

□ 1400

RELATING TO CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE AMENDMENT TO SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2642, FEDERAL AGRICULTURE REFORM AND RISK MANAGEMENT ACT OF 2013; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 378, EXPRESSING SENSE OF HOUSE RELATING TO TARIFF-RATE QUOTAS FOR RAW AND REFINED SUGAR; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 379, EXPRESSING SENSE OF HOUSE RELATING TO CROP INSURANCE

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 380 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 380

Resolved, That it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order for the chair of the Committee on Agriculture or his designee to move that the House insist on its amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2642 and agree to a conference with the Senate thereon.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 378) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding certain provisions of the Senate amendment to H.R. 2642 relating to the Secretary of Agriculture's administration of tariff-rate quotas for raw and refined sugar. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution to its adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by Representative Pitts of Pennsylvania or his designee and an opponent.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 379) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding certain provisions of the Senate amendment to H.R. 2642 relating to crop insurance. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution to its adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by Representative Ryan of Wisconsin or his designee and an opponent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from 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

Ms. FOXX. 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 gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. House Resolution 380 provides for a motion to go to conference with the Senate on H.R. 2642, the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act, also known as the farm bill.

Mr. Speaker, this rule authorizes House Agriculture Committee Chairman FRANK LUCAS to make a motion to go to conference with the Senate on the farm bill and provides for consideration of two resolutions expressing the sense of the House regarding specific provisions in the farm bill.

Conference committees are a crucial step in resolving policy differences between the House and Senate, and I am encouraged that the House is taking this step to provide certainty for farmers across this country by reauthorizing Federal agriculture policy.

The House proposal is not perfect, but it moves Federal agriculture policy in the right direction; and my hope is that during a conference committee with the Senate, we can find common ground.

Additionally, the rule makes in order the consideration of two resolutions that express the sense of the House on crop insurance and the U.S. sugar program. The first resolution expresses the sense of the House that conferees should agree to limit crop insurance based on average adjusted gross income in excess of \$750,000. This commonsense proposal ensures that crop insurance is appropriately targeted to those who need it most.

The second resolution instructs conferees to advance provisions to repeal the administration of tariff rate quotas and, thus, restore the Secretary of Agriculture's authority to manage supplies of sugar throughout the year to meet domestic demand at reasonable prices. I strongly support this resolution, as it restores free-market principles to the U.S. sugar program.

This rule provides for the business of legislating and resolving differences between our two Chambers to find common ground and move forward in reauthorizing Federal agriculture policy. I urge my colleagues to support this rule, the motion to go to conference, and the motions to instruct provided by this rule.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlelady from North Carolina for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that we are finally going to conference on the farm bill. I believe strongly that we need to reauthorize a 5-year bill to provide some clarity and provide some certainty not just for our farmers, but also for the millions of Americans who rely on nutrition assistance to feed themselves and their families.

I need to just say a few words about the process. I do not think I have ever seen a motion to go to conference with two motions to instruct conferees to

the majority party in the House as all part of one rule. This is kind of an odd precedent, Mr. Speaker; but there are a lot of odd things going on around here during these last few days. We see major pieces of legislation, appropriation bills, coming to the Rules Committee that have never even been considered on the floor; and all of a sudden, they are brought before the House under a closed process. But anyway, I think it is pretty clear that regular order has been discarded in this House.

But putting that aside, let me say that I would like to take most of my time here to talk about the issue of hunger in America because this bill is very relevant to that subject.

After a \$20 billion cut to the SNAP program was voted down by the House in June, the Republican leadership sadly decided to double-down on the cruelty with a nearly \$40 billion cut. That bill also narrowly passed, and I want to thank the brave Republicans who stood with us, who listened to their own constituents, and who listened to their consciences and joined with us in voting "no" on that \$40 billion cut.

Supporters of those cuts say it is all about "reform." Well, this is not about reform, Mr. Speaker. It is about trying to destroy a very important part of the social safety net.

I am happy to talk to anyone and everyone about how we can improve SNAP. Where there is waste or there is fraud or there is abuse, we should crack down on it; but the House bill takes a sledgehammer to a program that provides food—food, Mr. Speaker—to some of our most vulnerable neighbors.

The CBO says that the nearly \$40 billion cut would throw 3.8 million low-income people off SNAP in 2014 and millions more in the following years. These are some of America's poorest adults as well as many low-income children, seniors, and families that work for low wages. Let me say that again, Mr. Speaker, so there is no confusion. People who work or who don't make enough to feed their families would be cut from this program.

Well, if that weren't bad enough, 210,000 children in these families will also lose their free school meals; and 170,000 unemployed veterans will lose their SNAP benefits. Now, we all stand up here and tell our constituents how much we care about our veterans and how much we honor them; but to throw 170,000 of these veterans off this food program because they can't find work, that is unbelievable. That is unbelievable, and it is unacceptable.

Mr. Speaker, it is not easy to be poor in America. It is not a glamorous life. It is a struggle just to make it through the day. The average SNAP benefit is \$1.50 per meal. Housing costs, transportation costs, child care costs—they all add up.

Fighting hunger used to be a bipartisan issue. Think of people like Bob Dole and Bill Emerson working with George McGovern and Tony Hall.

I am hopeful that once we get to conference, we can resurrect that bipartisan spirit and work together to strengthen our Nation's food assistance programs.

I would also note that we are approaching November 1, a day of reckoning for my Republican colleagues. Automatic cuts to SNAP are already scheduled to take place. If they do not end the Republican shutdown, we are going to see even more terrible, terrible consequences for the hungry in this country. We have already seen some assistance delayed or denied. If this shutdown isn't ended, SNAP, WIC, Meals on Wheels, and the Emergency Food Assistance Program will all be devastated.

