central Minnesota, which is also in my district.

Yellow Ribbon is a truly remarkable program that eases the transition of our soldiers to civilian life by providing job training, counseling, and all kinds of support for servicemembers, veterans, and military families.

So I want to say a special thanks to Morrison and Crow Wing Counties in Minnesota—and to the communities of Little Falls, Motley, Royalton, Swanville, Sobieski, Harding, Buckman, Upsala, Randall, Pierz, Bowlus, Elmdale, and Lastrup, all in my district—for supporting our returning servicemen and -women as Yellow Ribbon communities.

We thank and honor all our military for their service to our great Nation.

STUDENT LOAN INTEREST RATES

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, unless Congress acts, in less than 2 weeks, the interest rates on federally subsidized Stafford loans will double from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent for more than 7 million students.

In my home State of Rhode Island, which is home to more than 40,000 borrowers of federally subsidized Stafford loans, this means that higher education will become less attainable for more and more young people who depend on financial aid. As we work to get our economy back on track, we should be making it easier, not more difficult, for young people to access higher education.

Once again, the House Republican leadership is failing to act in the best interest of the American people. Rather than working towards a commonsense solution on student loan interest rates, we are spending this week voting on a $20 billion cut to children's nutrition programs and a bill that would severely restrict reproductive health care for women.

This has gone on long enough. In the interests of our constituents, Republicans and Democrats should set aside our differences and get back to solving the problems that our country faces. The Republican leaders in the House should bring bills to the floor for a vote that focus on protecting students from interest rate increases and getting Americans back to work.

SUGAR REFORM IS NEEDED

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

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Mr. Speaker, the current United States sugar program is a clear example of government intrusion into a market. Nowhere is there a larger gap between the U.S. Government's free-trade rhetoric and its protectionist practices than in our sugar policy.

The most prominent argument I hear from the other side is this program is of no cost to the taxpayers. That simply isn't true. It was reported yesterday the USDA intends to purchase sugar off the domestic market, costing taxpayers nearly $38 million. The government then plans to sell this sugar at a loss to ethanol companies. And who is ultimately footing the bill for this not-so-sweet deal? The taxpayers.

But the most egregious point is that other countries actively try to lure U.S. companies to relocate. An official Canadian Government brochure states:

> Canadian sugar users enjoy a significant advantage—the average price of refined sugar is usually 30 to 40 percent lower in Canada than the U.S.

When a government program becomes a recruitment technique to lure away our manufacturers and move U.S. jobs abroad, I believe reform is not only necessary but essential.

ONGOING VIOLENCE IN SYRIA

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

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, since March of 2011 in Syria, 90,000 people have been killed, millions have been displaced internally, hundreds of thousands have fled, and between 100 and 150 people have been murdered by Bashar al-Assad's chemical weapons.

We can debate what we should do and how far we should go, but there is one thing that we can all agree on, and that is legislation that my colleague from Oklahoma, Congressman TOM COLE, and I have introduced on a bipartisan basis that would bring Bashar al-Assad to the International Criminal Court where he will be prosecuted for war crimes and crimes against humanity. This is an example of bipartisan cooperation and accord on a challenging foreign policy crisis.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor the Cole-Israel resolution and pass it immediately.

□ 1230

PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1947, FEDERAL AGRICULTURE REFORM AND RISK MANAGEMENT ACT OF 2013

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 271 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 271

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1947) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes. No further general debate shall be in order.

SEC. 2. (a) In lieu of the amendments recommended by the Committees on Agriculture and the Judiciary now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-14, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived.

(b) No amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution and amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution.

(c) Each amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, may be withdrawn by its proponent at any time before action thereon, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

(d) All points of order against amendments printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules or against amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution are waived.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time for the chair of the Committee on Agriculture or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture or their designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. The original proponent of an amendment included in such amendments en bloc may insert a statement in the Congressional Record immediately before the disposition of the amendments en bloc.

SEC. 4. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 426 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, I make a point of order against consideration of the rule, House Resolution 271.

Section 426 of the Budget Act specifically states that the Rules Committee may not waive the point of order prescribed by section 425 of that same Act. House Resolution 271 states:

All points of order against amendments printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules or against amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution are waived.

Therefore, I make a point of order pursuant to section 426 that this rule may not be considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts makes a point of order that the resolution violates section 426(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The gentleman has met the threshold burden under the rule, and the gentleman from Massachusetts and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes of debate on the question of consideration. Following debate, the Chair will put the question of consideration as the statutory means of disposing of the point of order.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LOEBSACK).

Mr. LOEBSACK. I do thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding.

I would first like to voice my support for the gentleman's particular amendment, actually, that he has before us—and will later on today—that restores the unfair SNAP cuts. I thank the gentleman for his amendment, for his courage and for his very, very good idea of restoring those cuts when it comes to the underlying bill.

Later today, I will offer an amendment to ensure farmers and rural small businesses have continued access to a critical tool to pursue investments in energy technologies and to meet their energy needs in an affordable and sustainable way.

Currently, the Rural Energy for America Program supports farmers and rural small businesses in pursuing sustainable and value-added energy project investments, including wind power, biofuels, solar, or anaerobic digestion. These projects put people to work, they create entrepreneurial opportunities, and they have created new value-added opportunities for our farmers, for rural small businesses, and for our communities.

I have heard from Iowans about the importance of this energy and economic development tool, and my amendment ensures farmers and rural businesses have continued access to it.

I am strongly opposed to the changes made in the underlying bill, which weaken essential energy initiatives that create jobs and boost our economy. Because of these initiatives, thousands of jobs have been created in rural communities in recent years. In Iowa alone, over 1,600 rural energy projects were initiated between 2003 and 2012, mainly stemming from farm bill energy programs.

My amendment stresses the importance of farm bill energy programs to job creation and our rural economies, and allows one of our best resources—our farmers—to play a critical role in our domestic energy production, and I urge support for it. As I said at the outset, I also urge support for the amendment of my colleague from Massachusetts to restore the SNAP cuts.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the point of order and in favor of the consideration of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SESSIONS. The question really before us today, Mr. Speaker, is plain and simple, and that is: Should the House now consider H. Res. 271?

I have great respect not only for the gentleman from Iowa but for the gentleman from Massachusetts. Yesterday, we sat through a very, very long committee hearing in which we considered over 200 amendments that were presented to the Rules Committee.

I believe that what we have done with the rule that is in reference and is being questioned here on the floor is not only a very fair and bipartisan approach, but we took this actually from the Ag Committee, from the gentleman from Minnesota—the ranking member—and the chairman of the committee, from Iowa, both of whom have not only extensive farm backgrounds but also extensive service here in the House, both as chairmen of the Agriculture Committee, to the people of the United States.

The bill was brought to the Rules Committee on a bipartisan basis. We talked about the amendments that the committee felt were worthy. We worked extensively with the committee and with other committees of jurisdiction. We had Member after Member come to the Rules Committee in a fair and open process. We deliberated. The gentleman from Massachusetts knows that he, in some sense, got some satisfaction with how the process worked.

So, today, what we are here for is, yes, to talk about the amendments—some that were made in order and some which changed policy—but the essence of this is: Are we going to put a point of order against the bill? I think that the resolution waives all points of order against amendments printed in the Rules Committee Report, yes, and the Committee on Rules is not aware of any violation of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act.

I think this is simply an opportunity for my friends to come to the floor in order to allow for more discussion and time—and I respect that. I respect that the gentleman from Massachusetts has very strong feelings as a member of the Agriculture Committee and as a senior member of the Rules Committee, and I respect also those Members of the Democratic Caucus who have strong feelings about some changes that are taking place.

I admire my colleagues. I disagree. I do not believe in any way that there should be any point of order against the bill. I think it's open. I think it's fair. I think it's inclusive. I think it includes a wide-ranging group of ideas and thoughts that are directly germane to the appropriateness of the Agriculture Committee and other committees that have jurisdiction. I think the Rules Committee did an awesome job. I think we did this in a fair and open process. I think our product is good.

□ 1240

How would I characterize it? I think this is a fair rule that made 103 amendments from both sides of the aisle with 53 Democratic amendments and 50 Republican amendments in order. There were a number of bipartisan amendments. It's a fair rule that comes from a good process.

In order to allow the House to continue its scheduled business for the day, I encourage us to keep moving.

I thank the gentleman and respect the gentleman, and he knows this. We have been dear friends for many years on this committee. I know he wants more time, and I respect that.

I urge all Members to vote ''yes'' on the question of consideration of the resolution if necessary, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I appreciate the comment of the gentleman from Texas.

I now yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

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

Ms. MOORE. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding me these couple of minutes.

I would hope that we would listen to the point of order that's been raised by Mr. MCGOVERN. For one thing, this bill criminalizes poverty. People with felony records won't be allowed to get food stamps. There will be work requirements in order to get food stamps.

These kinds of amendments and additions that we're going to see in this bill really add to the fallacious arguments that we have heard about the gargantuan cuts that are made to the SNAP program: that SNAP is run inefficiently, that these cuts won't hurt anyone, that these cuts don't serve the most vulnerable.

Let me just reiterate the facts:

SNAP is effectively targeted at our most vulnerable populations, primarily serving children, seniors, and the disabled in the poorest communities, people who cannot work, people who don't have felony records;

In my own State of Wisconsin, 47.2 percent of SNAP households include children, 15.4 percent include the very elderly, 21.7 percent include a disabled person. 84.3 percent of those receiving SNAP in my State are children, elderly, and disabled;

Nationwide, 76 percent of SNAP households are composed of those who are children, seniors, or disabled persons;

There is a rate of 68.7 percent of SNAP households that have a gross income at or below 100 percent of the poverty level.

Let me just say going forward that as soon as this bill is enacted, as soon as we take away the categorical eligibility, 200,000 children will lose free lunch.

I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership.

I rise in opposition to H.R. 1947. Why?

850,000 needy households would see their SNAP benefits cut by an average $90 per month. That's real food that these families will no longer afford to be able to put on the table. Last time I checked, the prices at the grocery store were not going down and wages were not going up!

2 million individuals would lose their eligibility entirely.

And just in time for the new school year in the fall, 200,000 low-income kids who are eligible and are currently enrolled in the school meals programs will be disenrolled because of the changes in this bill.

These are kids who we designed and create the school meals program to serve. And we are tossing them out for what reason . . . Mr. Speaker this just doesn't make sense.

The bill would also cut funding for nutrition education that helps SNAP households maximize the value of the meager SNAP benefit by teaching them how to shop and cook nutritious food on a budget.

The average SNAP benefit in Wisconsin is just $1.29 per person per meal, hardly enough to afford a nutritious diet.

This all comes on top of the reduction in SNAP benefits that all SNAP households will experience later this year when the ARRA increase expires.

On November 1, the average family of 3 on SNAP will lose $20–25 in monthly benefits.

That may not sound like much to you, but that's the equivalent of a gallon of low-fat milk $3.79, a box of corn flakes $2.99, and a half dozen bananas $1.80; a loaf of wheat bread $1.79 and some deli ham $2.49; and a box of spaghetti $1.00, sauce $2.89, and some ground beef $6.99 total $23.74.' In other words, that's several days' worth of food for a struggling family.

There is a myth going on that these changes will not really hurt people or that those being dislodged aren't low-income, do not have real and significant food needs that are not being met, and will be easily able to make up any gaps in access to food created by these changes as if they have secret Swiss bank accounts available.

Listen to the stories from my district . . .

How ridiculous. The people on SNAP are the poorest, most vulnerable, (kids, seniors, disabled).

