

But here we go again. The Republicans show that they aren't listening and that they don't really care about protecting the middle class. Today, Republicans are going to spend their time in Washington helping speculators, speculators inflate gas prices and food prices, making sure that oil companies keep getting unnecessary tax breaks.

The Agriculture appropriations bill to be considered today by the House is just another part of the Republican agenda to reward millionaires while leaving everybody else behind.

Tucked away in the end of the appropriations bill we'll consider today is a provision that would cut money for the Commodity Futures Trading Commission. Now what is the Commodity Futures Trading Commission? It's a cop on the beat. It's a cop on the beat whose job it is to make sure that the speculators don't drive up the price of commodities like gasoline, like food, like wheat, things like that.

And at a time when the middle class is being squeezed by high gas prices, this is the wrong time to side with the millionaires and billionaires and against the American people.

#### TRICKLE-DOWN ECONOMICS DOES NOT WORK

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the 90th anniversary of White Castle, the 25-cent hamburger I used to remember, it came in that little cardboard box. You could buy four of them for a dollar. The price has gone up now, but I've got a feeling if this Congress continues to do business like it has, we will be eating about two of those little, small hamburgers, for dinner every single day.

What they want to do, ladies and gentlemen, on the Republican side is to cut Medicare and gut Medicaid and do everything they can to take care of their wealthy patrons with another round of tax cuts. It's like a drunken binge that they have been on with these tax cuts.

Trickle-down economics, ladies and gentlemen, does not work. It has not trickled down. And, in fact, it has closed off to where all of the money stays up top. It never trickles down to the bottom. We have got to change that.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, June 14, 2011.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,  
*The Speaker, U.S. Capitol, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of

the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on June 14, 2011 at 10:38 a.m.:

Appointments:  
Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group.

With best wishes, I am  
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,  
*Clerk.*

#### CONTINUATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO BELARUS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 112-35)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency and related measures blocking the property of certain persons undermining democratic processes or institutions in Belarus are to continue in effect beyond June 16, 2011.

The flawed December 2010 Presidential election in Belarus and its aftermath—the harsh violence against peaceful demonstrators; the continuing detention, prosecution, and imprisonment of opposition Presidential candidates and others; and the continuing repression of independent media and civil society activists—all show that the Government of Belarus has taken steps backward in the development of democratic governance and respect for human rights. The actions and policies of the Government of Belarus and other persons to undermine Belarus democratic processes or institutions, to commit human rights abuses related to political repression, and to engage in public corruption pose a continuing unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared to deal with this threat and the related measures blocking the property of certain persons.

BARACK OBAMA,  
THE WHITE HOUSE, June 14, 2011.

#### APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276h, and the order of

the House of January 5, 2011, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group:

Mr. MACK, Florida  
Mr. NUNES, California  
Mr. BILBRAY, California  
Mr. CANSECO, Texas

#### AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2021, JOBS AND ENERGY PERMITTING ACT OF 2011

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules may meet the week of June 20 to grant a rule that could limit the amendment process for floor consideration of H.R. 2021, the Jobs and Energy Permitting Act of 2011.

Any Member wishing to offer an amendment must submit an electronic copy of the amendment and description via the committee's Web site. Members must also submit 30 hard copies of the amendment, one copy of a brief explanation of the amendment, and an amendment log-in form to the Rules Committee in room H-312 of the Capitol by 5 p.m. on Monday, June 20, 2011. Both electronic and hard copies must be received by the date and time specified.

Members should draft their amendments to the text of the bill as ordered reported by the Committee on Energy and Commerce which is available on the Rules Committee Web site.

Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments are drafted in the most appropriate format. Members should also check with the Office of the Parliamentarian, the Committee on the Budget, and the Congressional Budget Office to be certain their amendments comply with the rules of the House and the Congressional Budget Act. If anyone has questions, they are asked to please contact the Committee on Rules.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2112, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 300 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 300

*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 consideration of the bill (H.R. 2112) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and

Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived except for sections 740, 741, 743, and 744. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the chair of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 1 hour.

□ 1230

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (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

Ms. FOXX. 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 300 provides for an open rule providing for consideration of H.R. 2112, a bill which makes appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans have offered yet another open rule on this legislation, something we did not see when Democrats were in the majority for 4 years. House Republicans are keeping their promise to the American people by submitting a bill that contains no earmarks. House Republicans are keeping their promise to reduce spending and rein in the Federal deficit which threatens our very existence as a free country. This bill addresses many of the glaring inefficiencies of Washington by reducing wasteful and redundant programs.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bill that, under the control of the liberal Democrats, kept growing and growing. In fiscal year 2008, this same bill had a price tag

of \$90.8 billion. One year later, fiscal year 2009, the liberal Democrats increased spending by 14 percent to \$103.3 billion. And for fiscal year 2010, yet another liberal hike in the cost of appropriations to the taxpayer to the tune of \$125 billion, representing a whopping 21 percent increase in spending.

The liberals claim that any cuts in spending for any program covered by this bill drives more people into hunger. Strange that they did not say that last year when these very same liberal Democrats cut \$562 million from WIC so that they could spend it in unrelated matters. That is only one example of the lack of leadership, courtesy of our friends across the aisle.

Lest we forget, it was their failed policies that ruined the economy when they were in charge of the power of the purse. Their habitual and unending spending increases have not helped the economy as they had promised but, rather, have saddled our children and grandchildren with outrageous debt to pay off.

With better fiscal stewardship, our economy would be stronger and our country's job creators would be able to provide the jobs that our Nation's workforce is hungry for. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, in January 2007—the month that the Democrats took over Congress—unemployment was at 4.6 percent. Mr. Speaker, let me repeat that. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, in January 2007, the month the Democrats took over Congress, with a Republican President, unemployment was at 4.6 percent. That number has nearly doubled under the eyes of the liberal Democrats and the Obama administration. Last year, the Democrats failed to pass a budget or any appropriations bill. There has been a complete lack of leadership on their side of the aisle and at the White House.

While it got very little publicity from the lame stream media, the Senate this year overwhelmingly rejected President Obama's budget proposal on a unanimous vote of 97-0; unanimous opposition to the President's budget and nothing said about it in the press. The Republican House budget that we sent to the Senate fared much better than the President's budget. Again, Mr. Speaker, we've seen nothing but a lack of leadership from the administration and the liberal Democrats in Congress.

