

The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities estimates that these cuts would leave 2 million Americans without essential food assistance and cut 200,000 children from the school lunch program.

Food pantries in all corners of my district tell me that they are already struggling to keep up with the need. The Interfaith Food Pantry in Aurora, Illinois, provides food assistance to 750 families each week. Forty percent of those families also get SNAP benefits, which are, unfortunately, insufficient to meet their food needs.

If these SNAP cuts are implemented, more families will be forced to turn to volunteer-run pantries, which are already stretched dangerously thin, and many people will have nowhere to turn.

Madam Speaker, there is a long list of Federal programs for which the benefits are uncertain or for which the benefits are certain to be delivered to narrow groups for which the need is unclear. SNAP is not one of these, and I urge my colleagues to reconsider these drastic cuts.

2013 ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE YOUTH TOUR

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Speaker, today I rise to recognize the more than 1,600 young men and women who have come to our Capitol from across America this week to participate in the 49th annual Electric Cooperative Youth Tour.

These high school juniors and seniors that you see around the Capitol this week are here to get firsthand insights about our Nation's government and its political process and gain a greater understanding of our history. They will meet with their Representatives and Senators and watch Congress in action from the galleries and also visit many memorials and the museums.

I look forward to meeting with the 106 students from the State of Georgia, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

These students coming from the Electric Cooperative Tour are part of a great tradition. In 1957, Texas Senator Lyndon Baines Johnson inspired the youth tour when he addressed the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association meeting in Chicago. The Senator and future President declared:

If one thing comes out of this meeting, it will be sending youngsters to the Nation's capital where they can actually see what the flag stands for and represents.

So every June, for the past 49 years, over 50,000 young citizens and future leaders have put those words into action, and you can see the results of this tradition right here in the Capitol. Several of the groups have spawned congressional aides and elected Representatives themselves.

Back home in Georgia, the chairman of our State House Appropriations

Committee, Terry England, is a prime example of someone who had the desire for public office and ran for elective office when it was fueled as a student when he came up here on the electric co-op tour some 20 years ago.

I congratulate Terry and thousands of others just like him who have engaged in this great tour. And I commend the national Electric Cooperative Youth Tour and thank the Georgia EMCs for all the great work they are doing in developing America's youth.

COMMEMORATING THE LIVES LOST IN THE SHOOTING RAM- PAGE AT SANTA MONICA

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

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, today I rise to commemorate the lives lost in the tragic shooting rampage on the streets of Santa Monica and at Santa Monica College. On June 7, Samir Zawahri, Chris Zawahri, Marcela Franco, Carlos Navarro Franco, and Margarita Gomez lost their lives. We take a moment to honor them, and make a promise that we will remember them.

I want to express my condolences to the victims' families. Your losses are Los Angeles' losses, and we grieve with you.

There were many wounded, and we send our best wishes for a full and speedy recovery.

I also rise to commend the heroic actions of our first responders. Without their fearless response, many more lives could have been lost. We thank these first responders who arrived on the scene and bravely protected us all. Our Nation expresses its gratitude.

We are losing too many of our fellow citizens to gun violence. We must stop this cycle. My colleagues in Congress must come together to enact common-sense reforms, including comprehensive background checks. We must address the mental health needs of our community.

We cannot allow the tragedy that occurred in Santa Monica to be repeated. The lives lost in Santa Monica cannot just be another statistic. They must inspire us to make our community and our Nation safer and more secure for everyone.

□ 0920

FEDERAL AGRICULTURE REFORM AND RISK MANAGEMENT ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CASIDY). Pursuant to House Resolution 271 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1947.

Will the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) kindly resume the chair.

□ 0924

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1947) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes, with Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, June 19, 2013, amendment No. 58, printed in part B of House Report 113-117, offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 98 OFFERED BY MR. PITTS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 98 printed in part B of House Report 113-117.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Chairman, I rise to offer my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike subtitle C of title I (sugar) and insert the following:

Subtitle C—Sugar

SEC. 1301. SUGAR PROGRAM.

(a) SUGARCANE.—Section 156(a) of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7272(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4), by striking “and” after the semicolon at the end;

(2) in paragraph (5), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(6) 18 cents per pound for raw cane sugar for each of the 2014 through 2018 crop years.”.

(b) SUGAR BEETS.—Section 156(b)(2) of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7272(b)(2)) is amended by striking “2012” and inserting “2018”.

(c) EFFECTIVE PERIOD.—Section 156(i) of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7272(i)) is amended by striking “2012” and inserting “2018”.

SEC. 1302. FLEXIBLE MARKETING ALLOTMENTS FOR SUGAR.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 359b of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1359bb) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)—

(A) in the matter before subparagraph (A), by striking “2012” and inserting “2018”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by inserting “at reasonable prices” after “stocks”; and

(2) in subsection (b)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “but” after the semicolon at the end and inserting “and”; and

(B) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

“(B) appropriate to maintain adequate domestic supplies at reasonable prices, taking into account all sources of domestic supply, including imports.”.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF FLEXIBLE MARKETING ALLOTMENTS.—Section 359c of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1359cc) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “but” after the semicolon at the end and inserting “and”; and

(ii) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

“(B) appropriate to maintain adequate supplies at reasonable prices, taking into account all sources of domestic supply, including imports.”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)(B), by inserting “at reasonable prices” after “market”; and

(2) in subsection (g)(1)—

(A) by striking “ADJUSTMENTS.—” and all that follows through “Subject to subparagraph (B), the” and inserting “ADJUSTMENTS.—The”; and

(B) by striking subparagraph (B).

(c) **SUSPENSION OR MODIFICATION OF PROVISIONS.**—Section 359j of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1359jj) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) **SUSPENSION OR MODIFICATION OF PROVISIONS.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of this part, the Secretary may suspend or modify, in whole or in part, the application of any provision of this part if the Secretary determines that the action is appropriate, taking into account—

“(1) the interests of consumers, workers in the food industry, businesses (including small businesses), and agricultural producers; and

“(2) the relative competitiveness of domestically produced and imported foods containing sugar.”.

(d) **ADMINISTRATION OF TARIFF RATE QUOTAS.**—Section 359k of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1359kk) is amended to read as follows:

“**SEC. 359k. ADMINISTRATION OF TARIFF RATE QUOTAS.**

“(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, at the beginning of the quota year, the Secretary shall establish the tariff-rate quotas for raw cane sugar and refined sugar at no less than the minimum level necessary to comply with obligations under international trade agreements that have been approved by Congress.

“(b) **ADJUSTMENT.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to subsection (a), the Secretary shall adjust the tariff-rate quotas for raw cane sugar and refined sugar to provide adequate supplies of sugar at reasonable prices in the domestic market.

“(2) **ENDING STOCKS.**—Subject to paragraphs (1) and (3), the Secretary shall establish and adjust tariff-rate quotas in such a manner that the ratio of sugar stocks to total sugar use at the end of the quota year will be approximately 15.5 percent.

“(3) **MAINTENANCE OF REASONABLE PRICES AND AVOIDANCE OF FORFEITURES.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may establish a different target for the ratio of ending stocks to total use if, in the judgment of the Secretary, the different target is necessary to prevent—

“(i) unreasonably high prices; or

“(ii) forfeitures of sugar pledged as collateral for a loan under section 156 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7272).

“(B) **ANNOUNCEMENT.**—The Secretary shall publicly announce any establishment of a target under this paragraph.

“(4) **CONSIDERATIONS.**—In establishing tariff-rate quotas under subsection (a) and making adjustments under this subsection, the Secretary shall consider the impact of the quotas on consumers, workers, businesses (including small businesses), and agricultural producers.

“(c) **TEMPORARY TRANSFER OF QUOTAS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—To promote full use of the tariff-rate quotas for raw cane sugar and refined sugar, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall promulgate regulations that provide that any country that has been allocated a share of the quotas may temporarily transfer all or part

of the share to any other country that has also been allocated a share of the quotas.

“(2) **TRANSFERS VOLUNTARY.**—Any transfer under this subsection shall be valid only on voluntary agreement between the transferor and the transferee, consistent with procedures established by the Secretary.

“(3) **TRANSFERS TEMPORARY.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Any transfer under this subsection shall be valid only for the duration of the quota year during which the transfer is made.

“(B) **FOLLOWING QUOTA YEAR.**—No transfer under this subsection shall affect the share of the quota allocated to the transferor or transferee for the following quota year.”.

(e) **EFFECTIVE PERIOD.**—Section 359l(a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1359ll(a)) is amended by striking “2012” and inserting “2018”.

SEC. 1303. REPEAL OF FEEDSTOCK FLEXIBILITY PROGRAM FOR BIOENERGY PRODUCERS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 9010 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8110) is repealed.

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—

(1) Section 359a(3)(B) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1359aa(3)(B)) is amended—

(A) in clause (i), by inserting “and” after the semicolon at the end;

(B) in clause (ii), by striking “; and” at the end and inserting a period; and

(C) by striking clause (iii).

(2) Section 359b(c)(2)(C) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1359bb(c)(2)(C)) is amended by striking “, except for” and all that follows through “ of 2002”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, for those of us in support of my amendment, I will divide 5 minutes under the control of Congressman DANNY DAVIS, 5 minutes on my side.

I rise in support of my amendment, one that would reform our government's sugar program. For too long, we've seen these subsidies and market protections drive up costs on taxpayers, consumers, and businesses. Let me highlight some of the costs now:

Consumers are paying an extra \$3.5 billion a year to subsidize this policy.

Taxpayers are set to foot a bill of \$239 million over the next several years, according to the CBO. The CBO estimated our amendment would save \$73 million.

American workers are paying the price in job losses. Nearly 127,000 jobs were lost by sugar-using industries between 1997 and 2011. At risk are an additional 600,000 manufacturing jobs.

My amendment would help get the price of sugar closer to the world price. It does so by reforming the sugar program, not repealing it. American sugar is still going to have its support program much the same as it did before the 2008 farm bill. We're simply returning to those policies in order to get a more competitive price, one that will help consumers, manufacturers, and even growers.

Under the 2008 farm bill, refined sugar prices have averaged 68 percent more than under the 2002 farm bill. Our detractors are quick to point out that sugar prices are falling, but then they neglected to tell the taxpayer that they are set to bail out the sugar industry, possibly by amounts of \$100 million a year in the coming years. So at the same time this reckless policy sticks the costs of subsidies to consumers, we are set to start spending taxpayer money on supporting sugar farmers, even while the price of U.S. sugar was 64 percent higher than the world price last year.

All we are seeking to do is to return the sugar program to what it was under the 2002 farm bill policy. I'm not sure about you, but I don't remember having any trouble getting sugar into my coffee in 2008. But since the last farm bill, companies have been struggling to find affordable sugar, so much so that Canada has actively been advertising to our manufacturing base that they have access to cheaper sugar. Furthermore, the inflated price of sugar has incentivized Mexico to dump sugar into our market.

So, we're losing jobs to the north, and we're getting hit from foreign sugar from the south due to this reckless policy. So let's reform it. Let's get back into the free market, into the sugar market. Let's get American jobs to stay here. Let's save consumers and taxpayers money. Let's reform our sugar policy.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PETERSON. Madam Chair, I'd like to claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PETERSON. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Chairman, we hear a lot from the proponents of this amendment about moving American companies to Mexico and to Canada. But that has nothing to do with the price of sugar. It has everything to do with labor costs, health care costs, and trying to get every penny out of the American farmer.

□ 0930

Have any of you seen the price of sugar, cakes or cookies plummet over the last few years as sugar prices have decreased by 55 percent? No, you haven't.

You will hear a lot from the proponents of this amendment about the high prices of sugar—so high indeed that restaurants give it away and that you can buy a five-pound bag of sugar for almost nothing. The idea that adopting this amendment is going to somehow create a free market for sugar is ludicrous.

The world sugar market is one of the most distorted markets in the world. Adopting this amendment or even repealing sugar policy would do nothing but subject the U.S. to that distorted

market even more than we are today, cost a lot of farmers their livelihoods, and cost this country an industry with all the jobs and economic activity that go with it. Let's be quite clear, the U.S. is already one of the largest sugar importers in the world.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PETERSON. I yield the gentleman 1 minute.

Mr. LUCAS. The second argument is that we are all of a sudden going to have cheaper sugar if we adopt this amendment.

What bothers me the most about this argument is that it was made when sugar prices were 55 percent higher, and it is made just the same when prices are in the tank. How cheap is cheap enough for those who are backing this amendment?

They claim that consumers are being bilked by the high price of sugar, but have any of our colleagues noticed a drop in the price of candy bars as manufacturers faithfully pass along to consumers the savings from a 55 percent drop in sugar prices? Of course not.

Sugar policy has operated at zero cost to the taxpayers for 10 years now. Our farmers are efficient and competitive. Consumers in this country enjoy cheaper sugar than anywhere else in the world, and sugar users enjoy a reliable source of safe sugar.

Candy makers are reporting strong profits as sugar farmers and processors struggle. Neither today's climate nor the climate of 55 percent higher prices was caused by sugar policy. It was caused by conditions in a distorted market. All sugar policy does is provide a low-level safety net so farmers can repay their loan principal plus interest and farm another day.

I urge my colleagues to reject the amendment.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS.)

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Illinois will control 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chairman, let's be clear: unequivocally, and without a doubt, we know that the sugar subsidy raises the price of sugar on the domestic market in this country.

I know that I have lost out of my congressional district major candy makers and food processors who left town—not because of labor costs, not because of any rifts, but because they were paying so much for the price of sugar that they knew that if they went to Mexico, if they went to Canada that they could get sugar at a much lower price.

I don't know why we help 4,000 sugar growers at the expense of 600,000 workers in America. I say vote "yes" for the Pitts-Davis-Blumenauer-Goodlatte amendment. When you do that, you are helping the guy who gets a cup of coffee and needs to use sugar for the sweetener.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PETERSON. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment. This is nothing but an attack on the thousands of family farms in my district and across the country.

The district I represent is home to Michigan Sugar, a co-op owned by 900 American family farmers. The idea of Big Sugar is flat-out false. To compare a co-op, a growers' co-op such as Michigan Sugar, to a large, multinational corporation is fallacy and wrong.

Back in my district, when I visit these hardworking third- and fourth-generation farmers, all they ask for is a fair and even playing field. These farmers work hard, they play by the rules, and they shouldn't be punished, as this amendment would do. That's why I stand with the American family farms and not foreign government-subsidized sugar.

Big corporate food processors are not moving overseas because of sugar costs; they are moving overseas to avoid providing health care and living wages to their workers. Furthermore, if Big Business is able to target one crop at a time, the entire farm bill loses its worth.

If you support family farms, you will oppose this amendment.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Chairman, at this time I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished vice chair of the Ag Committee, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Chairman, this FARRM Bill reforms many commodity programs. It makes major policy changes that leave no commodity untouched except for one. This bill makes absolutely no change to the sugar program. In fact, the sugar program wasn't even given the scrutiny of an audit hearing.

Under this bill, we are being asked to demand sacrifices from farmers in our districts. Wheat, corn, soybeans, cotton, peanuts, and rice—these commodities and more are undergoing major changes and contributing to the deficit reduction in this bill. But we're asked to believe that the sugar program and the sugar program alone is so perfect that it must be left untouched, it cannot be reformed or even discussed. I respectfully disagree.

The sugar program needs to be reformed for many reasons:

First, all serious studies show that the sugar program increases food costs. Economists at Iowa State University put this consumer cost at up to \$3.5 billion a year for the first 4 years of the 2008 farm bill.

Second, because it harms the competitiveness of U.S. food manufacturing, the sugar program costs jobs. The Iowa State study estimated that as many as 20,000 new jobs a year could be created if sugar policy were fully reformed. The U.S. Department of Commerce found that for every sugar indus-

try job saved by the program, three good manufacturing jobs were lost.

Third, current sugar policy may not have cost taxpayers at the moment, but the Congressional Budget Office projects that it will in the future. The Feedstock Flexibility Program—which was added to the sugar policy in 2008—is forecast to cost \$193 million.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Fourth, the sugar program constitutes an almost unbelievable government intrusion into private business decisions. Under the marketing allotment system, the federal government tells every sugar company the exact amount of sugar that it is legal for the company to sell, down to the pound. USDA issues press releases every year with each private company's exact sales quota listed. Can you imagine what my colleagues would call that if we did it in any other industry in America? It is a pure command-and-control regime.

For all these reasons, I believe we need a serious discussion about sugar policy. A case could be made to repeal it completely. But that is not what I am proposing.

This amendment does not repeal the sugar program or sugar import quotas.

Instead, the amendment removes several features that were added to sugar policy in 2008, and makes some additional program reforms. Specifically, it eliminates—new restrictions that prevent Secretary Vilsack from increasing import quotas between October 1 and April 1, and require that he set the import quota at the bare minimum allowed under our international obligations, regardless of market needs; the Feedstock Flexibility Program, which requires the government to buy up surplus sugar and re-sell it to ethanol plants at a loss to taxpayers; a de facto domestic content requirement, which prevents USDA from reducing marketing allotments below 85% of the market, even if that would save the government money; and price support increases that were mandated in 2008. This part of the amendment is scored by CBO as contributing to a net savings of \$73 million.

The amendment also makes the sugar program more flexible and transparent: first, by permitting developing countries to lease one another's sugar quotas temporarily, thus allowing small quota-holding countries that no longer produce sugar to derive some benefit from their quotas, and ensuring that all quota sugar will actually be imported; second, by setting a goal that ending stocks of sugar will be approximately 15.5% of total demand, thereby making policies more transparent; and third, by restoring Secretary Vilsack's authority to suspend marketing allotments in emergency conditions, authority taken away in 2008.

In 2008, Congress went too far in shackling sugar policy with new market-shortening provisions. We have seen the results in the four years after enactment of the farm bill.

With USDA unable to increase imports even when supplies were tight, both wholesale and retail sugar prices in the United States have set all-time records.

At the same time, the gap between U.S. and world sugar prices widened far beyond historic levels.

Supplies were so tight in the summer of 2010 that the United States imported 200,000 tons of "high-tier" or "over-quota" sugar. This means the importer willingly paid a tariff that

is deliberately set so high as to be prohibitive in normal conditions. There was simply no other sugar available from U.S., Mexican or quota sources.

Once again, our amendment does not change the basic tenets of sugar policy. A good case can be made to do that, but I fully understand that many of my colleagues would not support a repeal. Instead, this amendment rolls back counterproductive policies that have distorted markets and increased consumer costs since they were enacted in 2008.

The amendment's scope is modest, but it is genuine reform. I once again ask my colleagues: Do you really believe that we should cut programs for farmers in your district, but leave sugar policy absolutely untouched? If you do not believe that, please vote for the sugar reform amendment.

Mr. PETERSON. Madam Chairman, I am pleased now to yield 1 minute to the chairman of the subcommittee that deals with this, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY).

Mr. CONAWAY. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

Sugar users and folks who buy it by the ton are not going broke. If you look at Hershey, which is one of the main proponents for changing this policy, in 2007 they made \$217 million—I don't begrudge them that; I wish I were a shareholder. In 2012, they made \$660 million—a threefold increase in their prices. Their own annual report says that sugar costs went from 54 cents a pound to 37 cents a pound, and that that would not be reflected in their prices because of the way they manage the rest of their business. If the sugar buyers were actually going broke, then that would be reflected in one of the largest sugar users, which is Hershey.

This is about protecting American producers, men and women who get up every morning to fight the fight for American agriculture and grow sugar, process sugar, so that you and I can pick it up off a table free and walk out of a restaurant with it.

The current policy works. Often, if it's not broke, don't fix it. This also fits in the category that if a fellow is down, you don't kick him. The sugar industry is down right now because of a 52 percent decrease in the price of sugar. Let's don't kick them while they're down.

This current policy works. Let's don't fix it, because it's not broken. And the \$38 million pro-rated over 10 years is a bargain.

Oppose this amendment.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chairman, I now yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. Madam Chairwoman, I don't have any sugar manufacturing jobs in my district, let alone any sugar beet farms or sugar cane fields, but all of my constituents and all of the constituents of every Member of this body pay a share of the \$3.5 billion annual hidden food tax on consumers. So it seems to me that's what this is about.

And to go from the personal to the national, according to the U.S. Depart-

ment of Commerce, for each sugar production job saved, this sugar program has eliminated three jobs in food manufacturing. Three jobs lost for every job saved. So if we're really about creating jobs and not losing them, we ought to reform this sugar program.

□ 0940

Current policy keeps sugar prices higher than the world market price and that encourages food manufacturing jobs to move offshore. As a result, between 1997 and 2011, 127,000 jobs were lost in segments of the food and beverage industries that use sugar to make their products.

I also object, Madam Chairman, to the idea of paying \$239 million in taxpayer purchases for a sugar-to-ethanol mandate. It ought to be eliminated, which this amendment would do.

Mr. PETERSON. Madam Chair, I am now pleased to yield 1 minute to a good friend of the American farmer and agriculture, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Pitts amendment.

The proponents of the amendment claim that sugar prices are too high, but U.S. raw sugar prices have dropped by more than half just since the fall of 2011.

In 2004, more than 200 people lost their jobs when the Domino sugar plant in Brooklyn, New York, closed its doors. That plant predated the Brooklyn Bridge, it outlasted the Brooklyn Dodgers, and now it is gone. So are the paychecks that its employees used to collect.

I have a sugar refinery in my district in Yonkers, New York, and I don't want the same thing to happen to them. The sugar industry supports 142,000 jobs in 22 States, including 300 at this plant in my district.

Our current policy supports this industry at no cost to the taxpayers. In fact, the USDA has predicted a zero cost increase over the next 10 years.

I come from the school that "if it ain't broke, don't fix it." Until we have a level playing field on the world market, we must continue our current sugar policy.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Minnesota has 5 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 30 seconds remaining. And the gentleman from Illinois has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Chairman, we have all heard the phrase "American as apple pie," but it is shameful to think that every American pie has baked into it Soviet-style sugar. We have a Byzantine array of government production quotas, import quotas, mandatory target prices. And what does it do? It destroys three jobs for every one it creates and transfers

millions of dollars from working Americans to 6,000 sugar growers.

It is time for us to put "American" back into "American as apple pie." Let's support the gentleman from Pennsylvania's amendment.

Mr. PETERSON. Madam Chairman, I am now pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Food and candy opponents of U.S. sugar policy would like to expose American sugar farmers to distorted world market for sugar. But the United States sugar growers are already exposed. Mexico has unlimited access to the United States market.

One thing that hasn't been said: 20 percent of the Mexican sugar industry is owned by the Mexican Government. Mexico owns and operates its sugar industry, which is five times larger than the Texas sugar-producing industry. As this chart shows, since 2008, Mexico has gotten unlimited access to the United States sugar market, and, in fact, the prices of sugar are the same prices as they were in the 1980s.

My friends on both sides that propose this amendment say that we need a more free market. The United States cannot unilaterally disarm. That jeopardizes 142,000 jobs and leaves us dependent on the Brazilian and Mexican food industry that is run by the Mexican Government.

This amendment does not promote free trade or free market; it promotes a government-run industry from Mexico and Brazil.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chairman, I keep hearing "if it is not broken, don't fix it." Well, I can tell you for the 600,000 people whose jobs are at risk when their companies move out of the country, that seems like broken to me.

I would now like to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Chairman, there have been assertions that somehow the American sugar industry is down. Because of the changes that were made in the last farm bill, prices soared up to 92 percent. And so there was a temporary increase in American sugar, which created some downward pressure, which in fact is going to require the American taxpayer to bail out in the next several years because of the sugar program's feedstock flexibility.

We are talking about returning to the 2002 law. Every independent economist agrees that the American consumer is paying from \$2 billion to \$3.5 billion excess.

The reason jobs are going to Canada is not because their jobs pay less, it is because the sugar price is less. There are far more jobs in the industries that use sugar than those who produce it.

We are merely asking to return to the 2002 provisions, which were generous enough. Someday—someday—we will deregulate. Someday we will truly

reform. But in the short term this is a reasonable accommodation.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chairman, I yield the balance of my time, 1½ minutes, to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS).

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania will control the time.

There was no objection.

Mr. PETERSON. Madam Chairman, I am now pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY).

Mr. CASSIDY. Madam Chairman, I oppose this amendment.

We advocates for American farmers know that we need free world markets. The proponents of this amendment ignore that other countries, such as Brazil, subsidize their sugar industry as much as \$3 billion per year.

This amendment unilaterally disarms our economy. By doing so it threatens 142,000 farming jobs and potentially places the U.S. consumer at the mercy of market manipulation by foreign governments. At stake is our food security, 142,000 jobs, and the American consumer.

By eliminating this program, which operates at zero cost to the American taxpayer, we hamstring the ability of our farmers to provide food security for our people.

I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Chairman, there is nothing in the amendment that will bring an additional ounce of sugar under our shores without explicit approval of the Secretary of Agriculture.

At this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

Mr. DENT. Madam Chairman, I must take exception to some of the remarks I've heard here today. This amendment is absolutely necessary for this country, for the consumer. We are talking about saving consumers \$3.5 billion a year and saving 20,000 manufacturing jobs.

I must strenuously object to those who say the price of sugar is so low. Let me tell you what is going to happen. When the price of sugar drops below a certain level, the Federal Government will buy that excess sugar, then sell it to ethanol producers at a loss. The taxpayer and the consumer is royally abused twice.

This is protectionism at its worse. We all know it. It is time to reform this program.

This is not a zero-zero policy as the proponents claim. This is going to cost taxpayers \$239 million over the next several years. That is according to CBO. \$80 million of taxpayer-funded bailout could come later this year.

This issue is about protecting manufacturing jobs, making sure that we have something closer to a market-based price.

I represent Hershey, Pennsylvania. I just heard a statement saying, no sugar packets handed out to res-

taurants are free. Well, that cost is built into the meal that you eat. It is absurd. It is absolutely absurd. We are losing jobs to countries that have more market-based sugar policies.

I urge strong support for the Pitts-Goodlatte-Davis-Blumenauer amendment.

Mr. PETERSON. Madam Chairman, I am now pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Hawaii (Ms. HANABUSA).

□ 0950

Ms. HANABUSA. Madam Chair, I represent a State that was literally built on sugar, and we are now down to one sugar-producing company in the whole State. We do not have the sugarcane blowing in the wind as we had in the past. What this amendment is going to do is really, when you think about it, do away with a program that doesn't cost the taxpayers anything. It is an agreement between the USDA and the sugar producers to ensure that the agriculture industry remains stable.