I would say to my colleagues, you can't approach the budget in a piecemeal way, and you can't approach the social safety net in this country in a piecemeal way. If you miss a part of that net that makes up the social safety net in this country, then people fall through the cracks; and people are falling through the cracks because of this ridiculous shutdown that my Republican friends have thrust upon this country.

We shouldn't be here talking about a shutdown or about whether we are going to default on our debt come October 17. We should be talking about how we create jobs for people or how we strengthen programs to end hunger in America and how we make life for people in this country better, not worse. And yet here we are, as we are about to go to conference on the farm bill, dealing with this shutdown that is making hunger worse in America.

I would urge my colleagues to, once again, come to the floor with a clean continuing resolution. Bring up the Senate bill, the Senate bill that is at Republican numbers, the budget numbers that my Republican friends said they wanted, the sequester numbers that I think are awful; but let's bring it up and have a clean vote.

I am willing to compromise and cooperate with my Republican colleagues to pass a short-term continuing resolution at their numbers to keep the government going. I think that is the least we could do. And I would urge my colleagues, before the day is out, to bring that kind of resolution to the House floor.

So I urge my colleagues to pass a clean continuing resolution and remove the sword hanging over the heads of the hungry in this country. I would also urge all of my colleagues, as we go to conference, to insist that in that conference we fix this terrible, terrible mistake that this House of Representatives made when they passed a \$40 billion cut in the SNAP program.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague from the State of Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS).

□ 1415

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in favor of the rule to consider my resolution to reform the sugar program. At the time we passed the farm bill this summer, opponents of sugar reform were telling us that the program didn't cost taxpayers a dime. Now, just a few months later, the program is costing taxpayers \$250 million.

Sugar is the only commodity program in the farm bill that had no reform. Even as other commodities were modified to put more risk on farmers, sugar continues to get its sweet deal. Cotton, peanuts, dairy farmers will all see changes in the coming year, but not sugar farmers.

It is a sweet deal that is sour for consumers, for taxpayers, and for businesses across the country. For consumers, those who use sugar, high prices mean they are paying an additional \$3.5 billion a year. For taxpayers, low sugar prices mean bailouts rising to hundreds of millions of dollars. For businesses, for those who use and consume sugar in the food industry, high sugar prices place them at a distinct disadvantage to foreign competition.

The Department of Commerce estimates that 127,000 jobs were lost in food industries between 1997 and 2011. There are 600,000 jobs across the country at risk.

My resolution does not repeal the sugar program. It is very modest reform, modest reform that would allow the Secretary of Agriculture to stabilize the price of sugar. Stabilizing the price isn't just good for consumers, it is good for farmers who can rely on a more constant price and not be subject to wild swings in the market.

With the truth about the sugar program even more clear now, it is time we had an honest debate about fairness in our agriculture programs. This does not require the import of a single additional pound of sugar. It gives the Secretary flexibility to meet domestic demand.

So I urge Members to support the resolution and support the rule.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am very proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON), the ranking member of the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. PETERSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I reluctantly rise to oppose this motion because we have been trying to get this farm bill resolved since May of 2010, back when I was still chairman of the committee, so we have been working on it this long and we need to get this resolved. But what is being done here today is unprecedented as far as I can tell in the history of the House, where we are giving these two sense of the Congress resolutions to the majority.

From what I can tell, this has never been done before, and we are re-litigating issues that were settled on the floor of the House when we debated the

farm bill. These motions take a contrary position to the position that the House took, so we are going to be voting to go against the position that we took here just a couple of months ago. So that is my problem with this.

Historically, the minority gets a motion to instruct, and that has been the way it has been. In all the years that I have been here, that is the way it has been. But there's never been a situation like this. I think it is a bad precedent. It is going to be confusing to people, and we need to get to conference to get this resolved.

Given the way this conference appears it is going to be put together, I am not so optimistic that it is going to work because you are bringing people from outside of the committee into this process, which is what blew this thing up in the first place in June. And it's not going to make anything easier.

We are going to work together and try to get this resolved, but the way all this is coming down is making our job a lot harder, rather than a lot easier, which is the wrong direction, as far as I am concerned.

So I encourage Members to oppose this rule. This is unprecedented. It is apparently being done because that is the only way they can get the votes. And we are doing a lot of things around here because of that, and that is not the way we should do things.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2642 makes commonsense, market-oriented reforms to agricultural policy, which is why it is time to begin conversations with our Senate colleagues on a path forward that ultimately gets these important reforms enacted into law.

This bill isn't perfect, but it puts us on a path to provide certainty to America's farmers and ranchers by adopting a 5-year farm bill that will actually become law.

This measure is the result of more than 3 years of debate and discussion, including 46 hearings and a 2-year audit of every farm program. The bill repeals or consolidates more than 100 programs administered by the United States Department of Agriculture, including direct payments.

It eliminates and streamlines duplicative and overlapping conservation programs and trims traditional farm policy by almost \$23 billion. The bill eliminates direct payments and ensures no payments are made to those who do not actually farm.

The bill also provides regulatory relief for farmers and ranchers. It eliminates a duplicative permitting requirement for pesticides and prohibits the EPA from implementing the unjustified and unscientific biological opinions of the National Marine Fisheries Service until there is an unbiased, scientific peer review of those opinions.

The bill requires regulatory agencies across the government to use scientifically sound information in moving forward with their regulatory initiatives. It requires the Secretary of Agriculture to advocate on behalf of the

farmers and ranchers as other agencies move forward with regulations affecting food and fiber.

The bill also eliminates duplicative reporting requirements for seed importers.

Finally, H.R. 2642 repeals the underlying 1949 permanent law and replaces it with the 2013 farm bill. This is important, Mr. Speaker, because without reauthorization farm policy will revert to permanent statutes established in the 1938 and 1949 laws which are drastically different from current programs.

