

the American people a better deal on prescription drug costs. Our plan cracks down on price gouging, allows Medicare to negotiate discounted prices, and requires new levels of transparency for big drug companies.

But more than 10 months since Democrats offered a way forward, President Trump and Republicans are still silent. Instead of addressing this crisis, the President and his allies in Congress have made the problem even worse. They tried to take away healthcare from 23 million Americans on more than one occasion. They gave the pharmaceutical industry a huge tax cut, and they made it even harder for working men and women to get ahead.

Democrats are putting the needs of working people first, ahead of big pharmaceutical companies, and we are going to keep fighting until the American people get a better deal on prescription drugs.

GOODWILL INDUSTRIES WEEK

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the week of May 6 through May 12 as Goodwill Industries Week.

This week is about the people of Georgia who value hard work and support the right of individuals to provide for themselves and their families. Some members in our communities require additional education, job preparation, skill training, and support services to reach the goal of self-sufficiency.

Goodwill has a rich history of providing essential services for these people to be productive members of our community since 1902. Since 1965, in southeast Georgia, Goodwill has provided community-based services, including career counseling, GED preparation, financial education, resume preparation, and more.

In this time of low unemployment, it is more important than ever for us to reach out to the unemployed and give our businesses the workforce they need to succeed.

Thank you to the employees of Goodwill Southeast Georgia for everything you are doing to keep our national economy strong, and for maximizing individuals' contributions to self, family, and community.

ADVANCE PAROLE

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

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, on September 5, 2017, President Trump terminated the DACA program, disrupting the lives of nearly 800,000 hard-working DACA recipients. On that same day, the administration decided

to no longer allow DACA recipients to travel abroad under the authority of advance parole.

In the past, DACA recipients have been allowed to take short trips out of the country for humanitarian, educational, or employment purposes. This is no longer the case, and the consequences have been devastating.

In January of this year, the father of my constituent, Mayra—a college student and Dreamer—died in Mexico. She immediately gathered the necessary paperwork, including her father's death certificate, and applied for advance parole. Her request was denied, and then denied again.

Mayra was unable to pay her last respects to her beloved father due to the unconscionable decisions made by this irresponsible and heartless administration.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the administration to immediately reverse this harmful directive.

DISASTROUS IRAN NUCLEAR DEAL

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend President Trump for withdrawing the U.S. from the disastrous Iran nuclear deal.

Iran's pursuit of nuclear weapons—and ballistic missiles capable of delivering them—is a serious threat to its neighbors in the Middle East, as well as eventually the U.S. But the 2015 Iran nuclear deal, hatched by John Kerry and the Obama administration, does little to curb that pursuit.

The fact is, there aren't nearly strong enough measures in place to actually hold Iran accountable for compliance with the deal. It is too bad the Obama administration has already traded billions of U.S. and foreign dollars in exchange for promises Iran clearly has no intention of keeping. We can't get those dollars back either.

Of course, now Iran isn't even using this money for its economy, as reported. Much of it is being funneled directly to active terrorist organizations around the Middle East.

This deal was a danger from the start, and it lets Iran off the hook. We must do better. We must negotiate better than has been done.

THREATS TO SNAP PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to be leading this Special Order hour on the SNAP program and the current threats against it in the farm bill.

SNAP, of course, is America's most important antihunger program, serving

more than 42 million Americans and delivering improved economic, health, and nutrition outcomes for millions of our families, reducing poverty and food insecurity.

To kick us off tonight, I yield to the gentlewoman from the great State of Washington, PRAMILA JAYAPAL, my distinguished colleague.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his continued leadership on these Special Order hours, and also for his leadership in the Progressive Caucus, and on the Judiciary Committee.

I am here to talk about SNAP because I am sort of dumbfounded that we are where we are. I serve as the vice ranking member on the Budget Committee, and I saw firsthand how a Republican tax scam, the tax cut, was pushed through in favor of the top 1 percent and the largest corporations, creating a transfer of wealth from the middle class and working people to the wealthiest; creating what will be a \$1 trillion deficit according to the Congressional Budget Office next year; and then coming back and saying somehow we don't have enough money to feed our kids.

That, to me, is really not just ludicrous, but it is outrageous, and I am deeply saddened by it because the program that we are talking about is the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program—that is what SNAP stands for—and it feeds 42 million American families across the country. This is a target of our colleagues on the Republican side, using the farm bill to take this crucial program away from Americans who need it the most. The bill would strip critical food assistance from unemployed and employed workers by shortening the time limits to be eligible for SNAP for millions of people.

My home State of Washington in 2016 received \$1.1 billion in SNAP funding, and there and across the country, as I said, 42 million families benefit from this critical program. These are workers and families who face low wages, unreliable schedules, underemployment, and unstable incomes. They all rely on SNAP to buy groceries and put food on the table.

So we are talking about stripping food assistance from families and individuals with children under 6 if they can't consistently work 20 hours a week. And it would strip food assistance for a whole year if that requirement isn't met.

Cutting SNAP is not magically going to reduce the deficit, a deficit that was dramatically increased by our Republican colleagues when they passed the tax scam, and so this is just an attempt to take resources from the most vulnerable and to leave these 40 million families stranded on the side of the road.