The bottom line is that if we do not make sound and responsible fiscal decisions that focus on reducing spending and making the government leaner and more efficient, we risk forfeiting control of our own purse to debtor nations. The simple truth is that we are currently borrowing 43 cents for every dollar spent at the Federal level. To have foreign nations provide funds for so much of what our country spends is simply negligent and irresponsible. Even the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Mike Mullen, has stated that the national debt is the single biggest threat to our national security.

Taxpayers will be paying around \$600 billion in interest on the national debt by 2012. To put that figure in perspective, Mr. Speaker, the fiscal year 2011 defense budget is \$685 billion. In order to grow the economy and provide an environment in which Americans can prosper, we need to end expensive and ineffective government programs and remove the barriers of uncertainty that prevent employers from hiring.

Many liberal elites are calling for higher taxes—higher taxes, Mr. Speaker—on hardworking Americans in order to pay for their irresponsible spending and fiscal decisions. The Democrat plan is to continue to borrow, spend, and tax, taking money out of the pockets of hardworking Americans.

A clear difference between liberal Democrats and Republicans is that Republicans do not claim ownership of the salaries of hardworking Americans and businesses that create jobs. Elite Democrats believe that they are entitled to take money from Americans and small businesses in order to carry out their liberal agenda, and job creators are left with whatever the liberal elites deem is necessary for them. You cannot help the job seeker by punishing the job creator with higher taxes and more government red tape.

Mr. Speaker, American businesses need a clear perspective of what the future holds in order to create American jobs and strengthen our economy. The uncertainty and mixed messages that the Obama administration provide are completely counterproductive to achieving any kind of economic prosperity.

President Obama's economic policies have consisted of bullying businesses to help union allies, such as the case in South Carolina where the NLRB is telling a private company where to do business for the benefit of Big Labor bosses at the expense of 1,000 jobs in South Carolina.

When Americans needed a jobs agenda, President Obama and the elite Democrat-controlled Congress gave them a spending agenda. From the President's first day in office in January 2009 through April 30, 2011, the economy has lost 2.5 million jobs, an average of 3,044 jobs lost every day. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, 150,000 new jobs are needed to be created each month just to keep up with population growth. The economy is not growing fast enough or strong enough to employ the 13.7 million Americans looking for work.

But the liberal elites seem content on sitting back and watching agencies expand the bureaucracy by coming out with an unending stream of job-killing regulations. This in no way helps create confidence in American business, jobs, or economic prosperity. The Democrat elites, indeed, have made history. The result of their liberal agenda has been trillion-dollar deficits, historic debt, and historic unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, we must empower America's job creators, small businesses, families, and entrepreneurs to

lead us to real job growth. More wasteful Washington spending isn't the solution. That's why Republicans propose saving Americans over \$800 billion worth of tax increases by repealing ObamaCare and by adopting the appropriations bills that we are proposing now.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for yielding the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, before I get into my statement, I just, for the record, would like to point out to the gentlelady that, in response to her very political and partisan remarks, I want to remind her that George Bush came into office in 2000. Republicans were in charge of both the House and the Senate until 2006. And so if you want to point fingers at why this economy is in a ditch, I would suggest that my Republican friends look in the mirror.

Mr. Speaker, budgets are moral documents. Budgets lay out our priorities and document what we think is important for our country to succeed and our citizens to thrive. A few months ago, this Republican-controlled House made a statement by passing the Ryan budget. With that vote, most Republicans showed that they want to end Medicare as we know it. But their budget did more than just undermine Medicare; it set the stage for the appropriations process.

□ 1240

So here we are today to begin the consideration of the FY 2012 Agriculture appropriations bill. This bill, while not as high-profile as some others, is one, I believe, to be of critical importance to our Nation and to the world. It funds many of the programs that keep our Nation and many parts of the world from going hungry. It deals with the most helpless people, the most vulnerable people, in our country and in the world. It protects the food supply so that our children and families don't have to worry about contaminated food, and it provides important funds for rural America, including critical funds for broadband Internet access and other rural development programs.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is important in many, many ways; but like the Ryan budget, the FY 2012 Agriculture appropriations bill, as written by the Republicans, is just plain wrong. This allocation is unworkable. So, quite frankly, I don't care if you have an open rule or a super-duper open rule or a quadruple bypass rule. It doesn't make any difference because this bill, as written, is unfixable. The only way to help programs that they cut that feed hungry people is to cut from other programs that feed hungry people, so there is no way to make this bill better. The bill, as written, in my opinion, is morally indefensible. Instead of making invest-

ments in our Nation's agriculture and anti-hunger programs, this bill slashes funds for WIC, CSFP, TEFAP, P.L. 480, and the Food Safety Programs.

And those aren't just meaningless acronyms.

WIC is the Women, Infants and Children Program. Funds for WIC provide food and nutrition education to pregnant women, newborn children and kids up to 5 years of age. CSFP is the Commodity Supplemental Food Program, and it helps put food on the tables of America's senior citizens. TEFAP is The Emergency Food Assistance Program, and it provides assistance to food banks that are struggling with decreased donations and increased demand during these difficult times. P.L. 480 is a program that helps provide American-grown food to hungry and impoverished people in developing nations around the world. It's known as Food for Peace. The Food Safety Programs protect our citizens from foodborne bacteria like E.coli and salmonella.

Taken together, cuts in domestic anti-hunger programs total more than \$500 million. Add in the cuts to P.L. 480 and the McGovern-Dole School Feeding Program, and the cuts add up to well over \$1 billion to programs, again, that provide food to hungry people here at home and around the world.

As written, this is a pro-hunger bill. There is no other way to say it. No matter what anyone says, this bill will increase hunger here at home and around the world. A vote for this bill is a vote to willfully allow people in America and around the world to go without food. A vote for this bill is to take food from children and seniors, to allow food banks to open with half full and empty shelves. These aren't just freezes in current spending. A freeze in current spending would be bad enough with the continued rising demand and rising food prices that people are facing here at home and around the world. That would be bad enough. No. These are real cuts that do real damage to real people. The only thing crueler than ignoring a hungry person is giving a hungry person food and then taking it away.

No one would condone that, Mr. Speaker. Yet that's what this bill does. We're not just talking about that tired, old stereotype of the welfare queen gaming the system. No, Mr. Speaker.

