

In just 2 months, we will once again adjourn for a month-long recess without a budget or getting all our appropriations done, to say nothing of the other issues that remain unresolved, like immigration—take your pick.

Once again, if we don't make some hard choices, the government may shut down. I think that is unacceptable. We know exactly how this plays out. We saw it last year, as we careened from one budgetary deadline to the next, with one short-term extension after another.

We simply can't keep repeating these same mistakes over and over again. To do so would be the literal definition of "insanity."

So I urge my colleagues: let's put an end to this madness. Let's stay here, if necessary, even if that means canceling recess. Let's work with a sense of urgency and purpose to better this country, because that is what our constituents sent us here to do.

HONORING SECOND LIEUTENANT RICHARD "RICHIE" COLLINS III

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago, my community was shaken by the murder of Second Lieutenant Richard "Richie" Collins III, a young African American stabbed to death while waiting for a bus on the campus of the University of Maryland.

He was a student at Bowie State University just days from graduation. Richie was in College Park visiting friends to celebrate his recent commission as an officer in the United States Army.

He was a young man of great promise, very talented and driven to success. He was popular on campus and helped create Bowie State University's first lacrosse team. He was an avid player of golf, soccer, and baseball. Richie loved deep conversations about life, politics, and philosophy.

The individual on trial for his murder has been charged with a hate crime.

Mr. Speaker, we must do more to combat the spread of hatred by spreading tolerance and respect instead, and we must never forget those, like Richie Collins, whose lives were cut short by hatred and prejudice.

I again offer my condolences, as I have, to Richie's parents, Richard and Dawn, his family, his friends to mark this somber anniversary. We ask for whom the bell tolls; it tolled for us.

RECOGNIZING STEVEN D. HOGAN

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

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the passing of a truly great American, the mayor of Aurora, Colorado, Stephen D. Hogan.

Mayor Hogan passed away on May 13. Throughout his nearly 8-year tenure as a mayor of my hometown, Steve Hogan oversaw a remarkable and exciting renaissance of the city. Aurora has become Colorado's third-largest city and the driving force behind innovation, development, and economic opportunity. Aurora has also become an even greater place to live, work, and raise a family.

I met Steve Hogan 35 years ago when I returned home to Aurora after having served in the Marine Corps. I have had the distinct pleasure to call him a friend ever since.

Mayor Hogan's career in public service has taken him from serving in the Colorado House of Representatives in the 1970s to serving six terms as an Aurora City Council member and, finally, two terms as the mayor of the city, a city I know he loved so dearly.

Mayor Hogan exemplified the spirit of public service, and my hometown of Aurora would not be the wonderful place it is today without his vision and his leadership. We all are better off because of his decades of hard work.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have been able to call Mayor Steve Hogan a friend, and his family will remain in my thoughts and prayers.

AGREEMENT ON SOCIAL SECURITY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE REPUBLIC OF SLOVENIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 115-125)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to section 233(e)(1) of the Social Security Act, as amended by the Social Security Amendments of 1977 (Public Law 95-216, 42 U.S.C. 433(e)(1)), I transmit herewith a social security totalization agreement with Slovenia, titled "Agreement on Social Security between the United States of America and the Republic of Slovenia" and the accompanying legally binding administrative arrangement, titled "Administrative Arrangement between the United States of America and the Republic of Slovenia for the Implementation of the Agreement on Social Security between the United States of America and the Republic of Slovenia" (collectively the "Agreements"). The Agreements were signed in Ljubljana, Slovenia, on January 17, 2017.

The Agreements are similar in objective and content to the social security totalization agreements already in force with other leading economic partners in Europe and elsewhere, including Australia, Canada, Chile, Japan, Norway, the Republic of Korea, and Switzerland. Such bilateral agree-

ments provide for limited coordination between the United States and foreign social security systems to eliminate dual social security coverage and taxation and to help prevent the loss of benefit protection that can occur when workers divide their careers between two countries.

The Agreements contain all provisions mandated by section 233 of the Social Security Act and, pursuant to section 233(c)(4), other provisions which I deem appropriate to carry out the purposes of section 233.

I also transmit for the information of the Congress a report required by section 233(e)(1) of the Social Security Act on the estimated number of individuals who will be affected by the Agreements and the Agreements' estimated cost effect. Also included are a summary of the main provisions of the Agreements and an annotated version of the Agreements with descriptions of each article. The Department of State and the Social Security Administration concluded that these Agreements are in the national interest of the United States.

I commend to the Congress the Agreement on Social Security between the United States of America and the Republic of Slovenia and the Administrative Arrangement between the United States of America and the Republic of Slovenia for the Implementation of the Agreement on Social Security between the United States of America and the Republic of Slovenia.

DONALD J. TRUMP.
THE WHITE HOUSE, May 17, 2018.

□ 1215

PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2, AGRICULTURE AND NUTRITION ACT OF 2018

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 900 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 900

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes. No further amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such

further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment pursuant to this resolution the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. 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

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 900, providing for further consideration of a very important piece of legislation for America's farmers and ranchers: H.R. 2, the Agriculture and Nutrition Act, commonly referred to as the farm bill. The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 2 under a structured rule, allowing for consideration of 31 amendments that were offered.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, I traveled to every county in my district for one reason: to listen, to hear, and to get the input and the concerns from farmers, ranchers and producers across central Washington State. I traveled to Pateros, where my constituents discussed the vital need for strengthening market access and opening new sources for exporting across the globe.

I visited with farmers from East Wenatchee in Douglas County who discussed the importance of commodity sourcing and stressed the need for stronger education for the public about farming and where the food that lands on our tables comes from.

I heard from constituents in Prosser and Benton and Yakima Counties who stressed the importance of agricultural research from producers in Quincy, who shared their personal stories of the impacts of crop insurance on their livelihoods, and from farmers in Othello who raised concerns regarding regulatory burdens on the agricultural community.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise today to say that this farm bill makes great strides in addressing these challenges that face America's farmers. The rule

we bring before the House provides for further consideration of the underlying legislation, H.R. 2, the Agriculture and Nutrition Act, a bill that is critically important to my district in central Washington and to rural districts just like it across the country.

As a farmer myself and as a former State agricultural director, I know how important these farm policies are when it comes to our agricultural economy. This farm bill strengthens the farm safety net to help America's farmers and ranchers compete.

After 5 years of depressed prices, and a 52 percent drop in farm income, our farmers need us—they need Congress—to reauthorize these important programs.

Mr. Speaker, while American farmers have faced these depressed prices and severe drops in farm income, we, luckily, have a robust safety net in place. Due to the previous 2014 farm bill, our agriculture community was able to hold on and continue to provide American consumers with food in our grocery stores, in our schools, and in our food banks.

It is incumbent upon us to ensure these policies continue. We must pass this farm bill and ensure a steady food supply will be on the shelves and in our markets for the years to come.

The underlying legislation includes the creation of a new international market program, which I would argue is more important today than ever before. Programs within it, including the Market Access Program and the Foreign Market Development Program, are incredibly important to producers seeking to maintain and expand their export markets for U.S. agricultural products and commodities. The Market Access Program, on its own, is a net positive program, which for every \$1 spent, \$28 is returned to the American economy.

I know these critical trade and export resources are at the top of the minds of American farmers and producers across the country, and we must continue to ensure their availability and access for the agricultural industry.

This bill also maintains and strengthens the Nation's nutrition programs to assist those who struggle to put food on the table, while providing critical training to help people attain the skills necessary to gain good-paying jobs, financial self-sufficiency, and better futures for themselves and their families. It supports the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP, without any cuts in funding. Instead, this bill adds further funding and empowers States with the flexibility on how to best administer their respective programs.

The State of Washington has done innovative work in their administration of SNAP through the BFET and the RISE programs to help some of the most vulnerable populations, and I am pleased that this farm bill will allow these programs to continue if the State so chooses.

This legislation contains employment and education provisions for those who need a hand up due to falling on hard times.

Mr. Speaker, the farm bill contains comprehensive approaches to farm policy, nutrition, trade, conservation, crop insurance, regulatory reform, rural development, animal health, specialty and organic crops, and provisions to help beginning farmers and ranchers.

This rule provides for further consideration of amendments offered by our colleagues in the House on a great variety of these issues. I look forward to listening to the robust debate on potential provisions to strengthen this legislation.

As this is the first farm bill I have had the opportunity to engage in since being in Congress, I welcome input from my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and from every perspective. We must continue to bring forward solutions for America's farmers, ranchers, rural communities, and families.

Mr. Speaker, this body, the people's House, is made up of many walks of life. We have physicians. We have attorneys. We have ordained ministers. We have engineers, school administrators, former State and local government officials, scientists, and law enforcement officials. Today, I am proud to come before you as a farmer. I am not the only one.

There are maybe about 20 farmers, ranchers, and producers in the House, in the people's House. Among us are an almond farmer from central California, a blueberry farmer from the State of Maine, a rancher from South Dakota, a cattleman from Kentucky, a rice farmer from Minnesota, and, yes, a proud hops farmer from the Yakima Valley from the State of Washington.

I am privileged to come before you in support of this rule and the underlying legislation, H.R. 2, the Agriculture and Nutrition Act. I humbly urge my colleagues to support the rule, support the bill, and strengthen the future for America's farmers and all of those who depend on them.

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

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

(Mr. MCGOVERN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE) for the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I spoke yesterday about the big-picture numbers behind this cruel bill, how it would cut the SNAP benefits that families rely on to buy groceries by over \$20 billion. That includes slashing benefits for vulnerable adults like veterans, the chronically homeless, and teenagers aging out of foster care by \$9.2 billion.

There is a provision in this bill that would rip benefits away from nearly 1 million people, mostly from working

families with kids, by eliminating an important State flexibility option called categorical eligibility.

The bill even included a provision that would have constructed barriers to accessing SNAP for those with disabilities who have out-of-pocket utility costs—that is, until Democrats shamed the majority into abandoning it as part of their manager's amendment unveiled late last night.

But get this: this fix didn't come without a cost, Mr. Speaker. Tucked into the manager's package—which was, yet again, written in secret—is a provision that will kick over 600,000 vulnerable adults off of SNAP in the first 2 years after enactment of this bill—2 years before their misguided work bureaucracy goes into effect. Six hundred thousand vulnerable men and women will lose their benefits before they even have the opportunity to take advantage of the majority's new make-work program.

Really? What are you thinking?

This entire bill is an embarrassment, and this manager's amendment only makes it worse. It should be scrapped and sent back to the Agriculture Committee, where we can have real bipartisan negotiations and craft a bill that actually helps people, because despite some changes around the margins, the Republican farm bill remains an unmitigated disaster.