My colleagues seem to be astonished about why in a middle of the Great recession SNAP rolls would have grown. Why, when food insecurity in our country is at record highs, we should see a surge in Americans seeking the safety net protections of this program.

Food insecurity is high. Nationally 50 million Americans live in households that struggle to put food on the table. In Wisconsin, there are 744,410 food insecure individuals, including 270,150 children.

An Institute of Medicine report released earlier this year found that the SNAP allotment is inadequate to improve food security and access to a nutritious diet and needs to be updated

Many Americans remain out of work. Those who are lucky enough to be back at work may be working for lower wages than before the recession.

SNAP is effectively targeted at our most vulnerable, primarily serving children, seniors, and the disabled in the poorest households. In Wisconsin, 47.2 percent of SNAP households include children, 15.4 percent include elderly, and 21.7 percent include a disabled person. Nationally, 76 percent of SNAP households included a child, senior, or disabled person.

I hear a lot about making sure SNAP goes to those who "truly need it." Perhaps we need a reminder about just how poor SNAP participants really are. In Wisconsin, 68.7 percent of SNAP households have gross income at or below 100 percent of the poverty line $19,530 for family of 3 in 2013.

I will remind you that federal law sets a maximum for gross income of 130 percent of the federal poverty line. seven out of ten in the Wisconsin fall well below that threshold and I know the story is the same throughout our country.

The families on SNAP are in real need. No wonder that 90 percent of SNAP benefits are used by the 21st day of the month.

This myth that SNAP benefits are not going to those in need is dead wrong and dangerous.

Cuts to SNAP would only increase demand on already over-strapped charitable food providers. An increase in TEFAP commodities as provided in the bill is critical to our nation's food banks and hunger-relief charities but it won't come close to meeting the needs created by the SNAP cuts in the bill.

A need that even these generous and kind hearted groups know they cannot come close to meeting. No wonder they almost unanimously oppose the SNAP cuts in this bill.

Charity groups alone cannot feed everyone who's hungry.

Food benefits provided by charity groups in 2011 totaled approximately $4.1 billion according to Bread for the world.

These groups supplement the work that the federal government is doing to combat hunger. They cannot replace it but the bill would throw millions more of hungry families their way nonetheless.

The Harford Institute for Religion and Research estimates that there are 350,000 religious congregations in the U.S. and each would have to spend approximately $50,000 every year for the next ten years to feed those who would lose benefits or face reduced benefits under the Republican Budget Resolution approved in the House last year.

As the recession took hold in our country, SNAP was not the only safety net that stood in the gap to help combat growing hunger across America. Our nation's food banks also saw a 46 percent increase in clients served during the recession. Those needs have not abated and will only get worse if this Farm bill passes in its current form.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this unbalanced bill which seems to provides a safety net for everyone else but the most vulnerable and hungry in our country.

PERSONAL SNAP STORIES FROM THE DISTRICT

Name	Age	SNAP is important to me because:	Cutting my SNAP would mean:
Earline	63	It allows me to eat on a fixed income	That I won't be able to eat nutritious meals
Michelle	36	So I can feed my family	We won't eat!
Moria	26	My income is not enough to support my children with food	I would not have the proper funds to provide food for my children
Debbie	33	Because it is hard to buy food. I don't get enough cash to buy food.	
Leiela		Don't have enough money to pay rent and food.	
Jesele	18	Don't have enough money to pay for food for me and my son	We don't eat.
Babette	50	We are a one income family! Just my social security. Without FoodShare me and my family would die. I already can't afford my household bills if I had to pay all the bills and food I would be out—lights, gas, toiletries.	If FoodShare is cut, I might as well die. I would not be able to feed my family, and that would make me feel useless and less than human; down right degrading.
Jessica	25	It helps me provide for my children. I have 7 children and even though I work 2 jobs I still need assistance with food and other bills.	It would make it harder on me as a single mother, not only will I have to worry about food, but then shelter for my children and more hours at work and that's more time I'm not able to spend with them.
Solomon	20	Some people are less fortunate and need the benefits	people like me would starve on the streets
Temera	18	It is important to me because I'm homeless and this is the ONLY thing that feeds me and gets me by.	I would be homeless and hungry with NO type of help.
Felicia	38	It's a lot of people out here that does work and they don't make enough to buy food. They need food stamps.	It will be a lot of children without food to eat, I work, but I can't even get any stamps.
Anchea	27	Because at times like this when my hours are being cut I might only make enough for my child to eat and just supply a roof over her head.	A lot because it is very important to the community we all live in.
Rayshanda	21	That is how I provide my groceries and my job money is for bills	That I would have to pay rent and light bills so all my personal money would be gone. I need stamps—how would we eat?
Brooks	43	Because FoodShare allows me to provide nutritional food for my children, instead of junkfood	Taking away nutritional food items, such as fruits and vegetables that would be otherwise easily obtainable.
Katie	27	I am able to feed my children. I am using this program as a stepping stone to where I want to be. I just graduated college and am looking for a full time job to where I can actually provide for my children on my own.	My children and I would not be able to eat healthily. With our SNAP we eat very healthy and without it would mean having to cut back and buy cheap processed fatty foods.
Khinh	20	FoodShare is important to me because it is enough for me to take care of my kid. I am having twins and the income I make is not enough for me to take care of them.	It's not going to be enough for me to take care of my kid. And I just make a little bit of income every month.

Ella is 57 and has been sick for a while. Her doctor put her on a strict diet of Ensure, her limited income and medical bills make it extremely hard for her to afford the drink. She applied for FoodShare and was able to buy what she needed to stay healthy.

Harry—retired lawyer who's practice went under during the recession. He is too young for Social Security benefits and his disability ran out. His $200 worth of FoodShare has helped him greatly.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman is correct. There is an amendment that was presented at the Rules Committee that has been made in order that essentially does what the gentlewoman says, and she'll have a

chance to vote for it or against it. What it says is the amendment ends eligibility of food stamps for those convicted who are rapists, pedophiles, and murderers.

So the gentlewoman and every Member of this body today will have a chance to say on record that it's okay if you're a convicted rapist, pedophile, or murderer, that it's okay for you to be eligible for food stamps in a program that does compete against mothers and children who, in these difficult times, you're seeing the Agriculture Committee try and set priorities about who should receive this government assistance.

This amendment has not been accepted yet, but every Member of this body will be able to help prioritize; and the amendment that the gentlewoman speaks of is about whether we will let rapists, pedophiles, and murderers, who are convicted felons, continue to receive food stamps. The gentlewoman is right. And today she will get her chance to help us prioritize these government programs about who should be receiving food stamps in America.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HORSFORD).

(Mr. HORSFORD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, first let me commend the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) and his leadership for 18 years on fighting for the needs of SNAP assistance for our most vulnerable citizens.

I rise and stand with Mr. MCGOVERN against this procedural rule and in support of the underlying amendment that Mr. MCGOVERN, myself, and other Members have. This amendment will prevent cuts to the SNAP funding program.

The Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013 includes $20.5 billion in cuts to the SNAP program. That will come on top of an expiration of a benefits boost from the Recovery Act of 2009.

SNAP provides food assistance to approximately 46 million Americans in need, and it is estimated that at least 353,000 Nevadans will feel the impact of the upcoming double whammy of SNAP cuts from the FARRM Bill and the expiration of the Recovery Act boost.

The bottom line is that the SNAP program is our Nation's most important antihunger program. It kept 4.7 million people out of poverty in 2011, including 2.1 million children.

I had a community conference call with my constituents and families in my district who count on SNAP. Many of them live in food deserts. The benefits they receive right now aren't enough for a healthy meal.

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

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

Mr. HORSFORD. Yet we are talking about cutting these benefits even further while we continue subsidies to big industries that are well-off. Those priorities are backwards.

For the mother in my district who is expecting another child and who counts on SNAP, for the disabled family that stands in line for hours at the food bank, and for the elderly who rely on SNAP to get the food that they need, for everyone who made their voice heard by calling my office, I refuse to accept that we should cut $20.5 billion in vital food assistance programs, and I will continue to work with Mr. MCGOVERN and my colleagues until we can restore these funds.

Today's rule will allow for a number of amendments to be considered. I urge all of my colleagues to support an amendment offered by Mr. MCGOVERN, myself, and other members. Our amendment will prevent cuts to SNAP funding.

The Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013 includes $20.5 billion in cuts to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (or SNAP). That will come on top of an expiration of a benefits boost from the Recovery Act in 2009.

Without the Recovery Act's boost, SNAP benefits will average about $1.40 per person per meal. If the Farm Bill passes the House as it is currently written, the average benefit may drop even lower.

SNAP provides food assistance to approximately 46 million Americans in need and it is estimated that at least 353,000 Nevadans will feel the impact of the upcoming double whammy of SNAP cuts from the Farm Bill and expiration of the Recovery Act boost.

The bottom line is that SNAP is our nation's most important anti-hunger program. It kept 4.7 million people out of poverty in 2011, including 2.1 million children. And SNAP has cut the number of children living in extreme poverty in half.

I had a community conference call with families in my district who count on SNAP. They live in food deserts. The benefits they receive right now are not enough for a healthy meal. And yet, we are talking about cutting these benefits even further while we continue subsidies to industries that are well-off. Those priorities are backwards.

So for the mother in my district who is expecting another child who counts on this program, for the family that stands in line for hours at the food bank, and for elderly who rely on SNAP to get the food they need, for everyone who made their voice heard by calling my office, I refuse to accept that we should cut $20.5 billion in vital food assistance.

Extra points: According to the USDA's Economic Research Service: Each $1 billion of retail generated by SNAP creates $340 million in farm production, and 3,300 farm jobs; every $1 billion of SNAP benefits also creates 8,900–17,900 full-time jobs; an additional $5 of SNAP benefits generates $9 in total economic activity.

These programs are not handouts. They are a hand up. And they help stimulate the economy.

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

I appreciate the gentleman for coming down to the floor, and I want to respond to the gentleman that what this bill is about is trying to make decisions about what we're going to do in difficult times.

There are 25 million people unemployed and underemployed as a result of the policies that President Obama has placed on this country. Millions of people cannot find work today. There are millions of people across this country who are denied opportunities because the job market out there is not growing. We're seeing rules and regulations. What is known as ObamaCare is causing employers to back away from hiring people. There is the President's inability to make a decision about a simple, most publicized and most looked-at pipeline that would employ thousands of people in this country and us use energy from our friends.

The President's inability to lead is what is causing this country to have massive unemployment and a GDP rate of about 1.5 percent. It is a nightmare for people.

So I do understand that we have those in our midst who are in trouble. I don't think this bill is ever aimed at, and we shouldn't try and say that it would be aimed at, the disabled or mothers with children. That's not what we're trying to accomplish here.

What we're trying to accomplish is to end the eligibility of food stamps for rapists, pedophiles, and murderers, those that compete against needy families. That's why you see members of the Democratic Party coming down here today saying we're going to take it away from other people. No. Rapists, pedophiles, and murderers.

□ 1250

Furthermore, under the current law, people who receive as little as $1 in energy benefits, $1 in State benefits, automatically qualify for SNAP payments.

This legislation that we're talking about today says if you're going to give away a Federal benefit, the State has to have some skin in the game. You can't just give away something that comes from somewhere else. This legislation closes the costly loopholes that have been out there. And without reform, you're going to continue to see dead people, illegal immigrants, lottery winners, and others who are still eligible for SNAP. That is what we are doing as we reform this bill today. We are doing this because we believe it is the right thing to do to save the system.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to yield 1½ minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

(Mr. LANGEVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I support the point of order that the gentleman has raised against the rule, and I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for raising that point of order.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the rule and to the proposed cuts to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program in the underlying farm bill.

