

In order to allocate more funding per title I student to local education agencies, or LEAs, with higher concentrations of poverty, the funding formula weighs the count of eligible students in an LEA. However, the formulas have the perverse effect of directing funds away from all smaller school districts, both urban and rural, towards larger LEAs, regardless of the poverty rate. The ACE Act would gradually decrease the effects of number weighting and return the focus to areas with the highest concentration of poverty, as originally intended under the law.

Mr. Speaker, I'm proud to have Representative SLAUGHTER of New York join me in introducing this important bill. I encourage my colleagues to join us in correcting this fundamental injustice.

STAND FOR SNAP

(Mrs. BEATTY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BEATTY. I stand here today in dismay and in disgust. I stand here on this same floor where we have the words, "In God we trust," where we say the Pledge of Allegiance, where my Republican colleagues dare come to this podium and use words like "train wreck" and "work in a bipartisan fashion" in the same minute, and then today we are confronted with removing SNAP dollars from the farm bill.

I came here to work on a compromise. Members of this great Congressional Black Caucus and Democratic Caucus stand together because we want America to know that we stand for poor families: Black, White, urban, suburban, and, yes, rural.

We ask you to take note today, Mr. Speaker, that Republicans dare come to this floor and tell us that we want to serve the people. Aren't our children, our mothers, and families part of the people? Yes.

We stand for SNAP.

REPEAL OBAMACARE

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, last week, the President quietly decided to delay a major part of what many media pundits consider his crowning achievement: ObamaCare. The President is telling businesses that they will be given a year reprieve from complying with ObamaCare's onerous and costly employer mandate. The President is once again picking which laws his administration enforces and which ones he chooses not to. He's also picking winners and losers again. Employers will have another year to comply with the employer mandate, but President Obama has decided that individuals—the middle class—will not be given more time to comply with the individual mandate.

Meanwhile, the economy continues to limp along with businesses, large and small, afraid to hire more workers because the cost of doing business continues to go up without a clear end in sight. High taxes, enormous tax burdens, and the specter of ObamaCare continue to hang over them like a storm cloud. For the good of our Nation, ObamaCare must be repealed and replaced.

INCLUDE NUTRITION ASSISTANCE IN THE FARM BILL

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

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express great disappointment in my Republican colleagues for bringing a version of the farm bill that does not include nutrition assistance.

When I joined this great, august body, I was a member of the Agriculture Committee. The Agriculture Committee, time and time again, reauthorized the farm bill. Bipartisanship was always the hallmark. And this is not the hallmark of what we as Americans stand for.

Our minister today just stood up here with us in prayer and said that we would walk justly, that we would do and love mercifully, and that we would be humbled before God. If we are to truly have those words mean something in America, we must take care of our working families, our needy families, our children, in addition to our farmers.

The farmers that I represent in Alabama do not want a farm bill that does not include nutrition assistance. We cannot provide government subsidies to farmers without providing government assistance to people in poverty. It is not what we as Americans stand for.

If we have no further business in this august body this week, we should go home.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn.

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

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 125, nays 260, not voting 49, as follows:

[Roll No. 346]

YEAS—125

Andrews
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bishop (GA)

Blumenauer
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield

Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)

Castro (TX)
Chu
Clarke
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Costa
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Garamendi
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes

Hoyer
Israel
Jackson Lee
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kirkpatrick
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Maloney,
Carolyn
Matsui
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Miller, George
Moore
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peterson
Pingree (ME)

Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Schakowsky
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Wilson (FL)

NAYS—260

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cicilline
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Conyers
Cook
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent

DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Enyart
Esty
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Honda
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones

Jordan
Joyce
Keating
Kelly (PA)
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lynch
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson

Owens	Rokita	Terry
Palazzo	Ros-Lehtinen	Thompson (CA)
Pascarell	Roskam	Thompson (PA)
Pastor (AZ)	Ross	Thornberry
Paulsen	Rothfus	Tiberi
Pearce	Royce	Tierney
Perry	Runyan	Tipton
Peters (CA)	Ryan (WI)	Tonko
Peters (MI)	Salmon	Turner
Petri	Sanford	Upton
Pittenger	Scalise	Valadao
Pitts	Schneider	Vela
Poe (TX)	Schock	Wagner
Pompeo	Schweikert	Walberg
Price (GA)	Scott, Austin	Walden
Radel	Sensenbrenner	Walorski
Rahall	Sessions	Weber (TX)
Rangel	Sherman	Welch
Reed	Shuster	Wenstrup
Reichert	Simpson	Westmoreland
Renacci	Sinema	Williams
Ribble	Smith (MO)	Wilson (SC)
Rice (SC)	Smith (NE)	Wittman
Rigell	Smith (TX)	Wolf
Roby	Southerland	Womack
Roe (TN)	Stewart	Woodall
Rogers (AL)	Stivers	Yarmuth
Rogers (KY)	Stockman	Yoder
Rohrabacher	Stutzman	Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—49

