Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2642) to provide for the reauthorization of the Farm Bill and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration shall be waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as agree to the bill and any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture; and (2) one motion to recommit.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only. I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Worcester, Massachusetts (Mr. McGovern), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to recognize that while the rule before us today is closed, this legislation, exactly the legislation, has gone through an amendment process on this floor, debated—just a few weeks ago—debated, discussed, and voted on. The amendments which were agreed to as a result of that process are in this underlying legislation. So in no way, in no way, is this bill anything other than the work of both parties, with all Members, that have gone through a nutrition policy in the agriculture legislation, be fairly spoken of.

The House would show up with no position to change any of these items related to food stamps, and thus it would show up without a position on nutrition programs are an essential part of not just government services, but an essential part of a civilization that we agree with as part of the programs from the United States Government. So in no way, in no way, is this intended to be a trick or to be seen that we would not believe, or would believe, that we would show up to do anything to the nutrition program.

It was stated that the House would show up without a position on those issues, which would mean in reality that the current law would prevail. The House would show up with no position to change any of these items related to food stamps, and thus it would stay as is. So for someone to suggest that Republicans are not going to be supportive of the nutrition programs would simply not, in my opinion, be fairly spoken of.

The House will have an opportunity, however, once we get this done, to move forward a bill that if a decision was made could move to conference.

Today's legislation is an important step in making sure that the agriculture programs provide the American farmers with innovative risk-management tools and so many other things that have been placed in this bill on a bipartisan basis, as a result of the work that began with then-Democrat Chairman Collin Peterson when the bill began its writing process and now has
continued on a bipartisan basis with the gentleman. Mr. Lucas, the chairman of the committee. That is what we are trying to present today.

The bill which we are presenting today has every consideration that I believe to the request of the unanimous consent of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. McGovern) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. WATT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in opposition to the rule which prohibits Members from offering amendments that would protect the children of America from hunger.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will advise each Member to confine the unanimous-consent request to a simple declarative statement of the Member’s attitude toward the measure. Further embellishments will result in a deduction of time from the yielding Member.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in very strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it takes the safety net away from America’s poor families.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will advise each Member to confine the unanimous-consent request to a simple declarative statement of the Member’s attitude toward the measure. Further embellishments will result in a deduction of time from the yielding Member.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. Payne) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it hurts America’s children.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Ms. Moore) for a unanimous consent request?

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it hurts America’s children.

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

There was no objection.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in very strong opposition to the bill because it increases hunger in America.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it hurts America’s children.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. Payne) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in total opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it hurts America’s children.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. Beatty) for a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it increases hunger in America.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?
There was no objection.
Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Ms. Johnson) for a unanimous consent request.
Ms. Eddie Bernice Johnson of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill because we are the conscience of the Congress. The majority of the people getting food stamps are not African American.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?
There was no objection.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts’ time will be charged.
Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. Lewis) for a unanimous consent request.
Mr. Lewis. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it takes the safety net away from America’s poor families.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?
There was no objection.
Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Conyers) for a unanimous consent request.
Mr. Conyers. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it hurts the working poor.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?
There was no objection.
Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. Sewell) for a unanimous consent request.
Ms. Sewell of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it takes the safety net away from America’s poor families.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Alabama?
There was no objection.
Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Al Green) for a unanimous consent request.
Mr. Al Green of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it hurts the working poor.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?
There was no objection.
Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. Kelly) for a unanimous consent request.
Ms. Kelly of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in very strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it increases poverty in America.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?
There was no objection.
Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. Clarke) for a unanimous consent request.
Ms. Clarke. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in total and strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it starves America’s children.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?
There was no objection.
Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. Wilson) for a unanimous consent request.
Ms. Wilson of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it hurts the working poor.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?
There was no objection.
Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. Jackson Lee) for a unanimous consent request.
Ms. Jackson Lee of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it takes food from children, and it increases the number of starving children in America.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?
There was no objection.
Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it increases hunger in America.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?
There was no objection.
Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. Edwards) for a unanimous consent request.
Ms. Edwards of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it contributes to hunger in America.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Maryland?
There was no objection.
Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. Bass) for a unanimous consent request.
Ms. Bass of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it contributes to hunger in America.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?
There was no objection.
Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. Bass) for a unanimous consent request.
Ms. Bass of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in total and strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it increases poverty in America.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?
There was no objection.
Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. Bass) for a unanimous consent request.
Ms. Bass of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it contributes to hunger in America.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Maryland?
There was no objection.
Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. Edwards) for a unanimous consent request.
Ms. Edwards of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will state her inquiry.
Ms. Edwards of Maryland. Is it in order to amend the underlying bill and the rule that currently provides for billions in subsidies to corporate farms while children and families go hungry, school lunch programs are decimated, and Meals on Wheels is taken from the disabled and senior citizens?
The SPEAKER pro tempore. An amendment to the rule could be offered only if its manager yields for that purpose.
Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mr. Scott) for a unanimous consent request.
Mr. David Scott of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it takes food and nutrition from working families.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will not this day go down as one of the most shameful days in American history?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not stated a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Rush) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it takes the safety net away from America's poor families and takes food out of the mouths of children.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it hurts the working poor.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it hurts the working poor.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, as chair of the CHC, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it increases poverty in America.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) for a unanimous consent request.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, as chair of the CHC, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it hurts America's poor children and senior citizens.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts' time will be charged.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Isn't it true, Mr. Speaker, that this rule takes and bifurcates the bill that came out of the authorizing committee and separates it into two separate bills in a way that ultimately hurts the working poor of this country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is not the role of the Chair to interpret the underlying bill.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield to the gentlelady from California (Ms. WATERS) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it takes the safety net away from America's poor families and takes food out of the mouths of children.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlelady from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts' time will be charged.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN) for a unanimous consent request.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) for a unanimous consent request.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MECKS) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. MECKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it hurts the working poor, it leaves children without food, and it hurts seniors on an everyday basis.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts' time will be charged.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. HOYER. In explaining your answer to the last parliamentary inquiry, you indicated that the problem was that he embellished by introducing himself as chairman of the Hispanic Caucus. The gentleman from New York who just spoke did not do so, but simply articulated three reasons he was opposed to this bill.