The American Dream isn't just about individuals lifting themselves up by their own bootstraps. It is the idea that we are all better off when we are all

better off; that we need to lift up every person, and make sure every person has bootstraps to be lifted up by.

Today, my office received a call from Dave in my district who works at our University District Food Bank, and he called just imploring Congress not to allow this to happen. Our community food banks in red and blue districts across the country will not be able to keep up with the need if we gut SNAP. Yesterday, I met with Aaron from Food Lifeline, who knows from experience that for every one meal provided by a food bank in our community, SNAP provides 12.

Yesterday, I spoke at a rally and we had a constituent of mine—a woman named Tina—who came out from Washington State. She is a single mom. She has got a 9-year-old kid, and she was just begging and pleading for us to please keep this program.

The reality is that SNAP is one of the most cost-effective public assistance programs. It quickly and directly gets food assistance to those who need it. So why would we wage a war on that program or a war on poor people by cutting these essential benefits?

Mr. Speaker, I know that Mr. RASKIN shares my deep commitment to make sure that we provide these essential benefits for families across the country, and I believe that there are colleagues on the other side who will share this commitment once they understand what this is doing to poor folks in their districts who just need a hand up; kids who need food on the table—fruits, vegetables, healthy foods—so that they can grow and nourish their bodies and their souls, and help contribute to our economy. And that is what SNAP does.

So I urge all of my colleagues on the Republican side to join us Democrats in fighting for our kids and fighting for nutrition, and fighting for this critical program.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman JAYAPAL for her terrific leadership on the SNAP program and for defending the ability of all of our families to not send their kids to bed at night hungry. That is really what this is all about.

People on the SNAP program receive an average of only \$1.40 per meal, and in order to get assistance, of course, they have got to complete a detailed application process with meticulous documentation of their name, their legal status in the country, their identity, their income, their address, and so on. Ninety percent of participants are in households with children under the age of 18, or with elderly people, or with individuals with disabilities.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to yield next to our distinguished colleague from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I have just a few observations. The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program is a good program. It is the number one food assistance

program our country has. And it has gotten families through tough times, for sure. The truth is, most people who use SNAP aren't on it very long. They find themselves in a rough patch. They use SNAP. They get off.

Programs that impose artificial timelines and kick people off or deny them or have work requirements, ignore the fact that people do not get on SNAP to stay on SNAP unless they are too young, too old, or too sick to work.

Generally, people are trying to get jobs. The irony of this is that from a Republican standpoint, it seems like they are happy to give really, really rich people money without any expectations. And, yet, if a low-income person needs some help, money from the government, now all of a sudden we have got to put all kind of restrictions and all kind of waits on it.

Why does help and assistance from the government not ruin rich peoples' worth ethic, but it seems in the Republican mind to ruin the work ethic of working people and low-income people? It is totally ironic. It must be premised on the myth that somehow species of humanity are different from one another, and they are just not. People are the same.

I want to just point out as well, that if you really want to do something meaningful, why don't we pass legislation that would stop fast-food companies from conspiring with each other to restrict wages? There are two bills that got introduced. One is an antipoaching law that means that the employers can't come together and agree that they are not going to hire each other's workers if they leave looking for better pay, and the other one is a provision that would ban this process of noncompete clauses for people who work in fast-food.

These two bills together conspired to restrict the pay of working people. They keep wages down. What if we did real antitrust legislation and stopped huge companies from dominating the entire market, creating a single buyer, a monopsony, which then has the power to hold people down?

I just got through talking to some employees at Toys-R-Us. Their company was bought by some private equity firms. A lot of debt was piled on to them. The bonuses were given out to the top management. They took off on their golden parachutes. The company goes through bankruptcy, and now it is closing 800 stores and laying off 30,000 people.

The bottom line is: SNAP helps people in tough economic times. If they are able-bodied, I am sure they want to work. They don't need these punitive kicks to go to work. They just need an opportunity to get back up on their feet. These programs are insulting, demeaning, unnecessary, and they shouldn't exist.

If we really want to give working people an opportunity, let's increase the minimum wage to \$15 an hour. Let's support the Employee Free

Choice Act which can give them a voice on the job so they can negotiate with their employers for better wages.

It seems like Republicans don't want to do anything to meaningfully change the lives of working people, but, work requirements, drug tests, all this sort service moralistic stuff, it doesn't work. It is a waste of money and there are way better ways to do what you say you are trying to do.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) very much. He makes an excellent point which is, more than two-thirds of SNAP participants are in families with children, and in the majority of those, you have at least one working adult in the house.

□ 1700

So despite efforts to portray this as some kind of welfare, we are talking about millions of Americans who are working but still can't afford to feed their families. That is what the SNAP program is about. It is about helping working families meet the basic nutritional standards of our people.

We are the richest society in the history of the world, and we can certainly support working families, through the SNAP program, to benefit from the great bounty that is the agricultural output of the United States of America, which is the breadbasket of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I yield now to our colleague from California, NANETTE BARRAGÁN. I thank Ms. BARRAGÁN very much for joining us.