□ 1230

Today I want to zoom in on that big picture and give telling examples of how this disastrous Republican bill would impact real people in their everyday lives, because that is what is at stake with the Republican farm bill. That is what we need to be focussed on, because it goes well beyond the numbers on a page.

McClatchy reported a story earlier this month that put it succinctly, entitled: "50-Something Food Stamp Recipients Could Face Tough Job Search Under Proposed Rules."

Take, for example, a woman named Sabrina, who was quoted in the story. She works side jobs, like cleaning houses and doing yard work, but has a difficult time finding steady employment at her age of 59. This bill will take away her benefits, because she may not meet its 20-hour-per-week requirement. She is working. She is exactly the kind of person my Republican friends say they want to support. Do they think she purposely found jobs that pay so little and have so few hours? That doesn't fit so nicely into the majority's press releases, but that is the reality.

Or take, for example, Thomas, a single dad who lost his wife a few years ago and is raising his preteen daughter on his own. He has worked diligently to find stable employment, but jobs are scarce in his community. Without SNAP and reduced-price school meals, Thomas said he and his daughter "would not be able to survive."

These are the kind of people my Republican colleagues are demonizing

during this debate, and it is deeply frustrating.

Or take Lisa, a working mother of four kids earning about \$14 per hour as a nursing assistant. Lisa has to stretch her monthly income to cover rent and utilities after-school care, clothing, and car costs so that she can get to her job. Currently, she receives a modest SNAP benefit to feed her family and her kids receive free school meals, but because her income is just over the 130 percent threshold for a family of five, she would automatically lose her SNAP benefits if this bill becomes law.

For Lisa, SNAP makes an incredible difference in her ability to feed her children.

Or take Elton, a U.S. Navy veteran who lost his benefits for 2 years because of the strict work requirements and time limits that are already part of the SNAP law. During the 2-year period he was unable to access SNAP benefits, Elton was hungry every day wondering what he could eat in order to get by.

It wasn't that Elton chose not to work. He worked physically demanding jobs his entire life, but he lost his job after an injury. He continues to struggle with health conditions and doesn't have reliable access to transportation; issues that are exacerbating his job search. Under this bill, Elton may lose his modest food benefits entirely.

These are real people, and if the majority on the Agriculture Committee actually took the time and did a hearing on the heartless nutrition title in this bill, they would have heard these and many other real-life stories.

Take a moment to think about what you are doing here. My Republican colleagues are denying food benefits to veterans, single dads struggling to find work, and working moms. Why? Because PAUL RYAN asked you to? Because of a myth that people aren't struggling? It is sickening.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is just legislation by sound bite; bad legislation. It demonizes the poor and trades in stereotypes, apparently just to help some in the majority with their next hit on FOX News.

This bill has real consequences. It will hurt real people, our constituents, yours and mine, in every single congressional district in this country.

Now, it is obvious that this isn't a serious attempt at legislating, because the process here was atrocious. The majority ignored the recommendations from Democratic and Republican witnesses during the Agriculture Committee's 23 hearings on SNAP. Controversial provisions were inserted into this bill without explanation on where they came from. I asked. I still can't find out. Democrats were left in the dark as this legislation was drafted, we were left to read about it in news reports; a total affront to the bipartisan tradition that has defined the farm bill for years.

Now, the majority may be calling this a farm bill, but it is really a total

transformation of our social safety net. It is a farm bill that doesn't even improve the farm economy. Let me state, our farmers work hard, they should be valued, and they certainly deserve a hell of a lot better than what is contained in this bill.

If Republicans want to hurt our workers and denigrate the poor, they are going to have to do it alone, because, make no mistake about it, that is what this bill is designed to do and that is what it will do unless the responsible adults in the Republican Party join us in defeating it.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, Mr. CONAWAY, and I have worked together on many issues, and I know that he recognizes that the trade promotion programs that I referenced in my opening remarks are vital to our agricultural economy.

For decades, USDA export development programs like MAP have helped American farmers create, expand, and maintain access to foreign markets. Throughout their history, this successful public-private partnership has cultivated hundreds of billions of dollars in exports and created millions of American jobs both in the agricultural sector and in support industries, as well as the program brings a return to the United States economy.

In the findings of the underlying bill, it states: "United States export development programs significantly increase demand for United States agricultural products . . . generating a return of \$28 in added export revenue for each invested program dollar."

Additionally: ". . . our global competitors provide substantially more public support for export promotion than is provided to United States agricultural exporters."

We are at a competitive disadvantage when it comes to the rest of the world when it comes to agricultural trade.

Mr. Speaker, without these private contributions and the private sector's resolve to support our export programs, it is very likely that the U.S. would not be the net agricultural exporter of the highest quality products that we are today. I think it is time that we look at our export promotion programs and take a serious look if we want to continue our exporting success.

Mr. Speaker, I introduced a bill to grow the investment in the MAP and FMD programs and I also offered an amendment that would have made a smaller investment in the MAP and FMD programs, and while we are not considering those amendments today, I am grateful that Chairman CONAWAY has agreed to come and engage in this important issue.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY), the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. NEWHOUSE for his commitment to ensuring that American farmers and ranchers maintain the tools necessary to remain competitive on the global stage.

As you well know, trade is of immense importance to the agricultural industry, with U.S. agricultural exports estimated at \$140 billion per year and trade accounting for one of every \$5 of agricultural production value.

Through its extensive farm bill hearing series and listening sessions, the committee heard from every segment of the agricultural industry about the importance of maintaining support for our trade promotion and our market development programs, especially considering the uncertainty in the current trade climate.

While I am confident that America's farmers and ranchers are incredibly efficient and can compete with anyone in the world on a level playing field, they simply cannot be expected to compete against foreign treasuries on their own.

So in addition to maintaining and strengthening the farm safety net, H.R. 2 restores and increases funding for the popular and successful Market Access Program and Foreign Market Development Program.

This was no small feat, considering the CBO zeroed out funding for FMD as well as the Technical Assistance for Specialty Crops Program in its most recent baseline projections.

But the committee worked together to get creative and make it happen.

I certainly wish we could have come closer to answering the calls for doubling funding for MAP and FMD, but am proud of the work we did, and believe that the streamlined International Market Development Program will give the newly established USDA Undersecretary for Trade and Foreign Agricultural Affairs the tools necessary to continue tearing down barriers to trade and opening up new markets to U.S. agricultural products.

That said, we can always do better, so I am committed to working with Mr. NEWHOUSE and my colleagues in the Senate to continue searching for additional funding for these important trade promotion efforts while we move forward.

Mr. Speaker, I am very appreciative of Mr. NEWHOUSE's efforts and his support for these important programs. I look forward to working with him in conference when the Senate gets their work done after we get our bill passed.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman CONAWAY for his commitment to continue working on this important issue, and I look forward to working with him.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), and I ask unanimous consent that he may control that time.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, as my colleague, the gentleman from Washington, is leaving, I would just urge him to read the bill, because if he did, he would realize that if this bill were to become law, there are 60,000 people in his home State of Washington who would lose SNAP benefits just due to categorical eligibility changes alone; more would lose their benefits, but just for this one tweak in this bill.

The majority of the people who would lose their benefits under categorical eligibility changes are working families, working families with kids. Children, Mr. Speaker, will lose their SNAP benefits and many of them will lose access to free school meals.

So, again, for all the talk on the other side about how this bill is somehow a good bill for families, read the bill. It is a pretty cruel bill for working families and for children.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask that we defeat the previous question, and if so, I will offer an amendment ensuring that before the legislation can take effect, the President must certify to Congress that none of the administration's recent trade and tariff actions and negotiations will harm U.S. farmers, ranchers, and other agriculture producers.

I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BUSTOS), a member of the Agriculture Committee.

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I appreciate the time.

Mr. Speaker, hardworking families across the heartland know firsthand what the negative impacts of trade can look like. They have lived through it in places like Galesburg, Illinois, when the Maytag plant padlocked its gates and sent every last one of those jobs to Mexico.

They lived through it in Freeport, Illinois, when venture capitalists bought out the Sensata factory and sent every last one of those jobs over to China.

And today, at the end of planting season, corn growers and soybean farmers and pork producers all across the heartland are getting hit in their wallet by the Trump trade war.

Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago I rode in a John Deere tractor with a young soybean farmer named Jared Kunkle while he was planting his soybeans.

You see, right now as planting season is wrapping up, our farmers are making a lot of tough decisions. That is because in Illinois and many of our neighboring States, our soybean farm-

ers sell about a quarter of their crops to China. In fact, in Illinois, if our State was its own country, we would be the fourth largest producer of soybeans in the world.

So when President Trump's thumbs got the better of him and started tweeting us into a trade war with China, there were very real consequences for the families that I serve. To be clear, those consequences and the harm and uncertainty that they are generating is being felt right now.

In fact, just this morning, there was a headline in Bloomberg News that I want to read to you, I want to show to you: "China Buys Record Amount of Russian Soy as it Shuns U.S. Growers."

That is this morning.

The fact is, our farmers have been struggling in a tightening market with low profit margins. So in 2016, when President Trump stood at a podium in Iowa and proudly declared that he would "end this war on the American farmer," they took him at his word. Midwesterners do that; we believe people when they say something, and we also believe that promises ought to be kept.

For farmers like Jared Kunkle of Cameron, Illinois, and thousands of farmers like him, that promise has been broken.

It has been broken by this President, and now, if you do not support this amendment, it will also be broken by this Congress.

So I urge you, please keep your word. Support this measure to protect our hardworking farmers and ranchers from this Trump trade war. Let's work together. And as the President says, let's "end this war on the American farmer."

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

I think that the gentlewoman from Illinois speaks on behalf of a lot of Members in this Chamber. Nobody wants to see a trade war. Nobody is advantaged by a trade war.

I think so many of the provisions that are in this underlying bill, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2, are designed to create more stability for farm families.

The gentlewoman is absolutely right when she references the instability trade war conversations create. So much more important, then, that we come together now to provide that safety net and that stability that is included here in H.R. 2.

I appreciate the gentlewoman's encouragement that we get to the other end of these trade negotiations, and I do believe that is something that we all share.

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

□ 1245

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to one of the amendments made in order

by this rule. The Foxx-Davis amendment would dramatically alter American sugar policy by eliminating the economic safety net for sugar producers.

There is a Domino Sugar Refinery located in my district in Yonkers, New York, which has been a staple of the neighborhood for almost a century. According to their own figures, the refinery employs 280 people and sustains an additional 138 jobs through trucking, terminal operations, cargo handling, and ship piloting. That is more than 400 local jobs, most of them union jobs, supporting local families and pumping additional dollars into our communities.