In the wealthiest nation in human history, it is simply unconscionable that every American cannot afford life's basic necessities. SNAP helps millions of Americans living in poverty put food on the table. Eighty percent of the households receiving SNAP earn below the Federal poverty level, making it a vital form of assistance for million of working families.

Yesterday, I proudly joined a group of my Democratic colleagues in taking the SNAP challenge, a commitment to living on no more than $4.50 in daily food costs. Mr. Speaker, every Member of Congress should experience what it's like to subsist on such a paltry sum and should understand how the decisions we make affect the lives of hardworking Americans.

When we take food off the plates of hungry children, we have a moral obligation to fully comprehend the consequences of those actions. Under this bill, 2 million people will lose their eligibility, and many more will see reduced nutritional assistance.

I urge a ''no'' vote on this rule, and I encourage Members to vote against these unnecessary and harmful cuts. We can do better. We can put that funding back into this farm bill and make it a bill that we can all support.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise to support the point of order and in strong opposition to the bill that would cut more than $20 billion from critical nutrition programs, especially those that serve our Nation's most vulnerable children. In my home State of Rhode Island, it is estimated that nearly 67,000 children rely on support from the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP.

The bill before us today would devastate funding that these and millions of children and families all across our country depend on each and every day. Because of the way this funding is structured, it would be especially devastating for States like mine, where families are struggling in a difficult economy, and where reductions in LIHEAP would be a grave hardship in long, cold New England winters.

In the next couple of days, we will consider a wide range of amendments. Some, like one offered by my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), of which I am a cosponsor, would restore this critical funding for nutrition programs. Others would impose additional burdens on families already struggling to get back.

The actions we take in this Chamber and the bills we enact into law should reflect our values as a country. We should not take actions that will make hunger worse in America, and this bill will do that.

I urge my colleagues to oppose these drastic cuts to nutrition programs and support the McGovern amendment so that we can continue to help improve the lives of millions of families and children across our Nation. America has always stood for the idea that we look after each other. We take care of the least fortunate among us. And most importantly, we protect our most treasured asset, the children of America.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman if he has any further speakers or if he believes that we have now gotten to the end of this opportunity?

Mr. MCGOVERN. How much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. SESSIONS. And I believe I have the right to close. Is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is correct.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Let me thank my colleagues who have come to the floor to speak in support of an amendment that I and dozens and dozens of other Members have authored to repeal the SNAP cuts, to repeal the $20.5 billion worth of cuts in SNAP that will result in 2 million people losing the benefit, and hundreds of thousands of children losing a free breakfast or lunch at school. That cut is too much. It is too harsh. It is a deal breaker for many of us when it comes to the farm bill.

What we should be about in this House of Representatives is to improve the quality of life for people, lift people up, not put people down, and these cuts put people down. We can do much better.

Again, I thank my colleagues for coming to the floor and look forward to more debate on this.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Massachusetts for furthering his feelings that he wants to talk about this. It is true, there will be people dropped off the rolls. We're having to make decisions based upon money. There's a vote today—it has not been decided—whether rapists, pedophiles, or murderers will be eligible. Also, whether we will have people have to qualify on their own as opposed to some other consideration maybe that a State would put. And we're going to take off those who are lottery winners, illegal aliens, and people quite honestly who should have the money to pay for these things. That's what we're doing today. So in order to allow the House to continue its scheduled business, which we're trying to do today, I urge Members to vote ''yes'' on the question of consideration of the resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

The question is, Will the House now consider the resolution?

The question of consideration was decided in the affirmative.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues on the Democratic side for not only their vigorous support for the things that they believe in today on this important bill but also for their consideration, participation, and bipartisanship yesterday as the Rules Committee considered this important bill.

I believe it is important what we are doing in the House. I think doing our work on a bipartisan basis should draw the attention of the President of the United States, who has said he will veto this bill, veto the bill before we even see what it looks like. I think that we should understand that what we are trying to do is work together. So, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Worcester, Massachusetts, my very dear friend, Mr. MCGOVERN, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, we've already had a lot of discussion about this awesome farm bill that comes to us today. H. Res. 271 provides for a structured rule for consideration of H.R. 1947. This rule provides for discussion and opportunities for Members of the minority and majority, both Republicans and Democrats who represent 700,000 people back home, to come together with their thoughts and ideas about how to make our farm policies and the things which are included in this bill even better, sustainable, and moving forward so that we can know that we have done our job.

This week, 230 amendments were submitted to the Rules Committee. The rule before us today provides for consideration of 103 of those amendments, 50 Republican and 53 Democrat or bipartisan amendments.

□ 1300

Many of the amendments submitted were duplicative, some violated the rules of the House, and several were nongermane. Given the universe of the amendments the committee received, I believe that this rule allows the House to debate each and every important

issue contained in the bill and provides this body with an opportunity to work its will.

Despite the large number of amendments submitted, I believe the underlying legislation, H.R. 1947, is a strong and meaningful statement and measure that provides our Nation with agriculture and nutrition policy necessary to meet the needs of this country.

And I want to commend, in particular, the young chairman of the Agriculture Committee, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS), and the ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota (COLLIN PETERSON), who have worked together over the years, not just the time when Mr. PETERSON served as chairman of the committee, but also throughout the years that Mr. LUCAS has worked in a bipartisan basis together, the committee, to work on agriculture policy.

Their hard work over the past several years has led us to the point where we are today. Hard work, working together, thinking, talking about the policy that would be good for the country—that's where we are today.

We follow that up with an opportunity to make sure, on a bipartisan basis, that I work together with my colleague, my colleagues at the Rules Committee. Notwithstanding Ms. SLAUGHTER was busy on the floor a lot of the time yesterday, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) sat in, heard the amendments with the rest of the Rules Committee. We worked together, staffs, to try and make as many amendments in order that would create an opportunity to follow the leadership set by Mr. PETERSON and Chairman LUCAS.

So this year's FARRM Bill reforms our Nation's agriculture programs to provide American farmers with innovative risk management tools. It reforms our Nation's supplemental nutrition programs for the first time in nearly two decades, and it invests in meaningful conservation programs to ensure that future generations of Americans benefit from the same resources that we do today.

The bottom line is the top soil, that top soil that is in America, which is the greatest in the world, enables our farmers and ranchers to produce goods and services, food that serves the entire world. And I am proud of supporting those people who live a way of life in a rural area. I know them well, and I respect the hard work and what they do to make our country stronger and better.

Impressively, H.R. 1947 accomplishes all of this, while making difficult decisions on saving over $40 billion over the life of the bill. This legislation is common sense. This legislation is bipartisan.

This legislation allows us, through an amendment process, to make many tough and difficult decisions based upon representation of this House of Representatives about issues because we're re-looking at the entire FARRM Bill.

Most of all, I hope it's fiscally responsible for those. And we offer solutions, solutions to not only consumers, but also solutions to farmers about how we are going to keep their products and services, farmers and ranchers, families, rural communities and consumers all in a balance to where we know that, through the leadership of this House of Representatives, that we have done our job.

That is why we're here today. We're here to take on tough decisions. We're here to make this FARRM Bill better, and I am proud of the product that we present today.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule, and I support the underlying legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), the distinguished chairman, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself 4½ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by thanking Chairman SESSIONS and thanking the staff on the Rules Committee, both the majority and the minority, for their hard work in trying to put this rule together.

I want to commend Chairman SESSIONS, in particular, I think, for making an honest attempt of trying to include as many amendments as possible. There are over 100 amendments that have been made in order, and I appreciate the fact that so many amendments were made in order, and many Democratic amendments were made in order.

Unfortunately, some important amendments were not made in order, which means that those of us on this side of the aisle, I think, will have to oppose this rule. And I certainly also want to make it clear that I oppose the underlying bill as it is now written.

But before I explain why I oppose the FARRM Bill, let me begin also by commending Chairman LUCAS and Ranking Member PETERSON and their staffs for all their hard work in crafting this legislation. It is no easy task, and they have done their best to thread a very small needle.

I'm honored to be a member of the Agriculture Committee, and I want to support a farm bill. I believe this Nation needs a farm bill. And, indeed, this bill contains a number of good things.

I'm pleased that the bill includes an amendment that I offered in committee to close a loophole in Federal animal-fighting laws that allow spectators at animal fights to avoid prosecution.

I support the dairy program in this bill and believe that it would be good for dairy farmers in the Northeast, who are such an important part of our economy.

But I cannot and I will not support this FARRM Bill as it is currently written. I cannot support a bill that cuts the SNAP program by $20.5 billion.

I cannot support a bill that will force 2 million Americans to lose their benefits.

I cannot support a bill that throws over 200,000 American children off the free school breakfast and lunch program. In short, I cannot support a bill that will make hunger in America even worse than it already is.

Right now, as we speak, as we gather here, there are 50 million hungry Americans; 17 million of them are children. Many of them work but do not earn enough to make ends meet. All of us, every single one of us in this Chamber, should be ashamed by those numbers.

Food is not a luxury; it is a basic necessity. But there isn't a single congressional district in America that is hunger-free.

Ending hunger in America used to be a bipartisan issue. To my Republican friends, I say, remember the work of people like Bob Dole and Bill Emerson, who dedicated themselves to this issue. Be proud of that legacy; don't dismantle it.

And to my fellow Democrats, I say, if we do not stand for helping the poor and the hungry, then what are we doing here?

There are all sorts of nice little deals in this bill for all sorts of people. Peanut growers get a nice deal; cotton growers get a nice deal. Even sushi rice producers get a really nice deal for some reason.

But poor people in America, hungry people, get a raw deal. It is a rotten thing to do to cut SNAP by $20.5 billion. It's a lousy thing to do to throw 2 million people off this program.

I will have an amendment later in this process to restore these cuts to SNAP in a way that not only reduces subsidies to big agribusiness, but actually reduces the deficit by an additional $12 million beyond the base bill. So I would urge any of my colleagues who are concerned about deficit reduction to support my amendment.

You know, we hear a lot of rhetoric about waste, fraud, and abuse in the SNAP program even though SNAP has an incredibly low error rate. I promise you that if our defense programs had the same error rate as SNAP, we would save billions and billions and billions of dollars.

I'm going to have more to say about my amendment during its consideration, but I would urge my colleagues to take a look at it and support it.

I'd also like to take a moment to ask my colleagues to support the amendment offered by House Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL to provide modest, but important, reforms to our international food aid programs. This amendment will enable more people to benefit from our scarce U.S. dollars, while ensuring that U.S. commodity producers and shippers remain actively engaged in alleviating hunger around the world.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that the rule makes in order several,

quite frankly, mean-spirited amendments that do nothing but demonize the poor and make their lives even more difficult. I urge my colleagues to oppose those amendments, oppose this rule, and oppose the underlying bill.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I can certify that at no time during this process have we vilified any poor people. We're here to help them. The Republican Party cares very much about families and children, moms who are trying to make a go of it.

We're the ones that are up here trying to lower taxes on everybody. We're the ones that are trying to make sure we've got jobs for people. We're the ones that are making sure that we're trying to take pedophiles and rapists and murderers off the rolls of government assistance so that it would serve those who need it the most.

We're trying to help prioritize and save this system. That is what Republicans are trying to do.

We would never vilify those that are disabled, or who are seniors, or who are men and women who richly deserve the opportunity for the government to help them.

□ 1310

But likewise, we believe that those who are able-bodied, those who really should be getting up during the day and trying to go find work do not take government assistance.