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland for yielding.

When we talk about SNAP, I often think about my own childhood. When I was a kid, I remember my parents needing some assistance. We would get a bag of groceries that had block yellow cheese in it; it had things we could use to make some food. It was temporary. It was to get us through a tough time.

SNAP is our Nation's cornerstone antihunger program, providing millions of American households with access to food assistance. Children living in these households are also eligible to receive free school meals, ensuring that they are not worried about going hungry when they should be free to focus on their academics.

In California alone, 4.1 million people rely upon SNAP, with 74 percent of participants being part of families with children and half of participants already being part of working families. In my district, California's 44th Congressional District that covers areas like Compton, Watts, and San Pedro, 17 percent of households depend upon SNAP to assist them in feeding their families. SNAP not only provides families in need with vital nutritional assistance; it also helps to stimulate local economies. For every dollar invested in SNAP, nearly \$2 are generated in economic activity.

That is why the current efforts to “reform” SNAP are so misguided. These include the recent Harvest Box proposal, which would reduce or eliminate a SNAP recipient’s access to nutritious products like fresh produce and meats, taking away their right to choose how best to fulfill their family’s specific nutritional needs. Additionally, the recently unveiled farm bill expands work requirements for SNAP. This would make it harder for our most vulnerable to access food assistance, knocking them back down when we should be offering them a hand up.

I am proud to support SNAP, and I will continue fighting with my colleagues to ensure that no American has to struggle to put food on their table.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ms. BARRAGÁN very much for her leadership in defending the SNAP program. She talked about California. I just want to add to her point, a point about my home State in Maryland, where the SNAP program reaches 684,000 residents of my State, which is more than 1 in 10 people who live in the State.

Nationally, of course, it is 42 million people who participate in the SNAP program, which is 13 percent of the total population. And that is not a stagnant, permanent pool of Americans; that is a transient group because people move in and move out according to their economic circumstances.

The SNAP program is a reflection of our investment in ourselves as a people and our determination that here, in the wealthiest country on Earth, nobody should be sending their kids to bed at night hungry.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield to our distinguished colleague from New Jersey, BONNIE WATSON COLEMAN.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. I want to thank my colleague from Maryland for yielding to me so I might speak on an issue that is very important to all of us.

I want to speak on behalf of the 43 million people who are SNAP recipients, many of whom are working each and every day. I want to talk about the fact that those are individuals whom we consider working poor. Mr. RASKIN mentioned that SNAP was a reflection of something. SNAP is a reflection of the fact that we have so many jobs that don’t pay adequate wages. SNAP is a reflection of the raw deal that our citizens are getting under an administration that would choose to give trillions of dollars worth of money to those people who are already rich, asking nothing in return for that horrible tax scam, and, at the same time, asking those at the lowest income spectrum in the entire United States of America to work so that they can be supplemented with meals that are \$1.40 a meal.

That is hypocrisy. That is disgusting. We should not even be having a discussion about whether or not we should be eliminating, reducing, or changing a SNAP benefit. We should make sure that there is adequacy for every child

and every family to not go hungry in this country; and, at the same time, we should be looking at giving our citizens who have had a really raw deal over these last couple of years a better deal, a better deal with better wages that we would like to proffer so that individuals wouldn’t have to work and get supplemental food assistance as well.

Better jobs. Better skills. Better opportunities.

I am going to close very shortly on this. I was at a hearing today on the issue of SNAP and what we were planning to do with SNAP and what were the recommendations for the SNAP program. And I heard from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle some very disgusting insinuations or accusations about people who were on SNAP who were perhaps sitting on their porch drinking a cup of coffee or whatever. And the assumption was that that person was sitting on his duff as opposed to out there working, and he was a recipient of SNAP. You know nothing about that person’s situation. But that person probably was a member of the minority class.

And we talk about getting a job. Well, I said to those people who came and testified today at our hearing: You have come here with some Pollyanna idea that this country is a country of equality. Well, it may have been working towards equality, but we are experiencing a period right now where we have the greatest sense of inequality we have had in decades, in hundreds of years.

We are underemployed. We are unemployed. The people who are working every day for wages to bring home are the ones who are paying for every tax break that is given to the 1 percent in this country. You can give millions and millions of dollars in the State of New Jersey even to the wealthiest 1 percent and ask nothing in return. If you are an individual, you are asked nothing in return. If you are a corporation, you are not even asked to create a job, a training opportunity, or to increase wages.

Do not talk to me about those people who are on SNAP and what they should be doing. Talk to me about what America should be doing for all of its people, because we are all members of the human race. Some of us just weren’t born rich. Some of us just don’t have the opportunity to go around with a silver spoon in our mouth.

This Congress should be ashamed of itself for not taking care of the needs of those who simply need government to recognize that it represents everybody, not just the very wealthy. I thank Mr. RASKIN for the opportunity.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mrs. Coleman for her comments. She has made some very important points, and I wonder if I would pursue a couple with her before she goes, perhaps have a moment for colloquy.