It seems to me that that is certainly within the contemplation of the unanimous-consent request. If we start parsing that people can only articulate one reason, we would emerge, if our friends, the Parliamentarians, and to the Speaker, that will establish a precedent which will be very difficult...
and subjective for implementation by the Speaker.
I ask the Speaker to perhaps further explain why Mr. MEEKS' objection was charged to Mr. McGovern's time.

The Speaker pro tempore. Mr. MEEKS' objection was charged to Mr. McGovern's time.

The Speaker pro tempore. The Chair will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry.

The Speaker pro tempore. The Speaker will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOYER. There was one declarative sentence. It had two commas in it. If we're going to parse this to that extent, I suggest to the Speaker and, frankly, to those who are advising the Speaker, that we're going down a road which is very dangerous.

Clearly, if there was an extended time, one could understand that. But adding short parenthetical phrases is, I think, Mr. Speaker, inconsistent with your previous rulings as to when you would not charge the time against Mr. McGovern.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I understood that Mr. McGovern, for example, introduced himself as representing all of the Hispanic Caucus, when he objected to the underlying bill, that that might be perceived as a greater explanation than the Speaker would think warranted. But Mr. MEEKS' statement, following that on the floor, was a simple declarative statement with two parenthetical phrases, not long in nature, explaining why he was objecting. It seems to me that's consistent with the rules and the position of the House.

The Speaker pro tempore. The Chair will continue to evaluate each individual declarative statement and make the judgment with regards to embodiment according to the previously announced standard.

Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time has been charged against us for these unanimous consent requests thus far?

The Speaker pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts' time has been charged two minutes total.

Parliamentary Inquiry

Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The Speaker pro tempore. The Speaker pro tempore. The gentleman may make his request.

Mr. McGovern. I ask unanimous consent that the time charged against us be restored given the fact that we are operating under a closed rule of a very important piece of legislation where a lot of Members would like to be heard.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. There is objection.

The Speaker pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it violates a decade-old principle uniting urban and rural interests together in feeding hungry people.

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

There was no objection.

The Speaker pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts' time will be charged.

Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in very strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because veterans in my district, children and patriotic families across America are hungry.

The Speaker pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

The Speaker pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. Davis) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. Davis of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because veterans in my district, children and patriotic families across America are hungry.

The Speaker pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

The Speaker pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. Velázquez) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. Velázquez of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it increases hunger not only in my congressional district but hunger in all congressional districts in America.

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

There was no objection.

The Speaker pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. Andrews) for a unanimous consent request.

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

The Speaker pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Speaker pro tempore. The gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. Cicilline) for a unanimous consent request.

Parliamentary Inquiry

Mr. Cicilline. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. Cicilline. Mr. Speaker, is it the ruling of the Chair that if in stating my request for unanimous consent I state a single reason, it is not charged to the time of the gentleman from Massachusetts; if I state several reasons in the same sentence because I've cited multiple reasons for requesting unanimous consent, that it is charged, assuming I do it passionately, quietly?

The Speaker pro tempore. The Chair does not respond to hypotheticals.

Mr. Cicilline. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it increases hunger in America, hurts seniors, and hurts the working poor.

The Speaker pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The Speaker pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts' time will be charged.

Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. Huffman) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. Huffman. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it increases hunger not only in my district but hunger in all congressional districts in America.

The Speaker pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Speaker pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. Thompson of Mississippi). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it increases hunger not only in my congressional district but hunger in all congressional districts in America.

The Speaker pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Speaker pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. Andrews) for a unanimous consent request.

