

Owens	Rokita	Terry
Palazzo	Ros-Lehtinen	Thompson (CA)
Pascrell	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
Riggell	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)
Galleo	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

continued on a bipartisan basis with the gentleman, Mr. LUCAS, the chairman of the committee. That is what we are trying to present today.

The bill which we are presenting today has every consideration that I believe is necessary and important about why this House should move forward and support this legislation. Legislation is commonsense, fiscally responsible; and it is a solution to answers that are in the marketplace.

I urge my colleagues to understand not only what we have stated today, but which was testimony last night in an agreement in the Rules Committee. I support the underlying legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. WATT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in opposition to the rule which prohibits Members from offering amendments that would protect the children of America from hunger.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise each Member to confine the unanimous-consent request to a simple declarative statement of the Member's attitude toward the measure. Further embellishments will result in a deduction of time from the yielding Member.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in very strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it takes the safety net away from America's poor families.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts' time will be charged.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it hurts America's children.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts' time will be charged.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, your position as you enunciate is when a person says why they are opposed, that that is beyond the boundaries of the clarity that you say one must offer when he or she is in opposition to the rule?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Members must limit their requests to simple declarative statements. Any other embellishment will be charged.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the Speaker has enunciated the rule; a simple declaratory statement. Clearly, Mr. HASTINGS made a simple declaratory statement as to why he was opposed, and it seems to clearly fall within the ambit of the contemplated statement that a Member can make without time being charged. The Chair has, however, articulated the fact that, without objection, the gentleman's time will be charged. If that is subject to an objection, which I think it probably is not, I would object. But I will also appeal the ruling of the Chair if the Chair continues that ruling, and we will have a vote on that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will evaluate each declarative statement individually. The gentleman's point has been made.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the Speaker for his observation, and I would hope that the declaratory statement, similar to the one being made by Mr. HASTINGS, will clearly not, as it historically, in my view, has not done so, count against the time from the gentleman from Massachusetts.

□ 1000

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. LEE of California. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it increases hunger in America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it increases hunger in America.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it takes the safety net away from America's poor families.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it hurts the children of America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it hurts America's children.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. I have finally received a copy of the bill. It appears to have no "nutrition" title at all. Is this a printing error?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not stated a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in total opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it hurts America's children.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY) for a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it increases hunger in America.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JOHNSON) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because we are the conscience of the Congress. The majority of the people getting food stamps are not African American.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts' time will be charged.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it takes the safety net away from America's poor families.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it hurts the working poor.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it takes the safety net away from America's poor families.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it hurts the working poor.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in very strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it increases poverty in America.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Ms. CLARKE) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. CLARKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in total and strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it starves America's children.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts' time will be charged.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WILSON) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it hurts the working poor.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it takes food from children, and it increases the number of starving children in America.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts' time will be charged.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state her inquiry.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Referring to your previous ruling, one is allowed to give explanation for one's opposition, and those words are to be counted as part of the unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, a Member is allowed to make a simple declarative statement on a unanimous consent re-

quest. The Chair is trying to be fair with this.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Will you declare, Mr. Speaker, what the interpretation is for excessiveness?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will judge each statement as to its simple declarative nature.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. In continuing the parliamentary inquiry, is the amount of passion in your voice in opposition to the idea that this bill creates more starving children?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not stated a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time the Speaker has charged us for these unanimous consent requests thus far?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland has been charged 1¼ minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California (Ms. BASS) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it contributes to hunger in America.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it increases hunger in America.

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

There was no objection.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state her inquiry.

Ms. EDWARDS. Is it in order to amend the underlying bill and the rule that currently provides for billions in subsidies to corporate farms while children and families go hungry, school lunch programs are decimated, and Meals on Wheels is taken from the disabled and senior citizens?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. An amendment to the rule could be offered only if its manager yields for that purpose.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it takes food and nutrition from working families.

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

There was no objection.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will not this day go down as one of the most shameful days in American history?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not stated a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it takes the safety net away from America's poor children.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it hurts the working poor.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it hurts the working poor, and it violates the long-standing partnership between agriculture producers and our Nation's nutrition programs.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts' time will be charged.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Isn't it true, Mr. Speaker, that this rule takes and bifurcates the bill that came out of the authorizing committee and separates it into two separate bills in a way that ultimately hurts the working poor of this country?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is not the role of the Chair to interpret the underlying bill.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield to the gentlelady from California (Ms. WATERS) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it takes the safety net away from America's poor families and takes food out of the mouths of children.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts' time will be charged.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it significantly increases poverty in America.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it increases poverty in America.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, as chair of the CHC, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in very strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it hurts America's poor children and senior citizens.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts' time will be charged.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. HOYER. I've been listening, as you've observed, to the judgments.

What the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) just did was to state one sentence, but it had an "and," and he gave a second reason he was opposed. The first reason was that it increased poverty, and the second was that it under-

mined children. That was in the same sentence. It seems there was little substantive difference between the statement that preceded it for which you did not charge time and the statement of the gentleman from the Hispanic Caucus.

I would like to understand the parliamentary difference that the Speaker perceived in those two statements.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, the gentleman engaged in embellishment.

Mr. HOYER. He stated two reasons he was opposed.

Is it the Chair's ruling that only one reason will be allowed to be articulated by a Member who is in opposition to this bill?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman also prefaced his remarks.

Mr. HOYER. He did do that. He explained to the American public, presumably who is watching this, Mr. Speaker, as to the framework from which he was speaking, that of representing a large group of Hispanic Americans, who have a large number of Representatives in this body.

Can he not explain that he is the person from Maryland, for instance, or the person from some other State?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, the gentleman engaged in embellishment.

□ 1015

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it hurts the working poor, it leaves children without food, and it hurts seniors on an everyday basis.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts' time will be charged.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOYER. In explaining your answer to the last parliamentary inquiry, you indicated that the problem was that he embellished by introducing himself as chairman of the Hispanic Caucus. The gentleman from New York who just spoke did not do so, but simply articulated three reasons he was opposed to this bill.

It seems to me that that is certainly within the contemplation of the unanimous-consent request. If we start parsing that people can only articulate one reason, I would suggest to our friends, the Parliamentarians, and to the Speaker, that that will establish a precedent which will be very difficult

and subjective for implementation by the Speaker.

I ask the Speaker to perhaps further explain why Mr. MEEKS' objection was charged to Mr. MCGOVERN's time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is drawing the line at a simple declarative statement. Multiple, simple declarative statements constitute debate.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOYER. There was one declarative sentence. It had two commas in it. If we're going to parse this to that extent, I suggest to the Speaker and, frankly, to those who are advising the Speaker, that we're going down a road which is very dangerous.

Clearly, if there was an extended time, one could understand that. But adding two very short parenthetical phrases is, I think, Mr. Speaker, inconsistent with your previous rulings as to when you would not charge the time against Mr. MCGOVERN.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I understood that when Mr. HINOJOSA introduced himself as representing all of the Hispanic Caucus, when he objected to the underlying bill, that that might be perceived as a greater explanation than the Speaker would think warranted. But Mr. MEEKS' statement, following that immediately, was a simple declarative statement with two parenthetical phrases, not long in nature, explaining why he was objecting. It seems to me that's consistent with the rules and the position of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will continue to evaluate each individual declarative statement and make the judgment with regards to embellishment according to the previously announced standard.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time has been charged against us for these unanimous consent requests thus far?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has been charged 2 minutes total.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may state his inquiry.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Would it be in order for me to ask unanimous consent that the time that has been charged against us be restored?