The bill we're talking about are people who play by the rules but who are struggling to make ends meet because of the difficult economy. We are seeing middle-income families who are now turning to food banks and food pantries. In times of need, we are supposed to help our brothers and sisters in need. That's what a community is about. That's what our country is supposed to be about. Yet this bill does not do that. Instead, it cruelly targets those who are hurting at no fault of their own.

Yes, we are facing tough, difficult economic times. Yes, we need to ad-

dress the budget deficit. But what kind of Nation are we if we choose to balance our deficit on the backs of the poor and the hungry? What kind of Congress are we if we choose to cut the programs that protect our seniors and our children in favor of protecting gas, oil and farm subsidies? I want my colleagues to understand that those subsidies, those examples of corporate welfare, are all protected and have been protected by this new majority since they took office. What kind of people are we if we stand idly by and allow our children to go hungry? Nations go to war over food riots. We all watched with great interest what unfolded in Egypt with the protests and the demand of democracy and freedom, but they were also demanding food. They were also rioting over the lack of food that people had in Egypt.

This is especially tragic because it kind of demonstrates where the new majority's priorities are. One of the first things they insisted on was that we protect the Bush tax cuts for the wealthiest people in this country. Donald Trump got his tax cut protected, and we didn't have to offset that even though it's costing a great deal to our deficit and our debt. They didn't offset it. They just wanted to protect it and have all the corporate welfare protected. So now they bring a bill to the floor, and they say, Well, we have to make tough choices. We have to make tough decisions.

The tough decisions and tough choices they make are to cut the WIC Program. 300,000 people will be thrown off of WIC. That's not tough on anybody here in the United States House of Representatives—we're all fine—but it's tough on a lot of low-income pregnant mothers and their children all around this country. We can do better than that. Congress needs to do better than that, and this Nation should do better than that.

This bill follows in the grand tradition of the Ryan budget. Like the Ryan budget, it does great damage to the American people. Like the Ryan budget, it breaks our Nation's great promise to protect our Nation's citizens. Like the Ryan budget, in my opinion, this is morally indefensible.

I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this bill. I urge my Republican colleagues: Don't do this. Don't do this. Don't try to balance the budget on the backs of the most helpless people in our country and around the world.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am always having to help balance out the comments that my good colleague from Massachusetts is making. He criticizes Republicans for keeping tax cuts. Well, I have to explain to him his President, a Democrat, supported that. Most Democrats here supported that last year. We didn't keep tax cuts. We stopped tax increases. Even the President and his

people have a little sense about economics in that, if you raise taxes in the middle of a terrible economic situation, you create problems.

I would also like to point out to my friend from Massachusetts that they were in charge for 4 years. It was during those 4 years that we got into the mess that we got into. They controlled both Houses of Congress, and they controlled the Presidency for 2 years of that. Yet they didn't stop any of these things that they had talked about.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Will the gentlelady yield?

Ms. FOXX. I will when I have completed my comments. I appreciate that.

He refers to this legislation as the "pro-hunger bill." This tired claim by our liberal friends that Republicans are intent on starving children really goes beyond clichés now.

Putting that aside, my friend from Massachusetts needs to understand, if he really cares about the funding for Federal food programs, he should vote for the underlying bill. Why? Because it provides \$6 billion for the WIC Program. Let me point out again that, last year, my colleague from across the aisle voted to cut the WIC Program, for a totally unrelated program, of over \$500 million, \$68.2 billion for food stamps, \$180 million for the McGovern-Dole food program, and \$18.8 billion for the Child Nutrition Program.

□ 1250

Perhaps these aren't the funding levels he would like to see, but I think my colleague knows that legislating is the art of compromise, and there are plenty of Members who would like to see deeper cuts to further enhance efficiencies in this program.

The bottom line is that by voting against this bill, using his logic, Mr. MCGOVERN is actually voting to starve the children and to create more hunger by denying over \$93 billion in overall Federal food assistance to the hungry people that he claims to support. In contrast, by voting for the underlying bill, he is voting to provide the funding he argues these programs so desperately need.

Let me do a recap of what is in this bill, Mr. Speaker. Seventy-seven percent of the bill is SNAP, that is food stamps, child nutrition and WIC. Child nutrition programs will receive \$18.8 billion in mandatory funding this year. That is funding that is on autopilot. This covers 68 percent of all school lunches and 85.5 percent of all school breakfasts, either free or at a reduced rate.

The SNAP, or food stamp program, \$68.2 billion, provides support to 45 million people. Mr. Speaker, it is unconscionable that we have 45 million people in this country getting food stamps. That is a result of the policies of our Democratic friends across the aisle. Again, WIC, \$6 billion; CAP, \$136 million; the McGovern-Dole International Food for Education, Child Nutrition grants, \$180 million. There is a

lot that the liberals can be grateful for in this program.

I would yield to a question from Mr. MCGOVERN, if he has a question to ask me.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I would just simply say to the gentlelady that, again, I would reiterate my view that this bill is morally indefensible the way it is written.

The gentlelady talks about WIC. Under the cuts in this bill, and I say conservatively, between 200,000 and 350,000 low income women and children will be thrown off of WIC. You mention the McGovern-Dole school feeding program. The monies you cut in that program would mean that we would serve 5 million less children.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the gentleman will have plenty of time under his time to make the comments that he wants to make. I was more than willing to answer a question, but he will have time to make those comments when it is his turn.

I would now like to yield 3 minutes to my colleague from Indiana (Mr. STUTZMAN).

Mr. STUTZMAN. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I find it very interesting in listening to the discussion here today about whose responsibility it is to feed those who are hungry. I don't think anybody on this floor would say that we don't want to help someone who is in need of food or basic essential services. I think what this is is a discussion about the difference in philosophy in Washington about the role of government in Washington.

There is plenty of blame to go around for all of the spending that has come out of Washington over the last decade—the last 30 years, actually. What we are doing is we are sinking our Nation and our children, the children that we are talking about and whom we want to help and feed. We are actually giving them over \$40,000 of debt. Each child that is born in this country is saddled with \$40,000 of debt because of government spending that continues to grow more and more every year.

I can tell you as an American farmer in Indiana that myself and many other American farmers and individuals are much better suited to help those who are in most need, in helping in the community, donating food, being a part of a food pantry. We are a generous Nation, and what has become of our ability to help is that we have a Federal Government that continues to saddle us with more and more debt, more and more taxes and regulation, making it much more difficult to make the profits with which we can then turn around and help our communities with food, with the basic services that our churches, our charities and many other organizations in our local communities provide.

