) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2016(h)(8)) is amended—

(1) in the heading by striking “CARD FEE” and inserting “OF CARDS”; and

(2) by striking “A State” and inserting the following:

“(A) FEES.—A State”; and

(3) by adding after subparagraph (A) (as so designated by paragraph (2)) the following:

“(B) PURPOSEFUL LOSS OF CARDS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to terms and conditions established by the Secretary in accordance with clause (ii), if a household makes excessive requests for replacement of the electronic benefit transfer card of the household, the Secretary may require a State agency to decline to issue a replacement card to the household unless the household, upon request of the State agency, provides an explanation for the loss of the card.

“(ii) REQUIREMENTS.—The terms and conditions established by the Secretary shall provide that—

“(I) the household be given the opportunity to provide the requested explanation and meet the requirements under this paragraph promptly;

“(II) after an excessive number of lost cards, the head of the household shall be required to review program rights and responsibilities with State agency personnel authorized to make determinations under section 5(a); and

“(III) any action taken, including actions required under section 6(b)(2), other than the

withholding of the electronic benefit transfer card until an explanation described in subclause (I) is provided, shall be consistent with the due process protections under section 6(b) or 11(e)(10), as appropriate.

“(C) **PROTECTING VULNERABLE PERSONS.**—In implementing this paragraph, a State agency shall act to protect homeless persons, persons with disabilities, victims of crimes, and other vulnerable persons who lose electronic benefit transfer cards but are not intentionally committing fraud.

“(D) **EFFECT ON ELIGIBILITY.**—While a State may decline to issue an electronic benefits transfer card until a household satisfies the requirements under this paragraph, nothing in this paragraph shall be considered a denial of, or limitation on, the eligibility for benefits under section 5.”.

SEC. 112. DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS ON ACCEPTANCE OF BENEFITS OF MOBILE TRANSACTIONS.

Section 7(h) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2016(h)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(14) **DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS ON ACCEPTANCE OF BENEFITS OF MOBILE TRANSACTIONS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall pilot the use of mobile technologies determined by the Secretary to be appropriate to test the feasibility and implications for program integrity, by allowing retail food stores, farmers markets, and other direct producer-to-consumer marketing outlets to accept benefits from recipients of supplemental nutrition assistance through mobile transactions.

“(B) **DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.**—To be eligible to participate in a demonstration project under subsection (a), a retail food store, farmers market, or other direct producer-to-consumer marketing outlet shall submit to the Secretary for approval a plan that includes—

“(i) a description of the technology;

“(ii) the manner by which the retail food store, farmers market or other direct producer-to-consumer marketing outlet will provide proof of the transaction to households;

“(iii) the provision of data to the Secretary, consistent with requirements established by the Secretary, in a manner that allows the Secretary to evaluate the impact of the demonstration on participant access, ease of use, and program integrity; and

“(iv) such other criteria as the Secretary may require.

“(C) **DATE OF COMPLETION.**—The demonstration projects under this paragraph shall be completed and final reports submitted to the Secretary by not later than July 1, 2016.

“(D) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—The Secretary shall submit a report to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate that includes a finding, based on the data provided under subparagraph (C) whether or not implementation in all States is in the best interest of the supplemental nutrition assistance program.”.

SEC. 113. USE OF BENEFITS FOR PURCHASE OF COMMUNITY-SUPPORTED AGRICULTURE SHARE.

Section 10 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2019) is amended in the 1st sentence by inserting “agricultural producers who market agricultural products directly to consumers shall be authorized to redeem benefits for the initial cost of the purchase of a community-supported agriculture share,” after “food so purchased.”.

SEC. 114. RESTAURANT MEALS PROGRAM.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 11(e) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2020(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (22) by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (23)(C) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(24) if the State elects to carry out a program to contract with private establishments to offer meals at concessional prices, as described in paragraphs (3), (4), and (9) of section 3(k)—

“(A) the plans of the State agency for operating the program, including—

“(i) documentation of a need that eligible homeless, elderly, and disabled clients are underserved in a particular geographic area;

“(ii) the manner by which the State agency will limit participation to only those private establishments that the State determines necessary to meet the need identified in clause (i); and

“(iii) any other conditions the Secretary may prescribe, such as the level of security necessary to ensure that only eligible recipients participate in the program; and

“(B) a report by the State agency to the Secretary annually, the schedule of which shall be established by the Secretary, that includes—

“(i) the number of households and individual recipients authorized to participate in the program, including any information on whether the individual recipient is elderly, disabled, or homeless; and

“(ii) an assessment of whether the program is meeting an established need, as documented under subparagraph (A)(i).”.

(b) **APPROVAL OF RETAIL FOOD STORES AND WHOLESALE FOOD CONCERNS.**—Section 9 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2018) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(h) **PRIVATE ESTABLISHMENTS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to paragraph (2), no private establishment that contracts with a State agency to offer meals at concessional prices as described in paragraphs (3), (4), and (9) of section 3(k) may be authorized to accept and redeem benefits unless the Secretary determines that the participation of the private establishment is required to meet a documented need in accordance with section 11(e)(24).

“(2) **EXISTING CONTRACTS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—If, on the day before the effective date of this subsection, a State has entered into a contract with a private establishment described in paragraph (1) and the Secretary has not determined that the participation of the private establishment is necessary to meet a documented need in accordance with section 11(e)(24), the Secretary shall allow the operation of the private establishment to continue without that determination of need for a period not to exceed 180 days from the date on which the Secretary establishes determination criteria, by regulation, under section 11(e)(24).

“(B) **JUSTIFICATION.**—If the Secretary determines to terminate a contract with a private establishment that is in effect on the effective date of this subsection, the Secretary shall provide justification to the State in which the private establishment is located for that termination.

“(3) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 90 days after September 30, 2014, and 90 days after the last day of each fiscal year thereafter, the Secretary shall report to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate on the effectiveness of a program under this subsection using any information received from States under section 11(e)(24) as well as any other information the Secretary may have relating to the manner in which benefits are used.”.

(c) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—Section 3(k) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2012(k)) is amended by inserting “subject to section 9(h)” after “concessional prices” each place it appears.

SEC. 115. MANDATING STATE IMMIGRATION VERIFICATION.

Section 11(p) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2020(p)) is amended to read as follows:

“(p) **STATE VERIFICATION OPTION.**—In carrying out the supplemental nutrition assistance program, a State agency shall be required to use an income and eligibility, or an immigration status, verification system established under section 1137 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1320b-7), in accordance with standards set by the Secretary.”.

SEC. 116. DATA EXCHANGE STANDARDIZATION FOR IMPROVED INTEROPERABILITY.

(a) **DATA EXCHANGE STANDARDIZATION.**—Section 11 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2020) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(v) **DATA EXCHANGE STANDARDS FOR IMPROVED INTEROPERABILITY.**—

“(1) **DESIGNATION.**—The Secretary shall, in consultation with an interagency work group established by the Office of Management and Budget, and considering State government perspectives, designate data exchange standards to govern, under this part—

“(A) necessary categories of information that State agencies operating such programs are required under applicable law to electronically exchange with another State agency; and

“(B) Federal reporting and data exchange required under applicable law.

“(2) **REQUIREMENTS.**—The data exchange standards required by paragraph (1) shall, to the extent practicable—

“(A) incorporate a widely accepted, non-proprietary, searchable, computer-readable format, such as the eXtensible Markup Language;

“(B) contain interoperable standards developed and maintained by intergovernmental partnerships, such as the National Information Exchange Model;

“(C) incorporate interoperable standards developed and maintained by Federal entities with authority over contracting and financial assistance;

“(D) be consistent with and implement applicable accounting principles;

“(E) be implemented in a manner that is cost-effective and improves program efficiency and effectiveness; and

“(F) be capable of being continually upgraded as necessary.

“(3) **RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to require a change to existing data exchange standards for Federal reporting found to be effective and efficient.”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The Secretary shall issue a proposed rule within 24 months after the date of the enactment of this Act. The rule shall identify federally required data exchanges, include specification and timing of exchanges to be standardized, and address the factors used in determining whether and when to standardize data exchanges. It should also specify state implementation options and describe future milestones.

SEC. 117. PILOT PROJECTS TO IMPROVE FEDERAL-STATE COOPERATION IN IDENTIFYING AND REDUCING FRAUD IN THE SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

Section 12 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2021) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(i) **PILOT PROJECTS TO IMPROVE FEDERAL-STATE COOPERATION IN IDENTIFYING AND REDUCING FRAUD IN THE SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.**—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out, under such terms and conditions as determined by the Secretary, pilot projects to test innovative Federal-State partnerships to identify, investigate, and reduce retailer fraud in the supplemental nutrition assistance program, including allowing States to operate retail Food Store investigation programs. At least 1 such pilot project shall be carried out in an urban area that is among the 10 largest urban areas in the United States (based on population) if the supplemental nutrition assistance program is separately administered in such area and if the administration of such program in such area complies with the other applicable requirements of such program.

“(2) SELECTION CRITERIA.—Pilot projects shall be selected based on criteria the Secretary establishes, which shall include—

“(A) enhancing existing efforts by the Secretary to reduce retailer fraud;

“(B) requiring participant States to maintain their overall level of effort at addressing recipient fraud, as determined by the Secretary, prior to participation in the pilot project;

“(C) collaborating with other law enforcement authorities as necessary to carry out an effective pilot project;

“(D) commitment of the participant State agency to follow Federal rules and procedures with respect to retailer investigations; and

“(E) the extent to which a State has committed resources to recipient fraud and the relative success of those efforts.

“(3) EVALUATION.—

“(A) The Secretary shall evaluate the projects selected under this subsection to measure the impact of the pilot projects.

“(B) Such evaluation shall include—

“(i) each pilot project's impact on increasing the Secretary's capacity to address retailer fraud;

“(ii) the effectiveness of the pilot projects in identifying, preventing and reducing retailer fraud; and

“(iii) the cost effectiveness of such pilot projects.

“(4) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than September 30, 2017, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry of the Senate, a report that includes a description of the results of each pilot project, including an evaluation of the impact of the project on retailer fraud and the costs associated with each pilot project.

“(5) FUNDING.—Any costs incurred by the State to operate the pilot projects in excess of the amount expended under this Act for retailer fraud in the respective State in the previous fiscal year shall not be eligible for Federal reimbursement under this Act.”

SEC. 118. PROHIBITING GOVERNMENT-SPONSORED RECRUITMENT ACTIVITIES.

(a) ADMINISTRATIVE COST-SHARING AND QUALITY CONTROL.—Section 16(a)(4) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2025(a)(4)) is amended by inserting after “recruitment activities” the following: “designed to persuade an individual to apply for program benefits or that promote the program via television, radio, or billboard advertisements”.

(b) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS AUTHORIZED TO BE APPROPRIATED UNDER ACT.—Section 18 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2027) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(g) BAN ON RECRUITMENT AND PROMOTION ACTIVITIES.—(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), no funds authorized to be appropriated under this Act shall be used by the Secretary for—

“(A) recruitment activities designed to persuade an individual to apply for supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits;

“(B) television, radio, or billboard advertisements that are designed to promote supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits and enrollment; or

“(C) any agreements with foreign governments designed to promote supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits and enrollment.

“(2) Paragraph (1)(B) shall not apply to programmatic activities undertaken with respect to benefits made available in response to a natural disaster.”

(c) BAN ON RECRUITMENT ACTIVITIES BY ENTITIES THAT RECEIVE FUNDS.—Section 18 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2027) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(h) BAN ON RECRUITMENT BY ENTITIES THAT RECEIVE FUNDS.—The Secretary shall issue regulations that forbid entities that receive funds under this Act to compensate any person for conducting outreach activities relating to participation in, or for recruiting individuals to apply to receive benefits under, the supplemental nutrition assistance program if the amount of such compensation would be based on the number of individuals who apply to receive such benefits.”

SEC. 119. REPEAL OF BONUS PROGRAM.

Section 16(d) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2025(d)) is repealed.

SEC. 120. FUNDING OF EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAMS.

Section 16(h)(1)(A) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2025(h)(1)(A)) is amended by striking “\$90,000,000” and all that follows through “\$79,000,000”, and inserting “\$79,000,000 for each fiscal year”.

SEC. 121. MONITORING EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAMS.

(a) REPORTING MEASURES.—Section 16(h)(5) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2025(h)(5)) is amended to read:

“(5)(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall monitor the employment and training programs carried out by State agencies under section 6(d)(4) and assess their effectiveness in—

“(i) preparing members of households participating in the supplemental nutrition assistance program for employment, including the acquisition of basic skills necessary for employment; and

“(ii) increasing the numbers of household members who obtain and retain employment subsequent to their participation in such employment and training programs.

“(B) REPORTING MEASURES.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Labor, shall develop reporting measures that identify improvements in the skills, training education or work experience of members of households participating in the supplemental nutrition assistance program. Measures shall be based on common measures of performance for federal workforce training programs, so long as they reflect the challenges facing the types of members of households participating in the supplemental nutrition assistance program who participate in a specific employment and training component. The Secretary shall require that each State employment and training plan submitted under section 11(e)(19) identify appropriate reporting measures for each of their proposed components that serve at least 100 people. Such measures may include:

“(i) the percentage and number of program participants who received employment and training services and are in unsubsidized employment subsequent to the receipt of those services;

“(ii) the percentage and number of program participants who obtain a recognized postsecondary credential, including a registered apprenticeship, or a regular secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent, while participating in or within 1 year after receiving employment and training services;

“(iii) the percentage and number of program participants who are in an education or training program that is intended to lead to a recognized postsecondary credential, including a registered apprenticeship or on-the-job training program, a regular secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent, or unsubsidized employment;

“(iv) subject to the terms and conditions set by the Secretary, measures developed by each State agency to assess the skills acquisition of employment and training program participants that reflect the goals of their specific employment and training program components, which may include, but are not limited to—

“(I) the percentage and number of program participants who are meeting program requirements in each component of the State's education and training program; and

“(II) the percentage and number of program participants who are gaining skills likely to lead to employment as measured through testing, quantitative or qualitative assessment or other method; and

“(v) other indicators as approved by the Secretary.

“(C) STATE REPORT.—Each State agency shall annually prepare and submit to the Secretary a report on the State's employment and training program that includes the numbers of supplemental nutrition assistance program participants who have gained skills, training, work or experience that will increase their ability to obtain regular employment using measures identified in subparagraph (B).

“(D) MODIFICATIONS TO THE STATE EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING PLAN.—Subject to the terms and conditions established by the Secretary, if the Secretary determines that the state agency's performance with respect to employment and training outcomes is inadequate, the Secretary may require the State agency to make modifications to their employment and training plan to improve such outcomes.

“(E) PERIODIC EVALUATION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to terms and conditions established by the Secretary, not later than October 1, 2016, and not less frequently than once every 5 years thereafter, the Secretary shall conduct a study to review existing practice and research to identify employment and training program components and practices that—

“(I) effectively assist members of households participating in the supplemental nutrition assistance program in gaining skills, training, work, or experience that will increase their ability to obtain regular employment, and

“(II) are best integrated with statewide workforce development systems.

“(ii) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall submit a report that describes the results of the study under clause (i) to the Committee on Agriculture in the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry in the Senate.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Notwithstanding section 4(c) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2013(a)), the Secretary shall issue interim final regulations implementing the amendment made by subsection (a) no later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act. States shall include such reporting measures in their employment and

training plans for the 1st fiscal year thereafter that begins no sooner than 6 months after the date that such regulations are published.

SEC. 122. COOPERATION WITH PROGRAM RESEARCH AND EVALUATION.

Section 17 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2026) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(1) COOPERATION WITH PROGRAM RESEARCH AND EVALUATION.—States, State agencies, local agencies, institutions, facilities such as data consortiums, and contractors participating in programs authorized under this Act shall cooperate with officials and contractors acting on behalf of the Secretary in the conduct of evaluations and studies under this Act and shall submit information at such time and in such manner as the Secretary may require.”.

SEC. 123. PILOT PROJECTS TO REDUCE DEPENDENCY AND INCREASE WORK EFFORT IN THE SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

Section 17 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2026), as amended by section 121, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(m) PILOT PROJECTS TO REDUCE DEPENDENCY AND INCREASE WORK EFFORT IN THE SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out, under such terms and conditions as the Secretary considers to be appropriate, pilot projects to identify best practices for employment and training programs under this Act to raise the number of work registrants who obtain unsubsidized employment, increase their earned income, and reduce their reliance on public assistance, including but not limited to the supplemental nutrition assistance program.

“(2) SELECTION CRITERIA.—Pilot projects shall be selected based on criteria the Secretary establishes, that shall include—

“(A) enhancing existing employment and training programs in the State;

“(B) agreeing to participate in the evaluation described in paragraph (3), including making available data on participants’ employment activities and post-participation employment, earnings, and public benefit receipt;

“(C) collaborating with the State workforce board and other job training programs in the State and local area;

“(D) the extent to which the pilot project’s components can be easily replicated by other States or political subdivisions; and

“(E) such additional criteria that ensure that the pilot projects—

“(i) target a variety of populations of work registrants, including childless adults, parents, and individuals with low skills or limited work experience;

“(ii) are selected from a range of existing employment and training programs including programs that provide—

“(I) section 20 workfare;

“(II) skills development for work registrants with limited employment history;

“(III) post-employment support services necessary for maintaining employment; and

“(IV) education leading to a recognized postsecondary credential, registered apprenticeship, or secondary school diploma or its equivalent;

“(iii) are located in a range of geographic areas, including rural, urban, and Indian reservations; and

“(iv) include participants who are exempt and not exempt under section (6)(d)(2).

“(3) EVALUATION.—The Secretary shall provide for an independent evaluation of projects selected under this subsection to measure the impact of the pilot projects on the ability of each pilot project target popu-

lation to find and retain employment that leads to increased household income and reduced dependency, compared to what would have occurred in the absence of the pilot project.

“(4) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—By September 30, 2017, the Secretary shall submit, to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate, a report that includes a description of—

“(A) the results of each pilot project, including an evaluation of the impact of the project on the employment, income, and public benefit receipt of the targeted population of work registrants;

“(B) the Federal, State, and other costs of each pilot project;

“(C) the planned dissemination of the reports’ findings with State agencies; and

“(D) the steps and funding necessary to incorporate components of pilot projects that demonstrate increased employment and earnings into State employment and training programs.

“(5) FUNDING.—From amounts made available under section 18(a)(1), the Secretary shall make \$10,000,000 available for each of the fiscal years 2014, 2015, and 2016 to carry out this subsection. Such amounts shall remain available until expended.

“(6) USE OF FUNDS.—

“(A) Funds provided under this subsection for pilot projects shall be used only for—

“(i) pilot projects that comply with the provisions of this Act;

“(ii) the costs and administration of the pilot projects;

“(iii) the costs incurred in providing information and data to the independent evaluation under paragraph (3); and

“(iv) the costs of the evaluation under paragraph (3).

“(B) Funds made available under this subsection may not be used to supplant non-Federal funds used for existing employment and training activities.”.

SEC. 124. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 18(a)(1) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2027(a)(1)) is amended in the 1st sentence by striking “2012” and inserting “2016”.

SEC. 125. LIMITATION ON USE OF BLOCK GRANT TO PUERTO RICO.

Section 19(a)(2)(B) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2028(a)(2)(B)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—None of the funds made available to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico under this subparagraph may be used to provide nutrition assistance in the form of cash benefits.”.

SEC. 126. ASSISTANCE FOR COMMUNITY FOOD PROJECTS.