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

The Speaker pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Speaker pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. Andrews) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. Andrews. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it increases hunger in America.
I represent where Saline County, a rural county, has greater poverty than Jackson County, where I live. I will not support this bill. I will not abandon what's right. I will not abandon the things that I keep my eyes on. I will not support this bill.

There are people in rural counties that I represent where Saline County, Missouri, a rural county, has greater poverty than Jackson County, where I live. I will not support this bill.

This is about trying to destroy something good because we're able to move in the United States, particularly to the rural areas. There are poor children in rural areas that I represent, and I will never turn my back on them and I will never turn my back on children in the urban core.

Mr. Speaker, I object to this bill because this bill is not just going to create tension among us but the people of this country who depend on us. They depend on us. It is not like they can go to an alternative body to redress their concerns. If we are about anything, it is about trying to take care of these people. That's why we're here.

I suffer from vertigo. The only way I can stop from wiggling around and fainting when I get dizzy with vertigo is to keep my eyes on something that doesn't move. I get frustrated and dizzy being in this body, and the only way I can stand up is to keep my eyes on something that doesn't move. And the thing that does not move are the people of Saline County, particularly those who are hurting. They don't move. My mind is going to stay right there on people who don't move: the hurt, the wounded—even the will to be an American. We've got to make sure that we take care of everybody in this country. Mr. Speaker, I will not. I shall not. I cannot be silent as we continue to divide the Nation, and then we think we're doing something good because we're able to say our say to somebody. The people of this country deserve better. We deserve better.

I've never attacked people on the basis of their party or their ideology, and I won't do it. I will not do it. But I will not abandon what's right. I will not abandon the things that I keep my eyes on. I will not support this bill.

There are people in rural counties that I represent where Saline County, Missouri, a rural county, has greater poverty than Jackson County, where Kansas City sits.

This is about trying to destroy some kind of system that we put in place to protect the rural areas. I am concerned about the rural areas. I was born in Waxahachie, Texas. My daddy sent my mother to college when I was in the eighth grade. I had never lived in a house with indoor plumbing until I was almost 8 years old. I lived in public housing. My daddy struggled. With a little help, my daddy sent four children through college. We moved out of public housing. My daddy lives in his own house right now in Wichita Falls, Texas.

All people are asking for, in some cases, is just a little help. Who can they turn to? I hope, I actually even pray, that it's the United States Congress.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts' time will be charged.

Mr. RANGEL. Were the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri charged to the debate as it relates to the rule?

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

Mr. RANGEL. And how long was that?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts' time was charged 4½ minutes.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts' time was charged 4½ minutes.

Mr. McGOVERN. So 4½ minutes total for all of the unanimous consent requests?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts was charged 7¼ minutes.

Mr. McGOVERN. So 7¼ minutes have been charged to us for unanimous consent requests, notwithstanding the fact that we have a closed rule. I think everybody stayed within the limit maybe with a little bit of an exception. I ask unanimous consent that our time be reinstated.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. There is objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There is no ruling before the House at this time.
will pass which would go to conference. And the Senate, because they have passed their own farm bill, has included in provisions where they discuss SNAP. As a result of that, that will be included in their bill on a conference measurement.

The House simply at this point, if we pass this part, could go to conference—could go to conference—and would be without resolution, would not have passed an amendment or a piece which would discuss it. So, in essence, my colleagues, your conferees, our conferees, that would include the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON) as well as Mr. LUCAS from Oklahoma, would go to the conference without resolution from this body. That’s all we’re talking about. It’s fully debatable under the conference. We simply would not have made a decision to change existing law. And the change in existing law would mean that the Senate conferees could stick to their position and hold the cut to $4 billion, and we would not have a position to cut a penny. I believe that this is an honest attempt to get us to go to—by passing part of the farm bill—to get to conference. And the tactics against that are simply to keep us from going to conference where we would show up with whatever we pass.

Now, if I have overstated this or understated this, I would encourage the minority whip to please engage me in a colloquy at this time, and I would yield to the gentleman on the substance of what I have spoken about to feel free to enlighten me, and for us to work through this very important issue.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROYER. I thank my friend for yielding.

First, let me say that this side of the aisle believes the passage of the farm bill is very, very important. It is important for our agricultural interests, for our farmers. We believe it’s very important for those who are relying on nutritional programs and support from us. So we share the view and are strongly in favor of the view of passing a farm bill, number one, I tell my friend.

Secondly, I would tell the gentleman, as he well knows, the farm bill, for the past 2 years, has passed out of the committee with a majority of Democrats, and I think maybe unanimous, but certainly our minority was supported by the Republicans. It passed last year as a bipartisan bill. It was not brought to the floor. It was not brought to the floor, as the gentleman recalls, because of the controversies on your side, not our side, of the aisle.