Instead of us always looking to the government for that assistance, let's back off of the American people and let

them help themselves, when they are capable and when they are willing to do it, rather than continuing to put them further and further into debt.

The Democrat Party talks about, Where are the jobs? Well, government doesn't provide jobs. Indeed, the private sector, people in our communities, entrepreneurs, people that want to expand their businesses to provide a job for that family that needs to provide for their children, they need the job, and there is not going to be enough government jobs to give them that opportunity. Instead, every time we take dollars away from the private sector, that individual who is out working hard, working 50 to 60 hours a week just trying to make ends meet, we are putting them in a very difficult position where they are not able to pay the bills because we continue to make it much more difficult for businesses to be successful here.

Small businesses are the backbone of this country, and until Washington, DC, backs off, the American economy is going to continue to struggle and families are going to continue to struggle.

I believe that this is a responsible bill that will instead help the American economy to grow and help Americans.

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

Let me assure the gentleman from Indiana that churches and faith-based organizations all across this country are doing their share. They are doing more than their share. Many of them, representing every faith denomination in this country, are up on the Hill today saying, We need you, those of you in Congress, to do your part, because this is not just a problem for charities to deal with. We all have to be involved in dealing with this issue of poverty and dealing with the issue of hunger in America and around the world.

Let me say to my colleague from North Carolina, I will match my antihunger credentials against hers 7 days a week. But in this bill that has been brought before us, the cuts in WIC would end food assistance for 200,000 to 350,000 low-income women and children. That is a conservative estimate.

She mentioned Food for Peace, how grateful we should be that they are throwing some scraps at the problem of international hunger. In this bill, there is a 39 percent decrease in Food for Peace title II funding, and it will put millions of lives at risk and undermine the ability of USAID to prevent famine. Food aid provided by USAID is a lifesaving measure for millions of vulnerable people overseas. According to USAID, these brutal cuts will mean up to 16 million people, mainly women and children, will not receive the lifesaving food aid.

The gentlelady mentions the McGovern-Dole program, which is near and dear to my heart. The McGovern-Dole program serves about 5 million people,

5 million children, children, in 28 countries. The \$20 million cut to McGovern-Dole will end school meals for over 400,000 children in the world's poorest countries. We are literally, literally, taking food out of the mouths of these children. Imagine how that would make you feel if it were your child.

So I say to the gentlelady and to the gentleman who just spoke, this is not a jobs bill that we are bringing to the floor here today. Unfortunately, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle don't want to bring a jobs bill to the floor. They are too busy trying to undermine or underfund funding for National Public Radio instead of dealing with more important issues.

But this bill deals with the reality, and I don't care who you want to blame for it, that there are tens of millions of our own citizens who are hungry in the United States of America, the richest country on the face of this Earth, and we have a choice to either try to help them out during this difficult time or to turn our backs. And the way this bill is funded, we turn our backs on millions of our fellow citizens.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I am always very reluctant to talk about personal experiences on the floor, but I want to tell my colleague across the aisle that I grew up probably poorer than anybody in this body.

□ 1300

And I know something about what it means to struggle to get food. I know what that's all about. And let me tell you, there's nobody here who feels more strongly that more Federal Government involvement in this is not the right way to go. What we need is to be able to develop policies that allow people to get a job so they can provide for themselves instead of being dependent on the Federal Government to provide for them.

Let me talk about my colleague says budgets are moral documents. Again, my colleague and I don't agree on a lot of issues when it comes to policies, but we certainly agree on that: budgets are moral documents. And what the Republicans have done with the budget that we passed here in this body this year is to say to the American people, We understand that budgets are moral documents. We passed a budget. The Democrats didn't even pass a budget last year. So they didn't want to face up to it.

I don't know what that says about their morality, but I know what it says about Republicans' morality. We have a strong sense of morality. We passed a budget. We're being honest with the American people. We're telling them, You cannot continue to spend above your means. The average person understands that. And we are going to continue to be honest with the American people. We're going to cut inefficient government programs wherever we can.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that right now, if you are a 3-year-old child in

this country, there are 12 Federal feeding programs to serve you. If you're a 10-year-old, there are nine Federal feeding programs. If you're 65 years old, there are five Federal feeding programs. We do not lack for programs to help take care of the hungry people in this country, Mr. Speaker.

What we lack is efficiency in our programs. And Republicans are going to do all that we can to make sure that we bring efficiency and effectiveness to whatever programs are funded here.

I now yield 3 minutes to my colleague from Georgia (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I just want to take the opportunity to address this because there is one issue facing this Nation right now that is far greater than what we're even discussing at this point and that is jobs and the lack of jobs in this Nation as a result of 2 failed years of an experiment that just didn't work.

Now, we can talk about spending all we want. We're going to talk about that, I know, for the next day or two and over the next couple of weeks. The American people just expect us to deal with cutting spending here in the Federal Government. They just sent us here and they said, Just take care of your job. Get it done. Spend within your means. Don't spend more than you get. And take care of your job. At the same time, understand what's happening back home on Main Street.

I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, as I go home each and every week and I see the devastation that's occurring all across all the communities in my district, it is amazing to see the "For Sale" signs and "For Rent" signs that just pop up each and every week that are anew because of a failed experiment that has occurred here.

So we heard the gentleman a minute ago say the Republicans have no plan. Let's talk about their plan and how effective it has been with, what, we've had 2 years now of at or above 9 percent unemployment, 15 million Americans looking for a job, deficit spending now going on \$1 trillion for 3 consecutive years. And yet we are on the eve of the week here in which we're going to celebrate President Barack Obama's claim of the "summer of recovery," the 1-year anniversary of that claim.

I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, there has been no recovery as a result of the policies passed by this administration. We must take a different direction. It starts here by cutting spending. It starts by reducing the size of government. And the reason is very simple. Because the less the government has in its pocket, the less it's spending, there is more left for the American people. And when the American people have more money in their pockets, they have the ability to expand their businesses, they have the ability to dream an idea, have a great idea, go out and invest in that idea. They have the ability to hire new employees. They have the ability to invest in new capital.