(a) DEFINITION.—Section 25(a)(1)(B)(i) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2034(a)(1)(B)(i)) is amended—

(1) in subclause (II) by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in subclause (III) by striking “or” at the end and inserting “and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(IV) to provide incentives for the consumption of fruits and vegetables among low-income individuals; or”.

(b) ADDITIONAL FUNDING.—Section 25(b) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2034) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) FUNDING.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer to the Secretary to carry out this section not less than \$10,000,000 for fiscal year 2014 and each fiscal year thereafter. Of the amount made available under this subparagraph for

each such fiscal year, \$5,000,000 shall be available to carry out subsection (a)(1)(B)(I)(IV).

“(B) RECEIPT AND ACCEPTANCE.—The Secretary shall be entitled to receive, shall accept, and shall use to carry out this section, the funds transferred under subparagraph (A) without further appropriation.

“(C) MAINTENANCE OF FUNDING.—The funding provided under subparagraph (A) shall supplement (and not supplant) other Federal funding made available to the Secretary to carry out this section.”.

SEC. 127. EMERGENCY FOOD ASSISTANCE.

(a) PURCHASE OF COMMODITIES.—Section 27(a) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2036(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by striking “2008 through 2012” and inserting “2013 through 2016”;

(2) in paragraph (2) by striking subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C), and inserting the following:

“(A) for fiscal year 2013, \$265,750,000;

“(B) for fiscal year 2014, the dollar amount of commodities specified in subparagraph (A) adjusted by the percentage by which the thrifty food plan has been adjusted under section 3(u)(4) between June 30, 2012 and June 30, 2013, and increased by \$70,000,000;

“(C) for fiscal year 2015, the dollar amount of commodities determined for fiscal year 2014 under subparagraph (B) adjusted by the percentage by which the thrifty food plan has been adjusted under section 3(u)(4) between June 30, 2013 and June 30, 2014;

“(D) for fiscal year 2016, the dollar amount of commodities determined for fiscal year 2015 under subparagraph (C) adjusted by the percentage by which the thrifty food plan has been adjusted under section 3(u)(4) between June 30, 2014 and June 30, 2015, and reduced by \$50,000,000; and

“(E) for each subsequent fiscal year, the dollar amount of commodities determined for the preceding fiscal year adjusted to reflect the percentage by which the thrifty food plan has been adjusted under section 3(u)(4) for the 12-month period ending on the preceding June 30.”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) FUNDS AVAILABILITY.—For purposes of the funds described in this subsection, the Secretary shall—

“(A) make the funds available for 2 fiscal years; and

“(B) allow States to carry over unexpended balances to the next fiscal year pursuant to such terms and conditions as are determined by the Secretary.”.

(b) EMERGENCY FOOD PROGRAM INFRASTRUCTURE GRANTS.—Section 209(d) of the Emergency Food Assistance Act of 1983 (7 U.S.C. 7511a(d)) is amended by striking “2012” and inserting “2016”.

SEC. 128. NUTRITION EDUCATION.

Section 28 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2036a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b) by inserting “and physical activity” after “healthy food choices”; and

(2) in subsection (d)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (D) by striking “\$401,000,000;” and inserting “\$372,000,000; and”;

(B) by striking subparagraph (E); and

(C) in subparagraph (F) by striking “(F) for fiscal year 2016” and inserting “(E) for fiscal year 2015”.

SEC. 129. RETAILER TRAFFICKING.

The Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 29. RETAILER TRAFFICKING.

“(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to provide the Department of Agriculture

with additional resources to prevent trafficking in violation of this Act by strengthening recipient and retailer program integrity. Additional funds are provided to supplement the Department's payment accuracy, and retailer and recipient integrity activities.

“(b) FUNDING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer to the Secretary to carry out this section not less than \$5,000,000 for fiscal year 2014 and each fiscal year thereafter.

“(2) RECEIPT AND ACCEPTANCE.—The Secretary shall be entitled to receive, shall accept, and shall use to carry out this section the funds transferred under paragraph (1) without further appropriation.

“(3) MAINTENANCE OF FUNDING.—The funding provided under paragraph (1) shall supplement (and not supplant) other Federal funding for programs carried out under this Act.”.

SEC. 130. TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) Section 3 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2012) is amended—

(1) in subsection (g) by striking “coupon,” the last place it appears and inserting “coupon”;

(2) in subsection (k)(7) by striking “or are” and inserting “and”;

(3) by striking subsection (l);

(4) by redesignating subsections (m) through (t) as subsections (l) through (s), respectively; and

(5) by inserting after subsection (s) (as so redesignated) the following:

“(t) ‘Supplemental nutritional assistance program’ means the program operated pursuant to this Act.”.

(b) Section 4(a) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2013(a)) is amended by striking “benefits” the last place it appears and inserting “Benefits”.

(c) Section 5 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2014) is amended—

(1) in the last sentence of subsection (i)(2)(D) by striking “section 13(b)(2)” and inserting “section 13(b)”;

(2) in subsection (k)(4)(A) by striking “paragraph (2)(H)” and inserting “paragraph (2)(G)”.

(d) Section 6(d)(4) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2015(d)(4)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B)(vii) by moving the left margin 4 ems to the left, and

(2) in subparagraph (F)(iii) by moving the left margin 6 ems to the left.

(e) Section 7(h) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2016(h)) is amended by redesignating the 2d paragraph (12) as paragraph (13).

(f) Section 12 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2021) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(3)(C) by striking “civil money penalties” and inserting “civil penalties”;

(2) in subsection (g)(1) by striking “(7 U.S.C. 1786)” and inserting “(42 U.S.C. 1786)”.

(g) Section 15(b)(1) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2024(b)(1)) is amended in the 1st sentence by striking “an benefit” both places it appears and inserting “a benefit”.

(h) Section 16(a) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2025(a)) is amended in the proviso following paragraph (8) by striking “, as amended.”.

(i) Section 18(e) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2027(e)) is amended in the 1st sentence by striking “sections 7(f)” and inserting “section 7(f)”.

(j) Section 22(b)(10)(B)(i) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2031(b)(10)(B)(i)) is amended in the last sen-

tence by striking “Food benefits” and inserting “Benefits”.

(k) Section 26(f)(3)(C) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2035(f)(3)(C)) is amended by striking “subsection” and inserting “subsections”.

(l) Section 27(a)(1) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2036(a)(1)) is amended by striking “(Public Law 98-8; 7 U.S.C. 612c note)” and inserting “(7 U.S.C. 7515)”.

(m) Section 509 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3056g) is amended in the section heading by striking “**FOOD STAMP PROGRAMS**” and inserting “**SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM**”.

(n) Section 4115(c)(2)(H) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-246; 122 Stat. 1871) is amended by striking “531” and inserting “454”.

(o) Section 3803(c)(2)(C)(vii) of title 31 of the United States Code is amended by striking “section 3(l)” and inserting “section 3(s)”.

(p) Section 115 of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-193) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2) by striking “section 3(l)” and inserting “section 3(s)”;

(2) in subsection (b)(2) by striking “section 3(l)” and inserting “section 3(s)”;

(3) in subsection (e)(2) by striking “section 3(l)” and inserting “section 3(s)”.

(q) The Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973 (7 U.S.C. 612c) is amended—

(1) in section 4(a) by striking “Food Stamp Act of 1977” and inserting “Food and Nutrition Act of 2008”; and

(2) in section 5—

(A) in subsection (i)(1) by striking “Food Stamp Act of 1977” and inserting “Food and Nutrition Act of 2008”; and

(B) in subsection (l)(2)(B) by striking “Food Stamp Act of 1977” and inserting “Food and Nutrition Act of 2008”.

(r) The Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 301 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in the heading of section 453(j)(10) by striking “FOOD STAMP” and inserting “SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE”;

(2) in section 1137—

(A) in subsection (a)(5)(B) by striking “food stamp” and inserting “supplemental nutrition assistance”;

(B) in subsection (b)(4) by striking “food stamp program under the Food Stamp Act of 1977” and inserting “supplemental nutrition assistance program under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008”; and

(3) in the heading of section 1631(n) by striking “FOOD STAMP” and inserting “SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE”.

SEC. 131. TOLERANCE LEVEL FOR EXCLUDING SMALL ERRORS.

The Secretary shall set the tolerance level for excluding small errors for the purposes of section 16(c) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2025(c))—

(1) for fiscal year 2014 at an amount no greater than \$25; and

(2) for each fiscal year thereafter, the amount specified in paragraph (1) adjusted by the percentage by which the thrifty food plan is adjusted under section 3(u)(4) of such Act between June 30, 2012, and June 30 of the immediately preceding fiscal year.

SEC. 132. COMMONWEALTH OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Prior to establishing the pilot program under subsection (b), the Secretary shall conduct a study to be completed not later than 2 years after the effective date of this section to assess—

(A) the capabilities of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands to operate the supplemental nutrition assistance pro-

gram in the same manner in which the program is operated in the States (as defined in section 3 of the Food and Nutrition Act (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.)); and

(B) alternative models of the supplemental nutrition assistance program operation and benefit delivery that best meet the nutrition assistance needs of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

(2) SCOPE.—The study conducted under paragraph (1)(A) will assess the capability of the Commonwealth to fulfill the responsibilities of a State agency, including—

(A) extending and limiting participation to eligible households, as prescribed by sections 5 and 6 of the Act;

(B) issuing benefits through EBT cards, as prescribed by section 7 of the Act;

(C) maintaining the integrity of the program, including operation of a quality control system, as prescribed by section 16(c) of the Act;

(D) implementing work requirements, including operating an employment and training program, as prescribed by section 6(d) of the Act; and

(E) paying a share of administrative costs with non-Federal funds, as prescribed by section 16(a) of the Act.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—If the Secretary determines that a pilot program is feasible, the Secretary shall establish a pilot program for the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands to operate the supplemental nutrition assistance program in the same manner in which the program is operated in the States.

(c) SCOPE.—The Secretary shall utilize the information obtained from the study conducted under subsection (a) to establish the scope of the pilot program established under subsection (b).

(d) REPORT.—Not later than June 30, 2019, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report on the pilot program carried out under this section, including an analysis of the feasibility of operating in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands the supplemental nutrition assistance program as it is operated in the States.

(e) FUNDING.—

(1) STUDY.—Of the funds made available under section 18(a)(1) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, the Secretary may use not more than \$1,000,000 in each of fiscal years 2014 and 2015 to conduct the study described in subsection (a).

(2) PILOT PROGRAM.—Of the funds made available under section 18(a)(1) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, for the purposes of establishing and carrying out the pilot program established under subsection (b) of this section, including the Federal costs for providing technical assistance to the Commonwealth, authorizing and monitoring retail food stores, and assessing pilot operations, the Secretary may use not more than—

(A) \$13,500,000 in fiscal year 2016; and

(B) \$8,500,000 in each of fiscal years 2017 and 2018.

SEC. 133. ANNUAL STATE REPORT ON VERIFICATION OF SNAP PARTICIPATION.

(a) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later 1 year after the date specified by the Secretary in the 180-period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, each State agency that carries out the supplemental nutrition assistance program shall submit to the Secretary a report containing sufficient information for the Secretary to determine whether the State agency has, for the then most recently concluded fiscal year preceding such annual date, verified that households to which such State agency provided such assistance in such fiscal year—

(1) did not obtain benefits attributable to a deceased individual;

(2) did not include an individual who was simultaneously included in a household receiving such assistance in another State; and

(3) did not include, during the time benefits were provided, an individual who was then disqualified from receiving benefits.

(b) **PENALTY FOR NONCOMPLIANCE.**—For any fiscal year for which a State agency fails to comply with subsection (a), the Secretary shall reduce by 50 percent the amount otherwise payable to such State agency under section 16(a) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 with respect to such fiscal year.

SEC. 134. TERMINATION OF EXISTING AGREEMENT.

Effective on the date of the enactment of this Act, the memorandum of understanding entered into on July 22, 2004, by the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States Department of Agriculture and the Secretary of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Mexico and known as the “Partnership for Nutrition Assistance Initiative” is null and void.

SEC. 135. SERVICE OF TRADITIONAL FOODS IN PUBLIC FACILITIES.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **FOOD SERVICE PROGRAM.**—The term “food service program” includes—

(A) food service at a residential child care facility with a license from an appropriate State agency;

(B) a child nutrition program (as defined in section 25(b) of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1769f(b)));

(C) food service at a hospital or clinic or long term care facility; and

(D) a senior meal program.

(2) **INDIAN; INDIAN TRIBE; INDIAN TRIBAL ORGANIZATION.**—The terms “Indian”; “Indian tribe”; and “Indian Tribal Organization” have the meanings given those terms in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b).

(3) **TRADITIONAL FOOD.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term “traditional food” means food that has traditionally been prepared and consumed by an Indian tribe.

(B) **INCLUSIONS.**—The term “traditional food” includes—

(i) wild game meat;

(ii) fish;

(iii) seafood;

(iv) marine mammals;

(v) plants; and

(vi) berries.

(b) **PROGRAM.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall allow the donation to and serving of traditional food through a food service program at a public facility, nonprofit facility, including facilities operated by an Indian tribe or tribal organization that primarily serves Indians if the operator of the food service program—

(1) ensures that the food is received whole, gutted, gilled, as quarters, or as a roast, without further processing;

(2) makes a reasonable determination that—

(A) the animal was not diseased;

(B) the food was butchered, dressed, transported, and stored to prevent contamination, undesirable microbial growth, or deterioration; and

(C) the food will not cause a significant health hazard or potential for human illness;

(3) carries out any further preparation or processing of the food at a different time or in a different space from the preparation or processing of other food for the applicable program to prevent cross-contamination;

(4) cleans and sanitizes food-contact surfaces of equipment and utensils after processing the traditional food; and

(5) labels donated traditional food with the name of the food and stores the traditional

food separately from other food for the applicable program, including through storage in a separate freezer or refrigerator or in a separate compartment or shelf in the freezer or refrigerator.

(c) **LIABILITY.**—Liability for damages from donated traditional food and products to the participating food service program shall not be subject to civil or criminal liability arising from the nature, age, packaging, or condition of donated food.

SEC. 136. TESTING APPLICANTS FOR UNLAWFUL USE OF CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES.

Section 6 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2015), as amended by section 109, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(s) **TESTING APPLICANTS FOR UNLAWFUL USE OF CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES.**—

“(1) Nothing in this Act, or in any other Federal law, shall be considered to prevent a State, at the full cost to such State, from—

“(A) enacting legislation to provide for testing any individual who is a member of a household applying for supplemental nutrition assistance benefits, for the unlawful use of controlled substances as a condition for receiving such benefits; and

“(B) finding an individual ineligible to participate in the supplemental nutrition assistance program on the basis of the positive result of the testing conducted by the State under such legislation.

“(2) For purposes of this subsection, term ‘controlled substance’ has the meaning given such term in section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act ((21 U.S.C. 802)).”

SEC. 137. ELIGIBILITY DISQUALIFICATIONS FOR CERTAIN CONVICTED FELONS.

(a) **AMENDMENT.**—Section 6 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2015), as amended by sections 109 and 135, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(t) **DISQUALIFICATION FOR CERTAIN CONVICTED FELONS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—An individual shall not be eligible for benefits under this Act if the individual is convicted of—

“(A) aggravated sexual abuse under section 2241 of title 18, United States Code;

“(B) murder under section 1111 of title 18, United States Code;

“(C) an offense under chapter 110 of title 18, United States Code;

“(D) a Federal or State offense involving sexual assault, as defined in 40002(a) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13925(a)); or

“(E) an offense under State law determined by the Attorney General to be substantially similar to an offense described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C).

“(2) **EFFECTS ON ASSISTANCE AND BENEFITS FOR OTHERS.**—The amount of benefits otherwise required to be provided to an eligible household under this Act shall be determined by considering the individual to whom paragraph (1) applies not to be a member of such household, except that the income and resources of the individual shall be considered to be income and resources of the household.

“(3) **ENFORCEMENT.**—Each State shall require each individual applying for benefits under this Act, during the application process, to state, in writing, whether the individual, or any member of the household of the individual, has been convicted of a crime described in paragraph (1).”

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 5(a) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2014(a)), as amended by section 109, is amended in the 2d sentence by striking “and (r)” and inserting “, (r), and (t)”.

(c) **INAPPLICABILITY TO CONVICTIONS OCCURRING ON OR BEFORE ENACTMENT.**—The amendments made by this section shall not apply to a conviction if the conviction is for con-

duct occurring on or before the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 138. EXPUNGEMENT OF UNUSED SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM BENEFITS.

Section 11 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2020), as amended by section 115, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(w) **EXPUNGEMENT OF UNUSED BENEFITS.**—The State agency shall expunge from the EBT account of a household benefits that are not used before the expiration of the 60-day period beginning on the date such benefits are posted to such account.”

SEC. 139. PILOT PROJECTS TO PROMOTE WORK AND INCREASE STATE ACCOUNTABILITY IN THE SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

(a) **PILOT PROJECTS.**—Section 17 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2026), as amended by sections 122 and 123, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(n) **PILOT PROJECTS TO PROMOTE WORK AND INCREASE STATE ACCOUNTABILITY IN THE SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall carry out pilot projects to develop and test methods allowing States to run a work program with certain features comparable to the State program funded under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.), with the intent of increasing employment and self-sufficiency through increased State accountability and thereby reducing the need for supplemental nutrition assistance benefits.

“(2) **AGREEMENTS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary shall enter into cooperative agreements with States in accordance with pilot projects that meet the criteria required under this subsection.

“(B) **APPLICATION.**—To be eligible to enter into a cooperative agreement to operate a pilot project under this subsection, a State shall amend its State plan under section 11(d) to include a description of its pilot project and explanations of how such project meets the criteria required under this subsection. The Secretary may not disapprove a pilot project which meets the requirements under this subsection.

“(C) **ASSURANCES.**—A State shall include in its plan assurances that its pilot project will—

“(i) operate for at least three 12-month periods but not more than five 12-month periods;

“(ii) have a robust data collection system for program administration that is designed and shared with project evaluators to ensure proper and timely evaluation; and

“(iii) intend to offer a work activity described in paragraph (3) to adults assigned and required to participate under paragraph (4)(A) and who are not exempt under paragraph (4)(B).

“(D) **NUMBER OF PILOT PROJECTS.**—Any State may carry out a pilot project that meets the requirements of this subsection.

“(E) **EXTENT OF PILOT PROJECTS.**—Pilot projects shall cover no less than the entire State.

“(3) **WORK ACTIVITY.**—(A) For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘work activity’ means any of the following:

“(i) Employment in the public or private sector that is not subsidized by any public program.

“(ii) Employment in the private sector for which the employer receives a subsidy from public funds to offset some or all of the wages and costs of employing an adult.

“(iii) Employment in the public sector for which the employer receives a subsidy from public funds to offset some or all of the wages and costs of employing an adult.

“(iv) A work activity that—

“(I) is performed in return for public benefits;

“(II) provides an adult with an opportunity to acquire the general skills, knowledge, and work habits necessary to obtain employment;

“(III) is designed to improve the employability of those who cannot find unsubsidized employment; and

“(IV) is supervised by an employer, work site sponsor, or other responsible party on an ongoing basis.

“(v) Training in the public or private sector that is given to a paid employee while he or she is engaged in productive work and that provides knowledge and skills essential to the full and adequate performance of the job.

“(vi) Job search, obtaining employment, or preparation to seek or obtain employment, including—

“(I) life skills training;

“(II) substance abuse treatment or mental health treatment, determined to be necessary and documented by a qualified medical, substance abuse, or mental health professional; or

“(III) rehabilitation activities, supervised by a public agency or other responsible party on an ongoing basis.