Mr. SESSIONS. I object to that.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry. I didn't make the request yet.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may make his request.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I ask unanimous consent that the time charged against us be restored given the fact that we are operating under a closed rule on a very important piece of legislation where a lot of Members would like to be heard.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. There is objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it violates a decade-old principle uniting urban and rural interests together in feeding hungry people.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts' time will be charged.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in very strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because veterans in my district, children and patriotic families all across America are hungry.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS) for a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it increases hunger of our constituents throughout this great country of ours.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to this mean-spirited farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it takes food nutrition from those most vulnerable among us, our children.

Is this what compassionate conservatism is all about?

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts' time will be charged.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it increases hunger not only in my congressional district but hunger in all congressional districts in America.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it increases hunger in America.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) for a unanimous consent request.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, is it the ruling of the Chair that if in stating my request for unanimous consent I state a single reason, it is not charged to the time of the gentleman from Massachusetts; if I state several reasons in the same sentence because I've cited multiple reasons for requesting unanimous consent, that it is charged, assuming I do it dispassionately, quietly?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair does not respond to hypotheticals.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it increases hunger in America, hurts seniors, and hurts the working poor.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts' time will be charged.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it hurts the working poor.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr.

CLEAVER) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because, Mr. Speaker, there is a five-decade symbiosis between urban America and the farm community.

I rarely come to this well for a lot of reasons—most of them are negative—because I didn't come to Congress to make an enemy. I came here to make a difference.

I'm not here, Mr. Speaker, trying to put politics above productive policy; ideology above the injured. I'm not here to form a division, but inclusion. I'm not here because I believe in capitulation, but in compromise.

I believe that this bill is doing enormous damage not only to the body politic, but to this Nation, and we, the elected leaders of the United States Congress—this is not some little club. We are the Congress of the United States of America, the most powerful Nation on this planet. We can take care of all of the people.

There are poor children in rural areas that I represent, and I will never turn my back on them and I will never turn my back on children in the urban core.

Mr. Speaker, I object to this bill because this bill is not just going to create tension among us but the people of this country who depend on us. They depend on us. It is not like they can go to an alternative body to redress their concerns. If we are about anything, it is about trying to take care of these people. That's why we're here.

I suffer from vertigo. The only way I can stop from wiggling around and fainting when I get dizzy with vertigo is to keep my eyes on something that doesn't move. I get frustrated and dizzy being in this body, and the only way I can stand up is to keep my eyes on something that doesn't move. And the thing that does not move are the people of the United States, particularly those who are hurting. They don't move. My mind is going to stay right there on people who don't move: the hurt, the wounded—even the will to be an American. We've got to make sure that we take care of everybody in this country, Mr. Speaker.

I will not, I shall not, I cannot be silent as we continue to divide the Nation, and then we think we're doing something good because we're able to say something nasty to somebody. The people of this country deserve better. We deserve better.

I've never attacked people on the basis of their party or their ideology, and I won't do it. I will not do it. But I will not abandon what's right. I will not abandon the things that I keep my eyes on. I will not support this bill.

There are people in rural counties that I represent where Saline County, Missouri, a rural county, has greater poverty than Jackson County, where Kansas City sits.

This is not about trying to destroy some kind of system that we put in

place to protect the rural areas. I'm concerned about the rural areas. I was born in Waxahachie, Texas.

My daddy sent my mother to college when I was in the eighth grade. I had never lived in a house with indoor plumbing until I was almost 8 years old. I lived in public housing. My daddy struggled. With a little help, my daddy sent four children through college. We moved out of public housing. My daddy lives in his own house right now in Wichita Falls, Texas.

All people are asking for, in some cases, is just a little help. Who can they turn to? I hope, I actually even pray, that it's the United States Congress.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts' time will be charged.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. RANGEL. Were the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri charged to the debate as it relates to the rule?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. RANGEL. And how long was that?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts' time was charged 4½ minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MCGOVERN. So 4½ minutes total for all of the unanimous consent requests?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts was charged 7¼ minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. So 7¼ minutes have been charged to us for unanimous consent requests, notwithstanding the fact that we have a closed rule. I think everybody stayed within the limit maybe with a little bit of an exception.

I ask unanimous consent that our time be reinstated.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. There is objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There is no ruling before the House at this time.

□ 1030

Mr. HOYER. Parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, would it be in order to move a motion that the

time not be charged to Mr. MCGOVERN as the representative, the ranking member, of the Rules Committee, that a motion be in order that we could vote on? Would that be in order, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is not an appropriate motion.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOYER. I am reluctant to move something that the Speaker has advised is not available to us. On the other hand, this is an issue, under my parliamentary inquiry, I would ask my friend, the chairman of the Rules Committee, if he might reconsider his objection.

There are very strong feelings on this bill. This bill was not noted for consideration until last night. This bill comes to the floor with less than 12 hours' preparation; and while I understand the gentleman's view, it would seem not so much because it is the rule but because it is fair, there are strong, deeply held feelings on this bill, I would urge my friend to withdraw his objection. We're talking about probably 5, 6, 7, 8—I don't know how much time Mr. CLEAVER took—minutes, so we could have the full 30 minutes of debate on the rule itself. I would ask my friend if he would consider that.

Mr. SESSIONS. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I object. When I receive the time, I will offer an explanation.

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

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

To the gentleman, the minority whip, I would encourage him to please recognize that his request to me, as my dear friend, Mr. MCGOVERN, as we stated last night in the Rules Committee, I would encourage you to please offer me an opportunity to explain not just the position but what I believe is the intent of what we are attempting to do.

Mr. Speaker, in the vote that was held for the farm bill, 171 Republicans voted for it, 62 Republicans voted against it. For the farm bill, 24 Democrats voted for it, 172 Democrats voted against it. This meant that the farm bill did not pass. It did not pass this body; and as a result of the significance of the underlying legislation of the farm bill that does include provisions related to SNAP, the Republican leadership, up to and including the Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Ohio; and the majority leader, the gentleman from Virginia, felt it was very important for this body to, as quickly as we returned, to offer a bill that could be passed. With the hope that it could be passed, an analysis of that bill was done; once again, remembering that only 24 Democrats helped to pass the previous bill.

We are attempting to then separate, bifurcate, offer today a rule and the underlying legislation which hopefully

will pass which would go to conference. And the Senate, because they have passed their own farm bill, has included in provisions where they discuss SNAP. As a result of that, that will be included in their bill on a conference measure.

The House simply at this point, if we pass this part, could go to conference—could go to conference—and would be without resolution, would not have passed an amendment or a piece which would discuss it. So, in essence, my conferees, your conferees, our conferees, that would include the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON) as well as Mr. LUCAS from Oklahoma, would go to the conference without resolution from this body. That's all we're talking about. It's fully debatable under the conference. We simply would not have made a decision to change existing law. And the change in existing law would mean that the Senate conferees could stick to their position and hold the cut to \$4 billion, and we would not have a position to cut a penny.