The first is the point she was making about the growing economic inequality in the country. That is something that

has been on the minds of Americans, at the very least, since the Occupy movement took place after the 2008 mortgage meltdown crisis, which cost 11 million Americans their jobs, 12 million Americans their homes, and created an economic dislocation panic across the country, which thankfully President Obama and his administration moved to address, unleashing 60 straight months of economic growth and expansion in the country.

Today we have an administration which vowed to drain the swamp when it came to Washington. It seems like they have moved into the swamp and they are just draining the treasury instead: \$1.5 trillion added to our budget deficit from the tax scam giveaway, which you referenced.

I wonder if she would reflect for a moment on the relationship between a vision of government, which is that it is a money-making operation for a handful of people, and growing inequality and poverty among other parts of the population.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. RASKIN for raising that issue. I think that that is one of the most prominent issues that people of this country need to understand.

Government has a significant role. That role is to protect the opportunities, rights, and privileges of all people, to create the level playing field. What we have experienced in this administration, in this Republican-controlled Congress, is that we care not. We prioritize the value of human beings based upon how much money they are worth or how much money they can get.

So we are taking resources that should not be taken out of our treasury; we are then giving them in heaps and piles to the very, very wealthy; and then we are talking about deficits that are being created and how we need to make up those deficits. And how do we look to do that? Well, we look to do things like reduce the benefits of Medicaid, mess with Social Security, take away SNAP from people who need supplemental nutritional assistance.

We talk about this America not being one America anymore. This is an America of the haves and the have-nots. Never have we seen this tremendous diversity or disparity between the very, very, very wealthy and those who are struggling.

And those who are struggling get this. My colleagues think of poor people as lazy people who are not doing what they can do. We are poor people in this country—hungry, homeless people—because of our policies, because of our budget, which is the greatest reflection of our priorities and our values. Our values are askew right now, and we need to make sure that we are looking after that responsibility for which we were elected.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, let me ask Mrs. Coleman one final question before she goes. She made a point before which I thought was profound,

which is that millions and millions of people on the SNAP program are working, but they are not making enough money to support their family in a dignified way, in a way that lives up to even the most minimal expectations for health and nutrition. That is what the SNAP program is all about. In a way, you could view the SNAP program as a subsidy to the employers of these people because we are taking care of them because their salaries don't.

Now, I could understand someone saying: Let's get rid of the SNAP program and make those employers pay a real living wage to these people, or let's make them pay a full living wage and give them all healthcare. But that is not the proposal that we are getting from our friends from across the aisle. They want to reduce the SNAP program at the same time that they don't want to increase the minimum wage and give people benefits.

I wonder if she could just explain what the theory is about how these people are going to survive.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I think that it isn't so much a theory of survival as it is the possibility of not surviving at all. I think that we are finding ourselves in a situation right now where those who have less have the rawest deal they have had in a very long time. And I am proud to associate myself with my Democratic colleagues in this caucus who want a better deal for those people.

We want wages that you can live off of, that you don't have to rely upon assistance from anyone in order to be able to put food on your table, put a roof over your head or heat in your home. We want to make sure that everybody has an opportunity to learn and to have a good job. So we want to see investment in jobs, in training, in apprenticeships, in opportunities to do better.

We could do better with an infrastructure program that not only makes sense because we have a crumbling infrastructure on so many levels, but it also generates jobs. Generates jobs, which generates good incomes. Good incomes generate a desire to purchase. Desire to purchase helps to build our small businesses. We are looking in the wrong places, and we need to look at where we can grow our economy.

Our economy doesn't grow when we just simply continue to enrich the rich to be richer and richer and richest and to put that money overseas somewhere or anyplace that they want to put it but not to invest it in this country, in this economy. We need a better chance for everyone. We need a better deal for all of our citizens.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mrs. Coleman for her strong voice and for participating in tonight's Special Order hour.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield to our distinguished colleague from Connecticut, ROSA DELAURO, who has been one of Congress' leading cham-

pions for the security of America's working people and for building an American middle class that includes everybody.

I am thrilled that Ms. DELAURO could join us, and I yield to her now.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Congressman RASKIN and my other colleagues here this evening as we talk about what is going on in the lives of families in our country today.

I rise to defend the Food Stamp program and to denounce the severe and immoral—I view them as immoral—cuts by the majority's farm bill.

□ 1715

You know, everyone knows that millions of people are struggling in this country. The biggest economic problem we have is that people are in jobs that just don't pay them enough money; they can't pay the high cost of healthcare; they can't afford to put food on the table; they don't take vacations; they don't take retirement; they are barely making it.

And with regard to hunger, it is truly remarkable. Over 15 million children, nearly one in four in our country, live in the heavy shadow of what is going on in working families today. In my district, the Third District of Connecticut—Connecticut is the State that is statistically the richest in the Nation, and that is because of Fairfield County and a whole variety of other issues. But one in seven people in my district don't know where their next meal is coming from. People want to talk about that, they put a nice term around it, "food insecure." That is not food insecurity. It is hunger—hunger in the United States of America.

So, you know, the social safety net programs are vital tools for reducing poverty and hunger, and the food stamp program is one of the most powerful programs we have for ending hunger in the United States. Last year, our Nation's largest nutrition safety net, food stamps, prevented 42.2 million people from going hungry. That includes 20 million children, 4.8 million low-income seniors, and 1.5 million low-income military veterans.