The permanent statutes exclude many commodities such as rice, soybeans, and peanuts; set support prices much higher than current levels; and prevent new enrollment in various conservation programs.

Permanent agriculture law established by the Agriculture Adjustments Act of 1938 and the Agriculture Act of 1949 does not reflect current farming and marketing practices, trade agreements or market circumstances.

Farmers, as well as taxpayers, will benefit from a modernized bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I just want to associate myself with the remarks of the ranking member on the Ag Committee, Mr. PETERSON, when he talks about kind of how unusual this process is with the sense of Congress resolutions that are put into this rule, basically, to instruct conferees on what to do.

It is highly unusual that the majority gives itself two of these sense of Congress resolutions. But this whole process has been really strange.

I would just say to my colleagues, I come to this floor every week and I talk about the issue of hunger and food insecurity in America. There are 50 million people who are hungry; 17 million are kids. I think it is something we all should be ashamed of.

I am on the Agriculture Committee, as well as being on the Rules Committee. I am on the Subcommittee on Nutrition. I was anxious to get on that committee so I could talk about the importance of a social safety net, about the importance of making sure that people in this country have enough to eat. Much to my surprise, Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Nutrition held a total of zero hearings on SNAP. The full committee held no hearings.

Then, even more surprising, Mr. Speaker, was that the nutrition title wasn't even written in the Agriculture Committee. It was written in the majority leader's back room somewhere by God knows who wrote this thing. But it never came to the Agriculture Committee.

It was never brought up for a hearing. There was no markup. There were no amendments that were to be offered. And then it showed up at the Rules Committee magically and was brought

to this floor, a \$40 billion cut that would throw 3.8 million people off the program, that would throw 170,000 veterans off the program.

No hearings, nothing. Nothing.

And my colleagues like to talk about regular order. That is not regular order. That is blowing up the whole process.

If my friends have concerns about the SNAP program, which, by the way, is the most efficiently and effectively-run Federal program we have, with one of the lowest error rates—I wish the Department of Defense had those kind of low error rates—then you hold a hearing.

You talk to the people who are on the program. You talk to the people who administer the program. You do this thoughtfully. You do it so that people who don't deserve to get the benefit don't get it, and people who deserve to get it get it.

But my friends come to the floor with this sledgehammer approach, this mindless approach of just gutting the program, close to \$40 billion.

We are slowly but surely getting out of this terrible economy, and as we do, fewer and fewer people will be on the program.

That is the way it works. When the economy is good, fewer people need the benefit. When the economy is bad, more people need the benefit.

But to pull the rug right from underneath people who are still struggling—my friends say all we want to do is make sure that able-bodied people who can work, work. Well, most of the people who are able to work, work, who are on SNAP, but they earn so little that they qualify for this benefit.

If my friends want to help lift people off the program, raise the minimum wage. But there is something wrong in this country when you have got people working full time and earning so little that they are still in poverty. That is what we should be addressing.

But rather than going through regular order, rather than having the Agriculture Committee, the committee of jurisdiction, come up with a proposal, the majority leader takes this in his own hands and does it on his own and brings it to the floor, and we are all supposed to just take it.

I want to, again, thank the handful of Republicans that had the guts to stand up and do the right thing and vote against it. We came very close to defeating it.

But I will tell my friends right now that people like me are not going to support a farm bill that makes more people hungry in America.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I respect my colleague from Massachusetts, and it is obvious that every time we have anything on this floor or in the Rules Committee where we are dealing with the subject of hunger that he is extraordinarily passionate about the issue.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans care about Americans who are hungry. We care about hunger issues. He makes it sound as though we are heartless people. We are not.

What we are doing here is our best to preserve the program for the truly needy and those who are hungry in this country.

My colleague says it is the most efficiently and effectively-run program in the country, with low error rates. That is not what the research shows. It isn't even what TV programs find out on their own with very little research.

They go out and they find the terrible abuse with the program, the SNAP program, which used to be called the food stamp program, but it was given this Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program name some time ago to get away from the term "food stamps." But that is what it is. It is a food stamp program.

Almost everybody in this country knows of people who have abused the program. Now, we don't want to deny help to truly needy people. If we can make these reforms in this program, Mr. Speaker, we have a chance to preserve the entire program for those who truly need it.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3102, the Nutrition Reform and Work Opportunity Act of 2013, as I said, is designed to preserve the integrity of the SNAP program, or food stamps for families, and especially for children who rely on food stamps. Its cost-saving reforms are a step in the right direction and are long overdue out of respect for needy Americans and taxpayers.

This bill makes the first reforms to the program since the Welfare Reform Act of 1996, and these reforms were strengthened during a rigorous amendment process on the House floor.

Despite media reports to the contrary, House Republicans are not cutting SNAP for individuals who currently meet the program's eligibility requirements. Instead, our reforms focus on eliminating fraud and abuse that exist within the program and remove from the programs individuals who do not qualify for the benefits.

□ 1430

Mr. Speaker, I think that bears repeating. What we are doing is eliminating fraud and abuse and removing from the program individuals who do not qualify for benefits. That is what the American people expect us to do in our oversight processes here.

Because of several well-documented and legally questionable efforts by President Obama's Department of Agriculture and by the individual States that administer the program, SNAP benefits have been extended to a number of recipients who would not otherwise qualify. The growth in SNAP spending caused by such expansion efforts will strain the safety net until it breaks, necessitating much higher taxes and indiscriminate cuts that would hit the poorest Americans the

hardest. From a moral perspective, such an outcome would harm the very people programs like SNAP are intended to help, and that is unacceptable. That is why I voted for H.R. 3102 when it passed the House on September 19.

The bill ensures benefits are reserved for legal recipients and aren't directed to illegal immigrants.

The bill closes the "heat-and-eat" loophole related to electricity bill assistance, gives States the authority to require drug testing for recipients, and prohibits felons from receiving SNAP benefits.