We are very concerned about the rights of seniors, about the rights of women, particularly women that have children, and about children and about the disabled. I work very extensively as a Republican with other Republicans and with Democrats on a bipartisan basis to make sure that we're looking at those needs of disabled people. So, I think it would be unfair to say, Well, this bill is aimed to vilify the people that we're intending to help, and that's why we are here today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to a gentleman who is from Gainesville, Florida, and was a large animal vet. He understands a lot, not just about agronomics, but also about the men and women who take care of this country in agriculture, people who spend their lives there, people who have to take care of their animals and, day in and day out, the needs that it takes to make sure that we have the best farms and ranches in America, animals who are safe and consumers that get a good deal.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida, Dr. YOHO.

Mr. YOHO. I thank my colleague from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS).

This bill has been a long time coming. With over 3 years of reviewing every single USDA program, 11 audit hearings, and 2 markups, we've finally brought a farm bill to the house floor—and I need to remind everybody, with a lot of bipartisan support. This is hugely important for the stability and security of our Nation's food supply; and without that supply, a nation like ours cannot truly call itself secure.

I've worked in agriculture all my life, since I was 16 years of age, and I've seen the regulations that stood in the way of farmers and ranchers, and I've seen the regulations that have made sure our food supply is the safest in the world.

This legislation cuts through the red tape by eliminating and consolidating over 100 programs, while bolstering farm risk management programs so that our farmers can keep feeding America during the tough times.

I see a lot of theatrics and drama when we hear people talk about 50 million starving people in this country. I disagree with that. I think there are 330 million starving people at least three times a day. We call it breakfast, lunch, and dinner. But as far as 300 million nutritionally deprived people, I would beg to differ. The SNAP program does not take one calorie off the plate of anyone who qualifies for the program.

Let me repeat that. The SNAP program does not take one calory off the plate of those who qualify for the program. We simply close the loophole that allows States to sign people up into the program without the proper qualifications.

To have a secure nation, we must have a secure food source. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for the rule and for passing the underlying bill.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me yield myself 10 seconds.

I would just say to the gentleman in response, the Congressional Budget Office—not me, but the Congressional Budget Office—says that these cuts would throw 2 million people off of SNAP and over 200,000 kids off the free breakfast and lunch program. I assure you that people will lose food over these cuts. This is not something we should do.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank Ranking Member MCGOVERN and commend him for his work on this important rule.

I rise in opposition to this rule, but, frankly, I'm relieved to finally debate a farm bill in this country. This past year and a half has been marked by far too much uncertainty in our agriculture industry as a result of Republican leaders here refusing to even consider a farm bill in the last Congress. That has hurt economic growth in this country from coast to coast.

American agriculture is responsible for 1 in 12 jobs in our country, and it's vital to give confidence to the market and to give certainty to our agricultural enterprises that we move a bill forward. Thank goodness the other body did it and we are compelled to do it here.

But this bill cuts $20.5 billion in nutrition assistance that will cut over 2 million low-income people, starting with senior citizens in this country and with children who won't get school meals anymore. I don't know what the gentleman from Texas is talking about. I invited him to Ohio before, and I hope he accepts my invitation. Simply, these cuts are unconscionable.

Shockingly, the bill also has zero funding for the energy title. When American energy security is at stake and gas prices are hovering around $4 a gallon, to not invest in that is simply backwards thinking.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the rule, and hopefully we can improve the bill as it comes to the floor for a final vote.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to a leader on this issue, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. I rise in opposition to this rule and the underlying bill. It includes severe, immoral cuts to the food stamp program, slashing so deeply into nutrition support for hungry families at a time of great need all across this country. It is cruel, it is unnecessary, and it's an abdication of our responsibilities to the American people.

Over the past 30 years of policies aimed at debt and deficit reduction, the key programs that help the most vulnerable among us to get by have always been protected from deep cuts. Recent examples: Simpson-Bowles. This has been a bipartisan tradition for decades. But this FARRM Bill destroys that tradition.

This bill slashes food stamps by more than $20 billion. It hurts millions of Americans in our economy. It will force up to 2 million Americans to go hungry. It kicks roughly 210,000 children from the school lunch program, and it changes the relationship between the food stamp program and the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program, which takes benefits away from seniors and from our families.

Let's make it clear: you cannot get food stamps unless you qualify for them. There is nothing automatic about it. Food stamps are our country's most important effort to deal with hunger here at home. Forty-seven million Americans are helped—half of them kids—and they are proven to curb hunger and improve low-income children's health, growth, and development. They have one of the lowest error rates of any government program. It's 3.8 percent.

I tell my colleague from Texas: Do you want to find money in this budget? Go to the crop insurance program, which is ripping off billions of dollars from U.S. taxpayers. That's where the money is, not where the program is to feed our kids.

Food stamps are good for the economy. They get resources into the hands of families who will spend them right away. And, most importantly, they are the right thing to do.

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

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

Ms. DELAURO. Let me quote the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops:

> We must form a ''circle of protection'' around programs that serve the poor and vulnerable in our Nation and throughout the world.

Harry Truman said:

> Nothing is more important in our national life than the welfare of our children, and proper nourishment comes first in attaining this welfare.

Let's pursue a balanced approach. I urge my colleagues to vote against this rule. Vote against the underlying bill. Balancing the budget on the backs of hungry Americans, especially children, does not reflect the values of this great Nation, and it abdicates our moral responsibility in this Chamber.

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

I appreciate the gentlewoman's coming down and speaking. She was at the Rules Committee yesterday and really sat for a long period of time in order to have her ideas taken up by the Rules Committee. As she knows, she's going to get a vote on what she spoke about today. It's not in there yet. She'll have a chance. This body will have a chance to determine whether we're going to go one direction or the other.

What drives the behavior of all this is very interesting. We're trying to work with, on a high level, something that's going to happen again soon in this next cycle starting at the end of September, and it is called sequestration—again, President Obama's idea of sequestration—which will cut $85 billion more across the board, and the entire government is struggling with how we're going to make these changes.

Our GDP is at less than 1 percent. Twenty-five million people are unemployed and underemployed. We're working with the policies of the Democratic Party that are bankrupting this country.

There are people who are hurting. There are people who need jobs, who need food, need to take care of their families, and need to take care of paying their student loans. This House of Representatives is on the mark of saying how we should solve each and every one of these problems.

□ 1320

They essentially go back to when Republicans had control of the House of Representatives, the United States Senate and the Presidency. For 60 straight months there was sustained, ongoing economic growth. Oh, my gosh, that was under George Bush. Well, that's right. President Bush and Republicans helped this country to achieve a doubling of GDP, of moving our country forward.

But there's also another model of success out there, and it was called President Clinton, who came and worked with the House of Representatives, who took Republican ideas, who took the ideas which we put and merged them with his own—probably called them his own—but moved this country forward. Instead, today we have leadership of our country that says no, no, no.

We've passed bipartisan legislation—cybersecurity. What's the President's answer? No. We've come today with bipartisan legislation from two stalwarts, men who have served this great Nation in the Agriculture Committee for years of service, bringing them together with the best ideas to try and formulate a policy.

Today, there will be examples of people who can control the destiny of these ideas. One is about trying to take rapists, pedophiles, and murderers off the rolls. Another that says we are not going to allow those that have won the lottery to be able to continue receiving food stamps. That's how this bipartisan bill is being crafted and worked together. And every Member of this body will have a chance to vote on the final direction that we go through amendments that were made in order by the Rules Committee.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, let me be clear that the $20.5 billion worth of cuts in SNAP are not about taking rapists, pedophiles, and murderers off the rolls. This is about going after poor people. And it is curious that we have an amendment to go after rapists, pedophiles, and murderers who are not SNAP, but those who receive crop insurance, not those who receive agricultural subsidies. I mean, it's incredible what's going on here.

I'd also say to my colleague that it was the Republicans' idea to have sequestration; it was Republicans in this House that passed sequestration. But I'm going to give you credit that at least SNAP was exempted; it was exempted from sequestration and from Simpson-Bowles because it was thought that to balance the budget on the backs of poor people who have nothing was a rotten and cruel thing to do.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM).

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. I rise in opposition to the rule and the bill because I am absolutely appalled by the proposed cuts to the SNAP program in the FARRM Bill.

Now, I know how important the FARRM Bill is to American ranchers and farmers and to New Mexico ranchers and farmers. I want to vote for the bill, but I cannot support it if these disastrous cuts remain.

For the past week, I've joined dozens of my colleagues in the SNAP challenge, to take a walk in the shoes of the over 442,000 New Mexicans—half of whom are children—who have to eat on less than $4.50 every day, to show just how devastating any cuts to the food program would be. Nearly one in three children in New Mexico is chronically hungry. It's the worst in the Nation. It's unconscionable, and these cuts make it worse.

In addition to the SNAP cuts, this bill also cuts funding for nutrition education programs that teach SNAP recipients how to stretch their dollars further and feed their families nutritious food.

New Mexico's farmers, ranchers, and consumers need and deserve a farm bill. But this cut, this bill is morally wrong, it's cruel, and it's reckless—harming children, seniors, the disabled, and veterans in the process.

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

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Forty-five years ago, in a now famous film, Edward R. Murrow, for CBS, produced a program called ''Hunger in America.'' It described 100,000 residents of San Antonio—mostly Latino—who were ''hungry all the time'' and the indifference of some local leaders to their plight. This spring, with the inspirational leadership of Rod and Patti Radle, we rewatched that film, discussed the progress, and outlined the remaining challenges.

In one west side ZIP code, we still have 40 percent of the population in poverty and over one-third relying on SNAP. We cannot snap our fingers and snap away that poverty. But if we make these cuts five times larger than what the United States Senate approved, we will snap away food security from many needy families—people like Daniela, who lost her job and relies on SNAP to feed her young daughter.

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

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

Mr. DOGGETT. In San Antonio and Austin, a public-private partnership, across this Nation, involves responsible corporate citizens, like HEB, working together with local entities to see that there's food security. But without SNAP, they cannot do their job.

This bill has very little to do with reform and everything to do with denying a vital lifeline to school children and to poor Americans across this country.

Let us reject it.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to remind the young gentleman from Austin, Texas, that he'll have a chance to vote on this, and then we can make a determination. But it's pedophiles, murderers, rapists, those who should have enough money not to have government assistance, that's what we're trying to do here. And he'll have a chance to decide that today.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I'd like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Taylorsville, Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS), a member of the Ag and Transportation and Infrastructure Committees.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. I thank the gentleman from Texas. I will

say that my home town has no ''s,'' it's Taylorville. But, hey, Mr. SESSIONS has been there. So thank you very much for your time spent in that community and thank you very much for the time today.

I rise today in steadfast support of H.R. 1947, the FARRM Bill. Thanks to the leadership of Chairman LUCAS and Ranking Member PETERSON, we have crafted a farm bill that provides 5 years of certainty, cuts $40 billion, closes loopholes in the SNAP program, and preserves crop insurance as the key risk management tool for our producers.

Ag has been a bright spot for this economy. For every $1 billion in agricultural exports, it supports nearly 8,000 American jobs.

The district I represent is home to ADM, the University of Illinois, the Farm Progress Show, GSI, and Kraft Foods. From the farm to the classroom to the table, agriculture is a crucial economic driver in the 13th District of Illinois.

I'd also like to quickly highlight two amendments I authored, which were included in the FARRM Bill. The first one would provide the agricultural community with a place at the table when the EPA considers regulations impacting agriculture. This is how we stop regulations from coming to the table that want to regulate milk spills like oil spills from the Exxon Valdez. They don't make sense, and the Department of Agriculture deserves a seat at the table to tell them that.