These are the men and women I represent, and they are the ones for whom I cast my vote. I will cast my vote against the Foxx-Davis amendment and encourage my colleagues to do the same.

America's sugar policy is working. It has operated at zero cost to taxpayers in 14 of the past 15 years, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture projects that sugar will run at a zero cost to taxpayers over the next 10 years.

According to the International Sugar Organization, food manufacturers in the U.S. pay 10 percent less for sugar than other developed countries. Meanwhile, America's grocery shelf sugar prices are among the lowest in the world.

Again, most importantly, the reason I rise is that the U.S. sugar industry provides good union jobs. Without the current sugar policy, 142,000 American jobs are in jeopardy of being outsourced, and the U.S. stands to lose nearly \$20 billion in annual economic activity.

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman just spoke about one of the amendments that is going to be offered today. In total, there are 51 different amendments that have been made in order both in the rule that we did yesterday and this rule that we hope that our colleagues will support today, 51 different amendments proffered by Members of this Chamber to try to make this bill better. If we pass this rule today, we will be able to move to the underlying bill for consideration of those amendments.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia for reminding us that there were 51 amendments made in order, but he forgot to mention that 54 were blocked.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. LAWSON), who is a member of the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. LAWSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the House Republican farm bill. I really didn't think that I would have to say the "Republican farm bill" when we worked so diligently in committee.

This bill would strip our Nation's most vulnerable of the necessary resources they need to feed their families. The farm bill would bring hunger and pain to children. The bill kicks 265,000 schoolkids out of free and reduced lunch, and I have attended a lot of those schools where I see the kids on free and reduced lunch.

Florida will be the hardest hit State resulting from the removal of categorical eligibility. In addition, 130,000 hardworking Floridians will go hungry as a result of this farm bill.

The farm bill doesn't just hurt Floridians. It hurts the entire country. It hurts seniors. It hurts college students and young adults. It hurts the disabled, and it even hurts our active military families.

The farm bill also hurts rural communities. I represent several of those rural communities in north Florida, and it also hurts the communities that we border in rural Georgia that I receive calls from.

Before voting on this bill, I want to remind my colleagues of the motto of the USDA, "Do right and feed everyone." The farm bill does not do right, and it surely doesn't feed everyone.

Mr. Speaker, I want to end with a quote from Isaiah 58:10.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. LAWSON of Florida. "If you pour yourself out for the hungry and satisfy the desire of the afflicted, then shall your light rise in the darkness and your gloom be as the noonday."

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to associate myself with the gentleman from Florida in his commitment to public service. He is a relatively new Member to this Chamber, but he has been fighting for his constituents since he arrived, and I admire him for that.

There are lot of men and women in this Chamber who fit that bill, Mr. Speaker. I wish we spent more time celebrating those good public servants among us.

Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure at this time to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. POLIQUIN), a gentleman who fits exactly that mold. The gentleman from Maine has come time and time again to this floor, to committees, every single opportunity he has, to build bipartisan support, to work together with his colleagues, to work not just on behalf of the citizens of Maine, but on behalf of all Americans. He really is a model for energy and partnership on something that everyone in this Chamber would agree on.

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for those kind words. I would agree with him, Maine is the greatest State in the Union. I know he didn't say that, but I know he meant that.

Mr. Speaker, Maine is the home of the most honest, hardest working peo-

ple you can find anywhere in this country. We grew up in a very resilient, independent time in the State of Maine, and we cared for our neighbors and friends because it is compassionate to make sure you extend a helping hand.

Mr. Speaker, my 90-year-old mother was a terrific nurse. She had a career in nursing, caring for thousands of folks in nursing homes and hospitals throughout central Maine. My dad, who is now 88, was a beloved seventh grade social studies teacher and a coach and a basketball official for 30 years throughout the State.

I was raised in a very big-hearted Franco-American family devoted to helping others, and that is why I work so hard to make sure government does the same thing.

I have got some great news for folks across America who are looking to escape poverty and work their way up the ladder of independence. For 2 years, I have been pushing very hard to include job training, commonsense job training, community service, and work requirements for able-bodied adults with no disabilities themselves, no young kids at home, no elderly parents they are caring for, in order to receive food stamps.

We have got to be compassionate, Mr. Speaker, to help folks escape poverty instead of being trapped in a government program that has no end to it. The role of government, Mr. Speaker, is not to keep folks trapped in poverty and help make them comfortable living in it, but to try to give them a helping hand so they can learn a job skill, get a job, and live better lives with more independence.

Now, my work requirement, against what the media has reported and continues to report, has no cuts to food stamps by imposing these work requirements. If the benefits are not used because someone got a job, they are simply recycled back into job training.

And if you are pregnant or caring for young kids or you have a disability yourself, again, you are exempt from these requirements. But if you are able to work, we need to be compassionate and require people to work to lift themselves out of poverty.

Mr. Speaker, there is one other part of the farm bill that I am really proud of that is included in the bill, and that is one that helps rural Maine and rural America. For the first time, locally grown fruits and vegetables can now be frozen or dried or pureed in order to qualify for school lunches and school snacks.

That means taxpayer dollars are able to buy foods that are just as nutritious as those that are fresh, save a lot of money, and make sure our kids can eat in a healthy way year round, and it also helps our local farmers.

I have one son, Mr. Speaker, who is 27, and I raised him from the time he was in diapers. Nothing was more important than making sure he had nutritious food on the table to eat. This helps us do that.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage everybody to vote "yes" for this farm bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Maine coming here and giving a speech to the cameras, but I would suggest he read the bill. When he says that nobody will lose their benefits, no benefits will be cut from SNAP, he is wrong. The bottom line is that benefits will be cut. Benefits will be cut to support an underfunded, unproven, ridiculous excuse for a workforce and training program.

I also should say I hope nobody wants to emulate the State of Maine when it comes to dealing with people who are struggling in poverty and who need food. I would instruct my colleagues to read an article that appeared in *The Washington Post* last year about what Maine's harsh policies have resulted in.

A veteran who served this country with distinction lost his job due to an injury and, because of Maine's strict work requirements, was thrown off of his SNAP benefits, became homeless, and was skinning squirrels in order to be able to survive. That is not a compassionate policy that I think any State or, certainly, this country should want to reach toward.

One of the things I am proud about the SNAP program is that it means that we recognize that we have an obligation to make sure that nobody in this country goes hungry. Why is that such a radical idea? Why has this program been so demonized?

When the gentleman talks about a life of dependency, read the statistics from the USDA. The average time somebody is on SNAP is less than a year. That is not a life of dependency. I am not sure what he is talking about.

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, the hypocrisy of this farm bill from President Donald Trump and the Republicans in this Congress means more subsidies for the rich and greater hunger for the poor.

The food stamp program is one of the most important and successful antihunger programs in our Nation. Last year, it prevented 42.2 million people from going hungry, including 4.8 million seniors and 1.5 million low-income military veterans. And yet my colleagues in the majority are seeking to undermine food stamps as they shield farm subsidies for the rich.

When you take a look at the number of people who are the farm subsidy beneficiaries and the millions of people who are the SNAP beneficiaries, what you will see is that the SNAP beneficiaries get \$1,115 per year, and the farm subsidy beneficiaries get almost \$10,000 a year. Farms receive more than six times the benefit of a person receiving food stamps even though the vast majority of the farm bill beneficiaries are food stamp recipients.

This farm bill would kick 2 million people off of food stamps, cutting bene-

fits by more than \$23 billion. Meanwhile, Republicans refuse to include limits on subsidies provided for crop insurance, one of the few Federal programs without any eligibility caps or payment limits. That is the untold story: who benefits.

In the Republican tax scam for the rich, 83 percent of the benefits went to the top 1 percent. The Republican farm bill is rigged, as well, for the rich.

Farm subsidies, which the CBO says will cost \$12.6 billion more than planned, are so skewed toward the rich that the top 10 percent of farms, about 76,000 farms, received over 60 percent of all farm subsidies.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, SNAP recipients have income limits, asset limits. They get \$1.40 per meal. Millionaires and billionaires who pocket farm subsidies do not.

SNAP recipients have work requirements. Millionaires and billionaires who pocket farm subsidies do not, even though many of them do not work the land.

Nearly 18,000 people in the 50 biggest cities received farm subsidies. They do not work the land. They do not till the soil. Where are their work requirements?

In fact, 23 Republican Members of this Congress who vocally oppose SNAP have financial ties to farms that receive subsidies. They are poised to support this bill. They get theirs while the kids go hungry.

The country needs to know this. In the land of food abundance, in the United States, no one should go hungry. The Republican farm bill is a massive giveaway to the rich, which will deny children in our country food. It is unspeakable. We need to eradicate hunger. We do not need to eradicate the antihunger programs.

□ 1300

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

The farm bill is a little different this year than what we have seen in years past. We would ordinarily have more bipartisan support here on the floor. We got sideways on a couple of issues early on in the process, but the arguments that we are hearing aren't different than the arguments we traditionally hear in a farm bill, as if we are pitting those families in need of food against those families who produce the food. We are not.

This bill is H.R. 2 for a reason, Mr. Speaker. A lot of folks don't understand how bill numbers get handed out in this institution. They get handed out by order of priority.

H.R. 1 was the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. That bill has brought unemployment down to the lowest levels in my lifetime and economic growth to the highest levels we have seen in decades.

H.R. 2 is the farm bill, because if you want to know who benefits from American farm policy, it is anybody who eats—anybody who eats.

I tell folks, Mr. Speaker, we don't need to give every child a laptop. We need to send every child on a mission trip around the globe to see how other families live, to see how other countries do it. We are so blessed in this country, and we take it for granted oftentimes.

For example, I can put up charts about the distribution of farm policy until the cows come home, but the largest 15 percent of farms in this country produce almost 90 percent of all the food.

I will say that again. Those folks who are doing it bigger and better than anybody else, those 15 percent of farmers produce almost 90 percent of American food. And I will tell you something, Mr. Speaker, we can't afford to lose those 15 percent of farmers.

What keeps food in this country available and affordable is a consistent farm policy, which is why, time and time again, Republicans and Democrats come together from across rural America to try to provide certainty to American agriculture.

It is the largest part of the Georgia economy, Mr. Speaker: agriculture. That is true of so many districts, so many States across this land.

This ought to be a partnership. It is not today, and I regret that. We are going to have opportunities to make that change going forward, but just understand, for folks who are here seeing this debate for the very first time, go back and see the farm bill debate from 5 years ago. You will see the same accusations. You will see the same re-creations. You will see the same fear and scare tactics used. Then you will see a huge bipartisan vote because this bill is so important to so many Americans.