I believe that this is an honest attempt to get us to go to—by passing part of the farm bill—to get to conference. And the tactics against that are simply to keep us from going to conference where we would show up with whatever we pass.

Now, if I have overstated this or understated this, I would encourage the minority whip to please engage me in a colloquy at this time, and I would yield to the gentleman on the substance of what I have spoken about to feel free to enlighten me, and for us to work through this very important issue.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I thank my friend for yielding.

First, let me say that this side of the aisle believes the passage of the farm bill is very, very important. It is important for our agricultural interests, for our farmers. We believe it's very important for those who are relying on nutritional programs and support from us. So we share the view and are strongly in favor of the view of passing a farm bill, number one, I tell my friend.

Secondly, I would tell the gentleman, as he well knows, the farm bill, for the past 2 years, has passed out of the committee with a majority of Democrats, and I think maybe unanimous, but certainly the overwhelming majority of Republicans. It passed out last year as a bipartisan bill. It was not brought to the floor. It was not brought to the floor, as the gentleman recalls, because of the controversies on your side, not our side, of the aisle.

Mr. PETERSON, to whom the gentleman referred and the ranking member of the committee, was in support of the farm bill. In fact, he indicated that he thought there would be sufficient Democrats, with Republicans, to pass the farm bill. Very frankly, as the gentleman articulated, you lost 62 votes on your side of the aisle, notwithstanding the fact that you adopted

three amendments during the course of consideration of the farm bill that Mr. PETERSON advised would undercut his ability and the Democrats' ability to support the bill.

Very frankly, I tell my friend that what has happened, the farm bill was a bipartisan bill supported by a majority of the Democrats in the committee, as the gentleman knows, and by the ranking Democrat, Mr. PETERSON. It came to the floor, however, and that bipartisanship was undermined by the amendments that were adopted. I think that was to the knowledge of certainly Mr. LUCAS. I know that Mr. LUCAS knew that it was undermining it.

We now find ourselves in a position—and I understand what the gentleman has said trying to get to conference—where there was little or no discussion, certainly not with me, not with Leader PELOSI, about how we could move forward in creating a greater bipartisan coalition, while clearly recognizing there was opposition in your party and opposition in my party. So the way this could have passed in a constructive way, in my view, would have been had we reached a bipartisan compromise.

Unfortunately, as is too frequently the case, we have seen where we have gone to, in my perspective, an ultra-partisan resolution to try to pass this bill and presumably pick up a number of the 62; and you'll need a substantial number of the 62 because we don't believe, as you can tell, that this is a process that we can support. But it is unfortunate because the gentleman is correct, and I respect the gentleman's observation, it's important that we pass a farm bill. But for over half a century, we have passed a farm bill in a bipartisan fashion with consideration from the nutrition people in our country to make sure that those who are without food and are hungry would have food.

Mr. SESSIONS. Reclaiming my time, and I would encourage the gentleman to still stand.

We are now here at a point on the floor where we are, rightly or wrongly, attempting to be forthright and honest about what is in the bill and what our intents are. I would hope that the gentleman would recognize that what we have carefully done is excluded some extraneous pieces which might mean—excluded the things that would cause the bill to fail and would not allow us, because we come to no decision therein of the House, that we could not pass the final bill.

And what we're trying to do is take this to conference without any decision thereon. That is not an indication of a lack of willingness on the part of the Republican leadership or any of our Republican Members. It simply says we could not come to a decision at this point, and what we're trying to do is to move forward so we can get to conference.

The gentleman, I hope, does recognize that the Senate has spoken. Our

conferees would be at the table and simply would not have a position that has been taken by this House. In no way would it mean it couldn't be discussed or could not be done.

So I would encourage the gentleman to understand then current law would prevail. The current law would prevail because we have come to no decision therein.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I urge every single Democrat and Republican to oppose this rule and to oppose this bill. This is a closed rule. Closed. No amendments. Closed.

And contrary to the claims by some, this bill is not identical to the bill we voted on a few weeks ago. The Republican majority has, in fact, dramatically changed this farm bill. This 608-page bill, introduced an hour before the Rules Committee met last night, has several major changes that we know about. I say "know about" because we really don't know what's in this bill, and we do not know how some of the changes will affect long-term farm policy.

Something new in this bill is the repeal of the 1949 permanent law. What does that mean? What impact will that language have on future farm policy? Who knows. There hasn't been a single hearing on this language; nor has there been a markup. Nothing. Nothing.

This bill also eliminates the entire nutrition title, which includes more than just food stamps. It includes monies for food banks, emergency food assistance, and food for our senior citizens. The whole title is gone.

Three weeks ago, the farm bill was defeated because Democrats were strongly opposed to the assault on nutrition programs. And, quite frankly, some right wing Republicans voted "no" because they oppose nearly all government programs. Rather than trying to moderate the bill by working with Democrats, rather than compromising, Republican leaders have veered sharply to the right trying to win back the Republican Tea Partyers who voted "no." And the result of all of this is the bill before us.

Now, my question is: What were the right wingers in the Republican conference promised in order to change their votes from "no" to "yes"? What is the backroom deal that they have negotiated with the Republican leadership? How deep of a cut in the SNAP program were they promised?

Now, last night in the Rules Committee we were told there's nothing to worry about; that even though title IV was not included in this legislation, it is still conferenceable if the bill were to go to conference with the Senate. We were told that rather than the \$20.5 billion cut to SNAP that was in the House bill, that it was possible we could end up with the Senate-passed \$4.5 billion cut, or that we could end up with no cuts at all.

□ 1045

Does anybody believe that either of those two scenarios is likely or even possible—in this Congress?

I have great respect for the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, Mr. LUCAS; but I do not trust this Republican leadership.

I spent a great deal of time on this House floor during the debate on this bill a few weeks ago, and I heard Republican speaker after Republican speaker attack SNAP, attack poor people and diminish their struggle. We had nasty amendment after nasty amendment attached to the bill attacking the nutrition programs that benefit the most vulnerable in America. Some of the rhetoric that was spoken on this floor, quite frankly, was offensive.

And leading up to today's vote, I read with great interest the recent quotes from Republican Members, some who called for sunseting of the food stamp program, and some who called for deeper cuts in the program.

I just want to say, for the RECORD, to my friend from Texas, the 47 million people who are on SNAP are not extraneous. They are important. They are part of our community, and we should not diminish their struggle.

So let's be clear. This attempt to separate the nutrition title from the rest of the farm bill is all about gutting the nutrition title. It's all about going after Americans who are struggling in poverty. It's all about denying the working poor the right to food.

So when we're asked to trust Republican leaders, to give them the benefit of the doubt, I can't. Trust is something that is earned, and the behavior of this Republican House towards programs that help the working poor, the needy, and the vulnerable has been appalling.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bad bill. This is a bad process. It should be defeated.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I've represented my party and my leadership on the floor today in the most sincere way, with an opportunity for me to discuss with senior members, not just of the Rules Committee, but also of the Democratic leadership. And in no way, in no way, is the Republican Party trying to do anything more in this bill that's on here today other than to bifurcate and to pass pieces of legislation that then can go to conference. But we have to find a way to pass the bill.

I would remind my colleagues that 172 Democrats voted against the bill, then passing it to go to conference, and 171 Republicans voted for the bill and sending it to conference.