H.R. 3102 reinstates work requirements for all able-bodied adults, without dependents, receiving SNAP benefits.

An overextended, unchecked SNAP program won't be capable of serving the citizens it is purposed to help. It is the job of this Congress to ensure the program is held accountable as a steward of taxpayer dollars and to provide a safety net for the needy.

For the first time, the House separated farm policy from the food stamp program, which is only appropriate, as 80 percent of the so-called "farm bill" in the past was spent on providing nutrition assistance to needy families. The farm-only portion of the farm bill authorizes farm programs through fiscal year 2018; however, H.R. 3102 authorizes appropriations for SNAP only through fiscal year 2016.

If enacted and if the two bills were addressed on 5-and 3-year intervals, respectively, this would decouple SNAP from the authorization of farm programs until 2031. Considering agriculture and nutrition programs independently, going forward, will help take politics out of the equation and allow for reforms that will sustain both categories of programs in years to come.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I strongly disagree with the gentleman's statement—strongly disagree. My friend talks about oversight. There were no hearings—none.

She talks about research somehow shows that there is lots of fraud, waste, and abuse. What research? The Government Accountability Office and the USDA have all documented fraud, waste, and abuse in the SNAP program, and it is minimal—a little over a 2 percent error rate—and much of that is underpayment. People are not getting what they are entitled to.

Enough of this demonizing poor people; enough of diminishing their struggle. We ought to do the right thing and make sure that people in this country have enough to eat. That shouldn't be a radical idea.

At this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I could not agree more with my friend from Massa-

chusetts, who has actually spent the time getting inside this program. In fact, if the Republicans really care about hungry people in this country, these legislative efforts are a strange way to show it.

They are restricting the ability of Governors to grant waivers in places where people have no access to jobs. Governors, Republicans and Democrats alike, have requested these waivers because people need help, and the system couldn't meet their needs.

If they are concerned about fraud, waste, and abuse, look at the Crop Insurance Program, which has a higher rate of abuse than the miniscule amount with the food stamp program. And yet they are in the process not of reforming crop insurance, but enriching it and putting in another provision, the so-called "shallow loss" provision.

They are cutting benefits for poor people, increasing payments for wealthy farmers, and not dealing with simple, commonsense reforms that would give more value to the taxpayer—and not at the expense of the neediest Americans.

This is kind of a through-the-looking-glass situation. There are two proposals on the floor—"sense of Congress"—that I will probably support.

I have worked on a bipartisan basis to try and reform the egregious sugar program and to try and move in a modest sense to reform crop insurance, but we can do far more. And I note that these have bipartisan support.

It is outrageous that we are giving more money to farmers who need it least, shortchanging farmers and ranchers in States like mine in Oregon, cutting into the benefits for poor people who have no alternative, and taking away the right of the Governor to provide waivers for them.

It is an Alice-in-Wonderland situation that exemplifies the weird space that we are in today.

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

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. If we would return to regular order, if we would have honest debate on this floor about getting more value for taxpayers, we could come forth with a farm bill at a fraction of what it costs now. It would be better for farmers and ranchers. It would be better for hunters and fishermen. It would be better for the environment and better for the taxpayer.

I strongly hope that we will stop this Alice-in-Wonderland experience, reopen the Federal Government, and get back to doing our job right.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this rule and the \$40 billion in disastrous cuts to the food stamp program that the House Republican majority is trying to make law.

This is a cut of \$40 billion from the food stamp program. It goes against decades of bipartisan support for the fight against hunger in the United States. It is a reflection of how extreme today's Republican Party has become. Even former Republican Senator Bob Dole has called these egregious cuts "an about-face on our progress fighting hunger."

If these cuts become law, over 4 million of the Nation's poorest citizens—children, seniors, veterans, and the disabled—would go hungry in the United States of America, the most bountiful Nation in the world. This is even as Republicans continue to give \$90 billion in crop insurance subsidies to some of America's wealthiest families and agribusiness.

For food stamp recipients that include a family of four, if their income is \$23,000 or less, that would give them eligibility for food stamps.

Let's talk about the Crop Insurance Program. You have got 26 beneficiaries of that program today who get at least a million dollars in a subsidy from U.S. taxpayers. They do not have any income threshold. They can get the money under any set of circumstances. And the top 1 percent of most farm operators in the Nation each get \$220,000.

You want to talk about the most needy? These are not the most needy. Cut out the \$90 billion in the subsidies to the richest people in the Nation.

The cuts are awful enough, but the majority's plan also includes cruel, mean-spirited restrictions. For instance, it encourages Governors to slash families from the food stamp rolls who cannot find work or a job training program for 20 hours a week. It rewards these Governors with half of the savings and allows them to use the money for tax cuts for the wealthy or whatever else they want.

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

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

Ms. DELAURO. Even if the food stamp recipient, including parents with young children and those with disabilities, is actively searching for a job, the House majority would end their benefits.

This is immoral. It goes against the values that we hold dear in the United States of America. Cutting 4 million Americans who live on the edge while providing subsidies for the wealthiest is wrong, and I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule and to oppose the cruelty that this rule embodies.

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

Mr. Speaker, the rule and this legislation underlying it is not designed to abuse or demonize poor people. What we are trying to do is to save these programs for the truly needy.

Mr. Speaker, we are not simply doing oversight on the farm bill and on agriculture issues. The House has been doing its job of oversight throughout the Federal Government. We have been

doing that throughout this entire session. We are looking to find fraud, abuse, and waste in every program. It just happens that today we are talking about this program.

But as you know, Mr. Speaker, almost every day we bring forth legislation that will help us identify waste, fraud, and abuse and do everything we can to protect hardworking taxpayers in this country who are providing the funds to take care of the truly needy in this country and to allow us to help those people, and that is what this legislation does.