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

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

I include in the RECORD the article that I referred for you to read called "Trump to Poor Americans: Get to Work or Lose Your Benefits," which talks about a veteran in Maine that basically was shut out of his food benefit because of Maine's policies.

[From the Washington Post, May 22, 2017]
TRUMP TO POOR AMERICANS: GET TO WORK OR LOSE YOUR BENEFITS

(By Caitlin Dewey and Tracy Jan)

For a period last year after he lost his food stamps, Tim Keefe, an out-of-work and homeless Navy veteran, used his military training to catch, skin and eat squirrels, roasting the animals over an open fire outside the tent he pitched in frigid Augusta, Maine.

The new additions to Keefe's diet resulted from a decision by state authorities to tighten work requirements for recipients of the social safety net—forcing the 49-year-old, who lost his job at a farm equipment factory because of an injury, off the food stamp rolls.

"I was eating what I could find, and borrowed from friends and strangers," Keefe

said in testimony to the Maine legislature. "There were many times . . . when I would go two or even three days without food. If one was inclined to lose a lot of weight, I could recommend this diet wholeheartedly."

Now the Trump administration in its first major budget proposal has proposed more stringent work requirements—similar to those in effect in Maine and other states—to limit eligibility for food stamps and a host of other benefits as part of sweeping cuts to anti-poverty programs.

The White House budget proposal, due to be unveiled on Tuesday, would reduce spending on anti-poverty programs from food stamps to tax credits and welfare payments by \$274 billion over a decade, largely by tightening eligibility for these programs, according to administration officials. With additional reforms on Medicaid and disability insurance, total safety net cuts would top \$1 trillion over 10 years.

Making low-income Americans work to qualify for so-called welfare programs is a key theme of the budget. "If you are on food stamps and you are able bodied, we need you to go to work," said budget director Mick Mulvaney during a White House briefing on Monday.

He said the strengthened requirements in the budget focuses on putting the 6.8 million unemployed or underemployed Americans back to work. "There is a dignity to work," he said, "and there's a necessity to work to help the country succeed."

The White House did not offer details Monday on how the work requirements would be implemented, other than saying it would be "phased in" for able-bodied adults without dependent children.

The White House estimated the combined reforms to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, better known as food stamps, would generate nearly \$193 billion in savings over a decade.

In addition to SNAP reforms, Trump will propose taking the earned income and child tax credits away from undocumented immigrants working in the United States, many of whom pay taxes or have American born-children. That reform alone would save \$40 billion over a decade, according to the White House.

Anti-poverty advocates say the White House could implement its desired reforms to SNAP in two ways: require recipients to work more than the current minimum of 20 hours a week, or cut the unemployment waivers in areas with high joblessness rates.

The influential Heritage Foundation, as well as a number of House conservatives have championed a crackdown on waivers, leading many anti-poverty advocates to conclude that is the most likely way the White House would implement its proposed reforms.

Robert Rector, a senior research fellow at the Heritage Foundation who has asked the White House to prioritize work requirements, said the Trump administration needs to "go after" the four million able-bodied adults without dependents in the food stamp program.

"You say to them, 'We will give you assistance, but come to the office one day a week to do job search or community service,'" Rector said. "When Maine did that, they found almost immediately that their caseload dropped 85 percent."

Critics say such a change could endanger people like Keefe, a veteran who has been unable to find a job after injuring his wrist on the job at a plow factory in Rockland, Maine. As a result, Keefe now is medically unable to lift more than 25 pounds—which disqualifies him from other work in manufacturing.

The Navy veteran was one of several thousand former food stamp recipients who lost

benefits when Maine, in 2015, declined to renew its waiver and reinstated statewide work requirements. He has spent much of the last year living in a tent.

"I don't wanna worry no one," said Keefe, who recently testified to Maine's Committee on Health and Human Services about the impact the work requirement had on him. But, he added: "I hope they understand that people fall through the cracks."

The Trump administration is considering other changes to SNAP. While details remain sparse, Mulvaney said the federal government would be asking states to share in the costs for the food stamps program, through a phased-in "state match" so they have a "little more skin in the game."

"We believe in, the social safety net. We absolutely do," Mulvaney said. "What we've done is not to try and remove the safety net for folks who need it, but to try and figure out if there's folks who don't need it that need to be back in the workforce."

Suspending employment waivers would hit hard in areas with high unemployment such as southern and central California, where the unemployment rate can spike as high as 19 percent, as well as cities such as Detroit and Scranton, Pa., where joblessness remains rampant. The change would also hit hard in large portions of New Mexico, Oregon, Washington, Georgia, Kentucky, Tennessee, West Virginia, Idaho and Michigan.

"It's unconscionable, cruel and ineffective," said Josh Protas, the vice president of public policy at Mazon, a national anti-hunger organization. "I'm honestly not sure what their goal is."

Critics say the changes in unemployment waivers would be devastating for Native American families living on reservations in North and South Dakota, Arizona and Montana where there is chronic poverty and high unemployment.

"The President's budget proposal will force kids in rural America to go hungry while wasting billions of taxpayer dollars on misplaced priorities like a wall that won't keep us safe," said Senator Jon Tester (D-MT), in a statement to the Post. "Parents in Montana and across Indian Country should not have to choose between food for their tables, gas for their cars, and shoes for their kids."

The number of Americans on SNAP remains high, however. In 2016, 44 million Americans receive the benefits, compared to just 28 million people in 2008.

"They have not come down like we would expect them to do," Mulvaney said. "That raises a very valid question: Are there folks on SNAP who shouldn't be?"

Anti-hunger advocates argue that, generally speaking, there are not. Because SNAP benefits decrease gradually with increased income, there is no incentive for people to avoid work to get benefits—a phenomenon economists call the "welfare cliff." And benefits are too small for people to subsist on them without working: The average food stamp benefit was \$465 a month for a family of four in 2015. Most people are on the program for between seven and nine months on average.

"The notion that people would prefer not to work to get that benefit, give me a break," said U.S. Representative Jim McGovern, (D-Mass.) a longtime anti-hunger advocate. "This is a lousy and rotten thing to do to poor people. They look at SNAP as an ATM to pay for their other priorities."

Additionally, three quarters of households using SNAP contain children, seniors, or people with disabilities, said Elaine Waxman, a senior fellow in the Income and Benefits Policy Center at the Urban Institute. Without SNAP, the country would have had 3 to 4.5 million more people in poverty during the recession, she said.

More than a quarter of able-bodied adults without dependents on SNAP do not have a high school diploma, Waxman said; another 57 percent don't have college degrees—putting them at a disadvantage when it comes to finding work.

A number are also veterans, young adults aging out of the foster care system, and felons recently released from jail. SNAP recipients who cannot find work, for these or other reasons, are supposed to attend job training programs—but they're not widely available because of lack of funding.

"This is the trick. On the one hand, you want people to do something, when in fact a lot of folks may not realistically be able to find a job," Waxman said. "Most states don't want to put the money in. This is a dilemma that we're in."

The evidence that stricter work requirements actually cause people to get jobs is mixed, at best. In Kansas, which reinstated the requirements in October 2014, 40 percent of unemployed adults were still unemployed a year after being kicked off SNAP. Among former SNAP participants who lost benefits, the average annual income was only \$5,562, according to the Foundation for Government Accountability, a right-wing think tank based in Florida.

Progress has also been hotly debated in Maine, a state that conservatives regularly hold up as evidence that stricter work requirements are effective. When the state dropped its waiver in 2015, the number of unemployed adults in the program immediately fell by nearly 80 percent.

But a May 2016 report by the state found that nearly 60 percent of those affected individuals did not report any income in the year after they left the program—suggesting they were still unemployed or underemployed a year later.

On the national level, Michael Tanner, a senior fellow who focuses on social welfare issues at the Cato Institute, a libertarian think tank, said he doesn't think similar mandates will have a huge impact on moving large numbers of recipients into employment or result in significant budget savings. Most SNAP recipients who can work are already working, and many of those who are not meet one of the various exemptions such as being disabled.

"It's making a statement that Republicans think people who are on public assistance should be doing all they can to get off," Tanner said, "and that means working whenever possible."

McGovern, who sits on the House Agriculture Committee, said he was surprised to learn about the White House proposal given Agriculture Secretary Sonny Perdue's testimony before the committee last week saying he did not favor any major changes to the food stamps program.

"It's been a very important, effective Program," Perdue said, according to a recording of the hearing. "As far as I'm concerned we have no proposed changes. You don't try to fix things that aren't broken."

The Trump administration is advocating other "fixes" to the safety net, as well. The budget will also propose requiring people to have a Social Security number to collect tax credits. Mulvaney said it is unfair that taxpayers support immigrants working illegally in this country.

"How do I go to somebody who pays their taxes and say, 'Look, I want you to give this earned income tax credit to somebody who is working here illegally? That's not defensible,'" Mulvaney said.

Rector, of the Heritage Foundation, said he also hopes Trump will prioritize work requirements for those receiving housing subsidies. Mulvaney did not address that on Monday.

Diane Yentel, president of the National Low Income Housing Coalition, said the majority of Americans receiving housing subsidies are elderly, disabled or already include someone who works. Of the remaining households, nearly half include a preschool child or an older child or adult with a disability who needs the supervision of a caregiver.

Establishing work requirements for the remaining six percent of households who are 'work able' but not employed would require state and local housing agencies already facing funding shortfalls to establish cumbersome monitoring and enforcement systems for a very narrow segment of rental assistance recipients, she said.

"This is neither cost effective nor a solution to the very real issue of poverty impacting millions of families living in subsidized housing or in need," Yentel said in a statement to the Post.

Correction: This story incorrectly stated the average annual income for SNAP participants in Kansas who had lost and then found jobs was \$5,562. That figure applied to all SNAP participants who had lost the benefit.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia suggests that we all take a mission trip around the world to see hunger and see how lucky we are here in the United States.

Let me tell the gentleman, you don't have to go halfway around the world to see hunger. I can take you halfway down the block, and you can see hunger right here in our Nation's capital and in every congressional district in this country.

There are over 41 million Americans who are hungry or food-insecure in this country. We are the richest country in the history of the world. We all should be ashamed. We ought to do something about it, and this farm bill makes hunger worse.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT), a distinguished member of the Agriculture Committee.

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I would posit to my colleague across the aisle who said that we are trying to pit farm producers against food recipients, I believe that it is this bill that has done that.

We have worked in a bipartisan manner for, I understand, years before this bill was put through without being discussed, without the hearings on both sides of the aisle.

I try to think about what it would have meant to impose the massive system of new SNAP requirements under the bill during the time immediately after the islands were hit by two Category 5 hurricanes. How would families submit their monthly paperwork? How would they go to jobs at businesses that were shut down? How would job slots be provided when localities must focus on providing receipts?