Barton	Horsford	Rooney
Bonner	Hunter	Ryan (OH)
Campbell	Jeffries	Sanchez, Loretta
Clay	Kaptur	Sarbanes
Culberson	Kinzinger (IL)	Schiff
DeGette	Langevin	Shimkus
Deutch	Larsen (WA)	Smith (NJ)
Diaz-Balart	Maffei	Titus
Dingell	Markey	Visclosky
Ellmers	Massie	Waxman
Farr	McCarthy (NY)	Webster (FL)
Gallego	Messer	Whitfield
Graves (MO)	Murphy (FL)	Yoho
Grimm	Nadler	Young (AK)
Herrera Beutler	Negrete McLeod	Young (FL)
Hinojosa	Posey	
Holt	Rogers (MI)	

□ 0945

Messrs. HALL, LUCAS and McINTYRE, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Messrs. GARCIA and KILMER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. POLIS, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, and Messrs. DEFAZIO, CROWLEY, McDERMOTT, and FATTAH changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 346, had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 346, had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

Stated against:

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 346, had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 346, had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2642, FEDERAL AGRICULTURE REFORM AND RISK MANAGEMENT ACT OF 2013

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 295 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 295

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2642) 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. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture; and (2) one motion to recommit.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Worcester, Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 295 provides for a closed rule for consideration of H.R. 2642. However, I think it is important to recognize that while the rule before us today is closed, this legislation, exactly the legislation, has gone through an amendment process on this floor, was debated—just a few weeks ago—debated, discussed, and voted on. The amendments which were agreed to as a result of that process are in this underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us today is the exact same language that this body considered in June with two important considerations and exceptions. Unlike last month, this legislation contains a repeal of the 1949 backstop, which means that in the farm bill we will do away with that 1949 law as the backstop to the farm products and legislation. However, it does not include the nutrition programs from the previous bill. We will hear that today.

On the other hand, however, this bill does include the exact same language as the previous bill, including adopted amendments.

Since the House considered a farm bill last month, there has been a great deal of and many conversations, including today with Members, that have raised significant concerns with the language as it was previously drafted. The chief concern was the inclusion of a nutrition policy in the agriculture bill.

Therefore, after careful consideration of all aspects of the issue, the decision

was made to consider nutrition and agriculture policy separately. However, I want to be clear: removing the nutrition provisions from this legislation in no way seeks to marginalize the importance of the nutrition programs, nor in any effort are we trying to avoid their reauthorization. Anything that would be said on this floor contrary to that simply would not be true.

I think you would be hard-pressed to find any Member, Republican or Democrat, who does not think that these programs are vitally important, in particular, to women and children. They simply will be considered separately and not in this bill.

Now, the practicality to this, Mr. Speaker, is and was discussed last night in the Rules Committee, that is, that if it is not in this title, and it is not, and if the House does not move forward on a nutrition or SNAP program, then all of these items still go to conference with the United States Senate, and it is contained within the Senate bill and would be fully operational, debatable, and decisions can be made in that conference. In that conference, it is fully authorized and the House would simply not have taken a position.

To assume or to say that we are trying to move a bill without nutrition and to take things away would not be truthful. To say that we would show up at conference without a position of the House of Representatives would be truthful.

Republicans and Democrats, including leadership of both parties, understand and recognize that nutrition and nutrition programs are an essential part of not just government services, but an essential part of a civilization that we agree with as part of the programs from the United States Government. So in no way, in no way, is this intended to be a trick or to be seen that we would not believe, or would believe, that we would show up to do anything to the nutrition program.

It would be stated that the House would show up without a position on those issues, which would mean in reality that the current law would prevail. The House would show up with no position to change any of these items related to food stamps, and thus it would stay as is. So for someone to suggest that Republicans are not going to be supportive of the nutrition programs would simply not, in my opinion, be fairly spoken of.

The House will have an opportunity, however, once we get this done, to move forward a bill that if a decision was made could move to conference.

Today's legislation is an important step in making sure that the agriculture programs provide the American farmers with innovative risk-management tools and so many other things that have been placed in this bill on a bipartisan basis as a result of the work that began with then-Democrat Chairman COLLIN PETERSON when the bill began its writing process and now has