Mr. Speaker, the work of making these improvements and reforms to longstanding Federal policy is not easy. I commend Chairman LUCAS and the members of the Agriculture Committee for their thoughtful work. I was pleased to work with them and to have three commonsense amendments included in H.R. 2642 when it passed the House.

The spending safeguard amendment will cap spending on the Farm Risk Management Election program at 110 percent of CBO-predicted levels for the first 5 years in which payments are disbursed.

And, Mr. Speaker, let me point out to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that this amendment passed with bipartisan support, as did most of the amendments to that legislation.

In the event government's cost projections prove completely wrong, the amendment will ensure taxpayers are not forced to automatically pay the difference between Washington's mistake and reality.

My second amendment, the Sunset Discretionary Programs amendment, will automatically end discretionary programs in the 2013 farm bill upon expiration of the bill's 5-year authorization period. Many programs authorized by the farm bill are authorized indefinitely. This amendment will require Congress to justify a program's continued existence and funding through regular reauthorization efforts.

As our national debt approaches \$17 trillion, Mr. Speaker, Congress simply cannot afford to add to the number of costly Federal programs that are on autopilot. This was really an excellent amendment, Mr. Speaker.

Finally, Congressman KEITH ELLISON, my Democrat colleague, and I offered the crop insurance transparency amendment, which will require the government to disclose the names of key persons or entities receiving Federal crop insurance subsidies. Specifically, disclosure would be required for Members of Congress and their immediate families, Cabinet Secretaries and their immediate families, and entities in which any of the preceding parties are majority stockholders. This information is already recorded, but members of the public have to petition the government under the Freedom of Information Act to acquire the data.

□ 1445

It shouldn't take a 4-year request for the American people to figure out

whether their leaders are receiving government farm subsidies. This bipartisan amendment makes this information available to the public without a FOIA request.

Mr. Speaker, we want transparency, and my amendment takes us much closer to that. I appreciate Chairman LUCAS' willingness to work with me on these amendments, and I look forward to seeing them maintained during the conference committee.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me just say to my colleague from North Carolina that I look forward to the day when she and her Republican colleagues bring to the floor a bill to go after fraud, waste, and abuse in defense contracting; but, instead, they have chosen to go after poor people and are not even giving them the benefit of a hearing. There has been no hearing, no markup on this at all. This came out of thin air in the majority leader's office. This wasn't even brought to the committee of jurisdiction. This is astounding. My friends are talking about reform. This isn't reform. This is a joke.

At this point, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me thank the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentlelady who is managing this legislation and indicate that I wish we did have, Mr. MCGOVERN, a bipartisan mission like Mickey Leland and Bill Emerson. If anybody remembers those late Members, they founded the Select Committee on Hunger in order to stamp out hunger.

Mr. Speaker, I wish we had the kind of passion that drew Robert Kennedy to Appalachia to show America that the hunger that existed in this Nation was not a respecter of race or region—or maybe even the sensitivity of Martin Luther King in the same year. Tragically, they both lost their lives in 1968. He was galvanizing poor people to come to Washington because they wanted jobs, because they wanted to eat.

Here we are on the floor of the House, Mr. MCGOVERN, and I read from the statement made from the gentleman of Iowa last night on the floor that we need to start the long march to start to reform the expansion of the dependency class. Who is in the dependency class? There are charges that President Obama has put 48 million people on food stamps. How has President Obama put 48 million people on food stamps?

People are hungry, and 16 percent of the poor people in America are children. What our friends want to do with regard to reform is if you get a school lunch and a school breakfast, that is not evident that your family needs food stamps. So maybe this family is dysfunctional. Maybe these mothers and fathers are desperate, so now you are going to put them through another maze. You haven't documented that they are fraudulently taking food

stamps, but you are going to drop them off food stamps and say, Guys, if you want to get out of your hospice bed or if you want to get out of your sick bed or if you want to get out of your disabled bed and if you have these children who are getting lunch and breakfast, you have got to come and reapply, because there is something ingrained about those who are getting a hand up or who are in the dependency class.

I didn't say that. Robert Kennedy didn't say that.

Let's put a clean CR on the floor, by the way, to open the government, and let's stop talking about the idea. I just can't understand. We need a clean CR, and let's get it to the floor.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE), who is the ranking member on the Nutrition Subcommittee on the Agriculture Committee. It is the subcommittee that should have held a hearing on this SNAP bill, but it never did.

Ms. FUDGE. I thank my colleague, Mr. MCGOVERN, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I just had the opportunity with 10 of my colleagues to go to a community shelter today to serve lunch to some of the poorest people in our community. The community shelter is So Others Might Eat, and I listen to my colleagues talk about waste, fraud, and abuse.

I am disappointed and embarrassed to serve in a House in which we would not want to take care of the poorest people in this Nation. Some of the poorest people in our Nation, many of them children, seniors, and veterans, depend on SNAP. SNAP puts food on the tables of struggling parents who need to send their children to school properly nourished. It also gives low-income working families—by the way, who represent nearly half of all SNAP recipients—and seniors the necessary support they need.

Last month, this House passed a bill that cut nearly \$40 billion in food stamps. It is both inappropriate and inexcusable to cut food assistance when more than 7 percent of the Nation remains unemployed and when we will not pass a jobs bill. Our economy is struggling to produce enough jobs so that families can eat without needing this assistance; and we all know that, beginning on November 1, SNAP recipients will see a reduction in their benefits when the 2009 Recovery Act's temporary benefits end. According to the CBO, benefits will be reduced by as much as \$300 per year. This cut will result in less food for more than 47 million Americans.

Mr. Speaker, at some point we have to be honest with ourselves. We either have to believe that we are doing our jobs by taking care of the people of this country or that we are only taking care of a few.