Think about it.

Why do you want to do away with something that doesn't cost us anything at this point in time, that produces jobs and is essential and, instead, give away to world markets that are subsidized? What will happen when those subsidies are deemed to be no longer necessary because of the fact that there is nothing in the United States anymore?

Think about it.

We need to keep agriculture strong. That is what this is all about. It doesn't cost taxpayers anything. This is a program that clearly works and that keeps this industry alive and well, so it makes no sense.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FLEISCHMANN).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 30 seconds.

Mr. FLEISCHMANN. I represent the Third District of Tennessee. We've heard a great debate today. Let's be clear. The numbers are self-evident.

When the world price of sugar compared to the United States' price of sugar is so out of kilter since reform—72, 91, 77, and 63 percent since 2008—we cannot compete in America based on the world price. It's a commodity. It's an agreement. I urge strong support of this amendment. We've got American jobs at stake. We cannot compete if this program continues. Jobs will leave America. Let's support this amendment.

Mr. PETERSON. Madam Chair, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. PETERSON. I am now pleased to yield 1 minute to my good friend from across the border in North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER).

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The idea that somehow this amendment creates free and fair trade is a fallacy, and the idea that somehow sugar has not been reformed in recent years and decades is also a fallacy.

The greatest reformation of the sugar program is the North American Free Trade Agreement, which gave access to U.S. markets completely, not only to the sugar farmers south of us, but to the Governments of Mexico and Brazil. The idea that a no-net-cost program like the American sugar program is somehow a great advantage over countries like Brazil, which is subsidized with tax dollars of \$2.5 to \$3 billion per year, I think is the most distorting fact in this entire debate.

I rise to oppose this amendment, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. PETERSON. Madam Chair, in closing, I want to thank my colleagues for their statements. I represent the biggest sugar-producing area in the country, and I agree with what has been said by my colleagues.

People need to understand that every country that produces sugar in the world has some intervention in the sugar market. For us to unilaterally disarm, all we are going to do is give away our jobs and our industry to other countries. We import sugar from 41 countries, sugar that we could make in the United States. Fifteen percent of our market we have given to other people. We have opened up the market to Mexico, and yet we haven't had a no-net-cost program until this year when sugar prices collapsed, which is not our fault. It's what's going on in Brazil and other places. So, for people to be complaining that sugar prices are too high when, right now, they're about as low as they've ever been is kind of crazy.

I ask my colleagues to reject this amendment and to continue a policy that works—that's good for America, that's good for the farmers, that's good for the workers, and that's good for the economy.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOHO. Madam Chair, I rise today against this job killing amendment. Madam Chair, for years people have rallied against our domestic sugar program because they felt it artificially increased prices here at home. Nothing could be further from the truth. Prices have dropped dramatically over the past year, with the culprit being an influx of sugar from foreign countries.

Worldwide agriculture is a distorted market due to foreign price and supply control programs, but sugar takes the cake as being the most distorted commodity in the world. Each year countries like Brazil and Mexico dump millions of tons onto export markets dropping the price of sugar below the cost of producing sugar. This is price manipulation at its worst. That is why I have joined with many of my colleagues in calling for a "Zero-For-Zero" policy that would reduce subsidies world wide. But until our trading partners agree with this policy, we should not place our farmers in direct competition with massive government controlled production by changing our already modest domestic program.

I urge my colleagues to vote for thousands of American jobs by defeating this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 113-117 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 18 by Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

Amendment No. 25 by Mr. BUTTERFIELD of North Carolina.

Amendment No. 26 by Mr. MARINO of Pennsylvania.

Amendment No. 30 by Mr. SCHWEIKERT of Arizona.

Amendment No. 32 by Mr. TIERNEY of Massachusetts.

Amendment No. 37 by Mr. POLIS of Colorado.

Amendment No. 38 by Mr. GARAMENDI of California.

Amendment No. 41 by Mr. MARINO of Pennsylvania.

Amendment No. 43 by Mr. MCCLINTOCK of California.

Amendment No. 44 by Mr. GIBSON of New York.

Amendment No. 45 by Mrs. WALORSKI of Indiana.

Amendment No. 46 by Mr. COURTNEY of Connecticut.

Amendment No. 47 by Mr. KIND of Wisconsin.

Amendment No. 48 by Mr. CARNEY of Delaware.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MR. BROOKS OF ALABAMA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 103, noes 322, not voting 9, as follows:

Amash
Bachmann
Barr
Bentivolio
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Broun (GA)
Burgess
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Cook
Cooper
Cotton
Culberson
Daines
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Fleischmann
Flores
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Garrett
Gohmert
Gosar
Gowdy

Aderholt
Alexander
Amodei
Andrews
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Costa
Courtney
Cramer

[Roll No. 264]

AYES—103

Graves (GA)
Guthrie
Hall
Hensarling
Holding
Huizenga (MI)
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Jones
Jordan
Kingston
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Long
Lummis
Marchant
Massie
McCauley
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McKintley
Meadows
Messer
Miller (FL)
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Nugent
Palazzo
Paulsen
Perry
Petri

NOES—322

Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Brown (FL)
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleming
Forbes
Portenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva

Pitts
Polis
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Radel
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuster
Stockman
Tiberi
Wagner
Walberg
Westmoreland
Woodall
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

Grimm
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Hultgren
Hunter
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
LaMalfa
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb
Loeb
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lucas
Luetkemeyer

Lujan Grisham (NM)
Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeke
Meng
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Pallone
Pascarelli
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter

Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Richmond
Rohy
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)

Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southernland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Vislosky
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Yarmuth
Yoho

NOT VOTING—9

Hastings (FL)
Herrera Beutler
Honda
Larsen (WA)
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Slaughter
Young (AK)

□ 1022

Messrs. GUTIÉRREZ, KELLY of Pennsylvania, and MEEKS changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. ROONEY, Mrs. CAPITO, Messrs. COOPER, MULVANEY, ROKITA, NUGENT, and Mrs. BACHMANN changed their vote from “no” to “aye.” So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MR. BUTTERFIELD

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 123, noes 297, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 265]

AYES—123

Andrews Green, Al
 Bass Green, Gene
 Beatty Gutiérrez
 Becerra Hahn
 Bishop (GA) Higgins
 Bishop (NY) Holt
 Blumenauer Horsford
 Bonamici Hoyer
 Brady (PA) Huffman
 Braley (IA) Israel
 Brown (FL) Jackson Lee
 Brownley (CA) Jeffries
 Butterfield Johnson (GA)
 Carson (IN) Johnson, E. B.
 Cartwright Jones
 Castor (FL) Kaptur
 Chu Kelly (IL)
 Clarke Kirkpatrick
 Clay Kuster
 Clyburn Labrador
 Courtney Langevin
 Cummings Larson (CT)
 Davis (CA) Lee (CA)
 Davis, Danny Lewis
 DeFazio Lofgren
 DeLauro Lowenthal
 Deutch Lowey
 Doggett Luján, Ben Ray
 Doyle (NM)
 Edwards Marchant
 Ellison McDermott
 Engel McNeerney
 Enyart Meeks
 Eshoo Meng
 Esty Miller, George
 Fattah Moore
 Fitzpatrick Moran
 Frankel (FL) Nadler
 Fudge Napolitano
 Garamendi Negrete McLeod
 Grayson Noem
 O'Rourke Wilson (FL)

NOES—297

Aderholt Cook
 Alexander Cooper
 Amash Costa
 Amodei Cotton
 Bachmann Cramer
 Bachus Crawford
 Barber Crenshaw
 Barletta Cuellar
 Barr Culberson
 Barrow (GA) Daines
 Barton Davis, Rodney
 Benishek DeGette
 Bentivolio Delaney
 Bera (CA) DelBene
 Bilirakis Denham
 Bishop (UT) Dent
 Black DeSantis
 Blackburn DesJarlais
 Bonner Diaz-Balart
 Boustany Dingell
 Brady (TX) Duckworth
 Bridenstine Duffy
 Brooks (AL) Duncan (SC)
 Brooks (IN) Duncan (TN)
 Broun (GA) Ellmers
 Buchanan Farenthold
 Bucshon Farr
 Burgess Fincher
 Bustos Fleischmann
 Calvert Fleming
 Camp Flores
 Campbell Forbes
 Cantor Fortenberry
 Capito Foster
 Capps Foxx
 Capuano Franks (AZ)
 Cárdenas Frelinghuysen
 Carney Gabbard
 Carter Gallego
 Cassidy Garcia
 Castro (TX) Gardner
 Chabot Garrett
 Chaffetz Gerlach
 Cicilline Gibbs
 Coble Gibson
 Coffman Gingrey (GA)
 Cohen Gohmert
 Collins (GA) Goodlatte
 Collins (NY) Gosar
 Conaway Gowdy
 Connolly Granger
 Conyers Graves (GA)

Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Lujan Grisham
 (NM)
 Lummis
 Lynch
 Maffei
 Maloney,
 Carolyn
 Maloney, Sean
 Marino
 Massie
 Matheson
 Matsui
 McCarthy (CA)
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McCollum
 McGovern
 McHenry
 McIntyre
 McKeon
 McKinley
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 Meadows
 Meahan
 Messer
 Mica
 Michaud
 Miller (FL)
 Miller (MI)
 Mullin
 Mulvaney
 Murphy (FL)
 Murphy (PA)
 Neal
 Neugebauer
 Nolan
 Nugent
 Nunes
 Nunnelee
 Olson
 Owens
 Palazzo
 Pascrell
 Paulsen
 Pearce
 Perry

NOT VOTING—14

Cleaver
 Cole
 Hastings (FL)
 Herrera Beutler
 Hinojosa
 Honda
 Larsen (WA)
 Markey
 McCarthy (NY)
 Miller, Gary

□ 1026

Ms. WATERS changed her vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against: Mrs. NOEM. Madam Chair, on rollcall No. 265, I inadvertently voted “yea” when I intended to oppose the amendment.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 265, had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

AMENDMENT NO. 26 OFFERED BY MR. MARINO
 The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered. The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 79, noes 346, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 266]

AYES—79

Amodei
 Bachmann
 Barletta
 Barton
 Bentivolio
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (UT)
 Brady (TX)
 Buchanan
 Burgess
 Cantor
 Chabot
 Chaffetz
 Coffman
 Cooper
 Cotton
 Culberson
 Daines
 DeSantis
 Franks (AZ)
 Garrett
 Gerlach
 Gohmert
 Goodlatte
 Gowdy
 Olson
 Peters (CA)

NOES—346

Aderholt
 Alexander
 Amash
 Andrews
 Bachus
 Barber
 Barr
 Barrow (GA)
 Bass
 Beatty
 Becerra
 Benishek
 Bera (CA)
 Bishop (GA)
 Bishop (NY)
 Black
 Blackburn
 Blumenauer
 Bonamici
 Bonner
 Boustany
 Brady (PA)
 Braley (IA)
 Bridenstine
 Brooks (AL)
 Brooks (IN)
 Broun (GA)
 Brown (FL)
 Brownley (CA)
 Bucshon
 Bustos
 Butterfield
 Calvert
 Camp
 Campbell
 Capito
 Capps
 Capuano
 Cárdenas
 Carney
 Carson (IN)
 Carter
 Cartwright
 Cassidy
 Castor (FL)
 Castro (TX)
 Chu
 Cicilline
 Clarke
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Coble
 Cohen
 Cole
 Collins (GA)
 Collins (NY)
 Conaway
 Connolly
 Conyers
 Cook
 Costa
 Courtney
 Cramer
 Crawford
 Crenshaw
 Crowley
 Graves (MO)
 Guthrie
 Hall
 Hanna
 Hastings (WA)
 Hensarling
 Hunter
 Kinzinger (IL)
 Labradore
 Lamborn
 Lankford
 Marchant
 Marino
 McCarthy (CA)
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McKeon
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 Messer
 Mica
 Miller (FL)
 Murphy (FL)
 Neugebauer
 Nugent
 Olson
 Peters (CA)
 Heck (WA)
 Higgins
 Himes
 Hinojosa
 Holding
 Holt
 Horsford
 Hoyer
 Hudson
 Huelskamp
 Huffman
 Huizenga (MI)
 Hultgren
 Hurt
 Israel
 Issa
 Jackson Lee
 Jeffries
 Jenkins
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Johnson, Sam
 Jones
 Jordan
 Joyce
 Kaptur
 Keating
 Kelly (IL)
 Kelly (PA)
 Kennedy
 Kildee
 Kilmer
 Kind
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kingston
 Kirkpatrick
 Kline
 Kuster
 LaMalfa
 Lance
 Langevin
 Larson (CT)
 Latham
 Latta
 Lee (CA)
 Levin
 Lewis
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Loebsock
 Lofgren
 Long
 Lowenthal
 Lowey
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Lujan Grisham
 (NM)
 Luján, Ben Ray
 (NM)
 Lummis
 Lynch
 Maffei
 Maloney,
 Carolyn

Maloney, Sean Price (GA)
 Massie Price (NC)
 Matheson Quigley
 Matsui Radel
 McCollum Rahall
 McDermott Rangel
 McGovern Reichert
 McHenry Renacci
 McIntyre Ribble
 McKinley Richmond
 McNeerney Roby
 Meadows Roe (TN)
 Meehan Rogers (AL)
 Meeks Rogers (KY)
 Meng Rogers (MI)
 Michaud Rohrabacher
 Miller (MI) Rokita
 Miller, George Rooney
 Moore Ros-Lehtinen
 Moran Roskam
 Mullin Rothfus
 Mulvaney Roybal-Allard
 Murphy (PA) Ruiz
 Nadler Runyan
 Napolitano Ruppertsberger
 Neal Ryan (OH)
 Negrete McLeod Salmon
 Noem Sánchez, Linda
 Nolan T.
 Nunes Sanchez, Loretta
 Nunnelee Sanford
 O'Rourke Sarbanes
 Owens Schakowsky
 Palazzo Schiff
 Pallone Schneider
 Pascrell Schock
 Pastor (AZ) Schrader
 Paulsen Schwartz
 Payne Scott (VA)
 Pearce Scott, Austin
 Pelosi Scott, David
 Perlmutter Serrano
 Perry Sessions
 Peterson Sewell (AL)
 Pingree (ME) Shea-Porter
 Pittenger Sherman
 Pocan Simpson
 Polis Sinema
 Pompeo Sires
 Posey Smith (MO)

Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Smith (WA)
 Southerland
 Speier
 Stewart
 Stivers
 Swalwell (CA)
 Takano
 Terry
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Thompson (PA)
 Tiberi
 Tierney
 Tipton
 Titus
 Tonko
 Tsongas
 Turner
 Upton
 Valadao
 Van Hollen
 Vargas
 Veasey
 Vela
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Wagner
 Walden
 Walorski
 Walz
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Watt
 Waxman
 Webster (FL)
 Welch
 Wenstrup
 Whitfield
 Williams
 Wilson (FL)
 Wittman
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yarmuth
 Yoder
 Yoho

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 194, noes 232, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 267]
 AYES—194

Aderholt
 Alexander
 Amash
 Amodei
 Bachmann
 Bachus
 Barr
 Barton
 Benishek
 Bentivolio
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (UT)
 Black
 Blackburn
 Bonner
 Boustany
 Brady (TX)
 Bridenstine
 Brooks (AL)
 Brooks (IN)
 Broun (GA)
 Buchanan
 Bucshon
 Calvert
 Camp
 Kelly (PA)
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kingston
 Kline
 Cassidy
 Chabot
 Chaffetz
 Coble
 Collins (GA)
 Collins (NY)
 Conaway
 Cook
 Cotton
 Crawford
 Culberson
 Daines
 Denham
 DeSantis
 DesJarlais
 Duffy
 Duncan (SC)
 Duncan (TN)
 Ellmers
 Farenthold
 Fincher
 Fleischmann
 Fleming
 Flores
 Forbes
 Fortenberry
 Foxx
 Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Gardner
 Garrett
 Gingrey (GA)
 Gohmert
 Goodlatte
 Gosar
 Gowdy

NOES—232

Andrews
 Barber
 Barletta
 Barrow (GA)
 Bass
 Beatty
 Becerra
 Bera (CA)
 Bishop (GA)
 Bishop (NY)
 Blumenauer
 Bonamici
 Brady (PA)
 Braley (IA)
 Brown (FL)
 Brownley (CA)
 Burgess
 Bustos
 Butterfield
 Capps
 Capuano
 Cárdenas
 Carney
 Carson (IN)
 Cartwright

Garamendi
 Garcia
 Gerlach
 Gibbs
 Gibson
 Grayson
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Grijalva
 Grimm
 Grimm
 Gutiérrez
 Hahn
 Hanabusa
 Hanna
 Harper
 Heck (NV)
 Heck (WA)
 Higgins
 Himes
 Hinojosa
 Holt
 Horsford
 Hoyer
 Huffman
 Israel
 Jackson Lee
 Jeffries
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson (E. B.)
 Kaptur
 Keating
 Kelly (IL)
 Kennedy
 Kildee
 Kilmer
 Kind
 Kinzinger (IL)
 Kirkpatrick
 Kuster
 Lance
 Langevin
 Larson (CT)
 Lee (CA)
 Levin
 Lewis
 Lipinski
 Loeb sack
 Lofgren
 Lowenthal
 Lowey
 Lucas
 Lujan Grisham (NM)
 Luján, Ben Ray (NM)

NOT VOTING—8

Hastings (FL)
 Herrera Beutler
 Honda

□ 1036

Mr. JOYCE changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 32 OFFERED BY MR. TIERNEY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.
 The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 211, noes 215, not voting 8, as follows:

Hastings (FL)
 Herrera Beutler
 Honda

NOT VOTING—9

So the amendment was rejected.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:
 Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Chair, during rollcall vote No. 266 on H.R. 1947, I mistakenly recorded my vote as “no” when I should have voted “yes.” I ask unanimous consent that my statement appear in the record following rollcall vote No. 266.

Stated against:
 Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Chair, on rollcall No. 266 I inadvertently voted “yea” and I intended to vote “nay.”

AMENDMENT NO. 30 OFFERED BY MR. SCHWEIKERT

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.
 The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

[Roll No. 268]

AYES—211

Alexander	Green, Al	Owens
Andrews	Green, Gene	Palazzo
Bass	Grijalva	Pallone
Beatty	Grimm	Pascrell
Becerra	Gutiérrez	Pastor (AZ)
Bera (CA)	Hahn	Payne
Bishop (GA)	Hanabusa	Pelosi
Bishop (NY)	Hanna	Perlmutter
Blumenauer	Harris	Peters (CA)
Bonamici	Heck (WA)	Peters (MI)
Boustany	Higgins	Peterson
Brady (PA)	Himes	Pingree (ME)
Braley (IA)	Holt	Pocan
Brown (FL)	Horsford	Posey
Brownley (CA)	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Bustos	Huffman	Quigley
Butterfield	Israel	Rahall
Capps	Jackson Lee	Rangel
Capuano	Jeffries	Richmond
Cárdenas	Johnson (GA)	Rooney
Carney	Johnson, E. B.	Ros-Lehtinen
Carson (IN)	Jones	Roybal-Allard
Cartwright	Joyce	Runyan
Cassidy	Kaptur	Ruppersberger
Castor (FL)	Keating	Rush
Castro (TX)	Kelly (IL)	Rush
Chu	Kennedy	Ryan (OH)
Ciçilline	Kildee	Sánchez, Linda T.
Clarke	Kilmer	Sanchez, Loretta
Clay	Kind	Sarbanes
Cleaver	King (NY)	Schakowsky
Clyburn	Kirkpatrick	Schiff
Coble	Kuster	Schneider
Cohen	Langevin	Schrader
Connolly	Larson (CT)	Schwartz
Conyers	Lee (CA)	Scott (VA)
Cooper	Levin	Scott, David
Costa	Lewis	Serrano
Courtney	Lipinski	Sewell (AL)
Crenshaw	LoBiondo	Shea-Porter
Crowley	Loeb sack	Sherman
Cuellar	Lofgren	Sinema
Cummings	Lowenthal	Sires
Davis (CA)	Lowe y	Smith (NJ)
Davis, Danny	Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)	Smith (WA)
DeFazio	Lynch	Southernland
DeGette	Maffei	Speier
Delaney	Maloney,	Swalwell (CA)
DeLauro	Carolyn	Takano
DelBene	Maloney, Sean	Thompson (CA)
Deutch	Matheson	Thompson (MS)
Dingell	Matsui	Tierney
Doggett	McColum	Titus
Doyle	McDermott	Tonko
Duckworth	McGovern	Tsongas
Edwards	McIntyre	Van Hollen
Ellison	McNerney	Vargas
Engel	Meeks	Veasey
Enyart	Meng	Vela
Eshoo	Mica	Velázquez
Esty	Michaud	Vislosky
Farr	Miller, George	Walz
Fattah	Moore	Wasserman
Fitzpatrick	Moran	Schultz
Foster	Murphy (FL)	Waters
Frankel (FL)	Nadler	Watt
Fudge	Napolitano	Waxman
Gabbard	Neal	Welch
Gallego	Negrete McLeod	Wilson (FL)
Garamendi	Nolan	Yarmuth
Garcia	O'Rourke	Young (AK)
Gibson		

NOES—215

Aderholt	Buchanan	Davis, Rodney
Amash	Bucshon	Denham
Amodei	Burgess	Dent
Bachmann	Calvert	DeSantis
Bachus	Camp	DesJarlais
Barber	Campbell	Diaz-Balart
Barletta	Cantor	Duffy
Barr	Capito	Duncan (SC)
Barrow (GA)	Carter	Duncan (TN)
Barton	Chabot	Ellmers
Benishek	Chaffetz	Farenthold
Bentivolio	Coffman	Fincher
Bilirakis	Cole	Fleischmann
Bishop (UT)	Collins (GA)	Fleming
Black	Collins (NY)	Flores
Blackburn	Conaway	Forbes
Bonner	Cook	Fortenberry
Brady (TX)	Cotton	Fox x
Bridenstine	Cramer	Franks (AZ)
Brooks (AL)	Crawford	Frelinghuysen
Brooks (IN)	Culberson	Gardner
Broun (GA)	Daines	Garrett

Gerlach	Marchant	Rothfus
Gibbs	Marino	Royce
Gingrey (GA)	Massie	Ruiz
Gohmert	McCarthy (CA)	Ryan (WI)
Goodlatte	McCaul	Salmon
Gosar	McClintock	Sanford
Gowdy	McHenry	Scalise
Granger	McKeon	Schock
Graves (GA)	McKinley	Schweikert
Graves (MO)	McMorris	Scott, Austin
Grayson	Rodgers	Sensenbrenner
Griffin (AR)	Meadows	Sessions
Griffith (VA)	Meehan	Shimkus
Guthrie	Messer	Shuster
Hall	Miller (FL)	Simpson
Harper	Miller (MI)	Smith (MO)
Hartzler	Mullin	Smith (NE)
Hastings (WA)	Mulvaney	Smith (TX)
Heck (NV)	Murphy (PA)	Stewart
Hensarling	Neugebauer	Stivers
Hinojosa	Noem	Stockman
Holding	Nugent	Stutzman
Hudson	Nunes	Terry
Huelskamp	Nunnelee	Thompson (PA)
Huizenga (MI)	Olson	Thornberry
Hultgren	Paulsen	Timberly
Hunt	Pearce	Tiberi
Hurt	Perry	Tipton
Issa	Petri	Turner
Jenkins	Pittenger	Upton
Johnson (OH)	Pitts	Valadao
Johnson, Sam	Poe (TX)	Wagner
Jordan	Polis	Walberg
Kelly (PA)	Pompeo	Walden
King (IA)	Price (GA)	Walorski
Kingston	Radel	Weber (TX)
Kinzinger (IL)	Reed	Webster (FL)
Kline	Reichert	Westrup
Labrador	Renacci	Westmoreland
LaMalfa	Ribble	Whitfield
Lamborn	Rice (SC)	Williams
Lance	Rigell	Wilson (SC)
Lankford	Roby	Wittman
Latham	Roe (TN)	Wolf
Latta	Rogers (AL)	Womack
Long	Rogers (KY)	Woodall
Lucas	Rogers (MI)	Yoder
Luetkemeyer	Rohrabacher	Yoho
Lujan Grisham	Rokita	Young (FL)
(NM)	Roskam	Young (IN)
Lummis	Ross	

NOT VOTING—8

Hastings (FL)	Larsen (WA)	Miller, Gary
Herrera Beutler	Markey	Slaughter
Honda	McCarthy (NY)	

□ 1041

Mr. GUTHRIE changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. SHERMAN and PALAZZO changed their vote from “no” to “aye.” So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 37 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 225, noes 200, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 269]

AYES—225

Amash	Gowdy	Paulsen
Andrews	Graves (GA)	Payne
Bachus	Grayson	Pelosi
Barr	Green, Al	Perlmutter
Bass	Griffith (VA)	Peters (CA)
Becerra	Grijalva	Peters (MI)
Benishek	Guthrie	Peterson
Bentivolio	Gutiérrez	Petri
Bera (CA)	Hahn	Pingree (ME)
Bishop (GA)	Hanabusa	Pocan
Bishop (NY)	Hanna	Poe (TX)
Blumenauer	Harris	Polis
Bonamici	Hastings (WA)	Price (NC)
Brady (PA)	Heck (WA)	Quigley
Braley (IA)	Higgins	Radel
Broun (GA)	Himes	Reed
Brown (FL)	Holt	Ribble
Brownley (CA)	Horsford	Rice (SC)
Bustos	Hoyer	Rohrabacher
Butterfield	Huelskamp	Rokita
Capps	Huffman	Roybal-Allard
Capuano	Hunter	Ruppersberger
Cárdenas	Hurt	Rush
Carney	Israel	Ryan (OH)
Carson (IN)	Jackson Lee	Salmon
Cartwright	Jeffries	Sánchez, Linda T.
Cassidy	Johnson (GA)	Sanchez, Loretta
Castor (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Sanford
Castro (TX)	Chaffetz	Sarbanes
Chu	Kelly (IL)	Schakowsky
Ciçilline	Kennedy	Schiff
Clarke	Kildee	Schneider
Cleaver	Kilmer	Schrader
Clyburn	Kind	Schwartz
Coble	Kline	Schweikert
Cohen	Kuster	Scott (VA)
Connolly	Labrador	Serrano
Conyers	Cohen	Sewell (AL)
Cooper	Labrador	Shea-Porter
Costa	Langevin	Sherman
Courtney	Larson (CT)	Sires
Crenshaw	Lee (CA)	Smith (WA)
Crowley	Lipinski	Speier
Cuellar	Loeb sack	Stewart
Cummings	Lofgren	Stivers
Davis (CA)	Lowenthal	Stockman
Davis, Danny	Lowe y	Stutzman
DeFazio	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Swalwell (CA)
DeGette	Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)	Takano
Delaney	Lynch	Thompson (CA)
DeLauro	Maffei	Tierney
DelBene	Maloney,	Tipton
Deutch	Carolyn	Titus
Dingell	Maloney, Sean	Tonko
Doggett	Matheson	Tsongas
Doyle	Matsui	Valadao
Duckworth	McColum	Van Hollen
Edwards	McDermott	Vargas
Ellison	McGovern	Vela
Engel	McNerney	Velázquez
Enyart	Meeks	Vislosky
Eshoo	Meng	Walden
Esty	Mica	Walz
Farr	Michaud	Watt
Fattah	Miller, George	Waxman
Fitzpatrick	Moore	Welch
Foster	Moran	Wenstrup
Frankel (FL)	Murphy (FL)	Westmoreland
Fudge	Nadler	Whitfield
Gabbard	Napolitano	Wilson (FL)
Gallego	Neal	Woodall
Garamendi	Negrete McLeod	Yarmuth
Garcia	Nolan	Young (AK)
Gibson	O'Rourke	Young (IN)

