

what some economists call, “the Great Recession.” We find ourselves at a crossroads where we must decide how to manage our fiscal priorities while still protecting those who were hardest hit by the recent recession. When considering H.R. 1947 we should not forget the underlying principal which defines the farm bill, which is to provide assistance to those most in need.

Our Nation looks on as the Republican majority in the House of Representatives attempts to justify having nearly two-thirds of the savings generated from the entire bill come from cutting \$20.5 billion in SNAP funding. While we are in a very difficult fiscal climate, we simply cannot continue to place further burden on our Nation’s most vulnerable citizens. In these tough budgetary times, we should not signal to our constituents that helping those most in need is no longer a priority.

President Eisenhower once said, “Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired, signifies in the final sense a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and are not clothed.” We must consider the short and long term consequences of these cuts on our children, the elderly and disabled. Madam Chair, I would like to remind my colleagues that 95% of SNAP funding goes directly to families to buy food. For many of these at-risk populations, SNAP is the sole form of income-assistance they receive and is a powerful anecdote to extreme poverty.

Madam Chair, I am disappointed that two amendments I offered, which would have made improvements to this bill were not considered. Although I have many concerns with this bill, I feel they would have made modest improvements. My first amendment would have provided language which would have enabled the reauthorization of USDA’s Hunger-Free Communities grant program. This program was created to provide public funding for comprehensive and collaborative efforts to end hunger at the community level. The 2008 Farm Bill authorized the grant program and \$5 million was appropriated for Fiscal Year 2010. 14 communities in eight states, including my State of Texas, were awarded 2-year grants ranging from \$63,000 to \$2,000,000.

My second amendment addressed the issue of broad-based categorical eligibility. My understanding is that if broad-based categorical eligibility is ended under H.R. 1947, all states will have to use the asset test. Current law states that “that a household otherwise eligible to participate in the supplemental nutrition assistance program will not be eligible to participate if its resources exceed \$2,000 or, in the case of a household which consists of or includes an elderly or disabled member, if its resources exceed \$3,000.” If that is the case I feel that the asset limit should be higher. My amendment would have increased the asset eligibility for the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program to \$5,000 for all households, including those households including elderly and disabled members.

Madam Chair, In conclusion, I simply cannot support a bill which cuts \$20.5 billion from our Nation’s most important anti-hunger program which touches nearly 1 out of 7 American’s.

THE INTRODUCTION OF THE MAJOR GENERAL DAVID F. WHERLEY, JR., DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA NATIONAL GUARD RETENTION AND COLLEGE ACCESS GRANT

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 20, 2013

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the four-year anniversary of the tragic June 22, 2009, Metro crash, in which Major General David F. Wherley, former Commanding General of the D.C. National Guard, his wife, Ann, and seven others were killed when Metro trains collided on the Red Line, I introduce a bill, the Major General David F. Wherley, Jr., District of Columbia National Guard Retention and College Access Act (NGRCA), to permanently authorize funding for a program that provides grants for higher education to members of the D.C. National Guard. In 2010, I renamed this bill after General Wherley because he worked tirelessly with me to get funding for the program for many years, and because of his devotion to the youth of the District of Columbia.

The NGRCA authorizes an education incentive program, recommended by the late Major General David F. Wherley, Jr., and his successor, Major General Errol Schwartz, to stem the troublesome loss of members of the D.C. Guard to other units. Surrounding states offer such educational benefits to their Guards. I am grateful that the Appropriations committees have provided funds for the program in some years, most recently in fiscal year 2013. Naming a permanently authorized program after General Wherley would memorialize his service to the country and to the Guard in a way that I believe he would have appreciated. Authorizing funding is necessary to ensure that D.C. Guard members receive the same treatment and benefits as other National Guard members, especially those in states that provide the higher education benefits we seek for D.C. Guard members. The Guard for the nation’s capital has a limited ability to compete for regional residents, who find membership in the Maryland and Virginia Guards more beneficial. A competitive tuition assistance program for the D.C. Guard will provide significant incentives and leverage to help maintain enrollment and level the field of competition. The D.C. Guard is a federal instrument not under the control of the mayor of the District of Columbia. The federal government supports most other D.C. Guard functions and should support this small benefit as well.

The small education incentives in my bill would not only encourage high-quality recruits, but would have the important benefit of helping the D.C. Guard to maintain the force necessary to protect the federal presence, including members of Congress and the Supreme Court, and visitors if a terrorist attack or natural disaster should occur. I am pleased to introduce the bill based on the advice of Guard personnel, who best know what is necessary.

