

All of our witnesses have confirmed what we know to be true: SNAP works. It is a powerful program that helps to alleviate poverty and food insecurity, and it is worthy of our support.

Today I would like to share with my colleagues a few of the most important takeaways from the 21 hearings I participated in as ranking member of the Nutrition Subcommittee.

First, SNAP benefits should not be cut. Forty-two million Americans, including working families, veterans, seniors, children, and the disabled, struggle to put food on the table. In the richest country in the history of the world, I find that unconscionable. SNAP is a vital tool that helps struggling Americans get back on their feet, and participation has steadily declined as economic conditions have improved.

Second, the current SNAP benefit is inadequate. On average, SNAP households receive about \$225 a month. The average benefit per person is about \$126 per month, which works out to be a meager \$1.40 per person per meal. You can't buy a Starbucks coffee for that.

Pamela Hess with the Arcadia Center for Sustainable Food and Agriculture, said it best during her testimony before the Agriculture Committee: "... people can't parent well and raise happy, healthy children who are ready to learn, and you can't work well if you are hungry, if you are wondering where your next meal is coming from. . . ."

Cutting this meager benefit would be a rotten and heartless thing to do, especially as so many in our country continue to face incredible hardships.

Third, SNAP does not discourage work. The majority of people on SNAP who can work, do work. Almost 70 percent of SNAP recipients aren't expected to work because they are kids, they are elderly, disabled, or caring for a young child or disabled family member. More than half of SNAP households with at least one working-age, nondisabled adult do work while receiving SNAP, and more than 80 percent work in the year before or after receiving benefits.

Under current law, able-bodied adults without dependents, known as ABAWDs, are limited to 3 months on SNAP out of every 3 years if they aren't working. I don't agree with that provision, but I have come to learn that some of my Republican colleagues want to shorten that time that these very vulnerable adults can remain in the program. Make no mistake, such a move wouldn't help people find jobs; it would only make them hungry and more vulnerable.

As Sherrie Tussler of the Milwaukee Food Bank noted in her testimony before the Agriculture Committee: "Somehow, we have determined that punishing people with hunger will motivate them towards work. Hunger doesn't motivate. It dulls and it makes people sick."

Fourth, case management requires a well-funded, multiyear commitment. Case management that helps connect

those in need with tailored services to move out of poverty can be successful, but those investments cost money. We need to adequately fund these efforts.

Lastly, block grants threaten programs that provide an economic ladder. Past Republican budgets have proposed block-granting SNAP, but we know from decades of experience that funding for block-granted programs erodes over time and does not provide the same responsiveness to economic conditions that SNAP does.

SNAP expands during times of economic hardship and contracts as the economy recovers. It successfully reaches those in need and is only limited by the modest benefit calculation and hurdles to access like the ABAWD time limit. There is no reason whatsoever, based on all of our hearings, to undermine SNAP through structural changes, block grants, further restrictions, more onerous requirements, or cuts.

At a minimum, the next farm bill must do nothing to make hunger worse in this country—period. Instead, we should focus on strengthening our antihunger safety net to make sure anyone who needs modest food assistance benefits has access to them. We need to support and expand innovative programs that help to increase the purchasing power of SNAP, and we need to increase SNAP benefits to provide families who benefit from the program access to more nutritious foods that last them through the month.

Mr. Speaker, today, chefs and advocates from across the country are on the Hill with Food Policy Action and Environmental Working Group to discuss issues related to the farm bill, including our antihunger safety net. I urge my colleagues to listen to these chefs—they are food experts—and pay attention to them, especially when they ask you to support policies that will be aimed at ending hunger now.

THANKING SHERIFF JOHN SANNER FOR HIS SERVICE

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

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and thank recently retired Stearns County Sheriff John Sanner for his service to the people of Minnesota. For the past 33 years, Sheriff Sanner has watched over our community, ensuring our safety and the safety of our loved ones. In 1984, he started out as a patrol deputy and was elected sheriff 20 years later.

After the horrific abduction of Jacob Wetterling in 1989, Sheriff Sanner was one of the main officers on the case. He worked for more than 26 years searching tirelessly for Jacob, hoping to finally give Jacob's family an answer. Years went by and, soon, decades, but Sheriff Sanner never gave up on Jacob or the Wetterling family. He stood by them until the case was finally solved just this past year, proving his dedica-

tion to his job and to the people he served.

