and maintains beneficiary access to durable medical products and quality services.

THE FARM BILL

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, we have a major piece of legislation again being considered by this Congress, the farm bill. It expired in the last Congress; and, due to significant political machinations and controversies, we couldn't get it across the finish line because it was too expensive, didn't have enough reform, shortchanged nutrition and, frankly, didn't deal with the conservation elements that Americans care about.

Well, we're at it again, and the big, contentious issues remain. The direct payments appear to be gone, subsidies that go to farmers regardless of whether or not they even farm the land; but the big, contentious issues remain.

The issues of subsidization have simply migrated. There's an effort to have a shallow-loss provision or additional crop insurance subsidies that may actually end up being far more expensive than the direct payments they're supposed to be replacing.

There is an ongoing controversy regarding nutrition. The Senate bill cuts $4 billion at a time when too many Americans are, in fact, food insecure; and food stamps, the SNAP program, plays a vital interest in communities around the country.

The House bill is even worse: $16 billion in additional cuts that families rely upon and, frankly, that provide $1.70 of economic activity for each dollar that is given to beneficiaries.

Well, there is one area that shouldn't be unduly controversial: the conservation title of the farm bill. The farm bill is the most important piece of environmental legislation that will be considered by this Congress. The question is whether it will be a good environmental bill or a poor one.

The conservation title deals with programs that are very, very important but that the private market doesn't provide, a market-based incentive for people to invest in. I'm talking about things that, if you asked the public generally, of course they are concerned about clean air, clean water, soil protection, wetland and grassland preservation.

□ 1040

But these are things that we've seen for the last 60 years. Unless the Federal Government steps in with either subsidy or regulation, we pay a terrible price, dating back to the monstrous soil erosion that was part of the Dust Bowl tragedy.

Here, again, we're in a situation where the conservation title is in the crosshairs. It's the conservation programs that too often have been cut when we are in need of money. They are touted when people are encouraged to vote for the bill, and then those resources dissipate. Funding is diverted to large projects. Large, confined animal feedlot operations take huge amounts of this money to deal with something that should be part of their cost of doing business and large operations that could fund it themselves. It takes away resources from small and medium-size farmers, or drains valuable wetlands.

There's a reason why only one in four of the applications for conservation programs are approved. Because there isn't enough money and too much is diverted. I've introduced H.R. 1890, the Balancing Food, Farms, and Environment Act, which seeks to change those priorities to be able to have more money available, targeted toward small and medium-size farmers and ranchers, and be able to put a premium on longer-term conservation.

We have a bizarre situation now where, because of the amazingly bloated and inefficient farm crop insurance program, people are plowing up land that previously had been in conservation, land that's going to be eroded and that's probably going to fail because it's marginal cropland but they don't care because the Federal Government is going to pay them anyway. And the taxpayer loses twice. They pay through unnecessary crop insurance subsidies and they pay because they lose the water quality, the water quantity, the protection of wildlife habitat—and soil erosion.

By all means, let's have the political tug-of-war over unnecessary subsidization in terms of fighting nutrition, but let's come together on the conservation items, which really ought to be nonpartisan, focused, and economically productive.

U.S.-CHINA RELATIONSHIP

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

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, in a few days, China's new President, Xi Jinping, will conclude a tour of the Western Hemisphere by meeting with President Obama in an informal summit in California. The leaders of the Pacific Rim's two most powerful countries will discuss many issues of mutual concern. This important relationship continues to evolve dynamically in spite of the difficulties that we both have. These difficulties spring from some radically different philosophical outlooks on both life as well as governance. These differences deserve both our attention and candor.

Mr. Speaker, 24 years ago, this week, June 3, 1989, a massacre took place in China in a place called Tiananmen Square. Student protesters who were seeking some form of liberty for their interests gathered there. And I remember very vividly two very stark images from that time. One was the homemade replica of the Statue of Liberty that was erected in their midst. The other was a courageous Chinese man who decided to take it upon himself to stand as a silent witness, arms at his side like a soldier at attention, for the cause of human rights. He stood in the street and blocked four tanks as they proceeded on toward the student protesters. The tanks tried to make their way around him. As they did, he would move and stand in front of them. Clearly, there was a dilemma going on in the minds of the young Chinese soldiers who were driving those tanks. Perhaps they didn't want to kill one of their countrymen. So they tried to avoid it. But the young man persisted. For a time, he blocked those tanks, courageously and alone, from carrying out part of what would become the Tiananmen Square massacre. Eventually, some of his friends or other Chinese citizens whisked him away from certain death. Those were two very stark images in my mind that have stayed with me ever since.

In the House Foreign Affairs Committee this week, another one of those student leaders actually spoke. Her name is Chai Ling. She's a courageous new American, one who knows well the tragedy of forced repression—both political repression and the painful, silent repression in China that is not spoken of enough, which is that country's forced abortion policies, its One Child policy, which has, by the way, disproportionately targeted unborn girls.

In her testimony, she spoke clearly about her passion and love for China and her hope that the United States and China can begin a new embrace in a spirit of cooperation rooted in the fundamental respect for human dignity, which transcends both language and culture. She argues that the fear that led to the devastating persecutions of the Cultural Revolution, Tiananmen Square, and more recently, this genocidal One Child policy, which has seriously distorted China's demographic balance, must be transformed by truth. She echoes the spirit of Chen Guangcheng, the blind Chinese activist who stood up so courageously against repression last year in China. When he visited here in Washington, he said this to a small group of us: The intrinsic kindness of persons cannot be defeated by violence and force.

