

to move more able-bodied people into work and into training. While the gentleman's motivations are certainly fine in this regard and he is attempting to get at the right thing, we think that the amendment, if it were adopted, would actually destroy the carefully constructed effort that we have made to try to encourage work and responsibility.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Delaware (Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER).

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Mr. Chairman, 42, 23, 89, 200, and 3. These numbers stand out for me. Forty-two million people will be impacted by the SNAP changes; 23 hearings; 89 witnesses, who didn't recommend the proposals that we are seeing today; \$200 million spent on 10 pilot programs, of which we won't get the results in time; and 3 years old, the age that we are reducing down from 6 for parents to go to work.

These numbers just don't add up. And one of my concerns is that great proposals might be put on the floor right now, but we had a process, and the process has been flawed, and now we have a flawed product.

So, again, I urge my colleagues across the aisle to come back together in the great tradition of the Agriculture Committee and work on a bipartisan piece of legislation that moves Americans into work—meaningful work.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has the right to close.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN), my colleague on the House Budget Committee.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank again the gentleman from California for bringing forth this amendment and the gentleman from Texas for all of the work that he did on the bill.

I think sometimes, rather than have hearings, you find out a lot more about these Federal programs and particularly the SNAP program if you talk to the local clerks at the convenience stores and the grocery stores and the income maintenance workers in the counties or the people who manage the low-income housing to find out what really is going on here.

I will bring to light one in particular of the four provisions in the amendment: the idea that participants in training programs have to go through E-Verify.

It has been said that you have to be a citizen to get SNAP anyway. I would suggest talking to some of the income maintenance workers or some of the people who talk to some of the people who use the SNAP program, and I think they will tell you that, whatever

the official Federal law is, SNAP is routinely used by people who are not here legally.

I think by requiring E-Verify for the training programs, we begin to go through the process of making sure that people who are in this country illegally are not taking advantage of taxpayer-funded programs.

□ 1630

I really wish we had more information on this topic, but, again, it is my belief that the average clerk in an average convenience store knows a lot more about the SNAP program than most Ph.D.s in sociology.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I ask support in opposing this amendment from my friend and colleague from California.

To my friends across the aisle who keep asking for bipartisan opportunity, you blew the first one. That was in subcommittee, where we could have amendments, and we are not seeing amendments from Members here. So there has been plenty of opportunity for bipartisan work.

I do appreciate the recommendations that my Democratic friends made in writing to both the ranking member and the chairman. All of those points and all the titles, I believe, were—I know in the nutrition title they were all incorporated into the base bill.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING) having assumed the chair, Mr. SIMPSON, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration 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, had come to no resolution thereon.

PERMISSION TO CONSIDER AMENDMENT NO. 7 OUT OF SEQUENCE DURING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2, AGRICULTURE AND NUTRITION ACT OF 2018

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during further consideration of H.R. 2 in the Committee of the Whole pursuant to House Resolution 900, amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 115-679 may be considered out of sequence.

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

There was no objection.

AGRICULTURE AND NUTRITION ACT OF 2018

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 900 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2.

Will the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1632

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the 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, with Mr. SIMPSON (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 115-679 offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK) had been postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. FORTENBERRY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 115-679.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 187, after line 10, insert the following (and redesignate the subsequent subsections accordingly):

(a) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It is in the national interests of the United States to advance food security in developing countries and open new markets for agricultural trade through programs that leverage the unique capabilities of Federal departments and agencies, and improve coordination between donors, beneficiaries, and the private sector.

(2) ROLE OF DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.—The Department of Agriculture plays an important role in establishing trade between the United States and other nations and should enhance its role in facilitating the transfer of the knowledge, skills, and experience of American farmers, land-grant universities, and extension services through the

John Ogonowski and Doug Bereuter Farmer-To-Farmer Program under title V of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1737).

Page 187, strike lines 11 through 14 and insert the following:

(b) CLARIFICATION OF NATURE OF ASSISTANCE.—Section 501(b)(1) of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1737(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by inserting “technical” before “assistance”; and

(2) in paragraph (2)(A)—

(A) by striking “; and” at the end of clause (viii); and

(B) by striking clause (ix) and inserting the following:

“(ix) agricultural education and extension;

“(x) selection of seed varieties and plant stocks;

“(xi) knowledge of insecticide and sanitation procedures to prevent crop destruction;

“(xii) use and maintenance of agricultural equipment and irrigation systems; and

“(xiii) selection of fertilizers and methods of soils treatment; and”.

Page 189, after line 6, insert the following:

(g) CROP YIELDS AND INNOVATIVE PARTNERSHIPS.—Section 501 of the Food for Peace Act (7 U.S.C. 1737) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f) ESTABLISHMENT OF A GEOGRAPHICALLY DEFINED CROP YIELD METRICS.—The Secretary of Agriculture, in cooperation with the Administrator of the Agency for International Development, should—

“(1) establish a geographically defined crop yield metrics system to assess improvements in crop yields in countries and areas receiving assistance under this title; and

“(2) store the data resulting from such geographically defined crop yield metrics system in a publicly available Internet database system.

“(g) GRANT PROGRAM TO CREATE NEW PARTNERS AND INNOVATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator of the Agency for International Development shall develop a grant program for fiscal years 2019 through 2023 to facilitate new and innovative partnerships and activities under this title.

“(2) USE OF FUNDS.—Grant recipients under this subsection shall use such funds—

“(A) to prioritize new implementing partners;

“(B) on innovative volunteer models;

“(C) on strategic partnerships with other United States development programs; and

“(D) on expanding the footprint and impact of the programs and activities under this title, and diversity among program participants, including land grant colleges or universities and extension services.

“(h) APPROPRIATIONS.—None of the amounts made available to carry out this title may be used to carry out subsections (f) and (g) of this section except to the extent that such subsections are carried out using authorities otherwise provided by this title.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 900, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Chairman, first, let me thank my good friend Chairman CONAWAY for working with us on this very important amendment.

Mr. Chair, I would like to share a story with you. I just got off the phone with Archie Devor from Lincoln, Nebraska. Archie grew up as a dairy farmer. He started milking cows at 12 and, up at 12 a.m., got slapped in the face

quite a lot with a wet tail. He put himself through college doing that and went on and earned a Ph.D. in dairy science.

He did agricultural extension work for 20 years and became involved with a very important United States Government program called Farmer-to-Farmer.

One of Archie's experiences was in Bangladesh. Bangladesh has as many dairy cows as we do in the United States, and we have 12 times the production capacity as they do.

Through Archie's work, through the techniques that he has provided them, particularly nutrition guidance, he has helped solve one of those problems that exists around the world with structural poverty and not enough to eat.

In fact, the Bangladeshis wanted to name him “Father of modern dairy.” He is a humble man, my constituent, and I am proud of his work. And, of course, he refuses that title.

Nonetheless, Mr. Chairman, the amendment before us today addresses this very important program. This program has connected volunteer American farmers, agriculture extension experts, and others with deep knowledge of agriculture production with farmers abroad as well as agricultural experts from American universities to other countries around the globe.

The sharing of America's agricultural expertise dramatically enhances the capacity of people elsewhere to grow their own food.

Really, Mr. Chairman, this initiative is about three things. It is about the richness of America's farm experience. It is about an engine of economic regeneration in the fight against structural global poverty. And it also, I believe, will enhance our 21st century architecture of emerging diplomatic relations.

This program was initially authorized in 1985, and it has been in subsequent farm bills and, again, has promoted sustainable economic growth, food security, and agricultural development worldwide.

All 50 States have been represented in volunteer trips overseas to assist farmers, and specialists from a variety of agricultural disciplines have taught host-country farmers in over 100 nations through coordination with 12,000 different local host organizations.

The growth of the program has fostered community ecosystems of sustainable agriculture. It has enhanced the ability to access new markets and conserved environmental and natural resources. The work of our American farmers has borne great fruit overseas, and, with some innovative rethinking, I think we can help fully realize this program's potential.

This amendment serves three critical objectives.

First, it elevates the role of the United States Department of Agriculture in coordinating sequencing and prioritizing farmer visits to host countries.

Second, it establishes geographically defined crop yield metrics, a system to assess whether improvements in crop yields in countries receiving our assistance are actually occurring.

Third, the data generated through this new metric will be available publicly.

It is important to note that the amendment enhances outreach to identify and prioritize new implementing partners, increases the diversity of program participants, and serves to expand recruitment of new volunteers from diverse agricultural knowledge and skill backgrounds.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this amendment will also better support our work in global food security programs that already exist and have wide congressional backing. We have an important moment here to renew, innovate, and modernize a very good program.

Mr. Chair, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY).

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment.

This actually is America at her best. It is taking American expertise, going people-to-people across this world, and sharing the great techniques we are developing here. And while that might make those host countries a little more competitive with our production of agriculture here in America, it is the right thing to do.

Mr. Chair, I support the amendment, and I appreciate Mr. FORTENBERRY's dedication not only to this specific issue but his broader work across the international arena that he has shown his expertise in.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Chair, I thank the chairman for his comments, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. MACARTHUR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in House Report 115-679.

Mr. MACARTHUR. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 247, line 23, strike “(I)” and insert “(J)”.

Page 256, line 13, strike the close quotation marks and the comma at the end.

Page 256, after line 13, insert the following:

“(I) HOUSEHOLD INELIGIBILITY.—If an individual becomes ineligible to participate in the supplemental nutrition assistance program as a household member due to failure to meet the requirements under subparagraph (B), the remaining household members (including children), shall not become ineligible to apply to participate in the supplemental nutrition assistance program due to such individual's ineligibility.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 900, the gentleman

from New Jersey (Mr. MACARTHUR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. MACARTHUR. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman of the Agriculture Committee for his help and support and for crafting a farm bill that I think will benefit a great many Americans.

Mr. Chair, this bill benefits both farmers and consumers across the country. Even in a densely populated State like mine, New Jersey, the most densely populated State in the Nation, I have over 800 family farms that will benefit from this bill.

I have cranberry and blueberry growers that will benefit from specialty crop grants. Our main State university, Rutgers, will benefit from research grants. There are crop insurance provisions, conservation measures, things that will benefit all of us.

But let's face it: the most controversial part of this bill, or at least one of the most controversial parts, has been the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, SNAP.

Of the \$867 billion of authorized spending over the next 10 years, \$664 billion, or more than 75 percent, is for this one program.

This has been bipartisan, up until now at least. It has always been that the Federal Government would partner with States to help the most vulnerable people in the Nation, and, at the same time, we would help those people towards self-sufficiency, help them prepare to enter the workforce so that they can have the dignity that comes with a job. I think every American deserves this.

We have always balanced both compassion and individual responsibility, and I think this bill goes a long way to continuing in that tradition.

My amendment is about children. It is imperative, as we continue this balance, that no child gets caught up, even unintentionally, in something harmful. No child can go to school on an empty stomach and learn, and no child should have to come home from school and wonder where their next meal is coming from.

There is a lot in this bill already that protects children. I recognize that. I recognize that the committee has been very attentive to this. My amendment goes a little farther and makes it explicitly clear to those who administer the SNAP programs around the country that children cannot be harmed in any way.

I will read the relevant part of the amendment. It says: "If an individual becomes ineligible to participate in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program as a household member due to failure to meet the requirements under subparagraph (B), the remaining household members (including children), shall not become ineligible to apply to participate in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program due to such individual's ineligibility."

In other words, kids are off limits.

Mr. Chair, I urge adoption of the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment even though I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chair, I do want to say a few words, and that is, I am trying to understand this amendment, because I really don't understand the point of it.

Under current law, children can still get SNAP even if their parents fail to comply with work requirements. That is the current law. H.R. 2, the farm bill, does nothing to change this, so I am unsure why this amendment has been offered.

I think I would classify this amendment as a covering-your-rear-end amendment, because the bottom line is that there is a lot in H.R. 2 that I think does harm to children, because when their parents are thrown off of SNAP, while they may not be thrown off of SNAP, the overall household allowance for food gets decreased, and so there is less food for the entire family.

I would say that if the majority really cared about the impact H.R. 2 would have on children, then they would address the changes that have been made in broad-based categorical eligibility, which will throw working parents off of SNAP.

According to CBO, the nonpartisan experts that we rely on to give us data, over 265,000 students will lose access to free school meals.

So there is nothing to be opposed to, I guess, because this is already current law. But I would say to the gentleman that broad-based categorical eligibility, the changes in this bill, are going to adversely impact a number of individuals in New Jersey.

With that alone, 35,000 individuals are going to lose their SNAP benefits. That is just on this one part of the bill. Many of them have kids, and the changes are going to affect these kids.

So, if you really care about these kids, I would urge you to reject this bill. Send it back to the Agriculture Committee. Let's work in a bipartisan way and construct a nutrition title which everybody understands, which is clear, which has been vetted, and which we can come to the floor and say with certainty that it will not adversely impact kids. Because this underlying bill, no matter how you want to slice and dice it, will have a negative impact on kids.

□ 1645

And this amendment, you go home and maybe do a press release on it, but it doesn't change the impact of this bill.

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

Mr. MACARTHUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I regret my friend's confusion over what it does, but, as he well knows, we pass sometimes this much law and those who implement that pass this much, in terms of how it actually gets played out.

This amendment makes it explicitly clear to those who administer the SNAP program that children must be held harmless, they must be protected.

On top of that, the underlying bill also stops family sanctioning.

So you can call it a belt-and-suspenders approach, but, when it comes to children, I think it is worth making it as crystal-clear as possible that they cannot be harmed.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment.

Much to the chagrin of many who just oppose any changes to actually help us get children out of poverty and out of the cycle of poverty that perpetual SNAP benefits bring to families, I would argue that it is language like this that reasserts the fact that we need to, as this goes through the legislative process—we are in the second step of the legislative process. As this goes through the process, this clearly shows all of us here in the House and in the Senate and on a conference committee the opportunity that we want to make sure that we protect those who need that protection.

That is exactly why I am glad Mr. MACARTHUR participated in this process. The gentleman wanted to make this bill better. The gentleman wanted to strengthen it to ensure that our children in the most vulnerable households had the opportunity to get the food that they need.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for doing that. I think this is a great addition to the farm bill, and I appreciate the gentleman yielding me this opportunity to say so.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am at a loss. We have no opposition to this amendment, but let's be honest with each other and let's be honest with our constituents. H.R. 2 will hurt families, will hurt working families, will hurt kids.

You know one thing that is also explicit, Mr. Chairman? According to CBO, 265,000 kids will be thrown off of the free breakfast and lunch program. That is according to CBO.

The other thing that is clear is that there are working families—there are working families, Mr. Chairman, people who work, who now get SNAP benefits, who, because we are eliminating broad-based categorical eligibility, a number of them will lose their benefits. And they still work. Their family

households, therefore, will have less of a food allowance. That will impact these kids. That is undeniable.

So don't sit here and say this shows that we are going to protect kids. The law is the law. If you want to restate the law, restate it. Restate it 100 times, "don't hurt kids." That doesn't change the fact that this bill will hurt kids.

That is why so many of us on this side of the aisle and, hopefully, a number of you on your side of the aisle are going to stand strong and oppose this.

This is not right. There was a right way to do this farm bill, and there was a wrong way to do this farm bill. This was the wrong way.

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

Mr. MACARTHUR. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. MACARTHUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON), my friend.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard about broad-based categorical eligibility. If this was a SNAP brochure, Mr. Chairman, and I hand this to you, regardless of what your income is, if you accept this SNAP brochure, you are now eligible for SNAP. That is broad-based categorical eligibility.

Mr. Chairman, if somebody offers you an 800 number to call regarding SNAP, which is a good thing, as is the brochure, and you use that number, under broad-based categorical eligibility, you are now eligible for SNAP, no matter what your income is.

So, if it has been found that some families will come off, it is because it has been found that there are families who already exceed the income.

Now, here is the thing. If they just go and fill out the application, they can be eligible for SNAP if they meet those financial and asset requirements.

Mr. MACARTHUR. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have left?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, the CBO, the nonpartisan experts that we all rely on, says that over 400,000 households will lose their benefits because of the changes in H.R. 2 with regard to categorical eligibility. We estimate that to be a million people. That is undeniable.

So you can sit here all you want and say this is going to hold everybody harmless and that kids won't suffer. It is just not true. I mean, read the CBO score. Better yet, read the bill.

Look, we have no objection to you passing a restatement of current law, because current law says that, even if parents don't comply, their kids can't

be punished. But make no mistake about it, the overall food allowance in that household will decrease. That is a fact. That will impact those kids.

So, if you truly want to help kids, if you truly care about kids, you will vote "no" on this bill. You will vote "no" on H.R. 2.

You will make sure that this bill goes back to committee, that we have a bipartisan process, and we have a bill that comes to the floor that helps our farmers and that helps those in need in this country.

This is not it. This does not help kids. This amendment does nothing. This is a covering-your-rear-end amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MACARTHUR).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting Chair. The Chair understands that amendment No. 10 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. HOLDING

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in House Report 115-679.

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, insert the following:

SEC. ____ DISQUALIFICATION OF CERTAIN CONVICTED FELONS.

Section 6 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2015), as amended by section 4015, is amended in subsection (p)(1)—

- (1) in subparagraph (A) by striking “: and” at the end and inserting a period, and
- (2) by striking subparagraph (B).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 900, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my amendment, and I urge all colleagues to support its inclusion in the farm bill today.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment is simple. It ends eligibility for the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program for convicted rapists, murderers, and those guilty of sexual exploitation.

The 2014 farm bill contained a prohibition for these individuals from being eligible for SNAP, but the individual also has to be considered a fleeing felon. This means that, in order to lose eligibility, the person has to not only be a convicted murderer, rapist, et cetera, but they also must be in violation of the terms of their sentence.

Mr. Chairman, I believe we should not have to wait before a criminal who has already been convicted of these acts violates the terms of their sentence before terminating the benefits.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would eliminate the fleeing felon provision from the underlying law and thereby prohibits convicted rapists, pedophiles, murderers, et cetera, from being eligible for SNAP.

This is a commonsense proposal that says if you commit these atrocious crimes that you are ineligible for this government program.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues to vote for this commonsense amendment and include it in the farm bill that we have under consideration.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MISS GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN OF PUERTO RICO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 12 printed in House Report 115-679.

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to H.R. 2 at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, insert the following:

SEC. ____ DETERMINATION OF AMOUNT OF BLOCK GRANT PAYABLE TO PUERTO RICO.

(a) STUDY.—With funds appropriated to carry out this subsection, the Secretary of Agriculture shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility and impact of using a thrifty food plan developed exclusively to apply under section 19(a)(2)(A)(ii) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2028(a)(2)(A)) to calculate the amount of the block grant payable to Puerto Rico.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out subsection (a).

(c) APPROPRIATION IN ADVANCE.—Only funds appropriated under subsection (b) in advance specifically to carry out subsection (a) shall be available to carry out such subsection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 900, the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico (Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico.

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my amendment to H.R. 2.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment aims to take a deeper look into the Thrifty Food Plan and how it influences the amount of funds currently calculated for Nutrition Assistance Block Grants provided to Puerto Rico through the Nutrition Assistance Program, NAP.

Puerto Rico is currently included in the Thrifty Food Plan of the 48 contiguous States. However, the island imports most food items that are sold in stores, which increases the cost families pay when purchasing foods included in their diet.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment will require the Secretary of Agriculture to produce a report on the feasibility and impact of Puerto Rico having its own Thrifty Food Plan. This will allow the government of Puerto Rico and the Department of Family, which administers the program on the island, to make an educated decision on how to move forward in terms of acquiring benefits and addressing factors that reflect increases in the cost of food items found and purchased on the island.

My second amendment will request the Secretary of Agriculture to produce an update on a 2010 report previously generated by the Food and Nutrition Service Agency at the USDA. That report will indicate the percentage of households that will receive nutritional assistance and what the average monthly benefit per household would be if Puerto Rico were treated equally under the Supplemental Nutritional Assistance Program, SNAP.

As approved by the 2014 farm bill, Puerto Rico's cash portion of benefits obtained through NAP will gradually be reduced by 5 percent each year until 2021—right now, that measure is waived by this administration because of the hurricane—when all NAP benefits will be then available through the electronic benefit transfer system.

In view of this and in preparation for this, we must start considering if a transition to SNAP is feasible or not and, if so, what it would mean for my constituency in terms of benefits and requirements. An updated study will allow us to have recent data to properly consider making this decision along with the government of Puerto Rico and the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, my amendments essentially seek better facts and better data on the nutritional benefits my constituents receive and depend on. For many families on the island, this is the main source of nutritional assistance.

As Puerto Rico's sole Representative here in Congress, it is my responsibility to make sure that we have the tools and information we need at hand to collaborate with State officials and make those decisions that will continue to help families on the island maintain proper access to a quality diet and, therefore, a proper quality of life.

Mr. Chairman, decisions that are this important and delicate should not be subjected to guesswork but based on updated facts, and my two amendments will do that.

Mr. Chairman, I also want to share that these amendments, as drafted, do not increase mandatory spending.

And, last, I would like to urge my colleagues to support these two amendments, and I want to thank the chairman of the Agriculture Committee for helping me out in drafting my amendments and helping the people of Puerto Rico.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico (Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. FASO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 13 printed in House Report 115-679.

Mr. FASO. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk made in order by the rule.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, insert the following:

SEC. —. ADMINISTRATIVE FLEXIBILITY FOR STATES.

Section 11(e)(6)(B) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2020(e)(6)(B)) is amended to read as follows:

“(B) personnel of the State agency or, at the option of the State agency and by contract with the State agency, personnel of an entity that has no direct or indirect financial interest in an approved retail food store, may undertake such certification or carry out any other function of the State agency under the supplemental nutrition assistance program and without restriction by the Secretary on the State agency's use of non-governmental employees to perform program eligibility or any other administrative function to carry out such program.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 900, the gentleman from New York (Mr. FASO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FASO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer my amendment, which would provide States additional flexibility to administer the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP.

If included in the farm bill, this amendment would provide States the option, not a mandate, to determine the appropriate mix of government staff and service provider staff for all administrative SNAP functions.

It would build on existing SNAP administrator flexibility within employment and training programs as well as technology initiatives like electronic benefits transfer.

This barrier, currently in the SNAP law dating from the 1970s, prevents the implementation of commonsense administrative solutions that include integrated call centers, leveraging investment to modernize programs, and incorporate best practices and the ability to address periodic peaks in enrollment activity that accompany times of economic distress.

□ 1700

Mr. Chairman, I know that at least a dozen Governors sent a letter to the leadership of the House and Senate today saying that States across the country have been calling for administrative flexibility to implement various government programs, and it is time that we provide each State the

choice to decide what is best for them in their overall effectiveness in running these programs.

Mr. Chairman, I would also like to thank my partners in this amendment, Representatives HARTZLER, POLIQUIN, MARSHALL, and GOODLATTE, who are supportive of this policy change.

I encourage my colleagues to vote in favor of this commonsense amendment and provide the States with added flexibility, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment. This proposal opens the door to sweeping changes in how States can operate SNAP. The amendment, which was never debated or discussed by the committee, could result in tens of thousands of American jobs being shipped overseas. I know Donald Trump wants to create more jobs in China, but I don't think we do.

This risks good-paying civil service jobs and puts benefits and services to vulnerable households at risk. SNAP's merit system ensures workers' aim is to effectively implement program rules unhindered by private interests or profit motives. Some SNAP operational functions can be appropriately turned over to private contractors, such as computer systems, custodial services, or debit card issuance in order to leverage businesses' competitive advantage.

Some, however, like eligibility determination, must remain a government function. Some SNAP clients, including many elderly, have very complex cases that require trained professional civil service workers to dedicate significant time to appropriately screen and verify their information, and ensure they receive the correct benefit levels, which is important.

Good local jobs likely could be exported out of the area or overseas. In many areas, including rural regions, civil service jobs offer some of the best paying, most stable employment for local workers. Privatizing core SNAP functions would mean many of these jobs would be moved to other locations, including overseas. Why do we want to do that?

Privatization could also compromise the security of a participant's data. SNAP collects detailed information about applicants and participants, including Social Security numbers, household composition and income, and employment information. Handing private data of millions of individuals over to private companies raises serious concerns about their ability to keep it secure, and their interest in using it for other purposes.

I respect the gentleman's intentions, I guess, but I think if we had spent some time in the committee actually discussing this, some of these concerns that I raise would be apparent. So this is a bad idea, a bad amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FASO. Mr. Chairman, in response to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts' comments, I would simply suggest that what this amendment is trying to do is: number one, give the States the option to utilize modern management techniques in terms of the operation of the SNAP program. It is an option. It is not a mandate.

Number two, I would point out that various programs such as TANF, and such as the Children's Health Insurance Program also have the ability to do precisely what I am suggesting in this amendment. This is not unusual. This is not sending jobs overseas. That is an absurd notion, I believe.

The fact of the matter is, we are trying to make it possible for States to seamlessly run these programs, whether it is TANF, whether it is housing assistance, whether it is the Children's Health Insurance Program, or whether it is Medicaid. Those programs, States already have the option and already have the ability to use social service nonprofit organizations like Catholic Charities to assist them in eligibility determinations, to assist States in assisting recipients in getting into employment and training programs.

So what this amendment is seeking to do is to eliminate the exclusion of that ability that is now only in the SNAP program. Mr. Chairman, it is only in the SNAP program that we exclude the opportunity for States to have these kind of abilities, to have these services performed by nonprofit organizations and by other providers that can efficiently and seamlessly coordinate the benefits and eligibility that exists for TANF, that exists for children's health insurance, that exists for a whole panoply of social services programs.

Mr. Chairman, I regret the gentleman from Massachusetts' opposition to the amendment. I hope he would reconsider, given the fact that CHIP and all of these other programs—which the gentleman supports already—permit doing precisely what I am suggesting here, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Chair, I am not going to reconsider my opposition. I think this is a bad amendment, plain and simple. And I think the issues like determining eligibility for who can receive SNAP should not be contracted out to some private company. I do worry about creating more jobs overseas and losing very good jobs here at home.

So if you are concerned about keeping good jobs—and these are good jobs, civil service jobs—here in the United States, then you have got to oppose this amendment.

Shifting core SNAP functions to private workers could disrupt timely and accurate benefits. In H.R. 2, we are

going after vulnerable populations in a very, very harsh way, and I think this would complicate things even worse.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, let me thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding.

Let me very quickly say that my first statement is my opposition to this bill. I can't imagine the cut of \$23 billion out of our food nutrition program, nor can I understand the breaching of the relationship between our support for farmers and our support for poor people.

I appreciate my good friend, Mr. FASO, but I have to stand in strong opposition to his amendment which would authorize States to privatize and contract out program eligibility and other administrative functions.

Mr. Chair, I come from Texas. We tried it. It was an enormous drain on the budget. It didn't work. It was costly. People lost their benefits. It is a terrible idea because removing SNAP's merit staffing requirement would prioritize profit, disrupt access to food assistance, and export good jobs.

The SNAP merit system ensures that an employee's core mission objective is to effectively implement program rules unhindered by private interests or profit motives. Many SNAP clients, including the elderly and disabled, have complex cases that require trained professional civil service workers to dedicate significant time.

When these functions are turned over to for-profit companies, there is a different priority, Mr. Chairman. They focus on the bottom line rather than providing comprehensive support. Your constituents of this program are the elderly and children and disabled. In the early 2000s, Texas transferred most of the operational aspects of its eligibility determination system to a private contractor with disastrous results. Services deteriorated as backlogs and other inefficiencies increased. There were 127,000 children who were dropped from health insurance. I am opposed to this legislation. Let's do what is right, Mr. Chairman, for the children.

Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to Amendment No. 13 offered by the gentleman from New York, Congressman FASO, which would authorize states to privatize and contract out program eligibility and other administrative functions.

This is a terrible idea because removing SNAP's merit staffing requirement would prioritize profit, disrupt access to food assistance, and export good jobs.

SNAP's merit system ensures that an employee's core mission objective is to effectively implement program rules unhindered by private interests or profit motives.

Many SNAP clients, including the elderly and disabled, have complex cases that require trained, professional civil service workers to dedicate significant time to appropriately screen and verify their information and ensure they receive the correct benefit levels.

When these functions are turned over to for-profit companies, they focus on the bottom line rather than providing comprehensive support to the needy.

This is what we saw in Texas when the state experimented with privatization.

In the early 2000's Texas transferred most of the operational aspects of its eligibility determination system to a private contractor with disastrous results.

Services deteriorated as backlogs and other inefficiencies increased.

The contractor's monthly abandoned call rate was four times higher than what was called for in the contract; more than 127,000 children were dropped from health insurance between December 2005 and April 2006; and thousands of experienced state employees were laid off or quit and replaced by poorly trained, low-paid vendor employees.

Former Texas Comptroller, Carole Keeton Strayhorn, after conducting an audit of the system, stated that the "project has failed the state and the citizens it was designed to serve" and called the privatization effort a "perfect story of wasted tax dollars, reduced access to services and profiteering at taxpayers' expense."

Additionally, the Faso Amendment puts at risk good local jobs that likely could be exported out of the area or overseas.

In many areas, including rural regions, civil service jobs offer some of the best-paying, most stable employment for local workers.

Privatizing core SNAP functions would mean many of these jobs would be moved to other locations, including overseas.

Diminishing the pool of good jobs with steady hours and benefits could leave many out of work or with less stable options, hurting local economies.

An added danger of privatization is that it could compromise the security of participants' data.

SNAP collects detailed information about applicants and participants, including social security numbers, household composition, and income and employment information.

Handing private data of millions of individuals over to private companies raises serious concerns about their ability to keep it secure and their interests in using it for other purposes.

Shifting core SNAP functions to private workers could disrupt timely and accurate provision of benefits.

During the early 2000's, Texas experimented with privatizing key pieces of the eligibility process, including accepting applications, advising clients on program requirements and eligibility, and verifying eligibility.

The results were disastrous.

Thousands were unable to apply or were given misinformation and many received incorrect benefit allotments.

Individuals' private information was released, compromising their security.

And taxpayer dollars were wasted—none of the promises of improved performance or cost-savings were realized.

I urge all Members to join me in voting no to Amendment No. 13.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FASO. Mr. Chairman, to close on the amendment, let me reiterate. This amendment simply seeks to treat States' flexibility for SNAP the same

as it does, as current law does, for TANF, for a host of other social services programs, and for CHIP.

I would also point out, in response to the gentleman from Massachusetts' concern, the States that do this for CHIP and use nonprofit organizations to assist them in eligibility and other determinations, explicitly prohibit the outsourcing of these jobs to foreign countries, and many even prohibit the outsourcing of any job out of State. So the gentleman raises a red herring that is not appropriate in this context, and should not be considered.

This simply gives the States the flexibility to seamlessly manage the SNAP program and coordinate the benefits as they might have for home heating assistance, or they might have for CHIP, or they might have for TANF.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. FASO).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 14 printed in House Report 115-679.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . SERVICE OF TRADITIONAL FOODS IN PUBLIC FACILITIES.

Section 4033 of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (128 STAT. 818) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)—

(A) by inserting “, a State, a country equivalent, or a local education agency,” after “programs” the 1st place it appears,

(B) by striking “ and facilities operated by tribal organizations, that primarily serve Indians” and inserting “and federally funded child nutrition and senior meal programs,”, and

(2) in subsection (d)(1)—

(A) by striking “and” the 1st place it appears, and

(B) by inserting “, a State, a county or county equivalent, a local educational agency, and an entity or person authorized to facilitate the donation, storage, preparation, or serving of traditional food by the operator of a food service program” after “organization”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 900, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is simple. It is to

make sure Alaska Natives and American Indian populations are able to access traditional foods in nutrition programs.

Many American Indians and Alaska Natives incorporate traditional foods: fish, game, seafood, wild berries, and plants into their daily diets. These foods are locally sourced and culturally significant.

The cultural significance of traditional foods is especially important in long-term care and hospital settings, where individuals are likely to be away from their homes for extended periods and are unable to easily carry on their traditions. It is likewise important for Native youth to have access to traditional foods for proper nutrition and cultural heritage.

May I say, Mr. Chairman, when you are in a hospital you can recover faster if you have a traditional food. This amendment builds on a previous provision of mine in the 2014 farm bill that authorized donation and serving of traditional foods which meet the safety standards and in facilities that serve these indigenous populations.

It applies to programs encompassing residential childcare, child nutrition programs, hospitals, long-term care facilities, and others. There have been no documented safety issues and the food handling and storage safety standards incorporated in my previous amendment are stringent. The standards were, in part, based on successful standards from Alaska which has long led the way for safety procedures for traditional foods.

For years, this provision has led the way to safely offer traditional foods to the vulnerable populations that need it the most. My amendment maintains these standards.

This amendment tonight, like the previous one, has no budgetary effects. That is for those who do not want to spend any more money. It simply works to ensure that Native American and Alaska Native youth and elders can participate in nutrition programs and access traditional foods, regardless of the facility in which the program is implemented.

This is important, given that child nutrition and senior meal programs that serve a significant number of natives are sometimes housed in facilities that are not specifically designated as Tribal, and the legislation is truly focused on the importance of nutrition.

This amendment should be heavily and heartily accepted and passed. I strongly urge adoption of this amendment. It is about nutrition, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chair, it is with great reluctance that I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment. If it were limited to just to Alaska, then that might be one thing, but the underlying language is too broad.

It would allow this to happen across the United States, and I have some concerns about food safety with respect to that.

I understand what he is trying to get at, and I agree with the intent in making that, but I reluctantly disagree, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON), the ranking member of the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I have been to Alaska with Mr. YOUNG a number of times and know the culture up there and what is going on. This is a good amendment. I think it makes a lot of sense for Alaska, and I support it. So I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman. Again, I understand why the chairman is against this, but we have no cases where there has been any food hazards, food abuses, or anything like that. And I have to describe one thing to my colleagues.

I am 85 years old. I am an Alaska Native. I have lived in one of the villages up north. My diet has consisted of seal meat, seal oil, whale meat, whale oil, and berries. I am an older man. I am in a hospital in Anchorage, Alaska, or I am in a long-term care facility to take care of me, and they serve me, of all things, a chicken, or they will serve me some salty Spam.

□ 1715

That is not too bad by the way.

But things that will not make me well. And in my mind I desire and my body craves what I have eaten during the history of my life. And that keeps me well. In fact, I might be able to go home and be able to harvest those things that I love.

This is all I am trying to do in facilities. This is a good amendment. I know there has been opposition from some of the Federal agencies: Oh, this is a safety issue. Keep in mind, this is an issue that takes care of that person who is receiving that food.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge a “yes” vote on this legislation. It should happen for those people, my Alaskan Natives. It is important.

Mr. Chairman, I don't have any other speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MISS GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN OF PUERTO RICO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 15 printed in House Report 115-679.

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, insert the following:

SEC. —. EXTENSION OF STUDY ON COMPARABLE ACCESS TO SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE FOR PUERTO RICO.

(a) **AMENDMENTS.**—Section 4142 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-246; 122 STAT. 1881) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b) by striking “this Act” and inserting “Agriculture and Nutrition Act of 2018”, and

(2) in subsection (d)(1) by striking “2008” and inserting “2018”.

(b) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out section 4142 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-246; 122 STAT. 1881) as amended by subsection (a).

(c) **APPROPRIATION IN ADVANCE.**—Only funds appropriated under subsection (b) in advance specifically to carry out section 4142 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-246; 122 STAT. 1881) as amended by subsection (a) shall be available to carry out such section as so amended.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 900, the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico (Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico.

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. Mr. Chairman, I spoke about the two amendments before, so I am going to be brief now in speaking about this amendment, not without thanking Chairman CONAWAY for helping us out to get this amendment through.

Amendment No. 15 will just request an update on the survey in the request of data for the island. This second amendment requests the Secretary of Agriculture to produce an update on the 2010 report previously generated by the Food and Nutrition Service Agency at the USDA. That report will indicate the percentage of households that will receive nutritional assistance and what the average monthly benefit to their household will be if Puerto Rico were treated equally under the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, SNAP. We don't receive that.

As approved in the 2014 farm bill, Puerto Rico's cash portion of the benefit obtained through the NAP program will gradually be reduced by 5 percent each year through 2021. Of course, that situation, that 5 percent reduction has been waived since last year by the administration because of the hurricane situation, but all NAP benefits would then be available through the electronic benefit transfer system, the EBT.

In view and in preparation for this, we are beginning to consider the transition to SNAP, if it is feasible or not, and I do think it is feasible. So we are looking forward to having a report that will allow us to know what kind of benefits my constituents will be receiving.

An updated study will allow us to have recent data to properly consider making this decision, along with the Government of Puerto Rico. My amendment will essentially seek better

facts and better data on the nutritional benefits my constituents, the people of Puerto Rico, receive and depend on. For many families on the island, as you may know, this is the main source of nutritional assistance.

I am the only representative of the people of Puerto Rico here and in the Senate, and it is my responsibility to make sure we receive that kind of data. The last time was in 2010. We are in 2018 without an update of that report.

So we look forward to having the tools and information we need at hand to collaborate with State officials and the Federal Government to enable those families to continue to receive those kinds of services and the island to maintain a proper access to a quality diet and, therefore, a proper quality of life. Those decisions need to be made by updated facts and not subjected to guesswork by some officials.

I do believe that this amendment, as drafted, does not increase mandatory spending, so it will require just data. That is what we need.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico (Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. BIGGS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 16 printed in House Report 115-679.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike page 382, line 8, and all that follows through page 386, line 19, and insert the following:

SEC. 6402. REPEAL OF DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE BIOENERGY SUBSIDY PROGRAMS AND OTHER RELATED SUBSIDY PROGRAMS.

Title IX of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8101 et seq.) is hereby repealed.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 900, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is straightforward. It merely eliminates the bioenergy subsidy programs that were established way back in title IX of the 2002 farm bill some 16 years ago. Those programs are the Biobased Markets Program; the Biorefinery, Renewable Chemical, and Biobased Product Manufacturing Assistance Program; the Repowering Assistance Program; the Biodiesel Fuel Education Program; the Rural Energy for America Program; the Biomass Research and Development Initiative; the Feedstock

Flexibility Program for Bioenergy Producers; the Biomass Crop Assistance Program; and the Community Wood Energy Program.

President Reagan said that there is nothing quite as everlasting as a Federal program, and I am hoping that we can end some of these programs today.

Needless to say, subsidies have no place in a free market. If biofuels are to succeed, it should be based on their benefit to the Nation's overall energy economy, not because they receive taxpayer funds.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all my colleagues to end this Washington giveaway, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Arizona for his amendment; however, I believe it is a little bit misguided.

The programs that the amendment would eliminate are not energy subsidies. What these programs do is to create infrastructure and market opportunities for America's farmers, ranchers, and rural communities. Furthermore, these programs often leverage private capital that actually works toward revitalizing our communities.

Additionally, while I strongly support the RFS and biofuels production, these programs do not incentivize the production of corn ethanol, do not fund ethanol blender pumps, and are not part of the renewable fuels mandate.

The Biggs amendment strikes infrastructure-focused initiatives that help farmers and ranchers improve energy efficiency in their operations and increase commercial opportunities for agricultural products.

Mr. Chairman, I therefore urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I respect my colleague's reasoned opposition, although I disagree with him.

I appreciate his passion on the issue, and I have no doubt that he and I will work together on many future projects. But with this, Mr. Chairman, I continue to hold my position and would urge the passage of my amendment.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Mrs. NOEM), who is my good friend and colleague.

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the Biggs amendment as well. This amendment would repeal the bioenergy programs established in the 2002 farm bill. These programs encourage investment in small towns.

Not only do they encourage renewable fuels—and to me, that is a national security issue—but they also

create jobs and investments that bring these benefits to our rural communities, our States, and our country. Not only that, but they also create new demand for many agricultural products.

H.R. 2 already makes reforms. It eliminates mandate funding and reauthorizes programs that reduce discretionary funding levels. This amendment is not necessary because, instead of improving successful programs, it repeals them, eliminating all their successes, while not saving any taxpayer money.

Mr. Chairman, I encourage my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my colleague's position, and I regrettably must disagree with that position and continue to urge passage of the amendment.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague, Mr. BIGGS. It is great to have this opportunity to talk about what we believe the impact of this amendment will be to many of the constituents that I serve in rural America. I appreciate the opportunity to debate. That is what this House is about, and that is what this process is about.

I would like to thank my colleague for offering this amendment, although I do disagree and urge my colleagues to vote against.

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

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I urge passage of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 115-679 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Ms. FOXX of North Carolina.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. MCCLINTOCK of California.

Amendment No. 8 by Mr. MCCLINTOCK of California.

Amendment No. 13 by Mr. FASO of New York.

Amendment No. 16 by Mr. BIGGS of Arizona.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. FOXX

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded

vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 137, noes 278, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 193]

AYES—137

Amash
Amodei
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Biggs
Black
Blum
Blumenauer
Brat
Brooks (IN)
Bucshon
Budd
Chabot
Cicilline
Coffman
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Cooper
Costello (PA)
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Danny
Delaney
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Doggett
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Foster
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Gallagher
Garamendi
Garrett
Goslatte
Gosar
Gottheimer
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Griffith
Gutiérrez
Handel

Harris
Heck
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hultgren
Hunter
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Kelly (PA)
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
Lance
Langevin
Latta
Lee
Lesko
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loudermilk
Love
Marino
Massie
Mast
McClintock
Meeks
Messer
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Pallone
Pascrell
Perry
Peters
Quigley
Raskin
Ratcliffe

Reichert
Renacci
Roe (TN)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rosen
Roskam
Rothfus
Royce (CA)
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Sanford
Schiff
Schneider
Schweikert
Sensenbrenner
Shea-Porter
Shimkus
Shuster
Sinema
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Tipton
Titus
Tsongas
Upton
Veasey
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walker
Walorski
Welch
Wenstrup
Williams
Wittman
Womack
Woodall

NOES—278

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Barragán
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brooks (AL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Burgess

Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cheney
Chu, Judy
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleave
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Comer
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Correa

Costa
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
Denham
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Donovan
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duffy
Dunn

Ellison
Emmer
Engel
Eshoo
Espallat
Estes (KS)
Esty (CT)
Evans
Faso
Ferguson
Fortenberry
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gaetz
Gallo
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grothman
Guthrie
Hanabusa
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings
Herrera Beutler
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Hurd
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
King (IA)
Kinzinger
Knight
Krishnamoorthi
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Lamborn
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)

Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (MN)
Lieu, Ted
Loebach
Loftgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marshall
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meng
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Panetta
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Price (NC)

Reed
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rooney, Thomas
J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Rutherford
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Simpson
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Soto
Stefanik
Suozi
Takano
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Turner
Valadao
Vargas
Vela
Velázquez
Walden
Walters, Mimi
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Westerman
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—12

Beyer
Blackburn
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brown (MD)

Buck
Clay
Gohmert
Labrador
Meadows

□ 1753

Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. HERERA BEUTLER, Messrs. CAPUANO, ADERHOLT, and LONG changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. LEE, Messrs. PASCRELL and ISSA changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) on

which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 34, noes 380, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 194]

AYES—34

Amash	Garrett	Mooney (WV)
Banks (IN)	Gosar	Perry
Biggs	Hensarling	Posey
Budd	Herrera Beutler	Rohrabacher
Chabot	Issa	Rooney, Francis
Coffman	Johnson, Sam	Rothfus
Cook	Lance	Royce (CA)
DeSantis	Lesko	Sanford
Duncan (TN)	LoBiondo	Schwepker
Fox	Loudermilk	Sensenbrenner
Frelinghuysen	McClintock	
Gaetz	Messer	

NOES—380

Abraham	Comstock	Gibbs
Adams	Conaway	Gomez
Aderholt	Connolly	Gonzalez (TX)
Aguilar	Cooper	Goodlatte
Allen	Correa	Gottheimer
Amodei	Costa	Gowdy
Arrington	Costello (PA)	Granger
Babin	Courtney	Graves (GA)
Bacon	Cramer	Graves (LA)
Barletta	Crawford	Graves (MO)
Barr	Crist	Green, Al
Barragán	Crowley	Green, Gene
Barton	Cuellar	Griffith
Bass	Culberson	Grijalva
Beatty	Cummings	Grothman
Bera	Curbelo (FL)	Guthrie
Bergman	Curtis	Gutiérrez
Bilirakis	Davidson	Hanabusa
Bishop (GA)	Davis (CA)	Handel
Bishop (MI)	Davis, Danny	Harper
Bishop (UT)	Davis, Rodney	Harris
Black	DeFazio	Hartzler
Blum	DeGette	Hastings
Blumenauer	Delaney	Heck
Blunt Rochester	DeLauro	Hice, Jody B.
Bonamici	DelBene	Higgins (LA)
Bost	Demings	Higgins (NY)
Brady (PA)	Denham	Hill
Brady (TX)	DeSaulnier	Himes
Brat	DesJarlais	Holding
Brooks (AL)	Deutch	Hollingsworth
Brooks (IN)	Diaz-Balart	Hoyer
Brownley (CA)	Dingell	Hudson
Buchanan	Doggett	Huffman
Bucshon	Donovan	Huizenga
Burgess	Doyle, Michael	Hultgren
Bustos	F.	Hunter
Butterfield	Duffy	Hurd
Byrne	Duncan (SC)	Jackson Lee
Calvert	Dunn	Jayapal
Capuano	Ellison	Jeffries
Carbajal	Emmer	Jenkins (KS)
Cárdenas	Engel	Jenkins (WV)
Carson (IN)	Eshoo	Johnson (GA)
Carter (GA)	Españillat	Johnson (LA)
Carter (TX)	Estes (KS)	Johnson (OH)
Cartwright	Esty (CT)	Johnson, E. B.
Castor (FL)	Evans	Jones
Castro (TX)	Faso	Jordan
Cheney	Ferguson	Joyce (OH)
Chu, Judy	Fitzpatrick	Kaptur
Ciçilline	Fleischmann	Katko
Clark (MA)	Flores	Keating
Clarke (NY)	Fortenberry	Kelly (IL)
Cleaver	Foster	Kelly (MS)
Clyburn	Frankel (FL)	Kelly (PA)
Cohen	Fudge	Kennedy
Cole	Gabbard	Khanna
Collins (GA)	Gallagher	Kihuen
Collins (NY)	Garamendi	Kildee
Comer	Gianforte	Kilmer

Kind	Newhouse	Sherman
King (IA)	Noem	Shimkus
King (NY)	Nolan	Shuster
Kinziger	Norcross	Simpson
Knight	Norman	Sinema
Krishnamoorthi	Nunes	Sires
Kuster (NH)	O'Halleran	Smith (MO)
Kustoff (TN)	O'Rourke	Smith (NE)
LaHood	Olson	Smith (NJ)
LaMalfa	Palazzo	Smith (TX)
Lamb	Pallone	Smith (WA)
Lamborn	Palmer	Smucker
Langevin	Panetta	Soto
Larsen (WA)	Pascrell	Speier
Larson (CT)	Paulsen	Stefanik
Latta	Payne	Stewart
Lawrence	Pearce	Stivers
Lawson (FL)	Pelosi	Suozzi
Lee	Perlmutter	Swalwell (CA)
Levin	Peters	Takano
Lewis (GA)	Peterson	Taylor
Lewis (MN)	Pingree	Tenney
Lieu, Ted	Pittenger	Thompson (CA)
Lipinski	Pocan	Thompson (MS)
Loeb	Poe (TX)	Thompson (PA)
Loeb	Poliquin	Thornberry
Long	Price (NC)	Tipton
Love	Quigley	Titus
Lowenthal	Raskin	Tonko
Lowe	Ratcliffe	Torres
Lucas	Reed	Trott
Luetkemeyer	Reichert	Tsongas
Lujan Grisham,	Renacci	Turner
M.	Rice (NY)	Upton
Lujan, Ben Ray	Rice (SC)	Valadao
Lynch	Richmond	Vargas
MacArthur	Roby	Veasey
Maloney,	Roe (TN)	Vela
Carolyn B.	Rogers (AL)	Velázquez
Maloney, Sean	Rokita	Visclosky
Marchant	Rooney, Thomas	Wagner
Marino	J.	Walberg
Marshall	Ros-Lehtinen	Walden
Massie	Rosen	Walker
Mast	Roskam	Walorski
Costa	Ross	Walters, Mimi
Granger	Rouzer	Wasserman
Graves (GA)	Roybal-Allard	Schultz
Graves (LA)	Ruiz	Waters, Maxine
Graves (MO)	Ruppersberger	Watson Coleman
Green, Al	Rush	Weber (TX)
Green, Gene	Russell	Webster (FL)
Griffith	Rutherford	Welch
Grijalva	Ryan (OH)	Wenstrup
Grothman	Sánchez	Westerman
Guthrie	Sarbanes	Williams
Gutiérrez	Scalise	Wilson (FL)
Hanabusa	Schakowsky	Wilson (SC)
Handel	Schiff	Wittman
Harper	Schneider	Womack
Harris	Schrader	Woodall
Hartzler	Scott (VA)	Yarmuth
Hastings	Scott, Austin	Yoder
Heck	Scott, David	Yoho
Hice, Jody B.	Serrano	Young (AK)
Higgins (LA)	Sessions	Young (IA)
Higgins (NY)	Sewell (AL)	Zeldin
Hill	Shea-Porter	
Himes		
Holding		
Hollingsworth		
Hoyer		
Hudson		
Huffman		
Huizenga		
Hultgren		
Hunter		
Hurd		
Jackson Lee		
Jayapal		
Jeffries		
Jenkins (KS)		
Jenkins (WV)		
Johnson (GA)		
Johnson (LA)		
Johnson (OH)		
Johnson, E. B.		
Jones		
Jordan		
Joyce (OH)		
Kaptur		
Katko		
Keating		
Kelly (IL)		
Kelly (MS)		
Kelly (PA)		
Kennedy		
Khanna		
Kihuen		
Kildee		
Kilmer		
Kind		
King (NY)		
Kinziger		
Knight		
Krishnamoorthi		
Kuster (NH)		
LaMalfa		
Lamb		
Lance		

NOT VOTING—13

Beyer	Buck	Meadows
Blackburn	Clay	Polis
Boyle, Brendan	Galleo	Rogers (KY)
F.	Gohmert	Walz
Brown (MD)	Labrador	

□ 1758

Mr. COFFMAN changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 83, noes 330, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 195]

AYES—83

Aderholt	Fleischmann	Messer
Arrington	Fox	Mooney (WV)
Bacon	Gaetz	Norman
Banks (IN)	Gallagher	Palazzo
Barr	Garrett	Palmer
Biggs	Gosar	Perry
Bishop (UT)	Graves (GA)	Pittenger
Black	Graves (LA)	Poe (TX)
Blum	Grothman	Ratcliffe
Brat	Guthrie	Rice (SC)
Budd	Harris	Roby
Byrne	Hensarling	Rohrabacher
Calvert	Hice, Jody B.	Rokita
Carter (GA)	Holding	Rooney, Francis
Chabot	Huizenga	Rouzer
Cheney	Hunter	Russell
Collins (GA)	Issa	Sanford
Comer	Johnson (LA)	Scalise
Cook	Johnson, Sam	Schweikert
Curtis	Jordan	Sensenbrenner
Davidson	King (IA)	Smucker
DeSantis	Kustoff (TN)	Walker
DesJarlais	LaHood	Westerman
Duffy	Lamborn	Williams
Duncan (SC)	Lesko	Wittman
Duncan (TN)	Loudermilk	Woodall
Estes (KS)	Mast	Zeldin
Ferguson	McClintock	

NOES—330

Abraham	Costa	Granger
Adams	Costello (PA)	Graves (MO)
Aguilar	Courtney	Green, Al
Allen	Cramer	Green, Gene
Amash	Crawford	Griffith
Amodei	Crist	Grijalva
Babin	Crowley	Gutiérrez
Barletta	Cuellar	Hanabusa
Barragán	Culberson	Handel
Barton	Cummings	Harper
Bass	Curbelo (FL)	Hartzler
Beatty	Davis (CA)	Hastings
Bera	Davis, Danny	Heck
Bergman	Davis, Rodney	Herrera Beutler
Bilirakis	DeFazio	Higgins (LA)
Bishop (GA)	DeGette	Higgins (NY)
Bishop (MI)	Delaney	Hill
Blumenauer	DeLauro	Himes
Blunt Rochester	DelBene	Hollingsworth
Bonamici	Demings	Hoyer
Bost	Denham	Hudson
Brady (PA)	DeSaulnier	Huffman
Brady (TX)	Deutch	Hultgren
Brooks (AL)	Diaz-Balart	Hurd
Brooks (IN)	Dingell	Jackson Lee
Brownley (CA)	Doggett	Jayapal
Buchanan	Donovan	Jeffries
Bucshon	Doyle, Michael	Jenkins (KS)
Burgess	F.	Jenkins (WV)
Bustos	Dunn	Johnson (GA)
Butterfield	Ellison	Johnson (OH)
Capuano	Emmer	Johnson, E. B.
Carbajal	Engel	Jones
Cárdenas	Españillat	Joyce (OH)
Carson (IN)	Esty (CT)	Kaptur
Carter (TX)	Evans	Katko
Cartwright	Faso	Keating
Castor (FL)	Fitzpatrick	Kelly (IL)
Castro (TX)	Flores	Kelly (MS)
Chu, Judy	Fortenberry	Kelly (PA)
Ciçilline	Foster	Kennedy
Clark (MA)	Frankel (FL)	Khanna
Clarke (NY)	Frelinghuysen	Kihuen
Cleaver	Fudge	Kildee
Clyburn	Gabbard	Kilmer
Cohen	Galleo	Kind
Cole	Garamendi	King (NY)
Collins (NY)	Gianforte	Kinziger
Comer	Gibbs	Knight
	Gomez	Krishnamoorthi
	Gonzalez (TX)	Kuster (NH)
	Goodlatte	LaMalfa
	Gottheimer	Lamb
	Gowdy	Lance

Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (MN)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Long
Love
Lowenthal
Lowe y
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meeks
Meng
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Noem

NOT VOTING—14

Beyer
Blackburn
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brown (MD)

Buck
Clay
Eshoo
Gohmert
Labrador

Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Paulsen
Soto
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Suo zzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Womack
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)

□ 1802

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. FASO

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. FASO) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 222, noes 192, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 196]

AYES—222

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blum
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Sanford
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Lewis (MN)
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Noem
Norman
Nunes
Olson

NOES—192

Adams
Aguilar
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Costello (PA)

Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Españat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallo
Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Ruiz
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Eshoo
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson

NOT VOTING—13

Beyer
Blackburn
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brown (MD)
Buck
Clay
Gohmert
Green, Gene
Labrador
Meadows
Polis
Rogers (KY)
Walz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1806

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. BIGGS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 75, noes 340, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 197]

AYES—75

Amash	Gallagher	Norman
Banks (IN)	Garrett	Palmer
Biggs	Gianforte	Poe (TX)
Bilirakis	Gosar	Posey
Bishop (UT)	Graves (GA)	Ratcliffe
Brat	Grothman	Roe (TN)
Budd	Harris	Rohrabacher
Burgess	Hartzler	Rokita
Carter (GA)	Hensarling	Rooney, Francis
Chabot	Hice, Jody B.	Rothfus
Coffman	Holding	Royce (CA)
Collins (GA)	Huizenga	Russell
Comer	Hunter	Sanford
Cooper	Issa	Scalise
Culberson	Johnson, Sam	Schweikert
Curtis	Jordan	Sensenbrenner
Davidson	Lamborn	Sessions
DeSantis	Lesko	Wagner
DesJarlais	Loudermilk	Walker
Duncan (SC)	Massie	Walters, Mimi
Duncan (TN)	McClintock	Webster (FL)
Estes (KS)	McHenry	Williams
Fleischmann	McSally	Williams
Foxx	Mooney (WV)	Woodall
Frelinghuysen	Mullin	Zeldin

NOES—340

Abraham	Crowley	Higgins (NY)
Adams	Cuellar	Hill
Aderholt	Cummings	Himes
Aguilar	Curbelo (FL)	Hollingsworth
Allen	Davis (CA)	Hoyer
Amodei	Davis, Danny	Hudson
Arrington	Davis, Rodney	Huffman
Babin	DeFazio	Hultgren
Bacon	DeGette	Hurd
Barletta	Delaney	Jackson Lee
Barr	DeLauro	Jayapal
Barragán	DelBene	Jeffries
Barton	Demings	Jenkins (KS)
Bass	Denham	Jenkins (WV)
Beatty	DeSaulnier	Johnson (GA)
Bera	Deutch	Johnson (LA)
Bergman	Diaz-Balart	Johnson (OH)
Bishop (GA)	Dingell	Johnson, E. B.
Bishop (MI)	Doggett	Jones
Black	Donovan	Joyce (OH)
Blum	Doyle, Michael	Kaptur
Blumenauer	F.	Katko
Blunt Rochester	Duffy	Keating
Bonamici	Dunn	Kelly (IL)
Bost	Ellison	Kelly (MS)
Brady (PA)	Emmer	Kelly (PA)
Brady (TX)	Engel	Kennedy
Brooks (AL)	Eshoo	Khanna
Brooks (IN)	Espallat	Kihuen
Brownley (CA)	Esty (CT)	Kildee
Buchanan	Evans	Kilmer
Bucshon	Faso	Kind
Bustos	Ferguson	King (IA)
Butterfield	Fitzpatrick	King (NY)
Byrne	Flores	Kinzinger
Calvert	Fortenberry	Knight
Capuano	Foster	Krishnamoorthi
Carbajal	Frankel (FL)	Kuster (NH)
Cárdenas	Fudge	Kustoff (TN)
Carson (IN)	Gabbard	LaHood
Carter (TX)	Gaetz	LaMalfa
Cartwright	Gallego	Lamb
Castor (FL)	Garamendi	Lance
Castro (TX)	Gibbs	Langevin
Cheney	Gomez	Larsen (WA)
Chu, Judy	Gonzalez (TX)	Larson (CT)
Cicilline	Goodlatte	Latta
Clark (MA)	Gottheimer	Lawrence
Clarke (NY)	Gowdy	Lawson (FL)
Cleaver	Granger	Lee
Clyburn	Graves (LA)	Levin
Cohen	Graves (MO)	Lewis (GA)
Cole	Green, Al	Lewis (MN)
Collins (NY)	Green, Gene	Lieu, Ted
Comstock	Griffith	Lipinski
Conaway	Grijalva	LoBiondo
Connolly	Guthrie	Loeb
Cook	Gutiérrez	Lofgren
Correa	Hanabusa	Long
Costa	Handel	Love
Costello (PA)	Harper	Lowenthal
Courtney	Hastings	Lowe
Cramer	Heck	Lucas
Crawford	Herrera Beutler	Luetkemeyer
Crist	Higgins (LA)	

Lujan Grisham, M.	Peters	Smith (TX)
Luján, Ben Ray	Peterson	Smith (WA)
Lynch	Pingree	Smucker
MacArthur	Pittenger	Soto
Maloney,	Pocan	Speier
Carolyn B.	Poliquin	Stefanik
Maloney, Sean	Price (NC)	Stewart
Marchant	Quigley	Stivers
Marino	Raskin	Suozzi
Marshall	Reed	Swalwell (CA)
Mast	Reichert	Takano
Matsui	Renacci	Taylor
McCarthy	Rice (NY)	Tenney
McCaul	Rice (SC)	Thompson (CA)
McCollum	Richmond	Thompson (MS)
McEachin	Roby	Thompson (PA)
McGovern	Rogers (AL)	Thornberry
McKinley	Rooney, Thomas J.	Tipton
McMorris	Ros-Lehtinen	Titus
Rodgers	Rosen	Tonko
McNerney	Roskam	Torres
Meeks	Ross	Trott
Meng	Rouzer	Tsongas
Messer	Roybal-Allard	Turner
Mitchell	Ruiz	Upton
Mooleenaar	Ruppersberger	Valadao
Moore	Rush	Vargas
Moulton	Rutherford	Veasey
Murphy (FL)	Ryan (OH)	Vela
Nadler	Sánchez	Velázquez
Napolitano	Sarbanes	Visclosky
Neal	Schakowsky	Walberg
Newhouse	Schiff	Walden
Noem	Schneider	Walorski
Nolan	Schrader	Wasserman
Norcross	Scott (VA)	Schultz
Nunes	Scott, Austin	Waters, Maxine
O'Halleran	Scott, David	Watson Coleman
O'Rourke	Serrano	Weber (TX)
Olson	Sewell (AL)	Welch
Palazzo	Shea-Porter	Wenstrup
Pallone	Sherman	Westerman
Panetta	Shinkus	Wilson (FL)
Pascarell	Shuster	Wilson (SC)
Paulsen	Simpson	Womack
Payne	Sinema	Yarmuth
Pearce	Sires	Yoder
Pelosi	Smith (MO)	Yoho
Perlmutter	Smith (NE)	Young (AK)
Perry	Smith (NJ)	Young (IA)

NOT VOTING—12

Beyer	Buck	Polis
Blackburn	Clay	Rogers (KY)
Boyle, Brendan	Gohmert	Walz
F.	Labrador	
Brown (MD)	Meadows	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1811

Mr. COFFMAN changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise. The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN) having assumed the chair, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration 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, had come to no resolution thereon.

**AGRICULTURE AND NUTRITION
ACT OF 2018**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 891 and rule

XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2.

Will the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1813

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the 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, with Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 20 printed in part C of House Report 115-677 offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) had been disposed of.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part C of House Report 115-677 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 13 by Mr. WESTERMAN of Arkansas.

Amendment No. 14 by Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY WESTERMAN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 224, noes 191, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 198]

AYES—224

Abraham	Black	Coffman
Aderholt	Blum	Cole
Allen	Bost	Collins (GA)
Amash	Brady (TX)	Collins (NY)
Amodei	Brat	Comer
Arrington	Brooks (AL)	Comstock
Babin	Brooks (IN)	Conaway
Bacon	Buchanan	Cook
Banks (IN)	Bucshon	Cramer
Barletta	Budd	Crawford
Barr	Burgess	Culberson
Barton	Byrne	Curtis
Bergman	Calvert	Davidson
Biggs	Carter (GA)	Davis, Rodney
Bilirakis	Carter (TX)	Denham
Bishop (MI)	Chabot	DeSantis
Bishop (UT)	Cheney	DesJarlais