There is no accommodation for disaster-impacted areas in this bill. And if the majority did not think to exempt out these communities, what else was overlooked in terms of reasonable standards?

Unfortunately, we didn't have the opportunity to work with the majority to

get answers to such key questions before this bill was unveiled and rushed to the floor.

This doesn't add any help to farmers facing record-low income and commodity prices or hardships due to trade retaliation, as my colleague from Illinois discussed earlier. It does not support farmer mental health, appropriate funding for broadband, or tackling the opioid epidemic.

This bill cuts hundreds of millions out of rural development and energy initiatives and falls short on assisting beginning, underserved, and veteran farmers. Why? Because it is not a bipartisan bill.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

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

My colleague has gone through some really challenging times in her community, and this Chamber has stood with her in those times. She has been a great advocate for her community in the face of some really extraordinary disasters.

We can make accusations on this floor all we like, but we could also spend some time bragging about those things that bring us together. There are already disaster provisions in law—disaster provisions that provide specifically disaster SNAP, for example, when communities are so hard-hit. We do have these conversations, we do have these concerns for one another and our communities, and we do work together to address those concerns.

We are not always successful, Mr. Speaker, but I promise you we are less successful when we don't work together than when we do.

My understanding—I don't sit on the Agriculture Committee, but my friends across the aisle do—is that not a single Democratic amendment was offered in committee.

It is my understanding—and, again, I don't sit on the committee. I don't mind being corrected. I won't be embarrassed at all to have the RECORD corrected. But my understanding is there were 5 hours of markup in the Agriculture Committee, and not one idea for improving the bill was offered.

Now, that is a legitimate, strategic position to take if folks want to take it, Mr. Speaker. I just don't understand it as someone who wants to get the job done and make a difference in a collaborative way on behalf of the American people.

This bill is getting better every single day. It has gotten better through every conversation. As you heard my friend from Washington say in his opening statement, so many farmers with real-world experience—we heard yesterday from Members who have real-world labor and workforce development experience. This bill is getting better every time.

If we support the rule that we are discussing at this time, Mr. Speaker, it will make 31 additional amendments in order so that we can improve the bill even further.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am just trying to think of a response to the gentleman from Georgia, who is trying to defend the process in the Agriculture Committee as that somehow, with this bipartisan process, Democrats didn't want to participate.

But you know what? It is just not worth it. We have been explaining it over and over and over again. This process is indefensible. It really makes a mockery of the Agriculture Committee, and it makes a mockery of this institution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I have not had the privilege to serve on the Agriculture Committee, but, given the comments of the gentleman there, I would suggest as an amendment that, since this bill is about work, we have work for 12-year-olds. Maybe boys could be shoeshine boys and the girls could be shampoo girls at the beauty salon so that they can help subsidize families.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, there is an old saying that is appropriate for this discussion: "If you aren't at the table, you are on the menu." And children are definitely on the menu and at the tender mercies of the job market.

This bill will cut access not only for SNAP but kids who go to school every day. This means in my State there will be 23,000 kids who will not get school lunch and breakfast because of this bill.

I am going to turn in, Mr. Speaker, some of the stories of people in my district who need SNAP, real people, single people like Jana, who has worked on a job for 11 years, lost her job, and has been looking for work for 3 months and couldn't find it.

I would ask that we reject this bill for people who need SNAP to survive. This bill is not about work. It is about taking food out of the mouths of babes.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, can I inquire of the gentleman from Georgia: Do you have any speakers over there or anybody who wants to talk about this bill? Because we have a ton, and we just want to—

Mr. WOODALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. It is an inquiry. I don't want to take it on my time.

Mr. WOODALL. I would be happy to answer the inquiry, or we could just leave it as an inquiry.

Mr. MCGOVERN. As long as it doesn't come out of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Georgia, but it is not coming out of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, we do have additional speakers remaining, and, of course, if we make this rule in

order, if we pass this rule, we will have 31 different amendments and speakers coming down on each one of those as well.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Reclaiming my time, I am just taking note of all of the excitement on your side of the aisle on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE).

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague Mr. MCGOVERN for yielding me the time and doing such a wonderful job on a very challenging bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my strong opposition to the current version of the farm bill. There are many reasons why—among them, the unrealistic challenges to food assistance programs that will have a big negative impact on my State in Maine.

What I want to focus on in my limited time is how much this legislation does a disservice to the farmers in rural communities we represent.

The public is very clear. They want greater access to healthy, locally grown food. They want more of it grown organically, and they want to support local farmers in rural economies. But Federal policy is way behind the times, and this legislation would make it much worse.

Farmers aren't ignoring the trends that consumers are asking us for. They are capitalizing on them. In my State, the changing market and the demand for locally grown and organic food has reinvigorated the State's agriculture economy.

Josh Girard, who is pictured here, is one of those farmers. After earning a master's degree, working abroad in the Peace Corps, and apprenticing at local farms, Josh decided to return to his hometown to start his own farm.

The small sources of Federal support available to farmers like Josh pale in comparison to what commodity farmers receive, but it can make all of the difference.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Maine.

Ms. PINGREE. For instance, Josh uses the Organic Certification Cost Share Programs to help cover the cost of certification, which helps him get more for his product. The funding for this and many other programs is endangered in this farm bill.

Over the next 5 years, consumers will continue to change their buying habits in our food system. The question is whether the Federal Government would make good policy to help farmers like Josh.

Ask anyone in this Chamber if they support rural America, and they will say, yes, absolutely. So I ask that we put our money where our mouths are.

We should send the message to those keeping our farming communities alive

that we believe in their potential, we value their service, and we will help them succeed by voting down this terribly partisan legislation and start over on making a good bill.

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

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

The gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) talked about how we are literally taking the food away from children. I want to make it clear to my colleagues, there should be no mistake: This bill is going to hurt kids.

First, it cuts 1 million people off of benefits through categorical eligibility challenges alone. These people are working families with kids. And once these kids lose their SNAP benefits, CBO, the nonpartisan group of experts that we rely on, expects 265,000 children will lose access to free school meals.

I ask my colleagues: Is that what you want out of a farm bill? We can do so much better.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Georgia is a rural State, like so many jurisdictions represented in this Chamber. Sometimes you have a big city in one part of the State and the rest of the State is rural. The conversations we have in Georgia are often not Republicans against Democrats politically; it is Atlanta against the rest of the State politically.

Folks often don't connect the dots between the food that they are buying on the shelf at Kroger being directly related to whether or not farmers are producing that food in the field.

We have made huge strides in terms of trying to bring more fresh produce not just into our school systems but into our local farmers markets, huge strides into making sure that electronic benefits aren't just able to be used at the local convenience store but are able to be used in farmers markets so that higher quality produce can end up on families' tables.

□ 1315

Again, Mr. Speaker, we can find disagreement in every bill that comes to the floor, but we can also find progress. There is a lot of progress in this bill. We will support this rule, we will get to the underlying bill, and we will spend the rest of the day discussing exactly that.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS).

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in opposition to this rule and the underlying bill which, much like the Republicans' tax measure, comforts the comfortable and afflicts the afflicted. It will have devastating impacts on SNAP recipients across the Nation, including one in seven in Ne-

vada who are on this program. It will take away food assistance from some of our most vulnerable: young children, seniors, and the disabled. It will also force families to jump through extra hoops in order to access other needed benefits like assistance with their electricity bills.

We can and should be doing more to lift families out of poverty and end hunger in the United States. Shamefully, this bill does just the opposite.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL).

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in opposition to this cruel and mean-spirited farm bill, a farm bill that will leave working families and our children out in the cold.

The farm bill we are debating today cuts \$23 billion from SNAP, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program. That would leave 2 million Americans without the support that they need to put food on the table.

Mr. Speaker, I represent both rural and urban, from Birmingham to the Black Belt of Alabama, and I can say definitely that every community in my district will be worse off under this bill.

For children and working families in my district, SNAP means the difference between a hot meal or going to bed hungry. For farmers and grocery stores in my district, SNAP is an investment in our food system that creates 50,000 agricultural jobs across the country.

After the Republicans have shoved down a tax bill that gives the cuts to the wealthiest Americans and adds \$2 trillion to our deficit, they now want to cut the benefits for hungry children and working families.

I believe this is morally wrong. You see, Mr. Speaker, the face of SNAP in my district is not the welfare mother trying to get over. No. The face of SNAP in my district—where 70 percent of the people who are beneficiaries in my district are children under the age of 17 years old—the face of SNAP in America are needy children.

We must and can do better. I am going to vote "no," and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

Mr. Speaker, we feel very passionately about issues on this floor. I want to give my colleague from Alabama an opportunity to retract the accusation that this is a mean-spirited and cruel bill. I know the men and women who serve on the Agriculture Committee, and they don't have a mean-spirited or cruel bone in their body. They care about farmers, and they care about families.

We can argue about whether or not if you are a working aged, able-bodied, childless man in this country whether or not we ought to try to get you a job while you are collecting Federal benefits. We can talk about that. I don't

think that is mean-spirited at all. I don't think that is cruel at all. I think that is exactly what we ought to be doing to lift families up out of poverty.

But I would say to my colleagues with their passion—which I know is heartfelt—feeding hungry children is a shared priority, and we see that every single day in the bills that are passed here; and we do damage to this institution and we do damage to the very honest and needed debates we have in this Chamber when we characterize one another in ways that we know are not accurate.

I know the men and women on the Agriculture Committee. I know why they chose to serve on that committee. I believe in the work they are doing. I regret that we are having this disagreement today, but we don't need to question each other's motives or integrity in order to make this debate of value.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

I rise in opposition to the rule and to the underlying bill because it is a missed opportunity. I had offered numerous, fiscally responsible reform amendments to improve the bill, all of which were rejected last night.

For instance, why is a farm entity with an adjusted gross income of over \$500,000 a year still receiving taxpayer subsidies under this bill? Why can't we at least track the crop insurance premium subsidy payments to the individual entities?

Right now, that is currently prohibited under the bill. That is not right. The American taxpayer deserves to see how their tax dollars are being run.

Why are we eliminating the entire Conservation Stewardship Program when three out of every four farmers applying for conservation funding assistance today are denied because of inadequacy of funds?

This farm bill should be about helping our family farmers succeed, not a sop to powerful special interests here in Washington. That is why this is a missed opportunity.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER), who is one of my classmates in the class of 2011. We were once Budget Committee mates together back in the day.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in favor of the 2018 farm bill.

Missouri farmers work hard every day to feed the world, and they need the certainty that this legislation provides. This bill strengthens safeguards for our food supply and improves public-private risk management programs that are vital to American agriculture.

In addition, the farm bill makes significant investments in broadband infrastructure in rural America by setting a minimum speed for Federal investment.