“(vii) Structured programs and embedded activities—

“(I) in which adults perform work for the direct benefit of the community under the auspices of public or nonprofit organizations;

“(II) that are limited to projects that serve useful community purposes in fields such as health, social service, environmental protection, education, urban and rural redevelopment, welfare, recreation, public facilities, public safety, and child care;

“(III) that are designed to improve the employability of adults not otherwise able to obtain unsubsidized employment; and

“(IV) that are supervised on an ongoing basis; and

“(V) with respect to which a State agency takes into account, to the extent possible, the prior training, experience, and skills of a recipient in making appropriate community service assignments.

“(viii) Career and technical training programs (not to exceed 12 months with respect to any adult) that are directly related to the preparation of adults for employment in current or emerging occupations and that are supervised on an ongoing basis.

“(ix) Training or education for job skills that are required by an employer to provide an adult with the ability to obtain employment or to advance or adapt to the changing demands of the workplace and that are supervised on an ongoing basis.

“(x) Education that is related to a specific occupation, job, or job offer and that is supervised on an ongoing basis.

“(xi) In the case of an adult who has not completed secondary school or received such a certificate of general equivalence, regular attendance—

“(I) in accordance with the requirements of the secondary school or course of study, at a secondary school or in a course of study leading to such certificate; and

“(II) supervised on an ongoing basis.

“(xii) Providing child care to enable another recipient of public benefits to participate in a community service program that—

“(I) does not provide compensation for such community service;

“(II) is a structured program designed to improve the employability of adults who participate in such program; and

“(III) is supervised on an ongoing basis.

“(B) PROTECTIONS.—Work activities under this subsection shall be subject to all applicable health and safety standards. Except as

described in clauses (i), (ii), and (iii) of subparagraph (A), the term ‘work activity’ shall be considered work preparation and not defined as employment for purposes of other law.

“(4) PILOT PROJECTS.—Pilot projects carried out under this subsection shall include interventions to which adults are assigned that are designed to reduce unnecessary dependence, promote self-sufficiency, increase work levels, increase earned income, and reduce supplemental nutrition assistance benefit expenditures among households eligible for, applying for, or participating in the supplemental nutrition assistance program.

“(A) Adults assigned to interventions by the State shall—

“(i) be subject to mandatory participation in work activities specified in paragraph (3);

“(ii) participate in work activities specified in paragraph (3) for a minimum of 20 hours per week per household;

“(iii) be a maximum age of not less than 50 and not more than 60, as defined by the State;

“(iv) be subject to penalties during a period of nonparticipation without good cause ranging from, at State option, a minimum of the removal of the adults from the household benefit amount, up to a maximum of the discontinuance of the entire household benefit amount; and

“(v) not be penalized for nonparticipation if child care is not available for 1 or more children under 6 years of age.

“(B) The State shall allow certain individuals to be exempt from work requirements—

“(i) those participating in work programs under a State program funded under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.) for an equal or greater number of hours;

“(ii) those with 1 or more dependent children under 1 year of age;

“(iii) 1 adult family member per household who is needed in the home to care for a disabled family member;

“(iv) an adult who is receiving temporary or permanent disability benefits provided by a governmental entity; and

“(v) those with a good cause reason for nonparticipation, such as victims of domestic violence, as defined by the State.

“(5) EVALUATION AND REPORTING.—

“(A) EVALUATION.—

“(i) INDEPENDENT EVALUATION.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide for each State that enters into a cooperative agreement under paragraph (2) an independent, longitudinal evaluation of its pilot project under this subsection to determine total program savings over the entire course of the pilot project with results reported in consecutive 12-month increments.

“(II) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the evaluation is to measure the impact of interventions provided by the State under the pilot project on the ability of adults in households eligible for, applying for, or participating in the supplemental nutrition assistance program to find and retain employment that leads to increased household income and reduced dependence.

“(III) REQUIREMENT.—The independent evaluation under subclause (I) shall use valid statistical methods which can determine the difference between supplemental nutrition assistance benefit expenditures, if any, as a result of the interventions as compared to a control group that—

“(aa) is not subject to the interventions provided by the State under the pilot project under this subsection; and

“(bb) maintains services provided under 16(h) in the year prior to the start of the pilot project under this subsection.

“(IV) OPTION.—States shall have the option to evaluate pilot projects by matched coun-

ties or matched geographical areas using a constructed control group design to isolate the effects of the intervention of the pilot project.

“(V) DEFINITION.—Constructed control group means there is no random assignment, and instead program participants (those subject to interventions) and non-participants (control described in subclause (III)) are equated using matching or statistical procedures on characteristics that may be associated with program outcomes.

“(B) REPORTING.—Not later than 90 days after the end of fiscal year 2014 and of each fiscal year thereafter, until the completion of the last evaluation under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate, a report that includes a description of—

“(i) the status of each pilot project carried out under this subsection;

“(ii) the results of the evaluation completed during the previous fiscal year; and

“(iii) to the maximum extent practicable—

“(I) baseline information relevant to the stated goals and desired outcomes of the pilot project;

“(II) the impact of the interventions on appropriate employment, income, and public benefit receipt outcomes among households participating in the pilot project;

“(III) equivalent information about similar or identical measures for control groups;

“(IV) the planned dissemination of the report findings to State agencies; and

“(V) the steps and funding necessary to incorporate into State employment and training programs the components of pilot projects that demonstrate increased employment and earnings.

“(C) PUBLIC DISSEMINATION.—In addition to the reporting requirements under subparagraph (B), evaluation results shall be shared broadly to inform policy makers, service providers, other partners, and the public in order to promote wide use of successful strategies, including by posting evaluation results on the Internet website of the Department of Agriculture.

“(6) FUNDING.—

“(A) ADDITIONAL AVAILABLE FUNDS.—From amounts made available under section 18(a)(1), the Secretary shall make available—

“(i) up to \$1,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2014 through 2017 for evaluations described in paragraph (5) to carry out this subsection, with such amounts to remain available until expended; and

“(ii) amounts equal to one-half of the accumulated supplemental nutrition assistance benefit dollars saved over each consecutive 12-month period according to the evaluation under paragraph (5) for bonus grants to States under paragraph (7)(B).

“(B) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—

“(i) REIMBURSEMENT.—Except as provided in clause (ii)—

“(I) if, in carrying out a pilot project under this subsection during a fiscal year, a State incurs costs that exceed the amount allocated to the State agency under section 16(h)(1), the Secretary shall pay such State an amount equal to 50 percent of such costs; and

“(II) the Secretary shall also reimburse the State in an amount equal to 50 percent of the total amount of payments made or costs incurred by the State agency in connection with transportation costs and other expenses reasonably necessary and directly related to participation in a pilot project under this subsection, except that the amount of the reimbursement for dependent care expenses shall not exceed an amount equal to the payment made under section 6(d)(4)(I)(i)(II) but not more than the applicable local market

rate, and such reimbursement shall not be made out of funds allocated under section 16(h)(1).

“(ii) LIMITATION.—For any fiscal year, the Secretary may not pay under clause (i) to a State an amount the exceeds the amount equal to the product of—

“(I) the amount of administrative expenses that would be reimbursable for such fiscal year to such State under clause (i) without regard to this clause; and

“(II) \$277,000,000 (plus the amount carried over, if any, under clause (iii)), divided by the aggregate amount of administrative expenses that would be reimbursable for such fiscal year to all of the States under clause (i) without regard to this clause.

“(iii) CARRYOVER.—The amount by which \$277,000,000 exceeds the aggregate amount paid under clause (i) for a particular fiscal year shall remain available for payments under such clause for any subsequent fiscal year.

“(C) OTHER FUNDS.—Any additional funds required by a State to carry out a pilot project under this subsection may be provided by the State from funds made available to the State for such purpose and in accordance with State and other Federal laws, including the following:

“(i) Section 403 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 603).

“(ii) The Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 9201 et seq.).

“(iii) The Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858 et seq.) and section 418 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 618).

“(iv) The social services block grant under subtitle A of title XX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397 et seq.).

“(7) USE OF FUNDS.—

“(A) SPECIFIC USES.—Funds provided under this subsection for evaluation of pilot projects under paragraph (6)(A)(i) shall be used only for—

“(i) pilot projects that comply with this subsection;

“(ii) the costs incurred in gathering and providing information and data used to conduct the independent evaluation under paragraph (5); and

“(iii) the costs of the evaluation under paragraph (5).

“(B) LIMITATION.—Funds provided for bonus grants to States for pilot projects under subparagraph (6)(A)(ii) shall be used only for—

“(i) pilot projects that comply with this subsection; and

“(ii) any State purpose, not to be restricted to the supplemental nutrition assistance program or its beneficiary population.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 16, as amended by section 121 of this Act—

(A) in subsection (a) by striking “subsection (k)” and inserting “subsections (k) and (h) and section 20”; and

(B) in subsection (h)—

(i) in paragraph (1)—

(I) in subparagraph (A) by inserting “under sections 6(d)(4) and 17(n)” after “programs”; and

(II) by striking subparagraph (E);

(ii) by striking paragraphs (2) and (3), and inserting the following:

“(2) EXCLUSION OF REIMBURSEMENT FOR ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—No funds may be paid under subsection (a) to a State agency for administrative costs incurred to carry out any of such programs in such fiscal year.”;

(iii) in paragraph (4) by inserting “or 17(n)” after “section 6(d)(4)”; and

(iv) by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively;

(2) in section 20 by amending subsection (g) to read as follows:

“(g) EXCLUSION OF REIMBURSEMENT FOR ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—No funds may be paid under this section to a State agency for administrative costs incurred to carry out a workfare program operated under this section.”; and

(3) in section 22(d)(1)(B)(ii) by striking “, (g), (h)(2), and (h)(3)” and inserting “and (g)”.

SEC. 140. IMPROVED WAGE VERIFICATION USING THE NATIONAL DIRECTORY OF NEW HIRES.

Effective October 1, 2013, section 11(e) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2020(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3) by inserting “and after compliance with the requirement specified in paragraph (24)” after “section 16(e) of this Act”;

(2) in paragraph (22) by striking “and” at the end,

(3) in paragraph (23) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”, and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(24) that the State agency shall request wage data directly from the National Directory of New Hires established under section 453(i) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 653(i)) relevant to determining eligibility to receive supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits and determining the correct amount of such benefits.”.

SEC. 141. FEASIBILITY STUDY FOR INDIAN TRIBES.

Section 4 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2013) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) FEASIBILITY STUDY FOR INDIAN TRIBES.—

“(1) STUDY.—Subject to the availability of appropriations to carry out this subsection, the Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of a tribal demonstration project for tribes to administer all Federal food assistance programs, services, functions, and activities (or portions thereof) of the agency.

“(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—In conducting the study, the Secretary shall consider—

“(A) the probable effects on specific programs and program beneficiaries of such a demonstration project;

“(B) statutory, regulatory, or other impediments to implementation of such a demonstration project;

“(C) strategies for implementing such a demonstration project;

“(D) probable costs or savings associated with such a demonstration project;

“(E) methods to assure quality and accountability in such a demonstration project; and

“(F) such other issues that may be determined by the Secretary or developed through consultation with pursuant to paragraph (4).

“(3) REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the effective date of this subsection, the Secretary shall submit a report to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry of the Senate and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives. The report shall contain—

“(A) the results of the study under this subsection;

“(B) a list of programs, services, functions, and activities (or portions thereof) within each agency with respect to which it would be feasible to include in a tribal demonstration project;

“(C) a list of programs, services, functions, and activities (or portions thereof) included in the list provided pursuant to subparagraph (B) that could be included in a tribal demonstration project without amending a

statute, or waiving regulations that the Secretary may not waive; and

“(D) a list of legislative actions required in order to include those programs, services, function, and activities (or portions thereof) included in the list provided pursuant to subparagraph (B) but not included in the list provided pursuant to subparagraph (C), in a tribal demonstration project.

“(4) CONSULTATION WITH INDIAN TRIBES.—The Secretary shall consult with Indian tribes to determine a protocol for consultation under paragraph (1) prior to consultation under such paragraph with the other entities described in such paragraph. The protocol shall require, at a minimum, that—

“(A) the government-to-government relationship with Indian tribes forms the basis for the consultation process;

“(B) the Indian tribes and the Secretary jointly conduct the consultations required by this subsection; and

“(C) the consultation process allows for separate and direct recommendations from the Indian tribes and other entities described in paragraph (1).

“(5) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection \$1,000,000.”.

TITLE II—COMMODITY DISTRIBUTION PROGRAMS

SEC. 201. COMMODITY DISTRIBUTION PROGRAM.

Section 4(a) of the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973 (7 U.S.C. 612c note; Public Law 93-86) is amended in the 1st sentence by striking “2012” and inserting “2016”.

SEC. 202. COMMODITY SUPPLEMENTAL FOOD PROGRAM.

Section 5 of the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973 (7 U.S.C. 612c note; Public Law 93-86) is amended—

(1) in paragraphs (1) and (2)(B) of subsection (a) by striking “2012” each place it appears and inserting “2016”;

(2) in the 1st sentence of subsection (d)(2) by striking “2012” and inserting “2016”;

(3) by striking subsection (g) and inserting the following:

“(g) ELIGIBILITY.—Except as provided in subsection (m), the States shall only provide assistance under the commodity supplemental food program to low-income individuals aged 60 and older.”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(m) PHASE-OUT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an individual who receives assistance under the commodity supplemental food program on the day before the effective date of this subsection shall continue to receive that assistance until the date on which the individual no longer qualifies for assistance under the eligibility criteria for the program in effect on the day before the effective date of this subsection.”.

SEC. 203. DISTRIBUTION OF SURPLUS COMMODITIES TO SPECIAL NUTRITION PROJECTS.

Section 1114(a)(2)(A) of the Agriculture and Food Act of 1981 (7 U.S.C. 1431e(2)(A)) is amended in the 1st sentence by striking “2012” and inserting “2016”.

SEC. 204. PROCESSING OF COMMODITIES.

(a) Section 17 of the Commodity Distribution Reform Act and WIC Amendments of 1987 (7 U.S.C. 612c note) is amended by—

(1) striking the heading and inserting “COMMODITY DONATIONS AND PROCESSING”; and

(2) adding at the end the following:

“(c) PROCESSING.—For any program included in subsection (b), the Secretary may, notwithstanding any other provision of State or Federal law relating to the procurement of goods and services—

“(1) retain title to commodities delivered to a processor, on behalf of a State (including a State distributing agency and a recipient agency), until such time as end products containing such commodities, or similar commodities as approved by the Secretary, are delivered to a State distributing agency or to a recipient agency; and

“(2) promulgate regulations to ensure accountability for commodities provided to a processor for processing into end products, and to facilitate processing of commodities into end products for use by recipient agencies. Such regulations may provide that—

“(A) a processor that receives commodities for processing into end products, or provides a service with respect to such commodities or end products, in accordance with its agreement with a State distributing agency or a recipient agency, provide to the Secretary a bond or other means of financial assurance to protect the value of such commodities; and

“(B) in the event a processor fails to deliver to a State distributing agency or a recipient agency an end product in conformance with the processing agreement entered into under this Act, the Secretary take action with respect to the bond or other means of financial assurance pursuant to regulations promulgated under this paragraph and distribute any proceeds obtained by the Secretary to one or more State distributing agencies and recipient agencies as determined appropriate by the Secretary.”

(b) **DEFINITIONS.**—Section 18 of the Commodity Distribution Reform Act and WIC Amendments of 1987 (7 U.S.C. 612c note) is amended by striking paragraphs (1) and (2) and inserting the following:

“(1) The term ‘commodities’ means agricultural commodities and their products that are donated by the Secretary for use by recipient agencies.

“(2) The term ‘end product’ means a food product that contains processed commodities.”

(c) **TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—Section 3 of the Commodity Distribution Reform Act and WIC Amendments of 1987 (7 U.S.C. 612c note; Public Law 100-237) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (2) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

“(B) the program established under section 4(b) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2013(b));”; and

(B) in paragraph (3)(D) by striking “the Committee on Education and Labor” and inserting “the Committee on Education and the Workforce”;

(2) in subsection (b)(1)(A)(ii) by striking “section 32 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act (7 U.S.C. 601 et seq.)” and inserting “section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7 U.S.C. 612c)”;

(3) in subsection (e)(1)(D)(iii) by striking subclause (II) and inserting the following:

“(II) the program established under section 4(b) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2013(b));”; and

(4) in subsection (k) by striking “the Committee on Education and Labor” and inserting “the Committee on Education and the Workforce”.

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 301. FARMERS' MARKET NUTRITION PROGRAM.

Section 4402 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 3007) is amended—

(1) in the section heading by striking “SENIORS”;

(2) by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

“(a) **FUNDING.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Secretary of Agriculture shall use to carry out and expand the farmers market nutrition program \$20,600,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2016.

“(2) **ADDITIONAL FUNDING.**—There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this subsection for each of the fiscal years specified in paragraph (1).

“(3) **REQUIREMENT.**—Not less than 50 percent of the funds made available to carry out this section in any fiscal year shall be used to provide assistance to seniors.”;

(3) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “seniors”; and

(B) in paragraph (1) by inserting “, and low-income families who are determined to be at nutritional risk” after “low-income seniors”;

(4) in subsection (c) by striking “seniors”;

(5) in subsection (d) by striking “seniors”;

(6) in subsection (e) by striking “seniors”;

(7) by redesignating subsections (c), (d), (e), and (f) as subsections (d), (e), (f), and (g), respectively; and

(8) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

“(c) **STATE GRANTS AND OTHER ASSISTANCE.**—The Secretary shall carry out the Program through grants and other assistance provided in accordance with agreements made with States, for implementation through State agencies and local agencies, that include provisions—

“(1) for the issuance of coupons or vouchers to participating individuals;

“(2) establishing an appropriate annual percentage limitation on the use of funds for administrative costs; and

“(3) specifying other terms and conditions as the Secretary deems appropriate to encourage expanding the participation of small scale farmers in Federal nutrition programs.”.

SEC. 302. NUTRITION INFORMATION AND AWARENESS PILOT PROGRAM.

Section 4403 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 3171 note; Public Law 107-171) is repealed.

SEC. 303. FRESH FRUIT AND VEGETABLE PROGRAM.

Section 19 of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1769a) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking “FRESH”;

(2) in subsection (a), by striking “fresh”;

(3) in subsection (b), by striking “fresh”; and

(4) in subsection (e), by striking “fresh”.

SEC. 304. ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY FOR PURCHASE OF FRESH FRUITS, VEGETABLES, AND OTHER SPECIALTY FOOD CROPS.

Section 10603 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 612c-4) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking “2012” and inserting “2016”;

(2) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d); and

(3) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

“(c) **PILOT GRANT PROGRAM FOR PURCHASE OF FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Using amounts made available to carry out subsection (b), the Secretary of Agriculture shall conduct a pilot program under which the Secretary will give not more than five participating States the option of receiving a grant in an amount equal to the value of the commodities that the participating State would otherwise receive under this section for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2016.

“(2) **USE OF GRANT FUNDS.**—A participating State receiving a grant under this subsection

may use the grant funds solely to purchase fresh fruits and vegetables for distribution to schools and service institutions in the State that participate in the food service programs under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.) and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1771 et seq.).

“(3) **SELECTION OF PARTICIPATING STATES.**—The Secretary shall select participating States from applications submitted by the States.

“(4) **REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.**—

“(A) **SCHOOL AND SERVICE INSTITUTION REQUIREMENT.**—Schools and service institutions in a participating State shall keep records of purchases of fresh fruits and vegetables made using the grant funds and report such records to the State.