NOES—200

Aderholt	Brooks (AL)	Collins (NY)
Alexander	Brooks (IN)	Conaway
Amodei	Buchanan	Cook
Bachmann	Bucshon	Cotton
Barber	Burgess	Crawford
Barletta	Bustos	Crenshaw
Barrow (GA)	Calvert	Denham
Barton	Camp	Dent
Beatty	Cantor	DesJarlais
Bilirakis	Capito	Diaz-Balart
Bishop (UT)	Carter	Duckworth
Black	Cassidy	Duncan (SC)
Blackburn	Chabot	Duncan (TN)
Bonner	Clyburn	Farenthold
Brady (TX)	Coble	Fincher
Bridenstine	Cole	Fitzpatrick
	Collins (GA)	Fleischmann

Cantor
Capito
Capuano
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Daines
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding

NOES—230

Andrews
Bachus
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)

Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quigley
Radel
Rahall
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuster
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stewart
Stockman
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—230

Hanabusa
Harper
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Horsford
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey

Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Noem
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)

NOT VOTING—10

Barr
Hastings (FL)
Herrera Beutler
Honda

Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Richmond
Robby
Rogers (AL)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson

NOT VOTING—10

Larsen (WA)
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
Meeks

Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Yarmuth

Miller, Gary
Slaughter

Chabot
Chaffetz
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Cotton
Culberson
Daines
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Hall
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)

Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lankford
Latta
Long
Duncan (TN)
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Messer
Mica
Miller (MI)
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)

NOES—269

Alexander
Andrews
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bustos
Butterfield
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw

Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene
Denham
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gerlach
Gibson
Goodlatte
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutiérrez

Radel
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuster
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stewart
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thornberry
Tipton
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Lance
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lucas
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn

□ 1054

Mr. FINCHER changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. BARR. Madam Chair, on rollcall No. 271, I was unavoidably detained with a constituent and unable to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT NO. 43 OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 156, noes 269, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 272]

AYES—156

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis

Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)

Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Carter
Cassidy

Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene
Denham
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gerlach
Gibson
Goodlatte
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutiérrez

Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Delaney
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Eilmers
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Griffin (AR)
Guthrie
Hall
Harris
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Hultgren
Hunter

Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCauley
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (CA)
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey

Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schneider
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stewart
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Tiberti
Tipton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—227

Andrews
Bachus
Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brady (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleave
Clyburn
Cohen
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa

Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves (MO)
Grayson

Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee (CA)

Levin
Lewis
Loebsock
Lofgren
Lowe
Lujan Grisham
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Noem
Nolan
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Owens

Pallone
Pastrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Ribble
Richmond
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman

Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Viscosky
Walden
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Yoho

Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleave
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa

Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kuster
Lance
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Forbes
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harris
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes

Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Richmond
Rigell
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Tierney
Titus
Tsongas
Turner
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Viscosky
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Yoho

NOT VOTING—10

Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hastings (FL)
Herrera Beutler

Honda
Larsen (WA)
Markey
McCarthy (NY)

□ 1105

Mr. WESTMORELAND changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mrs. ROBY, Madam Chair, on rollcall No. 274 I inadvertently voted “yes” when I intended to oppose the amendment. I would have voted “no.”

AMENDMENT NO. 46 OFFERED BY MR. COURTNEY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 208, noes 218, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 275]

AYES—208

Alexander
Andrews
Bachus
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)

Bishop (NY)
Buchanan
Bustos
Butterfield
Cantor
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney

Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Forbes
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harris
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes

Gerlach
Gibbs
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly (PA)
Kildee
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline

NOES—218

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brownley (CA)
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Capito
Carter
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)

Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Eilmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Gardner
Garrett

Labrador	Nunes	Scott, Austin	DeGette	Kuster	Radel	Lujan Grisham	Poe (TX)	Stivers
LaMalfa	Nunnelee	Sensenbrenner	Delaney	Lamborn	Rangel	(NM)	Pompeo	Stutzman
Lamborn	Olson	Sessions	DeLauro	Lance	Rigell	Maffei	Posey	Takano
Lankford	Owens	Shimkus	Dent	Langevin	Rogers (MI)	Maloney, Sean	Rahall	Thompson (CA)
Latham	Palazzo	Shuster	DeSantis	Larson (CT)	Rohrabacher	Marino	Reed	Thompson (MS)
Latta	Paulsen	Simpson	Dingell	Lee (CA)	Rokita	Matsui	Reichert	Thompson (PA)
Lofgren	Pearce	Sinema	Doggett	Levin	Rothfus	McCarthy (CA)	Renacci	Thornberry
Long	Perry	Smith (MO)	Doyle	Lewis	Roybal-Allard	McCaul	Ribble	Tiberi
Lucas	Peters (MI)	Smith (NE)	Duncan (TN)	LoBiondo	Royce	McHenry	Rice (SC)	Tipton
Luetkemeyer	Petri	Smith (TX)	Edwards	Lofgren	Runyan	McIntyre	Richmond	Turner
Lujan Grisham	Pittenger	Southerland	Ellison	Lowenthal	Ruppersberger	McKeon	Roby	Upton
(NM)	Pitts	Stewart	Engel	Lowe	Rush	McMorris	Roe (TN)	Valadao
Luján, Ben Ray	Poe (TX)	Stivers	Eshoo	Luján, Ben Ray	Ryan (OH)	Rodgers	Rogers (AL)	Veasey
(NM)	Polis	Stockman	Esty	(NM)	Ryan (WI)	McNerney	Rogers (KY)	Vela
Lummis	Pompeo	Stutzman	Fattah	Lummis	Salmon	Meehan	Rooney	Wagner
Maffei	Posey	Terry	Fleischmann	Lynch	Sánchez, Linda	Messer	Ros-Lehtinen	Walberg
Maloney, Sean	Price (GA)	Thompson (PA)	Fox	Maloney,	T.	Miller (MI)	Roskam	Walden
Marchant	Radel	Thornberry	Franks (AZ)	Carolyn	Sanford	Mullin	Ross	Walorski
Marino	Renacci	Tiberi	Frelinghuysen	Marchant	Sarbanes	Mulvaney	Ruiz	Walz
Massie	Ribble	Tipton	Fudge	Massie	Scalise	Murphy (FL)	Sanchez, Loretta	Walz
Matheson	Rice (SC)	Tonko	Garrett	Matheson	Schakowsky	Murphy (PA)	Schock	Weber (TX)
Matsui	Roby	Upton	Gingrey (GA)	McClintock	Schiff	Neal	Scott, Austin	Webster (FL)
McCarthy (CA)	Roe (TN)	Valadao	Graves (GA)	McCollum	Schneider	Negrete McLeod	Sessions	Welch
McCaul	Rogers (AL)	Wagner	Grayson	McDermott	Schrader	Neugebauer	Neugebauer	Westmoreland
McClintock	Rogers (KY)	Walberg	Green, Al	McGovern	Schwartz	Noem	Noem	Westmoreland
McHenry	Rogers (MI)	Walden	Green, Gene	McKinley	Schwartz	Nolan	Nolan	Whitfield
McKeon	Rohrabacher	Weber (TX)	Grijalva	Meadows	Schweikert	Nugent	Nugent	Simpson
McKinley	Rokita	Webster (FL)	Gutiérrez	Meeks	Scott (VA)	Nunes	Nunes	Sinema
McMorris	Rooney	Wenstrup	Hahn	Meng	Scott, David	Nunnelee	Smith (MO)	Smith (MO)
Rodgers	Roskam	Westmoreland	Hanabusa	Mica	Sensenbrenner	Owens	Smith (NE)	Womack
Meadows	Ross	Whitfield	Harris	Michaud	Serrano	Pastor (AZ)	Smith (NJ)	Yoder
Meehan	Rothfus	Williams	Heck (WA)	Miller (FL)	Shea-Porter	Pearce	Smith (TX)	Yoder
Messer	Royce	Wilson (SC)	Hensarling	Miller, George	Sherman	Perlmutter	Southerland	Young (AK)
Mica	Ruiz	Womack	Higgins	Moore	Sires	Peterson	Stewart	
Miller (MI)	Runyan	Woodall	Himes	Moran	Smith (WA)			
Mullin	Ryan (WI)	Yoder	Holding	Nadler	Speier			
Mulvaney	Salmon	Young (FL)	Holt	Napolitano	Stockman			
Murphy (PA)	Sanford	Schweikert	Horsford	O'Rourke	Swalwell (CA)			
Neugebauer	Schock		Hoyer	Olson	Terry			
Noem			Hudson	Palazzo	Tierney			
			Huffman	Pallone	Titus			
			Hunter	Pascrell	Tonko			
			Israel	Paulsen	Tsongas			
			Issa	Payne	Van Hollen			
			Jackson Lee	Pelosi	Velázquez			
			Jeffries	Perry	Visclosky			
			Johnson, Sam	Peters (CA)	Wasserman			
			Jones	Peters (MI)	Schultz			
			Jordan	Petri	Waters			
			Kaptur	Pingree (ME)	Watt			
			Keating	Pittenger	Waxman			
			Kelly (IL)	Pitts	Wilson (FL)			
			Kennedy	Pocan	Wolf			
			Kilmer	Polis	Woodall			
			Kind	Price (GA)	Yarmuth			
			Kingston	Price (NC)	Young (FL)			
			Kline	Quigley	Young (IN)			

NOT VOTING—8

Hastings (FL) Larsen (WA) Miller, Gary
Herrera Beutler Markey Slaughter
Honda McCarthy (NY)

□ 1109

Mr. GOODLATTE changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 47 OFFERED BY MR. KIND

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 208, noes 217, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 276]

AYES—208

Amash	Bridenstine	Clarke
Andrews	Brooks (AL)	Clay
Bachus	Broun (GA)	Coffman
Bass	Brown (FL)	Cohen
Beatty	Burgess	Collins (GA)
Becerra	Capps	Connolly
Bentivolio	Cardenas	Conyers
Bilirakis	Carney	Cooper
Bishop (NY)	Cartwright	Courtney
Black	Castor (FL)	Crowley
Blackburn	Chabot	Cummings
Blumenauer	Chaffetz	Davis (CA)
Bonamici	Chu	Davis, Danny
Brady (PA)	Ciulline	DeFazio

Aderholt	Costa	Gowdy
Alexander	Cotton	Granger
Amodei	Cramer	Graves (MO)
Bachmann	Crawford	Griffin (AR)
Barber	Crenshaw	Griffith (VA)
Barletta	Cuellar	Grimm
Barr	Culberson	Guthrie
Barrow (GA)	Daines	Hall
Barton	Davis, Rodney	Hanna
Benishek	DelBene	Harper
Bera (CA)	Denham	Hartzler
Bishop (GA)	DesJarlais	Hastings (WA)
Bishop (UT)	Deutch	Heck (NV)
Bonner	Diaz-Balart	Hinojosa
Boustany	Duckworth	Huelskamp
Brady (TX)	Duffy	Huizenga (MI)
Braley (IA)	Duncan (SC)	Hultgren
Brooks (IN)	Ellmers	Hurt
Brownley (CA)	Enyart	Jenkins
Buchanan	Farenthold	Johnson (GA)
Bucshon	Farr	Johnson (OH)
Bustos	Fincher	Johnson, E. B.
Butterfield	Fitzpatrick	Joyce
Calvert	Fleming	Kelly (PA)
Camp	Flores	Kildee
Campbell	Forbes	King (IA)
Cantor	Fortenberry	King (NY)
Capito	Foster	Kinzinger (IL)
Capuano	Frankl (FL)	Kirkpatrick
Carson (IN)	Gabbard	Labrador
Carter	Galleo	LaMalfa
Cassidy	Garamendi	Lankford
Castro (TX)	Garcia	Latham
Cleaver	Gardner	Latta
Clyburn	Gerlach	Lipinski
Coble	Gibbs	Loeb sack
Cole	Gibson	Long
Collins (NY)	Gohmert	Lucas
Conaway	Goodlatte	Luetkemeyer
Cook	Gosar	

NOES—217

Costa	Gowdy	Hastings (FL)
Cotton	Granger	Herrera Beutler
Cramer	Graves (MO)	Honda
Crawford	Griffin (AR)	
Crenshaw	Griffith (VA)	
Cuellar	Grimm	
Culberson	Guthrie	
Daines	Hall	
Davis, Rodney	Hanna	
DelBene	Harper	
Denham	Hartzler	
DesJarlais	Hastings (WA)	
Deutch	Heck (NV)	
Diaz-Balart	Hinojosa	
Duckworth	Huelskamp	
Duffy	Huizenga (MI)	
Duncan (SC)	Hultgren	
Ellmers	Hurt	
Enyart	Jenkins	
Farenthold	Johnson (GA)	
Farr	Johnson (OH)	
Fincher	Johnson, E. B.	
Fitzpatrick	Joyce	
Fleming	Kelly (PA)	
Flores	Kildee	
Forbes	King (IA)	
Fortenberry	King (NY)	
Foster	Kinzinger (IL)	
Frankl (FL)	Kirkpatrick	
Gabbard	Labrador	
Galleo	LaMalfa	
Garamendi	Lankford	
Garcia	Latham	
Gardner	Latta	
Gerlach	Lipinski	
Gibbs	Loeb sack	
Gibson	Long	
Gohmert	Lucas	
Goodlatte	Luetkemeyer	
Gosar		

NOT VOTING—9

Hastings (FL) Larsen (WA) Miller, Gary
Herrera Beutler Markey Slaughter
Honda McCarthy (NY) Vargas

□ 1114

Mr. CLEAVER changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 48 OFFERED BY MR. CARNEY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CARNEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 174, noes 252, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 277]

AYES—174

Amash	Castro (TX)	Doyle
Andrews	Chabot	Duncan (SC)
Bass	Chaffetz	Duncan (TN)
Becerra	Chu	Edwards
Bilirakis	Ciulline	Ellison
Bishop (NY)	Coffman	Eshoo
Bishop (UT)	Connolly	Fattah
Blumenauer	Cook	Fleischmann
Brady (PA)	Cooper	Fleming
Brady (TX)	Cotton	Fox
Bridenstine	Courtney	Franks (AZ)
Brooks (AL)	Crowley	Frelinghuysen
Brown (GA)	Daines	Fudge
Brown (FL)	Davis (CA)	Gabbard
Cantor	Davis, Danny	Garamendi
Capps	DeFazio	Garcia
Capuano	DeLauro	Garrett
Carney	Dent	Gingrey (GA)
Cartwright	DeSantis	Goodlatte
Cassidy	Dingell	Gowdy

Graves (GA) Maloney, Royce
 Grijalva Carolyn
 Gutierrez Massie
 Hahn Matheson
 Hanabusa McCaul
 Hanna McClintock
 Heck (WA) McGovern
 Hensarling Meadows
 Higgins Meehan
 Himes Meeks
 Holt Meng
 Hoyer Michaud
 Huffman Miller (FL)
 Hurt Miller, George
 Israel Moore
 Issa Moran
 Johnson, E. B. Mulvaney
 Johnson, Sam Murphy (FL)
 Jones Napolitano
 Jordan Neal
 Kaptur O'Rourke
 Keating Pallone
 Kennedy Pascrell
 Kilmer Paulsen
 Kind Payne
 Kingston Pelosi
 Kuster Perlmutter
 Lamborn Peters (CA)
 Lance Petri
 Langevin Pitts
 Larson (CT) Pocan
 Lee (CA) Poe (TX)
 Levin Polis
 Lewis Price (GA)
 Lipinski Quigley
 LoBiondo Radel
 Lowey Rangel
 Lynch Rigell

NOES—252

Aderholt Denham
 Alexander DesJarlais
 Amodei Deutch
 Bachmann Diaz-Balart
 Bachus Doggett
 Barber Duckworth
 Barletta Duffy
 Barr Ellmers
 Barrow (GA) Engel
 Barton Enyart
 Beatty Esty
 Benishek Farenthold
 Bentivolio Farr
 Bera (CA) Fincher
 Bishop (GA) Fitzpatrick
 Black Flores
 Blackburn Forbes
 Bonamici Fortenberry
 Bonner Foster
 Boustany Frankel (FL)
 Braley (IA) Gallego
 Brooks (IN) Gardner
 Brownley (CA) Gerlach
 Buchanan Gibbs
 Bucshon Gibson
 Burgess Gohmert
 Bustos Gosar
 Butterfield Granger
 Calvert Graves (MO)
 Camp Grayson
 Campbell Green, Al
 Capito Green, Gene
 Cárdenas Griffin (AR)
 Carson (IN) Griffith (VA)
 Carter Grimm
 Castor (FL) Guthrie
 Clarke Hall
 Clay Harper
 Cleaver Harris
 Clyburn Hartzler
 Coble Hastings (WA)
 Cohen Heck (NV)
 Cole Hinojosa
 Collins (GA) Holding
 Collins (NY) Horsford
 Conaway Griffith (VA)
 Conyers Huelskamp
 Costa Huizenga (MI)
 Cramer Hultgren
 Crawford Hunter
 Crenshaw Jackson Lee
 Cuellar Jeffries
 Culberson Jenkins
 Cummings Johnson (GA)
 Davis, Rodney Johnson (OH)
 DeGette Joyce
 Delaney Kelly (IL)
 DelBene Kelly (PA)

Rohrabacher Pittenger
 Royce Pompeo
 Runyan Posey
 Ruppersberger Price (NC)
 Ryan (WI) Rahall
 Salmon Reed
 Sanchez, Loretta Reichert
 Sanford Renacci
 Sarbanes Ribble
 Scalise Rice (SC)
 Schakowsky Richmond
 Schiff Roby
 Schneider Roe (TN)
 Schwartz Rogers (AL)
 Schweikert Rogers (KY)
 Scott (VA) Rogers (MI)
 Sensenbrenner Rokita
 Serrano Rooney
 Shea-Porter Ros-Lehtinen
 Sherman Roskam
 Sires Ross
 Smith (WA) Rothfus
 Smithwell (CA) Roybal-Allard
 Tierney Ruiz
 Titus Rush
 Tonko Ryan (OH)
 Tsongas Sanchez, Linda
 Van Hollen T.
 Velázquez
 Wagner
 Watt
 Waxman
 Webster (FL)
 Welch
 Westmoreland
 Wilson (FL)
 Woodall
 Young (FL)

Hastings (FL)
 Herrera Beutler
 Honda

Schock Turner
 Schrader Upton
 Scott, Austin Valadao
 Scott, David Vargas
 Sessions Veasey
 Sewell (AL) Vela
 Shimkus Visclosky
 Shuster Walberg
 Simpson Walden
 Sinema Walorski
 Smith (MO) Walz
 Smith (NE) Wasserman
 Smith (NJ) Schultz
 Smith (TX) Waters
 Southerland Weber (TX)
 Speier Wenstrup
 Stewart Whitfield
 Stivers Williams
 Stockman Wilson (SC)
 Stutzman Wittman
 Takano Wolf
 Terry Womack
 Thompson (CA) Yarmuth
 Thompson (MS) Yoder
 Thompson (PA) Yoho
 Thornberry Young (AK)
 Tiberi Young (IN)
 Tipton

NOT VOTING—8

Larsen (WA) Miller, Gary
 Markey Slaughter
 McCarthy (NY)

□ 1118

Mrs. BLACK changed her vote from "aye" to "no."
 So the amendment was rejected.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MR. CONAWAY
 Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 23 to the end that the amendment stand rejected in accordance with the previous voice vote thereon.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. SIMPSON). The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.
 The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Without objection, the request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 23 is withdrawn, and the amendment stands rejected in accordance with the previous voice vote thereon.

AMENDMENT NO. 99 OFFERED BY MR. GOODLATTE
 The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 99 printed in part B of House Report 113-117.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I have amendment No. 99 at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:
 Strike part I of subtitle D (Dairy) of title I and insert the following new part:

PART I—DAIRY PRODUCER MARGIN INSURANCE PROGRAM
SEC. 1401. DAIRY PRODUCER MARGIN INSURANCE PROGRAM.

Subtitle E of title I of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8771 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 1511. DAIRY PRODUCER MARGIN INSURANCE PROGRAM.

"(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:
 "(1) ACTUAL DAIRY PRODUCER MARGIN.—The term 'actual dairy producer margin' means the difference between the all-milk price and

the average feed cost, as calculated under subsection (b)(2).

"(2) ALL-MILK PRICE.—The term 'all-milk price' means the average price received, per hundredweight of milk, by dairy producers for all milk sold to plants and dealers in the United States, as reported by the National Agricultural Statistics Service.

"(3) AVERAGE FEED COST.—The term 'average feed cost' means the average cost of feed used by a dairy operation to produce a hundredweight of milk, determined under subsection (b)(1) using the sum of the following:

- "(A) The product determined by multiplying—
 - "(i) 1.0728; by
 - "(ii) the price of corn per bushel.
- "(B) The product determined by multiplying—
 - "(i) 0.00735; by
 - "(ii) the price of soybean meal per ton.
- "(C) The product determined by multiplying—
 - "(i) 0.0137; by
 - "(ii) the price of alfalfa hay per ton.

"(4) CONSECUTIVE 2-MONTH PERIOD.—The term 'consecutive 2-month period' refers to the 2-month period consisting of the months of January and February, March and April, May and June, July and August, September and October, or November and December, respectively.

"(5) DAIRY PRODUCER.—The term 'dairy producer' means an individual or entity that directly or indirectly (as determined by the Secretary)—

- "(A) shares in the risk of producing milk; and
- "(B) makes contributions (including land, labor, management, equipment, or capital) to the dairy operation of the individual or entity that are at least commensurate with the share of the individual or entity of the proceeds of the operation.

"(6) MARGIN INSURANCE PROGRAM.—The term 'margin insurance program' means the dairy producer margin insurance program required by this section.

"(7) PARTICIPATING DAIRY PRODUCER.—The term 'participating dairy producer' means a dairy producer that registers under subsection (d)(2) to participate in the margin insurance program.

"(8) PRODUCTION HISTORY.—The term 'production history' means the quantity of annual milk marketings determined for a dairy producer under subsection (e)(1).

"(9) UNITED STATES.—The term 'United States', in a geographical sense, means the 50 States.

"(b) CALCULATION OF AVERAGE FEED COST AND ACTUAL DAIRY PRODUCER MARGINS.—

"(1) CALCULATION OF AVERAGE FEED COST.—The Secretary shall calculate the national average feed cost for each month using the following data:

- "(A) The price of corn for a month shall be the price received during that month by agricultural producers in the United States for corn, as reported in the monthly Agriculture Prices report by the Secretary.
- "(B) The price of soybean meal for a month shall be the central Illinois price for soybean meal, as reported in the Market News - Monthly Soybean Meal Price Report by the Secretary.

"(C) The price of alfalfa hay for a month shall be the price received during that month by agricultural producers in the United States for alfalfa hay, as reported in the monthly Agriculture Prices report by the Secretary.

"(2) CALCULATION OF ACTUAL DAIRY PRODUCER MARGINS.—The Secretary shall calculate the actual dairy producer margin for each consecutive 2-month period by subtracting—

“(A) the average feed cost for that consecutive 2-month period, determined in accordance with paragraph (1); from

“(B) the all-milk price for that consecutive 2-month period.

“(C) ESTABLISHMENT OF DAIRY PRODUCER MARGIN INSURANCE PROGRAM.—The Secretary shall establish and administer a dairy producer margin insurance program for the purpose of protecting dairy producer income by paying participating dairy producers margin insurance payments when actual dairy producer margins are less than the threshold levels for the payments.

“(d) ELIGIBILITY AND REGISTRATION OF DAIRY PRODUCERS FOR MARGIN INSURANCE PROGRAM.—

“(1) ELIGIBILITY.—All dairy producers in the United States shall be eligible to participate in the margin insurance program.

“(2) REGISTRATION PROCESS.—

“(A) REGISTRATION.—

“(i) ANNUAL REGISTRATION.—On an annual basis, the Secretary shall register all interested dairy producers in the margin insurance program.

“(ii) MANNER AND FORM.—The Secretary shall specify the manner and form by which a dairy producer shall register for the margin insurance program.

“(B) TREATMENT OF MULTI-PRODUCER OPERATIONS.—If a dairy operation consists of more than 1 dairy producer, all of the dairy producers of the operation shall be treated as a single dairy producer for purposes of—

“(i) purchasing margin insurance; and

“(ii) payment of producer premiums under subsection (f)(4).

“(C) TREATMENT OF PRODUCERS WITH MULTIPLE DAIRY OPERATIONS.—If a dairy producer operates 2 or more dairy operations, each dairy operation of the producer shall require a separate registration to participate and purchase margin insurance.

“(3) TIME FOR REGISTRATION.—

“(A) EXISTING DAIRY PRODUCERS.—During the 1-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this section, and annually thereafter, a dairy producer that is actively engaged in a dairy operation as of that date may register with the Secretary to participate in the margin insurance program.

“(B) NEW ENTRANTS.—A dairy producer that has no existing interest in a dairy operation as of the date of enactment of this section, but that, after that date, establishes a new dairy operation, may register with the Secretary during the 180-day period beginning on the date on which the dairy operation first markets milk commercially to participate in the margin insurance program.