It is especially important for the D.C. Guard to be able to attract the best soldiers, given its unique mission to protect the federal presence here, in addition to D.C. residents. This responsibility distinguishes the D.C. Guard from all other National Guards. The D.C. Guard is specially trained to meet its unique mission.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

CELEBRATING THE CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY OF LAKE WORTH, FLORIDA

HON. LOIS FRANKEL

OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 2013

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the centennial anniversary of Lake Worth, Florida, a diverse and vibrant city in my district. Since its incorporation on June 4th, 1913, Lake Worth has grown into a lively community of 36,000 people.

Currently under the leadership of Mayor Pam Triolo, Lake Worth is a world-class tourist destination. It boasts one of the longest municipal piers on Florida’s Atlantic Coast, a unique downtown, and over 1,000 historical buildings. Lake Worth is also home to the Palm Beach County Cultural Center, which has delighted art-lovers and patrons of all ages since its founding in 1978.

Founded by former slaves, Lake Worth is one of the most diverse cities in Florida. Today, it boasts over 50 different nationalities. Its rich cultural history continues to promote a sense of hard work, diversity, and inclusiveness.

In honor of Lake Worth’s centennial anniversary, I am proud to recognize this dynamic community for their past successes and wish them a bright and prosperous future.

PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 2013

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1797. This bill, which would implement a nationwide ban on abortions after 20 weeks, is in direct violation of *Roe v. Wade*. H.R. 1797 is the latest attempt by House Republicans to undermine a woman’s fundamental right to choose.

H.R. 1797 does not provide an exception to protect a woman’s health. This dangerous omission would deny a woman the right to an abortion even when her doctor determines it would be necessary to protect her health. This infringement into the relationship between a woman and her doctor is the reason this legislation is opposed by the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists and the American Medical Women’s Association.

Additionally, H.R. 1797 contains a wholly inadequate exception for rape and incest. The threshold that the crime must have been reported to the authorities is arbitrary and cynical considering that it is estimated over half of the rapes in the United States go unreported.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this attack on a woman’s Constitutional right to choose.

CANCEL THE SEQUESTER: LET DR. WOODRUFF IMPROVE OUR UNDERSTANDING OF THE EFFECTS OF EXPOSURE TO METALS ON HUMAN REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 2013

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to tell my colleagues about the deleterious effect that sequestration is having on biomedical research and our ability to improve the health of people in communities across this country.

This week, Dr. Teresa Woodruff, a reproductive endocrinologist and the Chief of the Division of Fertility Preservation at the Feinberg School of Medicine at Northwestern University, contacted me to explain how the sequester is harming her ability to perform critical research into the effects of toxins on female reproductive health and fertility.

Last year, Dr. Woodruff applied for a grant from the Superfund Research Program, a joint program of the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences and the National Institutes of Health, to investigate and develop strategies to combat the proliferation of toxins at the DePue, Illinois Superfund site. Her application received a positive score and, after revising her research plan after being told that NIH lacked the resources needed to fully fund the project, she expected to receive funding and begin work this summer.

Unfortunately, Dr. Woodruff's team will be unable to start this critical research. In May, she was told that NIEHS cannot award the Superfund grant because of the sequester—an additional across-the-board cut to an already-modest research budget. The NIEHS administrator responsible for awarding these grants indicated that he had never seen anything like this before in his career—never before was he unable to fund a grant after a positive award decision was made.

Sequestration has pulled the rug out from under our researchers. Instead of working to understand the threats posed by environmental toxins, Dr. Woodruff's team is forced to delay this extremely valuable research. She is not giving up—and she will spend many more hours completing grant applications in hopes that funding will be available in the future. But, in the meantime, research that could result in real improvements for women's health and the environment is being put on hold.

I hope my colleagues will take the time to read a summary of the important research that Dr. Woodruff's team is unable to perform due to the unnecessary and harmful sequester cuts. I urge my colleagues to restore vital research funding by supporting H.R. 900, the Cancel the Sequester Act, so that our researchers can get back to doing their work.

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH HAZARDS SUPERFUND RESEARCH CENTER

SUMMARY

There is limited understanding of the effects of exposure to metals on human reproductive health. The proposed Northwestern University Reproductive Health Hazards Superfund Research Center was designed to investigate the effects of metal contaminants on reproductive function in DePue, Illinois and in Northwestern University laboratories.