Men and women who go to fight, sacrifice their families, and, in a number of instances, their lives, their families can't make it, and they are on food stamps. And what the farm bill would do was jettison those military families. The country needs to know about this. The food stamp program works. It is for those who need it the most. It has been successful in alleviating hunger and supporting our economy.

In 2014, the program lifted 4.7 million people out of poverty, including 2.1 million children, and it has lifted more than 1.3 million children out of deep poverty. And the benefits go well beyond childhood years, as my colleague knows. We know that there is an 18 percentage point increase in the likelihood of completing high school with disadvantaged households who have had access to the SNAP program, evi-

dence of significant improvements in health and economic self-sufficiency among women.

It is efficient. More than half of the benefits go to households in the deepest poverty. Over 70 percent of all the benefits go to households with children. But, you know, it would appear that our Republican colleagues appear to be more interested in reducing SNAP than in reducing hunger.

We talked—a few minutes ago, you were talking about the tax bill—\$2 trillion tax cut—83 percent of those tax cuts to the richest, wealthiest Americans and corporations. My gosh, I will bet those folks are eating well every day. I bet they have three squares or more, when we have families who are barely able to put food on the table.

Let me just give you a couple of notes about who is benefiting from the farm bill and the several loopholes.

The farm bill eliminates means testing. Now, we all know that the food stamp program, they are means tested, asset tested. They can't be over a certain amount of money in income. They can't have more than a certain amount of dollars in assets. This farm bill allows millionaires and billionaires to get subsidies. It eliminates the means test for some of these folks.

You have, under current law, family members, like siblings and adult children, are eligible for subsidies, but—and that is regardless of whether or not they live or work on the farm. What the House bill does, they make cousins, nieces, and nephews eligible for the subsidies as well. It doesn't limit subsidies to one person per farm.

Quite frankly, as the President proposed, it doesn't require work. It doesn't create work requirements for farm subsidy recipients. And, you know, a number of these folks, they don't till the soil, they don't work the land, they live in Manhattan, and they still get a subsidy. They don't have to work the land for that.

And what we are talking about, food stamp recipients do work, for the most part. And what the farm bill has done is it has said, as well, that funding in the bill only works out to be \$30 per person per month for job training. What kind of job training is that? So that the bill, which requires working, underfunds job training in order for people to be able to go to work.

One other statistic. The bill increases price guarantees by up to 15 percent. It fails to reduce crop insurance premium subsidies from 62 percent to 48 percent, as, quite frankly, the President proposed. It extends insurance company subsidies. It provides \$1.5 billion in annual subsidies to crop insurance agencies, to insurance companies, most of whom are foreign based.

The country needs to know this. And at the same time, they want to deny food to the children in this country. It is unspeakable, the direction that they are going in. It does not reflect the values of this great Nation.

So, you know, if we are serious about reforming in the farm bill, they would

have included limits on agricultural subsidies. And, by the way, the crop insurance program, there are no eligibility caps, no payment limits. You know, it is all bets are off.

I want to end with thanking my colleague for doing this. I am going to continue, as I know he is. I am going to continue, and I know he is going to continue to stand up against what are unconscionable attacks on America's poor working families.

You know, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle: Stand up. Stand with us. Let's ensure that Congress does not endanger families and children by decimating our hunger programs. We need to strengthen the SNAP program. We need not be sabotaging it.

I thank the gentleman for organizing this Special Order tonight. We need to be speaking here morning, noon, and night about what this administration, what this Republican majority Congress is doing to low-income families. The food stamp program is seniors, the disabled, and children.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ms. DELAURO, and I would ask if she would be willing to stick around just for a little colloquy.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I will.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, Ms. DELAURO made some really striking points, and I wanted to explore them a little bit more.

The tax bill, as we know, created a windfall bonanza of hundreds of billions of dollars for the wealthiest corporations and the wealthiest people in the country. Eighty-six percent of the benefit from the tax cut went to 1 percent of the people.

The interesting thing to me was that because it went overwhelmingly to investors, and one-third of the investment in our companies is held by foreigners, a third of the benefit of this tax cut just left the country. It went to foreign investors in Saudi Arabia or China or Mexico or wherever it might be.

Now, does it make sense for us to confer this extraordinary bonanza on the wealthiest people in the country and wealthy people abroad, and then turn around and start cutting the major antihunger assistance program we have got, the SNAP program? I mean, what is the morality of that? What is the logic of that?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, there is no morality. That is it. It is immoral, and we have an obligation and a responsibility. And it is not just a social responsibility. This is a moral responsibility to make sure that in the land of abundance and an abundance of food, that we are going to look at jettisoning millions of low-income families and creating for them a situation where they cannot access food for themselves or their families, I ask the question: Who are we? It is immoral the direction that they are going in.