But, instead, this Congress over the last couple of years has hoarded that

wealth, kept it here in Washington, divvied it out to the winners that they choose just through their own pickings here. Who's going to get the money of the American people? They dole it out left and right. Yet today, when we're looking at giving it back to the American people, the other side stands against it once again.

Mr. Speaker, it's time to get Americans back to work. We don't do that through the expansion of the public sector. We do it through the expansion of the private sector. Let's empower the American people and take some power away from the Federal Government.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds.

I just want to correct the record. The gentlelady suggests that people should go get a job, and that's the answer to the hunger crisis. A lot of the people, by the way, who qualify for these programs are working families. They're the working poor. So we all need to get serious about the economy. I would encourage you to work with us on a jobs bill rather than on your right-wing radical social agenda that keeps on coming to the floor.

At this point I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Thank you very much, Mr. MCGOVERN, for your leadership on this very important issue. To my colleague, the distinguished Congresswoman who is managing for my friends on the other side of the aisle, there are probably many of us who have lived the American story and began life on the rocky side of the mountain.

I rise because I happen to come from a district where my predecessor died on the side of an Ethiopian mountain. It's a far, far place away from Houston. My predecessor was Congressman Mickey Leland. He was so driven by the vastness of hunger, he was so much a soldier of Robert Kennedy's message that he didn't allow danger to thwart him from trying to help people who were literally dying. And so he was carrying grain. And he had colleagues who were not on that flight, Tony Hall and Congressman Emerson. And I would say to you that it really gets me in my heart, what we're doing today, because my predecessor, a Member of Congress, and we're described by many terms, but he felt that hunger was so severe that he helped found the Select Committee on Hunger. We have the Mickey Leland Hunger Center because hunger was prevailing in America and around the world.

So you can understand why I stand here today and tell you that it's not good enough to feed 85 percent of the hungry children so that 15 percent of them don't get breakfasts and don't get lunches. That's not something to give you a halo for or to give you an accolade. Because so many of us understand

how stretching that peanut butter or stretching that soup or stretching minimal food, so many of us have either heard those stories or experienced it.

And in this bill, \$2 billion is cut from food stamps. Do you realize that our soldiers and their families, young recruits, are on food stamps? Does anyone know the population that is on food stamps? Now, we've tried to make it better for them, but many of them are on food stamps. To cut the WIC program, you're impacting children who are innocent. And then, of course, Food for Peace is not a throwaway. It is to simply stop the folks who are simply dying in deserts around the world.

And \$35 million has been cut from trying to increase the number of grocery stores in urban centers and rural areas, to a certain extent, where there are no grocery stores where people can actually get fresh food. Try coming to my district and shopping for groceries in the local, down-the-street 2 by 4 store, where food dates, which I have actually seen for myself, are years old and sitting on the counter where people who only have foot transportation have to go and buy beans that are dated a year before or tuna that is dated a year before.

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

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I tried to buy tuna as a test case, and I had to put it back on the shelf of a little 2 by 4 in neighborhoods where people walk.

Be reminded that Calvin Coolidge, a Republican President, followed in the 1920s the same pattern, which is: give to the rich and let the poor die on the vine. He didn't run again because he knew there was a collapse coming. His fellow Republican elected said, Give to the rich. And we had the 1928 collapse. We're talking about where consumers and businesses are not buying or having business, we the government must invest. And I believe, in the name of Mickey Leland, we've got to do a better job of feeding the hungry.

□ 1310

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague from Massachusetts talking about right-wing radicals because I associate myself with George Washington, James Madison, and Thomas Jefferson, who were right-wing radicals, along with the other Founders.

I would now like to yield 3 minutes to my distinguished colleague from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS).

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to focus on what this bill does and what it does not do.

First of all, it increases spending because mandatory programs are growing. The mandatory programs, like SNAP and Child Nutrition, are growing so rapidly that they exceed the cuts in the discretionary programs in this bill. So while my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are talking about the

dreadful calamity associated with the cuts in this bill, the fact of the matter is food programs get more money under this bill, and that's because they are mandatory programs. The committee has no control over them. The only thing we have control over are the discretionary programs.

SNAP is projected to grow almost \$6 billion, and Child Nutrition is projected to cost an additional \$1.45 billion. Now, those and other mandatory spending add up to an additional \$282 million over the costs of fiscal year 2012. So to call this a cut is not acknowledging the additional spending that is mandatory and that is in the SNAP program and the Child Nutrition Program.

Now, we, as Members of Congress, who are facing 1.2, 1.3 trillion more dollars in spending every year than we take in and are racking up 14, soon to be more, trillion dollars in debt, this year we have now exceeded, in our national debt, the entire GDP of this country for 1 year.

We cannot go on like this. We're destroying the country with spending. That's the moral imperative that we're discussing today.

Consequently, let's keep our eye on the ball. We're not destroying spending for people in need. We're actually increasing it, \$6 billion for SNAP and almost \$1.5 billion for Child Nutrition. We've saved it in other areas. The Agriculture Committee's budget includes a variety of priorities, including traditional agriculture spending like research, animal and plant health and conservation, nutrition, food aid and safety, rural development, the Food and Drug Administration, and the Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

Spreading funding across this spectrum is a balancing act, and I would like to thank Chairman KINGSTON for his leadership on this bill.

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

Listening to the gentlelady from Wyoming, one would get the impression that there are no other choices but to cut programs that help the poorest of the poor.

There are lots of places we could find savings. We could begin by paying for the Bush tax cuts for the Donald Trumps of the world. We could maybe pay for these wars, or, better yet, how about ending these wars? We borrow billions and billions of dollars every week for the wars, and no one around here seems to want to pay for it. We could maybe take back some of the taxpayer subsidies to the Big Oil companies. I don't know why we're subsidizing oil companies. Or, better yet, maybe some of the generous agricultural subsidies that go to a lot of places in Wyoming, I haven't heard the gentlelady suggest that maybe we cut those subsidies.

Instead, all the focus is on the most helpless people in our country. And it is just wrong. It is wrong. Don't do this. We can do this better.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), a great leader on this issue.

Ms. DELAURO. I rise in opposition to this misguided rule.

It unravels the bipartisan work of our Appropriations Committee. It calls for even more drastic cuts to the Women, Infants, and Children food program than has already been suggested by the majority. In so doing, the rule puts the interests of Brazilian cotton farmers above the very real needs of American women and children.