The height of, really, the work that we do is to gain a chance to have a product, in this case the farm bill, that can then go to conference. It's not hyperbole. It is an actual event that can happen. Because the Senate has done their work and finished their work, we are trying to do the same.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RICHMOND) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it's sinful, it increases poverty in America, and it takes the food off the table of American families.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts' time will be charged.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman make a point of order?

Mr. HOYER. I make a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. HOYER. The point of order is that, in fact, consistent with your rulings today, that the gentleman's unanimous consent request was not any different, in substance or in length, than the unanimous consent requests that have been made on a number of occasions, and time was not charged. That is inconsistent. It is a subjective judgment, and I appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The decision on how and when a Member will be charged in debate is a matter confined to the discretion of the Chair. However, the question of whether the form of a unanimous consent request is in order under the rules is a proper subject for a ruling from the Chair.

In the opinion of the Chair, it is not in order to embellish a unanimous consent request with debate. Remarks in the form of debate are charged to the Member yielding.

The request by the gentleman from Louisiana contained remarks in the nature of debate. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. HOYER. I appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand in the judgment of the House?

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the appeal on the table.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 226, noes 196, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 347]

AYES—226

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

NOES—196

Andrews	Capuano	Courtney
Barber	Cárdenas	Crowley
Barrow (GA)	Carney	Cuellar
Bass	Carson (IN)	Cummings
Beatty	Cartwright	Davis (CA)
Becerra	Castor (FL)	Davis, Danny
Bera (CA)	Castro (TX)	DeFazio
Bishop (GA)	Chu	DeGette
Bishop (NY)	Cicilline	Delaney
Blumenauer	Clarke	DeLauro
Bonamici	Clay	DelBene
Brady (PA)	Cleaver	Deutch
Bralley (IA)	Clyburn	Dingell
Brown (FL)	Cohen	Doggett
Brownley (CA)	Connolly	Doyle
Bustos	Conyers	Duckworth
Butterfield	Cooper	Edwards
Capps	Costa	Ellison



Engel	Loeb sack	Richmond
Enyart	Lofgren	Roybal-Allard
Eshoo	Lowenthal	Ruiz
Esty	Lowey	Ruppersberger
Farr	Lujan Grisham	Rush
Fattah	(NM)	Ryan (OH)
Foster	Lujan, Ben Ray	Sánchez, Linda
Frankel (FL)	(NM)	T.
Fudge	Lynch	Sanchez, Loretta
Gabbard	Maffei	Sarbanes
Gallego	Maloney,	Schakowsky
Garamendi	Carolyn	Schiff
Garcia	Maloney, Sean	Schneider
Grayson	Markey	Schrader
Green, Al	Matheson	Schwartz
Green, Gene	Matsui	Scott (VA)
Grijalva	McCollum	Scott, David
Hahn	McDermott	Serrano
Hanabusa	McGovern	Sewell (AL)
Hastings (FL)	McIntyre	Shea-Porter
Heck (WA)	McNerney	Sherman
Higgins	Meeks	Sinema
Himes	Meng	Sires
Hinojosa	Michaud	Slaughter
Honda	Miller, George	Smith (WA)
Hoyer	Moore	Speier
Huffman	Murphy (FL)	Swalwell (CA)
Israel	Nadler	Takano
Jackson Lee	Napolitano	Thompson (CA)
Jeffries	Neal	Thompson (MS)
Johnson (GA)	Nolan	Tierney
Johnson, E. B.	O'Rourke	Titus
Jones	Owens	Tonko
Kaptur	Pallone	Tsongas
Keating	Pascarell	Van Hollen
Kelly (IL)	Pastor (AZ)	Vargas
Kennedy	Payne	Veasey
Kildee	Pelosi	Vela
Kilmer	Perlmutter	Velázquez
Kind	Peters (CA)	Visclosky
Kirkpatrick	Peters (MI)	Walz
Kuster	Peterson	Wasserman
Langevin	Pingree (ME)	Schultz
Larsen (WA)	Pocan	Waters
Larson (CT)	Polis	Watt
Lee (CA)	Price (NC)	Waxman
Levin	Quigley	Welch
Lewis	Rahall	Wilson (FL)
Lipinski	Rangel	Yarmuth

## NOT VOTING—12

Broun (GA)	Horsford	Negrete McLeod
Campbell	Hunter	Rogers (MI)
Gutiérrez	McCarthy (NY)	Schweikert
Holt	Moran	Shimkus

□ 1116

Ms. CHU and Ms. SPEIER changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. PERRY, SMITH of Missouri, GARDNER, WALBERG, GERLACH, SANFORD, WEBSTER of Florida, SMITH of Texas, WOODALL and DENHAM, and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I will insert in the RECORD the Statement of Administration Policy opposing this bill.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET,

Washington, DC, July 10, 2013.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY  
H.R. 2642—FEDERAL AGRICULTURE REFORM AND RISK MANAGEMENT ACT OF 2013  
(Rep. Lucas, R—OK)

The Administration strongly opposes H.R. 2642, the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013. Because the 608 page bill was made available only this evening, the Administration has had inadequate time to fully review the text of the

bill. It is apparent, though, that the bill does not contain sufficient commodity and crop insurance reforms and does not invest in renewable energy, an important source of jobs and economic growth in rural communities across the country. Legislation as important as a Farm Bill should be constructed in a comprehensive approach that helps strengthen all aspects of the Nation. This bill also fails to reauthorize nutrition programs, which benefit millions of Americans—in rural, suburban and urban areas alike. The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program is a cornerstone of our Nation's food assistance safety net, and should not be left behind as the rest of the Farm Bill advances.

If the President were presented with H.R. 2642, his senior advisors would recommend that he veto the bill.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Rules.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I want everybody who may be watching this or in earshot to understand that when the House of Representatives cannot pass a farm bill, we have reached a new low. The reverence in which we hold our farmers is so strong that the farm bill could almost be a part of the Pledge of Allegiance. I want to point out to you that this is the second time that this House is going to likely not be able to pass a farm bill.

I know I don't have to point out to my constituents on both sides of the aisle that the SNAP program, the nutrition program, the school lunch program, the Meals on Wheels and what we do to feed people in this country is also a farm program because, believe it, people, that's where the food comes from. So when you take those programs away, you also hurt the farmers.

We had a pretty offensive attempt here about 3 weeks ago to defund the program. So I do not trust, I'm sorry to say, the majority with trying to do something about this bill. In fact, I'll make a prediction right now. If they decide to bring up the nutrition program as a freestanding bill or anything from the Agriculture Committee, there's not a chance anywhere—it's better stated that way—that that could possibly pass the House simply because we had a lot of explaining here this morning. We were told that the fact that the Republicans took the SNAP and the nutrition program out of it would not be construed by the American people as if they're opposed to feeding people, it's just that they thought it was a piece of extraneous matter that they could deal with maybe in this some other way.

What a tragedy that is for all of us to have to go back home and try to explain to the people that we represent that this House—the most dysfunctional House in history—spending \$25 million a week to operate the House of Representatives, that our biggest trick here is to pass a bill here that we know from the outset will never see the light of day. Almost all of them have Statements of Administration Policy that no way in the world would the Presi-

dent ever sign any kind of a bill like that.