I also had a bipartisan seed amendment that removes duplicative layers of EPA regulations at our ports to ensure that we don't face shortages of seeds in the Midwest.

Lastly, I want to talk about another vital title to this bill. The area that I represent has the University of Illinois. And those of us who are fortunate enough to represent land grant universities know that they are the bedrock of agricultural research. With this FARRM Bill, we are reauthorizing university research and continuing the Agricultural and Food Research Initiative within the National Institute for Food and Agriculture.

Research through AFRI benefits the entire world, and I'm proud of the research that the U of I has conducted through this program. Their cutting-edge research is aimed at improving food security, achieving more efficient crop production, and promoting animal health through livestock genome sequencing.

We have an opportunity to move the FARRM Bill forward this week and avoid the uncertainty of year-long extensions that reform nothing and spend more money.

This FARRM Bill is well thought out, contains critical reforms, and benefits all Americans. Vote ''yes'' on this FARRM Bill.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I have great respect for the gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the Rules Committee, and I appreciate his courtesies in the Rules Committee yesterday, but I have to object to the way he is kind of characterizing those people who are on SNAP. Demonizing and stereotyping people who are on SNAP as somehow rapists, pedophiles, and murderers is just plain wrong. It's just wrong. Please don't do that.

□ 1330

These are people who are law-abiding citizens, they are good people, and they've fallen on hard times. Millions and millions and millions of these people work for a living but they earn so little that they still qualify for SNAP. I have to interject that because these people don't deserve to be demonized, they deserve a helping hand.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to insert in the RECORD a letter to the New York delegation from Governor Andrew Cuomo opposing these cuts in the farm bill.

STATE OF NEW YORK,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Albany, NY, June 13, 2013.

NEW YORK DELEGATION: It is well known that the importance of the Farm Bill goes beyond New York's agriculture industry and conservation efforts. The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), within the Nutrition Title, is a program that helps struggling New York families put food on their table. SNAP is one of the most effective anti-poverty components of the nation's safety net. Approximately 3.1 million New Yorkers utilize SNAP to buy groceries. As the Farm Bill moves toward enactment, I urge you to fight to protect the integrity of SNAP, its current streamlined administrative requirements and program benefit levels.

Specifically, I urge you to maintain the successful ''Heat and Eat'' state option. In New York, more than 300,000 households currently participate in the program. In New York, when a SNAP household is also eligible for Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP), the State deems that household eligible to have the Heating and Cooling Standard Utility Allowance (HCSUA) used in their benefit calculation, and usually results in a higher SNAP benefit for the household. It is critical to maintain the ability to predicate eligibility for the HCSUA on eligibility for and *anticipated* receipt of the LIHEAP benefit. Both the House and Senate bills restrict the states' ability by requiring SNAP households to be in actual receipt of the LIHEAP benefit. If the state option is restricted as written, these households will see their benefits decrease by roughly $90 per month. Congress should allow New York to continue this innovative strategy to deliver benefits, which reduces administrative costs, instead of increasing the administrative burden on the State, which ultimately requires more resources.

In addition, I urge you to preserve the Broad-Based Categorical Eligibility (BBCE) option that is slated for elimination in the House bill. Households which receive benefits through the Temporary Assistances for Needy Families (TANF) block grant, Supplemental Security Income (SSI), or a state-run low-income general assistance program are categorically eligible for SNAP. Since 2000, New York has been able to use BBCE to eliminate the duplicative and time-consuming requirement that households who already met financial eligibility rules in one specified low-income program go through another financial eligibility determination in SNAP.

Eliminating BBCE will force the state to revert back to requiring a separate asset limit for SNAP, with a threshold of $2,000 ($3,000 for elderly)—unchanged since 1986. This outdated threshold will disqualify applicants even though they meet the same extreme poverty requirements other safety net programs. Many low-income New Yorkers, particularly the elderly and working households, would no longer be eligible for SNAP.

These groups tend to have assets, such as a small savings account which, though putting over the asset threshold, is not a true indication of their poverty status. Eliminating BBCE will result in the elderly and children in low-income working families going without the food assistance upon which they depend.

Furthermore, BBCE is an example of good public policy that has both streamlined administrative requirements and reduced payment error rates to the lowest of any federal program. Without BBCE, states would be forced to waste critical resources in order to allocate staff time to duplicate enrollment procedures and incur the cost of modifying their computer systems, reprinting applications and manuals, and retraining staff.

In addition to the above cuts, the House bill would cut $11 million in funding from the SNAP Employment and Training program (E&T). The Senate bill would preserve the current $90 million funding level until FFY 2018, when it would cut the funding by $10 million. New York serves more than 150,000 individuals through SNAP E&T, which provides sorely needed job preparation and job placement services for SNAP participants. This funding is the only available targeted federal support to enable SNAP participants to engage in these services, which ultimately provides a path to employment, financial stability, and a reduction in SNAP costs for federal government.

The solution to lowering the cost of the SNAP program is not reducing enrollment numbers by restricting eligibility and cutting benefit levels. SNAP is a safety net program in the truest sense of the word; there is no other more fundamental human need than food. There is never a good time to cut SNAP benefits or pass burdensome unfunded mandates, but I respectfully suggest that doing so during a period of economic insecurity, it would be especially harmful to our most vulnerable citizens.

SNAP's low payment error rate—3.8 percent—shows us that benefits reach those who are truly struggling, and it is not a program filled with individuals ''gaming'' the system as many incorrectly proclaim. Cutting benefits and making the program more restrictive may help lower deficits in the short term, but it will prolong the struggle for the millions of New Yorkers who still feel the impacts of the worst recession since the Great Depression.

A Farm Bill is critically important to New York's recovering economy, but those still beaten down by the recession should not be denied basic food assistance. As a fellow New Yorker, I urge you to not support House and Senate Farm Bill provisions that will decrease benefit levels and limit future eligibility.

Sincerely,

ANDREW M. CUOMO,
Governor.

At this time, I would like to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS).

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let me say, first of all, we used to have—or we have—in the part of the

city that I live in, a statement that says, ''Give us your poor, your hungry, your huddled masses yearning to be free.'' We have people here yearning for food.

Now, I have heard my very good friend from Texas talk about rapists and murderers, et cetera, but the Congressional Budget Office, it talks about 200,000 children who will be cut off from the school program. That's not Democrats talking about it. It is the Congressional Budget Office that is talking about it, and we as a country should be focused on the least of these.

I think you judge a country by how you take care of the poor. Here we have clear evidence from an impartial group of about 200,000 children and hundreds of thousands of elderly individuals who will go hungry if we cut this $20.5 billion. This is what this is all about.

We talk about the future of America. Well, somebody within that 200,000 children, who are hungry, who will not have the ability to learn because their stomachs will be crying out for some food, could be the person that could take us where we want to go as a Nation. But what are we doing? In the name of saving money, which we are not, we are turning our backs on these children, on the elderly who have worked hard, many of whom came in with the sign of giving us your young, your poor, and your hungry.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, if I could inquire about the time remaining on both sides, please, sir.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 16 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 16½ minutes remaining.

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

The gentleman from New York, who is a very dear friend of mine, spoke very eloquently about this bill.

I will tell you that the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, known as SNAP, is designed to ensure that the neediest Americans are able to help themselves with food for themselves and their families. I care very much about people who are disabled seniors and those who are having problems.

I think you would be hard-pressed to find any Member who did not think that reforming this program is also the right thing to do. This program was reformed in the Agriculture Committee. That's the text that we are bringing here today—Republicans and Democrats together working together, looking at the problem, and trying to make sure that prioritization is done.

They also recognize this: in the past decades, SNAP payments, otherwise known as food stamps, have increased by almost 300 percent; 300 percent is non-sustainable. A 300 percent increase puts huge responsibilities on public policy.

This is why Republicans have been offering ideas, and we continue to, about jobs and job growth. This is why Republicans see the terrible plight that the American family and the American people are having in trying to have jobs that are available in their hometown. And this goes to the responsibility of all elected officials, not just Members of Congress, but mayors and Governors and Senators and, Mr. Speaker, Presidents, people who are elected officials who need to understand that increasing food stamps by 300 percent over 10 years should be a national disgrace.

We're not trying to take advantage of those who are on it. They're on it because they cannot find work, they cannot find an opportunity because of public policies that make work harder to find because of rules and regulations out of this body and the Federal Government that are creating circumstances on employers to where they don't go employ people. We've talked about this for years. We said when we got into ObamaCare, this will cause a tremendous loss of jobs. The CBO—we're talking about this organization CBO—predicted the same thing.

Well, by golly, we can look ahead and see exactly where Europe is. Europe is going through what is a tragedy where young people cannot find jobs. It is an international disgrace. You see riots across Europe, and have.

Mr. Speaker, we better be smart enough to recognize that we better reform our policies, not just in agriculture policies but economic policies; economic policies that help people, sure, to get an education, but then a thriving marketplace, not just through trade but also through policies of this country.

Our leaders—Members of Congress, Governors, Vice Presidents, Presidents, and Senators—need to focus on this. We need jobs, we need job creation. We need the opportunity for every Member of Congress to understand how jobs are formulated, how jobs are then formulated, created, and then saved.

We've got a group of people that are in Washington that I think fail to look at the ramifications of long-term unemployment to our country. They, I think, are more interested in what we are going to do for people who are having tough times.

So I'm not here to vilify people. I'm here to say I suffer with you because I know them all over our country. I've seen them, not just in Taylorville, Illinois, but across this country.

What we are doing here today is bigger than just SNAP. It's larger than just the agriculture bill. It is how are we going to create a public policy that we involve all elected officials to understand about jobs, job creation, rules and regulations, and that we do not follow Europe; that we admit that Europe is the problem, not the answer; that we go back to the American Dream, the formulation of hard work, the formulation of creation of jobs and, yes, I'll say it, even people making money so they can employ more people and give more wages.

The free enterprise system, that's really the underpinning of what this whole argument is about today; a creation of a policy in this country that is about helping people that need help and about creating economic opportunity for a vast number of other people and making our country and the American Dream work. That's what the Republican Party is for. That's why we're here today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1340

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

Mr. Speaker, just a couple of points to some of the things the gentleman from Texas said.

He talked about the increased numbers of people who are on SNAP. The reason why is that we've had a difficult economy. We've had the worst recession since the Great Depression. Lots of people lost work, and lots of people are underemployed right now, so that's why. The CBO tells us that, as we look to the future and as the economy gets better, the number of people on SNAP will go down. So this is there for people who have fallen on hard times. That's why the numbers have increased, and they're going to go down.

The gentleman says that this bill somehow represents reform. This is not about reform. When you come up with reforms, we deliberate. In the Agriculture Committee, in the Subcommittee on Nutrition, do you know how many hearings there were on SNAP? Zero. None. In the full committee, do you know how many hearings there were on SNAP? Zero. None. Then the language appears in the bill that we have before us during a markup.

If you really want reform, you have to listen to people, and you have to deliberate. That's what hearings are for. We have to reach out and figure out how to make this program better. I'm all for making this program better, but that's not what this is about, so let's not have anybody be under the misimpression that this is about reform.

This really is about trying to find an offset to be able to pay for all of the other things and to try to use this to help kind of balance the budget. We're not going after the big agribusiness, and we're not going after crop insurance. What we're doing is going after poor people. They don't have super PACs, and they don't have big lobbyists down here, so there are no political repercussions. That's what this about.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to yield 1½ minutes to a leader on this issue, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH).

Mr. DEUTCH. I thank my friend from Massachusetts.