This bill contains historic improvements to SNAP which helps recipients break the cycle of poverty by improving work opportunities for able-bodied adults receiving Federal nutrition assistance. This bill also promotes work and individual success while empowering those dependent on government assistance.

These reforms will reduce unemployment and instill a sense of pride and work ethic by helping people move from dependency to independence and self-sufficiency. These are common-sense improvements that we are discussing today.

The 2018 farm bill is a responsible and effective piece of legislation which maintains safety net programs in crop insurance for America's farmers while making investments in job training programs to lift those in need out of poverty.

This bill has my full support, and I thank and commend Chairman CONAWAY for his hard work on moving this legislation forward.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am here to speak against an amendment included in this rule, the Foxx-Davis amendment, in defense of the 2,300 factory workers and 900 family farmers who grow sugar beets in my community.

The sugar program in this country supports family farmers. The company that is formed is a co-op formed by local family-owned growers who come together, and all they ask for is a fair chance to compete, to grow their high quality product, and to not have to compete with state-subsidized foreign sugar that is dumped if we don't have a program that protects our local growers.

The question is really simple. It comes down to marginally increasing the profits of large corporations or supporting family farmers who support their families by growing high quality sugar beets and sugarcane in this country.

This is a program that does not cost the taxpayers a dime according to CBO.

It comes down to a simple question: Are we going to support our own growers, or are we going to support foreign-produced sugar and moderately, if at all, increase the profits of large companies?

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan. He actually spent a good deal of his time just the other day in a Budget Committee hearing trying to help get us some bipartisan solutions.

He got grilled by both the Republicans and the Democrats. Everybody wanted their ounce of Michigan flesh in that day. But at the end of that conversation—and I don't say this flipantly—I felt more optimistic about

our coming together and doing some very difficult infrastructure investments in this country than I did when I walked into that room.

Those things don't happen without people investing the kind of time and energy that Representative KILDEE has invested over his career. I want to tell the gentleman how much I appreciate that.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the gentleman how many more speakers he has remaining.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I would advise my friend I am prepared to close when he is.

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

Mr. Speaker, I have to give credit where credit is due. This majority can't balance a budget; they can't even pass a budget. They can't fund the government without first shutting it down. They are so busy cozying up to the big banks and passing tax cuts for the wealthy that they ignore virtually every major issue facing our Nation. Right now as we speak, this Republican majority is trying to jam through a farm bill that won't even help most farmers.

But the one thing this Republican majority is incredibly good at, and the one thing that they do with ruthless efficiency is stick it to poor people. This majority is Robin Hood in reverse. They are master legislators for the megawealthy. They might want this Chamber to look out solely for those at the top, giving them more tax breaks, making it easier for them to pollute our planet and systematically attacking the safeguards we put in place to stop another financial collapse, but while they work with unflagging, unshakeable, and dogged determination to give a helping hand to the fat cats, they tell those struggling to get by and those begging for an opportunity and a living wage that they should just work harder.

Never mind that they didn't grow up in nice neighborhoods or in a stable home with good nutrition and a quality education. Maybe they started out in life having to play catchup. Maybe they need just a little help from the Government to make the American Dream a reality in their life. Or maybe they were born with advantages but have fallen on hard times and they need a little bit of help.

I am standing here today—Democrats are standing here today—giving a voice to our workers, the middle class, and those trying to break into the middle class. If my Republican friends actually listened to their voices, they would join us and vote against this monstrosity of a bill that attacks working American citizens and takes lunch money away from children.

It is disgusting, Mr. Speaker.

Now, I urge a "no" vote on the previous question and the rule, and I urge all of you—no, I plead with all of you—to vote "no" on this bill.

I grew up in a family where helping those who were struggling was the right thing to do, the decent thing to do. Please send this bill back to committee. Surely we can do better. Let's demonstrate to the American people that we are here to help, that we care, and that we are decent.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia commented that we are all so emotional on this side of the aisle when we are debating this issue. You are damn right we are. We are emotional. We are angry. We are frustrated because people are going to be hurt.

Mr. Speaker, if you have ever met a hungry child, it should break your heart, and there are millions and millions in this country who are hungry. We are the greatest country in the history of the world and the richest country in the history of the world, and tens of millions of our fellow citizens are food insecure or hungry.

Why isn't that a priority? Why isn't that a bigger priority than another tax cut for a big corporation? I know my colleagues on the other side of the aisle deep down inside care about those who suffer in this country. Here is an opportunity to prove it. Let's do a farm bill that actually doesn't make hunger worse in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I am not even asking you to eliminate hunger, although I wish that were a priority. I am just saying: don't make it worse. This bill will throw millions of people off of a food benefit, and millions of children will be impacted.

Mr. Speaker, they are not just people who aren't working. You know better than that. Many of these people are working families, people who are working hard but can't make ends meet. You are taking away a food benefit. What is wrong with this institution? We can do better.

Mr. Speaker, vote "no" on this rule, and vote "no" on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1330

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friends on the Agriculture Committee for the work they did on this bill. It is not easy to do big pieces of legislation. We do a farm bill every 5 years. It is always a hard thing to do, and my friends on the Agriculture Committee have taken the slings and arrows. You have heard the accusations that have been made just here on the floor today.

The unemployment rate in this country, Mr. Speaker, is as low as it has ever been in my lifetime, and the number of childless, working-age men who are sitting it out is as high as it has ever been in my lifetime.

We can argue about how to care about people more, we can argue about

how to love people more, but I will tell you, helping someone to find a job matters.

Historically, Mr. Speaker, it is one of those things we agree on. For whatever reason, we have made it the topic of something we are going to pretend to disagree on today.

There are more jobs available in this country than ever before. I think we owe it to families that haven't been able to connect themselves with that job market to help them to do better.

Mr. Speaker, so often, we talk about all the lawyers in Congress, all the lawyers who are bureaucrats, all the folks who are working on policy that they just don't understand. I want to close with where my colleague from Washington State began. Of course, he is a former agriculture commissioner from Washington State. He said this.

He said he is not the only farmer in this House. There are 20 farmers, ranchers, and producers serving here in the people's House: an almond farmer from central California, a blueberry farmer from Maine, a rancher from South Dakota, a cattleman from Kentucky, a rice farmer from Minnesota, and a hops farmer from the Yakima Valley in Washington State.

Mr. Speaker, this body really does reflect working Americans, folks out there trying to be the breadbasket to the world, trying to put fresh produce on the shelves for every American family to benefit from. This bill continues our commitment to serving the hungry, and it continues our commitment to being the finest agricultural production nation that this planet has ever seen.

Vote "yes" on this rule. Let's consider some amendments to make this bill even better, and then let's send it to the Senate and give the American people a bill they can be proud of.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule governing debate, and the underlying bill, regarding H.R.2, the so-called "Agriculture and Nutrition Act of 2018," the House Republicans' failed attempt to produce a Farm Bill that is good for America.

A more fitting name for this terrible and bitter legislative pill would be the "Let Poor Families and Children Starve so Billionaires Can Get Fatter Act."

Going back to 1962, beginning with Senators Hubert Humphrey, Bob Dole, and George McGovern, Farm Bills have always attracted bipartisan support and engendered an enduring alliance between urban and rural legislators in the common cause of ensuring livable incomes for farm families and an affordable and nutritious food supply.

With this purely partisan bill, House Republicans have turned their back on this 56 year heritage.

Mr. Speaker, St. Augustine, the great Catholic theologian, said: "Without justice, what else is the state but a gang of robbers?"

There is no justice in this Farm Bill, but there is harm—lots of it—inflicted on the most vulnerable, so much so that many people are saying that the House Republican majority has produced a bill that is worthy of a gang of robbers.

I oppose this rule and underlying legislation for several reasons but most of all because of its abject cruelty to American's most vulnerable families and children.

H.R. 2 slashes \$23 billion from the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program ("SNAP"), a lifeline depended upon by millions of families and children to provide for their daily nutrition needs.

But who among us can say they are truly surprised?

Since taking office sixteen months ago, the President has made abundantly clear his indifference to the most vulnerable citizens in society.

And he has been aided in his endeavors by a feckless House Republican majority.

The President began his presidency with a concerted and determined push to repeal the Affordable Care Act, a law which has helped over 17 million individuals gain health insurance; reduced the uninsured rate by 40 percent and, provided 89 percent of Americans with the security and peace of mind that comes with access to affordable quality healthcare.

When that effort failed, the President next turned his efforts to passing the massive Trump-GOP Tax Scam, which slashed taxes for the top one percent and multi-national corporations, but the negative consequences of which the Trump-GOP Tax Scam have been devastating for the average American.

The GOP Tax Scam has now been revealed not to generate broad-based economic growth but instead to create annual trillion dollar deficits as far as the eye can see.

Mr. Speaker, if we are to be honest about creating an environment where individuals have an opportunity to emerge from poverty conditions, there must be access to nutritious food.

SNAP is a critical component to providing food security to lower-income Americans.

SNAP sets children up for success.

Children on SNAP achieve higher test scores and are more likely to graduate from high school, helping to break the cycle of poverty and build a stronger economy in the long term.

SNAP is temporary.

The average family spends just ten months on SNAP, receiving assistance only during difficult times.

(SNAP is critical for poor and working families.

Most participate in SNAP when they are between jobs.

Among households with at least one working-age non-disabled adult roughly 80 percent of SNAP households work in the year before or the year after receiving SNAP.

Close to two-thirds of SNAP recipients are children, elderly, or disabled.

The vast majority of those who are required to work, do work.

The average per person benefit is \$132 per month, or about \$1.60 per meal.

Mr. Speaker, if this bill were to become law, it would cut \$23 billion from SNAP and would kick one million households off the program.

That means 83,000 Texas families would see their benefits cut, impacting more than 96,000 individuals.

In Texas, over half of all SNAP beneficiaries live below the poverty line so cutting access to SNAP would be devastating.

Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that we not increase food security for the least vulnerable among us.

If our children are not adequately and safely housed, they are not protected from life's crueler elements.

If they are not fed, they lack nourishment and preparation for school and all its challenges.

Mothers know this and their children know this.

Everyone knows this, with the apparent exception of the President and House Republicans.

The House Republicans' eagerness to sacrifice poor and working families and children by cutting SNAP and other food assistance programs for up to 23 million people by \$23 billion is an accurate reflection of their priorities and values, which favor tax cuts for multinational corporation and the top 1 percent at the expense of the poor and working class and those striving to enter the middle class.

Mr. Speaker, there are other major insults, injuries, and cruelties inflicted on working families by this callous legislation.