“(B) **STATE REQUIREMENT.**—Each participating State shall submit to the Secretary a report on the success of the pilot program in the State, including information on—

“(i) the amount and value of each type of fresh fruit and vegetable purchased by the State; and

“(ii) the benefit provided by such purchases in conducting the school food service in the State, including meeting school meal requirements.”.

SEC. 305. ENCOURAGING LOCALLY AND REGIONALLY GROWN AND RAISED FOOD.

(a) **COMMODITY PURCHASE STREAMLINING.**—The Secretary may permit each school food authority with a low annual commodity entitlement value, as determined by the Secretary, to elect to substitute locally and regionally grown and raised food for the authority's allotment, in whole or in part, of commodity assistance for the school meal programs under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.) and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1771 et seq.), if—

(1) the election is requested by the school food authority;

(2) the Secretary determines that the election will reduce State and Federal administrative costs; and

(3) the election will provide the school food authority with greater flexibility to purchase locally and regionally grown and raised foods.

(b) **FARM-TO-SCHOOL DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may establish farm-to-school demonstration programs under which school food authorities, agricultural producers producing for local and regional markets, and other farm-to-school stakeholders will collaborate with the Agriculture Marketing Service to, on a cost neutral basis, source food for the school meal programs under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.) and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1771 et seq.) from local farmers and ranchers in lieu of the commodity assistance provided to the school food authorities for the school meal programs.

(2) **REQUIREMENTS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Each demonstration program carried out under this subsection shall—

(i) facilitate and increase the purchase of unprocessed and minimally processed locally and regionally grown and raised agricultural products to be served under the school meal programs;

(ii) test methods to improve procurement, transportation, and meal preparation processes for the school meal programs;

(iii) assess whether administrative costs can be saved through increased school food authority flexibility to source locally and regionally produced foods for the school meal programs; and

(iv) undertake rigorous evaluation and share information about results of the demonstration program, including cost savings, with the Secretary, other school food authorities, agricultural producers producing for the local and regional market, and the general public.

(B) PLANS.—In order to be selected to carry out a demonstration program under this subsection, a school food authority shall submit to the Secretary a plan at such time and in such manner as the Secretary may require, and containing information with respect to the requirements described in clauses (i) through (iv) of subparagraph (A).

(3) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary shall provide technical assistance to demonstration program participants to assist such participants to acquire bids from potential vendors in a timely and cost-effective manner.

(4) LENGTH.—The Secretary shall determine the appropriate length of time for each demonstration program under this subsection.

(5) COORDINATION.—The Secretary shall coordinate among relevant agencies of the Department of Agriculture and non-governmental organizations with appropriate expertise to facilitate the provision of training and technical assistance necessary to successfully carry out demonstration programs under this subsection.

(6) NUMBER.—Subject to the availability of funds to carry out this subsection, the Secretary shall select at least 10 demonstration programs to be carried out under this subsection.

(7) DIVERSITY AND BALANCE.—In selecting demonstration programs to be carried out under this subsection, the Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, ensure—

(A) geographical diversity;

(B) that at least half of the demonstration programs are completed in collaboration with school food authorities with small annual commodity entitlements, as determined by the Secretary;

(C) that at least half of the demonstration programs are completed in rural or tribal communities;

(D) equitable treatment of school food authorities with a high percentage of students eligible for free or reduced price lunches, as determined by the Secretary; and

(E) that at least one of the demonstration programs is completed on a military installation as defined in section 2687(e)(1) of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 306. REVIEW OF PUBLIC HEALTH BENEFITS OF WHITE POTATOES.

The Secretary shall conduct a review of the economic and public health benefits of white potatoes on low-income families who are determined to be at nutritional risk. Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall report the findings of this review to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate.

SEC. 307. HEALTHY FOOD FINANCING INITIATIVE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle D of title II of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 6951 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 242. HEALTHY FOOD FINANCING INITIATIVE.

“(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to enhance the authorities of the Secretary to support efforts to provide access to healthy food by establishing an initiative to improve access to healthy foods in underserved areas, to create and preserve quality jobs, and to revitalize low-income communities by providing loans and grants to eligible fresh, healthy food retailers to overcome

the higher costs and initial barriers to entry in underserved areas.

“(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—The term ‘community development financial institution’ has the meaning given the term in section 103 of the Community Development Banking and Financial Institutions Act of 1994 (12 U.S.C. 4702).

“(2) INITIATIVE.—The term ‘Initiative’ means the Healthy Food Financing Initiative established under subsection (c)(1).

“(3) NATIONAL FUND MANAGER.—The term ‘national fund manager’ means a community development financial institution that is—

“(A) in existence on the date of enactment of this section; and

“(B) certified by the Community Development Financial Institution Fund of the Department of Treasury to manage the Initiative for purposes of—

“(i) raising private capital;

“(ii) providing financial and technical assistance to partnerships; and

“(iii) funding eligible projects to attract fresh, healthy food retailers to underserved areas, in accordance with this section.

“(4) PARTNERSHIP.—The term ‘partnership’ means a regional, State, or local public-private partnership that—

“(A) is organized to improve access to fresh, healthy foods;

“(B) provides financial and technical assistance to eligible projects; and

“(C) meets such other criteria as the Secretary may establish.

“(5) PERISHABLE FOOD.—The term ‘perishable food’ means a staple food that is fresh, refrigerated, or frozen.

“(6) QUALITY JOB.—The term ‘quality job’ means a job that provides wages and other benefits comparable to, or better than, similar positions in existing businesses of similar size in similar local economies.

“(7) STAPLE FOOD.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘staple food’ means food that is a basic dietary item.

“(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term ‘staple food’ includes—

“(i) bread;

“(ii) flour;

“(iii) fruits;

“(iv) vegetables; and

“(v) meat.

“(c) INITIATIVE.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish an initiative to achieve the purpose described in subsection (a) in accordance with this subsection.

“(2) IMPLEMENTATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the Initiative, the Secretary shall provide funding to entities with eligible projects, as described in subparagraph (B), subject to the priorities described in subparagraph (C).

“(ii) USE OF FUNDS.—Funds provided to an entity pursuant to clause (i) shall be used—

“(I) to create revolving loan pools of capital or other products to provide loans to finance eligible projects or partnerships;

“(II) to provide grants for eligible projects or partnerships;

“(III) to provide technical assistance to funded projects and entities seeking Initiative funding; and

“(IV) to cover administrative expenses of the national fund manager in an amount not to exceed 10 percent of the Federal funds provided.

“(B) ELIGIBLE PROJECTS.—Subject to the approval of the Secretary, the national fund manager shall establish eligibility criteria for projects under the Initiative, which shall include the existence or planned execution of agreements—

“(i) to expand or preserve the availability of staple foods in underserved areas with

moderate- and low-income populations by maintaining or increasing the number of retail outlets that offer an assortment of perishable food and staple food items, as determined by the Secretary, in those areas; and

“(ii) to accept benefits under the supplemental nutrition assistance program established under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.).

“(C) PRIORITIES.—In carrying out the Initiative, priority shall be given to projects that—

“(i) are located in severely distressed low-income communities, as defined by the Community Development Financial Institutions Fund of the Department of Treasury; and

“(ii) include 1 or more of the following characteristics:

“(I) The project will create or retain quality jobs for low-income residents in the community.

“(II) The project supports regional food systems and locally grown foods, to the maximum extent practicable.

“(III) In areas served by public transit, the project is accessible by public transit.

“(IV) The project involves women- or minority-owned businesses.

“(V) The project receives funding from other sources, including other Federal agencies.

“(VI) The project otherwise advances the purpose of this section, as determined by the Secretary.

“(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this section \$125,000,000, to remain available until expended.”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 296(b) of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 7014(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (6) by striking “or” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (7) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(8) the authority of the Secretary to establish and carry out the Health Food Financing Initiative under section 242.”

SEC. 308. REVIEW OF SOLE-SOURCE CONTRACTS IN FEDERAL NUTRITION PROGRAMS.

The Secretary shall conduct an evaluation of sole-source contracts in Federal nutrition programs, and the effect such contracts have on program participation, program goals, nonprogram consumers, retailers, and free market dynamics. Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall report the findings of this review to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate.

SEC. 309. PURCHASE OF HALAL AND KOSHER FOOD FOR EMERGENCY FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

Section 202 of the Emergency Food Assistance Act of 1983 (7 U.S.C. 7502) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(h) KOSHER AND HALAL FOOD.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall finalize and implement a plan—

“(1) to increase the purchase of Kosher and Halal food from food manufacturers with a Kosher or Halal certification to carry out the program established under this Act if the Kosher and Halal food purchased is cost neutral as compared to food that is not from food manufacturers with a Kosher or Halal certification; and

“(2) to modify the labeling of the commodities list used to carry out the program in a manner that enables Kosher and Halal food bank operators to identify which commodities to obtain from local food banks.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3102, the Nutrition Reform and Work Opportunity Act of 2013.

As we all know, in July, the House passed a farm bill—farm bill only. This legislation did not include title IV, which consists of the nutrition programs, including the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP.

Since that time, our Leader CANTOR has put together a working group, of which I was a part, to create a bill that better targets Federal nutrition programs to serve those in need of assistance. H.R. 3102 is the by-product of that effort.

Before I begin to highlight some of its provisions, let me take a moment to say what we all know to be true. There's no denying that SNAP provides important support for many Americans who are struggling. It serves a noble purpose: to help you when you hit bottom. But it's not meant to keep you at the bottom, and that's why it's important we ensure the integrity of the program, so that it's working in the most effective and efficient way, that it works to get you back up on your feet.

□ 1600

Let me highlight some of the provisions that make this possible.

First, it incorporates all of the savings and reforms that were in H.R. 1947 that was favorably reported by the House Agriculture Committee in a large bipartisan vote. H.R. 1947 saved more than \$20 billion by eliminating categorical eligibility to ensure that States are enforcing the asset and income test in SNAP law. It closed the heat-and-eat loophole to prevent States from sending out \$1 LIHEAP checks to SNAP recipients to artificially increase their benefit levels.

It ended the practice of giving States bonuses for responsibly administering SNAP, which is their duty. It tightened restrictions to prevent lottery winners and traditional college students from participating in the program. And it restricted the Department of Agriculture from advertising SNAP on radio and television shows, such as soap operas. The bill we are considering today also incorporates many reforms that were adopted on the floor when the House considered H.R. 1947 in June.

And, finally, the efforts of the working group. This bill includes additional reforms that eliminate a State's ability to waive the current work requirements for able-bodied adults without dependents. It encourages employment and training by providing cost-share funds to States that adopt provisions under a new work pilot program. And it increases funding for food banks,

which have been successful in effectively utilizing government dollars and securing private-sector donations in order to feed hungry Americans.

Ultimately, this bill encourages and enables work participation and makes commonsense reforms, closes program loopholes and eliminates waste, fraud, and abuse in the SNAP program, saving the American taxpayer nearly \$40 billion.

I will admit to you this has been an unusual process. But it remains my goal to get a 5-year farm bill enacted. I'm doing everything possible to make sure that that happens this year. This is a step toward that goal. It is my hope that we'll pass this bill so the farm bill process will continue. We have a responsibility to get this done. Quite simply, it shouldn't be this hard to pass a bill that ensures all of us in this economy have enough to eat. And that's what a farm bill does.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill so the process can continue.

With that, Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FUDGE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I ask my colleagues in this House, Why are we here today? The original farm bill, H.R. 1947, passed out of the Agriculture Committee with bipartisan support. While this bill eventually died when it came to the floor, I have to thank the chairman and the ranking member for their leadership and desire to work together for the common good of all of the American people.

Today's exercise is nothing more than a waste of our time and an insult to every American in need. The Cantor bill includes the same toxic amendments that derailed the farm bill's passage the first time around. The fact that we are considering this legislation makes me question whether the Republican leadership even wants a farm bill to pass.

The Cantor bill guts nutrition for those most in need and says to the poor, to hungry children, to the disabled, seniors and our veterans, You don't matter. You are not worthy of our help.

They deserve better.

I've heard the stories from my constituents who struggle every month on whether to pay for medicine or food because they cannot afford both. SNAP recipients will already see a reduction in their benefits beginning November 1 when the 2009 Recovery Act temporary benefit boost ends. It will be reduced by as much as \$300 per year for some people. That is a staggering amount.

Many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle look at SNAP purely from a dollars-and-cents standpoint. Earlier this year, I participated in a panel on poverty. One of the young ladies from Witnesses to Hunger said:

People do a lot of talking about us. They refer to SNAP beneficiaries as statistics. But I'm not a statistic, I'm a real person struggling to get by.

This bill would abandon 5.7 million people during a time when they need us the most. No one can justify a bill of \$40 billion in cuts when 47 percent of all SNAP recipients are children under the age of 18. I cannot justify such cuts when 16.5 percent of all SNAP households include seniors. This bill is more than a sucker punch to those in need. It may be their fatal blow.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, I rise for the purpose of a colloquy with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS), and I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to discuss the issue of our veterans as it relates to H.R. 3102. I commend you for working to include important reforms of the SNAP program in this bill. However, some concerns have been raised regarding the bill's impact on veterans who rely on SNAP benefits.

While the eligibility and work requirement reforms included in this legislation are important, I believe they will have unintended consequences on our veterans. Some of our veterans returning from Iraq and Afghanistan live in a world that is somewhere between battle fatigue and PTSD. That means they may need a little extra time to transition from service to employment than their fellow citizens. And, unfortunately, veterans have been hit hard during the recession. They are unemployed at higher rates than the rest of the country. In Michigan alone, there are 25,000 unemployed veterans staring down at a north of 9 percent unemployment rate.

I ask the chairman if he would commit to work with me in conference to include language ensuring veterans remain protected in the future the way they are protected today. While this would not impact a large number of soldiers, sailors, and marines, it would have a huge impact on the confidence our servicemembers have in their government to keep our promise to them. And that promise is that when you put your life on the line for the United States of America, you will have the support, especially in these difficult economic times, of the people of the United States.

Our Nation's veterans have sacrificed for this country, and it is especially important that in difficult times they have this support.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, as the gentleman from Michigan knows because he's been a leader in this area, this Congress is committed to ensuring that our Nation's veterans have the support they need to enter successful civilian careers after their military service. This House led by passing the VOW to Hire Heroes Act, a comprehensive jobs bill to reduce veteran unemployment by retraining veterans to make them more competitive in today's job market. I'm pleased that the Senate followed our lead and that the VOW Act is now law.

This bill does not target veterans, though I understand the concerns you have raised today. So long as a veteran meets the asset and income test currently in SNAP law and complies with the applicable work requirement, he or she will continue to receive nutrition benefits. As with all disabled adults, veterans who have a physical or mental disability are exempt from work requirements. There are also numerous Federal job training and education programs specifically targeting veterans that spend over \$10 billion a year to ensure our veterans can get back to work. Additionally, we currently provide up to 73 weeks of unemployment benefits for veterans in our highest unemployment States.

Even so, I know I speak for the entire Agriculture Committee when I say we are committed to protecting our veterans in a way that honors their service and sacrifice to our Nation, and I look forward to working with the gentleman to make sure that the final conference committee agreement does just that.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY).

Mr. CONAWAY. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3102, the Nutrition Reform and Work Opportunity Act.

Today, the House of Representatives has the opportunity to pass a bill that makes the greatest reforms to SNAP since the bipartisan 1996 welfare reform act, and results in less spending. Opposing this bill is a vote for the status quo in Washington.

Our goal throughout this process has not been to take millions of people off of food stamps but to restore the integrity of the program and ensure this safety net is preserved for the families most in need. The arguments you will hear from the other side of the aisle are just theatrics. If you listen to them out of context, you would assume that we're destroying or eliminating the entire SNAP program. But we are not talking about eliminating the SNAP program. We're committed to finding solutions that work with the resources we actually have.

Today, we have an opportunity to modernize the nutrition program, to close loopholes, and most importantly, keep the safety net intact for qualified American families who depend on this assistance every day.

This bill rids nutrition policy of provisions that have weakened the system. It will seek to limit the public assistance program to those who qualify and close the loopholes that have been used to game the system. It will also create a more efficient and effective program for the Americans who really need it. This bill gives people the tools to become self-sufficient, find work, and make a better life for themselves and their children.

The Nutrition Reform and Work Opportunity Act is a good bill that reforms nutrition policy and returns ac-

countability to the food stamp program. And yes, Madam Speaker, it does reduce spending.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" and support this good work.

Ms. FUDGE. Let me just say that I find it's not theatrics that 5,000 Active Duty families would be kicked off of food stamps if this bill passes as it is given to us today.

Madam Speaker, it is my distinct honor to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), our assistant Democratic leader.

Mr. CLYBURN. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 3102, the latest attempt by the Republican majority to add more insults to the injuries that have been inflicted upon many working families, making their lives much more difficult.

It's become clear to me that some of my colleagues on the other side either don't believe or don't care that their preferred policies would make the poor poorer and the hungry hungrier. They seem unmoved by the arguments of many, including former Senate majority leader and Republican Presidential nominee Bob Dole, that this bill would make it more difficult for millions of Americans to feed themselves and their families.

For the last half century, the farm bill has always included both agriculture subsidies and nutrition assistance. This combination makes a lot of sense. Every time the EBT card is swiped, farmers—large and small—grocers—national chains to local mom-and-pop stores, and banks—Wall Street and Main Street—all benefit. For American farmers and agribusiness industry to succeed, they need consumers to purchase the food that they produce.

With the comprehensive nature of past farm bills, it is no surprise that 532 agriculture, conservation, rural development, finance, energy, and crop insurance groups oppose the Republican leadership's cynical ploy to separate nutrition assistance from the rest of the farm bill.

We talk about how SNAP's benefits go to individuals, but if the truth be told, the real beneficiaries are local communities and enterprises. My Republican colleagues claim to be big supporters of small businesses. But you can't support small businesses if you don't support their customers. This ill-advised legislation would also hurt businesses that have nothing to do with food.

In my district, the average household income among SNAP recipients is less than \$25,000 a year. If these low-income people lose access to nutrition assistance, money they would otherwise spend on other needs would be spent instead on food, taking customers away from other businesses throughout our economy.

Out-of-a-job supermarket workers will also have less money to spend. Less demand means fewer jobs. An

analysis by the Department of Agriculture of similar SNAP cuts last year found that more than 50,000 jobs would be affected. SNAP funding is crucial to our economy because those dollars go directly into the local economy.

My Republican colleagues and I might differ on how to grow the economy, but at the very least, we should be able to agree that we can't grow the economy by shrinking it.

Madam Speaker, I recognize that there are legitimate philosophical differences between the two parties on the role of the federal government.

But if you disagree with me about the moral consequences of this legislation, I hope you will pause to consider its harmful economic consequences and vote down this bill.

□ 1615

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD), one of my subcommittee chairmen.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3102, the Nutrition Reform and Work Opportunity Act. This legislation takes a significant step in reforming the food stamp program by preserving benefits for Americans truly in need of help, while holding accountable those who are capable of helping themselves.

Throughout the Obama Presidency, we have seen the food stamp program grow exponentially because the government continues to turn a blind eye to a system fraught with abuse. This legislation will no longer allow States to exploit various loopholes, such as artificially making people eligible simply by mailing a TANF brochure, or substantially increasing benefits by sending a nominal LIHEAP check.

This legislation also no longer allows States to waive work requirements that were put in place in the 1996 welfare reform law. As another Arkansan, President Bill Clinton, said when he signed the reform bill into law, we are making "welfare what it was meant to be, a second chance, not a way of life."

The reforms in this bill will give people a second chance by ensuring food stamps will be there when people fall on hard times, but promoting self-sufficiency through employment training programs so able-bodied Americans can get back to work.