I would like to just highlight a point that the gentleman just made that my friend from Texas and everyone understands, which is that, of course, SNAP payments increased during the recession. It is supplemental nutrition, and it's that supplemental nutrition assistance that kept people out of poverty.

The majority ruled out of order my amendment to the FARRM Bill, which would ensure families relying on SNAP could skip fewer meals and buy healthier food. Contrary to my colleagues' claims, SNAP is not too generous, and processed food from the dollar store can't replace fresh fruits, fresh vegetables, and the protein needed in a healthy diet.

So, as the Republican majority prepares to vote to kick 2 million Americans off of SNAP, let's remember what they are not voting for, what they are not voting for today and what they have not voted for on one single day in this Congress:

The GOP is not voting for jobs; they are not voting to raise the minimum wage so that full-time workers can actually feed their kids without SNAP; they are not voting to invest in education so that children have a better shot at success; they are not voting to create new jobs by investing in new ports and new bridges and new roads. In short, my friends on the other side of the aisle are not voting to reduce poverty; they are not voting to reduce hunger; they are not voting to build an economy in which working families can get ahead and don't have to scrape by on SNAP benefits.

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

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

Mr. DEUTCH. What's the Democratic plan for reducing SNAP spending? Create jobs, build the economy, and stop punishing poor people.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HAHN).

Ms. HAHN. I wasn't able to attend my usual congressional Women's Bible Study this morning, but I am still feeling the command of scripture. So, today, as we begin the consideration of the House FARRM Bill—the FARRM Bill that takes $20 billion from the hungry in cuts to SNAP, $20 billion from the plates of fellow Americans who are struggling to feed themselves even with this meager benefit—I am holding in mind the words of Jesus from the Gospel of Matthew:

> Truly I tell you, whatever you did not do for one of the least of these, you did not do for me.

In my communities alone, 145,000 people rely on this benefit. Over half of them are children. This bill takes food from their mouths.

I hope all of my colleagues will remember what that means and will join me in supporting the McGovern amendment, which will reverse these cuts, or else vote down this immoral bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of issues that the House will be considering today as a result of amendments, ideas, that have come to the committee—some that are in the bill and some that are amendments against the bill. I'd like to, if I can, speak on one of those amendments at this time.

This amendment is amendment No. 194, and it is offered by the gentleman who is the former chairman of the committee and who is now the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE). It is cosponsored by a number of Members of this House, including the gentleman Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CHRIS COLLINS of New York, Mr. MORAN, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. POLIS, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. LEE, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. ISSA, and me.

The essence of what this is all about is that it would repeal the Dairy Market Stabilization Program. This program serves as a supply-and-control mechanism which distorts the private markets through which government intervention takes place and which unnecessarily fixes prices. As a result, American families pay higher prices for milk products, and American dairy exports are unnecessarily limited.

This amendment which I speak of, No. 194, known as the ''Goodlatte amendment,'' would replace the stabilization program with a voluntary margin insurance program, allowing producers to effectively manage their risks without unnecessary government intervention. It is government intervention that will simply raise prices for consumers.

It's an important amendment, and it has drawn a lot of attention. I would like to stand up and offer my support since I will not be here probably for the discussion of the bill at the time that the amendment comes up. I lend my support because I think this is one of the most critical piece parts to putting the free market together with the opportunities for reducing cost, bettering the services and products that are available, and helping keep America in the export market to where we are more competitive in the world marketplace.

I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense, free market amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD a letter to the Congress from Massachusetts Governor Deval Patrick, which opposes the cuts that are contained in the FARRM Bill.

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS,
Boston, MA, May 30, 2013.

Hon. HARRY REID,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.
Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.
Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.
Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER AND LEADERS PELOSI, REID AND MCCONNELL: As you continue your work on the 2013 Farm Bill, I write to ask that you consider the importance of the following priorities, which, while not an exhaustive list, will help ensure that we continue to provide the most vulnerable Americans with access to healthy and affordable food, as well as strengthen our many diverse farms that are integral to the Commonwealth.

In Massachusetts, over 880,000 individuals are served by the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), 40 percent of who are children. SNAP helps lift families out of poverty and works to bridge the gap so that struggling Americans can put food on the table. I urge you to protect the overall integrity of SNAP and refrain from restricting eligibility, reducing benefits or funding for this critical program. Specifically, I urge you to protect the highly successful Heat and Eat state option. In Massachusetts over 125,000 households currently participate in this program and if it were eliminated they would see a decrease of about $70 per month in their SNAP benefits. Eliminating or placing new burdensome requirements and restrictions on this successful state option will simply lead to increased food insecurity for more of our most vulnerable residents.

In addition, households receiving benefits through a Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) block grant are currently categorically eligible for SNAP. A proposal in the House bill would restrict this categorical eligibility. Many low-income individuals, particularly the elderly, would no longer be eligible for SNAP. This population is already under represented because they are either unaware they are eligible for SNAP benefits or too proud to apply. This change will result in many elders going without the food assistance they need and deserve.

I agree that program integrity is important for SNAP. Your committees can emphasize the importance of program integrity by increasing the percentage of administrative costs reimbursed by the federal government for those states, such as Massachusetts, that invest in efforts to improve program integrity, such as in data sharing and mining software designed to identify household composition, income, assets and participation in other public assistance programs.

As we continue to combat childhood obesity and the increased risk of diabetes, we should do all we can to promote and provide access to fresh fruits and vegetables for our SNAP families. I therefore also urge you to authorize appropriate funding to promote the acceptance of EBT in all farmers' markets and other non-traditional produce vendors.

Bay State farmers have averaged $490 million in cash receipts and employ over 12,000 workers across hundreds of thousands of acres of farmland in active production. In Massachusetts, approximately 80 percent of our farms are family-owned, making it all the more important to maintain an inventory of farmland for future generations. For this reason, I urge you to authorize robust funding for conservation programs in the 2013 Farm Bill, including the Farms and Ranchland Protection Program, which has helped the Commonwealth preserve and protect nearly 14,000 acres of farmland. I also urge you to provide adequate mandatory funding for the Environmental Quality Incentives Program, which helps our farmers plan and implement conservation practices to improve soil, water, plant and related resources, as well as Conservation Innovation Grants, which have directly assisted the implementation of over 100 farm energy projects in Massachusetts, saving hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Further, programs funded under the Energy Title have been critical to helping Massachusetts farmers and rural business owners

lower their energy bills through renewable energy installments and energy efficiency improvements. I urge you to authorize robust funding for the Rural Energy for America Program to help our farms continue to make key energy improvements. Since 2009, REAP has helped to fund 44 biomass, solar, energy efficiency and wind projects in rural areas of Massachusetts.

The dairy industry generates over $50 million in cash receipts from milk and other dairy product sales in Massachusetts. Small dairy farms, which predominate in Massachusetts, are particularly vulnerable to changes in the dairy industry, such as the wide fluctuation in market prices of milk and animal feed. At times, such market fluctuations drive down the price of milk while simultaneously driving up the cost of production, often resulting in low or negative margins. To ensure that the dairy industry continues to sustain and improve in Massachusetts, long term solutions including supply management and margin protection are crucial. I therefore support the inclusion of the Dairy Production Margin Protection Program and the Dairy Market Stabilization Program in the 2013 Farm Bill.

Finally, Specialty Crops Block Grant funding is critical to our agriculture economy, as specialty crops, including our vibrant cranberry bogs, make up a majority of our food crops. With over 400 growers producing approximately 35 percent of the nation's cranberry supply, cranberries are the number one food crop in Massachusetts and have a crop value of $104 million. I respectfully request that you authorize yearly funding for the Specialty Crops Block Grant at the FY2013 $55 million level, at a minimum, to allow us to continue to enhance the competitiveness of our specialty crops.

As you continue your work on the Farm Bill, I urge you to protect these important programs and vital benefits in order to provide certainty and stability for low-income families, our farmers and rural small businesses.

Sincerely,

DEVAL L. PATRICK,
Governor.

Mr. MCGOVERN. At this time, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to another leader on this issue, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I thank the gentleman, who has been such a tremendous leader and head of our Hunger Caucus in the House of Representatives.

Hunger in America—think of that. It ought to be a non sequitur. This is the richest country in the world, and yet one out of four of our children in this country is considered food insecure. That means that there are nights in this country when tens of thousands of children go to sleep hungry—American children.

So, despite what the gentleman from Texas may say about the compassion for these children, 2 million people will be cut off of the food stamp program. Not all of them are rapists and murderers—they are children; they are senior citizens; they are people who go to work every day and yet can't afford to eat.

I'm just finishing a week of living on the average food stamp, or SNAP, budget of $31.50 a week, $4.50 a day. You can spend $4.50 a day for one coffee at a Starbucks. It's not easy to live on that. That is the average food stamp benefit. It's just inconceivable to me that anyone has come to Congress with the idea that one would be willing to take food out of the mouths of hungry children—because it's not just the SNAP program. It's also school lunch programs and school breakfast programs, and 200,000 children are going to be cut off of those programs.

□ 1350

Are you kidding me? This is what we're going to do? This is what the majority is going to vote for to do in our country?

These are working people who often have overcome a rough time. I talked to a woman on SNAP who said she saw it as a trampoline. She was able to get over a rough spot in her life for herself and her children through the SNAP program.

Voting for this cut is immoral and wrong. We should be voting against this cut and against the FARRM Bill.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the more than 47 million Americans who rely on nutrition assistance and in strong opposition to the deep, unnecessary, and cruel cuts to these antihunger programs in the FARRM Bill.

The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program is one of our Nation's most effective tools for lifting children, seniors, and families out of poverty and helping vulnerable Americans put food on their table each day. SNAP is a lifeline for low-income and working Americans and their families.

Mr. Speaker, I speak in defense of the most basic elements of America's safety net, that regardless of circumstance, no American should go hungry. These deep and drastic cuts mean that 2 million Americans risk falling through the safety net. Some 210,000 children may go hungry throughout the school day; an additional 850,000 households will have less food on their tables. In my home State, nearly 1 million south Floridians don't know where their next meal will come from, and an astonishing 300,000 of them are children.

It is inexcusable for this Congress to try to balance the budget on the backs of hungry children and their families. We know that savings derived from these cuts are short-lived.

When Americans are food insecure, they are more likely to be anemic and have vitamin A and protein deficiencies, all of which lead to larger and more costly health issues, which we all pay for.

When needy children go off to school on empty stomachs, we dim their horizons and cripple their potential.

We are hurting our Nation's future through these severe burdens on needy families. This is not the way to find a balanced budget approach. Unfortunately, these cuts define the mindset of too many of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

It is shameful for us to tell the American people that when they fall on tough times, they're on their own. With these cuts, we are limiting their potential, risking their health, and leaving our fellow Americans writhing with hunger. It is immoral. The authors of this bill should be ashamed.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the $20 billion in cuts to nutrition programs in this bill. Support the McGovern amendment that would restore this critical funding, and oppose the rule and the FARRM Bill.

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

I want to thank the gentlewoman from Florida. I do resemble that remark. I helped put this bill together, and I'm proud of it. We did it on a bipartisan basis.

We also did it in a way to try and encourage a marketplace that will become more vibrant, that will ensure that farms and farmers and families and rural areas will not only survive tough times, but be able to see an advantage for working hard.

People who are farmers and ranchers get up early and go to bed late. They represent the people of our country. They are the bedrock of not just men and women and their children who go serve in our military, but they're people who care about basic American values.

In a larger sense, what this FARRM Bill is doing is trying to find a way in its place in all of the policy that we do to take care of people properly in this country who are the neediest, but to also ensure that we prioritize it.