“(4) RETROACTIVITY.—

“(A) NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY OF RETROACTIVE PROTECTION.—Not later than 30 days after the effective date of this section, the Secretary shall publish a notice in the Federal Register to inform dairy producers of the availability of retroactive margin insurance, subject to the condition that interested producers must file a notice of intent (in such form and manner as the Secretary specifies in the Federal Register notice) to participate in the margin insurance program.

“(B) RETROACTIVE MARGIN INSURANCE.—

“(i) AVAILABILITY.—If a dairy producer files a notice of intent under subparagraph (A) to participate in the margin insurance program before the initiation of the sign-up period for the margin insurance program and subsequently signs up for the margin insurance program, the producer shall receive margin insurance retroactive to the effective date of this section.

“(ii) DURATION.—Retroactive margin insurance under this paragraph for a dairy producer shall apply from the effective date of

this section until the date on which the producer signs up for the margin insurance program.

“(C) NOTICE OF INTENT AND OBLIGATION TO PARTICIPATE.—In no way does filing a notice of intent under this paragraph obligate a dairy producer to sign up for the margin insurance program once the program rules are final, but if a producer does file a notice of intent and subsequently signs up for the margin insurance program, that dairy producer is obligated to pay premiums for any retroactive margin insurance selected in the notice of intent.

“(5) RECONSTITUTION.—The Secretary shall ensure that a dairy producer does not reconstitute a dairy operation for the sole purpose of purchasing margin insurance.

“(e) PRODUCTION HISTORY OF PARTICIPATING DAIRY PRODUCERS.—

“(1) DETERMINATION OF PRODUCTION HISTORY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall determine the production history of the dairy operation of each participating dairy producer in the margin insurance program.

“(B) CALCULATION.—Except as provided in subparagraphs (C) and (D), the production history of a participating dairy producer shall be equal to the highest annual milk marketings of the dairy producer during any 1 of the 3 calendar years immediately preceding the registration of the dairy producer for participation in the margin insurance program.

“(C) UPDATING PRODUCTION HISTORY.—So long as participating producer remains registered, the production history of the participating producer shall be annually updated based on the highest annual milk marketings of the dairy producer during any one of the 3 immediately preceding calendar years.

“(D) NEW PRODUCERS.—If a dairy producer has been in operation for less than 1 year, the Secretary shall determine the initial production history of the dairy producer under subparagraph (B) by extrapolating the actual milk marketings for the months that the dairy producer has been in operation to a yearly amount.

“(2) REQUIRED INFORMATION.—A participating dairy producer shall provide all information that the Secretary may require in order to establish the production history of the dairy operation of the dairy producer.

“(3) TRANSFER OF PRODUCTION HISTORY.—

“(A) TRANSFER BY SALE.—

“(i) REQUEST FOR TRANSFER.—If an existing dairy producer sells an entire dairy operation to another party, the seller and purchaser may jointly request that the Secretary transfer to the purchaser the interest of the seller in the production history of the dairy operation.

“(ii) TRANSFER.—If the Secretary determines that the seller has sold the entire dairy operation to the purchaser, the Secretary shall approve the transfer and, thereafter, the seller shall have no interest in the production history of the sold dairy operation.

“(B) TRANSFER BY LEASE.—

“(i) REQUEST FOR TRANSFER.—If an existing dairy producer leases an entire dairy operation to another party, the lessor and lessee may jointly request that the Secretary transfer to the lessee for the duration of the term of the lease the interest of the lessor in the production history of the dairy operation.

“(ii) TRANSFER.—If the Secretary determines that the lessor has leased the entire dairy operation to the lessee, the Secretary shall approve the transfer and, thereafter, the lessor shall have no interest for the duration of the term of the lease in the production history of the leased dairy operation.

“(C) COVERAGE LEVEL.—A purchaser or lessee to whom the Secretary transfers a production history under this paragraph may not obtain a different level of margin insurance coverage held by the seller or lessor from whom the transfer was obtained.

“(D) NEW ENTRANTS.—The Secretary may not transfer the production history determined for a dairy producer described in subsection (d)(3)(B) to another person.

“(4) MOVEMENT AND TRANSFER OF PRODUCTION HISTORY.—

“(A) MOVEMENT AND TRANSFER AUTHORIZED.—Subject to subparagraph (B), if a dairy producer moves from 1 location to another location, the dairy producer may maintain the production history associated with the operation.

“(B) NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.—A dairy producer shall notify the Secretary of any move of a dairy operation under subparagraph (A).

“(C) SUBSEQUENT OCCUPATION OF VACATED LOCATION.—A party subsequently occupying a dairy operation location vacated as described in subparagraph (A) shall have no interest in the production history previously associated with the operation at that location.

“(f) MARGIN INSURANCE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—At the time of the registration of a dairy producer in the margin insurance program under subsection (d) and annually thereafter during the duration of the margin insurance program, an eligible dairy producer may purchase margin insurance.

“(2) SELECTION OF PAYMENT THRESHOLD.—A participating dairy producer purchasing margin insurance shall elect a coverage level in any increment of \$0.50, with a minimum of \$4.00 and a maximum of \$8.00.

“(3) SELECTION OF COVERAGE PERCENTAGE.—A participating dairy producer purchasing margin insurance shall elect a percentage of coverage, equal to not more than 80 percent nor less than 25 percent, of the production history of the dairy operation of the participating dairy producer.

“(4) PRODUCER PREMIUMS.—

“(A) PREMIUMS REQUIRED.—A participating dairy producer that purchases margin insurance shall pay an annual premium equal to the product obtained by multiplying—

“(i) the percentage selected by the dairy producer under paragraph (3);

“(ii) the production history applicable to the dairy producer; and

“(iii) the premium per hundredweight of milk, as specified in the applicable table under paragraph (B) or (C).

“(B) PREMIUM PER HUNDREDWEIGHT FOR FIRST 4 MILLION POUNDS OF PRODUCTION.—For the first 4,000,000 pounds of milk marketings included in the annual production history of a participating dairy operation, the premium per hundredweight corresponding to each coverage level specified in the following table is as follows:

“Coverage Level	Premium per Cwt.
\$4.00	\$0.000
\$4.50	\$0.01
\$5.00	\$0.02
\$5.50	\$0.035
\$6.00	\$0.045
\$6.50	\$0.09
\$7.00	\$0.18
\$7.50	\$0.60
\$8.00	\$0.95

“(C) PREMIUM PER HUNDREDWEIGHT FOR PRODUCTION IN EXCESS OF 4 MILLION POUNDS.—For milk marketings in excess of 4,000,000 pounds included in the annual production history of a participating dairy operation,

the premium per hundredweight corresponding to each coverage level is as follows:

Coverage Level	Premium per Cwt.
\$4.00	\$0.030
\$4.50	\$0.045
\$5.00	\$0.066
\$5.50	\$0.11
\$6.00	\$0.185
\$6.50	\$0.29
\$7.00	\$0.38
\$7.50	\$0.83
\$8.00	\$1.06

“(D) TIME FOR PAYMENT.—

“(i) FIRST YEAR.—As soon as practicable after a dairy producer registers to participate in the margin insurance program and purchases margin insurance, the dairy producer shall pay the premium determined under subparagraph (A) for the dairy producer for the first calendar year of the margin insurance.

“(ii) SUBSEQUENT YEARS.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—When the dairy producer first purchases margin insurance, the dairy producer shall also elect the method by which the dairy producer will pay premiums under this subsection for subsequent years in accordance with 1 of the schedules described in subclauses (II) and (III).

“(II) SINGLE ANNUAL PAYMENT.—The participating dairy producer may elect to pay 100 percent of the annual premium determined under subparagraph (A) for the dairy producer for a calendar year by not later than January 15 of the calendar year.

“(III) SEMI-ANNUAL PAYMENTS.—The participating dairy producer may elect to pay—

“(aa) 50 percent of the annual premium determined under subparagraph (A) for the dairy producer for a calendar year by not later than January 15 of the calendar year; and

“(bb) the remaining 50 percent of the premium by not later than June 15 of the calendar year.

“(5) PRODUCER PREMIUM OBLIGATIONS.—

“(A) PRO-RATION OF FIRST YEAR PREMIUM.—A participating dairy producer that purchases margin insurance after initial registration in the margin insurance program shall pay a pro-rated premium for the first calendar year based on the date on which the producer purchases the coverage.

“(B) SUBSEQUENT PREMIUMS.—Except as provided in subparagraph (A), the annual premium for a participating dairy producer shall be determined under paragraph (4) for each year in which the margin insurance program is in effect.

“(C) LEGAL OBLIGATION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clauses (ii) and (iii), a participating dairy producer that purchases margin insurance shall be legally obligated to pay the applicable premiums for the entire period of the margin insurance program (as provided in the payment schedule elected under paragraph (4)(B)), and may not opt out of the margin insurance program.

“(ii) DEATH.—If the dairy producer dies, the estate of the deceased may cancel the margin insurance and shall not be responsible for any further premium payments.

“(iii) RETIREMENT.—If the dairy producer retires, the producer may request that Secretary cancel the margin insurance if the producer has terminated the dairy operation entirely and certifies under oath that the producer will not be actively engaged in any dairy operation for at least the next 7 years.

“(6) PAYMENT THRESHOLD.—A participating dairy producer with margin insurance shall receive a margin insurance payment when-

ever the average actual dairy producer margin for a consecutive 2-month period is less than the coverage level threshold selected by the dairy producer under paragraph (2).

“(7) MARGIN INSURANCE PAYMENTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall make a margin insurance protection payment to each participating dairy producer whenever the average actual dairy producer margin for a consecutive 2-month period is less than the coverage level threshold selected by the dairy producer under paragraph (2).

“(B) AMOUNT OF PAYMENT.—The margin insurance payment for the dairy operation of a participating dairy producer shall be determined as follows:

“(i) The Secretary shall calculate the difference between—

“(I) the coverage level threshold selected by the dairy producer under paragraph (2); and

“(II) the average actual dairy producer margin for the consecutive 2-month period.

“(ii) The amount determined under clause (i) shall be multiplied by—

“(I) the percentage selected by the dairy producer under paragraph (3); and

“(II) the lesser of—

“(aa) the quotient obtained by dividing—

“(AA) the production history applicable to the producer under subsection (e)(1); by

“(BB) 6; and

“(bb) the actual quantity of milk marketed by the dairy operation of the dairy producer during the consecutive 2-month period.

“(g) EFFECT OF FAILURE TO PAY PREMIUMS.—

“(1) LOSS OF BENEFITS.—A participating dairy producer that is in arrears on premium payments for margin insurance—

“(A) remains legally obligated to pay the premiums; and

“(B) may not receive margin insurance until the premiums are fully paid.

“(2) ENFORCEMENT.—The Secretary may take such action as is necessary to collect premium payments for margin insurance.

“(h) USE OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION.—The Secretary shall use the funds, facilities, and the authorities of the Commodity Credit Corporation to carry out this section.

“(i) DURATION.—The Secretary shall conduct the margin insurance program during the period beginning on October 1, 2013, and ending on September 30, 2018.”

SEC. 1402. RULEMAKING.

(a) PROCEDURE.—The promulgation of regulations for the initiation of the margin insurance program, and for administration of the margin insurance program, shall be made—

(1) without regard to chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code (commonly known as the Paperwork Reduction Act);

(2) without regard to the Statement of Policy of the Secretary of Agriculture effective July 24, 1971 (36 Fed. Reg. 13804), relating to notices of proposed rulemaking and public participation in rulemaking; and

(3) subject to subsection (b), pursuant to section 553 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) SPECIAL RULEMAKING REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) INTERIM RULES AUTHORIZED.—With respect to the margin insurance program, the Secretary may promulgate interim rules under the authority provided in subparagraph (B) of section 553(b) of title 5, United States Code, if the Secretary determines such interim rules to be needed. Any such interim rules for the margin insurance program shall be effective on publication.

(2) FINAL RULES.—With respect to the margin insurance program, the Secretary shall promulgate final rules, with an opportunity for public notice and comment, no later than

21 months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) INCLUSION OF ADDITIONAL ORDER.—Section 143(a)(2) of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7253(a)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: “Subsection (b)(2) does not apply to the authority of the Secretary under this subsection.”

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield 5 minutes of my 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT) so he may manage that time.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to myself.

Mr. Chairman, like Ranking Member PETERSON, I have been closely involved in the debate to modernize our dairy system. In fact, at his request, I joined him and other Members to seek a solution to fix our dairy safety net after our current programs failed our producers. We agree that dairy farmers deserve access to a Dairy Margin Protection Program to ensure their production. However, I cannot support a Dairy Supply Management Program, and that’s why I’ve joined with Congressman SCOTT, Congressman COLLINS, Congressman MORAN, Congressman DUFFY, Congressman POLIS, Congressman COFFMAN, Congressman MEEKS, Congressman ISSA, Congresswoman DEGETTE, Congressman SESSIONS, and Congresswoman LEE to offer this amendment to take out the dairy provision and substitute for it what we have in all of our other commodity programs, and that is an insurance program that will save the taxpayers money, will save the consumers a lot of money, and not have a policy where we are actually having the government go to dairy farmers and say, If you want to get your check, you have to reduce the size of your herd.

I urge Members to support this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

I offer amendment #99 to remove the Dairy Market Stabilization Program with a bipartisan group of members—D. SCOTT/C. COLLINS/MORAN/DUFFY/POLIS/COFFMAN/MEEKS/ISSA/DEGETTE/SESSIONS/B. LEE.

Like Ranking Member PETERSON, I have been closely involved in the debate to modernize our dairy system. In fact at his request, I joined him and other members to seek a solution to fix our dairy safety net after our current programs failed our producers. We agree that dairy farmers deserve access to a Dairy Margin Protection Program, to insure their production. However, I cannot support a Dairy Supply Management Program.

This highly controversial program would attempt to manage the U.S. milk supply, and in the process penalize both consumers of dairy

products, as well as dairy farmers who want to expand their operations. Production controls or quotas, programs like the stabilization program are designed to limit milk supply in order to raise milk prices. Programs that directly interfere with free and open markets to raise prices will hurt exports, encourage imports, increase dairy prices for consumers and limit industry growth.

Our amendment is better for farmers. Our amendment gives farmers the tools to manage their risk without requiring them to participate in yet another government program. The new Title I programs and our existing insurance programs do not require producers to participate in government supply management, why is dairy different? A lot has been said that supply management has to be included to save the taxpayers' money. Frankly, the Congressional Budget Office has proven this inaccurate. Our bipartisan amendment without supply management saves the taxpayers \$15 million dollars. Farmers, consumers and taxpayers are better without Supply Management and I ask my colleagues to vote for our amendment.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to Mr. VALADAO from California, a new Member who's actually been in the dairy business and is probably the one guy in this place that understands how this works.

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Chairman, this has been a tough one for me because I am the only dairy farmer in this room, and it has been a tough issue because I've lived it for the last 15 years. I have seen how programs created by this body have hurt dairy farmers. There have been a lot of programs eliminated in this current farm bill, and that's a good thing. It takes us in a more market-oriented direction.

But what I see here is we're continuing that same path in a small way. This margin insurance, by definition, is an insurance when you lose money. You lose money because you're producing a product consumers aren't buying. If government is going to continue to push money in that direction, we have to make sure that they don't continue to produce that product consumers don't want.

The argument that we're going to miss out on an opportunity to export, if there's an export market and they're producing for that, they will sell that product. But you can't have a subsidized product coming into the marketplace and want to grow that export market again on a subsidized product because you can't continue to produce that product for that price. If we can't compete, we shouldn't be producing it. If it's going to require that margin insurance to make sure it's produced, it's not a long-term market. It's not a stable market. It's not something that we should spend billions of dollars investing in infrastructure that will not compete.

So I think, at the end of the day, that this is probably the best program.

We've gotten rid of MILC. We got rid of the price support. We've gotten rid of a lot of programs that continued production when consumers weren't buying that product.

And with this one, there's a choice. If they choose to take an opportunity to protect their margins so they can stay afloat—because we have to protect American products and make sure that consumers are buying the safest and the greatest product in the world, which I believe is American dairy product—you can't have them continue to produce that product in the name of exports or in the name of whatever. At the end of the day, consumers pay for it because consumers are taxpayers. If you're going to give them money on the backside out of their back pocket through taxes, you're again paying for that product. The product still has to be paid for.

Dairy farmers have to make a profit, but it has to be the right way. And if they're going to get that dollar to continue to produce that product that consumers aren't buying, there has to be somewhere along the line where they cut back and contract in the market.

So I rise in opposition. Mr. GOODLATTE has been a friend of mine and I have watched from afar. I appreciate everything he has done for the industry over the years, but I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. It is a very complicated issue, and I have great respect for our ranking member, but it does seem that we ought to be removing government production limits from our dairy program. Expanding distribution markets throughout the world is one of the best ways to grow American business and create jobs, and that should be one of the roles of government; to remove barriers to expansion and growth.

The fact is that the world demand for dairy products is growing at a faster rate than milk production increases in those regions that produce the most milk, like New Zealand and Australia. The U.S. dairy industry is best positioned to benefit from this growing world dairy demand, but this export growth is threatened by the proposed Dairy Market Stabilization Program in this bill. This provision would give USDA the ability to require every dairy producer enrolled in any level of margin insurance protection to reduce production to meet supply quotas.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. MORAN. As a result, domestic dairy producers would be constrained in their ability to respond to international market opportunities, and that results in lower growth and fewer American jobs. It's this type of supply

management plan that has failed in previous farm bills and would have the dangerous effect of stifling export growth. That is why I ask support for the Goodlatte-Scott amendment.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I am now pleased to yield 2 minutes to one of our ranking members, the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA).

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Chairman, the Dairy Security Act in this bill is as a result of 4 years of hard work on a bipartisan basis.

□ 1130

It's intended to provide a strong, market-based safety net that will keep dairy producers afloat while providing stable prices to our consumers.

Simply put, the amendment being offered here, the Goodlatte-Scott amendment, is about American taxpayers fully paying the bill for down prices that occur in down cycles in the dairy industry.

The dairy industry, especially producers, have been victims of these down cycles and the volatility in recent years because the old programs simply don't work and they encourage overproduction.

At the same time, producers have been forced to deal with increased feed costs that have increased from \$2 a bushel to \$7 a bushel, further impacting their bottom line.

The Goodlatte-Scott amendment will neither provide a safety net for producers, nor prevent the volatility in the market because of unpredictable swings. And, again, it's important to understand reform is in the bill.

This amendment would put the taxpayers footing the bill for the insurance program. This amendment will continue to foster the outdated, tired dairy programs that haven't worked.

In California, my home State, the Nation's leading dairy State in the Nation, we've seen over 100 bankruptcies in the last 18 months. The current program isn't good for the dairymen and -women, nor is it good for American consumers.

The Dairy Security Act not only provides more stability for the producer, but the consumer benefits as well. And you should understand this is voluntary. If you want to grow, you can grow. If you don't want to enter the program, you don't have to enter the program. It is voluntary.

I strongly urge, as a third-generation dairy family in California, my colleagues to oppose this amendment and to bring our Federal dairy policies into the 21st century, so dairymen and -women can compete, and American consumers can have milk prices at reasonable levels.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RIBBLE), America's dairy land, with more dairy farms than any other in the country.

Mr. RIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments from Mr. VALADAO, my colleague from California, earlier

when he said that they didn't have enough consumers to buy their milk. Well, we've got the opposite problem in Wisconsin.

People want Wisconsin milk, and they want Wisconsin cheese. And it shows the geographical difficulty with this problem and with this underlying bill.

Mr. GOODLATTE seeks to correct those geographical differences by taking the most controversial piece of it out, and I stand here in support of doing that.

You know, our Founders kind of instructed us and said, if you can find agreement in this Chamber, do those things; but if you can't find agreement—and we can't find agreement here—don't do those things.

And so what Mr. GOODLATTE is trying to do is go to the place where we have the most and most broad agreement, leaving the margin insurance element in place for farmers, but stripping out the supply management element where some regions of the country would be damaged by it.

I support the Goodlatte amendment because it's the right type of reform for all Wisconsans and all of this country's dairy producers and processors, not one or the other, but both.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I'm now pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH), one of our hard workers on this issue.

Mr. WELCH. The question facing this Congress is, Will we have a farm bill that respects farm families?

This is about individual families that are working hard to try to survive, not to get rich.

Market stabilization is exactly what Apple Computer does. If they make and sell more iPods, they produce more. If sales go down, they taper off.

Why not give that market signal to our farmers with second-, third-, fourth-generation families in Vermont, the Kennett family, the Richardson family, the Rowell family?

All they want to do is produce good, nutritious milk for the people in their community. This market stabilization gets them out of the death spiral, where they have absolutely no control over what that price is. And when it plunges, the only opportunity they have to try to survive is to increase production. The price goes down again.

This market stabilization is using the market. It's an ally of the farmer, as it should be. So this makes sense.

And what I am so proud of is that America's farmers, from Vermont to California, worked together to come up with something that would help pass that farm on to the next generation, and it saves money for the taxpayers.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me just correct one thing. The Goodlatte-Scott amendment has a very robust safety net program in it. As a matter of fact, it's the same safety net program that is in the bill itself.

Let me make one other point right quick, Mr. Chairman. With the recent

study by Professor Scott Brown, the University of Missouri put in a study that showed if this plan in this bill, this management supply bill, goes into effect, in the first month alone, school lunch program costs will go up \$14 million, and the price of a gallon of milk will go up 32 cents.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this bipartisan amendment which I am proud to cosponsor.

The underlying farm bill is designed to artificially raise the price of milk. This will have negative consequences for consumers, and that's why the Consumer Federation of America, the National Consumers League, the Consumers Union and other consumer groups, also the Teamsters, oppose the underlying language in this bill and support this amendment.

And when milk prices increase, it disproportionately harms America's poor, working families.

Now, there's a lot in this bill that I cannot support, including the heartless cuts to SNAP. Without this amendment, this bill adds insult to injury. Without this amendment, 246,000 women and children will lose access to milk because of the decrease of milk supply, and also prices, as the Representative from Georgia has so eloquently laid out, the milk prices will rise about 32 cents.

So this amendment protects families whose budgets are already stretched to the limit and they're already being cut in this bill.

So I hope that people understand this bill. There's been a lot of confusion, but this is a good bill that consumers support, that teamsters support; and I urge an "aye" vote on the amendment, not the bill, but the amendment.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I'm going to take 30 seconds right now, and then I'm going to reserve because I'm ahead.

But I just need to stand up and say that this is not true. Scott Brown put out a study on this bill, and they said the effect of this was going to be a half a cent a gallon, maybe a couple of cents a gallon. So where they're coming up with this 30 cents or 50 cents, I have no idea. This is complete fabrication that's made up out of something that I don't know where it comes from.

So people need to understand that. Scott Brown is probably the most respected economist in dairy in the country, and he did not say it was 30 cents or 50 cents.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, what Mr. BROWN said was up to 32 cents a gallon.

At this time I am happy to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP).

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to visit on this. I do believe in an individual's

right to earn a living, to start a business, to earn a profit, to grow that business, and to expand to meet new market opportunities without government interference.

And I also believe that should be specifically available to dairy farmers as well.

But in the dairy program before us today, that flies in the face of this right. Government should not have the power to tell dairy farmers that they won't be paid for the milk they produce.

I think it's completely hypocritical for Members of this body to come to the floor and rail against market manipulation by Big Business, then turn around and say Washington should do the same thing.

We should support the Goodlatte-Scott amendment. We should oppose government control and interference in the marketplace, and we should support dairy freedom, growth, and opportunity.

There are numerous dairy families across this country, but one in particular in my district, the McCarty family, please let them have the opportunity to grow their business. Give them that chance. If we adopt the language as is, it will restrict their ability to grow their business.

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

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE).

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chairman, haven't we done enough already in this bill to impact low-income families' access to food?

The U.S. Government purchases 20 percent of domestic milk production for use in anti-hunger programs. So if the price of milk goes up, so does the cost of our nutrition programs like the Supplemental Assistance Nutrition Program; Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children, or the WIC program; and the National School Lunch program.

Everybody admits that the effect of the underlying language in the bill will be to raise milk prices.

□ 1140

This is a burden that our low-income families simply cannot afford. We need a balance. We need a balance that will give a safety net to our dairy families but won't take it off of the backs of our low-income folks.

So I would urge a "yes" vote on this amendment. Just like the Consumer Federation of America and so many other groups that Ms. LEE talked about, this is a good thing for consumers, it's a good thing for Americans, and we should have that balance. Vote "yes."

Mr. PETERSON. I'm now pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE).

Ms. DELBENE. Thank you, Mr. PETERSON.

I rise in strong opposition to the Goodlatte-Scott amendment which would create unnecessary market volatility and uncertainty for our farmers. The Dairy Security Act creates a new, voluntary insurance program and will help consumers by eliminating the price spikes that are common today, ensuring stable milk prices.

There has been a great deal of misinformation about how the Dairy Security Act would affect consumers, but researchers like Dr. Brown at the University of Missouri, estimated milk prices will only rise between one-half of 1 cent to a few cents per gallon. The current volatility in the market is far more harmful to consumers than that very slight increase.

Simply put, it is poor policy to commit funds to a dairy program without fixing the underlying problem of oversupply, which is what this amendment would do. An insurance-only model poorly addresses the symptom of low margins and completely misses the issues of supply and demand. The stabilization program also has safeguards that will protect the U.S. export market, which is critical for dairy producers.

In my district, I've had long conversations with local dairy farmers, been to their farms, and the sentiment is unanimous: dairy farmers oppose this amendment because it will hurt them and consumers. I urge my colleagues to follow their advice and vote "no."

Mr. GOODLATTE. At this time, it's my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GRIMM).

Mr. GRIMM. Thank you, chairman.

Today, I rise in strong support of the Goodlatte-Scott amendment. The farm bill, as is, artificially increases the price of milk and cheese. And where I come from, this will devastate my local delis, my specialty food stores and restaurants throughout Staten Island, Brooklyn and throughout our Nation.

As for oversupply, today, New York is America's yogurt capital. That industry accounts for almost \$1 billion—with a B—in economic growth, revenue and 15,000 jobs.

Yet while we repeatedly talk about jobs and entrepreneurship, Chobani yogurt exemplifies this as a true American success story. Started in 2005, Chobani has transformed a groundbreaking new industry of Greek yogurt in America. But without an adequate milk supply at reasonable prices, Chobani, local delis and other companies will have a limited ability to grow and keep their products reasonably priced.