Madam Speaker, this bill preserves and protects the food stamp program for the most vulnerable Americans by putting an end to institutional abuses that threaten its future viability. We can't expect to continue to provide assistance to the poor if we allow abuse to bankrupt the food stamp system.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation so that we may restore integrity to the program and continue to provide for those in need.

Ms. FUDGE. Madam Speaker, let me just say that the First District of Arkansas, which my colleague represents, has a SNAP recipient percentage of 18.2 percent.

Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman

from North Carolina (Mr. MCINTYRE), one of my fellow subcommittee ranking members on the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. MCINTYRE. Madam Speaker, on Monday I visited a food bank in my district to discuss the importance of healthy food for healthy families. It is clear from their example, among many, that a healthy mind and a healthy body means a healthy workforce and a more productive economy.

In May, the Agriculture Committee passed a bipartisan farm bill with reforms to nutrition that would have saved almost \$40 billion. That bill was defeated, and now we're considering a bill with serious ramifications that have proposed cuts that are not bipartisan and that go way too far. They will take away food from children, seniors, veterans, and military families.

Our children are our future, and ensuring their access to healthy meals at school and at home is critical. The Greatest Generation paved our path to prosperity. How dare we not honor our seniors and we take food from them on their tables.

Third, those who serve in our military, we should keep our promises and make sure that they and their families and our veterans do not go hungry. As one who has worked with both sides of the aisle, I implore my colleagues to oppose this bill. Work together. Find a bipartisan, commonsense solution that stays true to our Nation's commitments to our children, our seniors, our veterans, and our military families. For I was hungry, and you gave me nothing to eat.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 3102.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING), the primary subcommittee chairman on this important issue.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the chairman for yielding me time, and I rise in support of H.R. 3102.

Madam Speaker, I'd like to explain my position with this bit of a narrative. When I came into this Congress a little over a decade ago, I was watching the growth in the nutrition program, the food stamp program—and I'm well aware that it was established to try to put an end to malnutrition in America. Now, it was growing too fast for me at that time. At that time there were 19 million Americans that were on the food stamp program. By 2008, there were then 28.2 million Americans on the program. The cost in 2003 was about \$25 billion. The cost in 2008 was \$37.6 billion. Today, our number is knocking on the door of 47 million people. From 19 million to 47 million people,

from \$25 billion to \$78.4 billion, and we're watching an administration that has been advancing the expansion of the sign-up of the nutrition program by spending millions of dollars in advertising to get more people to sign up, and hiring people to go out and recruit people to sign up for more food stamps.

I listened to the testimony before the committee that we had from La Raza that said that food insecurity is now a reason for obesity in America; that people have insecurity about where some of their future meals might come from. Therefore, they tend to overeat when they do get food. And we can help solve this obesity problem by giving an unlimited supply of food stamps, the EBT benefits, to people. Then we will somehow get thinner.

This thing has been turned completely around on its head from a problem of malnutrition to a problem of obesity—all tried by Democrats to solve with the same solution, which is more and more spending into a program.

There won't be needy people that are taken off this. There isn't going to be food coming out of the mouths of babes. This is categorical. This is so that the resources are available to the people that need it, those that are truly hungry.

By the way, this remark that it is a cynical ploy I completely disagree with. This is a sincere effort to manage our budget.

Ms. FUDGE. Madam Speaker, I just want to say to the ranking member on the subcommittee that oversees SNAP—who has not called one meeting all year—that he has 10 percent SNAP recipients in his district.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA), another of my fellow subcommittee ranking members on the Agriculture Committee and a member of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus.

Mr. COSTA. I thank the gentlewoman.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this irresponsible nutrition bill.

Should these cuts take effect, hundreds and thousands of Californians in need will lose access to a very important lifeline. This would include one of my constituents, Pazong Moua, a mother of two who works 33 hours a week and goes to school part time in hopes of becoming a teacher to get out of this network, this lifeline that she is presently in.

For her, the working poor—and in many cases some of the most vulnerable veterans across our country—SNAP is a hand “up,” not a hand “out.” It is a temporary safety net, not a lifestyle.

As we emerge from the Great Recession, now is not the time to play politics with hunger. With our rich agricultural heritage, we are also a Nation that has a duty to fight hunger here at home.

Former President Reagan maybe said it best:

As long as there is one person in this country who is hungry, that is one person too many.

Let's do the right thing. Vote “no” on this bill and fix it.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. I thank my colleague for yielding time.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Nutrition Reform and Work Opportunity Act.

The unfortunate reality is that one in seven people in this country is on food stamps. Spending on the program has doubled since 2008, and the number of Americans on SNAP has doubled since 2003.

Just as I believe that we must take care of fellow Americans who truly need the help, I also believe that we must address fraud and abuse in the SNAP program and provide opportunities and encouragement to put people back to work.

When unemployment declines, the number of food stamp recipients still increases under our current system. This is simply unsustainable.

It's time for some real change. This bill enforces the work requirements of able-bodied adults without dependents, similar to the reforms in Bill Clinton's 1996 bipartisan welfare reform bill. It eliminates taxpayer-funded advocacy campaigns, closes the “heat and eat” loophole, eliminates categorical eligibility to ensure program integrity, and ends State bonuses for administering the program.

I also support the work and job-training requirements in this bill. These programs offer real work skills. Investing in these skills will make individuals more marketable in the workplace. I have introduced a bill on the same topic. It's called the Opportunity Knocks Act. It's going to encourage Americans to take job-training courses while still being able to keep their unemployment benefits. These types of initiatives put Americans back to work.

The most important step we can take to help those 47 million Americans on SNAP is to grow our economy and promote opportunities to put our family, friends, and neighbors back to work.

The farm bill is a jobs bill. Let's move the process forward and support these reforms so that the taxpayers' dollars are spent much more wisely.

Ms. FUDGE. Madam Speaker, I appreciate my colleague. Job training is great, but there is nothing in this bill that ensures any money will go towards job training.

I also want to say that in Mr. DAVIS' district, 12.8 percent of his residents are on SNAP.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE), one of my colleagues on the Agriculture Committee.

Ms. DELBENE. Madam Speaker, we're debating an extreme bill with no chance of becoming law, when we could be weeks into conferencing a farm bill.

SNAP has prevented millions from falling into poverty. In the western part of Washington State, 690,000 people are still experiencing hunger, and we should not be arbitrarily cutting off aid.

This bill would force States to cut off people struggling to find a job, also stripping them of transportation and childcare assistance. If States don't comply, they lose funds for the SNAP employment and training programs like the model program we have in Washington State that has led many to self-sufficiency. Even at the height of the recession, 60 percent in Washington's programs found employment and more than half were off assistance 2 years after the program.

House leadership says this bill will lead to more people working. But how does cutting programs proven to help people find jobs accomplish this? All this bill does is cut the lifeline for 3.8 million hungry American families, children, veterans, and seniors. This is not a serious proposal. I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. COFFMAN), and I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COFFMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise to engage in a colloquy with Chairman LUCAS.

Colorado has been a leader in training programs. And I want to ensure, when passing this Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program reform bill, that the formulas for States to receive Federal funds for operating training programs are done in a way that encourages States to be active in helping individuals become self-sufficient.

To clarify, I would like to work with the chairman to make sure Federal dollars are available to States like Colorado that actively move people to self-sufficiency.

Mr. LUCAS. Reclaiming my time, I am aware of the leadership of Colorado in this area. I look forward to working with the gentleman from Colorado as we move forward with this legislation to ensure that Federal dollars are available to States that actively move people to self-sufficiency.

Ms. FUDGE. Madam Speaker, yes, Colorado has been a leader, but the bill specifically gives States the ability to spend savings any way they choose.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NEGRETE McLEOD), another one of my colleagues on the Agriculture Committee.

Mrs. NEGRETE McLEOD. Madam Speaker, I strongly oppose the proposed cuts offered by H.R. 3102.

As a member of the Agriculture Committee, I am greatly concerned that this is a \$39 billion cut to our Nation's most powerful antipoverty tool—a tool because each month SNAP helps feed 3.4 million households with elderly individuals.

In 2011, 4.8 million Americans over the age of 60 lacked access to food.

Some seniors are already making the decision between food and their medicine. Cuts to SNAP will only intensify the problem, setting seniors into deeper destitution and hunger. I ask the bill's supporters: How will these Americans eat without the means to afford food?

I urge my colleagues to remember the most vulnerable constituents in their States and to vote "no" on this bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER).

Mr. CRAMER. Madam Speaker, I don't question the sincerity of our Democrat colleagues' desire to feed the truly needy; I share in that commitment. But, Madam Speaker, I do resent the idea that somehow asking able-bodied adults without dependent children to at least be looking for work as a requirement to receive these benefits is somehow immoral.

When did America trade the dignity of a job for a culture of permanent dependency? President Theodore Roosevelt writes in his autobiography about his life as a North Dakota rancher. In chapter four, "In Cowboy Land," he writes:

We knew toil and hardship, hunger and thirst, but we felt the beat of hardy life in our veins because ours was the glory of work and the joy of living.

□ 1630

Madam Speaker, I say let's encourage the dignity of work again and pass these modest reforms.

Ms. FUDGE. Madam Speaker, I just want to say to my friend that able-bodied work has always been in the farm bill. What has changed by this bill is that it takes away the opportunities for Governors to request a waiver when their unemployment rate is very high.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. LUJAN GRISHAM), another member of the Agriculture Committee.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. I thank my colleague from Ohio.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this disastrous bill that cuts \$40 billion from SNAP, a vital program that feeds over 442,000 New Mexicans, half of whom are children.

I want to share the story of LaNae Havens, which shows just how much SNAP means to the people in my district.

LaNae is a single mother with a handsome 9-year-old son named Konnor. She works full time, but she doesn't make a lot of money. She has to pay for childcare, rent, transportation to work, utility costs, and all the other expenses families face. That doesn't leave much money for food—and certainly not for the healthy, nutritious food that growing children need.

Konnor suffers from anemia. Without her \$33 a week in food assistance, LaNae says there's no way she is able

to feed her son the protein- and iron-rich foods he desperately needs. She is terrified of what happens if she loses SNAP.

I did the SNAP challenge, and it's just enough to get by. You can't buy fresh vegetables. You can't buy enough protein. The thought that we would make it even less for those Americans who need it is unconscionable. I don't want Konnor to go hungry.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote against this bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOUTHERLAND), who's worked very diligently on this bill.

Mr. SOUTHERLAND. I would like to thank and commend you, Mr. Chairman, on your great work.

Madam Speaker, there's been a lot of things talked about today and in the past about the motivation. I've been very involved in this bill. The ranking member, she and I have gotten to know each other, and it has been a pleasure. I mean that sincerely. I want you to know, Madam Speaker, that my motivation has only been to introduce the blessing of work to able-bodied people.

Madam Speaker, from your chair, if you look down the center aisle, you can see one of 23 faces that are at the top of this room. The face you are looking at is the face of Moses. That is the only face that is a full frontal view and not a side view like the other 22 faces that surround this room. It was his work, the work of Moses, that in the very first chapter of Genesis, God created Adam and placed him in the garden to work it.

Work is not a penalty; work is a blessing. God's very first work was to introduce the responsibility of an able-bodied individual to do not just a physical activity, not just an economic activity, but, in every sense of the word, a spiritual activity.

What we have done in this country is wrong. We have failed in introducing the blessing of work to able-bodied people who have the ability, who are mentally, physically, psychologically able to work, and we have robbed them of knowing a better life that they helped create for themselves and their families.

I want to be very clear. This bill excludes children. It excludes the disabled. It excludes seniors. It makes sure that able-bodied individuals who are mentally, physically, and psychologically able to work know the blessing that God intended.

There's been a lot of talk about Scripture and a lot of talk about God's plan. I want people to know that it was Moses—Moses—who in this very room is placed in a position of prominence. It was his very first chapter that he gave us God's plan for able-bodied.

Ms. FUDGE. Madam Speaker, I do consider Mr. SOUTHERLAND a friend, but I would just say that we cannot pick and choose what we take out of the Bible. The Bible mentions the words "poor" and "hungry" more than 200 times.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER), another member of the Agriculture Committee.

Ms. KUSTER. Madam Speaker, I want to address my remarks to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle because I, too, believe in work. But in the northern part of my district, we have veterans who are unable to find work.

I recently visited the Bridge House in the rural north country of New Hampshire which provides for the homeless, many of them veterans. It is already hard for folks to find a job, especially for returning veterans who had faithfully served our country, yet this bill says that they should go hungry.

My constituents are frugal Yankees. They believe that every tax dollar should be spent wisely or not spent at all. They agree that we cannot afford the subsidies for agribusiness that this underlying bill that has now gone over to the Senate continues to include.

Let's ask ourselves: Who are we as a people? Would we truly not feed a homeless veteran? We are Americans, and Americans take care of each other. The United States is an exceptional country, and now is the time to prove it.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, I have the honor and privilege to yield 1 minute to the majority floor leader of the United States House of Representatives, Mr. CANTOR.

Mr. CANTOR. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman, the gentleman from Oklahoma, for the leadership that he has demonstrated throughout this process on this bill, on the farm bill, and know that his heart has been placed into this process and know that the outcome will be one that has been benefited by his leadership throughout the last several years in his dedication and leadership on this issue.

Madam Speaker, I do rise today in support of the Nutrition Reform and Work Opportunity Act. This bill is designed to give people a hand when they need it most. Most people don't choose to be on food stamps. Most people want a job. Most people want to go out and be productive so that they can earn a living, so that they can support a family, so that they can have hope for a more prosperous future. They want what we want.

If others, and there may be some, choose to abuse the system—that's not out of the realm of possibility—frankly, it's wrong for hardworking, middle class Americans to pay for that.

Madam Speaker, I want to tell you a story that's very fitting for this bill. There was a woman from Arkansas. Her name was Sherry. She moved there to that State with her two children, ages 11 and 14. She lived with her mom. The four of them shared a two-bedroom apartment.

Sherry didn't have much work experience as a stay-at-home mom, so she applied for help through Temporary

Assistance for Needy Families, otherwise known as the TANF program, the welfare program that President Clinton and a Republican Congress reformed in 1996 to impose work requirements for able-bodied adults. Sherry's case officer worked with her to obtain an on-the-job training position at a local hotel where she was hired for an entry-level position before she was quickly promoted to being a team leader.

As the Department of Workforce Services in Arkansas reported, Sherry's welfare case was closed and she continued her job at that hotel, a job she loved, going so far as to equate her coworkers with family. And like a family, when the hotel was remodeled, they gave Sherry the hotel furniture for her own apartment.

Madam Speaker, there is dignity in work. I am supporting this bill today because I want to see, as I know all of us do, more success stories like Sherry's. The reforms made by this bill will put people on the path to self-sufficiency and independence.

I also want to say, Madam Speaker, there's been a lot of demagoguery around this bill and, unfortunately, a lot of misinformation. Because the truth is anyone subjected to the work requirements under this bill who are able-bodied, who are able-bodied under 50, will not be denied benefits if only they are willing to sign up for the opportunity for work. There is no requirement that jobs exist. There are workfare programs. There are options under the bill for community service. This bill is a bill that points to the dignity of a job to help people when they need it most with what they want most, which is a job.

Again, I would like to thank the gentleman from Oklahoma, Chairman LUCAS, for his leadership and the gentleman from Florida, who just spoke before, Congressman STEVE SOUTHERLAND, for their hard work on this issue.

I would also like to recognize a member of my staff, who I can tell you has personally been a teacher to me on welfare policy and how the wrong policies can destroy a person's self-identity and lull them into a life of dependence, but how the right policies can help lift people out of poverty and on a path to independence. Roger Mahan, Madam Speaker, who is here in the Chamber, has dedicated his professional life to helping lawmakers adopt the right policies. I'm privileged to have Roger as a part of my team and as my teacher. This House and this country benefit from his knowledge and dedication on this very emotional issue, and I thank him for his service and guidance.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma has 10½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Ohio has 17 minutes remaining.

Ms. FUDGE. Madam Speaker, I just want to say that one in eight Virginians are on SNAP and that able-bodied

adults without dependents already work if there is a job. We all know that there are three people for every available job in this country.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. MENG).

Ms. MENG. Madam Speaker, unfortunately, this is the second time this year that the other side of the aisle has proposed funding SNAP at a level that completely disregards the purpose of the program. This newest iteration disrespects families struggling to survive and parents who are unable to feed their children. It doubles down on a determination to end hunger assistance and increase the suffering of our Nation's most vulnerable.

There is only one word that comes to mind: "cruel"—cruel to seniors, cruel to children, cruel to veterans, cruel to people struggling to survive with a shred of dignity. Children, elderly, disabled, and currently employed make up 92 percent of SNAP recipients. Yesterday, an elderly veteran called my office about his incredible struggle to purchase enough food. He said that without SNAP, he does not know how he will survive.

I want to take time to thank the organizations in my district and throughout New York City—Queens Jewish Community Council, Masbia, CPC, KCS, South Asian Council for Social Services, and the Hispanic Federation—for the amazing work they do every day to help our community.

I want to take this opportunity to reaffirm my commitment to the millions of people relying on SNAP and the millions more that oppose cutting this program.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from the great State of Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP), my next-door neighbor from across the State line.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H.R. 1302.

Participation in SNAP has grown 83 percent since 2008 and will cost us nearly \$80 billion this year alone. It is imperative that Congress takes steps to rein in this out-of-control entitlement, and I believe this bill does that.

The work requirements in this bill go to the heart of the reforms I have been advocating since I began working on similar bills nearly 3 years ago. It follows a simple line of thought: if you are a healthy adult and don't have someone relying on you to care for them, you ought to earn the benefits you receive. Look for work, start job training to improve your skills, or do community service, but you can no longer sit on your couch or ride a surfboard, like Jason in California, and expect the Federal taxpayer to feed you.

I also would like to applaud my home State of Kansas for moving to reinstate work requirements for Kansas adults. The folks in Kansas recognize that if you want to help people get back to work, you shouldn't pay them not to work. Washington should follow our example.

Support fiscal responsibility. Support a paycheck over a welfare check. Support the bill.

□ 1645

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, the last time we considered devastating cuts to nutrition programs, I brought messages my constituents had written on paper plates, telling stories of how much the SNAP program has helped them. I read aloud each plate's personal, heartbreaking story of the difference food assistance makes for a parent, a student, or a family, but today I have an empty plate because that's what so many of my constituents would see if this bill became law—in fact, 27,000 to be specific. I thought about bringing 27,000 plates down here—like this one—to make my point, but I decided not to create that kind of a waste just to make a point that is already so obvious.

The Republicans want you to believe that we don't have the money to feed hungry kids but that we can afford subsidies for Big Oil and tax breaks for corporate jet owners. It is ridiculous. If this week doesn't show the backward priorities of the Republican majority, I don't know what will. This shortsighted, slash-and-burn approach to governing won't get this country moving forward.

Taking food away from children?

The sad truth is, all that's being served up by the Republicans is a lack of vision.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in full support of H.R. 3102.

This commonsense bill reforms the SNAP program and simply requires that able-bodied adults without dependents obtain employment, participate in job training activities, or perform voluntary community service activities in exchange for continued benefits.

I've been hearing a lot of chatter these days about how there aren't any jobs out there to get people back to work. Perhaps if government weren't killing businesses through overregulation, increased taxes, and bureaucratic delays, it might be easier to get people back to work.

The President did state 3 days ago that the economy was improving and jobs were being created, so it seems reasonable to get people into job training programs in order to get these job openings filled. Let's say the President is wrong about these. Even in the most economically challenged areas of this Nation, there are opportunities to better one's community through volunteerism.