Enough already. Enough. We've disgraced ourselves before the country. We have disgraced ourselves in front of the world. Now, we are raising a generation of children right now who have not been adequately—

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YODER). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I will just end up this way: I've been here a while. I've never seen anything this dysfunctional. I really am embarrassed to say today that trying to feed people could be a reason why they would stop the farm bill—which, as I said, has been a bipartisan bill, has gone through like a hot knife through butter ever since we started doing farm bills in the United States. This is the lowest of the low. When we can't pass this, you know, ladies and gentlemen, they can't run the House.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I'm here to tell you that the opportunity for the Rules Committee to put the bill on the floor, as we did several weeks ago, resulted in 172 Democrats voting against the bill, which meant that it did not make it out of the House, and that's why we're here today. We are here today because the bill did not pass. My party and our friends, the Democrats, did not supply enough votes to make sure that we move forward. And my party is here trying to make sure that we get a second shot at passing the farm bill, and that's what we intend to do.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me just say to the gentleman that the reason why we did not support the farm bill was because the farm bill that the Republicans put on the floor would throw 2 million of our fellow citizens off of the food stamp program. The price of the farm bill should not be to make more people hungry in America.

I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. I want to say to my friends, the reason the farm bill lost is because 62 of your people wouldn't support your Chairman LUCAS, who pleaded for their support. That's why the farm bill lost. Secondly, it lost because you adopted three amendments that undercut poor people in America. And so your response has been to abandon them altogether so you could get those votes back. Isn't that a shame.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is reminded to address his remarks to the Chair and not to other Members of the body in the second person.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, as has previously been stated, it is the intent of the Republican leadership and this majority party to have a bill that will be available and ready that can pass on what might be considered the SNAP portions of this farm bill.

What we're trying to do today is to pass this bill on the farm portions. And it is a fair opportunity to take up the bill exactly as we were several weeks ago on debate, on the rule, and on the things which passed this House for the will of the House to have its say. That is what we're attempting to do today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in this bill a straight reauthorization of the SNAP program without any cuts; current policy, which would be the same language as the chairman of the Rules Committee has promised would be included in the final product.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Texas yield for such unanimous consent?

Mr. SESSIONS. I would not yield for that purpose.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this point, it's my privilege to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the distinguished Democratic leader.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his tremendous leadership on behalf of feeding the American people. It seems a very fundamental thing, Biblical in nature, family-wise, and a very important priority for all of us—except maybe not in this House of Representatives.

I want to thank Congresswoman DELAURO for her relentless, persistent advocacy to feed the hungry in our country.

But I rise today—and I've thanked them over and over again—to once again thank the Congressional Black Caucus. When they came to the floor today to speak in the manner that they did against this legislation and for values that our country shares about being a community, they spoke not just for the Congressional Black Caucus and for their constituents, they spoke for America.

They have fought this fight over and over again. The inference to be drawn from their leadership on this is not that the black community is a community that benefits from food stamps. Some people in the community do. Overwhelmingly, there are people in your districts in rural America, there are people in rural America who really need us to pass this legislation. You are taking food out of the mouths of your own poor constituents.

Poverty in America—poverty—I'm saying the word on the floor of the House: poverty, poverty, poverty. Poverty in America seems to be a word that people get nervous about. Poverty in America among our children is something shameful, but it is a reality. It has an impact on children to have the uncertainty in their lives that poverty brings. And when that poverty says to those children, one in four of you are going to sleep hungry tonight, that's just wrong, and it's wrong for America. It is not consistent with our values. It does not represent the sense of community that makes America strong and that makes America great.

So to MARSHA FUDGE, the distinguished chair of the Caucus, to Mr. CLEAVER, the former chair, to Mr. CLYBURN, our distinguished assistant leader, to all of my colleagues in the CBC—and a champion on the poverty issue, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE—I could name all of you because you've all been out there on the forefront of this.

Our democracy is as strong as we are as a people. The middle class is the backbone of America. The aspirations of Americans to become part of the middle class is what we should be addressing in Congress. And what are we doing? One hundred ninety days we've been in this session and no jobs bill yet.

The leadership of the Republican Party says they want regular order. They want regular order. They passed a budget bill. Over 3 months ago, the Senate passed a budget. The regular order would be to go to conference, get rid of the sequester, and to proceed with a bill that invests in America—Mr. HOYER's Make It in America, invest in innovation in America, build the infrastructure of America, create jobs, and to do so in a way that builds community, strengthens the middle class, and grows our economy with jobs.

The distinguished leadership of this Republican Party in the House said they want regular order and they have respect for their committees. Well, the Agriculture Committee, in a bipartisan way, passed a bill out of the committee.

□ 1130

I didn't like the bill. It wouldn't have been a bill I would have written. When Republicans had the leadership, Democrats cooperated, and a bipartisan bill came out of committee.

The rumor was—and I guess it was just a rumor, but it floated—that then it would respect that bill. If they could come out with a bipartisan bill, it would be taken up on the floor.

The bill that we have here—as little we know about it because it emerged in the middle of the night—bears no resemblance to the bill that came out of committee. Actions of the Republican leadership have been disrespectful to the committee process, so don't hand us the regular order argument.

The audacity to split off the nutrition parts of this bill is so stunning it would be shocking, except this is a "House of shocks." I would say it is one of the worst things you have done, but there is such stiff competition for that honor that I can't really fully say that.

But when you take food out of the mouths of babies and you prevent a bill from going forth that addresses our food banks and our nutrition needs and the rest for our country, what are you thinking? Or are you thinking—or are you thinking?

I thank you, CBC, for your leadership on this. I thank you, JIM MCGOVERN and ROSA DELAURO, and all of you, because this is a fight that you are making for every person in America to live in a country of values, of values that

include our faith. Our faith tells us that to minister to the needs of God's creation is an act of worship; to ignore those needs, as this bill does, is to dishonor the God who made us.

This is very wrong. This, even in this place, crosses a threshold that we should never go past—should never go past. This is totally out of the question.

I am a mom. One of the reasons I am involved in politics is I see this as an extension of my role as a mother of five kids, and now many grandchildren. God blessed us. But what drove me to this was that I saw all that my kids had, all the opportunity, all the love, all the concern, all of the rest of it; and I thought the best thing that we could all do is to make sure that our children, for their own welfare, grew up in a country where all of America's children were treated with respect as we meet their needs. That's just not happening here today.

I call upon our friends in the faith community, and they are here on this issue, as well as most of the farmers groups and all the rest. There is nobody—there is nobody outside this body who supports this bill who cares about the values that we all profess to have within these walls.

Again, taking food out of the mouths of babies, that's a good policy? I don't think so. Vote "no" on this rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are again reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and not to other Members of the body.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, the opportunity, once again, as I stated at the very top of this rule that we began several hours ago, is that the Republican leadership and the Republican membership have great respect for men and women who have fallen on hard times. We have great respect for the millions of people who have lost their jobs and continue to lose their jobs—full-time jobs that have gone to part-time jobs. We recognize that our country is facing very difficult times and more difficult each and every day.

It is our hope through this bill, and a following opportunity, to make sure that the entire piece parts of the will of this body go directly to the conference and meet with the Senate. That is what we are attempting to do today. For Members to ensure that we get to a conference with a complete part of this bill, that is why we are here today and will be here in the immediate future.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the RECORD a letter from Bob Stallman, the president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, in opposition to this bill.