This so-called Farm Bill changes SNAP from a food program to a work program by imposing new draconian work requirements on adult SNAP participants between 18 and 59 years old, requiring documentation showing 20 hours per week of work or participation in a job training program.

The changes include severe, harsh penalties if the paperwork is not filed on time, ignoring the reality of low-wage work, which is plagued by unstable, uncertain work schedules, unpredictable hours, and few benefits like paid sick or family leave.

This mean-spirited legislation threatens free school meals for 265,000 children and SNAP eligibility for 400,000 households by eliminating Broad-Based Categorical Eligibility (BBCE), which allows states flexibility to link their social service programs to SNAP.

The bill also severs the connection between SNAP and Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP), which helps families pay their energy utilities, adversely impacting working families and people with disabilities.

Mr. Speaker, this wretched legislation is an equal-opportunity catastrophe because it also inflicts serious damage on farm families and rural America at a time of great challenge and economic uncertainty.

Farm prices are plummeting amid the self-inflicted damage of President Trump's tariffs yet this bill instead of providing relief exacerbates the economic and social pain in rural America by killing good-paying rural jobs, cutting a gaping hole in the critical farmer safety net and shifting opportunity away from America's small towns with cuts to vital rural development, sustainable conservation, and energy initiatives.

Inexplicably, H.R. 2 fails to address the 52 percent decline in farm income and eliminates the Conservation Stewardship Program, the nation's largest working lands conservation program, by merging it with the Environmental Quality Incentives Program, resulting in \$800 million less for investments in preserving working lands and sustainable farm practices.

The legislation hurts rural families in several additional ways by:

Failing to increase funding for USDA's trade assistance programs that help farmers stay globally competitive through initiatives that help to develop and expand their business in overseas markets;

Abolishing the entire Energy Title, resulting in lost investments in jobs of the future in renewable energy and biofuels;

Adding onerous fees to rural development guaranteed loans;

Curtailling broadband assistance in remote areas by adding administrative burdens and fails to boost USDA's telemedicine initiatives that help combat opioid abuse in rural America;

Underfunding the Beginning Farmer and Rancher Development Program, which provides funding to organizations that educate, mentor and provide technical assistance for new and veteran farmers; and

Betraying the next generation of farm and food leaders by failing to provide mandatory funding for scholarships at 1890 land grant institutions.

This so-called Farm Bill is so bad in so many ways to so many people that it is little wonder that it is strongly opposed by leading organizations and associations from all sides of the political spectrum, including: National Farmers Union, National Sustainable Agriculture Coalition, Environmental Working Group, National Young Farmers Coalition, Union of Concerned Scientists, Agriculture Energy Coalition, American Biogas Association, Institute for Agriculture & Trade Policy, AARP, American Academy of Pediatrics, AFSCME, Alliance for Retired Americans, American Psychological Association, Center for Law and Social Policy (CLASP), Child Care Aware of America, Child Welfare League of America, Children's Defense Fund, Coalition on Human Needs, Every Child Matters, Families USA, Feeding America, First Focus Campaign for Children, Food Research & Action Center, Hispanic Federation, Lutheran Services in America, Mazon: A Jewish Response to Hunger, Meals on Wheels America, MomsRising, NAACP, National Consumers League, National Council on Aging, National Employment Law Project, National PTA, National Urban League, National Women's Law Center, NOW, Partnership for America's Children, Sargent Shriver National Center on Poverty Law, SEIU, Share Our Strength, UnidosUS, YWCA USA, Heritage Foundation, R Street Institute, and Taxpayers for Common Sense.

I urge all Members to join me in voting to reject the rule and this cruel, heartless legislation.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 900 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN

On p. 2, line 2, insert "The amendment specified in section 2 of this resolution shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole." after "purposes."

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

"SEC. 2. The amendment referred to in the first section of this resolution is as follows:
'Add at the end the following:

Subtitle H Protections From Retaliatory
Tariffs

SEC. 11801. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall not take effect until the President transmits a certification to Congress that the following Administration efforts will not result in adverse trade or tariff impacts against U.S. farmers, ranchers, and other agriculture producers:

(1) the renegotiation of the North American Free Trade Agreement;

(2) the application of tariffs and/or quotas on steel and aluminum imports under Section 232 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962;

(3) any enforcement action taken pursuant to the investigation into China's acts, policies, and practices related to technology transfer, intellectual property, and innovation under Section 301 of the Trade Act of 1974; and

(4) the application of global safeguard tariffs on imports of large residential washing machines and solar cells and modules under Section 201 of the Trade Act of 1974."

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.

Mr. WOODALL. 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.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Adopting the resolution, if ordered; and

Agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 189, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 190]

YEAS—228

Abraham	Dunn	LaMalfa
Aderholt	Emmer	Lamborn
Allen	Estes (KS)	Lance
Amash	Faso	Latta
Amodei	Ferguson	Lesko
Arrington	Fitzpatrick	Lewis (MN)
Babin	Fleischmann	LoBiondo
Bacon	Flores	Long
Banks (IN)	Fortenberry	Loudermilk
Barletta	Fox	Love
Barr	Frelinghuysen	Lucas
Barton	Gaetz	Luetkemeyer
Bergman	Gallagher	MacArthur
Biggs	Garrett	Marchant
Bilirakis	Gianforte	Marino
Bishop (MI)	Gibbs	Marshall
Bishop (UT)	Goodlatte	Massie
Black	Gosar	Mast
Blum	Gowdy	McCarthy
Bost	Granger	McCaul
Brady (TX)	Graves (GA)	McClintock
Brat	Graves (LA)	McHenry
Brooks (AL)	Graves (MO)	McKinley
Brooks (IN)	Griffith	McMorris
Buchanan	Grothman	Rodgers
Buck	Guthrie	McSally
Bucshon	Handel	Meadows
Budd	Harper	Messer
Burgess	Harris	Mitchell
Byrne	Hartzler	Moolenaar
Calvert	Hensarling	Mooney (WV)
Carter (GA)	Herrera Beutler	Mullin
Carter (TX)	Hice, Jody B.	Newhouse
Chabot	Higgins (LA)	Noem
Cheney	Hill	Norman
Coffman	Holding	Nunes
Cole	Hollingsworth	Olson
Collins (GA)	Hudson	Palazzo
Collins (NY)	Huizenga	Palmer
Comer	Hultgren	Paulsen
Comstock	Hunter	Pearce
Conaway	Hurd	Perry
Cook	Issa	Pittenger
Costello (PA)	Jenkins (KS)	Poe (TX)
Cramer	Jenkins (WV)	Poliquin
Crawford	Johnson (LA)	Posey
Culberson	Johnson (OH)	Ratcliffe
Curbelo (FL)	Johnson, Sam	Reed
Curtis	Jordan	Reichert
Davidson	Joyce (OH)	Renacci
Davis, Rodney	Katko	Rice (SC)
Denham	Kelly (MS)	Roby
DeSantis	Kelly (PA)	Roe (TN)
DesJarlais	King (IA)	Rogers (AL)
Diaz-Balart	King (NY)	Rohrabacher
Donovan	Kinzing	Rokita
Duffy	Knight	Rooney, Francis
Duncan (SC)	Kustoff (TN)	Rooney, Thomas
Duncan (TN)	LaHood	J.

Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (NE)
Roskam	Smith (NJ)
Ross	Smith (TX)
Rothfus	Smucker
Rouzer	Stefanik
Royce (CA)	Stewart
Russell	Stivers
Rutherford	Taylor
Sanford	Tenney
Scalise	Thompson (PA)
Schweikert	Thornberry
Scott, Austin	Tipton
Sensenbrenner	Trott
Sessions	Turner
Shimkus	Upton
Shuster	Valadao
Simpson	Wagner
Smith (MO)	Walberg

NAYS—189

Adams	Gomez
Aguilar	Gonzalez (TX)
Barragán	Gottheimer
Bass	Green, Al
Beatty	Green, Gene
Bera	Grijalva
Bishop (GA)	Gutiérrez
Blumenauer	Hanabusa
Blunt Rochester	Hastings
Bonamici	Heck
Boyle, Brendan F.	Higgins (NY)
Brady (PA)	Himes
Brownley (CA)	Hoyer
Bustos	Huffman
Butterfield	Jackson Lee
Capuano	Jayapal
Carbajal	Jeffries
Cárdenas	Johnson (GA)
Carson (IN)	Johnson, E. B.
Cartwright	Jones
Castor (FL)	Kaptur
Castro (TX)	Keating
Chu, Judy	Kelly (IL)
Cicilline	Kennedy
Clark (MA)	Khanna
Clarke (NY)	Kihuen
Clay	Kildee
Cleaver	Kilmer
Clyburn	Kind
Cohen	Krishnamoorthi
Connolly	Kuster (NH)
Gaetz	Lamb
Gallagher	Langevin
Garrett	Larsen (WA)
Gianforte	Larsen (CT)
Gibbs	Lawrence
Goodlatte	Lawson (FL)
Gosar	Lee
Gowdy	Levin
Granger	Lewis (GA)
Graves (GA)	Lieu, Ted
Graves (LA)	Lipinski
Graves (MO)	Loeb
Griffith	Loeb
Grothman	Lofgren
Guthrie	Lowenthal
Handel	Lowe
Harper	Lujan Grisham, M.
Harris	Lujan, Ben Ray
Hartzler	Lynch
Hensarling	Maloney
Herrera Beutler	Carolyn B.
Hice, Jody B.	Maloney, Sean
Higgins (LA)	Matsui
Hill	McCollum
Holding	McEachin
Hollingsworth	McGovern
Hudson	McNerney
Huizenga	Meeks
Hunt	Meng
Hunter	Moore
Hurd	Moulton
Issa	Murphy (FL)
Jenkins (KS)	Nadler
Jenkins (WV)	Napolitano
Jordan	
Joyce (OH)	
Katko	
Kelly (MS)	
Kelly (PA)	
King (IA)	
King (NY)	
Kinzing	
Knight	
Kustoff (TN)	
LaHood	

NOT VOTING—10

Beyer	Gohmert	Walz
Blackburn	Labrador	Webster (FL)
Brown (MD)	Polis	
DeGette	Rogers (KY)	

□ 1356

Ms. TSONGAS changed her vote from "yea" to "nay."