Who in this body can argue with work or volunteer requirements for able-bodied adults without dependents? When did asking able-bodied adults to

look for work become an unrealistic or a demeaning request?

This bill preserves the SNAP program for those who need the assistance while also helping them to find employment and live the American Dream.

How does any of that sound unreasonable?

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that, in Mr. LAMALFA's district, 10 percent of all households are on SNAP.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK).

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose H.R. 3102.

Ending nutrition assistance for millions of hungry children and adults in the middle of a fragile economic recovery is, frankly, close to the very last thing we should be doing right now. As former Republican Senate leader Bob Dole wrote in the LA Times this week, "this is no time to play politics with hunger."

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the district I represent has one of the highest concentrations of veterans in all of the United States, and I feel morally compelled to point out that the legislation before us would end nutrition assistance for as many as 170,000 veterans who currently receive it. These are men and women who have served our country with honor and who were prepared to give the last full measure of devotion to America.

So, while I absolutely appreciate Mr. ROGERS' pointing out the flaw herein, assurances, however genuine, that we will try to take care of this later do not measure up to the sacrifices these men and women have made. Whatever your stereotypical image in your head you carry around of the average recipient, please understand that that includes the men and women who wore our Nation's uniform, and when you know that, you will vote "no."

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. ELLMERS).

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3102, the Nutrition Reform and Work Opportunity Act.

I commend the chairman for his tireless work on this effort, the effort to put in place sensible reforms and close loopholes in order to improve this nutrition program. One reform which has been mentioned many times is that of the modest work requirements of people who are able to do so.

We will be able to save nearly \$40 billion over 10 years. All we are asking is that those receiving benefits—who do not have children, who are without disabilities, and who do not have any other extreme circumstances—simply work, volunteer, train or go to school for 20 hours a week.

Mr. Speaker, we are preserving this program for those who truly need it. I urge my colleagues to support these important reforms so that the truly vulnerable never go hungry.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, would you tell us how much time is still left in debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The gentleman from Ohio has 13¾ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Oklahoma has 7½ minutes remaining.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI), another of my colleagues on the Agriculture Committee.

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you for the opportunity to speak here.

Mr. Speaker, if this were only about work reforms, that would be something, but it's far, far more. These are devastating cuts. Hunger is real. In my northern counties, the counties along the Sacramento River—Sutter, Glenn, Colusa, and Yuba—20 percent of the citizens are hungry. They need food. This bill would dramatically affect that.

My daughter is a teacher. She has a community garden. She went to find a kid from her kindergarten class who wasn't getting on the bus. He was hidden underneath the cucumbers in the garden, stuffing his pockets full of tomatoes and cucumbers, so that on the weekend he would have food for himself and his brother.

Hunger is real—it's real in every one of our districts—and this particular bill devastates the food programs for seniors, for working men and women, and for those who desperately need help.

I oppose the bill. I would ask for compassion from our colleagues on the Republican side and to put this bill down and get on with decent legislation.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENTIVOLIO).

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Anti-Poverty Initiative, I have been blessed to work closely with the people "on the ground" who are committed to lifting people out of poverty. Many in Washington believe a hand out is a hand up. It's not. We need a social safety net that focuses on the empowering of the individual.

The men and women I've met with all have wanted me to hear their stories. I asked them directly: What do we do that works? What do we do that doesn't work, and how can I make it better? All of the men and women shared the same themes: Lift me spiritually, not just economically. They told me they don't want to be taken care of. They want to be able to take care of themselves and are challenged to find and utilize the gifts God blessed them with.

I am proud to say many of the reforms in this bill didn't come from a bunch of people in suits and ties here in Washington, D.C. They came directly from the American families we are trying to help. This bill is a forward-looking approach that propels

people towards opportunity. It fulfills the promise made in the Declaration—that our country believes in the right to pursue happiness however each citizen defines it.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the Democratic whip, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentlelady, and I thank her for her leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I lament with Mr. LUCAS that we don't have a bipartisan bill, because I know that's what he wanted, that that's what he forged and that that's what has been abandoned, unfortunately, by his party. I think that's sad for the country. It's even sadder for the people who will be so adversely affected.

Mr. Speaker, several weeks after House Republicans broke with longstanding practice and cut nutrition program funding out of the farm bill, they are now bringing a nutrition-denying bill to the floor. Shockingly, their version of nutrition assistance is to cut \$40 billion over the next 10 years from the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, called "SNAP."

What does this mean for the 14 percent of our fellow citizens? Luckily, 86 percent of us are doing pretty well—we can put a meal on the table, and we can feed our children; but 14 percent of our fellow citizens can't have confidence that they can do that.

Has America fallen so low in its moral compass that we are not prepared to make sure that, in the richest country on the face of the Earth, they have food on their tables? Have we fallen that low?

It means 210,000 children dropped from the school meals program. It means 170,000 veterans in need losing some or all of their food assistance. It will affect Americans of all ages, and it will especially harm seniors, students, and individuals with disabilities.

Tuesday's Census Bureau report confirms that too many Americans remain in poverty as a result of lingering effects from the recession. This is reflected in the rise over the past few years in the number of Americans who rely on food assistance to eat a decent meal from day to day. In the wealthiest country on Earth, there is no reason why so many Americans should have to go hungry, and now is certainly not the time for Congress to make it harder for them to feed themselves and their families.

Do we need to bring down the deficit? We do. Do we need to do it on the backs of the poor? We do not.

Instead, we ought to be helping Americans find jobs and access to opportunities so they will no longer need SNAP assistance. We should go to conference with the Senate, as I know my friend Mr. LUCAS wanted to do, which passed a bipartisan farm bill in June by a vote of 66-27. Two-thirds of the Members of the United States Senate, a majority of the House Agriculture Committee, and, in my view, a majority of

this House wanted to do this, but we did not do it. Of course, we should have gone to conference weeks ago, but, sadly, this Congress remains dysfunctional.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this punitive legislation, and I call on the Speaker to appoint conferees for the farm bill so we can see a compromised version reflecting the compassion and wisdom shown by bipartisan-acting Congresses over the last four decades.

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

Ms. FUDGE. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. HOYER. I thank Mr. LUCAS for his leadership, and I regret that it is not being followed.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. STUTZMAN).

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3102, the Nutrition Reform and Work Opportunity Act. This is an opportunity to enact commonsense reforms.

I would like to thank Leader CANTOR and especially Chairman LUCAS for their leadership and long hours of hard work.

Mr. Speaker, food stamps and farm policy should be considered individually and on their own merits. It's just common sense, and it's exactly why we are here.

In July, we passed a farm-only farm bill that ended direct payments and made other reforms. Today, we have an opportunity to continue that work by passing a food stamp bill that doubles the savings that the House originally considered. We can save taxpayers \$40 billion by eliminating loopholes, ensuring work requirements, and putting food assistance on a fiscally responsible path.

In the real world, we measure success by results. It's time for Washington to measure success by how many families are lifted out of poverty and are helped back on their feet, not by how much Washington bureaucrats spend year after year.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this commonsense step in the right direction.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. VARGAS), another member of the Agriculture Committee.

□ 1700

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition of this bill. Senator Dole is right: this is no time to play politics with hunger.

I want to thank those in the faith community that have come out against these cuts to the nutrition program because of the moral imperative in the Bible from Matthew 25:

When I was hungry, you gave me to eat.

I want to thank in particular Reverend David Beckman, who writes:

The proposed cuts are a clear indication that some in Congress underestimate the hunger that is present in American homes.

The bill picks on the poorest people in the country. This is morally and economically unacceptable, especially as some areas continue to experience high unemployment.

I also want to thank Reverend Stephen Blaire, who said:

Adequate and nutritious food is a fundamental human right and the basic need that is integral to protecting the life and dignity of the human person.

Please, defeat this bill. It's the wrong thing to do. In a country as rich as our own, we can feed the poor. It's the most basic imperative in the Bible.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, might I inquire as to how much time is remaining for both myself and the ranking member?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma has 5½ minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from Ohio has 8¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the ranking member that I potentially have some additional speakers, but they've not made an appearance yet. Therefore, I reserve the balance of my time to close if they do not appear.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege and pleasure to yield 1 minute to our Democratic leader, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. I thank her also for her leadership on this very important issue to the values of our country. Her service on the Agriculture Committee is indeed a blessing to us all as we fight for our children.

Mr. LUCAS, thank you for your leadership of the committee, as well. I know you tried to bring a bipartisan bill to the floor. What happened after that, I won't go into. I also want to salute COLLIN PETERSON, our colleague on the committee. We need a farm bill. We want to have a good farm bill for our farmers, for our ranchers, for food security, for our country. Hopefully, we can get to that place, but not by doing violence to our children.

Mr. Speaker, this body is so magnificent because it is so diverse. We represent districts all over the country. We represent people of different backgrounds all over the country. But one thing, among others, that we certainly have in common is that each one of us have people in our districts who depend on the SNAP program for their nutrition. There isn't one person in this room who could rise up and say: Nobody in my district relies on the nutrition programs that are in the farm bill. Chief among them are children, seniors, veterans and their families. They are the real faces of hunger in America, and their stories are the most compelling reason to reject this dangerous Republican legislation.

In my district in San Francisco, people from all walks of life have relied on the SNAP program to make it through tough and trying times. One young woman I want to highlight is Catlin, now in her twenties, worked hard at a

part-time job to put herself through college. As the recession took its toll on students across the country looking for work, Catlin found that she could not afford to pay rent and purchase food each month. Because she qualified for the emergency food SNAP initiative, she was able to get by, get a promotion, and now works full time.

There's Brian, 50 years old and homeless. Even though he searches constantly for full-time employment, he spends his spare time volunteering at St. Anthony's dining room, helping other people. This is a place that helps other people to find food, shelter, clothes, and compassion in our community. There he gives back what little he has to the community, wholeheartedly serving our seniors, veterans, children, and families who also rely on the generosity of people like Brian to feed themselves and their loved ones.

Like Brian and Catlin, millions of people across America are working hard and giving all they have to lift themselves up and help others get on their feet.

One of my colleagues said something like if you don't work, you shouldn't eat. Something to that effect. I hope I heard it incorrectly. It's really important to note that because of the low minimum wage in our country, a family of four, with both parents working full time and earning the minimum wage, are below the poverty line. They don't even come close to the 130 percent of poverty. They are below the poverty line. So in some respects the SNAP program is subsidizing a low minimum wage in our country, as other support does as well.

I wish that we could respect how hard it is for a family of four, with two people working full time, not making enough money to put food on the table, that we respect them for their struggle and for their concern for their families and not judge them that they don't have food on the table because our country has chosen to pay a sub-living wage to so many people in our country.

The Republican proposal on the floor today slashes the legs on which many of these people stand. Indeed, cutting the investments is a full assault on the health and economic security of millions of families. Consider this: one in five children—it is soon becoming one in four—struggle with hunger, and nearly half of all SNAP recipients are children. Nearly 4 million Americans over age 60 rely on nutrition assistance. Five thousand Active Duty military families depend on SNAP. Nearly 3 million veterans and their families don't get enough to eat each month, and this bill would jeopardize food assistance for as many as 170,000 veterans.

A couple of weeks ago I was in Houston, Texas, visiting my grandchild, and we were at mass. The sermon was a beautiful one and actually the Gospel was that day, too. Many of our colleagues have quoted the Gospel of Matthew, "When I was hungry, you gave

me to eat," and other parts of the Bible. The Gospel that day was talking about how we have a responsibility to each other. In the sermon, the priest said something that I think we should consider as we consider our vote here today. He said:

You just can't come to church and pray on Sunday and go out and prey on people the rest of the week.

This legislation is preying on people, on children, on veterans, on seniors, on all those who are struggling to do their best in our country.

It is our moral obligation to reject this legislation and to preserve these investments for Americans who need them and other Americans who want them to have it. It is our moral duty to vote down this measure and to work across the aisle in conference on a comprehensive farm bill that ensures food security, supports our farmers and ranchers, and strengthens world communities.

"Community"—that should be the word of the hour. What is our responsibility to community? It certainly isn't to say to kids, We want you to do your best in school, but we're not going to fuel your mind by giving you food to eat. And it certainly isn't to thank our veterans by depriving them or our seniors for all that they have done. Something is very wrong with this picture.

I know one thing for sure: every person who votes for this Republican measure is voting to hurt his or her own constituents because we all represent people who at some time need help.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings or other audible conversation is in violation of the rules of the House.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

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

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, the Nutrition Reform and Work Opportunity Act of 2013 is rife with fraud, waste and abuse.

This bill is fraudulent in its claims that it's a benevolent bill that merely institutes work requirements and won't hurt children. In my very own State of Wisconsin, 4,000 children will lose free and reduced lunch, and as the entire family will be able to be penalized, it will also hurt the elderly and disabled who live in these households.

It's fraudulent. It's a bill that is a waste of our constituents' belief and stewardship in us that we would do the conscientious and right thing for the American people. We just don't throw people under the bus when they're in a recession and they can't find employ-

ment. It's a waste, and it is abusive of 15 percent of Americans and 22 percent of children who live in abject poverty.

I ask my colleagues to reject this bill rife with fraud, waste, and abuse.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA).

Ms. SINEMA. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, in Arizona, one in four children live in food insecurity, unsure of when they'll eat next or where they'll find food. Cuts to SNAP will make this already grave situation even worse.

When I was a kid, my family went through tough times, and after my parents got divorced, my mom relied on food stamps to feed us kids. Later, when my stepfather was out of work and my family was homeless, food stamps once again helped my family survive. Yet, my family was lucky. We had friends and family and my parents' church helping us, in addition to SNAP. Today, SNAP provides hardworking families with food security while they're struggling to make ends meet. The program helped me, just as SNAP is helping kids and working families in Arizona today.

Both family farmers and hungry children in Arizona are waiting on Congress to pass a complete farm bill. I've called on Congress to put hardworking farmers and families ahead of partisanship. Congress should pass a bipartisan farm bill, just as it has for decades in the past. Today's bill unfortunately isn't a solution for families or farmers.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

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

Mr. RANGEL. I thank Ranking Member FUDGE for giving me this opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I was sitting in the back and I heard one of the Republicans say that what Moses would want—and he was talking about some picture—and I just came up to say that I just talked with Moses, and he's not in support of this legislation. As a matter of fact, he referred me to other biblical things about how we treat the lesser of our brothers and sisters. He directed my attention to the disparity between the rich that we have in this country and the very poor.

I got the impression after reviewing Matthew that if we're going to refer to Moses, you can't ignore Jesus, who had some concern about the rich people that did not treat their brothers and sisters fairly. I don't know how it ends, but it seems as though they were trying to get into Heaven and he told them to go to hell.

I don't know how it spins out, but everything that seems to be happening in

this House strikes against us helping the kids and the vulnerable and helping the sick and the aged. So I would suggest that if we have to go to the Bible, everything we're trying to do to hurt the poor is not going to count for us when we need God the most.

□ 1715

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time I have.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Ohio has 4¾ minutes remaining.

Ms. FUDGE. I thank the Chair.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

Ms. EDWARDS. I thank the gentlelady.

Mr. Speaker, it's really hard to know what to say anymore. It's impossible for us to rationalize what has become completely irrational, but I'm just going to say what it is.

From the other side, this bill is mean. It's unconscionable. And it's really just plain wrong. The rational person would ask, don't they know that nearly 4 million people would have benefits cut and would lose their benefits entirely? A rational person would ask, don't they know that millions of people, beneficiaries, already work, that they go to school, and that they're looking for work?

I know what it's like to struggle to feed a child, to wonder whether there's food tomorrow or the next week. Don't they know that this is what families across America are struggling with right now? I don't know.

I'll tell you what, I see the plan—shut down government, starve children, the elderly, the disabled, demonize the poor, blame them for everything. But I'm going to just tell you, when I go to sleep at night, I sleep well. After you cast this vote, after Republicans cast this vote today, they won't sleep well.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLEAVER).

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I have only 1 minute, but I would imagine 1 minute is sufficient to plead with my colleagues to pay attention to the facts.

The U.S. economy has not healed. We are still struggling with \$7.25 an hour for minimum wage. And if you make \$7.25 working all day, every day, you're going to make slightly over \$15,000 a year; and you get approximately \$4.50 a day to eat on, \$4.50.

I think that there is a right thing that we all can do. We ought to join forces to do the right thing; and the right thing is not to approve this bill, to back away from it. I mean, we are a rich Nation that really is having economic problems. We can deal with our poor. Everybody in this country ought to have equal access to food.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentlelady for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say to my colleagues that this is a sad day because the whole effort to end hunger used to be a bipartisan issue. I would say to my Republican colleagues, remember Bob Dole and Bill Emerson. Your party has a great tradition, a proud tradition of being part of the effort to end hunger, working with Democrats. Don't blow that up today.

What you are doing here is wrong; and I'm urging my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, please don't do this. Please don't do this. Please do not do this. This is wrong. This is about how we treat the most vulnerable in our society.

And I have to just say to all my colleagues here, we should be having a bigger discussion about how to end hunger; and, instead, what we're doing here today is moving in a direction where we are going to make hunger worse in this country. You're going to throw 170,000 veterans who are unemployed off this program; 3.8 million people will be thrown off this program. Surely that is not what you want, but that is what your bill does. That is what the bill that never went through the Agriculture Committee, that was forced upon this House by the majority leader, brought onto the floor under a closed rule does. Please rethink this. I know that you are better than this.

Ms. FUDGE. I yield to the gentlelady from Texas for a unanimous consent request.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this legislation and place a statement in the RECORD because those who get food stamps are not criminals. They are just hungry.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in opposition to 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.

Finding hungry people in the United States is not hard—they are in every community. The problem is so dire that—September has been declared hunger action month. People in the 18th Congressional District along with people in Congressional Districts around the nation are putting forth an extra effort to raise awareness that 1 in 6 Americans are going without enough food to sustain a healthy life.

Although the United States is considered to be the world's wealthiest nation 14.5 percent or almost 49 million Americans, which includes 15.9 million children face challenges to getting enough to eat.

According to the United States Department of Agriculture 50 million people experience hunger because they have limited access to resources. The type of resources could be adequate or reliable means of transportation to where food can be obtained, or money to buy food.

In the United States 17 million children live in food insecure households. Children with inadequate nutrition are affected by cognitive and behavior development problems. Eating enough to stay alive but not enough to meet nutrition requirements means the body will break down muscle and tissue.

The majority of SNAP recipients which is about 68 percent do not work—they are children, elderly, disabled or those caring for a disabled family member in their home or for a child less than 6 years of age.

Food insecurity is not limited to urban and suburban areas—over 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.

Children in food insecure homes—who do not consume healthy food on a regular basis are more likely to experience irritability, fatigue, and difficulty concentrating.

These children's ability to get ahead in life are demonstratively impacted by food insecurity.

Nutrition does not need reform—we know what foods are nutritious and how much nutritious food should be consumed by each man, woman and child regardless of age must consume each day to remain healthy and productive.

We should pass the American Jobs Act:

If this Congress was serious about work opportunities they would have passed the President's American Jobs Act. The irony is that if the American Jobs Act had become law it would have significantly reduced the numbers of persons in need of food assistance from the government.

Prior to the financial crisis and economic recession, 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 weak economy as being the cause of the nearly 65 percent of the growth in spending on benefits 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.

Adding the words "Work Opportunity" is not about work but about how to prevent the working poor from accessing SNAP benefits.