Mr. PETERSON, to whom the gentleman referred and the ranking member of the committee, was in support of the farm bill. In fact, he indicated that he thought there would be sufficient Democrats, with Republicans, to pass the farm bill. Unfortunately, as the conferee articulated, you lost 62 votes on your side of the aisle, notwithstanding the fact that you adopted three amendments during the course of consideration of the farm bill that Mr. PETERSON advised would undercut his ability and the Democrats’ ability to support the bill.

Very frankly, I tell my friend that what he believes the farm bill was a bipartisan bill supported by a majority of the Democrats in the committee, as the gentleman knows, and by the ranking Democrat, Mr. PETERSON. It came to the floor, however, and that bipartisan was undermined by the amendment of 62 because we didn’t know that was to the knowledge of certainly Mr. LUCAS. I know that Mr. LUCAS knew that it was undermining it.

We now find ourselves in a position—and I understand what the gentleman has said trying to get to conference—where there was little or no discussion, certainly not with me, not with Leader PELOSI, about how we could move forward in creating a greater bipartisan coalition, while clearly recognizing there’s a party and opposition in my party. So the way this could have passed in a constructive way, in my view, would have been had we reached a bipartisan compromise.

Unfortunately, as is too frequently the case, we have seen where we have gone to, in my perspective, an ultra-partisan resolution to try to pass this bill and presumably pick up a number of the 62, and you’ll need a substantial number of the 62 because we don’t believe, as you can tell, that this is a process that we can support. But it is unfortunate because the gentleman is correct, and I respect the gentleman’s observation, it’s important that we pass a farm bill. But for over half a century, we have passed a farm bill in a bipartisan fashion with consideration from the nutrition people in our country to make sure that those who are without food and are hungry would have food.

Mr. SESSIONS. Reclaiming my time, and I would encourage the gentleman to still stand.

We are now here at a point on the floor where we are, rightly or wrongly, attempting to be forthright and honest about what is in the bill and what our intents are. I would hope that the gentleman would recognize that what we have carefully done is excluded some extraneous pieces which might mean—exclude the things which would cause the bill to fail and would not allow us, because we come to no decision therein of the House, that we could not pass the final bill.

And what we’re trying to do is take this to conference without any decision thereon. That is not an indication of a lack of willingness on the part of the Republican leadership or any of our Republican Members. It simply says we could not come to a decision at this point, and what we’re trying to do is to move forward so we can get to conference.

The gentleman, I hope, does recognize that the Senate has spoken. Our conferees would be at the table and simply would not have a position that has been taken by this House. In no way would it mean it couldn’t be discussed or could not be done. So I would encourage the gentleman to rethink that current law would prevail. The current law would prevail because we have come to no decision therein.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I urge every single Democrat and Republican to oppose this rule and to oppose this bill. This is a closed rule. Closed. No amendments. Closed.

And contrary to the claims by some, this bill is not identical to the bill we voted on a few weeks ago. The Republican majority has, in fact, dramatically changed this farm bill. This 608-page bill, introduced an hour before the Rules Committee meeting, has several major changes that we know about. I say “know about” because we really don’t know what’s in this bill, and we do not know how some of the changes will affect long-term farm policy.

Something new in this bill is the repeal of the 1949 permanent law. What does that mean? What impact will that language have on future farm policy? Who knows? There hasn’t been a single hearing on this language; nor has there been markup. Nothing.

This bill also eliminates the entire nutrition title, which includes more than just food stamps. It includes monies for food banks, emergency food assistance, and food for our senior citizens. The whole title is gone.

Three weeks ago, the farm bill was defeated because Democrats were strongly opposed to the assault on nutrition programs. And, quite frankly, some right wing Republicans voted themselves into the gutter by opposing nearly all government programs. Rather than trying to moderate the bill by working with Democrats, rather than compromising, Republican leaders have veered sharply to the right trying to win back the Republican Tea Partyers who voted “no.” And the result of all of this is the bill before us.

Now, my question is: What were the right wingers in the Republican conference promised in order to change their votes from “no” to “yes”? What is the backroom deal that they have negotiated with the Republican leadership? How deep of a cut in the SNAP program were they promised?

Now, last night in the Rules Committee we were told there’s nothing to worry about; that even though title IV was not included in this legislation, it is still conferenceable if the bill were to go to conference with the Senate. We were told that rather than the $30.5 billion cut to SNAP that was in the House bill, that we could end up with the Senate-passed $1.5 billion cut, or that we could end up with no cuts at all.
Does anybody believe that either of those two scenarios is likely or even possible—in this Congress?

I have great respect for the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, Mr. Lucas; but I do not trust this Republican leadership.

I spent a great deal of time on this House floor during the debate on this bill a few weeks ago, and I heard Republican speaker after Republican speaker attack SNAP, attack poor people and diminish their struggle. We had nasty amendments after nasty amendments attached to the bill attacking the nutrition programs that benefit the most vulnerable in America. Some of the rhetoric that was spoken on this floor, quite frankly, was offensive.