In the village of DePue, which was designated a Superfund site in 1999, the Center would investigate the longitudinal risk of heavy metal contamination on human reproductive health and track how such contaminants are dispersed through the food chain and microbial environments. Additionally, the Center would work with the village of DePue to educate the local community and translate new knowledge into policy changes to improve public health.

At Northwestern University laboratories, Center researchers would also investigate the impact of metals on gamete (egg and sperm) function and reproductive health. Additionally, the team would develop new assays to assess the reproductive health risks of heavy metals and mitigation strategies for metal removal and environmental remediation. The knowledge gained by the Center would be applicable to the village of DePue, Superfund sites, and other contaminated sites across the United States.

HISTORY

Our team initially applied to the Superfund Research Program, a joint program of the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences and the National Institutes of Health, in the spring of 2012. In the fall of 2012, we were awarded a positive score with a good chance or receiving funding in response to our application, and we were asked to supply a letter of information responding to the limited criticisms from the peer review.

In March 2013, we were offered an option informally to receive funding at a reduced amount for a reduced time period since our application was well reviewed and deemed meritorious but available funding was limited. We elected to accept this funding rather than resubmit and provided approximately 80 pages of revised budgets and supporting materials toward this option. That material was well-received, but two weeks prior to the annual resubmission deadline, it was suggested that we also resubmit our original application with revisions because the informally offered funding was in jeopardy due to sequestration and rescission. Even on this limited time-frame we managed to resubmit our application. Despite the continued confidence of the NIH program officers that the reduced grant would be funded as of July or August, in May we were formally informed that it would not be. It is important to note that the NIH receives funding for Superfund Research through the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee rather than the standard Labor/HHS/Education Appropriations Subcommittee, which funds the majority of the NIH budget. We are now awaiting review of the resubmitted grant proposal in November and hope to obtain funding in April 2014.

Sequestration, and the unpredictable nature of funding during this time, has not only delayed the creation of a critical research program but has consumed hundreds of man hours for the research team at Northwestern University.

CONTACT INFORMATION

Kate Timmerman, PhD, Program Director, Oncofertility Consortium, Northwestern University.

Teresa K. Woodruff, PhD, Vice Chair for Research, Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology; Director, Oncofertility Consortium, Northwestern University.

FEDERAL AGRICULTURE REFORM AND RISK MANAGEMENT ACT OF 2013

SPEECH OF

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 2013

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration 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:

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Chair, as we finish debate on the House farm bill, I can't help but remember when as a young fifteen-year-old I was riveted as America debated these very same issues but with oh such a different outcome. I remember the Senate field hearings in 1967 where our elected leaders highlighted the need for government to protect our most vulnerable. There were those in Congress then who would have had us believe there was nothing we could do. But fortunately Robert Kennedy's trip to the Mississippi Delta changed America forever.

As a country, Kennedy helped us to see poverty firsthand. Innocent children with distended stomachs, who hadn't eaten in days. Their mothers unsure where their next meal would come from. It raised our awareness of and concern for our fellow citizens.

Yet here we are more than 40 years later, and once again we are being presented with those same false choices. The House majority would have you believe we have no choice but to make draconian cuts to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (or SNAP), a program that we know has worked in reducing significantly malnutrition in America.

SNAP has been a critical safety net for millions of families who need help putting food on the table. Nearly half of the 46 million low-income participants are children, and a significant portion of adult participants are employed but simply do not earn enough to support their family.

SNAP provides more than \$1.2 billion in benefits a month to more than 786,000 Virginians. In my district, more than 6,000 households receive SNAP benefits. Sixty percent of those families have children under the age of 18. One-third of these families live below the poverty line despite the fact that 45% have one family member working and 42% have at least two family members working.

Simply put, SNAP prevents hunger in the wealthiest nation on earth. Sadly, the House majority's bill will cut SNAP by \$21 billion, forcing more than 2 million people off this program and causing more than 210,000 children to lose eligibility for free or reduced school meals.

Beyond the human face of hunger, a tragic irony is lost within this policy debate. The very people who routinely call on this body to limit government and rein in spending are today asking for government handouts in the form of crop subsidies and insurance payments.

They want the American taxpayer to cover their risks while telling those at risk of hunger that they are on their own. A bold faced Darwinian philosophy except, of course, when it involves them.