For this reason, I urge my colleagues to support the Goodlatte amendment.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I'm now pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS), one of our good champions of the dairy industry.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. GRIMM for mentioning the yogurt

industry. That is very prominent in my district, and we supply milk to many of the yogurt plants. There is no question that Mr. GOODLATTE's amendment would negatively impact that, whereas the Dairy Security Act would have a positive impact on our ability to supply milk to a growing industry that does, in fact, create jobs.

I rise in support of the Dairy Security Act and opposed to this amendment because it represents 4 years of bipartisan compromise worked out between Mr. LUCAS and Mr. PETERSON, and those are the kinds of activities we should be doing in this Congress.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. I now yield 1 minute to the distinguished lady from Florida, Ms. CORRINE BROWN.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, to the Members of the House, let me be clear, I will not be voting for this bill. I will vote for no bill that cuts \$20.5 billion from the SNAP program, but I will be voting for this amendment.

We had a hideous bill on the floor a couple of days ago. And I want to be clear. I support all children, and it does not end at birth. It is ludicrous that we're here and the goody goody two shoes are now cutting the SNAP program and an attack on children. The families of three can earn no modern \$24,000 per year in income. Seventy-six percent of the SNAP households include a child, an elderly person or a disabled person. Because of the insensitivity of this Congress, there was an announcement in my paper that Meals on Wheels for seniors are being cut.

I am fighting for babies who need milk and families that cannot afford food for their children. Support this amendment and vote against this bad bill.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair will inform the Members that the gentleman from Minnesota has 2½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Virginia has 1 minute remaining. The gentleman from Georgia's time has expired.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 30 seconds to my colleague from Minnesota (Mr. WALZ).

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Chairman, dairy farming is risky business. You've heard that from them themselves. These are the folks that are up at 4 a.m., rain, shine, snow or sleet—doesn't matter—7 days a week, 365 days a year milking cows, and then they do it again 12 hours later. They don't get rich off this. They don't get sick time, and they don't get paid holidays. They get no time off if you want to get to it.

The one thing we can provide them is certainty and take the volatility out of the market to make sure that when they have a bad year, we don't end up liquidating these, consolidating into large dairies and harming the very people that the people who support this amendment claim to support.

I ask my colleagues to reject this amendment and do the right thing for these hardworking Americans.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio, a member of the Agriculture Committee, to close our debate.

Mr. GIBBS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I rise in support of this amendment. This amendment builds on the reforms in the underlying bill and scraps the proposed "supply management" program. Doing so will allow farmers and dairy producers to expand and meet the growing global demand for American dairy products. It will grow our exports and grow our economy.

It also will protect families and farmers. Families are already having enough trouble making ends meet. This amendment will help bring down prices for our constituents by providing more opportunity and fairness to dairy farmers across the country.

It also will save taxpayers dollars. This amendment saves taxpayers another \$15 million on top of the savings in the underlying bill. Every penny counts.

This amendment will create better and more market-driven policies for our farmers. Supply management is not the way to go. I support the Goodlatte-Scott amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Minnesota has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

As has been said, we've been working on this for 4 years. Clearly, the current policy doesn't work because we've got all this volatility. If you adopt this Goodlatte-Scott amendment, you're going to continue to have that volatility.

Now, those people that are concerned about the price of milk, when we had high prices, the processors raised the prices. When the prices collapse \$11, they didn't cut the prices. I've sent out charts to you to explain that. So what people need to understand is what we're trying to do here is give farmers a way to protect themselves against the feed costs and this volatility.

Now, this program is voluntary. Nobody has to get into this program. If they don't like the stabilization fund, they don't have to take the insurance and they don't have to be involved in it. But what we're saying is, if you're going to have the government subsidize your insurance, which is what we're doing, then you're going to have to be responsible if this thing gets out of whack. And what the Goodlatte-Scott amendment does is it puts that responsibility on the taxpayers, not on the farmers, which is irresponsible in my opinion.

The other thing you need to understand is, in regular crop insurance, the prices, you can only ensure the price for that year. But in this amendment, in the Goodlatte-Scott amendment, you ensure the price not based on what the market is, it's based on the feed costs plus the margin. So you're going

to insure milk for \$18 per 100 weight, but if the price goes to \$11, the farmer still can have \$18 insurance. He doesn't care if it's \$11, the government is going to pay for that, not him.

This is a crazy thing that we're talking about doing here. We're putting the responsibility on the taxpayer. We're actually probably going to raise costs to consumers. It's the wrong way to go, and I urge my colleagues to oppose the Goodlatte-Scott amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia will be postponed.

□ 1150

AMENDMENT NO. 100 OFFERED BY MR.
FORTENBERRY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 100 printed in part B of House Report 113-117.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike section 1603 and insert the following new sections:

SEC. 1603. PAYMENT LIMITATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1001 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

“(3) LEGAL ENTITY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘legal entity’ means—

“(i) an organization that (subject to the requirements of this section and section 1001A) is eligible to receive a payment under a provision of law referred to in subsection (b), (c), or (d);

“(ii) a corporation, joint stock company, association, limited partnership, limited liability company, limited liability partnership, charitable organization, estate, irrevocable trust, grantor of a revocable trust, or other similar entity (as determined by the Secretary); and

“(iii) an organization that is participating in a farming operation as a partner in a general partnership or as a participant in a joint venture.

“(B) EXCLUSION.—The term ‘legal entity’ does not include a general partnership or joint venture.”;

(2) by striking subsections (b) through (d) and inserting the following:

“(b) LIMITATION ON PAYMENTS FOR COVERED COMMODITIES AND PEANUTS.—The total amount of payments received, directly or indirectly, by a person or legal entity for any crop year for 1 or more covered commodities and peanuts under title I of the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013 may not exceed \$125,000, of which—

“(1) not more than \$75,000 may consist of marketing loan gains and loan deficiency payments under subtitle B of title I of the

Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013; and

“(2) not more than \$50,000 may consist of any other payments made for covered commodities and peanuts under title I of the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013.

“(c) SPOUSAL EQUITY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subsection (b), except as provided in paragraph (2), if a person and the spouse of the person are covered by paragraph (2) and receive, directly or indirectly, any payment or gain covered by this section, the total amount of payments or gains (as applicable) covered by this section that the person and spouse may jointly receive during any crop year may not exceed an amount equal to twice the applicable dollar amounts specified in subsection (b).

“(2) EXCEPTIONS.—

“(A) SEPARATE FARMING OPERATIONS.—In the case of a married couple in which each spouse, before the marriage, was separately engaged in an unrelated farming operation, each spouse shall be treated as a separate person with respect to a farming operation brought into the marriage by a spouse, subject to the condition that the farming operation shall remain a separate farming operation, as determined by the Secretary.

“(B) ELECTION TO RECEIVE SEPARATE PAYMENTS.—A married couple may elect to receive payments separately in the name of each spouse if the total amount of payments and benefits described in subsection (b) that the married couple receives, directly or indirectly, does not exceed an amount equal to twice the applicable dollar amounts specified in those subsections.”;

(3) in paragraph (3)(B) of subsection (f), by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) IRREVOCABLE TRUSTS.—In promulgating regulations to define the term ‘legal entity’ as the term applies to irrevocable trusts, the Secretary shall ensure that irrevocable trusts are legitimate entities that have not been created for the purpose of avoiding a payment limitation.”;

(4) in subsection (h), in the second sentence, by striking “or other entity” and inserting “or legal entity”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 1001 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308) is amended—

(A) in subsection (e), by striking “subsections (b) and (c)” each place it appears in paragraphs (1) and (3)(B) and inserting “subsection (b)”;

(B) in subsection (f)—

(i) in paragraph (2), by striking “Subsections (b) and (c)” and inserting “Subsection (b)”;

(ii) in paragraph (4)(B), by striking “subsection (b) or (c)” and inserting “subsection (b)”;

(iii) in paragraph (5)—

(I) in subparagraph (A), by striking “subsection (d)”;

(II) in subparagraph (B), by striking “subsection (b), (c), or (d)” and inserting “subsection (b)”;

(iv) in paragraph (6)—

(I) in subparagraph (A), by striking “Notwithstanding subsection (d), except as provided in subsection (g)” and inserting “Except as provided in subsection (f)”;

(II) in subparagraph (B), by striking “subsections (b), (c), and (d)” and inserting “subsection (b)”;

(C) in subsection (g)—

(i) in paragraph (1)—

(I) by striking “subsection (f)(6)(A)” and inserting “subsection (e)(6)(A)”;

(II) by striking “subsection (b) or (c)” and inserting “subsection (b)”;

(ii) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking “subsections (b) and (c)” and inserting “subsection (b)”;

(D) by redesignating subsections (e) through (h) as subsections (d) through (g), respectively.

(2) Section 1001A of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308-1) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking “subsections (b) and (c) of section 1001” and inserting “section 1001(b)”;

(B) in subsection (b)(1), by striking “subsection (b) or (c) of section 1001” and inserting “section 1001(b)”.

(3) Section 1001B(a) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308-2(a)) is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking “subsections (b) and (c) of section 1001” and inserting “section 1001(b)”.

(c) APPLICATION.—The amendments made by this section shall apply beginning with the 2014 crop year.

SEC. 1603A. PAYMENTS LIMITED TO ACTIVE FARMERS.

Section 1001A of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308-1) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(2)—

(A) by striking “or active personal management” each place it appears in subparagraphs (A)(i)(II) and (B)(ii); and

(B) in subparagraph (C), by striking “, as applied to the legal entity, are met by the legal entity, the partners or members making a significant contribution of personal labor or active personal management” and inserting “are met by partners or members making a significant contribution of personal labor, those partners or members”;

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

“(A) the landowner share-rents the land at a rate that is usual and customary”;

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) the share of the payments received by the landowner is commensurate with the share of the crop or income received as rent.”;

(B) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking “active personal management or”;

(C) in paragraph (5)—

(i) by striking “(5)” and all that follows through “(A) IN GENERAL.—A person” and inserting the following:

“(5) CUSTOM FARMING SERVICES.—A person”;

(ii) by inserting “under usual and customary terms” after “services”;

(iii) by striking subparagraph (B); and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(7) FARM MANAGERS.—A person who otherwise meets the requirements of this subsection other than (b)(2)(A)(i)(II) shall be considered to be actively engaged in farming, as determined by the Secretary, with respect to the farming operation, including a farming operation that is a sole proprietorship, a legal entity such as a joint venture or general partnership, or a legal entity such as a corporation or limited partnership, if the person—

“(A) makes a significant contribution of management to the farming operation necessary for the farming operation, taking into account—

“(i) the size and complexity of the farming operation; and

“(ii) the management requirements normally and customarily required by similar farming operations;

“(B)(i) is the only person in the farming operation qualifying as actively engaged in farming by using the farm manager special class designation under this paragraph; and

“(ii) together with any other persons in the farming operation qualifying as actively engaged in farming under subsection (b)(2) or as part of a special class under this subsection, does not collectively receive, directly or indirectly, an amount equal to more than the applicable limits under section 1001(b);

“(C) does not use the management contribution under this paragraph to qualify as actively engaged in more than 1 farming operation; and

“(D) manages a farm operation that does not substantially share equipment, labor, or management with persons or legal entities that with the person collectively receive, directly or indirectly, an amount equal to more than the applicable limits under section 1001(b).”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Chairman, first, I would like to begin by recognizing the hard work that Chairman LUCAS has put into this bill, as well as Ranking Member PETERSON. A complex bill such as this requires time, dedication, and a willingness to work with Members from a very diverse range of agricultural communities across this Nation, and I appreciate the effort.

I also recognize that many were here very late last night and there is a certain urgency to our deliberations. But I believe it is critically important that we also have a meaningful discussion and debate on the issue of payment limits.

The other legislative body has seen fit to include the language in this amendment in its version of the farm bill, and this amendment gives us the opportunity to send a message that some reform in this area is necessary.

While there is much to commend in this farm bill, Mr. Chairman, I am concerned that it falls short of successfully reforming the payment limit system. Without a doubt, agricultural payments are lopsided. Based on the USDA's annual Agricultural Resource Management Survey, the largest 12 percent of farms in terms of gross receipts received more than 62 percent of all government payments in 2009. Such a skewed system, Mr. Chairman, is simply not sustainable in the long run. It leads to the escalation of land prices and accelerates the concentration of land and resources into fewer hands. This is not healthy for rural America.

Continuation of the current system will only lead to greater concentration in agriculture and fewer opportunities for young and beginning farmers. We need a thoughtful and balanced approach here, one that encourages young people to take a chance and gives them some support when they need it, one that doesn't lend itself to the trend of fewer and fewer farms.

Mr. Chairman, we pride ourselves that agriculture is the main bright spot in America's economy. And how did we get here? By ensuring that we

have a vibrant marketplace which depends upon large numbers of producers actively engaged in stewardship of the land.

The amendment I am offering will help farm supports reach their intended recipients as well and close loopholes that benefit investors not actively engaged in farming. It levels the playing field for farm families facing competition from larger operations that do collect the lion's share of government payments.

The amendment reduces farm payment limits, capping commodity payments at \$250,000 for any one farm. That's a lot of subsidy. The legislation will also close loopholes in current law to ensure payments reach their intended recipient, that is, working farmers.

The savings from reforms established in this legislation help ensure that the farm payment system is also set on a more fiscally sustainable trajectory. It's fair to farmers, fair to the taxpayer, and fair to America because it incorporates good governing principles.

This amendment has wide support from a diverse range of agricultural groups, such as the National Farmers Union, the Center for Rural Affairs, National Sustainable Agriculture Coalition, Heritage Action, and Citizens Against Government Waste. They recognize the opportunity we have for meaningful reform here.

Now, it is important, Mr. Chairman, to emphasize that this does not address crop insurance subsidies. That is a completely separate matter, and I recognize the need to differentiate between a program in which producers must contribute their own dollars toward the actuarial success of the program and one that is directly coming from the government.

Mr. Chairman, I have been through two farm bills now, and I've talked to hundreds of farmers in rural America. What they're looking for is simply a chance to compete, and compete well, not a guarantee of unlimited money from the government. We owe it to our hardworking farmers to sustain that fair and robust marketplace.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LUCAS. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY).

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I stand in strong opposition to this amendment.

One particular troubling issue is the predefinition of “actively engaged in farming.” My good colleague should know that this will alter, fundamentally, the normal operations on a farm.

Take two quick examples, a brother and a sister. The sister runs the tractors, plants the crops, harvests the crops; the brother, on the other hand, does all the bookkeeping, files tax re-

turns, works with FSA, arranges the loans at the bank. He would no longer be actively engaged in farming. That makes no sense whatsoever.

The broader spread one, though, is the generational shift in farming operations. As parents and grandparents age, they take less of a physical role in farming operations and hand that off to the younger generation—the folks that my good colleague was speaking to. This redefinition would say that as they age out and quit doing the actual physical labor, and yet their wisdom and knowledge and vast experience has added to the success of those farming operations, they would no longer be considered actively engaged in farming and would be excluded from the program itself. This is wrongheaded. It adds additional regulatory burdens on family farms across this country in an unnecessary manner and doesn't get to what my good colleague is trying to get to.

I would strongly urge my colleagues to reject this amendment and vote “no” on the Fortenberry amendment.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. May I can inquire, Mr. Chairman, as to how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Nebraska has 1¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I'm not out to punish anyone's success. In fact, I celebrate it.

A \$250,000 subsidy is a lot of money to come directly from the government. I think many Americans would agree. We put caps and limits on virtually every other program, so why not this one? What I'm saying is that amount of money should be sufficient.

I would like to offer another example regarding direct engagement in farming that helps clarify the issue that my colleague just raised.

A farm in the Deep South recently received \$440,000—again, none of it to someone actually working the farm, but to six general partners and five spouses, all of whom claim to be providing the management needed to running the farm.

What this bill does, in addition to capping payments, it provides a more enforceable working definition for those actively engaged in farm management, and that's an important reform as well.

Again, this has been worked out in the other legislative body from Members who represent diverse agricultural districts all over this country. I think this is a reasonable reform that, again, is fair to the taxpayers, fair to the farm family, and consistent with good governing principles. It's a balanced, reasonable approach.

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

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the subcommittee chairman of the Agriculture Committee from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD).

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully oppose the gentleman's amendment.

In order for farmers in my district to compete, their operations must be economies of scale. This is largely due to the high cost of production, expensive machinery, and razor-thin margins.

In order to remain economically viable, a mid-South farmer must produce a high quantity of crops and then sell that crop at an adequate price, which doesn't always work out so well. Some years in Arkansas a farmer might do very well if conditions are right and the prices don't drop too low, but in other years times can be absolutely brutal. This amendment takes the wrong approach because it adds even more uncertainty to the farmer's operation.

Most farmers go to the bank for loans to pay production costs and purchases of new technology and machinery. Once you introduce a restrictive AGI, it becomes much more difficult to obtain the financing necessary to sustain an operation and stay in business.

Through a careful approach, the Ag Committee has already brought significant reforms to AGI eligibility, which has already been difficult on some of my producers. We certainly don't need to go a step further.

Additionally, requiring active, on-farm labor is counterproductive for two reasons: one, it discourages farms from improving and becoming more efficient; and, two, it discourages the participation of young farmers, and that could mean that they're out of a job. Farm owners and operators need to focus their attention on the management of the overall farm and key management decisions.

I strongly urge defeat of this amendment, with all due respect.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARROW).

Mr. BARROW of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for the time. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Farming in 2013 can be a very complicated, high-tech and high-risk business. For example, there are many farmers in my district who farm thousands of acres that they don't own. They might grow cotton, peanuts, grains and specialty crops. They need a whole fleet of different equipment for each one of these crops. They're probably irrigating a whole lot of their crops. They likely employ dozens of people. These might be multimillion-dollar enterprises, and yet they still fit in the definition of a family farm. For these kinds of crops, it simply takes that kind of scale to be sustainable. Many farmers simply cannot afford to farm on that scale unless they have a safety net that can cover their risk.

This bill includes sustainable reforms of our farm safety net to make sure it's available to the people who need it most. It's not fair, nor in our best interest, to limit the participation of these larger family farms by undercutting their safety net, as this amendment would do. We need these farmers and they need us.

I, therefore, urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

□ 1200

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, might I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 1¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield the balance of my time to the ranking member of the House Ag Committee, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON).

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

I rise in opposition to this amendment.

If you like the Department of Labor's overreach on child labor when they prevented 4-H kids from helping mom and dad on the farm, you're going to love this amendment. What this amendment does is it puts bureaucrats in charge of deciding who is a farmer and who isn't.

When we put this AGI test on, they developed 430 pages of regulations to try to figure out how to implement that. If this amendment passes, I would be hard-pressed to figure out how many pages of regulations they're going to come up with to try to figure out whether you're actually a farmer or not.

We're changing this "actively engaged" definition, which we've been struggling with for years, and which I think we did a pretty good job with in 2008, putting in new requirements, new tests, stuff that we really don't understand how it's going to work. I think it is just going to totally screw up the safety net, especially for our friends in the South that have a different situation than we do up in my part of the world.

This is an overreach. It's getting into areas that we've never done before with payment limitations at a time when we're changing these programs. We don't really even understand how this would work, other than to know it's going to really screw things up.

I would strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 101 OFFERED BY MR. HUELSKAMP

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 101 printed in part B of House Report 113-117.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In subtitle A of title IV, strike section 4007 and insert the following:

SEC. 4007. ELIMINATING THE LOW-INCOME HOME ENERGY ASSISTANCE LOOPHOLE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 5 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2014) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)(11)(A), by striking "(other than" and all that follows through "et seq.)" and inserting "(other than payments or allowances made under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.) or any payments under any other State program funded with qualified State expenditures (as defined in section 409(a)(7)(B)(i) of that Act (42 U.S.C. 609(a)(7)(B)(1)))";

(2) in subsection (e)(6)(C), by striking clause (iv); and

(3) in subsection (k)—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking subparagraph (C);

(ii) by redesignating subparagraphs (D) through (G) as subparagraphs (C) through (F), respectively; and

(iii) by striking paragraph (4).

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 2605(f) of the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981 (42 U.S.C. 8624(f)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking "(1)"; and

(2) by striking paragraph (2).

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, insert the following:

SEC. 4033. PROJECTS TO PROMOTE WORK AND INCREASE STATE AGENCY ACCOUNTABILITY.

Section 11 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2020), as amended by section 4015, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(w) PROJECTS TO PROMOTE WORK AND INCREASE STATE AGENCY ACCOUNTABILITY.—The State agency shall create a work activation program that operates as follows:

"(1) Each able-bodied individual participating in the program—

"(A) shall at the time of application for supplemental food and nutrition assistance and every 12 months thereafter, register for employment in a manner prescribed by the chief executive officer of the State;

"(B) shall, each month of participation in the program, participate in—

"(i) 2 days of supervised job search for 8 hours per day at the program site; and

"(ii) 5 days of off-site activity for 8 hours per day;

"(C) shall not refuse without good cause to accept an offer of employment, at a site or plant not subject to a strike or lockout at the time of the refusal, at a wage not less than the higher of—

"(i) the applicable Federal or State minimum wage; or

"(ii) 80 percent of the wage that would have governed had the minimum hourly rate under section 6(a)(1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206(a)(1)) been applicable to the offer of employment;

"(D) shall not refuse without good cause to provide a State agency with sufficient information to allow the State agency to determine the employment status or the job availability of the individual; and

"(E) shall not voluntarily—

"(i) quit a job; or

"(ii) reduce work effort and, after the reduction, the individual is working less than 30 hours per week, unless another adult in the same family unit increases employment at the same time by an amount equal to the reduction in work effort by the first adult.

“(2) An able-bodied individual participating in the work activation program who fails to comply with 1 or more of the requirements described in paragraph(1)—

“(A) shall be subject to a sanction period of not less than a 2-month period beginning the day of the individual’s first failure to comply with such requirements during which the individual shall not receive any supplemental food and nutrition assistance; and

“(B) may receive supplemental food and nutrition assistance after the individual is in compliance with such requirements for not less than a 1-month period beginning after the completion of such sanction period, except that such assistance may not be provided retroactively.”.

SEC. 4034. REPEAL OF CERTAIN AUTHORITY TO WAIVE WORK REQUIREMENT.

The Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 6(o) by striking paragraph (4); and

(2) in section 16(b)(1)(E)(i)—

(A) in subclause (II) by adding “and” at the end;’

(B) by striking subclause (III); and

(C) by redesignating subclause (IV) as subclause (III).

SEC. 4035. ELIMINATING DUPLICATIVE EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING.

(a) FUNDING OF EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAMS.—Section 16 of Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2025) is amended by striking subsection (h).

(b) ADMINISTRATIVE COST-SHARING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 16(a) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2025(a)) is amended in the first sentence, in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting “(other than a program carried out under section 6(d)(4))” after “supplemental nutrition assistance program”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Section 17(b)(1)(B)(iv)(III)(hh) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2026(b)(1)(B)(iv)(III)(hh)) is amended by striking “(g), (h)(2), or (h)(3)” and inserting “or (g)”.

(B) Section 22(d)(1)(B)(ii) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2031(d)(1)(B)(ii)) is amended by striking “, (g), (h)(2), and (h)(3)” and inserting “and (g)”.

(c) WORKFARE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 20 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2029) is amended by striking subsection (g).

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 17(b)(1)(B)(iv)(III)(jj) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2026(b)(1)(B)(iv)(III)(jj)) is amended by striking “or (g)(1)”.

SEC. 4036. ELIMINATING THE NUTRITION EDUCATION GRANT PROGRAM.

Section 28 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2036a) is repealed.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today along with several of my colleagues to offer what we believe should be the first step in serious reform of a SNAP program, also known as food stamps.

It has been said we should judge the success of government programs not by the number of people receiving the ben-

efits but by the number of people who no longer need them.

As a result of the bipartisan work reforms in the TANF program in 1996, after that period we saw a 57 percent reduction in the number of people on TANF. This amendment would take the most successful welfare reform in the history of this country, signed into law by President Bill Clinton and passed by a Republican Congress, and apply it to now the largest means-tested assistance program we have. That’s what that amendment would do.

In addition to applying that successful work requirement, we would have additional reforms in terms of LIHEAP and a few other items that would provide additional savings in the food stamp program.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I speak in opposition to this amendment.

This is really a very poorly conceived amendment that would require all non-disabled individuals to participate in a job search every month or immediately lose benefits, even if the individual is already working or even if the individual is a child, a minor.

This amendment would increase the SNAP cuts by 50 percent to \$31 billion, instead of the \$21.5 billion. It would immediately subject 2 million jobless, childless adults to harsh benefit cuts. It would slash benefits for 2 million people about \$90 a month. It would eliminate all the SNAP employment and training funds, eliminate nutrition education, impose new job search requirements on all people, even if they’re working, and it would send people into a deep, deep depression.

I think that this is an amendment that we should oppose.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 1 minute to a member of the Ag Committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER).

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

I rise in strong support of this amendment. In fact, part of the language of a bill that I had introduced is incorporated in this bill, and I appreciate the gentleman for including that.

What is this amendment about? It’s about making sure that people that are on these programs qualify for them. That they’re not automatically put on them because they’re on some other program. It’s also about reducing duplicative programs in the government, such as nutrition education and job training. We have job training in other programs.

But more importantly, what the American people understand is that our entitlement programs are growing

at an unsustainable rate, and so we need to make sure that people that are on food stamps are actively looking for work. I don’t think anybody argues with that.

The second thing is making sure that people that are on this program are the people that need it, and secondly, that qualify for it.

So this is a commonsense amendment and the American taxpayers deserve this kind of accountability. Anything less is unacceptable.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

This is yet another heartless cut on the backs of hungry families all across America. How much is enough for those who are relentless—relentless—in attacking low-income families and hungry children. Cutting over \$20 billion in SNAP benefits is bad enough, but this amendment would add insult to injury. This is mind-boggling.

Let me tell you, I know from personal experience, no one wants to be on food stamps. Many who are on SNAP are hardworking people making minimum wage, and others are desperately looking for a job in these difficult economic times.

This amendment demands that hungry families search for a job even while it eliminates all employment assistance and job-training funds for those very families. Let’s not pretend that by making a family suffer more hunger and more desperation and more hardship that a job will suddenly appear for them.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this very, very heartless, cruel, and inhumane amendment.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON).

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

We have worked this out between the chairman and myself and this is breaking the deal that we had. I would say a vote for this amendment is a vote against the farm bill, so oppose it.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire of the balance of the time.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Kansas has 3 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Oklahoma has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate waiting on a few other folks to speak.