And leading up to today’s vote, I read with great interest the recent quotes from Republican Members, some who called for sunsetting of the food stamp program, and some who called for deeper cuts in the program.

Just let’s be clear. This attempt to separate the nutrition title from the rest of the farm bill is all about gutting the nutrition title. It’s all about going after Americans who are struggling in poverty. It’s all about denying the work ethic to food stamp recipients.

So when we’re asked to trust Republican leaders, to give them the benefit of the doubt, I can’t. Trust is something that is earned, and the behavior of this Republican House towards programs that help the working poor, the needy, and the vulnerable has been appalling.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bad bill. This is a bad process. It should be defeated.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I’ve represented my party and my leadership on the floor today in the most sincere way, with an opportunity for me to discuss with senior members, not just of the Rules Committee, but also of the Democratic leadership. And in no way, in no way, is the Republican Party trying to do anything more in this bill that’s on here today other than to bifurcate and to pass pieces of legislation that can go to conference. But we have to find a way to pass the bill.

I would remind my colleagues that 172 Democrats voted against the bill, then passing it to go to conference, and 171 Republicans voted for the bill and sending it to conference.

The height of, really, the work that we do is to gain a chance to have a product, in this case the farm bill, that can then go to conference. It’s not by perfunctory action or event that this can happen. Because the Senate has done their work and finished their work, we are trying to do the same.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RICHMOND) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it’s sinful, it increases poverty in America, and it takes the food off the table of American families.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts’ time will be charged.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman appeal the ruling of the Chair?

Mr. HOYER. I appeal the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bad bill. This is a bad process. It should be defeated.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield.

Mr. Speaker, the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bad bill. This is a bad process. It should be defeated.

I reserve the balance of my time.
Ms. CHU and Ms. SPEIER changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Ms. Slaughter, Mr. Speaker, I’m here to tell you that the opportunity for the Rules Committee to put the bill on the floor, as we did several weeks ago, resulted in 172 Democrats voting against the bill, which meant that it did not make it out of the House, and that’s why we’re here today. We are here today because the bill did not pass. My party and our friends, the Democrats, did not supply enough votes to make sure that we move forward. And my party is here trying to make sure that we get a second shot at passing the farm bill, and that’s what we intend to do.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, I hope to say to my friends, the reason the farm bill was because the farm bill that the Republicans put on the floor would throw 2 million of our fellow citizens off of the food stamp program. The price of the farm bill should not be to make more people hungry in America.

I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. I want to say to my Chairman LUCAS, who pleaded your Chairman LUCAS, who pleaded your majority with trying to do something about this bill. In fact, I’ll tell you what I think. If they decide to bring up the nutrition program as a freestanding bill or anything from the Agriculture Committee, there’s not a chance anywhere—it’s better stated that way—that such could possibly pass the House simply because we had a lot of explaining here this morning. We were told that the fact that the Republicans took the SNAP and nutrition program that the Americans put to the floor is, they decided to go ahead instead of reforming the SNAP program, the Meals on Wheels and what we do to feed people in this country is also a farm program because, believe it, people, that’s where the food comes from. So when you take those programs away, you also hurt the farmers. We had a pretty offensive attempt here about 3 weeks ago to defund the program. So I do not trust, I’m sorry to say, the majority with trying to do something about this bill. In fact, I’ll tell you what I think. If they decide to bring up the nutrition program as a freestanding bill or anything from the Agriculture Committee, there’s not a chance anywhere—it’s better stated that way—that could possibly pass the House simply because we had a lot of explaining here this morning. We were told that the fact that the Republicans took the SNAP and nutrition program out of it would not be construed by the American people as opposed to doing that, it’s just that they thought it was a piece of extraneous matter that they could deal with maybe in this some other way.

What a tragedy is that for all of us to have to go back home and try to explain to the people that we represent that this House—the most dysfunctional House in history—spending $25 million a week to operate the House of Representatives, that our biggest trick here is to pass a bill here that we know there’s no chance in the light of day. Almost all of them have State statements of Administration Policy that no way in the world would the President ever sign any kind of a bill like that. Enough already. Enough. We’ve disgraced ourselves before the country. We have disgraced ourselves in front of the world. Now, we are raising a generation of children right now who have not been adequately taught:

The SPEAKER pro tempore has expired.

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

Ms. Slaughter. I will just end up this way: I’ve been here a while. I’ve never seen anything this dysfunctional. I really am embarrassed to say today that trying to feed people could be a reason why they would stop the farm bill—which, as I said, has been a bipartisan bill, has gone through like a hot knife through butter ever since we started doing farm bills in the United States. This is the lowest of the low. When we can’t pass this, you know, ladies and gentlemen, they can’t run the House.