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,  
Washington, DC, July 11, 2013.

Hon. \* \* \*,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR REP. \* \* \*: The American Farm Bu-

reau Federation is our nation's largest general farm organization, representing more than 6 million member families in all 50 states and Puerto Rico. Our members represent the grassroots farmers and ranchers who produce the wide range of food and fiber crops for our customers here and around the world. To achieve this, farmers and ranchers depend on the variety of programs such as risk management, conservation, credit and rural development contained in H.R. 2642 that is scheduled to be voted on by the full House today.

Last night the House Rules Committee approved the rule for considering H.R. 2642, which also includes separating the nutrition title from the remaining provisions of H.R. 1947, a complete farm bill that was reported out of the House Agriculture Committee by a 36-10 bipartisan vote.

We are very disappointed in this action. The "marriage" between the nutrition and farm communities and our constituents in developing and adopting comprehensive farm legislation has been an effective, balanced arrangement for decades that has worked to ensure all Americans and the nation benefits. In spite of reports to the contrary, this broad food and farm coalition continues to hold strong against partisan politics. In fact, last week, more than 530 groups representing the farm, conservation, credit, rural development and forestry industries urged the House to not split the bill. Similar communications were relayed from the nutrition community. Yet today, in spite of the broad-based bipartisan support for keeping the farm bill intact, you will vote on an approach that seeks to affect a divorce of this longstanding partnership. It is frustrating to our members that this broad coalition of support for passage of a complete farm bill appears to have been pushed aside in favor of interests that have no real stake in this farm bill, the economic vitality and jobs agriculture provides or the customers farmers and ranchers serve.

We are quite concerned that without a workable nutrition title, it will prove to be nearly impossible to adopt a bill that can be successfully conferenced with the Senate's version, approved by both the House and Senate and signed by the President.

We are also very much opposed to the repeal of permanent law contained in H.R. 2642. This provision received absolutely no discussion in any of the process leading up to the passage of the bill out of either the House or Senate Agriculture Committees. To replace permanent law governing agricultural programs without hearing from so much as a single witness on what that law should be replaced with is not how good policy is developed.

As recently as last December, the threat of reverting to permanent law was the critical element that forced Congress to pass an extension of the current farm bill when it proved impossible to complete action on the new five-year farm bill—an action that not only provided important safety net programs for this year, it ensured Congress would have time this year to consider comprehensive reforms that contribute billions to deficit reduction.

We urge you to oppose the rule as well to vote against final passage of this attempt to split the farm bill and end permanent law provisions for agriculture.

Sincerely,

BOB STALLMAN,  
*President.*

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, a vote for this bill is a vote to end nutrition

programs in America. Members on the other side of the aisle have already expressed that this morning. Imagine referring to the nutrition title of the farm bill as extraneous—extraneous. Dealing with hunger, dealing with people who have fallen on those hard times, dealing with their food insecurity and their being hungry and kids going to bed hungry every night in this Nation is extraneous. But that says it all. That tells you where their values are.

Before we consider the content of this legislation, take a minute to review what just has happened. Shortly before 8 p.m. last night, the majority posted a 608-page bill online and announced a meeting at 9 to consider the bill. The majority violated their own rule of allowing at least 3 days to review legislation before a vote.

I have a copy of the bill right here. This is the bill—608 pages. Have my colleagues read all of the 608 pages? Have they taken the time to know what is in it? Do they understand that in 2014, in fact, that what they have done adds to the deficit? No.

Instead, we are recklessly pushing forward this partisan bill designed to inflict great harm. And even more pernicious is the substance of this bill, which throws millions of American families aside. This removes the entire nutrition title from the farm bill with no indication that the majority intends to take up those programs in the near future.

Let's be clear about what this means. Food stamps are the critical central strand of our social safety net—our country's most important effort to deal with hunger—helping over 47 million Americans; nearly half of them are children; 99 percent of recipients live below the poverty line; and 75 percent of households receiving this aid include a child, a senior citizen, or an individual with a disability. These are the individuals and the people that this Republican majority has just called extraneous. They are not extraneous.

The bill before us would mean the death knell of the food stamp program and the other nutrition programs that have been part of the farm bill for decades. This bill is immoral, and it is a serious risk to our society.

532 farm groups sent the Speaker a letter opposing the splitting off of nutrition programs. Bishop Stockton and other religious leaders wrote a letter calling food stamps "one of the most effective and important Federal programs to combat hunger in the Nation," and "a crucial part of the farm bill," relieving "pressure on overwhelmed parishes, charities, food banks, pantries, and other emergency food providers." Yet this bill provides the way to gut the food stamp program.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlelady an additional 15 seconds.

Ms. DELAURO. Historically, the farm bill has been a safety net for farmers and families. It has enjoyed bipartisan support up until now until this majority has rent that support asunder.

A vote for this bill is a vote to end nutrition programs in America, to break the longstanding bipartisan compact that the farm bill represented for decades. It takes food out of the mouths of hungry children, seniors, veterans, and the disabled. It is immoral. These people are not extraneous.

I urge my colleagues to reject this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman's time has expired.

Members are reminded to confine their remarks to the time allocated to them.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, last night we had the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, Mr. LUCAS, who approached the committee and said he would like for us to consider this bill on farm bill portions. He indicated that he would follow up and had every intent to follow up with a companion part, the separation of these, which would be the SNAP portions.

Today, we are attempting to offer the bill on the farm policy, and we are doing that. We intend to be able to put these items together and move them forward. I have great confidence, not only in Mr. LUCAS, but also in every Member of this body who understands firsthand that women and children and those who have fallen on hard times do need the SNAP program. We intend to make sure that that is properly taken care of.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in opposition to the rule and the underlying bill, which cuts off nutrition assistance to millions of Americans, including thousands of Rhode Islanders.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the rule; and to the total elimination of funding for the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) in the underlying Farm Bill.

Three weeks ago, the House voted down the Republican-led Farm Bill, rejecting its draconian cuts to SNAP as unnecessarily harmful. The bill before us today contains virtually the same farm provisions, only this time it omits any and all funding for nutrition assistance. Splitting agricultural and nutrition policy sets a terrible precedent. In fact, over 500 agricultural groups oppose this bill, as do environmental and animal welfare advocates.

In the wealthiest nation in human history, it is unconscionable that every American cannot afford life's basic necessities. SNAP helps millions of Americans living in poverty put food

on the table. Eighty percent of the households receiving SNAP earn below the federal poverty level, making it a vital form of assistance for working families.

Last month, I proudly joined a group of my Democratic colleagues in taking the SNAP challenge, a commitment to living on no more than \$4.50 in daily food costs. Every member of Congress should experience what it's like to subsist on such a paltry sum and should understand the impact of the decisions we make on the lives of the constituents we represent.

When we take food off of the plates of hungry children, we have a moral obligation to fully comprehend the consequences of those actions. Under this bill, thousands of Rhode Island families will see their SNAP benefits evaporate. This isn't a solution; it's a bait and switch that I cannot support.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule and reject the underlying bill.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it hurts America's children.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and underlying bill because it takes food and nutrition from working families and veterans and seniors and children and the disabled and many others in need.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts' time will be charged.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state her parliamentary inquiry.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you could tell us whether it would be in order to allow the majority to amend the underlying bill that provides for agricultural subsidies to prohibit Members of Congress who receive financial benefits payments and taxpayer subsidies from the underlying legislation from actually voting on the legislation from which they directly profit financially? Would that be in order for the majority to amend the bill for that purpose?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The majority manager is in charge of the pending resolution.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I have a further parliamentary inquiry.