So I say to those of you who believe that all of this is about fraud, waste,

and abuse: go to the same shelter that I went to today. Go into your neighborhoods and your communities, because we all have them. There are poor people and hungry children everywhere. I want you to go and tell them that it is okay for you to cut \$40 billion in food stamps.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), a leader on this issue of food security and on so many other issues to combat poverty.

Ms. LEE of California. Let me thank the gentleman for yielding and for his determination to eliminate hunger, not only in our own country, but throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, there are 46 million Americans living in poverty, 16 million of whom are children. Instead of focusing on serious ways to lift people out of poverty and into the middle class, Republicans have insisted on placing a larger burden on the backs of the poor and the most vulnerable, effectively kicking them while they are down. That is what the Republicans' farm bill nutrition title did when it was passed on September 19. It would have decimated the anti-poverty SNAP program and would have left hundreds of millions of veterans, children, seniors, and millions of working poor hungry and with nowhere to turn for a meal. SNAP has one of the lowest fraud rates amongst government programs.

House Republicans were unsuccessful in their attempts to pass a farm bill this summer, so the Republican leadership doubled down on this immoral stance, surrendered the governing of the House down to the extreme Tea Party fringe of their party, and passed \$40 billion in cuts, which means cutting 24 meals a month for a family of four. This would be in addition, I might add, to SNAP cuts already scheduled to go into effect on November 1. This means about \$29 less per month for food for a family of three. These cuts to the SNAP program are really heartless. Let me tell you that I know from personal experience that the majority of people on food stamps wants a job that pays a living wage, and SNAP provides this bridge over troubled waters during very difficult times.

In my own congressional district, for example, over 22,000 households would have been impacted in more than 1.6 million homes throughout California. In 2011, SNAP lifted 4.7 million Americans out of poverty, including 2.1 million children. In addition to feeding the Nation's hungry, SNAP is vital to our economy. For every \$1 increase in SNAP benefits, we have received back in economic activity \$1.70.

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

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

Ms. LEE of California. Without SNAP, millions of families would fall

into poverty while millions more Americans would suffer extreme hunger and our economy would create even fewer jobs.

Let me remind you that millions of people on food stamps are working. Their wages are stagnant and low. Many make less than \$8 an hour; yet they are working every day to feed their families. Paying billions in farm subsidies and cutting SNAP benefits for the most vulnerable is not a value that a majority of Americans embrace. Cutting SNAP benefits is not the American way.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close whenever the gentleman from Massachusetts is prepared, so I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Let me inquire of the gentlewoman if she would be willing to yield us a few minutes on this side because we have a lot of speakers.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to close whenever the gentleman from Massachusetts is prepared.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I remember one time when I lent the gentlewoman a couple of minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding this time.

Mr. Speaker, the Republicans continue to demonstrate just how far out of whack their priorities are.

Here we are in the 11th day of the Republican government shutdown—a shutdown for the sole purpose of denying health care to millions of Americans. I guess America shouldn't be surprised. After all, last month, the majority pushed through severe, painful cuts to the nutrition programs for hungry families. We are now moving toward going to a conference with the Senate on these damaging cuts. By insisting on these nearly \$40 billion in cuts, the Republicans have made clear where they stand, even clearer where they don't stand.

Now, understand. I know that the gentlewoman talks about the truly needy, but what she is really saying is that the somewhat needy, the sorta needy, the kinda needy, the "needy" needy need not apply because they are not in need of food stamps. When you look at the number of \$20 billion, it was the original number, which is a block number, and it was without consequences to who they would hurt.

When that failed, they said, What would work? Let's use \$40 billion. Yes, \$40 billion will do it—a nice, neat number without any consequences to who might get hurt. Someone had a bright idea on the other side and said that this number will work, and it was without a rationale for the number and without any understanding of what the impact would be.

So we know where they stand. They don't stand with 900,000 veterans who receive food assistance each month.

They don't stand with 2.1 million children who have been kept out of poverty by the food stamp program. They don't stand with the seniors who have to choose between food and medicine—or with the families of disabled children or with our military families who turn to food stamps to stretch their budgets. Heaven forbid we suggest taking away subsidies from Big Oil or tax breaks from owners of corporate jets.

What does that say about Republican priorities and their vision? The fact is that their vision leads to a world in which millions more go hungry.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. CROWLEY. In New York City alone, the Republicans' cut would result in 130 million fewer meals. That is unacceptable to me, and it ought to be unacceptable to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. The fact that it is not unacceptable tells us something we need to know about our Republican colleagues' view of struggling families in this country: they don't care about their struggles. They wouldn't recognize a needy person if they tripped over him on the street outside the Capitol.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I have to say that I would challenge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle in terms of whether we recognize poor people or not. Some of us probably grew up poorer than anybody on the other side of the aisle. I am one of those people. I have great empathy for people who are poor, but I am so pleased that we live in the greatest country in the world in which we have the opportunities to overcome poverty because of the great opportunities that are given to us in the country.

With that, Mr. Speaker, in the spirit of comity and goodness, I yield the 3 minutes that is requested of me to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Massachusetts has an additional 3 minutes to control.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I want to thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina for her graciousness in allowing my side a few more minutes. I appreciate it very much.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule that will allow the House to vote on the Senate's clean continuing resolution so that we can send it to the President for his signature today and end this government shutdown.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment into the RECORD, along with extraneous materials, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question, and I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1500

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield for a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, in the spirit of goodness, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to House Joint Resolution 59, the clean CR, and go to conference on a budget so that we would end this idiotic government shutdown and not go on recess later today. The American people expect us to act today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure now to yield for a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO).

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean CR, and go to conference on a budget so that we end this Republican government shutdown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield for a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY).

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to House Joint Resolution 59, the clean CR, and go to conference on a budget so that we may end this irresponsible Republican government shutdown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to yield for a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY).