Mr. Sessions. Mr. Speaker, I’m here to tell you that the opportunity for the Rules Committee to put the bill on the floor, as we did several weeks ago, resulted in 172 Democrats voting against the bill, which meant that it did not make it out of the House, and that’s why we’re here today. We are here today because the bill did not pass. My party and our friends, the Democrats, did not supply enough votes to make sure that we move forward. And my party is here trying to make sure that we get a second shot at passing the farm bill, and that’s what we intend to do.
What we’re trying to do today is to pass this bill on the farm portions. And it is a fair opportunity to take up the bill exactly as we were several weeks ago on debate, on the rule, and on the things which passed this House for the will of the House to have its say. That is what we’re attempting to do today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in this bill a straight reauthorization of the SNAP program without any cuts; current policy, which would be the same language as the chairman of the Rules Committee has promised would be included and drafted by the committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Texas yield for such unanimous consent?

Mr. Sessions. I would not yield for that purpose.

Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, at this point, it’s my privilege to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. Pelosi), the distinguished Democratic leader.

Ms. Pelosi. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his tremendous leadership on behalf of feeding the American people. It seems a very fundamental thing, Biblical in nature, and a very important priority for all of us—except maybe not in this House of Representatives.

I want to thank Congresswoman DeLauro for her relentless, persistent advocacy to feed the hungry in our country. But I rise today—and I’ve thanked them over and over again—to once again thank the Congressional Black Caucus. When they came to the floor today to speak in the manner that they did against this legislation and for values that our country shares about being a community, they spoke not just for America, but for the middle class is what we should be addressing in Congress. And what are we doing? One hundred ninety days we’ve been in this session and no jobs bill yet.

The leadership of the Republican Party says they want regular order. They want regular order. They passed a budget bill. Over 3 months ago, the Senate passed a budget. The regular order would be to go to conference, get rid of the sequester, and to proceed with a bill that invests in America—Mr. Hoyle’s Make It in America, invest in innovation in America, build the infrastructure of America, create jobs, and to do so in a way that builds community, strengthens the middle class, and grows our economy with jobs.

The distinguished leadership of this Republican Party in the House said they want regular order and they have respect for their committees. Well, the Agriculture Committee, in a bipartisan way, passed a bill out of the committee.

I didn’t like the bill. It wouldn’t have been a bill I would have written. When Republicans had the leadership, Democrats cooperated, and a bipartisan bill came out of committee.

The rumor was—and I guess it was maybe not in this House of Representatives—

The audacity to split off the nutrition parts of this bill is so stunning it would be shocking, except this is a “House of shocks.” I would say it is one of the worst things you have done, but there is such still competition for that honor that I can’t really fully say that.

But when you take food out of the mouths of babies and you prevent a bill from going forth that addresses our food banks and our nutrition needs and the rest of our country, what are you thinking? Or are you thinking—or are you thinking?

I thank you, CBC, for your leadership on this. I thank you, Jim McGovern, for your leadership, and I yield back to you, because this is a fight that you are making for every person in America to live in a country of values, of values that include our faith. Our faith tells us that to minister to the needs of God’s creation is an act of worship; to ignore those needs, as this bill does, is to dishonor the God who made us.

This is very wrong. This, even in this place, crosses a threshold that we should never go over again. This is totally out of the question.

I am a mom. One of the reasons I am involved in politics is I see this as an extension of my role as a mother of five kids, and now many grandchildren. God blessed us. Of what drove me to this was that I saw all that my kids had, all the opportunity, all the love, all the concern, all of the rest of it; and I thought the best thing that we could all do is to make sure that our children, for their own welfare, grew up in a country where all of America’s children were treated with respect as we meet their needs. That’s just not happening here today.

I call upon our friends in the faith community, and they are here on this issue, as well as most of the farmers groups and all the rest. There is nobody—there is nobody outside this body who supports this bill who cares about the values that we all profess to hold within these walls.

Again, taking food out of the mouths of babies, that’s a good policy? I don’t think so. Vote “no” on this rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are again reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and not to other Members of the body.

Mr. Sessions. Mr. Speaker, the opportunity, once again, as I stated at the very top of this rule that we began several hours ago, is that the Republican leadership and the Republican membership have great respect for men and women who have fallen on hard times who have lost their jobs, and the millions of people who have lost their jobs and continue to lose their jobs—full-time jobs that have gone to part-time jobs. We recognize that our country is facing very difficult times and more challenges each and every day.

It is our hope through this bill, and a following opportunity, to make sure that the entire piece parts of the will of this body go directly to the conference and meet with the Senate. That is what we are attempting to do today. For Members to ensure that we get to a conference with a complete part of this bill, that is why we are here today and will be here in the immediate future.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the Record a letter from Bob Stallman, the president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, in opposition to this bill.


Hon. Sessions, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Dear Rep. Sessions: The American Farm Bu-
In the wealthiest nation in human history, it is outrageous for any Member of this body who understands the importance of the nutrition program to vote for any such cuts to SNAP as unnecessarily harmful. There is no reason to cut funding to vital programs in America, including thousands of Rhode Islanders.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the rule and the underlying bill, which cuts off nutrition assistance to millions of Americans, including thousands of Rhode Islanders.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the rule; and to the total elimination of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) in the underlying Farm Bill.