One thing I would like to point out, I appreciate the arguments of my colleague from Texas that indicates these are commonsense reforms. I think most Americans agree, let’s help folks that are in need, but we probably shouldn’t help those who don’t actually

qualify for food stamps. With the adoption of this amendment, it will require folks that would like to receive food stamps—SNAP benefits—to actually have to qualify for them instead of being qualified through another program.

It was also noted about the impact of these reforms and their potential impact on cuts. Let's look at a little history of this particular program. In 2002, in the 2002 farm bill, \$270 billion was the spending level—\$270 billion. In the 2008 farm bill, it was approximately \$400 billion. If this amendment is adopted, the spending level would be \$733 billion. Only in Washington could you say going from \$270 billion to \$733 billion is a cut.

These are commonsense reforms. These a few decades ago were considered bipartisan reforms to encourage people to look for work, to encourage people to get a job.

I agree with my colleagues: there isn't a person in America I don't think that wouldn't rather have a paycheck rather than a SNAP check or a SNAP card, or a Vision card if you're in the State of Kansas.

□ 1210

These are very commonsense reforms. They will work. They are good for Americans. They are good for our taxpayers. They are good for the people receiving benefits. We have 47 million Americans receiving food stamps today. Please, let's ask them—require them—to actually go out and look for jobs. They might actually find them.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oklahoma has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Colleagues, the process of crafting this farm bill has entailed much effort by the committee. We've looked at everything within our jurisdictions. We've come up with ways of saving money and reforming things and making things more efficient across the board in every title. Let me touch, for just a moment, on the nutrition title.

The committee agreed to \$20.5 billion in savings: ending categorical eligibility, compelling States to the tune of \$8 billion worth of savings to make adjustments in how they address LIHEAP. We have gone a tremendous distance in a bipartisan way to achieve the first real reform since 1996.

Now, I appreciate my colleagues' efforts to try and increase those savings, but I say to you that the number in the bill is workable, that it is something that we can achieve, that it is something through which I believe—and we don't all necessarily see eye to eye on this—we will still allow those folks who are qualified under Federal law to receive the help they need, that they deserve.

Please turn this amendment back. Please move forward with the reforms we have. Let's do things that we've not

been able to do since 1996. Let's not go so far that nothing is the end result. Defeat the amendment. Support the bill. Let us move forward.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 102 OFFERED BY MR. SOUTHERLAND

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 102 printed in part B of House Report 113-117.

Mr. SOUTHERLAND. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 336, line 8, strike "\$375,000,000" and insert "\$372,000,000".

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, insert the following:

SEC. 4033. PILOT PROJECTS TO PROMOTE WORK AND INCREASE STATE ACCOUNTABILITY IN THE SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

Effective October 1, 2013, section 17 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2026), as amended by sections 4021 and 4022, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(n) PILOT PROJECTS TO PROMOTE WORK AND INCREASE STATE ACCOUNTABILITY IN THE SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out pilot projects to develop and test methods allowing States to run a work program with certain features comparable to the State program funded under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.), with the intent of increasing employment and self-sufficiency through increased State accountability and thereby reducing the need for supplemental nutrition assistance benefits.

“(2) AGREEMENTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary shall enter into cooperative agreements with States in accordance with pilot projects that meet the criteria required under this subsection.

“(B) APPLICATION.—To be eligible for a cooperative agreement under this paragraph, a State shall submit to the Secretary a plan that complies with requirements of this subsection beginning in fiscal year 2014. The Secretary may not disapprove applications which meet the requirements of this subsection as described through its amended supplemental nutrition assistance State Plan.

“(C) ASSURANCES.—A State shall include in its plan assurances that its pilot project will—

“(i) operate for at least three 12-month periods but not more than five 12-month periods;

“(ii) have a robust data collection system for program administration that is designed and shared with project evaluators to ensure proper and timely evaluation; and

“(iii) intend to offer a work activity described in paragraph (4) to adults assigned

and required to participate under paragraph (3)(A) and who are not exempt under paragraph (3)(F).

“(D) NUMBER OF PILOT PROJECTS.—Any State may carry out a pilot project that meets the requirements of this subsection.

“(E) EXTENT OF PILOT PROJECTS.—Pilot projects shall cover no less than the entire State.

“(F) OTHER PROGRAM WAIVERS.—Waivers for able-bodied adults without dependents provided under section 6(o) are void for States covered by a pilot project carried out under paragraph (1).

“(3) WORK ACTIVITY.—(A) For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘work activity’ means any of the following:

“(i) Employment in the public or private sector that is not subsidized by any public program.

“(ii) Employment in the private sector for which the employer receives a subsidy from public funds to offset some or all of the wages and costs of employing an adult.

“(iii) Employment in the public sector for which the employer receives a subsidy from public funds to offset some or all of the wages and costs of employing an adult.

“(iv) A work activity that—

“(I) is performed in return for public benefits;

“(II) provides an adult with an opportunity to acquire the general skills, knowledge, and work habits necessary to obtain employment;

“(III) is designed to improve the employability of those who cannot find unsubsidized employment; and

“(IV) is supervised by an employer, work site sponsor, or other responsible party on an ongoing basis.

“(v) Training in the public or private sector that is given to a paid employee while he or she is engaged in productive work and that provides knowledge and skills essential to the full and adequate performance of the job.

“(vi) Job search, obtaining employment, or preparation to seek or obtain employment, including—

“(I) life skills training;

“(II) substance abuse treatment or mental health treatment, determined to be necessary and documented by a qualified medical, substance abuse, or mental health professional; or

“(III) rehabilitation activities; supervised by a public agency or other responsible party on an ongoing basis.

“(vii) Structured programs and embedded activities—

“(I) in which adults perform work for the direct benefit of the community under the auspices of public or nonprofit organizations;

“(II) that are limited to projects that serve useful community purposes in fields such as health, social service, environmental protection, education, urban and rural redevelopment, welfare, recreation, public facilities, public safety, and child care;

“(III) that are designed to improve the employability of adults not otherwise able to obtain unsubsidized employment; and

“(IV) that are supervised on an ongoing basis; and

“(V) with respect to which a State agency takes into account, to the extent possible, the prior training, experience, and skills of a recipient in making appropriate community service assignments.

“(viii) Career and technical training programs (not to exceed 12 months with respect to any adult) that are directly related to the preparation of adults for employment in current or emerging occupations and that are supervised on an ongoing basis.

“(ix) Training or education for job skills that are required by an employer to provide

an adult with the ability to obtain employment or to advance or adapt to the changing demands of the workplace and that are supervised on an ongoing basis.

“(x) Education that is related to a specific occupation, job, or job offer and that is supervised on an ongoing basis.

“(xi) In the case of an adult who has not completed secondary school or received such a certificate of general equivalence, regular attendance—

“(I) in accordance with the requirements of the secondary school or course of study, at a secondary school or in a course of study leading to such certificate; and

“(II) supervised on an ongoing basis.

“(xii) Providing child care to enable another recipient of public benefits to participate in a community service program that—

“(I) does not provide compensation for such community service;

“(II) is a structured program designed to improve the employability of adults who participate in such program; and

“(III) is supervised on an ongoing basis.

“(B) PROTECTIONS.—Work activities under this subsection shall be subject to all applicable health and safety standards. Except as described in clauses (i), (ii), and (iii) of subparagraph (A), the term ‘work activity’ shall be considered work preparation and not defined as employment for purposes of other law.

“(4) PILOT PROJECTS.—Pilot projects carried out under paragraph (1) shall include interventions to which adults are assigned that are designed to reduce unnecessary dependence, promote self sufficiency, increase work levels, increase earned income, and reduce supplemental nutrition assistance benefit expenditures among households eligible for, applying for, or participating in the supplemental nutrition assistance program.

“(A) Adults assigned to interventions by the State shall—

“(i) be subject to mandatory participation in work activities specified in paragraph (4), except those with 1 or more dependent children under 1 year of age;

“(ii) participate in work activities specified in paragraph (4) for a minimum of 20 hours per week per household;

“(iii) be a maximum age of not less than 50 and not more than 60, as defined by the State;

“(iv) be subject to penalties during a period of nonparticipation without good cause ranging from, at State option, a minimum of the removal of the adults from the household benefit amount, up to a maximum of the discontinuance of the entire household benefit amount; and

“(v) not be penalized for nonparticipation if child care is not available for 1 or more children under 6 years of age.

“(B) The State shall allow certain individuals to be exempt from work requirements—

“(i) those participating in work programs under a State program funded under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.) for an equal or greater number of hours;

“(ii) 1 adult family member per household who is needed in the home to care for a disabled family member;

“(iii) a parent who is a recipient of or becomes eligible for Social Security Disability Insurance (SSDI) or Supplemental Security Income (SSI); and

“(iv) those with a good cause reason for nonparticipation, such as victims of domestic violence, as defined by the State.

“(5) EVALUATION AND REPORTING.—

“(A) EVALUATION.—

“(i) INDEPENDENT EVALUATION.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide for each State that enters into an agreement under paragraph (2) an independent,

longitudinal evaluation of its pilot project under this subsection to determine total program savings over the entire course of the pilot project with results reported in consecutive 12-month increments.

“(II) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the evaluation is to measure the impact of interventions provided by the State under the pilot project on the ability of adults in households eligible for, applying for, or participating in the supplemental nutrition assistance program to find and retain employment that leads to increased household income and reduced dependency.

“(III) REQUIREMENT.—The independent evaluation under subclause (I) shall use valid statistical methods which can determine the difference between supplemental nutrition assistance benefit expenditures, if any, as a result of the interventions as compared to a control group that—

“(aa) is not subject to the interventions provided by the State under the pilot project under this subsection; and

“(bb) maintains services provided under 16(h) in the year prior to the start of the pilot project under this subsection.

“(IV) OPTION.—States shall have the option to evaluate pilot projects by matched counties or matched geographical areas using a constructed control group design to isolate the effects of the intervention of the pilot project.

“(V) DEFINITION.—Constructed control group means there is no random assignment, and instead program participants (those subject to interventions) and non-participants (control) are equated using matching or statistical procedures on characteristics that may be associated with program outcomes.

“(B) REPORTING.—Not later than 90 days after the end of fiscal year 2014 and of each fiscal year thereafter, until the completion of the last evaluation under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate, a report that includes a description of—

“(i) the status of each pilot project carried out under paragraph (1);

“(ii) the results of the evaluation completed during the previous fiscal year; and

“(iii) to the maximum extent practicable—

“(I) baseline information relevant to the stated goals and desired outcomes of the pilot project;

“(II) the impact of the interventions on appropriate employment, income, and public benefit receipt outcomes among households participating in the pilot project;

“(III) equivalent information about similar or identical measures among control or comparison groups;

“(IV) the planned dissemination of the report findings to State agencies; and

“(V) the steps and funding necessary to incorporate into State employment and training programs the components of pilot projects that demonstrate increased employment and earnings.

“(C) PUBLIC DISSEMINATION.—In addition to the reporting requirements under subparagraph (B), evaluation results shall be shared broadly to inform policy makers, service providers, other partners, and the public in order to promote wide use of successful strategies, including by posting evaluation results on the Internet website of the Department of Agriculture.

“(6) FUNDING.—

“(A) AVAILABLE FUNDS.—From amounts made available under section 18(a)(1), the Secretary shall make available—

“(i) up to \$1,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2014 through 2017 for evaluations described in paragraph (5) to carry out this

subsection, with such amounts to remain available until expended; and

“(ii) amounts equal to one-half of the accumulated supplemental nutrition assistance benefit dollars saved over each consecutive 12-month period according to the evaluation under paragraph (5) for bonus grants to States under paragraph (7)(B).

“(B) LIMITATION.—A State operating a pilot project under this subsection shall not receive more funding under section 16(h) than the State received the year prior to commencing a project under this subsection and shall not claim funds under 16(a) for expenses that are unique to the pilot project under this subsection.

“(C) OTHER FUNDS.—Any additional funds required by a State to carry out a pilot project under this subsection may be provided by the State from funds made available to the State for such purpose and in accordance with State and other Federal laws, including the following:

“(i) Section 403 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 603).

“(ii) The Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 9201 et seq.).

“(iii) The Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858 et seq.) and section 418 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 618).

“(iv) The social services block grant under subtitle A of title XX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397 et seq.).

“(7) USE OF FUNDS.—

“(A) SPECIFIC USES.—Funds provided under this subsection for evaluation of pilot projects shall be used only for—

“(i) pilot projects that comply with this subsection;

“(ii) the costs incurred in gathering and providing information and data used to conduct the independent evaluation under paragraph (5); and

“(iii) the costs of the evaluation under paragraph (5).

“(B) LIMITATION.—Funds provided for bonus grants to States for pilot projects under this subsection shall be used only for—

“(i) pilot projects that comply with this subsection;

“(ii) amounts equal to one-half of the accumulated supplemental nutrition assistance benefit dollars saved over each consecutive 12-month period according to the evaluation under paragraph (5); and

“(iii) any State purpose, not to be restricted to the supplemental nutrition assistance program or its beneficiary population.”.

SEC. 4034. IMPROVED WAGE VERIFICATION USING THE NATIONAL DIRECTORY OF NEW HIRES.

Effective October 1, 2013, section 11(e) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2020(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3) by inserting “and after compliance with the requirement specified in paragraph (24)” after “section 16(e) of this Act”;

(2) in paragraph (22) by striking “and” at the end,

(3) in paragraph (23) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”, and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(24) that the State agency shall request wage data directly from the National Directory of New Hires established under section 453(i) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 653(i)) relevant to determining eligibility to receive supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits and determining the correct amount of such benefits.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOUTHERLAND) and a

Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SOUTHERLAND. Mr. Chairman, the numbers don't lie. America's welfare system is broken.

Food stamp benefits have tripled in the past decade. There are more Americans living in poverty today than when the war on poverty was launched a half century ago. Instead of incentivizing work, we are reinforcing the same government dependency and cyclical poverty that we all wish to eliminate. It is clear that an important variable has been missing from America's anti-poverty equation, and that is the element of work.

History has proven that work is the surest way to empower able-bodied Americans to advance from welfare to self-sufficiency. When a Republican-controlled Congress and a Democrat President joined together to pass welfare reform requiring work, the results were dramatic. Nationwide, welfare rolls dropped by 67 percent. In my home State of Florida, the number was higher—approximately 85 percent. Work participation by never-married single moms and household earnings skyrocketed. Child poverty rates plummeted. This true bipartisan success story is what my amendment is based upon.

My amendment empowers the States to require work for Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP, benefits. We apply the same sensible work preparation, job training, and community service activities that are at the heart of welfare reform. Our plan is endorsed by several States' Human Services Secretaries who approached us because they understand how important work can be for individuals truly in need.

The simple fact, Mr. Chairman, is that "work" works. We must have a system in place that provides a helping hand to the most vulnerable among us. By requiring work for able-bodied SNAP recipients, we can ensure that the resources get to those in need more effectively and efficiently.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting my amendment and in renewing the God-given opportunity for earned success in America.

Mr. Chairman, with that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MOORE. I rise to claim the time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MOORE. Despite what we have heard from the author of this program, there is no work in this bill. This amendment would more appropriately be called "The State Bonuses for Terminating SNAP Benefits for People Who Want to Work but Can't Find a Job Because They're in a Recession," and it ends benefits for children, disabled people, yes, and even for disabled veterans.

I think the most egregious thing about this amendment is that there is no funding for worker training programs in this bill at all even though we are ordering people to do it, and there is a perverse incentive for States to end SNAP benefits for people because, suddenly, food stamps, or SNAP benefits, become fungible.

We just rejected an amendment in our last series of votes that would have allowed people to get toothpaste and toothbrushes with SNAP benefits; but what this amendment does is allow the States to pocket these sanctions and use them for whatever they want to—to balance the budget with it or to convert SNAP benefits into tax breaks for corporations or for wealthy people.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SOUTHERLAND. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia, Majority Leader CANTOR, who represents a State in which, as a result of the 1996 work requirement, welfare rolls were reduced by over 84 percent.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this amendment.

In 1996, the Congress came together in a bipartisan way to change the incentive structure in our basic cash welfare program that helps needy families. The results were nothing but a success. Within 5 years, welfare caseloads fell by more than 60 percent, and the economic prospects of many former welfare families were substantially improved. America saw increased earnings by low-income families and significant reductions in child poverty. The incentives were right, and even in the depths of the worst economic turmoil of a few years ago, the reforms were succeeding at moving families from dependency into work.

Those changes made in welfare reform resulted from a foundation laid before 1996 in which States experimented with different approaches to determine which ones were the most effective at increasing workforce participation and boosting earnings. Prior to enactment of welfare reform, States had been given waivers of the old law to become laboratories of innovation.

The amendment by Mr. SOUTHERLAND before us today builds on that successful approach and will give States the opportunity to test whether the same successful strategies that were used in cash welfare programs in the 1990s will help food stamp recipients gain and retain employment and boost their earnings today. Mr. SOUTHERLAND's amendment provides for a pilot program, which will allow States, if they choose, to apply the TANF work requirements to their able-bodied working age adult food stamp caseload.

□ 1220

States have come forward asking us for the ability to enter into these demonstration projects. But unless we

adopt the gentleman's amendment, these States won't be able to launch these demonstration projects.

This amendment is well crafted and takes into consideration the availability of child care for mothers with young children and hardship situations like families facing domestic violence.

The Southerland amendment also tells States that if they're successful at increasing work participation and families' earnings among the food stamp caseload, they will share in the savings that would otherwise end up in the hands of the Federal Government.

If enacted, this amendment will help reduce Federal expenditures, provide assistance to the States, and most importantly it will help struggling families who find themselves relying on public assistance to get back on their feet.

Right now, many American families are struggling, and the SNAP program is in place to help these families who find themselves in dire economic circumstances. While this program is an important part of our safety net, our overriding goal should be to help our citizens with the education and skills they need to get back on their feet so that they can provide for themselves and their families.

I'd like to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOUTHERLAND) for his work on this issue, and I urge my colleagues to support his amendment.

Ms. MOORE. I would like to inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Wisconsin has 3½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Florida has 1½ minutes remaining.

Ms. MOORE. Just because we keep saying that the 1996 welfare program was successful, doesn't make it so. Poverty has increased among women and children. A quarter of all children in this country are poor.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. I rise in strong opposition to this amendment, the effect of which would be to increase hunger and hardship across America. We have experienced the most devastating recession since the Great Depression.

Unemployment is at 7.5 percent. One in seven people today is availing himself of food stamps because there is a need to. People are struggling in our economy today. They want to work. They cannot find a job. Everyone is experiencing that in their own communities.

This amendment would allow an unlimited number of States to require an adult to receive or even apply for food stamps to be working or in job training, or else they lose their food stamp benefits. Why would a State want to do this? Because the amendment also allows States to keep part of the savings from cutting people off the program, use the money for whatever purpose the State officials want, instead of feeding people with those dollars.

States can cut taxes for companies or even maybe support special interest subsidies. And as my colleagues said, there is no funding in this bill for the creation of jobs; and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, they refuse to deal with the issue of job creation and there is no worker-training money in this bill. So there is no funding to do what they would like to do.

Let's take the crop insurance program, my friends. We just voted on an amendment that voted down reforming that program. We have 26 individuals in this Nation. We can't find out who they are. They get at least a million dollars in a subsidy. Do you think they're eating well? Three squares or better a day. You know what? They have no income threshold, no asset test, no cap. They don't even have to farm the land, and they don't have to follow conservation practices. Do you want to go and find out where we can save money here? Let's find out who these 26 people are or those people who are on the crop insurance program, and let's make sure that they are working otherwise we will cut their benefits.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this unbelievably misguided amendment.

Mr. SOUTHERLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT), whose welfare rolls were reduced by over 55 percent due to the 1996 work requirement.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this amendment.

My colleague was absolutely right, the unemployment rate is 7.5 percent. People do want to go back to work. This is what this bill does: it helps people go back to work. Currently, the government has 83 programs to help people.

I'm the chairman of the Subcommittee on Human Resources. We just had a hearing last week with Sada Randolph. Sada Randolph testified before our committee that she was under a government program. All they did was provide benefits to her until she got under TANF. That's where she got the help to find a job. We need to help people find jobs, keep jobs, support their families and give them hope.

I support this bill wholeheartedly because it gives the American people who are out of work today hope.

Ms. MOORE. We reduced welfare rolls because we literally threw people off. We did not help them find sustainable jobs, which is why poverty has increased.

I yield 30 seconds to the ranking member of the committee, Mr. PETERSON.

Mr. PETERSON. I thank the gentlelady, and I strongly oppose this amendment.

This amendment breaks the deal that we had and is offensive in the way that it treats the unemployed in this country.

In short what this proposal does is it takes money from benefits and hands it

over to the States, and they can do with it what they want, as was said earlier in the debate, with no strings attached, no accountability.

This Republican Congress has been vocal in support of block grants, and I suppose that's why they're supporting this amendment. But I'd like to point out that it was block-granting that is the very reason that we got into the LIHEAP situation and the categorical eligibility situation that we're trying to attempt in this bill.

Vote "no" on this amendment.

Mr. SOUTHERLAND. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON), whose welfare rolls were reduced by over 85 percent in the 1996 work requirements.

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding and stand in support of the amendment.

There's two very major points of this. Number one is that we cannot continue to deny able-bodied people the dignity of work. There seems to be a belief in the nanny state that there's something wrong with requiring able-bodied people to work. That's what this amendment does. It says to you that if you can work, you ought to be working so that other people who are unable to, they can get the needed assistance.

Number two, it gives States flexibility. I trust the people in Florida. I trust the people in Wisconsin. I trust the people in Georgia and Florida and all over the country to do what's best for their State. That's what we need in America today: less centralized, Washington bureaucratic planners and more State flexibility because what might work in your State might be different in mine, but this is a requirement for able-bodied people to get a job in order to receive public assistance benefits.

It's very common sense, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the last 30 seconds to our good friend and colleague, Mr. WELCH.

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentlelady.

This amendment is not on the level. It uses a word that is important to all of us: work.

Of course people want to work, but there is no money for a work program. There is an obligation on the person who has no income, who has children, to somehow magically create their own work program. Any of the work programs have to have some support to get people to be able to move from poverty to work.

This is a political statement. It's not a work program.

How poor is poor? This is telling folks they're not poor enough. Grind them and their children down; 1-year-old children will lose food as a result of this.

Ms. MOORE. With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOUTHERLAND).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SOUTHERLAND. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida will be postponed.

□ 1230

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 113-117 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 99 by Mr. GOODLATTE of Virginia.

Amendment No. 49 by Mr. RADEL of Florida.

Amendment No. 50 by Mr. WALBERG of Michigan.

Amendment No. 98 by Mr. PITTS of Pennsylvania.

Amendment No. 100 by Mr. FORTENBERRY of Nebraska.

Amendment No. 101 by Mr. HUELSKAMP of Kansas.