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean CR, and go to conference on a budget so that we end this unnecessary Republican shutdown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I again ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean CR, and go to conference on a budget so that we can finally end this Republican shutdown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, a request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield for the purpose of a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS).

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean CR, and go to conference on a budget so that we end this Republican government shutdown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean CR, and go to conference on a budget so that we can end the Republican government shutdown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

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

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean CR, and go to conference on a budget so that we can end this Republican government shutdown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean CR, and go to conference on a budget so that we can end this Republican government shutdown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

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

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean CR, and go to conference on a budget so that we can end this Republican government shutdown now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield to the gentleman from

Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up the Senate amendment to House Joint Resolution 59, the clean CR, so that we can go to conference on a budget so we can end this Republican government shutdown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD).

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I support the idea of the House and Senate reconciling their differences on the farm bill and going to conference. It is certainly long overdue.

I caution, however, that I will not vote for deep cuts in the SNAP program or the food stamp program, nor do I believe that Democrats will vote to take food away from those Americans who suffer from food insecurity. They have shut down the government, and now they want to shut down food assistance to the most vulnerable, many of whom live in my congressional district.

Open up the government, open up food banks, open up Meals on Wheels for seniors, and give a hand to those who are hurting. It is good for families, and it is good for farmers.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure now to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), the distinguished Member of the Democratic leadership.

Mr. CLYBURN. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to speak on this bill because I have worked very hard over the years helping to put together various farm bills, and this is one that I felt very, very good about from the outset. I even felt okay when the bill came back from the Senate. Although I had some issues with the Senate version, I thought that what we were doing made some sense.

But we have reached a point with this bill—\$40 billion in cuts to the food stamp program—that will not only impact negatively those people who would receive those stamps in fighting off poverty or hunger, but it would do tremendous harm to various community outlets—stores, family-owned markets—where so much of the income of small businesses depend upon this program and what it will do to help further the economy in various communities.

I am also very concerned that in this legislation, we treat the recipients of food stamps as if they are responsible for what may or may not have taken place with respect to drug addiction to children or to siblings. I think there is something erroneous about drug testing in order to receive food stamps. I

think that if you are going to have drug testing to get Federal assistance, then we ought to test all those people who get farm subsidies and see whether or not they are deserving of such assistance from the Federal Government.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield an additional minute to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. CLYBURN. Then I saw some reference as to whether or not people who may have been convicted of a felony, what it would do to their qualifications, as well as their family qualifications. At one instance—I hope this is out of the bill—we talked about barring for life a person who may be convicted of a felony. That is not the kind of treatment our society ought to be visiting upon anybody who may or may not have made a mistake early on in their lives.

So, Mr. Speaker, I do believe that there is much in this farm bill that ought to be supported, but I really believe these extraneous things ought to be taken out of this bill. We can't do it now, but I would hope when it gets to conference that those cooler heads will prevail, and we will have a compassionate piece of legislation that all of us can support.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, several unanimous consent requests have been offered and have been ruled out of order because they have not been pre-cleared by bipartisan leadership. It is my understanding that they have, in fact, been pre-cleared by the Democratic side.

Would it be in order to ask the Republicans if they would pre-clear the unanimous consent requests so that we can vote up or down on a clean CR?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As indicated in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, it is not a proper parliamentary inquiry to ask the Chair to indicate which side of the aisle has failed under the Speaker's guidelines to clear a unanimous consent request.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire as to how much time is remaining, and whether the gentleman from Massachusetts is prepared to close?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 1 minute remaining, and the gentlelady from North Carolina has 8½ minutes remaining.

Ms. FOXX. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House

bring up the Senate amendment to H.J. Res. 59, the clean CR, and go to conference on a budget so that we can end this Republican government shutdown. It is the right thing to do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

I want to thank the gentlelady from North Carolina for yielding us additional time. It is important, I think, that we be heard on these issues.

One of the reasons why we are so passionate about reopening the government is because this government shutdown is hurting people, and it is hurting the most vulnerable people in our society the most.

One of the things that has troubled me about the direction the Republican leadership has taken in this Congress is that it has become unfashionable to worry about the poor and the vulnerable in this people's House of Representatives. Time and time and time again, my friends seek to balance the budget by cutting programs that help the most vulnerable. The \$40 billion cut in SNAP will throw 3.8 million poor people off the program, it will throw children off the program, it will throw working people off the program.

A lot of the people—contrary to what my friends say—who are on SNAP work for a living, they work full time. If you are earning minimum wage working full time, you still qualify for SNAP.

There are people in this country who are hurting, who are depending upon us to be there, to make sure that there is a social safety net that will make sure that people don't fall through the cracks.

One of the reasons we object to this nutrition provision in the farm bill is because it will hurt people—it will hurt people. We were sent here to help people. This used to be a bipartisan issue. Democrats and Republicans need to join together on this.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the previous question and vote “no” on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, Republicans want to see the government reopen also. We have sent many pieces of legislation over to the Senate, but the Senate has refused to act on them. We hope very much to get the government open again.

We are not opposed to helping the truly needy in this country. We want to help those people. We believe by reforming the legislation related to food stamps that we will be able to save the program for the truly needy.

Mr. Speaker, negotiations are an absolute necessity in a divided government, and conference committees provide an avenue for the House and Senate to meet and resolve policy differences.

□ 1515

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this rule, to provide a

motion to go to conference on the farm bill so we can move the reauthorization process forward.

The material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 380 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

Sec. 4. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, with the House amendment to the Senate amendment thereto, shall be taken from the Speaker's table and the pending question shall be, without intervention of any point of order, whether the House shall recede from its amendment and concur in the Senate amendment. The Senate amendment shall be considered as read. The question shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the question of receding from the House amendment and concurring in the Senate amendment without intervening motion or demand for division of the question.

Sec. 5. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.J. Res. 59 as specified in section 4 of this resolution.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT
REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as “a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.” To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that “the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition” in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: “The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.”