And with the farm bill—if you wanted to just look at the farm bill—you talked about the tax bill, and we know what direction that went in and who are the beneficiaries there. But again, this farm safety net is filled with loopholes. The top 3 percent of farms, or about 60,000 farms in the United States receive roughly 40 percent of all farm subsidies. Many farms receive more than \$1 million in subsidies annually. They don't pass any income test. They pass no asset test. The largesse is overwhelming.

And the share of subsidies, the largest farms claimed, has increased from 11 percent in 1991 to 34 percent in 2015. You know, they are consistent. Watch what they do in the tax bill. Watch what they do in the farm bill and who benefits. Who has benefited from the tax—the tax scam, which is rigged for the rich? And now we have a farm bill, which is rigged for the rich.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I would say to Ms. DELAURO that that came out of the Agriculture Committee, as I understand it, on a party line vote.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, he got that right.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, this used to be bipartisan. It used to be a bipartisan commitment, and now, suddenly, it fell apart with no participation from Democrats. It comes flying out with the idea of targeting the SNAP program. What is going on here?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, Congressman RASKIN makes such a good point. Let me just tell you. I looked very, very hard at this issue over the number of years that I have served here. I served on the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee. I chaired that committee for awhile, so I have spent more than 25 years focused in. And the issue of hunger in the United States has become a passion for me, and I tell you why.

I published a book not that long ago called, "The Least Among Us: Waging the Battle for the Vulnerable." And when I did the research for this book, this is what I found: that the social safety net program and the food stamp program was crafted by Democrats and Republicans. George McGovern, Bob Dole, they took a commission across the country.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, they are both from farm States.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, that is right. And they said there is a serious problem of hunger in the United States. They came back to Washington, and Democratic Members and Republican Members came together to say that this challenge—we have to address this crisis of hunger in the United States, and therein lies the genesis of nutrition programs crafted by men and women who came here who understood what their job was and they understood what the power of this institution is.

Unfortunately, we do not have those giants in this body on both sides of the aisle—the people who have left—and I am so proud of our Democrats who have stood together on this farm bill and said: No. This is wrong. We are not going to be complicit in leaving millions of people hungry in the United States.

Robert Kennedy took a commission across this country and went and found children and babies who were hungry and came back, and, again, on a bipartisan basis, helped to craft the programs that we have today. These were men and women who understand and understood why they were elected to the United States House of Representatives and the United States Senate.

□ 1730

Unfortunately, so many of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have either forgotten their purpose here or never understood their purpose here.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to follow up on something Ms. DELAURO said, which I think is very important.

She pointed out that it was Senator Robert Dole, a Republican from Kansas; and Senator George McGovern, a Democrat from South Dakota, who came together and said: We have this extraordinary agricultural bounty and surplus in America.

We could be feeding the entire world. Certainly we could be feeding the people of America. Most people are able to afford it, but not everybody, and not at every point in their life. We should make sure that, in the wealthiest society that has ever existed, everybody has the opportunity to eat three meals a day for \$1.40.

Ms. DELAURO said that we don't have the giants that we had then. I don't know if that is true. I consider the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) a giant.

But I think what has changed is the public philosophy that is governing in Washington. I think there is a public philosophy that survives in town, which says that government is a moneymaking opportunity for the President and a handful of people: the President's friends and the people who surround the President. People are actually making money coming into government.

Whereas, the traditional ideal—the one I think Ms. DELAURO invoked with Senators Dole and McGovern and the new deal and Franklin Roosevelt—was government is an instrument of the common good to benefit everybody to advance the general will.

What has happened to our concept of government in America?

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I tracked in my research the Food Stamp program and child tax credits, bipartisan; equal pay for equal work, bipartisan; Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid, when the votes came, they were done in a bipartisan way, the votes were bipartisan.

Now we seem to have lost that sense that the challenges are there for us to take on, on both sides of the aisle, to put aside differences for that common good. That is what we need to get back to. That what we are not about is humiliating people and demeaning people so that we think that that will make them go out and try to work to do a better thing, to tell them that there is no hope for them when they look to Washington and to government.

Mr. Speaker, that is a slap in the face to the years and the work that so many on both sides of the aisle did in Congress, and that is what we have to get back to. That is what should be entrusted to us, as we look at each of these areas that people face in our country.

People want jobs. We define ourselves by our jobs. We get our self-confidence from our jobs. People want to work. Your family looks up to you when you have a job. And, when you don't, you are embarrassed to tell your kids: I don't have a job.

These great people who served said: We need to come together to work on these issues.

For me, that is what I want us to get back to. That is what I try to work at, as you do, every single day. To have people understand that, in times of difficulty, we are accountable to one another, and we have a responsibility. We are not a society that said it is every man or woman for himself or herself, particularly in challenging times.

That is what our social safety net is all about. It reflects the great values of this country. I believe we can get back there. I believe that we can. We were there before, and we are going to get back there again.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. RASKIN for what he is doing here tonight.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) for her leadership, for her vision, and for her writing. It is incisive and useful for us all.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS).

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman RASKIN for putting this Special Order hour together. I thank him for his commitment and for his concern.

I join all of my colleagues in opposing what is being proposed in terms of this farm bill.