SNAP benefits also help the working poor which includes those who earn 130% of the federal poverty guideline, but the majority of households have income well below the maximum: 83% of SNAP households have gross income at or below 100% of the poverty guideline this translates into incomes of \$19,530 for a family of 3 in 2013. These households receive about 91% of all benefits.

Unemployment remains at 7.3 percent with about 11.3 million people unemployed. We know that we have 6 million long term unemployed people who have been searching for work 27 weeks or longer. In July, unemployment percentages for the following states were:

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. To compound the problem—60 percent of the jobs lost were mid-wage occupations—people who did not need Federal or State food assistance or housing assistance programs.

These types of 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 at the start of the recession and now make up 58 percent of the new jobs of the recovery. The number of people who are in need of SNAP is greater because the recovery is not as strong as it should be nor reaching the people it should reach.

The bill's version of work opportunity threatens the working poor's opportunity to provide food for their families. 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, according to the Department of Agriculture 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 as a census tract where the distance to a grocery store is more than 10 miles.

Food deserts exist in rural and urban areas and are spreading as a result fewer farms as well as fewer places to access fresh fruits, vegetables, proteins, and other foods as well as a poor economy.

The result of food deserts are increases in malnutrition and other health disparities that impact minority and low income communities in rural and urban areas. Health disparities occur because of a lack of access to critical food groups that provide nutrients that support normal metabolic functions.

Poor metabolic function leads to malnutrition that causes breakdown in tissue. For example, a lack of protein in a diet leads to disease and decay of teeth and bones. Another example of health disparities in food deserts are the presence of fast food establishments instead of grocery stores. If someone only consumes energy dense foods like fast foods this will lead to clogged arteries, which is a precursor for arterial disease a leading cause of heart disease. A person eating a constant diet of fast foods are also vulnerable to higher risks of insulin resistance which results in diabetes.

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. Hunger is persistent and impacts millions of people who struggle to find enough to eat. Food insecurity causes parents to skip meals so that their children can eat.

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.

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 majority seeks to do everything imaginable to make it more difficult for people in this country to get access to affordable healthcare, a job that will pay a livable wage or meals that are nutritious are difficult to understand.

The bill would establish a nationwide "pilot program" under which states could impose new work requirements on SNAP recipients, including on parents of young children who are exempt under the current law. It would not be in the best interest of young children for their parents to leave them unattended and it would not be in the best interest of SNAP recipients to choose between rent and childcare.

The language of the bill authorizes states to conduct drug testing of SNAP applicants as a condition of receiving benefits. Since most of the benefits go to children, the elderly and disabled the question of drug testing is more a facade for a political philosophy than a real world problem with drug addiction and Federal and State food programs.

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. Is there a belief that Mayberry exists in every rural area and therefore there could be no possible cases of SNAP fraud?

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. LIHEAP and SNAP are two different programs and they serve different purposes. LIHEAP helps when homes are not safe or are in need of repairs to make them more safe for human occupation. The problem with this formula is that the funds sent for LIHEAP are not nearly enough for the numbers of persons who need housing repair. The second problem is it would require people who have no need of housing repairs, but who may need additional food assistance to apply for the LIHEAP program, which is already underfunded in order to get what they really need—more food assistance.

This formula will guarantee that people in need of additional assistance under SNAP will never receive it.

The bill before us would prohibit a state from telling someone they know is hungry about SNAP food programs. The bill defines this type of communication as recruiting SNAP participants by advertising the SNAP program.

The bill eliminates the ability of states to waive work requirements for "certain able-bodied" SNAP recipients even when unemploy-

ment is high. 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 the benefits are not used then they will be taken back. The reality is people make decisions about where and when to purchase food not based on our schedule but their own.

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% 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. According to news reports, 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, when \$99 million in food stamps were used on bases. In addition, 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 becomes 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 through our nation's food safety net.

As elected representatives we should see our nation's vital interest. 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 bad bill and return the food programs to the farm bill.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, Chairman LUCAS, for all of his work on the farm bill.

I want to ask, though, why did we play this charade on the American people today? Why would we use hunger and poverty as a political football, a game, some kind of sport? This is the people's House, so let's do what is best for the American people.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., said that the time is always right to do what is right. And to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, I know there's been a lot of arm-twisting to get you to support this bill; but, fortunately, I have many friends on that side of the aisle. And my friends are known to be people who are compassionate, caring patriots. And I implore

you to do what is right. Hopefully, you will all muster the courage to vote your conscience and do what is morally right because if you do it, the others who may not have as much courage as you will follow. You will set them free to do what is right.

It is time to stand up for the American people. Vote “no” on this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remaining time.

My dear colleagues, on several occasions we have alluded to the process that we have gone through now, literally, for years to try to craft a comprehensive farm bill.

I think most of you know that I would have preferred this have been accomplished a year ago. I was proud of the committee work done at the time, done in a bipartisan way. I was proud, even though we had to start over in a new session of Congress, of the bipartisan effort done in the committee this time.

Not every Republican or every Democrat on the committee voted for it; but we had a majority of both sides, something that seems to be kind of difficult these days on a lot of issues. But that bill came to the floor. And even after a number of amendments were adopted by a majority of this body primarily focused on the nutrition title, a majority of the body chose not to pursue that bill, not to allow it to move on. And we were compelled to bring what I affectionately referred to as a farm bill only to the floor, one without the critical title dealing with nutrition, and we were successful in passing that.

But as was noted by many of my colleagues on this side of the room, that left a critical piece out, the nutrition title. And that's the product that we are addressing today. It incorporates all of the efforts—I will repeat again—from the committee work dealing with categorical eligibility and LIHEAP and advertising and all of those things.

The language we deal with today incorporates the amendments adopted by this body in an effort to address the committee bill, empowering States through a pilot program to engage able-bodied individuals in TANF-type work, ending SNAP eligibility for convicted murderers and pedophiles and rapists—not their children, not their spouses, but they, themselves. Language allowing the States to very clearly use drug testing as a part of their SNAP application process was adopted by a majority of the votes on this floor, those items. And now it includes language that came out of the leader's working group, things that deal with what we refer to as “able-bodied adults without dependents,” ABAWDs.

That first committee draft, reform to the tune of about \$20 billion. Many of the things on the floor would have added to that, perhaps not substantially. And in the working group's language, an additional \$20 billion in reform. That presents us with the bill

that we're looking at today, with virtually everybody's ideas and reform rolled into one, a substantial amount of savings in a single bill to reform.

I would say this to all of my colleagues: you're going to vote your conscience today. You understand the bill, each and every one of you. You understand, I think from your perspective, the policy implications. I happen to believe that the items in this bill are of sufficient merit to be discussed in a conference committee; potentially, if the conference would agree, to incorporate them in a final conference committee report. But that discussion cannot take place if this bill is not passed.

Remember, if this bill is not passed and we go to conference, there are no instructions for reform from the House in effect. And what was one of the fundamental points that I and my colleagues in the Ag Committee discussed as we started this process a long time ago? There would be reforms in all parts of the next farm bill—commodity title, conservation title, nutrition title. There would be the implementation of changes based on our experiences and our learning from the last farm bill and series of farm bills.

I know you're going to vote your conscience; but I ask you, let me go to conference with the Senate with the maximum number of options to work through because, ultimately, whatever comes out of that conference has to be a comprehensive farm bill. It has to address our ability to raise the food and fiber safety net. It has to address the safety net that affects all of our consumers.

I will simply close by saying this: as I said at the beginning of this debate, it should not be this hard to pass a bill to make sure that the consumers in this country and around the world have enough to eat. It shouldn't be this hard, but everything seems to be hard these days. So let's do the hard things. Let's get our work done. Let's go to conference. Let's put a final bill together. Let's fulfill our responsibilities.

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose this misguided attempt to cut almost \$40 billion from the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program. I do not believe that depriving between 4 and 6 million Americans, and 105,000 Oregonians, of access to food will change an individual's motivation to find work. It's particularly ridiculous as work requirements already exist; this bill simply takes away a state's ability to allow for flexibility when there are no jobs or work-training programs available. I also find it ironic that this Congress has refused to apply the same means testing principles it requires for the nutrition program to the crop insurance program, which subsidizes wealthy farmers without regard to their financial need.

I oppose this legislation and it saddens me to see it on the House floor today.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 3102.

A vote for this bill is a vote to cut \$40 billion from U.S. food-aid programs, specifically to

the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP. It's a vote to take food away from millions of Americans in poverty, and it's a vote to poison America's economic growth from the ground up.

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office estimates that the cuts in this bill will cause 14 million people to lose SNAP benefits in the next decade.

The head of the local food bank in my District, the Second Harvest Food Bank of Santa Clara and San Mateo Counties, told me yesterday that her organization [quote] “simply cannot fill the meal gap these cuts would create” [unquote]. This means children, the elderly, veterans, single mothers, and others who rely on SNAP will go hungry.

SNAP benefits are part of America's social safety net. Like unemployment insurance, SNAP is a part of our economic recovery strategy.

And it's been a successful strategy.

According to the Census Bureau, SNAP lifted 4 million people out of poverty in 2012—the highest level on record. That's in addition to making tens of millions more Americans less poor by reducing the gap between their income and the poverty line.

Seventy-five percent of households receiving SNAP benefits have a senior citizen, a child, or a person with a disability. Fifty percent of households receiving SNAP benefits live below the poverty line.

These are the faces of our fellow Americans. These are the people who will be hurt by this pernicious bill.

Vote no on H.R. 3102.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to HR 3102, the majority's extreme legislation to cut 4 million seniors, working families, and individuals with disabilities from the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP).

SNAP is an effective, short-term anti-poverty program designed to help families stay on their feet when they face tough times and to ensure seniors and individuals with disabilities have access to the food they need.

On average, SNAP recipients receive about \$4.80 a day for food. How many on the floor of this chamber spent more than that on their cup of coffee this morning? I imagine very few of my colleagues can honestly say they can feed themselves, let alone their families, every day for that amount of money.

Despite these facts, the bill we debate today will gut SNAP. These \$40 billion in cuts will eliminate benefits for nearly 4 million Americans this year and further cut 3 million people off the program every year for the next decade. These cuts are designed to reduce SNAP enrollment and spending but ignore the link between SNAP and our economy. When the economy collapsed in 2008, SNAP enrollment increased as more families struggled to make ends meet amid record high unemployment. That is how the program is supposed to work, and as our economy continues to recover and more Americans go back to work, SNAP enrollment and spending has gone down and will continue to decrease. The Congressional Budget Office predicts that if we do nothing and let the economy improve, SNAP spending will return to its low 1995 levels as a percent of GDP in the next six years.

The majority claims this bill will increase incentives for SNAP recipients to work. That claim belies the fact that millions of Americans

who do work still rely on SNAP to meet their needs. Further, in New York State, the bill would actually have the opposite effect. The state receives nearly \$170 million in federal funding, and leverages nearly \$140 million in local funding, for job training and placement efforts to get SNAP recipients back in the workforce and transition them away from government assistance. Yet this bill would eliminate or severely cut funding for those programs, making it harder for individuals to find work and get back on their feet.

Rather than rewarding states for helping unemployed individuals, in a perverse twist, the only actual incentive this bill contains is one for states to kick SNAP recipients out of the program if they cannot find a job or job training. That approach will only serve to push more families on to government programs instead of lifting them out of poverty.

If we really want to reduce the number of people who use SNAP, we should focus on job creation legislation to assist the millions of Americans looking for work and on passing a budget that supports instead of undermines our economic recovery. Putting people back to work and rebuilding our economy is the only responsible way to ensure seniors and working families have the food and the resources they need.

But instead, we are voting to slash this vital safety net program and telling millions of Americans: good luck. Good luck putting food on your table tonight and ensuring your children succeed in school without the food they need. Good luck affording your prescription medication and making your mortgage payment this month.

Mr. Speaker, I will not turn my back on those millions of Americans who rely on SNAP to feed their families and get back on their feet. I urge my colleagues to vote no on these extreme cuts.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, once again, Republicans have succeeded at taking a bad bill and making it even worse. I categorically oppose the bill before the House today, which heartlessly cuts nearly \$40 billion from nutrition assistance programs, which assist the most vulnerable in our communities to stave off hunger and poverty. To enact this into law is outright shameful and runs counter to our most fundamental values as a nation. For seniors, children in low-income families, the disabled, and those who have lost jobs; food and nutrition programs are a lifeline and must be preserved.

Nearly 49 million Americans and 17.6 million U.S. households are food insecure, while nearly 17 million of these individuals are children, 5 million are seniors and 300,000 are elderly veterans. Last month, the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) released a report stating that in the aftermath of the recession, food hardship remained extremely high as more than 8 million Americans lost their jobs. From the unemployed factory worker to the teacher who lives paycheck to paycheck, hunger and poverty affect every community in America. Certainly, the need for food assistance is already greater than SNAP can fill, and food banks and charities have stepped up to the plate to address these additional needs. Demand for assistance at food banks has increased 46 percent during the recession, so it's no surprise they are having a hard time keeping up with the current levels of need.

Yet last month, rather than moving forward to pass a full Farm Bill last month, Republicans are doubling down on a failed strategy that only serves to undermine the health of millions of Americans and has no chance of becoming law since this bill will not pass the Senate or be signed into law by the President. Indeed, one would think that House Republicans' failure to pass their comprehensive, five-year Farm Bill, or subsequent partisan bills, should compel them to work with Democrats on behalf of the food and economic security of hardworking Americans, yet that is not the path they have chosen.

It's time for Republicans to trade in their pointlessness and partisan agenda for responsible solutions that will promote, expand, and strengthen America's middle class.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the draconian Nutrition Reform and Work Opportunity Act.

Rather than consider a bipartisan Farm Bill that would help hungry Americans and provide certainty for farmers and ranchers over the next five years, the House has instead decided to bring to the floor a partisan measure that would hurt those most in need and has no chance of passage in the United States Senate.

This legislation is wrong on many levels. First, the nutrition provisions were never intended to be considered separately from the other titles of the Farm Bill, as has been the bipartisan tradition for the past several decades.

As the distinguished former Senate Majority Leader Bob Dole said, "stripping the nutrition title from the [Farm Bill] . . . has severed the vital tie that helps connect our food system with those who struggle with hunger in our own backyard."

This bill, in fact, is all pain and no gain.

It is estimated that the Nutrition Reform and Work Opportunity Act will cause between four to six million low-income individuals to lose their SNAP benefits entirely. As many as 210,000 children potentially could lose their school meals and 850,000 households could see their benefits slashed by an average of \$90 per month.

In Georgia's Second Congressional District, which I represent and where 26 out of the 29 counties are sparsely populated and rural, nearly a quarter of the households receive SNAP benefits. Many of them could be in jeopardy of reduced benefits or a loss of benefits altogether if these cuts are enacted.

I know that supporters of this legislation are claiming that the reductions in SNAP benefits are intended to crack down on waste, fraud, and abuse in the program. They ignore the fact that the SNAP program actually has one of the lowest error and overpayment rates of any large federal program.

Last year, the SNAP overpayment rate was 2.77%, and that includes overpayments due to errors and due to fraud. By contrast, the rate of error and fraud in the federal income tax system is about 15%.

Supporters of the Nutrition Reform and Work Opportunity Act also claim that the legislation particularly the tough work requirements—will move people off of SNAP benefits and into full-time employment, leading to self-sufficiency. In fact, the bill immediately eliminates the ability of states to waive SNAP work requirements in areas of high employment or where no jobs are available.

According to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, this provision would end SNAP benefits to 1.7 million individuals whom live in high unemployment areas, even if they want to work and are looking for employment, but either cannot find a job or a place in a training program.

Mr. Speaker, the Nutrition Reform and Work Opportunity Act would devastate the safety net and lead to millions of hungry Americans throughout the nation.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the bill.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, once again on the Floor today we have a program with historic bipartisan support made divisive by the most extreme wing of the Majority party.

For decades, the Farm Bill has coupled programs for our nation's farmers with food assistance for our most vulnerable citizens, including children and the elderly. In June, the Senate passed a Farm Bill with a bipartisan vote of 66–27. But here in the House, rather than working together for a solution that gives certainty to farmers and maintains the safety net for the hungry, we have seen a one-sided process that first stripped food assistance from the Farm Bill altogether and now proposes draconian cuts to the program.

Slashing \$40 billion from SNAP would eliminate benefits for 4 million Americans. It would damage the safety net for our most vulnerable citizens—nearly half of SNAP recipients are children and 16.5% of households receiving benefits include seniors. Many are veterans or Americans out of work through no fault of their own in high unemployment areas. These are not lavish benefits—in my home state of Maryland, the average SNAP benefit is only \$128 per month. These are critical dollars that help fight hunger as American families work to get back on their feet after the recession.

The current Farm Bill is set to expire at the end of this month. But rather than move forward, the majority has brought forth an extreme proposal that is a nonstarter with the Senate and the President. It's time to stop these partisan games—I urge a no vote.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I am shocked at the blatant disregard for our Nation's poor displayed on this floor today. This bill before us cuts over forty billion from nutrition assistance programs, stripping away desperately needed food assistance benefits from over four million Americans, including up to 170,000 of our veterans. In addition, over two hundred thousand hungry children would be kicked off the school lunch program as a result of this Republican bill. That is an absolute disgrace. Who would agree to send all of those children to school hungry? Who would want to literally take food out of the mouths of our children?

As a father I cannot even imagine doing such a thing to one child much less hundreds of thousands. For decades I have been involved in helping create a better environment for our students in schools. How can we expect our Nation to move forward when our students are literally starving while trying to better themselves while learning on empty stomachs?

If this bill becomes law it will be devastating. I plead with my Republican colleagues. Do not be so cruel to our most vulnerable citizens, to our children, and to our veterans. Vote down this bill.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to submit two articles into the CONGRESSIONAL

RECORD. The first is an op-ed that I wrote about the importance of federal nutrition assistance that was published in the St. Paul Pioneer Press. The second is a powerful story published in the Star Tribune and written by Sue Bulger, a Minnesotan, whose family uses SNAP benefits.

As Members of Congress, we cannot ignore the harm enacting the Nutrition Reform and Work Opportunity Act (H.R. 3102) will have on millions of our fellow Americans. I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill and instead come together to craft a bill that strengthens SNAP and ends hunger in America.

CONGRESS MUST HELP ELIMINATE HUNGER

(By Betty McCollum)

For too many Minnesotans, a steady job no longer provides the guarantee of being able to always afford food for their family. One out of five children in the United States, including thousands in Minnesota, lives in a household struggling to put enough food on the table.

As many families continue to work toward recovery from one of the worst economic recessions, Congress must commit itself to helping struggling families make ends meet and providing a brighter, healthier future for their children.

The Supplemental Nutrition Access Program makes it possible for more than 45 million low-income families, people with disabilities and seniors to avoid hunger when times are tough. Simply put, SNAP helps our most vulnerable neighbors feed their children and themselves when they would otherwise run out of food before the next payday.

Working to eliminate hunger should be a bipartisan goal, but House Republicans have put SNAP on the fiscal chopping block. In July, Republicans tried to eliminate nutrition benefits for nearly 2 million Americans, including more than 30,000 Minnesotans, by cutting \$20.5 billion from SNAP. That harmful attack failed to pass the House. Instead of finding a bipartisan solution to fight hunger, Republicans have decided to double down on increasing hunger.

On Monday, Agriculture Committee Chairman Frank Lucas (R-Okla.) put forward a bill to cut an estimated \$39 billion from SNAP over the next decade. This latest Republican attack could eliminate benefits for as many as 3.8 million Americans and force many more struggling families to stretch their limited budgets even further. It would also cut funding for SNAP Nutrition Education, which supports nutrition education and teaches healthy food choices.