Everyone knows the WIC program provides nutrition assistance grants to States for low-income pregnant, breast-feeding, and postpartum women, infants, and children up to the age of 5. It serves 9 million mothers and young children nationwide, including 58,000 in my State of Connecticut. Nearly half of the babies born in the United States every year participate in the program. It is a short-term intervention that can help provide a lifetime of good nutrition and health behaviors.

Even notwithstanding this rule, this appropriation bill already threatens to slash WIC funding by \$650 million. WIC is being slashed by \$650 million. That means as many as up to 300,000 women and children will be turned away and forced to go hungry. In fact, Secretary Vilsack, the Secretary of the Agriculture Department, has warned our subcommittee that this number could be as high as 750,000 people, and I have his letter and his quote to confirm that.

Now, understand that during the committee consideration of this, I had an amendment to restore \$147 million to the WIC program. I paid for it by taking \$147 million which we currently provide to Brazilian cotton farmers. That amendment passed with a bipartisan vote.

This majority has no problem spending money for Brazilian cotton farmers, but they are loathe to do something for women and children in the United States. What this rule by this Republican majority has done is they took away this \$147 million, they gave it back to the cotton farmers in Brazil, and then they have said find \$147 million, cut it from the WIC program or cut it from somewhere else in this bill.

What are we doing here? Whom are they trying to fool? We're going to give the money back to Brazilian cotton farmers. The majority decided that that was more important. That's a fact.

There are many egregious cuts in this appropriation bill, not just to WIC, to the Commodity Supplemental Food Program, which goes to low-income seniors.

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

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

Ms. DELAURO. Thank you.

The Emergency Food Assistance Program, which goes to food banks, food pantries.

One out of five people in the United States today is going hungry, and we can't find it within our purview here to provide the funding to do that.

Again, Democrats and Republicans on the committee voted to take \$147 million, provide it to the WIC funding, take it away from the Brazilian farmers. This Rules Committee, Republican directed, took the money and gave it back to the Brazilian cotton farmers.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, take charge of what we did on our committee. Stand up for American women and children. Reject this rule. This is not what we voted for. This is not what the American people want.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished and eloquent chairman of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

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

□ 1320

Mr. DREIER. It's a tall order that my friend from Grandfather Community has just imposed on me, Mr. Speaker, but I will say it's great to be standing here as we proceed with consideration of the appropriations process. Last year, we for all intents and purposes had no appropriations process. When it was done, we all know it was shut down. We are here today considering the third appropriations bill under an open amendment process.

Now, my friend from Connecticut has just characterized this as a misguided rule. Since 1837, Mr. Speaker, 1837—it's been a few years—we have had within the rules of the House a structure whereby the authorizers have a responsibility and the appropriators have a responsibility. She said that we somehow are unraveling this very, very great and delicate compromise that was put together in the Appropriations Committee.

Ms. DELAURO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. I'm happy to yield to my friend from Connecticut.

Ms. DELAURO. There was a vote in the Appropriations Committee. It was an amendment and the fact of the matter is it was unprotected.

Mr. DREIER. If I could reclaim my time, my next line, Mr. Speaker, was going to be to my friend from Connecticut, there happen to be 435 Members of the United States House of Representatives, and we have a process known as appropriations. We also have an authorization process as well.

Since 1837, the rule that my friends say is misguided, it has been the rule of the House. Mr. Speaker, to call it misguided to comply with the rules of the House, something that our friends in the last two Congresses chose to ignore repeatedly, is outrageous.

Now, as we listen to these reports of hunger that exist in the United States of America, I was just talking to the

distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. KINGSTON, who made it very clear that there may be a stupidity factor, but the fact of the matter is there are so many programs that exist today, as Mr. KINGSTON reported up in the Rules Committee, that people do have an opportunity to benefit from those programs.

We also are dealing with tremendous constraints that have been imposed upon us because of the fact that we saw an 82 percent increase in nondiscretionary spending over the past 4 years, and what it means is, with a \$14 trillion national debt, we have to make some tough choices. We want to make sure—Mr. KINGSTON is working on this, as are the authorizers—we want to make sure that those programs that exist actually do provide an opportunity for three, not four or five, but three meals a day for people who are truly in need.

And my friend from Grandfather Community, Mr. Speaker, pointed to the fact that we need to put into place a program that will encourage job creation and economic growth. For literally years, we've had languishing agreements that would open up new markets around the world in Colombia, Panama, and South Korea. We have not taken action on that. I hope very much that before August we do. That will help create jobs and get people who may have to look to government programs today in a position where they can, in fact, feed themselves.

That's our goal. We want to make sure that everyone has an opportunity, and we want to continue this process allowing Democrats and Republicans alike to be heard.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, a vote for this rule is a vote to cut WIC even further and give it to Brazilian cotton farmers.

At this point, I would like to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Our Republican colleagues have chattered endlessly about making hard choices, but most of the hard choices they make today are hard only on the hungry, hard on hungry children, hard on hungry seniors. They've got tremendous cuts to the Women, Infant, and Children nutritional assistance. It means as many as 350,000 women and infants will be denied assistance, including tens of thousands in my home State of Texas.

They made a hard choice. Instead of putting food on the table for those women and infants, they chose to send \$147 million to Brazilian cotton farmers. I think that's not just a hard choice; it's a very bad choice. Those young children will never achieve their full God-given potential if they arrive at kindergarten malnourished.

Our food banks, are doing a tremendous job. In Texas, they get the support of grocers, of retailers, of private contributors, but they need this emergency food assistance. I've been to those food banks. I've seen some of

those rural food banks in times of economic distress that are bare. The cupboard is bare, and the lines are long to get that assistance. Republicans made a hard choice, hard on the hungry.

The Republicans have finally found that the only bank they don't want to bail out is the food bank. And the food bank needs that assistance. I say that we should reject this bill that takes the most from those who have the least.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 8¾ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from North Carolina has 3 minutes remaining.

Ms. FOXX. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentlewoman for the time.

I want to say to my friends from Texas and Connecticut that, number one, the DeLauro amendment which you alluded to that increases WIC \$147 million is intact, and that increase has gone on. We do have to offset it from another portion of the bill, and the reason is because that Brazilian cotton agreement was a WTO agreement that President Obama agreed to. The money is restored. So if that helps clarify things, and if not, let me know.