Three weeks ago, my Republican colleagues on the House Agriculture Committee sat silently while Chairman CONAWAY introduced a partisan farm bill. Then they allowed him to preach about the many reasons why he feels that SNAP should be transformed from a feeding program to a work program, uninterrupted.

Then they voted for this flawed bill that takes food off of the tables of veterans, seniors, and children. Now they want to pass it through the House and push it forward with their agenda to starve our Nation's most vulnerable.

My Republican colleagues ought to be ashamed of this because Proverbs 22:9 says: "The generous will themselves be blessed, for they share their food with the poor."

I have said it once, and I will say it again: I don't believe that the Lord is pleased with what we are considering in this bill.

In my home county of Mecklenburg, North Carolina, more than 162,000 people are considered food insecure. Worse, 50,000 of those are children.

In my community, more than 55,000 families depend on SNAP to help put food on their tables. No one should wonder where their next meal will come from. But, sadly, this is a reality for many, many people.

Last year, North Carolina Republicans introduced a bill on the State level that would have a similar impact to this partisan farm bill. Analysis of that bill shows that roughly 130,000 North Carolinians will lose their SNAP benefits if this bill passes, including 50,000 children.

Nationwide, the impact of this bill would even be worse: kicking 2 million people out of the program and causing an estimated 265,000 children to lose free or reduced lunch at school. So, no work, no eat?

If we are lawmakers and we aren't protecting our Nation's children, then I don't think we deserve to be here.

Republicans continue to push the idea that we need entitlement reform just to appease the Speaker. Well, I understand the Speaker has announced his retirement, and I would like for us to just retire the idea that this so-called reform is just numbers on a page because it is not. Real people depend on SNAP programs and, without it, they will go hungry. No one can expect to work if they are hungry. No child can expect to learn if the child is hungry.

More than \$8 in \$10 in nutrition assistance go to households that include a child, a senior, or a person with a disability. Additionally, many working Americans depend on SNAP to make ends meet in expensive cities where earning the minimum wage doesn't pay all of the bills. People work two and three jobs a day at minimum wage, leave work, and go to a food bank to eat.

Additionally, many American families depend on SNAP. Working hard is not enough if you don't make enough.

Instead of punishing working Americans, let's address the cause of the issue, and let's raise the minimum wage to a living wage.

Mr. Speaker, I join my Democratic colleagues in urging Chairman CONAWAY to scrap this flawed bill and return it to the drawing board. We can, and we should, craft a bipartisan farm bill that benefits all communities.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ms. ADAMS so much for her insightful remarks. Before Ms. ADAMS leaves, I would like to ask her a question.

Working in Washington and coming here several days a week, as Members

of Congress do, we are often treated to the spectacle of lifestyles of the rich and famous and political corruption. We see Scott Pruitt, the EPA chief, spending hundreds of thousands of dollars on first-class air travel with a security detail of a dozen people, something nobody has ever seen before for an EPA chief. He built, I think it was, a \$40,000 soundproof booth in his office in order to make secret phone calls.

Last night, we saw on TV, or pick up the paper this morning to read about, millions of dollars flowing into an up-till-now secret bank account that Michael Cohen had. Part of it was used as a slush fund to pay off a porn star, who had a relationship, allegedly, with President Trump. But then hundreds of thousands of dollars flowing in from one of the oligarchs in Russia with U.S. corporations involved.

There is a lot of money in this town. The power elite seems to have a lot of money, and gave hundreds of billions of dollars back to the wealthiest corporations and people in the country in the most recent tax legislation. Yet they get through with that, and then they turn and they want to pound the SNAP program, which is used to give a modicum of dignity and security to the poorest people in the country so that they can feed their families.

What is going on here?

How is it possible that we can see one kind of America operating in the Halls of power with the wealthiest people in the country, and another for the working people of the country who are trying to get by?

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. RASKIN is so absolutely right. I think that is why people have generally lost faith in their government.

I mentioned a Scripture from the Bible, but there are 3,000 references—more than 3,000—that speak to how we should treat the poor. We are, I think, being derelict in terms of our duties. Yes, there seems to be a lot of corruption going on. We are not placing our priorities on the people. We are putting profits over people. That is so unfortunate because we were elected to serve everyone, including the poor.

The poor will be with us always. We have a responsibility to reach out and to give a helping hand, a help up. We are not talking about people who some folks think are lazy and they are not working. They are working, and they are the caregivers of the children.

Children live in poverty because their parents do. We must ensure that we can help those adults who help our children. We want our children to go to school and we want them to do well. Children will not do well if their stomach growls because they are hungry.

Mr. Speaker, I think Mr. RASKIN is right. We have two worlds here: the haves and the have-nots. It is time to give something to those who have not.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, three-quarters of SNAP benefits go to families: households with children in them. That should be what people think of when they think of the SNAP program.

We heard a lot today in the Oversight and Government Reform Committee hearing that was referenced earlier, basically about lazy people sitting around. I tried to alter the image a little bit. I said: You can have lazy people who get a paycheck in public housing and they spend all day watching TV, tweeting, and filing for bankruptcy. You have lazy people in the middle class. You have rich lazy people and you have poor lazy people.