SNAP Ed programs help Minnesotans stretch an average daily food budget of less than \$4 to buy and prepare healthy meals. Hands-on cooking classes and interactive grocery store tours are offered to help individuals make smart, beneficial decisions. With less money to spend on groceries each month, the necessity of nutrition education becomes even more real.

Last month, I attended a Cooking Matters nutrition education class in St. Paul sponsored by University of Minnesota Extension and Share Our Strength's No Kid Hungry campaign. Since 2011, more than 1,600 Minnesota families have been empowered with the skills, knowledge and confidence to prepare nutritious, affordable meals. These extension classes are critical to ensure that households can continue putting healthy food on the table for their children. Studies demonstrate that children who get enough of the healthy food they need grow up facing fewer health problems, perform better in school, lead more productive lives and are less likely to struggle with hunger as adults. Nutrition education programs like Cooking

Matters are essential to helping families gain the skills they need.

These GOP cuts will do nothing except increase hunger and poverty across America. Throughout the summer, I heard from faith leaders, community advocates, government officials and other Minnesotans deeply concerned by the Republican efforts to eliminate SNAP for struggling Americans. The local focus is on ending hunger. As Patricia Lull, executive director of the St. Paul Area Council of Churches, put it, "No more hungry neighbors!"

SNAP is the most powerful and effective anti-hunger program for children that exists. To reduce childhood hunger in Minnesota and across America, we must continue to invest in SNAP and nutrition education services.

The Republican plan will deny nutrition assistance to millions of Americans and cruelly increase hunger. Congress needs to defeat this cruel and immoral proposal. To keep all our families healthy, strong and hunger-free it is critical that Congress fully fund SNAP, not cut it.

SHAMED IN EDINA FOR USING FOOD STAMPS

(By Sue Bulger)

To the irritated lady at the Cub Foods, I should have told you to your face that you were being presumptuous.

This is an apology to the lady behind me in line at Cub Foods in Edina on a recent Sunday night. This is also a reminder to me and to others who have ever slipped into believing that we are just a little better than others we encounter.

We were at the checkout, and just as the cashier started ringing me up, I saw you come to the line with a small order in your basket. My first apology is that I could not let you go ahead of me, but the checkout process had already begun.

My second apology was for pulling out my pile of discount coupons for the order, and especially when one required the manager's assistance. I know I was holding you up.

And then I swiped my payment method and you lost your patience. It was EBT—"food stamps."

I did not observe you, but my daughter was with me packing the groceries and saw it all: "EBT: Yeah, right," you muttered, with that look of disgust that would have shattered someone feeling just a little bit of shame over needing food stamps.

As we walked to the car, my daughter told me what had happened, and I sensed her resolve about having made the right decision to work for social justice as she starts her senior year in a social-work program.

We talked about you all the way to the car, and about how sorry we felt for people who were judged because they depended on support from others. But my real apology is that I did not make eye contact with you and get out of the car to talk with you as you got into your car right next to mine.

Instead, I did what many people would do: I felt ashamed and humiliated and angry about your ignorance.

If I'd had the guts to talk with you, I would have told you about my disabled 28-year-old son living with us. We have never asked for public support for him.

But recently we have decided that it is our responsibility to introduce him to the programs that will have to support him when we are no longer here to care for him. We started small: He is eligible for food support, and he agreed to receive it to be able to feel that he is contributing his share to the food bill, since he is unable to work.

I know we looked like people you might think need EBT: a bit unkempt in sweatpants and T-shirts. If I'd had the guts

to talk to you, I would have told you that I'd just had an emergency surgery and that my daughter came home from college five hours away to help for the weekend because my husband had scheduled surgery two days after mine. I haven't been able to put on real clothes yet, and I can't lift a bag of groceries.

I thought I could handle your disdain, since I am a professional working at a local corporation where I am surrounded every day by people who respect me and care about me. But it still made me feel a little dirty—unworthy—and I still went home and cried in the privacy of my shower so my family would not know I was hurt by you.

I am sorry I did not tell you all of this in person. What my daughter and I resolved is that we will never let my son (her brother) go to the store alone with his Electronic Benefits Transfer card and be subjected to this humiliation.

We all have our stories, and no one is any better than another. Everyone deserves the respect they want for themselves, even if they use an EBT card to pay for their groceries.

Sue Bulger lives in Minneapolis.

Mr. SIRE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my serious concern about H.R. 3102: the so called "Nutrition Reform and Work Opportunity Act of 2013". At a time when so many Americans are still struggling to recover from one of the greatest periods of economic downturn in our history, it is an outrage to me that Congress would once again seek to cut vital food assistance programs.

These are programs that ensure our children, our parents and grandparents, and America's working families get basic nutritional aide when they've fallen on hard times. And the timing couldn't be worse. Just last year, as a result of the short sighted budget cuts known as sequestration, many of our seniors were already hit hard by cuts to programs like Meals on Wheels. Some estimates put those cuts as high as 19 million fewer meals each year. And now Congress wants to cut food stamps for millions of Americans?

Let me be clear, food stamps are critical to the health and wellbeing of our Nation's most vulnerable populations. In New Jersey's 8th District, nearly thirty eight thousand (38,000) households rely on this benefit to feed their families. Statewide, 45 percent of recipients are children and nearly 25 percent are either elderly or disabled adults.

I understand the need to bring our budget under control, but I encourage my colleagues to find a smarter path forward. Let us not balance the budget on the backs of those among us who are the most vulnerable.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the draconian cuts in the SNAP program being proposed by H.R. 3102. This bill would cut \$40 billion from the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program and deny many vulnerable people the opportunity to feed themselves and their families. SNAP has already been reduced to dangerous levels and if this bill becomes law, 3.8 million people will no longer be able to receive this help by 2014. This is in addition to the drop in benefits that will occur when the provisions of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act expire at the end of October. This bill unnecessarily targets state and territorial governments struggling with high unemployment and ex-offenders trying to turn their lives around.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is based on misconceptions about the SNAP Program. These

misconceptions have led some of my colleagues to believe that SNAP is out of control, or that it needs reasonable work requirements or that there are loopholes that allow people who don't need it, to get it.

This is far from the truth. SNAP is not out of control, it is now being used by the many households that slid from the middle class into poverty during the Great Recession. The number of eligible households have increased and the urgent caseload has been expanded. In my district, the U.S. Virgin Islands there are over 9,000 households who receive this vital assistance monthly. Twenty-one million participate across the country. We cannot and should not leave these people behind. This bill also wants to take SNAP assistance away from those who get LIHEAP assistance, and for my district, which has some of the highest energy costs in the country, it would be catastrophic for those families who are already struggling to keep the lights on.

There are already work requirements for childless unemployed adults who can only receive SNAP for three months every three years unless they are working 20 hours per week or more. This bill wants to remove the ability of Governors to waive these requirements when their states and territories have high unemployment. I can tell you as the representative of a territory whose unemployment has skyrocketed due to a plant closure, through no fault of the workers who are left behind and must now utilize food stamps even though they prefer to work, this would be catastrophic and leave many people without resources.

Loopholes can and should be addressed, but not at the expense of those who are vulnerable, like children who need the free school meals, that are sometimes their only real meal of the day. I took the food stamp challenge, and believe me, it is barebones, no luxuries there, only sustenance for those who need it most.

Mr. Speaker, Hungry people in America did not create the Great Recession or the financial downturn or the wars that have drained our treasury. They should not have to pay with hunger or a lack of a life line.

I urge my colleagues to oppose these cuts to this vital food program.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to oppose the Nutrition Reform and Work Opportunity Act (H.R. 3102) to cut SNAP funding by \$40 billion over the next ten years.

H.R. 3102 denies SNAP to millions of poor, jobless adults without children whose incomes average only about one-fifth of the poverty line—and ends benefits for entire families if a parent is not working at least 20 hours per week. States will cut off families without considering high unemployment or care for small children to receive rewards promised in the bill.

The need for food assistance has increased dramatically during our nation's economic slump. Texas's rate for food insecurity is 27.6%—more than one in four Texas children is food insecure. As of the 2011 Census, over 42,000 residents of the 29th District receive SNAP benefits.

The impacts to Texas would be devastating, including 171,000 people immediately off of SNAP and the elimination of almost 500 million meals from hungry Texans.

Meeting the need for food assistance is especially critical for our most vulnerable citi-

zens—pregnant and nursing women, infants, children, and seniors for whom the consequences of hunger and poor nutrition are the most severe. It is critical that we maintain support for the charitable food system and funding for SNAP.

I have been a strong supporter of SNAP in Congress to help those who are food insecure during their time of need. Our office works closely with the Houston Food Bank, the largest in the Country, and the Texas Food Bank Network to help end hunger in America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 351, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GALLEGO. Yes, Mr. Speaker. I am opposed in its current form.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order against the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Gallego moves to recommit the bill (H. 3102) to the Committee on Agriculture, with instructions to report the bill back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of title I of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 142. PROTECTING VETERANS, SENIORS, PREGNANT WOMEN, AND CHILDREN FROM HUNGER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this Act, or the amendments made by this Act, shall result in a delay in issuing or providing benefits otherwise provided or available to a veteran, elderly or disabled member, pregnant woman, or minor child in the case of a Government shutdown or default.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—For the purpose of this section, the definitions of “elderly or disabled members” and “benefit” shall have the respective meanings as defined in the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2012).

Mr. LUCAS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes on his motion to recommit.

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, Members, we all know the rule that this motion doesn't kill the bill or send it back to committee. It just adds an amendment before proceeding to final passage.

There's a lot of confusion even here as the debate goes back and forth about whether or not veterans or kids are or are not included. There is a lot of apprehension around and across the

country about the sequester and the budget and the government shutdown and how that impacts many, many different services.

Because SNAP is a hybrid program, part automatic and part not, the benefits that it provides are in jeopardy. So regardless of whether or not SNAP and the cuts here today affect kids or veterans, this is a safety net.

This motion to recommit simply says that there will be no delay in benefits for kids, for the elderly, for the disabled, or for pregnant women in case of a government shutdown or a default.

□ 1730

Much has been made of this huge philosophical divide in this Chamber, but the truth is that there is a lot of consensus, too, a lot of commonality. All of us—all of us—want efficient government. We all love our kids. We're all taught to respect our elders, and we are all grateful for the services of our veterans.

And yet, in typical Congressional fashion, this bill decimates an efficient program that's not even broken. It has only a 3 percent error rate, a very low error rate. Ninety-seven percent of SNAP beneficiaries get SNAP because they need it. Ninety-one percent of SNAP benefits go to households below the poverty level. That's \$11,000 for an individual or \$19,000 for a family of three people.

I want to particularly focus that 82 percent of the households receiving SNAP have kids or elderly. 210,000 kids will lose their school lunch, and for many, it's the only good and reliable meal that they have. As a parent of a young son, I bet I know some of those kids. And you know what? I bet you know some of those kids, too.

The nonprofit group Feed Our Vets says that there are many vets who already don't have enough to eat, and yet 170,000 veterans have their SNAP benefits impacted under this legislation.

We can have that fundamental philosophical divide about the budget or about the debt or about many things, but we should all agree that we should take care of our kids. And we can all agree that we owe an obligation to our veterans.

Already, in November, without any action by this Congress, SNAP will automatically lose its ARRA funding. The average beneficiary gets \$133 a month. That's about \$1.40, a little under, per meal. Try eating for \$1.40 a meal or \$133 per month.

San Antonio's food bank already serves 58,000 people per week. Imagine how many they'll serve if this bill goes into effect.

And speaking of San Antonio, there's a young lady there, a working mother of three kids. Her name is Delaney. She works full-time at a doctor's office. That's 40 hours a week. She raises three young boys, one the age of my own son.

Delaney said to me, I'm trying my best. I'm working hard. She'd like to

get a second job, but there'd be nobody at home to take care of the kids.

SNAP isn't a luxury for her, by any means—it's a necessity. The family relies on that, especially towards the end of the month when their budget is tight, to help them put food on the table.

If we can make the program more efficient, let's look at that; but this bill cuts \$40 billion without public testimony, without public hearings, without investigation, without input. Somebody just decided that \$40 billion needed to be cut. It is not a well-reasoned or a reasonable approach. Our veterans deserve more than that. Our kids deserve better than that.

Regardless of what happens on the debt ceiling or the government shutdown, let's not make our kids and our veterans casualties of a prolonged conversation. Let's be sure that there is no delay in SNAP benefits for kids, for veterans, for the elderly, for the disabled, or for pregnant women in the event of a government shutdown or default.

I'd ask all of you, because this is simply a safety net, to please vote "yes" on this motion, because all it says is, in the event of a government shutdown, these people—the veterans, the kids, the elderly, and the disabled—will be protected.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma wish to withdraw his reservation on the point of order?

Mr. LUCAS. I withdraw my point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, my friends on the other side can say the same thing over and over again, but it does not make it true. This motion does nothing.

Food stamps are not affected by a government shutdown. No one—not a struggling mother, not a child, a veteran, or any person in need—will be denied benefits if they meet the program's current law and eligibility requirements.

All this bill does is ask them, just as we did in a bipartisan way in 1996, to prepare for work or participate in their communities in exchange for services.

But those much-lauded welfare reforms of 1996 have been thrown aside without the input of this Congress for years and has undermined the well-being of families participating in this program.

Work has been proven to be a beneficial part of the physical and mental health of every individual. It raises their family income and improves the outcomes of their children.

Why do the opponents of this bill want to undermine this successful

strategy for reducing hunger in America by increasing workforce participation and increasing incomes of American families?

I urge my colleagues to oppose this harmful motion and support the underlying bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of H.R. 3102, if ordered, and approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 193, nays 230, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 475]

YEAS—193

Andrews	Poster	Maloney,
Barber	Frankel (FL)	Carolyn
Barrow (GA)	Fudge	Maloney, Sean
Bass	Gabbard	Matheson
Beatty	Gallego	Matsui
Becerra	Garamendi	McCollum
Bera (CA)	Garcia	McDermott
Bishop (GA)	Grayson	McGovern
Bishop (NY)	Green, Al	McIntyre
Blumenauer	Green, Gene	McNerney
Bonamici	Grijalva	Meeks
Brady (PA)	Gutiérrez	Meng
Brown (FL)	Hahn	Michaud
Brownley (CA)	Hanabusa	Miller, George
Bustos	Hastings (FL)	Moore
Butterfield	Heck (WA)	Moran
Capps	Higgins	Murphy (FL)
Capuano	Himes	Nadler
Cárdenas	Hinojosa	Napolitano
Carney	Holt	Neal
Carson (IN)	Honda	Negrete McLeod
Cartwright	Horsford	Nolan
Castor (FL)	Hoyer	O'Rourke
Castro (TX)	Huffman	Owens
Chu	Israel	Pallone
Ciilline	Jackson Lee	Pascarell
Clarke	Jeffries	Pastor (AZ)
Clay	Johnson, E. B.	Payne
Clyburn	Jones	Pelosi
Cohen	Kaptur	Perlmutter
Connolly	Keating	Peters (CA)
Conyers	Kelly (IL)	Peters (MI)
Cooper	Kennedy	Peterson
Costa	Kildee	Pingree (ME)
Courtney	Kilmer	Pocan
Crowley	Kind	Price (NC)
Cuellar	Kirkpatrick	Quigley
Cummings	Kuster	Rahall
Davis (CA)	Langevin	Rangel
DeFazio	Larsen (WA)	Richmond
DeGette	Larson (CT)	Roybal-Allard
Delaney	Lee (CA)	Ruiz
DeLauro	Levin	Ruppersberger
DelBene	Lewis	Ryan (OH)
Deutch	Lipinski	Sanchez, Linda
Dingell	Loeb	T.
Doggett	Loftgren	Sanchez, Loretta
Doyle	Lowenthal	Sarbanes
Duckworth	Lowe	Schakowsky
Edwards	Lujan Grisham	Schiff
Ellison	(NM)	Schneider
Enyart	Luján, Ben Ray	Schrader
Eshoo	(NM)	Schwartz
Esty	Lynch	Scott (VA)
Farr	Maffei	Scott, David
Fattah		Serrano

Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)

Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky

NAYS—230

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amdel
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy

Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—9

Engel
Herrera Beutler
Johnson (GA)
Rush

□ 1759

Messrs. REED, COBLE, ROONEY, MARCHANT, STIVERS, ROGERS of

Alabama, and HUNTER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. WELCH, CAPUANO, SHERMAN, HOYER, and Mrs. CAPPS changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call No. 475, had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 217, nays 210, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 476]

YEAS—217

Aderholt	Forbes	McHenry
Alexander	Foxx	McKeon
Amash	Franks (AZ)	McKinley
Amodi	Frelinghuysen	McMorris
Bachmann	Gardner	Rodgers
Bachus	Garrett	Meadows
Barletta	Gerlach	Messer
Barr	Gibbs	Mica
Barton	Gingrey (GA)	Miller (FL)
Benishke	Gohmert	Miller (MI)
Bentivolio	Goodlatte	Mullin
Bilirakis	Gosar	Mulvaney
Bishop (UT)	Gowdy	Murphy (PA)
Black	Granger	Neugebauer
Blackburn	Graves (GA)	Noem
Boehner	Graves (MO)	Nugent
Boustany	Griffin (AR)	Nunes
Brady (TX)	Griffith (VA)	Nunnelee
Bridenstine	Guthrie	Olson
Brooks (AL)	Hall	Palazzo
Brooks (IN)	Harper	Paulsen
Broun (GA)	Harris	Pearce
Buchanan	Hartzler	Perry
Bucshon	Hastings (WA)	Petri
Burgess	Heck (NV)	Pittenger
Calvert	Hensarling	Pitts
Camp	Holding	Poe (TX)
Campbell	Hudson	Pompeo
Cantor	Huelskamp	Posey
Carter	Huizenga (MI)	Price (GA)
Cassidy	Hultgren	Radel
Chabot	Hunter	Reed
Chaffetz	Hurt	Reichert
Coble	Issa	Renacci
Coffman	Jenkins	Ribble
Cole	Johnson (OH)	Rice (SC)
Collins (GA)	Johnson, Sam	Rigell
Collins (NY)	Jordan	Roby
Conaway	Joyce	Roe (TN)
Cook	Kelly (PA)	Rogers (AL)
Cotton	King (IA)	Rogers (KY)
Cramer	Kingston	Rogers (MI)
Crawford	Kinzinger (IL)	Rohrabacher
Crenshaw	Kline	Rokita
Culberson	Labrador	Rooney
Daines	LaMalfa	Ros-Lehtinen
Davis, Rodney	Lamborn	Roskam
Denham	Lance	Ross
Dent	Lankford	Rothfus
DeSantis	Latham	Royce
DesJarlais	Latta	Runyan
Diaz-Balart	Long	Ryan (WI)
Duffy	Lucas	Salmon
Duncan (SC)	Luetkemeyer	Sanford
Duncan (TN)	Lummis	Scalise
Ellmers	Marchant	Schock
Farenthold	Marino	Schweikert
Fincher	Massie	Scott, Austin
Fleischmann	McCarthy (CA)	Sensenbrenner
Fleming	McCaul	Sessions
Flores	McClintock	Shimkus

Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)

Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup

Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—210

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene

Grijalva
Grimm
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal

Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

RESTORING HEALTHY FORESTS FOR HEALTHY COMMUNITIES ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 1526.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 351 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1526.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1814

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1526) to restore employment 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, with Mr. WOODALL in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

□ 1815

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Over the last few months, deadly wildfires, especially in California, Arizona, and Colorado, and wildfires in

NOT VOTING—6

Davis, Danny
Engel

Herrera Beutler
McCarthy (NY)

Polis
Rush

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1807

So the bill was passed.