Three weeks ago, the House voted down the Republican-led Farm Bill, rejecting its draconian cuts to SNAP as unnecessarily harmful. The bill before us today contains virtually the same farm provisions, only this time it omits any and all funding for nutrition assistance. Splitting agricultural and nutrition policy sets a terrible precedent. In fact, over 500 agricultural groups oppose this bill, as do environmental and animal welfare advocates.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) for a, as, as, as...
on the table. Eighty percent of the households receiving SNAP earn below the federal poverty level, making it a vital form of assistance for working families.

Last month, I proudly joined a group of my Democratic colleagues in taking the SNAP challenge to a community off of living on no more than $2.10 a day in food costs. Every member of Congress should experience what it’s like to subsist on such a paltry sum and should understand the impact of the decisions we make on the lives of the constituents we represent.

When you look at the faces of the plates of hungry children, we have a moral obligation to fully comprehend the consequences of those actions. Under this bill, thousands of Rhode Island families will see their SNAP benefits evaporate. This isn’t a solution; it’s a bait and switch that I cannot support.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule and reject the underlying bill.

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it hurts America’s children.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and underlying bill because it takes food and nutrition from working families and veterans and seniors and children and the disabled and many others in need.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts’ time will be charged.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

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

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you could tell us whether it would be in order to allow the majority to amend the underlying bill that provides for agricultural subsidies to prohibit Members of Congress who receive financial benefits payments and tax payer subsidies from the underlying legislation from actually voting on the legislation from which they directly profit financially? Would that be in order for the majority to amend the bill for that purpose?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The majority manager is in charge of the pending resolution.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I have a further parliamentary inquiry.

Would it be appropriate to ask the majority to make an amendment to the bill to prohibit Members who receive tax payer subsidies from benefiting financially and to prohibit them from voting on the underlying legislation from which they profit financially?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot speculate, but the majority manager may yield for an amendment to the resolution.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve my time.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to a great leader on issues dealing with poverty and hunger, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong opposition to this rule and the underlying Republican bill.

The partisan bill before us is an abomination and shows just how out of touch, out of control, this extreme Tea Party-controlled Congress is. I can’t say, though, that I am surprised. I am sad to say that this House has reached a very shameful point.

This bill also violates decades of bipartisan support for a delicate balance between America’s nutrition programs, farm conservation, and other priorities. This partisan bill also fails to reauthorize nutrition programs, which benefit millions of Americans in rural and urban areas across our country. The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program is our Nation’s first line of defense against hunger and among the most effective forms of economic stimulus.

Republicans say they want to decrease poverty and hunger—I hear this all the time on our committees—yet they do just the opposite.

Be assured this bill will increase poverty and hunger. It is a moral disgrace. Nobody should be in favor of this Republican bill to move forward—not the 532 companies and organizations from every congressional district that have urged this Congress to not break apart the farm bill, not the administration which issued a veto threat last night, and certainly not the millions of low-income and poor people and working families with children and seniors who continue to struggle from the impact of the Great Recession.

Enough is enough. This is un-American. It’s a shame and a disgrace. It’s not only on days that we worship that we must remember to do unto others as you would have them do unto you.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. STUTZMAN).

Mr. STUTZMAN. Thank you, Chairman Sessions, for yielding, and thank you for all of the hard work that you do in the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I am a farmer. I love to farm. It’s in my blood. I farmed before I came to Congress, and I’ll farm when I leave.

So, as a fourth-generation farmer, today I rise to say we have an historic opportunity to legislate responsibly and reform prudently when it comes to farm policy and food stamp policy. We, together, can defeat business as usual in Washington, D.C. For the first time in 40 years, this House has an opportunity to enact landmark reform in ag policy and to separate the farm bill. Because of policy dating back to the Carter administration, 80 percent of the last trillion-dollar farm bill went to food stamps. I don’t believe that’s right, and as a farmer, I can tell you it doesn’t serve farmers well. Believe it or not, it doesn’t serve the needs of those who need help in this country either.

A year ago, I began to call on Congress to separate the farm bill. Our goal has been to reform ag and food stamp policy so that they can really help the folks they were intended to help. Farm policy and food stamp policy should not be mixed. They should stand on their own merits. As Congress immorally sinks our country into debt by $17 trillion, taxpayers deserve an honest conversation in order to find solutions to help Americans who really need help.

Together, we can get this done and pass the first farm-only farm bill in 40 years. Today, we can pass a bill that sends a clear message that the days of deceptively named budget-busting bills are over. By splitting the bill, we can give taxpayers an honest look at how Washington spends our money. We’ve made progress by eliminating direct payments, but there is more work ahead, so splitting the farm bill is the next logical step on the path to real reform in farm policy and in helping those who genuinely need help.

