

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:

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
Bentivoglio
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

[Roll No. 348]

YEAS—138

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
Foxo
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene

Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCauley
McClintock
McCollum
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
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
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Becerra
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Broun (GA)
Campbell
Cole
DeFazio
Gingrey (GA)
Gosar
Grijalva
Hartzler

Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (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

NOT VOTING—31

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

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 AGRICULTURE 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 gentlewoman 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. BLUMENAUER).

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.