I want to just remind everyone, if you want to help hungry people you've got to have the money to do it. Now, both parties have overspent. For every dollar we spend, 40 cents is borrowed. Both parties. Under President Bush, in an 8-year period of time, the debt went up \$3.5 trillion. Now, under President Obama, in a 3-year period of time it's gone up \$5 trillion, a 56 percent increase. And President Obama now owns the wars in Iraq and Libya and Afghanistan in terms of this is his watch. He has had opportunity to change the direction. He has not done so. So let's quit hiding behind, We're at war, and therefore, it's the Republicans' fault.

I also want to remind my friends that the only budget that has passed either House is the Ryan budget, which is what we're operating under. The President of the United States' budget failed on the Senate floor 97-0. He did not even get HARRY REID's vote. So we're operating under the budget constraints that we have.

Let me say this—very important about the WIC program. From February 2010 to February 2011, the number of participants has dropped 300,000. The level now is 8.7 million. We will make sure no one falls through the cracks. There are three contingency funds which can be drawn on if that happens. And I want to point out for all the screaming and hollering and the self-righteousness, last year the Democrats cut WIC by \$562 million and put the money into an unrelated account that had nothing to do with hunger. It was a political settlement. Where was the screaming and hollering then?

And I want to say this in terms of the World Food Program, if we want to

help these countries—and I am committed to it—we have to have our own financial house in order. Otherwise, all we're doing, Mr. Speaker, is borrowing from our children to feed children overseas. That does not make sense.

I appreciate it, and I urge everyone to support the rule.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California, the ranking member on the Appropriations Committee on this subcommittee, Mr. FARR.

Mr. FARR. Thank you, Mr. MCGOVERN, for yielding and I rise with concerns with this rule.

The rule in one part is good because it's an open rule, allows unlimited amendments, but the rule on the second part, which protects the work of the committee, fails to do so. This committee is about food. It's about food production, about food packaging, about food delivery, and about feeding people. It is the largest poverty program in the United States. We have a lot of poor people in this country of all ages, and instead of taking care of those people, this rule eliminates that protection. It protects those that have but not those that have not.

I stand in opposition to the rule.

□ 1330

Ms. FOXX. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this point, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS), a leader on these issues.

Mrs. CAPPS. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule and the Agriculture appropriations bill. Instead of helping Americans hit hardest by the recent recession today, we are debating a Republican spending bill that guts critical nutrition programs which literally put food on the table so that millions of low-income women, children, and seniors don't go hungry. This bill hurts low-income seniors through cuts to the Commodity Supplemental Food Program. It cuts The Emergency Food Assistance Program, which could cause our local food banks to close their doors. And it slashes the budget of the Women, Infants, and Children, WIC, program, the effects of which will leave hundreds of thousands of women and children without adequate nutrition.

WIC not only keeps our low-income families from hunger, but by emphasizing adequate nutrition, the program reduces the incidence of low birth-weight babies, combats the childhood obesity epidemic, and promotes school readiness by giving children the nutritional building blocks their brains need to develop at a critical stage. Moreover, as it links these families to the local health infrastructure, it also increases child immunization rates. These benefits are not just to the child and the family. In fact, the program reduces overall health care costs. For every \$1 invested in WIC, we save about

\$2 to \$3 in health care costs just in the first 2 months of life. This is an incredible feat. It's one that should be expanded. Instead, the bill before us slashes these programs, plain and simple, with only one result: more Americans going hungry.

When I asked my local food safety net providers what the Republican cuts would do to our community, the answer was clear: Without this assistance, which choice will it be: rent or food? My constituents have been loud and clear on this issue, Stop trying to cut the budget on the backs of the poor, the elderly, and our children.

I urge my colleagues to start listening to their communities. Vote "no" on the rule, and vote "no" on this devastating bill.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. Speaker, I have some sympathy for my good friend from Georgia, Congressman KINGSTON. He got dealt a tough hand by a really unpleasant, mean-spirited, unnecessary Republican Budget bill. There are real consequences for moving forward with the Ryan budget. But in a sense, this is the first debate of the 2012 farm bill.

We have a farm policy that spends too much on the wrong people to do the wrong things. There are opportunities for us to rebalance the equities. Now you are hearing some debate about whether or not we should honor a WTO commitment to Brazilian farmers for \$147 million a year. The only reason we're doing this is because Congress, in its wisdom, would not cut back on the cotton subsidies that go to American farmers, that are inappropriate and unnecessary. But instead of changing the system, we're paying Brazilian farmers for our cheating. That's goofy. And I think, at a minimum, we ought to remedy that. Put it into nutrition for poor women and children.

Now I will tell you that all you have to do is ask the hunger advocates in your community. Every Member of Congress has people who are dealing with the problem of hunger and food insecurity in their districts. I commend my friend Mr. MCGOVERN for his leadership in dealing with the issue of hunger at home and abroad. We ought to be dealing with it here and now. This bill that's coming forward ought to rebalance the equities with the cotton subsidies for Brazilian farmers. There are other remedies. But we ought to look at every single amendment that comes to the floor to change the farm bill allocation under appropriations as a first important step towards rebalancing and having a healthy agricultural policy—

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

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. To having an agricultural policy that serves our interests, those of our children, our families; that gives more to farmers and ranchers and less to international farmers and huge agribusiness interests; that doesn't slash environmental support for American farmers but helps us here at home.

There is a better way. There is actually bipartisan support, if we can ever see our way clear to getting it to the floor. This debate this week is an important first step, and I urge my colleagues to vote accordingly. This is a battle we can win on a bipartisan basis.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I would inform my colleague from North Carolina that I have no further requests for time, and I am ready to close.

Ms. FOXX. Then I will continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote "no" on this rule, first and foremost. And there are two reasons to vote "no" on this rule. One is, the allocation that has been given to the Agriculture appropriations bill is so low that it's not fixable. I mean, the concerns that you have heard raised on the floor today about underfunding WIC and underfunding these other programs that feed the hungry and provide nutrition to feed our people, the only way to kind of restore those cuts is by cutting another program that does good things. So this is not even fixable.