Sheriff Sanner, I speak on behalf of all Minnesotans when I say thank you. We wish you a long, peaceful retirement spent with your family.

TRUMP ERA OF IMMIGRATION

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

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, "This is a new era. This is the Trump era." Mr. Speaker, those were the words of the Attorney General, the former Senator from Alabama.

The Attorney General has launched a campaign to paint immigrants as criminals, rapists, gang members, and "cartel henchmen." In his prepared remarks at the border a couple of weeks ago, the Attorney General planned to say the following: "It is here, on this sliver of land, where we first take our stand against this filth."

When he gave the speech he edited out the words "this filth" because, I guess, calling immigrants from Latin America "filth" was even too extreme for this Attorney General. But it remains on the DOJ website. In fact, as far as the Attorney General is concerned, any immigrant who is here illegally is a criminal.

He has ordered the government to prosecute immigration violations, even minor ones, to the full extent of the law and to make prosecution of immigrants a top priority—on par with murder, drugs, counterfeiting, and kidnapping.

He has ordered every one of the 94 U.S. Attorney Offices to appoint a special prosecuting attorney so that immigrants are considered public enemy number one, nationwide—not drug dealers, immigrants. According to the latest Federal data, 46 percent of all new Federal criminal prosecution is immigration related—not narcotics. The second highest crime prosecuted accounts only for 14 percent of new Federal cases. In the new Trump era, a felony prosecution against an immigrant who has been living and working here peacefully for decades is three times important than a felony prosecution of a drug dealer.

And that imbalance is not enough for the Attorney General. He wants to prosecute immigrants beyond the full extent of the law by turning misdemeanors into felonies, and turning felonies into aggravated felonies. They think it will not look so ugly when the U.S. is deporting moms and dads who have raised successful families—or deporting children who grew up in the U.S. from the time they were toddlers—if the Attorney General and his team can look and tell the American people they were just thugs, gangbangers, and rapists.

Jeff Sessions and Donald Trump want more immigrants criminalized, felonized, and deported. Yes, we are truly in the Trump era.

But let's be frank. This is not a surprise when Donald Trump descended the gold escalator and announced his candidacy for President. Almost the first words out of his mouth were Mexicans are rapists, murderers, drug dealers, and immigration is turning America into a war zone.

When he was a Senator from Alabama, the Attorney General made a career of associating immigrants with crime and doing his best to defeat reforms that would strengthen legal immigration and reduce illegal immigration. Deportation, criminalization, and restricting legal immigration were the bedrock of this Attorney General's approach when he was a U.S. Senator.

Our legal immigration system already works fine according to both Senator and Attorney General Sessions, no matter that some people who are receiving their visas today applied for them when Bill Clinton was President and that those applying for visas today will probably get them when Chelsea Clinton is President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, when your constituents say, "Hey, why don't those immigrants come here legally?" or, "Why don't they just go back and come back legally?" the answer is clear: as a Senator, our Attorney General made sure that that was impossible.

Next week, millions of Americans will take to the streets to demonstrate against mass deportation, the border wall, prison beds, and drive-by deportations. But it is not because we are soft on crime or love immigrants more than the people who were born here. No. We have a different vision of what the United States is and should always be.

We are not an incarceration nation, a nation hostile to other countries and their people. We are a great nation, a nation that, in her greatness, is a beacon of hope to refugees, a land of opportunity for entrepreneurs, and a democracy with separate branches of government that act as effective checks and balances on unlimited power.

The American people are sensible, fair, and pragmatic, and are correct when they reject the idea that a wall makes sense in the 21st century as the centerpiece of our immigration policy. We are not persuaded by the poetry of the Attorney General when he stands at the border and says: "It is here, on this sliver of land, where we first take our stand against this filth." No, we think of another, better poem, the one at the Statue of Liberty, the lady with her torch in the harbor, who shares our deeply held values as Americans and says every day to the entire world at that harbor: "Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free."