Would it be appropriate to ask the majority to make an amendment to the bill to prohibit Members who receive taxpayer subsidies from benefiting financially and to prohibit them from voting on the underlying legislation from which they profit financially?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot speculate, but the majority manager may yield for an amendment to the resolution.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to a great leader on issues dealing with poverty and hunger, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong opposition to this rule and the underlying Republican bill.

The partisan bill before us is an abomination and shows just how out of touch, out of control, this extreme Tea Party-controlled Congress is. I can't say, though, that I am surprised. I am sad to say that this House has reached a very shameful new low.

This bill also violates decades of bipartisan support for a delicate balance between America's nutrition programs, farm conservation, and other priorities. This partisan bill also fails to reauthorize nutrition programs, which benefit millions of Americans in rural and urban areas across our country. The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program is our Nation's first line of defense against hunger and among the most effective forms of economic stimulus.

Republicans say they want to decrease poverty and hunger—I hear this all the time on our committees—yet they do just the opposite.

□ 1145

Be assured this bill will increase poverty and hunger. It is a moral disgrace. Nobody wants this Republican bill to move forward—not the 532 companies and organizations from every congressional district that have urged this Congress to not break apart the farm bill, not the administration which issued a veto threat last night, and certainly not the millions of low-income and poor people and working families with children and seniors who continue to struggle from the impact of the Great Recession.

Enough is enough. This is un-American. It's a shame and a disgrace. It's not only on days that we worship that we must remember to do unto others as you would have them do unto you.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. STUTZMAN).

Mr. STUTZMAN. Thank you, Chairman SESSIONS, for yielding, and thank you for all of the hard work that you do in the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I am a farmer. I love to farm. It's in my blood. I farmed before I came to Congress, and I'll farm when I leave.

So, as a fourth-generation farmer, today I rise to say we have an historic opportunity to legislate responsibly and reform prudently when it comes to farm policy and food stamp policy. We, together, can defeat business as usual in Washington, D.C. For the first time in 40 years of farm policy, the House has an opportunity to enact landmark reform in ag policy and to separate the farm bill. Because of policy dating back to the Carter administration, 80 percent of the last trillion-dollar farm bill went to food stamps. I don't believe that's right, and as a farmer, I can tell you it doesn't serve farmers well. Believe it or not, it doesn't serve the needs of those who need help in this country either.

A year ago, I began to call on Congress to separate the farm bill. Our goal has been to reform ag and food stamp policy so that they can really help the folks they were intended to help. Farm policy and food stamp policy should not be mixed. They should stand on their own merits. As Congress immorally sinks our country into debt by \$17 trillion, taxpayers deserve an honest conversation in order to find solutions to help Americans who really need help.

Together, we can get this done and pass the first farm-only farm bill in 40 years. Today, we can pass a bill that sends a clear message that the days of deceptively named budget-busting bills are over. By splitting the bill, we can give taxpayers an honest look at how Washington spends our money. We've made progress by eliminating direct payments, but there is more work ahead, so splitting the farm bill is the next logical step on the path to real reform in farm policy and in helping those who genuinely need help.

I am proud to vote for this legislation, and I thank all of those who put such hard work into it. As a fourth-generation farmer, I am proud to vote for the first farm-only farm bill in 40 years.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. CICILLINE. Is it proper to offer an amendment at this time or at some future time on the underlying bill that would preclude Members of Congress who receive financial benefits, payments, or subsidies from the underlying legislation from voting on this bill from which they directly profit financially?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. An amendment to the rule may only be offered if the majority manager yields for such purpose.

Mr. CICILLINE. I ask the majority manager if he would yield for such an amendment.

Mr. SESSIONS. All time yielded is for the purpose of debate only, and I will not yield for that purpose.

Mr. CICILLINE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SESSIONS. I do not know that the gentleman has been yielded that time by his manager.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has reserved, and the gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD a statement from the Club for Growth which is in opposition to this bill and which indicates they will score this vote.

KEY VOTE ALERT—"NO" ON "FARM ONLY" BILL (H.R. )

The Club for Growth strongly opposes the "Farm-Only" bill and urges all House members to oppose it. We believe floor consideration of the bill could happen as early as this week. The vote on final passage will be included in the Club's 2013 Congressional Scorecard.

Breaking up the unholy alliance between agricultural policy and the food stamp program within the traditional farm bill is an excellent decision on behalf of House leadership. However, the whole purpose of splitting up the bill is to enact true reform that reduces the size and scope of government. Sadly, this "farm-only" bill does not do that, especially under an anticipated closed rule. It is still loaded down with market-distorting giveaways to special interests with no path established to remove the government's involvement in the agriculture industry.

Worse, we highly suspect that this whole process is a "rope-a-dope" exercise. We think House leadership is splitting up the farm bill only as a means to get to conference with the Senate where a bicameral backroom deal will reassemble the commodity and food stamp titles, leaving us back where we started. Unless our suspicions are proven unwarranted, we will continue to oppose this bill.

Our Congressional Scorecard for the 113th Congress provides a comprehensive rating of how well or how poorly each member of Congress supports pro-growth, free-market policies and will be distributed to our members and to the public.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. The only thing that this House will do when it votes today is defeat starving children. It will again put starving children in the abyss of the uncaring attitude of my friends who for the first time in decades are separating the heart line of the farm bill—the nutrition program, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, the food stamps program.

I am glad to stand with the Democratic Caucus and the Congressional Black Caucus and others to be able to say that hunger is silent. There are no children at that microphone on this floor today, standing over here, telling you that their bellies are protruding because they have not eaten. There is no one on this floor today who goes to a summer program and who did not eat because the breakfast program is tied to the school, and they are out of school, and summer brings about hunger. There is no one who has told you that families have an extra \$300 bill in

the summertime to feed their children, and for those who do not have it, no one has told you that the lack of protein in a diet leads to the disease and decay of teeth and bone for the very children that we say are the priority of this place.

In decades, you have never separated the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program—a \$20 billion cut, a \$3 billion cut, making it \$23 billion in cuts. You will never put that on the floor. You will slide it through because all the folks want is a piece of a sound bite at home to say they believe in deficit reduction.

I believe in the life of the children. I believe in growing our children. Vote "no."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired. The gentlewoman from Texas is out of order. The gentlewoman from Texas is reminded to address her remarks to the Chair and not to other Members of the body. Members are reminded to confine their remarks to the time allotted to them.

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. STUTZMAN), who is a farmer, very clearly, I believe, spoke about the intent of this bill, and that is that we are going to talk about farm policy.