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WEBER of Texas). 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—aye 228, noes 188, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 191]

AYES—228

Abraham	Gosar	Newhouse
Aderholt	Gowdy	Noem
Allen	Granger	Norman
Amash	Graves (GA)	Nunes
Amodei	Graves (LA)	Olson
Arrington	Graves (MO)	Palazzo
Babin	Griffith	Palmer
Bacon	Grothman	Paulsen
Banks (IN)	Guthrie	Pearce
Barletta	Handel	Perry
Barr	Harper	Pittenger
Barton	Harris	Poe (TX)
Bergman	Hartzler	Poliquin
Biggs	Hensarling	Posey
Bilirakis	Herrera Beutler	Ratcliffe
Bishop (MI)	Hice, Jody B.	Reed
Bishop (UT)	Higgins (LA)	Reichert
Blum	Hill	Renacci
Bost	Holding	Rice (SC)
Brady (TX)	Hollingsworth	Roby
Brat	Hudson	Roe (TN)
Brooks (AL)	Huizenga	Rogers (AL)
Brooks (IN)	Hultgren	Rohrabacher
Buchanan	Hunter	Rokita
Buck	Hurd	Rooney, Francis
Bucshon	Issa	Rooney, Thomas
Budd	Jenkins (KS)	J.
Burgess	Jenkins (WV)	Ros-Lehtinen
Byrne	Johnson (LA)	Roskam
Calvert	Johnson (OH)	Ross
Carter (GA)	Johnson, Sam	Rothfus
Carter (TX)	Jones	Rouzer
Chabot	Jordan	Royce (CA)
Cheney	Joyce (OH)	Russell
Coffman	Katko	Rutherford
Cole	Kelly (MS)	Sanford
Collins (GA)	Kelly (PA)	Scalise
Collins (NY)	King (IA)	Schweikert
Comer	King (NY)	Scott, Austin
Comstock	Kinzing	Sensenbrenner
Conaway	Knight	Sessions
Cook	Kustoff (TN)	Shimkus
Costello (PA)	LaHood	Shuster
Cramer	LaMalfa	Simpson
Crawford	Lamborn	Smith (MO)
Culberson	Lance	Smith (NE)
Curbelo (FL)	Latta	Smith (NJ)
Curtis	Lesko	Smith (TX)
Davidson	Lewis (MN)	Smucker
Davis, Rodney	LoBiondo	Stefanik
Denham	Long	Stewart
DeSantis	Loudermilk	Stivers
DesJarlais	Love	Taylor
Diaz-Balart	Lucas	Tenney
Donovan	Luetkemeyer	Thompson (PA)
Duffy	MacArthur	Thornberry
Duncan (SC)	Marchant	Tipton
Duncan (TN)	Marino	Trott
Dunn	Marshall	Turner
Emmer	Massie	Upton
Estes (KS)	Mast	Valadao
Faso	McCarthy	Wagner
Ferguson	McCaul	Walberg
Fitzpatrick	McClintock	Walden
Fleischmann	McHenry	Walker
Flores	McKinley	Walorski
Fortenberry	McMorris	Walters, Mimi
Fox	Rodgers	Weber (TX)
Frelinghuysen	McSally	Wenstrup
Gaetz	Meadows	Westerman
Gallagher	Messer	Williams
Garrett	Mitchell	Wilson (SC)
Gianforte	Moolenaar	Wittman
Gibbs	Mooney (WV)	Womack
Goodlatte	Mullin	

Woodall	Yoho	Young (IA)
Yoder	Young (AK)	Zeldin
NOES—188		
Adams	Gomez	Nolan
Aguilar	Gonzalez (TX)	Norcross
Barragán	Gottheimer	O'Halleran
Bass	Green, Al	O'Rourke
Beatty	Green, Gene	Pallone
Bera	Grijalva	Panetta
Bishop (GA)	Gutiérrez	Pascrell
Blumenauer	Hanabusa	Payne
Blunt Rochester	Hastings	Pelosi
Bonamici	Heck	Perlmutter
Boyle, Brendan	Higgins (NY)	Peters
F.	Himes	Peterson
Brady (PA)	Hoyer	Pingree
Brownley (CA)	Huffman	Pocan
Bustos	Jackson Lee	Price (NC)
Butterfield	Jayapal	Quigley
Capuano	Jeffries	Raskin
Carbajal	Johnson (GA)	Rice (NY)
Cárdenas	Johnson, E. B.	Richmond
Carson (IN)	Kaptur	Rosen
Cartwright	Keating	Roybal-Allard
Castor (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Ruiz
Castro (TX)	Kennedy	Ruppersberger
Chu, Judy	Khanna	Rush
Cicilline	Kihuen	Ryan (OH)
Clark (MA)	Kildee	Sánchez
Clarke (NY)	Kilmer	Sarbanes
Clay	Kind	Schakowsky
Cleaver	Krishnamoorthi	Schiff
Clyburn	Kuster (NH)	Schneider
Cohen	Lamb	Schrader
Connolly	Langevin	Scott (VA)
Cooper	Larsen (WA)	Scott, David
Correa	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Costa	Lawrence	Sewell (AL)
Courtney	Lawson (FL)	Shea-Porter
Crist	Lee	Sherman
Crowley	Levin	Sinema
Cuellar	Lewis (GA)	Sires
Cummings	Lieu, Ted	Smith (WA)
Davis (CA)	Lipinski	Soto
Davis, Danny	Loeb sack	Speier
DeFazio	Lofgren	Suoizzi
DeLaney	Lowenthal	Swalwell (CA)
DeLauro	Lowe y	Takano
DeBene	Lujan Grisham,	Thompson (CA)
Demings	M.	Thompson (MS)
DeSaulnier	Luján, Ben Ray	Titus
Deutch	Lynch	Tonko
Dingell	Maloney,	Torres
Doggett	Carolyn B.	Tsongas
Doyle, Michael	Maloney, Sean	Vargas
F.	Matsui	Veasey
Ellison	McCollum	Vela
Engel	McEachin	Velázquez
Eshoo	McGovern	Visclosky
Espallat	McNerney	Wasserman
Esty (CT)	Meeks	Schultz
Evans	Meng	Waters, Maxine
Foster	Moore	Watson Coleman
Frankel (FL)	Moulton	Welch
Fudge	Murphy (FL)	Wilson (FL)
Gabbard	Nadler	Yarmuth
Gallego	Napolitano	
Garamendi	Neal	

NOT VOTING—11

Beyer	DeGette	Rogers (KY)
Black	Gohmert	Walz
Blackburn	Labrador	Webster (FL)
Brown (MD)	Polis	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1404

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.

CONGRESSIONAL SPORTSMEN'S CAUCUS

(Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as the chairman of the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus, and it is the largest bipartisan and bicameral caucus in the United States Congress.

Every year we have an annual congressional shootout, which consists of sporting clays, trap, and skeet shotgunning, and it is a competition between Republican Members of Congress who are members of the Sportsmen's Caucus and Democratic Members of Congress who are members of the Sportsmen's Caucus.

This year, we had 28 shooters, and I am pleased to say that the Republican team once again retained the trophy for another year.

We also had some individual competitions going on, and I would like to recognize those Members of Congress.

The Top Gun Member of Congress this year goes to Representative JOHN RUTHERFORD from Florida. Now, Mr. Speaker, this was his first time at this event, and he had the second highest score for a Member of Congress since the year 2010. He shot 61 out of a total possible 75.

We also had a Top Gun Republican Member, RICHARD HUDSON from North Carolina.

We had a Top Gun Democrat. That was Representative MIKE THOMPSON from California, who always shoots well. I like shooting against him.

Of course, I won the Top Skeet Award. DUNCAN HUNTER from California won the Top Trap, and the Top Sporting Clays was Representative AUSTIN SCOTT, who is also the co-vice chair on the Republican side for the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus.

Now, the caucus is made up of two chairmen, one Republican and one Democrat, and two co-vice chairmen, one Republican and one Democrat. I would like to take this opportunity to yield to the co-chairman, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN).

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we only had four Democrats shooting. Somewhere along the way, we have to do better recruitment. You and I both know we are term limited as co-chairs, and my replacement next year will be another Texan.

Where is my Texan?

Okay. Congressman Mark Veasey, and I know he shot better than I did, so maybe he will improve our lot next time. It is a lot of fun, the camaraderie is great, and I just am honored to have that time to be the vice chair, now the co-chair of it, and so thank you.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas, and I want to invite all Members of Congress to join the Sportsmen's Caucus. It is not just about hunting and fishing. It is about access to outdoor property that we own as taxpayers. Public access is important. It is about trapping. It is about a lot of other outdoor activities that we can take advantage of.

The sporting clay competition that we had is open to all Members, from be-

ginner to expert. Come out and enjoy the day next year about this same time, and enjoy a day out in Maryland at the Prince George's Trap and Skeet Center gun range club. It is a great afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, this trophy will reside in my office, 2229 Rayburn House Office Building if anybody wants to come by and admire it. It will have a new plaque saying the Republicans won the 2018 competition.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

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.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 217, nays 188, answered “present” 2, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 192]

YEAS—217

Abraham	Davis (CA)	Hunter
Aderholt	Davis, Danny	Johnson (GA)
Allen	Davis, Rodney	Johnson (LA)
Amodei	DeLauro	Johnson, Sam
Arrington	DeBene	Jones
Bacon	Demings	Katko
Banks (IN)	DesJarlais	Kelly (PA)
Barletta	Deutch	Kennedy
Barr	Dingell	Kildee
Barton	Doggett	King (IA)
Beatty	Donovan	King (NY)
Billakis	Duffy	Krishnamoorthi
Bishop (UT)	Duncan (TN)	Kuster (NH)
Blum	Dunn	Kustoff (TN)
Blumenauer	Ellison	LaMalfa
Blunt Rochester	Engel	Lamborn
Bonamici	Eshoo	Larsen (WA)
Brady (TX)	Estes (KS)	Latta
Brat	Evans	Lawrence
Brooks (IN)	Ferguson	Lesko
Buchanan	Fleischmann	Lewis (MN)
Bucshon	Fortenberry	Lipinski
Budd	Foster	Long
Bustos	Frankel (FL)	Loudermilk
Butterfield	Frelinghuysen	Love
Byrne	Gabbard	Lucas
Carson (IN)	Gallego	Luetkemeyer
Carter (TX)	Garamendi	Lujan Grisham,
Cartwright	Garrett	M.
Castro (TX)	Gianforte	Luján, Ben Ray
Chabot	Gibbs	Marino
Chu, Judy	Goodlatte	Massie
Cicilline	Gowdy	McCarthy
Clay	Granger	McCaul
Cole	Griffith	McClintock
Collins (GA)	Guthrie	McCollum
Collins (NY)	Handel	McEachin
Comstock	Harper	McHenry
Cook	Harris	McMorris
Cooper	Heck	Rodgers
Cramer	Hensarling	McNerney
Crawford	Higgins (LA)	Meadows
Cuellar	Himes	Meeks
Culberson	Hollingsworth	Meng
Cummings	Huffman	Messer
Curtis	Huizenga	Mitchell
Davidson	Hultgren	Moolenaar