The Republican majority may say “the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.” But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: “Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule When the motion for the previous question is defeated,

control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman from Maryland seek recognition?

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues on either side of the aisle have stated their preference for, as the gentlelady from North Carolina said, opening the government. They want to open the government as soon as possible and would vote for a clean bill.

Mr. Speaker, we can have that vote right now. I would like to give my colleagues the opportunity to be heard right now in this Chamber and show the American people whether they want to reopen the government today or not.

Mr. Speaker, as a result, I request that this vote be conducted by a roll-call under clause 2 of House rule XX.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Those in favor of the yeas and nays will rise and be counted.

A sufficient number having arisen, the yeas and nays are ordered.

In response to the gentleman from Maryland, under clause 2(a) of rule XX, a record vote is conducted by electronic device unless the Speaker directs otherwise. This vote will be conducted by electronic device.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HOYER. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. HOYER. Does that mean if you ruled that we would take the vote in the manner in which I requested, that we would do so?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is the Speaker's discretion, and the Chair advises that this vote will be conducted by electronic device.

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 219, nays 193, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 543]

YEAS—219

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

NAYS—193

Andrews	Bera (CA)	Braley (IA)
Barber	Bishop (GA)	Brown (FL)
Barrow (GA)	Bishop (NY)	Brownley (CA)
Bass	Blumenauer	Bustos
Beatty	Bonamici	Butterfield
Becerra	Brady (PA)	Capps

Capuano	Honda	Pastor (AZ)
Cárdenas	Horsford	Payne
Carney	Hoyer	Perlmutter
Carson (IN)	Huffman	Peters (CA)
Cartwright	Israel	Peters (MI)
Castor (FL)	Jackson Lee	Peterson
Castro (TX)	Johnson (GA)	Pingree (ME)
Chu	Johnson, E. B.	Pocan
Cicilline	Kaptur	Polis
Clarke	Keating	Price (NC)
Cleaver	Kelly (IL)	Quigley
Clyburn	Kennedy	Rahall
Cohen	Kildee	Rangel
Connolly	Kilmer	Richmond
Conyers	Kind	Roybal-Allard
Cooper	Kirkpatrick	Ruiz
Costa	Kuster	Ruppersberger
Courtney	Langevin	Ryan (OH)
Crowley	Larsen (WA)	Sánchez, Linda
Cuellar	Larson (CT)	T.
Cummings	Lee (CA)	Sanchez, Loretta
Davis (CA)	Levin	Sarbanes
Davis, Danny	Lewis	Schakowsky
DeFazio	Lipinski	Schiff
DeGette	Loeb	Schneider
Delaney	Lofgren	Schrader
DeLauro	Lowenthal	Schwartz
DelBene	Lowe	Scott (VA)
Deutch	Lujan Grisham	Scott, David
Dingell	(NM)	Serrano
Doggett	Lujan, Ben Ray	Sewell (AL)
Doyle	(NM)	Shea-Porter
Duckworth	Lynch	Sherman
Edwards	Maffei	Sinema
Ellison	Maloney	Sires
Engel	Carolyn	Smith (WA)
Enyart	Maloney, Sean	Speier
Eshoo	Matheson	Swalwell (CA)
Esty	Matsui	Takano
Farr	McCollum	Thompson (CA)
Fattah	McDermott	Thompson (MS)
Foster	McGovern	Tierney
Frankel (FL)	McIntyre	Titus
Fudge	McNerney	Tonko
Gabbard	Meeks	Tsongas
Galleo	Meng	Van Hollen
Garamendi	Michaud	Vargas
Garcia	Miller, George	Veasey
Grayson	Moore	Vela
Green, Al	Moran	Velázquez
Green, Gene	Murphy (FL)	Visclosky
Grijalva	Nadler	Walz
Gutiérrez	Napolitano	Wasserman
Hahn	Neal	Schultz
Hanabusa	Negrete McLeod	Waters
Hastings (FL)	Nolan	Watt
Heck (WA)	O'Rourke	Waxman
Himes	Owens	Welch
Hinojosa	Pallone	Wilson (FL)
Holt	Pascrell	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—19

Bachmann	Granger	Runyan
Clay	Herrera Beutler	Rush
Coble	Higgins	Scalise
Crawford	Jeffries	Slaughter
Crenshaw	Jordan	Young (FL)
Culberson	McCarthy (NY)	
Gohmert	Pelosi	

□ 1540

Mr. GARCIA changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. BRADY of Texas and MEEHAN changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 223, noes 189, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 544]

AYES—223

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

NOES—189

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

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

NOT VOTING—19

Bachmann	Granger	Runyan
Clay	Herrera Beutler	Rush
Coble	Higgins	Scalise
Crawford	Jeffries	Slaughter
Crenshaw	Jordan	Young (FL)
Culberson	McCarthy (NY)	
Gohmert	Pelosi	

□ 1551

So the resolution was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I was not present during roll No. 544, on agreeing to H. Res. 380. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

COMMUNICATION FROM CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, October 10, 2013.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER, this is to notify you formally pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives that I have been served with a subpoena, issued by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, for documents in a third-party civil case.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

DANIEL J. STRODEL,
Chief Administrative Officer.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 2642, FEDERAL AGRICULTURE REFORM AND RISK MANAGEMENT ACT OF 2013

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 380, I move to take from the Speaker's table 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, with the House amendment to the Senate amendment thereto, insist on the House amendment, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YODER). The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS).

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to instruct at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Peterson moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the House Amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 2642 (an Act 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) be instructed to (1) recede to section 1602 of the Senate amendment (relating to suspension of permanent price support authority) and (2) recede to the Senate position in title IV of the Senate amendment providing at a minimum a five-year duration of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program and other nutrition programs.

Mr. PETERSON (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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