Mr. Speaker, dysfunction in this important bilateral relationship between the United States and China serves neither of our countries, nor the broader world, as the influence of this relationship extends far beyond our respective national borders. China wants our markets, we want their stuff and, perversely, there are incentives for our businesses to seek out their low-cost manufacturing. We want their investment, they want our resources. We sell our enterprises, we also run up our debt, and they buy the debt. In turn, we run down our economy in an endless

chase for near-term gain. This feeds a dysfunctional interdependence that is further aggravated by fundamental disagreements stemming from different world views and perspectives on the individual and the state.

We need to look closely at our notions of self-interest in this relationship, which vividly illustrates some of the challenges associated with global interdependence. But there are also opportunities that we need to grasp, Mr. Speaker. The President recently changed the way in which we talk about the concept of national interest in his State of the Union address, and I agree with him. We should talk about our national conscience in concert with our national interest. The two are inseparable. In conscience, we cannot say that all is well with the U.S.-China relationship.

We can hope for a better day. Hopefully, this meeting between the President and the new President of China will bear lasting fruit which transcends discussions about defense and economics, and looks to that which is fundamentally just and good for all peoples of the world.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 48 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Dr. Thomas Elliott, Jr., Cannon United Methodist Church, Snellville, Georgia, offered the following prayer:

Gracious God, You are the hope and end of all creation. Through Your love and mercy, You give us life and freedom. You bless us with an abundance of resources. You invite us to faith.

We thank You for Your presence and pray that You will guide us in the work You seek to accomplish.

Forgive us our indulgences and selfishness. Remove the prejudice, hatred, and contempt that divide us. Govern our thoughts with liberty and justice for all. Make us mindful of the needs of all peoples. Transform our economic woes. Influence our decisions. Free us from terrorism and war. Reveal Your will to us.

Today, we pray for our Nation, our President, and this Congress, the military and citizens, the less fortunate and peoples of the Earth.

Turn our hearts to You that we may serve this day with compassion, justice, courage, and peace.

In Jesus' name.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. KIRKPATRICK) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING REVEREND DR. THOMAS ELLIOTT, JR.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, it's my great pleasure this morning to introduce my colleagues to Dr. Tom Elliott. Not only is he our guest chaplain today and the senior pastor at Cannon United Methodist Church in Snellville, in my district, he was also my youth minister growing up in Decatur, Georgia. For over 30 years, I've known Tom.

He's here today with his wife, Kelly. He is surrounded in love by his daughter, Lucy, and his son, Thomas. He has a love of the Lord, and that's a love that he shares in the pulpit on Sunday morning, and a love that you can find expressed in music at coffeehouses around the district in his Wild at Heart band nights during the week.

It's my great pleasure to have Tom with us today. I thank you for your service to our community, Tom, and I thank you for your service to the Lord.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RIBBLE). The Chair will entertain 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

THE RECENT SUPREME COURT DECISION ON DNA COLLECTION

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

Mr. MASSIE. I rise today in strong opposition to the recent Supreme Court decision in Maryland v. King. As Justice Scalia warned in his brilliant dissent, a consequence of this week's ruling is that your DNA can now ''be taken and entered into a national DNA database if you are ever arrested, rightly or wrongly, or for whatever reason.''

On the day I was sworn in, I pledged that I would be a staunch defender of individual liberties and of our Constitution, an unwavering advocate for freedom. This includes upholding the Fourth Amendment to our Constitution that protects us against unreasonable searches and seizures.

I strongly disagree with the five Justices in this case who held that DNA collection is just ''another metric of identification,'' like ''a name or a fingerprint.'' It is not. It's an intrusive invasion of privacy and property that should never be allowed before a person has even been tried, convicted, or served a warrant.

As my Senate colleague TED CRUZ warned, ''unchecked government power and intrusive personal databases . . . pose real risks to our liberty.''

PAYCHECK FAIRNESS ACT

(Mrs. KIRKPATRICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, we are nearing the 50th anniversary of the Equal Pay Act, yet too many women continue to struggle. Too many women still don't receive equal pay for equal work.

Fifty years after President Kennedy signed the Equal Pay Act, women still earn only 77 cents for every dollar earned by men. That is not only wrong, it's bad for our economy.

Working families often rely on two incomes, and more and more households have women as the primary source of income. That means women's take-home pay must cover the rent, the groceries, the doctor's visits. And when women succeed, our families succeed; so does our economy.

I was proud to cast my first vote in Congress for the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act, which restored women's right to challenge unfair pay in court, but there's more work to do. Over the past 50 years, the Equal Pay Act has never been updated or strengthened. That's where the Paycheck Fairness Act comes in. It strengthens and closes loopholes in the law.

So let's get this done and send an important message that work is work, no matter who is doing it. Let's pass the Paycheck Fairness Act.

AMERICANS DESERVE BETTER

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

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to represent the great State of Utah and Salt Lake City. Forbes Magazine recently rated Utah as the best State in the Nation for business and careers. Salt Lake City was recently ranked as the best city in the country for new graduates.