The second reason to vote against this rule—and I say this to my Republican colleagues in particular—is because if you vote for this rule, you will allow the Republicans to eliminate an additional \$147 million from the WIC program because they have not protected the provision that was passed in the Appropriations Committee that took the money from Brazilian cotton farmers and gave it to WIC. Because it will not be protected, they will insist on a point of order, which means that that money will go from WIC back to the Brazilian cotton farmers at a time when Brazil's economy is booming. That does not make any sense. As it stands right now, the WIC cuts alone would force 200,000 to 350,000 low-income women and children off their rolls. If you vote for this rule, an additional 200,000 will be thrown off on top of the 200,000 to 350,000. That is just not right.

As I mentioned at the outset, Mr. Speaker, this bill cuts not only WIC but it cuts CSFP, TEFAP moneys, PL-480, and the food safety programs that are so important to the well-being of all of our citizens. Food safety is not just an issue with regard to low-income people. Those people who are earning lots of money are concerned about the safety of their food, and this bill cuts that program quite substantially.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is about helping the most vulnerable in our country and around the world. It doesn't usually receive a lot of attention. There are not a lot of lobbyists down here for



poor people. There are not a lot of PACs out there that support issues that benefit poor people. But in many respects, this is one of the most important appropriations bills that we consider. And I do think it reflects on our values and what kind of country that we want to be. I believe that, given the fact that we're the richest country on this planet, we ought to make sure that nobody in the United States of America goes hungry. I don't know why that's such a radical idea.

And yes, we need to rely, in large part, on the faith-based communities out there that are doing incredible work. They're working overtime, trying to deal with the people who have fallen into poverty as a result of this economic crisis that we're in. They're doing all that they can, so to brush it off onto their backs more is just wrong, and it doesn't represent the reality out there. We need to step up to the plate during these difficult times and help people get through this economic crisis. And if you don't respond, and if you want to ignore those who are struggling, they just don't go away. It results in other problems and other costs to our government and to our people. Hunger is not cheap. There is a price to pay for hunger.

Globally, Mr. Speaker, let me just say that no war in history has killed so many humans and spread so much disease and suffering in any year as world hunger does annually. We have an opportunity to do something about it. We ought to do it. Vote "no" on this rule. Please, I say to my Republican colleagues, don't do this. Don't go down this road. We could do so much better.

**BASIC FACTS ON CUTS TO INTERNATIONAL FOOD AID PROGRAMS IN THE FY 2012 AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS ACT**

Emergency food aid, programs to address chronic hunger, and school feeding programs all receive their funding in this bill—not the foreign aid bill. They are central pillars of U.S. strategy to address global hunger and food security—and making sure they are fully funded is in our national security interest. As Defense Secretary Robert Gates said last year, "Development is a lot cheaper than sending soldiers."

**Food for Peace Title II Funding Cut**

A 39 percent decrease in Food for Peace Title II funding—and will put millions of lives at risk and undermine the ability of USAID to prevent famine.

Food aid provided by USAID is a life-saving measure for millions of vulnerable people overseas. According to USAID, these brutal cuts will mean up to 16 million people, mainly women and children, will not receive life-saving food aid.

The cuts to Food for Peace will mean drastic cuts to our largest emergency food aid programs, including Darfur and southern Sudan, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Haiti and Ethiopia.

U.S. food aid not only helps people survive, it supports U.S. national security interests. It promotes stability and goodwill, especially in Libya, Afghanistan and Pakistan.

Our emergency and humanitarian food aid sends the clear message to desperate people in need: The American people care. This bill sends the opposite message—the American people don't care at all. Go ahead and starve.

U.S. food aid also supports domestic priorities, helping American farmers and the jobs of American millers, truck and rail transportation freight systems, and shipping the commodities abroad on U.S.-flagged ships.

My friends on the other side of the aisle might not have noticed, but the costs of commodities—the cost of purchasing food—have sharply escalated over the past year. This has already reduced USAID's purchasing power and the amount of food aid USAID can ship overseas. And now you're adding draconian cuts on top of the global food crisis.

**McGovern-Dole Funding Cut**

McGovern-Dole was funded at \$200 million in FY 2010, serving about 5 million children in 28 countries.

The \$20 million cut to McGovern-Dole will end school meals for over 400,000 children in the world's poorest countries. We are literally taking food out of the mouths of these children. Imagine how that would make you feel if it were your child?

□ 1340

I yield back the balance of my time. Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I want to point out again what my colleague from Georgia said. It was President Obama's agreement with the WTO that is forcing the funding for the Brazilian farmers. This is not something that Republicans did.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot continue to ignore the facts. With skyrocketing debt and unacceptable unemployment rates, the Federal Government must learn to live within its means and be accountable for how it spends taxpayer money.

House Republicans are continuing to fulfill our pledge to America and keep the promises we made to the American people before the election last November. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this rule.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34, the House-passed budget resolution for fiscal year 2012, I hereby submit revisions to the budget allocations set forth pursuant to the budget for fiscal year 2012. The revision is for new budget authority and outlays reported by the Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Defense, which are designated for the Global War on Terrorism. A corresponding table is attached.

This revision represents an adjustment pursuant to sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended (Budget Act). For the purposes of the Budget Act, these revised allocations are to be considered as allocations included in the budget resolution, pursuant to section 301 of H. Con. Res. 34.

**ALLOCATION OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS**  
(In millions of dollars)

		2012
Discretionary Action .....	BA	1,019,660
	OT	1,224,325
Adjustment for Global War on Terrorism Reported by Subcommittee on Defense .....	BA	118,684
	OT	59,733
Total Discretionary Action .....	BA	1,138,344
	OT	1,284,058
Current Law Mandatory .....	BA	745,700
	OT	734,871

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

The previous question was ordered. 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. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

**MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS AFFAIRS AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, consideration of the bill (H.R. 2055) making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill. The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

**MOTION TO RECOMMIT**

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. OWENS. I am opposed. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows: Mr. Owens moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2055 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 30, line 17, insert before the period at the end the following: "Provided further, That, in addition to the funds made available by Public Law 112-10 for 'Department of Veterans Affairs, Medical Services' for fiscal year 2012, an additional \$20,000,000 is appropriated for such account for advertising of assistance and services for the prevention of suicide among veterans (as authorized by section 532 of title 38, United States Code) for such fiscal year".

Page 35, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$25,000,000)".

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order against the gentleman's motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to offer this final amendment for the benefit of those men and women returning from Iraq and Afghanistan, as well as for veterans of all wars in need of care.

There's been much debate in the House today about hard choices. Our veterans made hard choices, made difficult decisions, and many of them suffer because of that.