There are revisions and changes that update not only Federal farm policy, but they are done on a bipartisan basis. The gentlemen on both sides of the aisle—the ranking member and the chairman of the Agriculture Committee—have worked very closely on this, and I believe that what is on the floor today offers an opportunity to debate that and to see if we can pass it. That's what we are trying to do.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, apparently, it was not enough for the House majority to decimate the nutrition title the last time we considered the farm bill a few weeks ago with the \$20 billion cut. When they couldn't get the majority of Republicans to vote for it because it just wasn't cut enough, they just eliminated the entire nutrition title—the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, the Emergency Food Assistance Program, the Commodity Supplemental Food Program. These are fancy names and acronyms for the programs that allow seniors, young children, and the disabled to stock their food pantries. I can't wrap my mind around the shameful nature of this moment, a moment when we are moving forward with the farm bill and leaving behind 47 million of our Nation's hungry.

Now, it has been asserted, Mr. Speaker, that the House leadership is not attempting to starve vulnerable families but merely wants to expedite the passage of the all-important agricultural components of the bill by removing the

extraneous nutrition title. Since 1965, we have reauthorized our antihunger programs alongside our agriculture-related policies in a marriage; but at this moment, the House has filed for divorce, and the primary breadwinner is abandoning two-thirds of the family, consisting of children—young, babies—the elderly, and the disabled. H.R. 2642 is a deadbeat majority's proposal to avoid child support, elderly subsidies, and food assistance to the disabled of 47 million people.

What kind of message are we sending with the passage of this bill? We are telling our Nation's hungry that Congress is willing to turn a blind eye and that food is an extraneous concern of the Congress.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on behalf of the people of the Virgin Islands in strong opposition to this farm bill. It hurts children and families in our country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to this farm bill rule and underlying bill because it cruelly takes food away from poor children, the elderly, and the disabled.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts' time will be charged.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it increases hunger in our country.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts' time will be charged.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to this farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it increases hunger in America, and it punishes all of

those who rely on the SNAP program in this country.

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I object. I can't agree to a unanimous consent that this increases hunger in America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is not recognized for the purpose of debate.

Objection to the gentleman from Pennsylvania's request was heard.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WATT. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. WATT. Whose time got charged with the last two unanimous consent requests? Both were one sentence, and you're saying they were charged.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts' time has been charged.

Mr. WATT. Would the Speaker explain to the House why that is the case.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Any request that is accompanied by remarks that are in the nature of debate is charged, not the unanimous consent request itself, but the remarks that follow the unanimous consent request that are in the nature of debate.

Mr. WATT. Mr. Speaker, I object to that ruling, and I would ask the Speaker to reverse it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There is no ruling pending at this time. There is nothing for the gentleman to object formally to.

Mr. WATT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the time of the two previous speakers who asked for unanimous consent not be charged to the time of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's motion is not in order. There is no motion that can achieve that end.

Mr. WATT. I ask unanimous consent to restore the time to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGOVERN).

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. I am not yielding for that purpose.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Ms. FUDGE. 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 noes appeared to have it.

Ms. FUDGE. 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 138, nays 265, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 348]

YEAS—138

Andrews  
Bass  
Beatty  
Bishop (GA)  
Blumenauer  
Brady (PA)  
Brown (FL)  
Brownley (CA)  
Butterfield  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cárdenas  
Carson (IN)  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu  
Cicilline  
Clarke  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Crowley  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DeBene  
Deutch  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Farr  
Fattah  
Foster  
Frankel (FL)  
Fudge  
Garamendi  
Aderholt  
Alexander  
Amash  
Amodei  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Barber  
Barletta  
Barr  
Barrow (GA)  
Barton  
Benishek  
Bentivolio  
Bera (CA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Bonamici  
Bonner  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)  
Braley (IA)  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Buchanan  
Bucshon  
Burgess  
Bustos  
Calvert  
Camp  
Cantor  
Capito  
Carney  
Carter  
Cassidy  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Coble  
Coffman  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Conaway  
Cook  
Cotton  
Courtney  
Grayson  
Green, Al  
Gutiérrez  
Hahn  
Hanabusa  
Hastings (FL)  
Heck (WA)  
Higgins  
Himes  
Hinojosa  
Honda  
Hoyer  
Israel  
Jackson Lee  
Jeffries  
Johnson, E. B.  
Kaptur  
Kelly (IL)  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lee (CA)  
Levin  
Lewis  
Lofgren  
Lowenthal  
Lowey  
Lujan Grisham (NM)  
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)  
Maloney, Carolyn  
Maloney, Sean  
Matsui  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McNerney  
Meng  
Miller, George  
Moore  
Moran  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Nolan

NAYS—265

Cramer  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Daines  
Davis, Rodney  
DeGette  
Denham  
Dent  
DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Duckworth  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Ellmers  
Enyart  
Esty  
Farenthold  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Foxx  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gabbard  
Gallego  
Gallego  
Garcia  
Gardner  
Garrett  
Gerlach  
Gibbs  
Gibson  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Conaway  
Cook  
Cotton  
Courtney

Pallone  
Pascarell  
Payne  
Peterson  
Pingree (ME)  
Pocan  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rangel  
Richmond  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Sánchez, Linda T.  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Mica  
Schrader  
Schwartz  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Shea-Porter  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Moore  
Watt  
Waxman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth  
Griffin (AR)  
Griffith (VA)  
Grimm  
Guthrie  
Hall  
Hanna  
Harper  
Harris  
Hastings (WA)  
Heck (NV)  
Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler  
Holding  
Hudson  
Huelskamp  
Huffman  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hurt  
Issa  
Jenkins  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Jordan  
Joyce  
Keating  
Kelly (PA)  
Kilmer  
Kind  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kline  
Kuster  
Labrador  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Lankford  
Latham  
Latta  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loeb  
Lucas

Luetkemeyer  
Lummis  
Lynch  
Maffei  
Marchant  
Marino  
Massie  
Matheson  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McCollum  
McHenry  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
Meehan  
Messer  
Mica  
Michaud  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller, Gary  
Mullin  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (FL)  
Murphy (PA)  
Neugebauer  
Noem  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Nunnelee  
Olson  
Owens  
Palazzo  
Pastor (AZ)  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Perlmutter  
Perry  
Peters (CA)  
Peters (MI)  
Petri  
Pittenger  
Pitts  
Poe (TX)  
Polis  
Pompeo  
Posey (GA)  
Radel  
Rahall  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rice (SC)  
Rigell  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Royce  
Runyan  
Ryan (OH)  
Ryan (WI)  
Salmon  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sanford  
Scalise  
Schneider  
Schock  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Sherman

Shuster  
Simpson  
Sinema  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (TX)  
Southernland  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Stockman  
Stutzman  
Terry  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tierney  
Tipton  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Vela  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walorski  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Westrup  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Wolf  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)  
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—31

Becerra  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (UT)  
Broun (GA)  
Campbell  
Cole  
DeFazio  
Gingrey (GA)  
Gosar  
Grijalva  
Hartzler  
Holt  
Horsford  
Hunter  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (OH)  
King (IA)  
Kirkpatrick  
Markey  
McCarthy (NY)  
Meeks  
Negrete McLeod

□ 1220

Messrs. PETRI and GOWDY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. YARMUTH and Mrs. LOWEY 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 against:

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 348 I was unavoidably absent. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, July 11, 2013, I missed rollcall vote No. 348 for unavoidable reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: rollcall No. 348: "nay" (on motion to adjourn).

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, July 11, 2013, I was unable to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: On rollcall No. 348, "nay."

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, on July 11, 2013, I was unavoidably detained and was not present for rollcall vote number 348. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced