Shuster

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

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

Brady (PA)

Brown (FL)

Butterfield

Capps

Capuano

Cárdenas

Carson (IN)

Cartwright

Castor (FL)

Castro (TX)

Chu Cicilline

Clarke

Cleaver

Clyburn

Connolly

Conyers

Cooper

Crowley

Delanev

DeLauro

DelBene

Deutch

Dingell

Doggett

Edwards

Ellison

Engel

Farr

Fattah

Foster

Fudge

Garamendi

Aderholt

Amash

Amodei

Bachus

Barletta

Barrow (GA)

Barr

Barton

Benishek

Bentivolio

Bera (CA)

Blackburn

Bonamici

Boustany

Brady (TX)

Braley (IA)

Bridenstine

Brooks (AL)

Brooks (IN)

Buchanan

Bucshon

Burgess

Bustos

Calvert

Camp

Cantor

Capito

Carnev

Carter

Cassidy

Chabot

Coble

Chaffetz

Coffman

Conaway

Courtney

Green, Gene

Lucas

Cook

Cotton

Collins (GA)

Collins (NY)

Bonner

Black

Bishop (NY)

Alexander

Bachmann

Dovle

Cummings

Davis (CA)

Costa

Cohen

Clay

Bass

Beatty

Grayson Pallone Green, Al Pascrell Gutiérrez Pavne Bishop (GA) Hahn Peterson Hanabusa Blumenauer Pingree (ME) Hastings (FL) Pocan Heck (WA) Price (NC) Brownley (CA) Higgins Quigley Himes Rangel Hinojosa Richmond Honda Roybal-Allard Hover Ruiz Israel Ruppersberger Jackson Lee Sánchez, Linda Jeffries т Johnson, E. B. Sarbanes Kaptur Kelly (IL) Schakowsky Schiff Kennedy Schrader Kildee Schwartz Langevin Scott (VA) Larsen (WA) Scott, David Larson (CT) Serrano Lee (CA) Sewell (AL) Levin Shea-Porter Lewis Slaughter Lofgren Smith (WA) Lowenthal Speier Lowey Lujan Grisham Swalwell (CA) Takano Davis Danny (NM) Thompson (MS) Luián. Ben Ray (NM) Titus Maloney Tsongas Van Hollen Carolyn Vargas Maloney, Sean Veasey Matsui McDermott Velázquez Visclosky McGovern Walz McNerney Wasserman Meng Miller, George Schultz Waters Moore Watt Moran Nadler Waxman Frankel (FL) Napolitano Welch Wilson (FL) Neal Nolan Yarmuth

NAYS-265

Cramer Griffin (AR) Crawford Griffith (VA) Grimm Crenshaw Cuellar Guthrie Culberson Hall Daines Hanna Davis, Rodney Harper DeGette Harris Denham Hastings (WA) Heck (NV) Dent DeSantis Hensarling DesJarlais Herrera Beutler Diaz-Balart Holding Duckworth Hudson Duffy Huelskamp Duncan (SC) Huffman Huizenga (MI) Duncan (TN) Ellmers Hultgren Envart Hurt Estv Issa Farenthold Jenkins Fincher Johnson, Sam Fitzpatrick Jones Fleischmann Jordan Fleming Joyce Flores Keating Kelly (PA) Forbes Fortenberry Kilmer Foxx Kind Franks (AZ) King (NY) Frelinghuysen Kingston Kinzinger (IL) Gabbard Gallego Kline Garcia. Kuster Gardner Labrador Garrett LaMalfa Gerlach Lamborn Gibbs Lance Gibson Lankford Gohmert Latham Goodlatte Latta Gowdy Lipinski Granger LoBiondo Graves (GA) Loebsack Graves (MO) Long

Luetkemeyer Peters (CA) Lummis Lynch Maffei Marchant Marino Massie Matheson McCarthy (CA) McCaul McClintock McCollum McHenry McIntyre McKeon McKinley Rodgers Meadows 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 (MI) Simpson Petri Sinema Pittenger Smith (MO) Pitts Smith (NE) Poe (TX) Smith (TX) Polis Southerland Pompeo Stewart Posey Stivers Price (GA) Stockman Radel Stutzman Rahall Terry Reed Thompson (CA) Reichert Thompson (PA) Renacci Thornberry Ribble Tiberi Rice (SC) Tierney Rigell Tipton Roby Turner Roe (TN) Upton Rogers (AL) Valadao Rogers (KY) Vela Rohrabacher Wagner Rokita. Walberg Rooney Walden Ros-Lehtinen Walorski Roskam Weber (TX) Ross Webster (FL) Rothfus Wenstrup Rovce Westmoreland Runyan Ryan (OH) Whitfield Williams Rvan (WI) Wilson (SC) Salmon Wittman Sanchez, Loretta Wolf Sanford Womack Scalise Schneider Woodall Yoder Schock Yoho Scott, Austin Sensenbrenner Young (AK) Sessions Young (FL) Sherman Young (IN) NOT VOTING-31

Becerra Holt O'Rourke Bilirakis Horsford Pelosi Bishop (UT) Hunter Rogers (MI) Broun (GA) Johnson (GA) Rush Campbell Johnson (OH) Schweikert Cole King (IA) Shimkus DeFazio Kirkpatrick Sires Markey Gingrey (GA) Smith (NJ) McCarthy (NY) Gosar Tonko Grijalva Meeks Hartzler Negrete McLeod

□ 1220

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

Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, YARMUTH and Mrs. LOWEY Mr. ''nay'' changed their vote from "yea."

So the motion to adjourn was reiected.

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, 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 that the Senate has passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 251. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal features of the electric distribution system of the South Utah Valley Electric Service District, and for other purposes.

H.R. 254. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to facilitate the development of hydroelectric power on the Diamond Fork System of the Central Utah Project.

The message also announced that the Senate agreed to the amendment of the House to a Senate amendment on a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 588. An act to provide for donor contribution acknowledgements to be displayed at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Visitor Center, and for other purposes.

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

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

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. Bonamici) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. BONAMICI. 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 will increase hunger in America.

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

Mr. GOHMERT. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Kennedy) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. KENNEDY. 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 nutrition away from working families.

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

Mr. GOHMERT. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts will state his point of parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. McGOVERN. Am I understanding the gentleman's objection correctly that what he is doing is not even giving Members on our side the courtesy of stating their statement in the RECORD?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state a proper parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. McGOVERN. I'm trying to understand what the objection means of the gentleman from Texas. Does that mean

that the statement that the gentleman from Massachusetts just made will not appear in the RECORD?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The objection was to the unanimous consent request.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this point I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. Lowey), my good friend, for a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. LOWEY. 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 takes food and nutrition from hardworking families.

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

Mr. GOHMERT. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlelady from Nevada (Ms. TITUS) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. TITUS. 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 and Nevada's poor families

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) for a unanimous consent request.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentle-woman from the District of Columbia?

Mr. GOHMERT. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

I think it is extremely unfortunate that Members on the other side of the aisle would deny Members on this side of the aisle the ability to insert written materials in the RECORD. In all my years here, I have never seen such a discourteous gesture.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am proud to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD).

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that the Republican Tea Party has a national agenda that is playing out right here in this Chamber today. You are attempting to defund food stamps—yes, you are—and place poor people, which includes children

and the elderly and veterans, in a position that none of you would want to be in.

When it was time to reauthorize the farm bill, Republicans cut \$16 billion in food stamps. And what happened? The Speaker refused to schedule the bill for floor action, not because the cuts were too deep, but because they were not deep enough. And so the Ag Committee made deeper cuts, this time \$20 billion in cuts. When the bill was debated, Republicans then added mean-spirit amendments that doomed the bill. Now you bring us another bill with no nutrition title at all.

We cannot stand by and be silent when Republicans take these actions that offend what we are as Americans. We can do better than this

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and not directly to other Members of the body in the second person.

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

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLU-MENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the relentless focus on the nutrition programs at risk; but remember, this is going to be the costliest farm bill in history. It contains no reform. It concentrates Federal cash on the largest, most profitable agribusiness. It shortchanges conservation, guts protection for wetlands, prairies, and forests. It rewards government dependency, not innovation.

You have managed to unite the Environmental Working Group, the Farm Bureau, and the Club for Growth in opposition. Congratulations.

Please reject the rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I believe it's important for us to understand what's in the bill, and I'd like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. Lucas), the chairman of the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I would have preferred to focus my time in the general debate, and that's still my intention. The rule debate historically, as we all know in this body, is more of a partisan discussion, generally less focused on the details of the bill than the intensity of the process or the perspective by which the next action takes place. I understand that.

But I would say to my friends, and I will go into greater detail on this in just a little bit, remember what you are about to vote on, a rule to enable us to proceed to a vote entails, is consideration of a bill that took two markups over 2 years in committee, where 100 amendments were considered in both markups, a process by which a bill to the floor a couple of weeks ago subject to another 100 amendments, tremendous debate, tremendous discussion, yet a bill that could not quite get the muster of both the left and the right.