CONGRESS SHOULD VOTE ON CONTINUING POLICY IN AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from

North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, last week was another reminder of the chaos in Afghanistan. Tragically, 200 Afghan soldiers were killed by the Taliban; but, unfortunately, that is no surprise.

After 16 years in Afghanistan, absolutely nothing has changed. If anything, it has gotten worse. The American taxpayer, United States military, and the marines in my district are frustrated with the 16 years of continued chaos. That is why Mr. GARAMENDI and I have introduced H.R. 1666 and have been joined by seven of our colleagues. Our bill asks that Congress be able to debate and vote on whether we should or should not continue our current policy in Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, I bring this poster on the floor as a reminder. Let me say to you today and my fellow colleagues that we have spent over 800 billion taxpayer dollars, over 2,200 American servicemembers have died, and over 20,000 of our troops have been severely wounded. The waste, fraud, and abuse is just as bad, if not worse, today than at the very beginning of 2002.

Now, some 300 additional marines, mainly from Camp Lejeune in my district, have been deployed to Afghanistan this spring, and we have had no discussion of that on the floor of the House. Mr. Speaker, I am calling on PAUL RYAN as Speaker of the House to permit a new debate on our future involvement in Afghanistan and whether or not our young men and women should be sent to war, as there are more than 300 Members of the House of Representatives that were not here in 2001 that have never had a debate or a vote on Afghanistan and the policy of Afghanistan.

It is time that the Congress interject itself. It is our constitutional responsibility to send our young men and women to die for this country, and yet we do not ever have a debate. That is why the bill that Mr. GARAMENDI and I have put in, H.R. 1666, will simply say that the House will have a debate on whether we should or should not be in Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know why that is asking too much because it is our constitutional duty. Nothing that we vote on in this House of Representatives is as sacred as sending a young man or woman to die for this country.

□ 1030

I have sent a letter to PAUL RYAN as recently as yesterday asking him to please give us the ability that we have taken the oath to debate war. And the Speaker of the House can order the committees of jurisdiction to send an authorization of military force to the floor of the House for debate.

Mr. Speaker, for all of our men and women in uniform, all of the families of our men and women in uniform who have died for this country, please, Congress, let's join together, Republican and Democrat, and let's debate the future of Afghanistan.

CONGRATULATING RABBI ELYSE FRISHMAN ON HER RETIREMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GOTTHEIMER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank my friend and spiritual mentor, Rabbi Elyse Frishman, for her 22 years of exceptional service to Barnert Temple in Franklin Lakes, New Jersey.

After decades of service to the Jewish community, Rabbi Frishman will be retiring this June. Personally, I am very lucky to call Rabbi Frishman my rabbi.

In addition to leading our congregation, she is the editor of the reform prayer book "Mishkan Tefilah," and a national leader in worship and congregational engagement.

Rabbi Frishman has stood as a model citizen and faith leader, going the extra mile to bring together the community in times of anxiety and fear.

She was recently featured by The Bergen Record for her work to unite the interfaith communities in a common mission, forming dialogues, understanding, and building friendships where they didn't exist before.

In doing so, she has long set an example for the families of our congregation. As a parent, I am glad my children are growing up knowing and being led and educated by her in our faith community.

Rabbi Frishman deserves to be held up as a model for public service. And though our congregation and I will miss her deeply, I congratulate her on her retirement, and I hope everyone enjoys the evening celebrating her years of service to us. America and our community has been very lucky to have Rabbi Elyse Frishman.

Thank you, Rabbi Frishman.

HONORING CAPTAIN JOSHUA TODD BYERS

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

Mr. AMODEI. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to honor Captain Joshua Byers, a fallen soldier, son, husband, brother, and friend.

In Sparks, Nevada, Captain Byers lives on as a legacy. His kind heart, patriotic soul, and strong ideals of servant leadership have left a strong and lasting impact on everyone who knew him.

Captain Byers attended Edward C. Reed High School in Sparks, the home of the Raiders. Although not originally from Sparks, Captain Byers moved with his mother, father, and two younger brothers to chase a dream and God's calling in Nevada.

While at Reed High School, he joined the Naval Junior ROTC program and various other clubs, all while maintaining excellent grades.

When he reached his senior year, he was student body president, the battalion commander of the Junior ROTC