Amendment No. 102 by Mr. SOUTHERLAND of Florida.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 99 OFFERED BY MR. GOODLATTE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 291, noes 135, answered "present" 1, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 278]

AYES—291

Alexander	Bridenstine	Clay
Amash	Brooks (AL)	Clyburn
Amodei	Brooks (IN)	Coble
Bachmann	Broun (GA)	Coffman
Bachus	Brown (FL)	Cohen
Barber	Brownley (CA)	Cole
Barletta	Buchanan	Collins (GA)
Barr	Bucshon	Collins (NY)
Barton	Burgess	Conaway
Bass	Butterfield	Connolly
Beatty	Calvert	Conyers
Becerra	Campbell	Cook
Bentivolio	Cantor	Cotton
Bilirakis	Capito	Crawford
Bishop (GA)	Cárdenas	Crenshaw
Black	Carney	Cuellar
Blackburn	Carson (IN)	Culberson
Blumenauer	Cassidy	Daines
Boehner	Castor (FL)	Davis (CA)
Bonner	Castro (TX)	Davis, Danny
Boustany	Chabot	Davis, Rodney
Brady (PA)	Chaffetz	DeGette
Brady (TX)	Clarke	Denham

Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxy
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Himes
Holding
Holt
Horsford
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston

NOES—135

Aderholt
Andrews
Barrow (GA)
Benishek
Bera (CA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Bonamici
Braley (IA)
Bustos
Camp
Capps
Capuano
Carter
Cartwright
Chu
Cicilline
Cleaver
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cramer

Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lowe
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McDermott
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
O'Rourke
Olson
Pallone
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Perlmutter
Perry
Peterson (CA)
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quigley
Radel
Rangel
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen

Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuster
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Veasey
Velázquez
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

Larson (CT)
Loeb
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lucas
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McGovern
McIntyre
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meng

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Nunes
Hastings (FL)
Honda
Larsen (WA)

NOT VOTING—8

Markey
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Nunnelee
Slaughter

□ 1254

Mr. HALL changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. SIREs, LaMALFA, WAXMAN, LEWIS, GRIJALVA, Ms. CLARKE, Messrs. JONES, MEEKS, and Ms. WATERS changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:
Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chair, I support the Dairy Security Act language as it was included in the Committee-passed draft of the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act. Inadvertently, I voted in support of Amendment No. 99, sponsored by Rep. GOODLATTE to H.R. 1947. My intention was to vote against the amendment and to support the dairy provisions in the underlying bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 49 OFFERED BY MR. RADEL

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RADEL) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered. The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 235, noes 192, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 279]

AYES—235

Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Bachmann
Barletta
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Beatty
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Buchson

Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clarke
Clay
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Cotton
Crenshaw
Culberson
Cummings
Delaney
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Esty
Farenthold
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxy
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Guthrie
Hanna
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins

Holding
Holt
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kilmer
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Long
Luetkemeyer
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moore
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Nugent
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Paulsen
Perry
Peterson (CA)
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)

NOES—192

Aderholt
Alexander
Bachus
Barber
Barr
Bass
Becerra
Benishek
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Bonamici
Bonner
Boustany
Braley (IA)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cole
Conaway
Conyers
Costa
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crowley
Cuellar
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham

Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schneider
Schock
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuster
Smith (MO)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stutzman
Terry
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Upton
Van Hollen
Wagner
Walorski
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

Harper	McDermott	Schakowsky	Black	Heck (NV)	Reichert	Herrera Beutler	Maloney,	Ros-Lehtinen
Heck (WA)	McGovern	Schiff	Blackburn	Hensarling	Renacci	Higgins	Carolyn	Royal-Ballard
Himes	McIntyre	Schrader	Blumenauer	Himes	Ribble	Hinojosa	Marino	Ruppersberger
Hinojosa	McKeon	Scott, Austin	Boustany	Huelskamp	Rice (SC)	Holding	Matsui	Ryan (OH)
Horsford	McNerney	Serrano	Brady (TX)	Huizenga (MI)	Rigell	Holt	McDermott	Sánchez, Linda
Hoyer	Meng	Sewell (AL)	Bridenstine	Hultgren	Roe (TN)	Horsford	McGovern	T.
Huffman	Michaud	Shea-Porter	Brooks (AL)	Hunter	Rogers (MI)	Hoyer	McIntyre	Sanchez, Loretta
Jackson Lee	Miller, George	Sherman	Brooks (IN)	Hurt	Rohrabacher	Hudson	McNerney	Sarbanes
Jeffries	Moran	Shimkus	Broun (GA)	Issa	Rokita	Huffman	Meehan	Schakowsky
Joyce	Mullin	Simpson	Buchanan	Johnson (GA)	Roskam	Israel	Meeks	Schiff
Kaptur	Murphy (PA)	Sinema	Bucshon	Johnson (OH)	Ross	Jackson Lee	Meng	Schneider
Keating	Nadler	Sires	Burgess	Johnson, E. B.	Rothfus	Jeffries	Michaud	Schock
Kelly (IL)	Napolitano	Smith (NE)	Butterfield	Johnson, Sam	Royce	Jenkins	Miller, George	Schrader
Kelly (PA)	Noem	Stivers	Calvert	Jones	Ruiz	Joyce	Moran	Schwartz
Kennedy	Nolan	Stockman	Camp	Jordan	Runyan	Kaptur	Murphy (FL)	Scott (VA)
Kildee	Nunes	Swalwell (CA)	Campbell	Kelly (PA)	Rush	Keating	Nadler	Scott, Austin
King (IA)	Owens	Takano	Cantor	Kilmer	Ryan (WI)	Kelly (IL)	Napolitano	Scott, David
King (NY)	Pastor (AZ)	Thompson (CA)	Carter	Kind	Salmon	Kennedy	Neal	Serrano
Kirkpatrick	Payne	Thompson (MS)	Cassidy	King (IA)	Sanford	Kildee	Negrete McLeod	Sewell (AL)
Kuster	Pearce	Thompson (PA)	Chabot	Kingston	Scalise	King (NY)	Noem	Shea-Porter
LaMalfa	Pelosi		Chaffetz	Kline	Schweikert	Nolan	Nolan	Sherman
Langevin	Perlmutter		Coffman	Klabador	Sensenbrenner	Kirkpatrick	Nunnelee	Sinema
Larson (CT)	Peters (MI)		Cole	Lamborn	Sessions	Kuster	Owens	Sires
Latham	Peterson		Collins (NY)	Latta	Shimkus	LaMalfa	Pallone	Smith (WA)
Lewis	Pingree (ME)		Cook	Lofgren	Shuster	Lance	Pascrell	Stivers
Loeb sack	Turner		Cotton	Long	Simpson	Langevin	Pastor (AZ)	Swalwell (CA)
Lowenthal	Pocan		Crawford	Long	Smith (MO)	Lankford	Pelosi	Takano
Lowe	Price (NC)		Vargas	Lujan Grisham	Smith (NE)	Larson (CT)	Perlmutter	Thompson (CA)
Lucas	Quigley		Veasey	(NM)	Smith (NJ)	Latham	Perry	Thompson (MS)
Lujan Grisham	Rahall		Vela	Maloney, Sean	Smith (TX)	Lee (CA)	Peters (MI)	Tierney
(NM)	Renacci		Velázquez	Daines	Southerland	Lee (CA)	Levin	Peterson
Luján, Ben Ray	Richmond		Visclosky	Massie	Speier	Lewis	Petri	Tsongas
(NM)	Roby		Walberg	Matheson	Stewart	Lipinski	Pingree (ME)	Vargas
Lummis	Rogers (AL)		Walden	McCarthy (CA)	Stewman	LoBiondo	Pocan	Veasey
Maloney,	Rogers (KY)		Walz	McCauley	Stockman	Loeb sack	Poe (TX)	Velázquez
Carolyn	Rooney		Waxman	McClintock	Stutzman	Lowenthal	Price (NC)	Visclosky
Marino	Ruppberger		Welch	McCollum	Terry	Lowe	Quigley	Walz
Matheson	Sánchez, Linda		Whitfield	McHenry	Thompson (PA)	Lucas	Rahall	Waxman
Matsui	T.		Wilson (FL)	McKeon	Thornberry	Luetkemeyer	Rangel	Welch
McCarthy (CA)	Sanchez, Loretta		Wolf	McKinley	Tiberi	Luján, Ben Ray	Richmond	Whitfield
McCollum	Sarbanes		Yarmuth	McMorris	Tipton	(NM)	Roby	Wilson (FL)
				Rodgers	Titus	Lummis	Rogers (AL)	Wilson (SC)
				Meadows	Tonko	Lynch	Rogers (KY)	Yarmuth
				Messer	Turner	Maffei	Rooney	Yoho
				Mica	Upton			
				Miller (FL)	Valadao			
				Miller (MI)	Van Hollen			
				Moore	Vela			
				Mullin	Wagner			
				Mulvaney	Walberg			
				Murphy (PA)	Walden			
				Neugebauer	Walorski			
				Nugent	Wasserman			
				Nunes	Schultz			
				O'Rourke	Waters			
				Olson	Watt			
				Palazzo	Weber (TX)			
				Paulsen	Webster (FL)			
				Payne	Wenstrup			
				Pearce	Westmoreland			
				Peters (CA)	Williams			
				Pittenger	Wittman			
				Pitts	Wolf			
				Polis	Womack			
				Pompeo	Woodall			
				Posey	Yoder			
				Price (GA)	Young (AK)			
				Radel	Young (FL)			
				Reed	Young (IN)			

NOT VOTING—7

Hastings (FL) Markey Slaughter
Honda McCarthy (NY)
Larsen (WA) Miller, Gary

□ 1303

Messrs. CASSIDY, JOHNSON of Georgia, MEEKS, Ms. LEE of California, Messrs. RANGEL and DOGGETT, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. FUDGE, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. WATERS, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Messrs. AL GREEN of Texas and NUNNELEE changed their vote from “no” to aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 50 OFFERED BY MR. WALBERG

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 215, noes 211, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 280]

AYES—215

Alexander	Bachmann	Barton
Amash	Barletta	Benishek
Amodei	Barr	Bentivolio
Andrews	Barrow (GA)	Bilirakis

Aderholt	Clarke	Engel
Bachus	Clay	Enyart
Barber	Cleaver	Eshoo
Bass	Clyburn	Esty
Beatty	Coble	Farenthold
Becerra	Cohen	Farr
Bera (CA)	Collins (GA)	Fattah
Bishop (GA)	Conaway	Fitzpatrick
Bishop (NY)	Connolly	Forbes
Bishop (UT)	Conyers	Foster
Bonamici	Cooper	Frankel (FL)
Bonner	Bonner	Fudge
Brady (PA)	Courtney	Galleo
Braleigh (IA)	Cramer	Garamendi
Brown (FL)	Crenshaw	Garcia
Brownley (CA)	Crowley	Gerlach
Bustos	Davis (CA)	Granger
Capito	Davis, Danny	Green, Gene
Capps	DeGette	Griffith (VA)
Capuano	DeLauro	Grijalva
Cárdenas	DelBene	Grimm
Carney	Denham	Guthrie
Carson (IN)	Dent	Gutiérrez
Cartwright	Diaz-Balart	Hahn
Castor (FL)	Dingell	Hall
Castro (TX)	Doyle	Harper
Chu	Edwards	Hartzler
Ciilline	Ellison	Heck (WA)

NOES—211

Franks (AZ)	Larsen (WA)	Miller, Gary
Hastings (FL)	Markey	Slaughter
Honda	McCarthy (NY)	

NOT VOTING—8

□ 1307

Mr. POLIS and Ms. WATERS changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

Mr. CONNOLLY changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 98 OFFERED BY MR. PITTS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 206, noes 221, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 281]

AYES—206

Amash	Bentivolio	Brooks (IN)
Amodei	Bishop (UT)	Broun (GA)
Andrews	Black	Bucshon
Bachmann	Blackburn	Burgess
Barletta	Blumenauer	Campbell
Barr	Brady (PA)	Cantor
Barton	Brady (TX)	Capito
Beatty	Bridenstine	Carney

Cartwright Johnson (GA)
 Chabot Johnson (OH)
 Chaffetz Jordan
 Cicilline Joyce
 Clay Kelly (IL)
 Coffman Kelly (PA)
 Collins (GA) Kilmer
 Collins (NY) Kind
 Cook King (IA)
 Cooper King (NY)
 Cotton Kingston
 Davis, Danny Kuster
 Delaney Lance
 Dent Langevin
 DeSantis Lankford
 DesJarlais Latta
 Doggett Lee (CA)
 Duncan (SC) Lipinski
 Duncan (TN) LoBiondo
 Esty Long
 Fattah Lowey
 Fitzpatrick Marino
 Fleischmann Massie
 Flores Matheson
 Forbes McCaul
 Foster McClintock
 Foxx McHenry
 Franks (AZ) McKinley
 Frelinghuysen McNerney
 Fudge Meadows
 Garamendi Meahan
 Garrett Meeks
 Gerlach Messer
 Gingrey (GA) Miller (FL)
 Gohmert Moore
 Goodlatte Moran
 Gosar Mulvaney
 Gowdy Murphy (PA)
 Graves (GA) Neugebauer
 Griffin (AR) O'Rourke
 Griffith (VA) Olson
 Guthrie Pallone
 Gutiérrez Pascrell
 Hanna Payne
 Harris Perry
 Heck (NV) Peters (CA)
 Heck (WA) Petri
 Hensarling Pittenger
 Herrera Beutler Pitts
 Higgs Polis
 Himes Pompeo
 Holding Price (GA)
 Holt Quigley
 Horsford Reichert
 Huelskamp Renacci
 Hultgren Ribble
 Hurt Rice (SC)
 Israel Rigell
 Issa Roe (TN)
 Jeffries Rogers (MI)
 Jenkins Rohrabacher

Rokita
 Rothfus
 Royce
 Ruppersberger
 Rush
 Ryan (WI)
 Salmon
 Sanford
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schneider
 Kuster
 Schock
 Schwartz
 Schweikert
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, David
 Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Shea-Porter
 Shuster
 Sinema
 Sires
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Smith (WA)
 Speier
 Stewart
 Stivers
 Stockman
 Stutzman
 Swalwell (CA)
 Terry
 Miller (FL)
 Thompson (PA)
 Tiberi
 Moran
 Titus
 Tonko
 Tsongas
 Turner
 Upton
 Van Hollen
 Veasey
 Visclosky
 Wagner
 Walberg
 Walorski
 Waters
 Watt
 Waxman
 Wenstrup
 Westmoreland
 Williams
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Wolf
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yoder
 Young (FL)
 Young (IN)

Kennedy
 Kildee
 Kinzinger (IL)
 Kirkpatrick
 Kline
 Labrador
 LaMalfa
 Lamborn
 Larson (CT)
 Latham
 Levin
 Lewis
 Loeb sack
 Lofgren
 Lowenthal
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Lujan Grisham
 (NM)
 Luján, Ben Ray
 (NM)
 Lummis
 Lynch
 Maffei
 Maloney,
 Carolyn
 Maloney, Sean
 Marchant
 Matsui
 McCarthy (CA)
 McCollum
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McIntyre
 McKeon
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 Meng
 Mica
 Michaud
 Hastings (FL)
 Honda
 Larsen (WA)

Miller (MI)
 Miller, George
 Mullin
 Murphy (FL)
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Negrete McLeod
 Noem
 Nolan
 Nugent
 Nunes
 Nunnelee
 Owens
 Palazzo
 Pastor (AZ)
 Paulsen
 Pearce
 Pelosi
 Perlmutter
 Peters (MI)
 Peterson
 Pingree (ME)
 Pocan
 Poe (TX)
 Posey
 Price (NC)
 Radel
 Rahall
 Rangel
 Reed
 Richmond
 Roby
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rooney
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Ross
 Roybal-Allard

Ruiz
 Runyan
 Ryan (OH)
 Sanchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sarbanes
 Scalise
 Schrader
 Scott, Austin
 Serrano
 Sewell (AL)
 Sherman
 Shimkus
 Simpson
 Smith (NE)
 Southerland
 Takano
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Thornberry
 Tierney
 Tipton
 Valadao
 Vargas
 Vela
 Velázquez
 Walden
 Walz
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Welch
 Whitfield
 Wilson (FL)
 Yarmuth
 Yoho
 Young (AK)

Dent
 DeSantis
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Doyle
 Duffy
 Duncan (SC)
 Duncan (TN)
 Edwards
 Ellison
 Engel
 Esty
 Farr
 Fattah
 Fitzpatrick
 Fleischmann
 Flores
 Fortenberry
 Foxx
 Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Fudge
 Garrett
 Gibson
 Gingrey (GA)
 Gohmert
 Gowdy
 Graves (GA)
 Grayson
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Grijalva
 Hahn
 Hanna
 Heck (NV)
 Heck (WA)
 Hensarling
 Higgs
 Himes
 Holding
 Holt
 Horsford
 Hoyer
 Huffman
 Huizenga (MI)
 Hunter
 Israel
 Issa
 Jeffries
 Johnson (GA)
 Jones
 Jordan
 Kaptur
 Keating
 Kelly (PA)
 Kennedy
 Kildee
 Kilmer
 Kind
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kingston

Kuster
 Labrador
 Lamborn
 Lance
 Langevin
 Lankford
 Larson (CT)
 Lee (CA)
 Levin
 Lewis
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Loeb sack
 Lofgren
 Lowenthal
 Lujan Grisham
 (NM)
 Luján, Ben Ray
 (NM)
 Lummis
 Lynch
 Maloney, Sean
 Marchant
 Matheson
 McClintock
 McCollum
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McHenry
 McNerney
 Meadows
 Meeks
 Meng
 Mica
 Michaud
 Miller (FL)
 Moore
 Moran
 Mulvaney
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Noem
 Nolan
 Nunes
 Hunter
 O'Rourke
 Owens
 Pallone
 Pascrell
 Paulsen
 Pelosi
 Peters (CA)
 Peters (MI)
 Petri
 Pingree (ME)
 Pittenger
 Pitts
 Pocan
 Polis
 Posey
 Price (GA)
 Price (NC)

Quigley
 Radel
 Rangel
 Reichert
 Ribble
 Rice (SC)
 Rigell
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rogers (MI)
 Rohrabacher
 Rokita
 Roskam
 Rothfus
 Roybal-Allard
 Royce
 Runyan
 Ruppersberger
 Ryan (OH)
 Ryan (WI)
 Salmon
 Sánchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanford
 Sarbanes
 Scalise
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schneider
 Schwartz
 Schweikert
 Scott (VA)
 Sensenbrenner
 Serrano
 Shea-Porter
 Sherman
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (WA)
 Speier
 Stewart
 Swalwell (CA)
 Terry
 Tiberi
 Tierney
 Titus
 Tonko
 Tsongas
 Van Hollen
 Visclosky
 Waters
 Watt
 Waxman
 Welch
 Westmoreland
 Wilson (FL)
 Wilson (SC)
 Wolf
 Yarmuth
 Young (FL)
 Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—7

□ 1311

So the amendment was rejected.
 The result of the vote was announced
 as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 100 OFFERED BY MR. FORTENBERRY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 230, noes 194, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 282]
 AYES—230

NOES—221
 Aderholt
 Alexander
 Bachus
 Barber
 Barrow (GA)
 Bass
 Becerra
 Benishek
 Bera (CA)
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (GA)
 Bishop (NY)
 Bonamici
 Bonner
 Boustany
 Braley (IA)
 Brooks (AL)
 Brown (FL)
 Brownley (CA)
 Buchanan
 Bustos
 Butterfield
 Calvert
 Camp
 Capps
 Capuano
 Cardenas
 Carson (IN)
 Carter
 Cassidy
 Castor (FL)
 Castro (TX)
 Chu
 Clarke
 Cleaver
 Clyburn

Coble
 Cohen
 Cole
 Conaway
 Connolly
 Conyers
 Costa
 Courtney
 Cramer
 Crawford
 Crenshaw
 Crowley
 Cuellar
 Culberson
 Cummings
 Daines
 Davis (CA)
 Davis, Rodney
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 DeLauro
 DelBene
 Denham
 Deutch
 Diaz-Balart
 Dingell
 Doyle
 Duckworth
 Duffy
 Edwards
 Ellison
 Ellmers
 Engel
 Eshoo
 Farenthold

Farr
 Fincher
 Fleming
 Fortenberry
 Frankel (FL)
 Gabbard
 Gallego
 Garcia
 Gardner
 Gibbs
 Gibson
 Granger
 Graves (MO)
 Grayson
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Grijalva
 Grimm
 Hahn
 Hall
 Hanabusa
 Harper
 Hartzler
 Hastings (WA)
 Hinojosa
 Hoyer
 Hudson
 Huffman
 Huizenga (MI)
 Hunter
 Jackson Lee
 Johnson, E. B.
 Johnson, Sam
 Jones
 Kaptur
 Keating

Amash
 Andrews
 Barton
 Bass
 Beatty
 Becerra
 Bentivolio
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (NY)
 Bishop (UT)
 Blackburn
 Blumenauer
 Bonamici
 Brady (PA)
 Braley (IA)
 Bridenstine

Brown (GA)
 Brownley (CA)
 Burgess
 Cantor
 Capps
 Capuano
 Cardenas
 Carney
 Cartwright
 Castor (FL)
 Chabot
 Chaffetz
 Chu
 Cicilline
 Clarke
 Clay

Aderholt
 Alexander
 Amodei
 Bachmann
 Bachus
 Barber
 Barletta
 Barr
 Barrow (GA)
 Benishek
 Bera (CA)
 Bishop (GA)
 Black
 Bonner
 Boustany
 Brady (TX)
 Brooks (AL)
 Brooks (IN)
 Brown (FL)
 Buchanan
 Buchson
 Bustos
 Butterfield
 Calvert
 Camp
 Campbell
 Capito
 Carson (IN)
 Carter
 Cassidy
 Chaffetz
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Coble
 Cole

NOES—194
 Collins (NY)
 Conaway
 Costa
 Cotton
 Crawford
 Crenshaw
 Crowley
 Cuellar
 Culberson
 Daines
 Davis, Rodney
 Denham
 DesJarlais
 Deutch
 Diaz-Balart
 Duckworth
 Ellmers
 Enyart
 Eshoo
 Farenthold
 Fincher
 Fleming
 Forbes
 Foster
 Frankel (FL)
 Gallego
 Garamendi
 Garcia
 Gardner
 Gerlach
 Gibbs
 Goodlatte
 Gosar
 Granger
 Graves (MO)

Griffin (AR)
 Griffith (VA)
 Grimm
 Guthrie
 Gutiérrez
 Hall
 Hanabusa
 Harper
 Harris
 Hartzler
 Hastings (WA)
 Herrera Beutler
 Hinojosa
 Hudson
 Huelskamp
 Hultgren
 Hurt
 Jackson Lee
 Jenkins
 Eshoo
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Johnson, Sam
 Joyce
 Kelly (IL)
 Kinzinger (IL)
 Kirkpatrick
 Kline
 LaMalfa
 Latham
 Latta
 Long
 Lowey
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Maffei

Maloney, Pompeo
 Carolyn, Rahall
 Marino, Reed
 Massie, Renacci
 Matsui, Richmond
 McCarthy (CA), Roby
 McCaul, Rogers (AL)
 McIntyre, Rooney
 McKeon, Ros-Lehtinen
 McKinley, Ross
 McMorris, Ruiz
 Rodgers, Rush
 Meehan, Sanchez, Loretta
 Messer, Schock
 Miller (MI), Schrader
 Mullin, Scott, Austin
 Murphy (FL), Scott, David
 Murphy (PA), Sessions
 Negrete McLeod, Sewell (AL)
 Neugebauer, Shimkus
 Nugent, Shuster
 Nunnelee, Simpson
 Olson, Sinema
 Palazzo, Sires
 Pastor (AZ), Smith (MO)
 Payne, Smith (NE)
 Pearce, Smith (TX)
 Perlmutter, Southerland
 Perry, Stivers
 Peterson, Stutzman
 Poe (TX), Takano

Thompson (CA), Huelskamp
 Thompson (MS), Huizenga (MI)
 Thompson (PA), Hultgren
 Thornberry, Hunter
 Tipton, Hurt
 Turner, Issa
 Upton, Jenkins
 Valadao, Johnson (OH)
 Vargas, Johnson, Sam
 Veasey, Jones
 Vela, Jordan
 Velázquez, King (IA)
 Wagner, Kingston
 Walberg, Labrador
 Walden, LaMalfa
 Walorski, Lamborn
 Walz, Latta
 Wasserman, Long
 Schultz, Luetkemeyer
 Weber (TX), Lummis
 Webster (FL), Marchant
 Wenstrup, Marino
 Whitfield, Massie
 Williams, McCarthy (CA)
 Wittman, McCaul
 Womack, McClintock
 Woodall, McHenry
 Yoder, McKinley
 Yoho, McMorris
 Young (AK), Rodgers
 Meadows, Royce
 Messer, Ryan (WI)
 Mica, Salmon
 Miller (FL), Sanford
 Miller (MI)

Mullin, Scalise
 Mulvaney, Schweikert
 Neugebauer, Scott, Austin
 Nugent, Sensenbrenner
 Nunes, Sessions
 Nunnelee, Shimkus
 Olson, Shuster
 Palazzo, Smith (MO)
 Paulsen, Smith (NE)
 Perry, Smith (TX)
 Petri, Southerland
 Pittenger, Stewart
 Pitts, Stockman
 Poe (TX), Stutzman
 Pompeo, Walden
 Posey, Terry
 Price (GA), Thornberry
 Radel, Tipton
 Ranacci, Upton
 Ribble, Wagner
 Rice (SC), Walberg
 Rigell, Walden
 Roby, Weber (TX)
 Roe (TN), Wenstrup
 Rogers (KY), Westmoreland
 Rohrabacher, Whitfield
 Rokita, Williams
 Rooney, Wilson (SC)
 Roskam, Wittman
 Ross, Womack
 Rothfus, Woodall
 Royce, Yoder
 Ryan (WI), Yoho
 Salmon, Young (FL)
 Sanford, Young (IN)

Price (NC), Schock
 Quigley, Schrader
 Rahall, Schwartz
 Rangel, Scott (VA)
 Reed, Scott, David
 Reichert, Serrano
 Richmond, Shea-Porter
 Rogers (AL), Sherman
 Rogers (MI), Simpson
 Ros-Lehtinen, Sinema
 Roybal-Allard, Sires
 Ruiz, Smith (NJ)
 Runyan, Smith (WA)
 Ruppberger, Speier
 Rush, Stivers
 Ryan (OH), Swalwell (CA)
 Sánchez, Linda, Takano
 T. Thompson (CA)
 Sanchez, Loretta, Thompson (MS)
 Sarbanes, Thompson (PA)
 Schakowsky, Tiberi
 Schiff, Tierney
 Schneider, Titus

Tonko, Tsongas
 Turner, Turner
 Valadao, Valadao
 Van Hollen, Van Hollen
 Vargas, Vargas
 Veasey, Veasey
 Vela, Vela
 Velázquez, Velázquez
 Visclosky, Visclosky
 Walorski, Walorski
 Walz, Walz
 Wasserman, Wasserman
 Schultz, Schultz
 Waters, Waters
 Watt, Watt
 Waxman, Waxman
 Webster (FL), Webster (FL)
 Welch, Welch
 Wilson (FL), Wilson (FL)
 Wolf, Wolf
 Yarmuth, Yarmuth
 Young (AK), Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—10

Cramer, Larsen (WA)
 Gabbard, Markey
 Hastings (FL), McCarthy (NY)
 Honda, Miller, Gary

□ 1314

So the amendment was agreed to.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 101 OFFERED BY MR. HUELSKAMP

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 175, noes 250, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 283]

AYES—175

Aderholt, Chabot
 Amash, Chaffetz
 Amodei, Coble
 Bachmann, Coffman
 Barletta, Collins (GA)
 Barr, Cook
 Barton, Cotton
 Bentivolio, Crawford
 Bilirakis, Crenshaw
 Bishop (UT), Culberson
 Black, Daines
 Blackburn, Davis, Rodney
 Brady (TX), DeSantis
 Bridenstine, DesJarlais
 Brooks (AL), Duffy
 Brooks (IN), Duncan (SC)
 Brown (GA), Duncan (TN)
 Buchanan, Ellmers
 Buehson, Farenthold
 Burgess, Fincher
 Camp, Fleischmann
 Campbell, Fleming
 Cantor, Flores
 Cassidy, Forbes

NOES—250

Alexander, Diaz-Balart
 Andrews, Dingell
 Bachus, Doggett
 Barber, Doyle
 Barrow (GA), Duckworth
 Bass, Edwards
 Beatty, Ellison
 Becerra, Engel
 Benishek, Enyart
 Bera (CA), Eshoo
 Bishop (GA), Esty
 Bishop (NY), Farr
 Blumenauer, Fattah
 Bonamici, Fitzpatrick
 Bonner, Fortenberry
 Boustany, Poster
 Brady (PA), Frankel (FL)
 Braley (IA), Frelinghuysen
 Brown (FL), Fudge
 Brownley (CA), Lynch
 Bustos, Gallego
 Butterfield, Garamendi
 Calvert, Garcia
 Capito, Gerlach
 Capps, Gibson
 Capuano, Grayson
 Cárdenas, Green, Al
 Carney, Green, Gene
 Carson (IN), Grijalva
 Carter, Grimm
 Cartwright, Hahn
 Castor (FL), Hanabusa
 Castro (TX), Hanna
 Chu, Harper
 Cicilline, Heck (NV)
 Clarke, Heck (WA)
 Clay, Higgins
 Cleaver, Himes
 Clyburn, Hinojosa
 Cohen, Holt
 Cole, Horsford
 Collins (NY), Hoyer
 Conaway, Huffman
 Connolly, Israel
 Conyers, Jackson Lee
 Cooper, Jeffries
 Costa, Johnson (GA)
 Courtney, Johnson, E. B.
 Cramer, Joyce
 Crowley, Kaptur
 Cuellar, Keating
 Cummings, Kelly (IL)
 Davis (CA), Kelly (PA)
 Davis, Danny, Kennedy
 DeFazio, Kildee
 DeGette, Kilmer
 Delaney, Kind
 DeLauro, King (NY)
 DeBene, Kinzinger (IL)
 Denham, Kirkpatrick
 Dent, Kline
 Deutch, Kuster

Lance, Diaz-Balart
 Langevin, Langevin
 Lankford, Lankford
 Larson (CT), Larson (CT)
 Latham, Latham
 Lee (CA), Lee (CA)
 Levin, Levin
 Lewis, Lewis
 Lipinski, Lipinski
 LoBiondo, LoBiondo
 Loeback, Loeback
 Lofgren, Lofgren
 Lowenthal, Lowenthal
 Lowey, Lowey
 Lucas, Lucas
 Lujan Grisham, Lujan Grisham
 (NM), (NM)
 Luján, Ben Ray, Luján, Ben Ray
 (NM), (NM)
 Lynch, Lynch
 Maffei, Maffei
 Maloney, Maloney
 Carolyn, Carolyn
 Maloney, Sean, Maloney, Sean
 Matheson, Matheson
 Matsui, Matsui
 McCollum, McCollum
 McDermott, McDermott
 McGovern, McGovern
 McIntyre, McIntyre
 McKeon, McKeon
 McNerney, McNerney
 Meehan, Meehan
 Meeks, Meeks
 Meng, Meng
 Michaud, Michaud
 Miller, George, Miller, George
 Moore, Moore
 Moran, Moran
 Murphy (FL), Murphy (FL)
 Murphy (PA), Murphy (PA)
 Nadler, Nadler
 Napolitano, Napolitano
 Neal, Neal
 Negrete McLeod, Negrete McLeod
 Noem, Noem
 Nolan, Nolan
 O'Rourke, O'Rourke
 Owens, Owens
 Pallone, Pallone
 Pascrell, Pascrell
 Pastor (AZ), Pastor (AZ)
 Payne, Payne
 Pearce, Pearce
 Pelosi, Pelosi
 Perlmutter, Perlmutter
 Peters (CA), Peters (CA)
 Peters (MI), Peters (MI)
 Peterson, Peterson
 Pingree (ME), Pingree (ME)
 Pocan, Pocan
 Polis, Polis

NOT VOTING—9

Gutiérrez, Larsen (WA)
 Hastings (FL), Markey
 Honda, McCarthy (NY)
 Miller, Gary
 Sewell (AL)
 Slaughter

□ 1317

So the amendment was rejected.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Chair, I was inadvertently absent and would like to show that, had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall vote 270, “nay” on rollcall vote 274, and “nay” on rollcall vote 283.