There are a lot of people that are my friends that are Democrats that talk about how this country is a rich and powerful country. Well, we're not as rich or as powerful as we used to be. In the last 5 years, we've diminished not only in stature and power, but in employment. We are falling behind because of policies in Washington, D.C.

This bill is about empowering people that are in real live America. They call it flyover country. It's to help people—farmers, ranchers, communities—to deal with these issues. We're for job creation and job growth.

The larger message is that we need jobs in this country. Let's not just take this as just an isolated incident to say just the FARRM Bill, but also the creation of jobs and job creation. There are 25 million people unemployed and underemployed. The GDP is less than 2 percent, where literally our country is not growing to sustain the newest generations of Americans who go to school, who go to college or to technical school, who come out and want to have a bright future. We are becoming more like Europe. We're becoming where we're beholden to a government that's bigger and more powerful and

one which drives entrepreneurship and individual responsibility out of the way. It's some of these policies that have led to a 300 percent increase in people who are on food stamps over the last 10 years.

We're trying to deal with the problem. I think we're going to do it in a bipartisan way, and I have confidence this bill is on the right pathway. Some may oppose that, and some may not like the bill. I respect that. I respect the gentlewoman from Florida. But I do resemble that remark, and I think our product is good.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule and urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the previous question and ''no'' on the rule.

I'm very disappointed my amendment was not made in order, a solution that was both simple and responsible. It would restore desperately needed SNAP funding, protect the vital programs ranchers and growers rely on, and end welfare for Big Oil and responsibly reduce the deficit.

By ending wasteful tax breaks for Big Oil, my amendment would help more than 68,000 families in Ventura County and families across the country struggling to keep food on the table without cutting programs that California ranchers and farmers depend on like agricultural research, disease and pest control, rural development, and conservation.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the previous question and ''no'' on the rule.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE).

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding me time this morning, and I thank everyone who has been on the floor to talk about the unconscionable and unthinkable cuts to SNAP benefits. This will have a devastating effect on my home State as it will across the country.

I want to mention one other thing. Just over a week ago, Speaker BOEHNER promised a fair and open debate on the FARRM Bill and said:

> If you have ideas on how to make the bill better, bring them forward. Let's have the debate and vote on them.

Lots of people brought ideas forward, ideas that would help farmers in States like mine, but we aren't getting a chance to debate those ideas here today.

The biggest programs in this bill, the revenue loss program and the price loss program that benefit big farmers, they won't do anything for the farmers in my State or many others. They won't make them more vital, as the Chair on the floor has said today. That's not going to happen.

A bipartisan amendment that I submitted—and this is just one of the 117 denied consideration—would benefit diversified farmers in every State. This is an amendment that has zero cost and is supported by over 400 organizations from 46 States. It's an amendment that would help the tens of thousands of small businesses that did $5 billion in local food sales last year.

I'm glad we will get to vote on the amendment to roll back the outrageous SNAP cuts in this bill, but I am very disappointed that local food and sustainable agriculture has been left out of the farm bill debate.

This is not an open process, and I urge my colleagues to join me in voting against the rule.

□ 1400

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, in fact the gentlewoman is correct, the Speaker of the House, Speaker BOEHNER, did make a public statement, and he did indicate that we would be open for business at the Rules Committee. I have attempted to do everything necessary and proper to make sure that not only a fair hearing was held, but that all the people who would choose to come and make an amendment available, that the committee was available. We listened. We asked tough questions. We did. But we asked questions that I considered to be fair.

I don't think one witness was discouraged at all from taking all the time they needed but respected that we had some 200 amendments to go through. We did not rush. We took our time. We were very deliberative. We worked with the committee on a bipartisan basis. We consulted others, and we received feedback, and we have a model that I believe many people, if you came to the Rules Committee yesterday, would say they received a fair hearing. Good process.

I'm for this bill. I think it is fair. I think it is balanced. I think it is a good representation of what I'm willing to put my name on as a product to present to this House.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I delighted to yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER).

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for his profound leadership on this issue.

You know, I rise in opposition to this rule because there are many amendments that were not made in order, but there's enough pork in this farm bill to make a dead pig squeal. I want to talk about just some of the silly things that are in this bill that were made in order as amendments for us to take up this afternoon, including pennycress as a research and development priority at the Risk Management Agency, or an amendment to direct the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture to conduct an economic analysis of the existing market for U.S. Atlantic spiny dogfish.

But an amendment I had that would have given veterans waiting for disability claims to be processed the opportunity for SNAP as a disabled person was not made in order.

And another amendment that would have made crop insurance subsidies that taxpayers in this country pay, some $9 billion a year, transparent—not in order. There are 26 companies in this country, agribusinesses, that are receiving more than $1 million apiece in crop insurance premiums, but we don't get to know who they are. That was an amendment I had that was not made in order, even though Grover Norquist thinks it should be made in order, U.S. PIRG thinks it should be made in order, and the Environmental Working Group thinks it should be made in order.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlelady.

Ms. SPEIER. But we're more interested in talking about the Atlantic spiny dogfish, or pennycress than dealing with issues around veterans accessing SNAP and whether or not the public has a right to know when we spend $9 billion a year on premium payments for crop insurance, just another name for what has historically been a farm subsidy.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I'm down to the bare minimum time I have left, and I'm going to reserve my time to close. I will close whenever the gentleman is prepared to do the same.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

I will insert in the RECORD a letter that was sent to Members of Congress by dozens and dozens of organizations ranging from the AFL–CIO; The Alliance to End Hunger; Bread for the World; Feeding America; Food Research and Action Center (FRAC); Jewish Council for Public Affairs; Mazon: A Jewish Response to Hunger; MomsRising; and Share Our Strength. I can go on and on.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important debate we are having and will have on this farm bill. It is about our values. The question is, is it acceptable to try to balance the budget or pay for other programs to benefit wealthy special interests by cutting a program that benefits the poorest of the poor in this country, a program called SNAP.

The people on SNAP, I want to remind my colleagues, are good, decent, honest people. They are our neighbors. They are people who have fallen on hard times. They are people who are working, working full time and still not earning enough to be able to not qualify for public assistance. Those are the people we're talking about. Those are the people who would be adversely impacted with a $20.5 billion cut.

I would also say to my colleagues who say that we can't afford to support our social safety net, can't afford to support anti-hunger programs, I want

them to know that hunger costs America a great deal. The Center For American Progress did a study that said it cost us $168.5 billion a year in avoidable health care costs, disability, lost wages, reduced learning capacity.

Hungry children who go to school don't learn. That's why it's particularly cruel that over 200,000 kids will lose their access to free lunch and breakfast at school. Those kids will go to school hungry. You don't learn if you're hungry. We all talk about preparing the new generation and making sure our kids have all the opportunities. But food is as essential to learning as that textbook is. And here we are, we're going to embrace a bill that cuts 200,000 kids off the school breakfast and lunch program. Cutting SNAP will make hunger worse, and it will have long-term consequences.

Let me just finally say that we're going to have an amendment coming up shortly after we vote on the rule that I have sponsored along with dozens and dozens of other Members here in the House of Representatives to restore the cuts in SNAP. I would urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to think long and hard before you vote. We don't have to do this. The price of a farm bill should not be making more people hungry in America, but yet that's the price that's being exacted through this bill.

We are a better country than this. Let's not go down this road. This used to be a bipartisan effort. Bob Dole and Bill Emerson championed some of the anti-hunger programs that have kept people fed, that have invested in people who are now very successful. Don't turn your backs on that tradition.

And to my Democratic colleagues, I remind you that if we do not stand with people who are hungry, with people who are poor and vulnerable, then what the hell do we stand for? You know, this is about our values.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this rule because a lot of amendments that should have been made in order were not. I appreciate the courtesies that my colleague, Mr. SESSIONS, afforded to us in the Rules Committee. I know he tried very hard to include as many amendments as possible. I appreciate that very much. I appreciate my amendment being made in order, but I think we could have done a little bit better.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this rule. And please vote ''yes'' on the McGovern amendment. If that should fail, do not send a farm bill forward that will throw 2 million people off the rolls of SNAP and 200,000 kids off of free breakfast and lunch programs. We can do much better than that.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

JUNE 19, 2013.

We, the undersigned, support Rep. James McGovern's amendment (#146) to restore the $20.5 billion/10 years cut to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) currently in H.R. 1947. As it stands, we oppose H.R. 1947 because it would increase hunger among millions of Americans—people with disabilities, children, seniors and struggling parents—those who work, as well as those who are unemployed or underemployed.

At a time when more than one in six Americans struggle to put food on the table, the cuts to SNAP proposed in the House farm bill are unconscionable and harmful. Specifically, the House bill would result in at least 1.8 million people losing SNAP benefits entirely, and another 1.7 million people seeing their benefits reduced by about $90 per month.

Our nation can ill afford to see SNAP weakened in the farm bill. Benefits are modest, averaging less than $1.50 per person per meal and are already scheduled to drop on November 1, 2013, with termination of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) benefit boost. This reduction, which will impact every SNAP beneficiary, will average about $25 per month for a family of three.

We support Rep. James McGovern's amendment (#146) to restore the $20.5 billion cut to SNAP and urge Members of Congress to vote YES when it comes up for a vote.

Advocates for Better Children's Diets (ABCD), AFL–CIO, Alliance for a Just Society, Alliance to End Hunger, American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP), American Commodity Distribution Association (ACDA), American Federation of State, County & Municipal Employees (AFSCME), American Federation of Teachers, AFL–CIO, American Public Health Association, Americans for Democratic Action (ADA), Association of Jewish Family and Children's Agencies, B. Sackin & Associates, Bread for the World, Center for Law and Social Policy (CLASP), Center for Women Policy Studies, Children's Defense Fund, Children's HealthWatch, Coalition on Human Needs (CHN), Community Action Partnership (CAP), Congressional Hunger Center (CHC), E S Foods, Environmental Working Group (EWG), Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

Families USA, Family Economic Initiative, Feeding America, First Focus Campaign for Children, Food Research & Action Center (F–RAC), Friends Committee on National Legislation, International Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers (IFPTE), International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace & Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW), Jewish Council for Public Affairs, Legal Momentum, MAZON: A Jewish Response to Hunger, MomsRising, National Association of County Human Services Administrators, National Black Child Development Institute, National Center for Law and Economic Justice (NCLEJ), National Council on Aging, National CSFP Association, National Education Association (NEA), National Employment Law Project (NELP), National Health Care for the Homeless Council, National Immigration Law Center (NILC).

National Law Center on Homelessness & Poverty, National WIC Association, National Women's Law Center, NETWORK: A National Catholic Social Justice Lobby, PolicyLink, Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), Racial and Ethnic Health Disparities Coalition (REHCD), RESULTS, Sargent Shriver National Center on Poverty Law, School Food FOCUS National Office, School Nutrition Association (SNA), Share Our Strength, Sisters of Mercy of the Americas Institute Justice Team, Society for Nutrition Education and Behavior (SNEB), SparkAction, The Food Trust, Union for Reform Judaism, United States Conference of Mayors (USCM), Voices for America's Children, Voices for Progress, WhyHunger, Wider Opportunities for Women.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, my colleague and friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, is most kind. He is most kind in not only how he presented his ideas today, and perhaps even some opposition, and I respect that. I respect him for not only standing up almost every day I see him for not just what he believes in, but caring about people.

My party cares about people, too. The Republican Party cares very much for people, not only those who have fallen on tough times but those who are friends and neighbors, and those who we don't know who live in our communities who are hurting, who are actually having tough times feeding their kids, finding work, paying student loans, and getting things done in their community that will better their community, following the guidelines that they always have about how tomorrow will be a better day for America and Americans. These are tough times.

But what we've done, and our mission today, is to take a farm bill that passed out of the committee that is very equally divided 36–10. This committee that looked at not just the policy on farm policy but has held hearing after hearing around this country, some 40 hearings over the last few years on the farm bill, to get it prepared and ready for this floor, to prepare it for the Rules Committee where both Republican and Democrat members of that committee came and thoughtfully presented their ideas, offered support for the bill once again that passed 36–10 in committee, and moved new ideas and allowed new ideas to be debated on this floor.

□ 1410

Look, not every amendment was made in order. I admit that. Did I want that as a goal to get closer? You bet I did.

But we allowed the debate and the opportunity up at the Rules Committee and then are trying to craft a bill that is in line with what the crafters wanted from farm policy. They're the people that understand this best. They're the people that know the impact.

And so I'm proud of the product. I think we've bettered it. I think we made it better up in the committee. I think we made it better here. And the gentleman, Mr. MCGOVERN, is a part of that process.

As chairman of the Rules Committee, I have the authority and the responsibility to ensure that the mark that we make, that the presentation that we put on this floor and, most of all, that the legislation that allows full debate and content is important.

So, look, what we're going to do is try and worry about a new farm bill that we can move forward. I am supporting this bill. I hope we'll vote on the underlying legislation.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of Jackson Lee amendment #94, which will be in the en bloc for H.R.

1947, the ''Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013.'' My thanks to Agriculture Committee Chair FRANK D. LUCAS and Ranking Member COLLIN C. PETERSON for including the Jackson Lee amendment in the en bloc.

I appreciate the work of Rules Committee Chair MCGOVERN and Rules Committee members for managing the debate on amendments to H.R. 1947.

I offered amendments to H.R. 1947 for deliberation by the Rules Committee for approval for consideration by the Full House. Only one of my amendments was made in order and will be included in the en bloc for the bill.

Jackson Lee #94 will be included in the en bloc and is a sense of Congress that the Federal Government should increase business opportunities for small businesses, black farmers, women and minority businesses.

Small farm businesses, black farmers, women and minority agriculture related businesses could benefit from partnerships with federal office location in receiving support for farmers markets. This would assist with eliminating food deserts, which are urban neighborhoods and rural towns without easy access to fresh, healthy and affordable food. These communities may have no food access or are served only by fast food restaurants and convenience stores.

Other amendments, I request that the Rules Committee favorably consider included Amendment #1, the McGovern amendment, which was joined by over 80 members of the House. This important amendment would restore $20.5 billion in cuts in SNAP funding by offsetting the Farm Risk Management Election Program and the Supplemental Coverage Option.

Jackson Lee amendments not included in the Rule for the bill include:

Jackson Lee amendment #182 was a sense of Congress that the Federal Government should increase financial support provided to urban community gardens and victory gardens to heighten awareness of nutrition.

The knowledge shared with urban dwellers can have a long term benefit to the health of our nation by increasing awareness regarding the link between what we eat and health. This would also be a means of expanding the diet options for persons who live in areas where the cost of fresh fruits and vegetables can be prohibitive.

Jackson Lee #183 is a sense of Congress regarding funding for a nutrition program for disabled and older Americans. Accessible and affordable nutrition is especially important when dietary needs change or must accommodate life's changes. Older Americans and persons with disabilities often must live with restricted diets.

Jackson Lee Amendment #184 was a sense of Congress that encourages food items being provided pursuant to the Federal school breakfast and school lunch program should be selected so as to reduce the incidence of juvenile obesity and to maximize nutritional value.

This amendment passed the House by a substantial margin in the 110th Congress by a recorded vote of 422 to 3. The inclusion of this amendment in the Rule for 1947 would affirm congressional commitment to fight juvenile obesity and to maximize nutritional value. The amendment should have been made in order considering the epidemic of juvenile and adult obesity.

Finally, I sought support by the Rules Committee of an amendment offered by Congresspersons KILDEE, FUDGE, PETERS, TIM RYAN, and Jackson Lee amendment #53.

This amendment was not included in the final Rule for the bill. This amendment would have brought healthy food to those with limited access to fresh fruits and vegetables through a public-private partnership. It would increase funding for SNAP incentive programs for fresh fruits and vegetables by $5 million per year, which is offset by decreasing the adjusted gross income limit for certain Title and Title II programs.

Food is not an option—it is a right that all people living in this Nation must have to exist and to prosper. The $20.5 billion cuts in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program also known as SNAP would remove 2 million Americans from this important food assistance program, and 210,000 children would lose access to free or reduced price school meals.

The course of our Nation's history led to changes in our economy, first from agricultural to industrial and now technological. These economic changes impacted the availability and affordability of food. Today our Nation is still one of the wealthiest in the world, but we now have food deserts. A food desert is a place where access to food may not be available and certainly access to health sustaining food is not available.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture defines a food desert as 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 of fewer farms as well as fewer places to access fresh fruits, vegetables, proteins, and other foods as well as a poor economy.

The results 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 function.

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 is 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 is 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.

At the beginning of the third millennium of this Nation's existence we should know better. Denying a higher quality of life that would result from better access to healthier food choices is shortsighted—it is also economically unsound and threatens our national security.

Social stability is threatened when people's basic needs are not met—food, clean drinking water and breathable air are the least of the requirements for life. Denying access to sufficient amounts of the right kinds of food means people will become less productive, more prone to disease and will not be able to function as contributing members of society.

For one in six Americans hunger is real and far too many people assume that the problem of hunger is isolated. One in six men, women or children you see every day may not know where their next meal is coming from or may have missed one or two meals yesterday.

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 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.

In 2011, according to Feeding America:

46.2 million people were in poverty;

9.5 million families were in poverty;

26.5 million people ages 18–64 were in poverty;

16.1 million children under the age of 18 were in poverty;

3.6 million (9.0 percent) of seniors 65 and older were in poverty.

In the State of Texas:

34% of children live in poverty in Texas;

21% of adults (19–64) live in poverty in Texas;

17% of elderly live in poverty in Texas.

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

In 2011:

50.1 million Americans lived in food insecure households, 33.5 million adults and 16.7 million children;

households with children reported food insecurity at a significantly higher rate than those without children, 20.6 percent compared to 12.2 percent.

Eighteen percent of households in the state of Texas from 2009 through 2011 ranked second in the highest rate of food insecurity—only the state of Mississippi exceeds the ratio of households struggling with hunger.

In the 18th Congressional District an estimated 151,741 families lived in poverty.

There are charitable organizations that many of us contribute to that provide food assistance to people in need, but their resources would not be able to fill the gap created by a $20.5 billion cut to Federal food assistance programs.

Food banks and pantries fill an important role by helping the working poor, disabled and the poor gain access to food assistance when government subsidized food assistance or budgets fall short of basic needs. Food pantries also help when an unforeseen circumstance occurs and more food is needed for a family to make it until payday or government assistance arrives. However, food pantries cannot carry the full burden of a community's need for food on their own.

During these difficult economic times, people who once gave to food pantries may now

seek donations from them. Millions of low income persons and families receive food assistance through SNAP. This program represents the Nation's largest program that combats domestic hunger.

For more than 40 years, SNAP has offered nutrition assistance to millions of low income individuals and families. Today, the SNAP program serves over 46 million people each month.

SNAP Statistics:

Households with children receive about 75 percent of all food stamp benefits.

23 percent of households include a disabled person and 18 percent of households include an elderly person.

The FSP increases household food spending, and the increase is greater than what would occur with an equal benefit in cash.

Every $5 in new food stamp benefits generates almost twice as much ($9.20) in total community spending.

The economics of SNAP food support programs benefit everyone by preventing new food deserts from developing. The impact of SNAP funds coming into local and neighborhood grocery stores is more profitable supermarkets. SNAP funds going into local food economies also make the cost of food for everyone less expensive and assure a variety and abundance of food selections found in grocery stores.

SNAP is the largest program in the American domestic hunger safety net. The Food and Nutrition Service programs supported by SNAP work with State agencies, nutrition educators, and neighborhood as well as faith-based organizations to assist those eligible for nutrition assistance. Food and Nutrition Service programs also work with State partners and the retail community to improve program administration and work to ensure the program's integrity.

Yes, more can be done to assure that food distribution from the fields to the tables of Americans in most need can be improved. The process of improving our nation's ability to more efficiently and effectively meet the food needs of citizens must begin with understanding the problem and acting on facts. I strongly support hearings on the subject and encourage all oversight committees to consider taking up the matter during this Congress.

However, we cannot ignore the safety process in place to prevent abuse or misuse of the program. The Federal SNAP law provides two basic pathways for financial eligibility to the program: (1) Meeting federal eligibility requirements, or (2) being automatically or ''categorically'' eligible for SNAP based on being eligible for or receiving benefits from other specified low-income assistance programs. Categorical eligibility eliminated the requirement that households who already met financial eligibility rules in one specified low-income program go through another financial eligibility determination in SNAP.

However, since the 1996 welfare reform law, states have been able to expand categorical eligibility beyond its traditional bounds. That law created TANF to replace the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program, which was a traditional cash assistance program. TANF is a broad-purpose block grant that finances a wide range of social and human services.

TANF gives states flexibility in meeting its goals, resulting in a wide variation of benefits and services offered among the states. SNAP allows states to convey categorical eligibility based on receipt of a TANF ''benefit,'' not just TANF cash welfare. This provides states with the ability to convey categorical eligibility based on a wide range of benefits and services. TANF benefits other than cash assistance typically are available to a broader range of households and at higher levels of income than are TANF cash assistance benefits.

Congress cannot afford to forget that by the year 2050, the world population is expected to be 9 billion persons. We cannot build our nation's food security on an uncertain future. Domestic food production and access to healthy nutritious food is essential to our Nation's long term national security.

Until we see the final farm bill, including the amendment adopted by the Full House, I cannot offer my support for the legislation as it is written.

The bill is too shortsighted about the realities of hunger in our Nation—the fact that it proposes to cut $20.5 billion from the SNAP program is of great concern. We should work to create certainty for farmers who run high risk businesses that are vulnerable to weather changes, insects or blight.

We should be equally concerned about providing long term food security for all of our Nation's citizens, which include rural, suburban and urban dwellers.

I thank the Agriculture Committee for including the Jackson Lee amendment in the en bloc for the bill. I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the McGovern amendment to prevent the $20.5 billion in cuts to the SNAP program. I urge all members to vote in favor of the en bloc and the McGovern amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FORTENBERRY). The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. 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 ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of House Resolution 271, if ordered, and approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 233, nays 187, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 253]

YEAS—233

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
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
Enyart
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
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)
Southerland
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)

NAYS—187

Andrews
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng

Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—14

Bonner
Clarke
Cleaver
Hastings (FL)
Holt
Honda
Larsen (WA)
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Pallone
Poe (TX)
Rogers (KY)
Slaughter

□ 1435

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 239, nays 177, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 254]

AYES—239

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Enyart
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
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)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—177

Andrews
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—18

Bonner
Clarke
Cleaver
Cummings
Garcia
Gohmert
Grijalva
Hastings (FL)
Holt
Honda
Hudson
Larsen (WA)
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Pallone
Rogers (KY)
Slaughter

□ 1443

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. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 254, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Stated against:

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 254, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

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.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 275, noes 139, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 255]

AYES—275

Aderholt
Alexander
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Beatty
Becerra
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cicilline
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Cramer
Crawford
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fleischmann
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Gibbs
Goodlatte