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, there are probably some lazy folks in here, too.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, we are not going to be able to eliminate laziness, but maybe we can take care of hunger in America so that kids don't go to sleep without food.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Ms. ADAMS for her leadership and her strong voice on these issues. It is very impressive to see how hard she has been fighting.

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. RASKIN for those comments.

One of the reasons that I wanted to serve on the Agriculture Committee was because of the issues that are impacted not only in my district but throughout this Nation. Having so many people who are food insecure gave us an opportunity, I think, to do good in this farm bill. It is my understanding that we have never had a bill that was not bipartisan, and I think we need to think about that. The citizens of this country are looking to us to do what is right because it is the right thing to do.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, in my district, I have urban, suburban, and rural. I have urban places like Rockville, Maryland; I have suburban places like Bethesda and Silver Spring; I have rural places in Frederick County like Middletown and Carroll County. I have sort of the full gamut of America in my district, and there is poverty in all of them. There are people struggling in all of them, just like there are people who have become very prosperous in all of them.

But our job, I think, as Representatives in Congress, is to keep the country unified and see what that beautiful, magical phrase in the beginning of the Constitution "We the people" means. For us to stand together in all of our magnificent diversity of ways of life and different kinds of communities that we have across the country, what is it that binds us together?

I think the goodness of the American people is that we are invested in the success of everybody, not just this or that group, not just our business buddies, not just our partners, not just people in our political party, but we are invested in the success of everyone, and that is our job.

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. RASKIN is exactly right. Hunger is not a partisan issue.

□ 1745

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ms. ADAMS for participating.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), my distinguished colleague.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted, if I might say, to be with Professor Raskin today, and I would like to use that terminology, or Congressman RASKIN, but it means that he gets into both the theory, the practice, and the passion of an idea. That is what teachers do. They try to instruct their students to look at the holistic concept of a theory.

Mr. Speaker, the loss of food stamps is not a theory, but it has passion in the loss of such. It has a broad landscape of impact. It certainly has a theory of which I don't adhere to, and that is that Americans who have asked for a hand up are the ones deserving of the brunt of an enormous tax cut that has created an enormous deficit that was not asked for by the top 1 percent, who are getting the major aspect, or major benefit, of this tax cut.

As a member of the Budget Committee, we took pains, the Democrats, to parse through the ultimate negative impact of the \$1.4 trillion-plus tax cut.

During the Obama administration, we discussed a corporate rate reduction. Many of us would have considered that on the idea of job creation, coming from the early thirties, if you will, down to about the mid-twenties. We did more than—when I say "we," this bill did 21, unasked for by any corporate entity, which added, again, insult to injury as it relates to those families, disabled, and seniors, children who are dependent upon these programs.

We have many Americans who are dependent upon means-tested programs, 70 percent. The supplemental nutrition program, unlike the 21 percent corporate rate reduction for taxes, is \$1.40 per person.

One of our colleagues in the other body, Senator BOOKER, as we all know who are familiar with him, and I think maybe we should join in that effort, spend that much per meal, all of the Members of the House of Representatives, because what we are dealing with today is the farm bill.

The farm bill takes to shutting down the SNAP program and to cutting it drastically, and to ignore and underfund important programs because we find ourselves in a predicament of the deficit, the tax cut, and what choices do we make.

The decision to limit SNAP is not limited to red States or blue States. Eighty-five of the top 100 counties of individuals receiving SNAP benefits are rural communities, and many of them are, in fact, Republican represented.

The disastrous changes to SNAP would jeopardize the food security of 42 million people, including 30 million children, 4.8 million low-income seniors, and 1.5 million low-income military veterans.

So in conclusion, I came to the floor today to ask the question: Why in the farm bill?

There is something about having a little seniority in this House. I can remember that of all the bills in this Nation that came out of this House and Senate—and I might say, joyfully, because I have been supported by the Farm Bureau. I come from a State of ranchers and farmers. We used to take pride in having that nexus between farmers and the SNAP program and the continuity of such.

So here we are. We have breached it. We have blown it up for no reason other than to pocket the money for the tax cut.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for bringing us together. I ask my colleagues to vote against the farm bill, because that would be standing up for maybe a better pathway of that bipartisan farm bill that we have had over the decades to make a difference in the lives of all Americans.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ms. JACKSON LEE for her really profound and important remarks tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I would close out our session here by just making an observation about the importance of this SNAP question.

It is important legislatively because our friends across the aisle have broken from a bipartisan tradition going back a very long time now in the passage of the farm bill just to make it a partisan power grab and a push over everybody else in the body, but it also goes to the question: What kind of government are we going to have? Will this be government for the few or will it be a government for everyone?

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

HONORING THE LIFE OF THE HONORABLE ZELL MILLER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CURTIS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the topic of this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the life of a former mayor, of a former Georgia State senator, of a former Governor of Georgia, and of a former United States Senator representing the State of Georgia, Mr. Zell Miller.

Zell Miller passed away on March 23 at the age of 86. He was born on February 24, 1932, in Young Harris, Georgia, in Towns County. He was born to Birdie Bryan and Stephen Grady Miller.

When Zell was 17 days old, his father died. His widowed mother raised her