AMENDMENT NO. 102 OFFERED BY MR. SOUTHERLAND

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOUTHERLAND) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 227, noes 198, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 284]

AYES—227

Aderholt, Calvert
 Alexander, Camp
 Amash, Campbell
 Amodei, Cantor
 Bachmann, Capito
 Bachus, Carter
 Barletta, Cassidy
 Barr, Chabot
 Barton, Chaffetz
 Bentivolio, Coble
 Benishek, Coffman
 Bilirakis, Cole
 Bishop (UT), Collins (GA)
 Black, Collins (NY)
 Blackburn, Conaway
 Blackburn, Bonner
 Bonner, Cooper
 Boustany, Cotton
 Brady (TX), Cramer
 Bridenstine, Crawford
 Brooks (AL), Brooks (AL)
 Brooks (IN), Crenshaw
 Brown (GA), Culberson
 Buehson, Daines
 Burgess, Davis, Rodney
 Denham, Denham
 Dent, Dent
 DeSantis, DeSantis
 DesJarlais, DesJarlais
 Diaz-Balart, Diaz-Balart
 Duffy, Duffy
 Duncan (SC), Duncan (SC)
 Duncan (TN), Duncan (TN)
 Ellmers, Ellmers
 Farenthold, Farenthold
 Fincher, Fincher
 Fleischmann, Fleischmann
 Fleming, Fleming
 Flores, Flores
 Forbes, Forbes
 Fortenberry, Fortenberry
 Foy, Foy
 Franks (AZ), Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen, Frelinghuysen
 Gardner, Gardner
 Garrett, Garrett
 Gerlach, Gerlach
 Gibbs, Gibbs
 Gingrey (GA), Gingrey (GA)
 Gohmert, Gohmert
 Goodlatte, Goodlatte

Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)

McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus

Royce
Ryunan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—198

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cueellar
Cummins
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch

Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)

Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan

O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger

Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Smith (WA)
Swailwell (CA)
Takano

Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—9

Carson (IN)
Hastings (FL)
Honda
Larsen (WA)
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Slaughter
Speier

□ 1320

So the amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 284 the vote was gavelled down before I could record my vote. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chair, had I been present for the following votes, I would have voted accordingly: roll No. 264 on agreeing to the amendment Brooks of Alabama Part B Amendment No. 18—“no” vote; roll No. 265 on agreeing to the amendment Butterfield of North Carolina Part B Amendment No. 25—“yes” Vote; roll No. 266 on agreeing to the amendment Marino of Pennsylvania Part B Amendment No. 26—“no” Vote; roll No. 267 on agreeing to the amendment Schweikert of Arizona Part B Amendment No. 30—“no” Vote roll No. 268 on agreeing to the amendment Tierney of Massachusetts Part B Amendment No. 32—“yes” Vote; 1,6. Roll No. 269 on agreeing to the amendment Polis of Colorado Part B Amendment No. 37—“yes” Vote; roll No. 270 on agreeing to the amendment Garamendi of California Part B Amendment No. 38—“yes” Vote; roll No. 271 on agreeing to the amendment Marino of Pennsylvania Part B Amendment No. 41—“no” Vote; roll No. 272 on agreeing to the amendment McClintock of California Part B Amendment No. 43—“no” Vote; roll No. 273 on agreeing to the amendment Gibson/Meeks/Sean Maloney of New York Part B Amendment No. 44—“yes” Vote; roll No. 274 on agreeing to the amendment Walorski of Indiana Part B Amendment No. 45—“no” Vote; roll No. 275 on agreeing to the amendment Courtney of Connecticut Part B Amendment No. 46—“yes” Vote; roll No. 276 on agreeing to the amendment Kind of Wisconsin Part B Amendment No. 47—“no” Vote; roll No. 277 on agreeing to the amendment Carney/Radel of Delaware Part B Amendment No. 48—“no” Vote; roll No. 278 on agreeing to the amendment Goodlatte/Scott (GA)/Moran/Polis/Meeks/ DeGette/Lee of Virginia Part B Amendment No. 99—“yes” Vote; roll No. 279 on agreeing to the amendment Radel of Florida Part B Amendment No. 49—“no” Vote; roll No. 280 on agreeing to the amendment Walberg of Michigan Part B Amendment No. 50—“yes” Vote; roll No. 281 on agreeing to the amendment

Pitts/Davis (IL) of Pennsylvania Part B Amendment No. 98—“no” Vote; roll No. 282 on agreeing to the amendment Fortenberry of Nebraska Part B Amendment No. 100—“no” Vote; roll No. 283 on agreeing to the amendment Huelskamp of Kansas Part B Amendment No. 101—“no” Vote; roll No. 284 on agreeing to the amendment Southerland of Florida Part B Amendment No. 102—“no” Vote.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. YODER) having assumed the chair, Mr. SIMPSON, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having 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, and, pursuant to House Resolution 271, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. I am opposed in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 496, after line 14, add the following:

SEC. 8408. PROTECTING HOMEOWNERS FROM THE DEVASTATING EFFECTS OF WILDFIRES IN THE WILDLAND-URBAN INTERFACE.

The Act of June 4, 1897 (30 Stat. 11) is amended by adding at the end of the second full paragraph at 30 Stat. 35 (16 U.S.C. 551) the following new sentence: “To ensure there are sufficient funds to provide the most modern equipment available for wildfire suppression and to ensure there are adequate numbers of personnel to manage and suppress wildfires, there is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Agriculture such sums as may be necessary for fire suppression equipment and personnel to conduct forest fire presuppression activities on National Forest System lands and emergency fire suppression on or adjacent to such lands or

other lands regarding which the Secretary has entered into a fire protection agreement.”.

Page 379, strike line 21 and all that follows through page 380, line 8.

Page 384, strike lines 3 through 9.

Page 391, strike lines 19 through 24 and insert the following:

SEC. _____ . CREATING JOBS AND SMALL BUSINESSES IN RURAL AMERICA, AND PROTECTING SAFE DRINKING WATER.

(a) **WATER, WASTE DISPOSAL, AND WASTE-WATER FACILITY GRANTS.**—Section 306(a)(2)(B)(vii) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1926(a)(2)(B)(vii)) is amended by striking “\$30,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2012” and inserting “\$40,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018”.

(b) **RURAL BUSINESS OPPORTUNITY GRANTS.**—Section 306(a)(11)(D) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1926(a)(11)(D)) is amended by striking “\$15,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2012” and inserting “\$20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2018”.

(c) **EMERGENCY AND IMMINENT COMMUNITY WATER ASSISTANCE GRANT PROGRAM.**—Section 306A(i)(2) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1926a(i)(2)) is amended by striking “2008 through 2012” and inserting “fiscal years 2014 through 2018”.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California (during the reading). I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the dispensing of the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued to read.

Mr. LUCAS (during the reading). I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to H.R. 1947. It will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

My amendment is a straightforward improvement that I believe both sides can agree is absolutely necessary.

First, the amendment would protect homes and businesses nationwide from devastating fires by funding wildfire suppression, personnel and firefighting equipment. Second, the amendment will help create jobs and small businesses throughout rural America and will provide safe drinking water to these communities as well.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly represent Ventura County in California. In May, we had a dangerous wildfire that burned over 24,000 acres. It threatened homes in Camarillo, surrounded Cal State University at Channel Islands, and burned parts of Naval Base Ventura County.

As the Springs Fire raged, we looked for help from the brave men and

women serving as firefighters, not only from my district, but throughout California and the Western States. Due to their tireless efforts, homes and businesses were saved, and not one life was lost.

Following the Springs Fire, I had the opportunity and occasion to thank the firefighters in my county.

They showed me the real time computer equipment they used to successfully fight this fire. With this equipment, firefighters could predict the direction of the fire and the terrain they would face next in real time. They asked that Congress make this life-saving communications equipment available to firefighters across this great Nation.

This is precisely the type of equipment my amendment would help provide along with aerial tankers and other firefighting aircraft.

So many Americans rely on the selfless help of firefighters across the Nation, most recently and courageously in fighting the recent fires in Colorado that have caused so much damage and loss of precious lives.

□ 1330

Our firefighters put their lives on the line, and we owe it to them and to our communities to provide adequate resources for fire suppression, personnel and state-of-the-art equipment.

My amendment would also support three critical rural development programs: water, waste disposal and wastewater facility grants; emergency and imminent water assistance grants; and rural business opportunity grants.

These grants help to provide critical water supplies to rural areas experiencing drought or other disasters. They also promote sustainable economic development, create jobs and build stronger communities.

Not only would these programs help in Ventura County, which was recently declared a rural disaster area by USDA, they would help in districts across the Nation suffering from similar and tragic hardships.

I came to Congress not to engage in partisan bickering but to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to solve the many critical challenges facing our Nation. Partnering with the States and our local communities during natural disasters and with communities that lack critical resources in difficult economic times is both a moral and economic imperative of this body.

It is with this in mind that I ask my colleagues to support this important amendment to help fight wildfires and to support our communities when they need it most.

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

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I will not dwell on the points made by the good

lady, but I would like to take this time to discuss for just a moment the process that we've gone through here and the nature of what we are trying to do in crafting another 5-year comprehensive farm bill.

We have gone through the most amazing open process in the House Agriculture Committee 2 years in a row, and we achieved consensus.

The bill this year might not be quite the same as the bill last year, and we have gone through, I think, an open process here on the floor where 103 or 104 amendments were considered by this body in open debate and open discussion and recorded votes in once again trying to achieve a consensus.

I know that not everyone has in this final bill exactly what they want. I know some of my very conservative friends think that it doesn't go far enough in the name of reform. I know some of my liberal friends think it goes too far in the name of addressing the needs of people.

But I would say to all of you that ultimately this body has to do its work. Ultimately, we have to move a product that we can go to conference with. Ultimately, we have to work out a consensus with the United States Senate so that we will have a final document that we can all consider together that hopefully the President will sign into law.

Now, I have tried in good faith, working with my ranking member and each and every one of you in every facet of these issues, to achieve that consensus. I have tried, and I hope that you recognize and acknowledge that.

We're at this critical moment. Whether you believe the bill has too much reform or not enough, or you believe it cuts too much or it doesn't cut enough, we have to move this document forward to achieve a common goal, to meet the needs of our citizens. No matter what part of the country, no matter whether they produce the food or consume the food, we have to meet those common needs in a responsible fashion.

I plead to you, I implore you to put aside whatever the latest email is or the latest flyer is or whatever comment or rumor you've heard from people near you or around you. Assess the situation. Look at the bill. Vote with me to move this forward. If you care about the consumers, the producers, the citizens of this country, move this bill forward. If it fails today, I can't guarantee you that you will see in this session of Congress another attempt, but I would assure each and every one of you, whether it's the appropriations process or amendments to other bills, the struggles will go on, but it won't be done in a balanced way.

If you care about your folks, if you care about this institution, if you care about utilizing open order, vote with us, vote with me on final. If you don't, when you leave here they'll just say it's a dysfunctional body, a broken institution full of dysfunctional people.

That's not true. You know that's not true.

Cast your vote in a responsible fashion. That's all I can ask.

Thank you, my friends. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by a 5-minute vote on passage of the bill, if ordered, and approval of the Journal, if ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 188, noes 232, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 285]

AYES—188

Andrews	Fudge	McDermott
Barber	Gabbard	McGovern
Barrow (GA)	Gallego	McIntyre
Bass	Garamendi	McNerney
Beatty	Garcia	Meeke
Becerra	Grayson	Meng
Bera (CA)	Green, Al	Michaud
Bishop (GA)	Green, Gene	Moore
Bishop (NY)	Grijalva	Moran
Blumenauer	Gutiérrez	Murphy (FL)
Bonamici	Hahn	Nadler
Brady (PA)	Hanabusa	Napolitano
Bralley (IA)	Hastings (FL)	Neal
Brownley (CA)	Heck (WA)	Negrete McLeod
Bustos	Higgins	Nolan
Butterfield	Himes	O'Rourke
Capps	Holt	Owens
Capuano	Horsford	Pallone
Cárdenas	Hoyer	Pascarell
Carney	Huffman	Pastor (AZ)
Carson (IN)	Israel	Payne
Cartwright	Jackson Lee	Perlmutter
Castor (FL)	Jeffries	Peters (CA)
Castro (TX)	Johnson (GA)	Peters (MI)
Chu	Johnson, E. B.	Peterson
Ciциlline	Jones	Pingree (ME)
Clarke	Kaptur	Pocan
Clay	Keating	Polis
Cleaver	Kelly (IL)	Price (NC)
Clyburn	Kennedy	Quigley
Connolly	Kildee	Rahall
Conyers	Kilmer	Rangel
Costa	Kind	Richmond
Crowley	Kirkpatrick	Roybal-Allard
Cuellar	Kuster	Ruiz
Cummings	Langevin	Ruppersberger
Davis, Danny	Larson (CT)	Rush
DeFazio	Lee (CA)	Ryan (OH)
DeGette	Levin	Sánchez, Linda
Delaney	Lewis	T.
DeLauro	Lipinski	Sanchez, Loretta
DelBene	Loeb sack	Sarbanes
Deutch	Loeb sack	Shakowsky
Dingell	Lofgren	Schiff
Dingell	Lowenthal	Schneider
Doggett	Lowey	Schrader
Doyle	Lujan Grisham	Schwartz
Duckworth	(NM)	Scott (VA)
Edwards	Lujan, Ben Ray	Scott, David
Ellison	(NM)	Serrano
Engel	Lynch	Sewell (AL)
Enyart	Maffei	Shea-Porter
Eshoo	Maloney,	Sherman
Esty	Carolyn	Sinema
Farr	Maloney, Sean	Sires
Fattah	Matheson	Smith (WA)
Foster	Matsui	Speier
Frankel (FL)	McCollum	

Swalwell (CA)	Vargas	Waters
Takano	Veasey	Watt
Thompson (CA)	Vela	Waxman
Thompson (MS)	Velázquez	Welch
Titus	Visclosky	Wilson (FL)
Tonko	Walz	Yarmuth
Tsongas	Wasserman	
Van Hollen	Schultz	

NOES—232

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

NOT VOTING—14

Brown (FL)	Honda	Miller, George
Cohen	Larsen (WA)	Pelosi
Courtney	Markey	Slaughter
Davis (CA)	McCarthy (NY)	Tierney
Hinojosa	Miller, Gary	

□ 1341

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 285, had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 195, noes 234, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 286]

AYES—195

Aderholt	Gibbs	Palazzo
Alexander	Gibson	Paulsen
Amodei	Gosar	Pearce
Bachus	Granger	Peters (MI)
Barber	Graves (MO)	Peterson
Barletta	Griffin (AR)	Petri
Barr	Griffith (VA)	Poe (TX)
Barrow (GA)	Grimm	Rahall
Barton	Guthrie	Reed
Benishek	Hall	Reichert
Bentivolio	Hanna	Renacci
Bera (CA)	Harper	Ribble
Bishop (UT)	Harris	Rice (SC)
Black	Hartzler	Roby
Blackburn	Hastings (WA)	Roe (TN)
Boehner	Herrera Beutler	Rogers (AL)
Bonner	Holding	Rogers (KY)
Boustany	Hudson	Rogers (MI)
Bralley (IA)	Huizenga (MI)	Rokita
Brooks (AL)	Hultgren	Rooney
Brooks (IN)	Hunter	Ros-Lehtinen
Brownley (CA)	Issa	Roskam
Buchanan	Jenkins	Ross
Bucshon	Johnson (OH)	Runyan
Burgess	Johnson, Sam	Schock
Bustos	Joyce	Schrader
Calvert	Kelly (PA)	Scott, Austin
Camp	King (IA)	Sessions
Campbell	King (NY)	Shimkus
Cantor	Kingston	Stutzman
Capito	Kinzinger (IL)	Simpson
Carter	Kline	Sinema
Cassidy	LaMalfa	Smith (MO)
Chaffetz	Lankford	Smith (NE)
Coble	Latham	Smith (TX)
Cole	Latta	Southerland
Collins (NY)	Loeb sack	Stewart
Conaway	Long	Stivers
Costa	Lucas	Terry
Cramer	Luetkemeyer	Thompson (PA)
Crawford	Lummis	Thornberry
Crenshaw	Marchant	Tiberi
Cuellar	Marino	Tipton
Daines	McCarthy (CA)	Turner
Davis, Rodney	McCaul	Upton
Denham	McHenry	Valadao
Dent	McIntyre	Vela
DesJarlais	McKeon	Wagner
Diaz-Balart	McKinley	Walberg
Duffy	McMorris	Walden
Ellmers	Rodgers	Walorski
Enyart	McNerney	Walz
Farenthold	Meadows	Weber (TX)
Farr	Messer	Webster (FL)
Fincher	Mica	Westmoreland
Fitzpatrick	Miller (MI)	Whitfield
Fleischmann	Mullin	Williams
Flores	Murphy (FL)	Wilson (SC)
Forbes	Murphy (PA)	Wittman
Fortenberry	Neugebauer	Womack
Fox	Noem	Woodall
Frelinghuysen	Nugent	Yoder
Garamendi	Nunes	Yoho
Garcia	Nunnelee	Young (AK)
Gardner	Olson	Young (FL)
Gerlach	Owens	Young (IN)

NOES—234

Amash	Bachmann	Beatty
Andrews	Bass	Becerra

Bilirakis	Hanabusa	Pelosi
Bishop (GA)	Hastings (FL)	Perlmutter
Bishop (NY)	Heck (NV)	Perry
Blumenauer	Heck (WA)	Peters (CA)
Bonamici	Hensarling	Pingree (ME)
Brady (PA)	Higgins	Pittenger
Brady (TX)	Himes	Pitts
Bridenstine	Hinojosa	Pocan
Brown (GA)	Holt	Polis
Brown (FL)	Horsford	Pompeo
Butterfield	Hoyer	Posey
Capps	Huelskamp	Price (GA)
Capuano	Huffman	Price (NC)
Cárdenas	Hurt	Quigley
Carney	Israel	Radel
Carson (IN)	Jackson Lee	Rangel
Cartwright	Jeffries	Richmond
Castor (FL)	Johnson (GA)	Rigell
Castro (TX)	Johnson, E. B.	Rohrabacher
Chabot	Jones	Rothfus
Chu	Jordan	Royal-Allard
Cicilline	Kaptur	Royce
Clarke	Keating	Ruiz
Clay	Kelly (IL)	Ruppersberger
Cleaver	Kennedy	Rush
Clyburn	Kildee	Ryan (OH)
Coffman	Kilmer	Ryan (WI)
Cohen	Kind	Salmon
Collins (GA)	Kirkpatrick	Sánchez, Linda
Connolly	Kuster	T.
Conyers	Labrador	Sanchez, Loretta
Cook	Lamborn	Sanford
Cooper	Lance	Sarbanes
Cotton	Langevin	Scalise
Courtney	Larson (CT)	Schakowsky
Crowley	Lee (CA)	Schiff
Culberson	Levin	Schneider
Cummings	Lewis	Schwartz
Davis (CA)	Lipinski	Schweikert
Davis, Danny	LoBiondo	Scott (VA)
DeFazio	Lofgren	Scott, David
DeGette	Lowenthal	Sensenbrenner
Delaney	Lowe	Serrano
DeLauro	Lujan Grisham	Sewell (AL)
DeBene	(NM)	Shea-Porter
DeSantis	Luján, Ben Ray	Sherman
Deutch	(NM)	Shuster
Dingell	Lynch	Sires
Doggett	Maffei	Smith (NJ)
Doyle	Maloney,	Smith (WA)
Duckworth	Carolyn	Speier
Duncan (SC)	Maloney, Sean	Stockman
Duncan (TN)	Massie	Stutzman
Edwards	Matheson	Swalwell (CA)
Ellison	Matsui	Takano
Engel	McClintock	Thompson (CA)
Eshoo	McCollum	Thompson (MS)
Eshoo	McDermott	Tierney
Fattah	McGovern	Titus
Fleming	Meehan	Tonko
Foster	Meeks	Tsongas
Frankel (FL)	Meng	Van Hollen
Franks (AZ)	Michaud	Vargas
Fudge	Miller (FL)	Veasey
Gabbard	Miller, George	Velázquez
Gallego	Moore	Vislosky
Garrett	Moran	Wasserman
Gingrey (GA)	Mulvaney	Schultz
Gohmert	Nadler	Waters
Goodlatte	Napolitano	Watt
Gowdy	Neal	Waxman
Graves (GA)	Negrete McLeod	Welch
Grayson	Nolan	Wenstrup
Green, Al	O'Rourke	Wilson (FL)
Green, Gene	Pallone	Wolf
Grijalva	Pascrell	Yarmuth
Gutiérrez	Pastor (AZ)	Young (FL)
Hahn	Payne	

NOT VOTING—6

Honda	Markey	Miller, Gary
Larsen (WA)	McCarthy (NY)	Slaughter

□ 1354

Messrs. COFFMAN and SHUSTER changed their vote from “aye” to “no.” So the bill was not passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on

agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. CLARKE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was unavoidably detained at a meeting and missed the first votes of the day.

Had I been present, I would have voted “no” on rollcall No. 254, the motion on ordering the previous question on the rule; and “no” on rollcall No. 253, H. Res. 271, the rule providing for further consideration of H.R. 1947, Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 475. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to include vaccines against seasonal influenza within the definition of taxable vaccines.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 23. An act to designate as wilderness certain land and inland water within the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore in the State of Michigan, and for other purposes.

S. 25. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal features of the electric distribution system to the South Utah Valley Electric Service District and for other purposes.

S. 26. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to facilitate the development of hydroelectric power on the Diamond Fork System of the Central Utah Project.

S. 112. An act to expand the Alpine Lakes Wilderness in the State of Washington, to designate the Middle Fork Snoqualmie River and Pratt River as wild and scenic rivers, and for other purposes.

S. 130. An act to require the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal land to the Powell Recreation District in the State of Wyoming.

S. 157. An act to provide for certain improvements to the Denali National Park and Preserve in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes.

S. 230. An act to authorize the Peace Corps Commemorative Foundation to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes.

S. 244. An act to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to modify the Pilot Project offices of the Federal Permit Streamlining Pilot Project.

S. 276. An act to reinstate and extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project involving the American Falls Reservoir.

S. 304. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the State of Mississippi 2 parcels of surplus land within the boundary of the Natchez Trace Parkway, and for other purposes.

S. 352. An act to provide for the designation of the Devil's Staircase Wilderness Area in the State of Oregon, to designate segments of Wasson and Franklin Creeks in the State of Oregon as wild rivers, and for other purposes.

S. 383. An act to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate a segment of Illabot Creek in Skagit County, Washington, as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

S. 393. An act to designate additional segments and tributaries of White Clay Creek, in the States of Delaware and Pennsylvania, as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

S. 459. An act to modify the boundary of the Minuteman Missile National Historic Site in the State of South Dakota, and for other purposes.

S. 579. An act to direct the Secretary of State to develop a strategy to obtain observer status for Taiwan at the triennial International Civil Aviation Organization Assembly, and for other purposes.

□ 1400

REAPPOINTMENT AS MEMBER TO ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE RECORDS OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLEISCHMANN). The Chair announces the Speaker's reappointment, pursuant to 44 U.S.C. 2702 and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, of the following individual on the part of the House to the Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress, effective June 24, 2013:

Mr. Jeffrey W. Thomas, Columbus, Ohio

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia, the majority leader, for the purpose of inquiring about the schedule for the week to come.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman from Maryland, the Democratic whip, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet in pro forma session at 11 a.m.; no votes are expected. On Tuesday, the House will meet at noon for morning-hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business; votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour and noon for legislative business. On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a few bills under suspension of the rules, a complete list of which will be announced by close of business tomorrow.

In addition, I expect the House to take up and pass two bills from the Natural Resources Committee: H.R. 2231, the Offshore Energy and Jobs Act, authored by Chairman DOC HASTINGS; and H.R. 1613, the Outer Continental Shelf Transboundary Hydrocarbon