I am proud to vote for this legislation, and I thank all of those who put such hard work into it. As a fourth-generation farmer, I am proud to vote for the first farm-only farm bill in 40 years.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Is it proper to offer an amendment at this time or at some future time on the underlying bill that would preclude Members of Congress who receive financial benefits payments, payments, or subsidies from the under lying legislation from voting on this bill from which they directly profit financially?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The amendment to the rule may only be offered if the majority manager yields for such purpose.

Mr. CICILLINE. I ask the majority manager if he would yield for such an amendment.

Mr. SESSIONS. All time yielded is for the purpose of debate only, and I will not yield for that purpose.

Mr. CICILLINE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?
Mr. SESSIONS. I do not know that the gentleman has been yielded that time by his manager.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has reserved, and the gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the Record a statement from the Club for Growth which is in opposition to this bill and which indicates they will score this vote.

KEY VOTE ALERT—“NO” on “FARM ONLY” BILL (H.R. 2642)

The Club for Growth strongly opposes the “Farm-Only” bill and urges all House members to oppose it. We believe floor consideration of the bill could happen as early as this week. The vote on final passage will be included in the Club’s 2013 Congressional Scorecard.

Breaking up the unholy alliance between agricultural policy and the food stamp program within the traditional farm bill is an excellent decision on behalf of House leadership. However, the whole purpose of splitting up the two is the true reform that reduces the size and scope of government. Sadly, this “farm-only” bill does not do that, especially under an anticipated closed rule. We are determined with market-distorting giveaways to special interests with no path established to remove the government’s involvement in the agriculture industry.

Worse, we highly suspect that this whole process is a “rope-a-dope” exercise. We think House leadership is splitting up the farm bill only to confer with the Senate where a bicameral backroom deal will reassemble the commodity and food stamp titles, leaving us back where we started. Unless provisions are proven to warrant, we will continue to oppose this bill.

Our Congressional Scorecard for the 113th Congress provides a comprehensive rating of how well or how poorly each member of Congress supports pro-growth, free-market policies and will be distributed to our members and to the public.

Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 1/2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. Jackson Lee).

Ms. Jackson Lee asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. The only thing that this House will do when it votes today is defeat starving children. It will again put starving children in the abyss of the uncaring attitude of my friends who for the first time in decades are separating the heart line of the farm bill—the nutrition program, the Special Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, the food stamps program.

I am glad to stand with the Democratic Caucus and the Congressional Black Caucus and others to be able to say that hunger is silent. There are no children at the microphone, on this floor today, standing over here, telling you that their bellies are protruding because they have not eaten. There is no one on this floor today who goes to a summer program and who did not eat because the breakfast program is tied to the summertime to feed their children, and for those who do not have it, no one has told you that the lack of protein in a diet leads to the disease and decay of teeth and bone for the very children that we say are the priority of this place.

In decades, you have never separated the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program—a $20 billion cut, a $3 billion cut, making it $23 billion in cuts. You will never put that on the floor. You will slide it through because all the folks will stand up in front of home to say they believe in deficit reduction. I believe in the life of the children. I believe in growing our children. Vote “no.”

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

Mr. McGovern. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. Stutzman), who is a farmer, very clearly, I believe, spoke about the intent of this bill, and that is that we are going to talk about farm policy.

There are revisions and changes that update not only Federal farm policy, but these are done on a bipartisan basis. The gentlemen on both sides of the aisle—the ranking member and the chairman of the Agriculture Committee—have worked very closely on this, and I believe that what is on the floor today offers an opportunity to debate that and to see if we can pass it.

That’s what we are trying to do.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 1 1/2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. Moore).

Ms. Moore. Mr. Speaker, apparently, it was not enough for the House majority to decimate the nutrition title the last time we considered the farm bill a few weeks ago with the $20 billion cut. When they couldn’t get the majority of Republicans to vote for it because it just wasn’t cut enough, they just eliminated the entire nutrition title—the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, the Emergency Food Assistance Program, the Commodity Supplemental Food Program. These are fancy names and acronyms for the programs that allow seniors, young children, and the disabled to stock their food pantries. I can’t wrap my mind around the shameless nature of this move, a moment when we are moving forward with the farm bill and leaving behind 47 million of our Nation’s hungry.

Now, it has been asserted, Mr. Speaker, that the House leadership is not attempting to starve vulnerable families but merely wants to expedite the passage of the all-important agricultural components of the bill by removing the extraneous nutrition title. Since 1965, we have reauthorized our antihunger programs alongside our agriculture-related policies in a marriage; but at this moment, the House has filed for divorce, and the primary breadwinner is abandoning two-thirds of the family. We know of children and families— the elderly, and the disabled. H.R. 2642 is a deadbeat majority’s proposal to avoid child support, elderly subsidies, and food assistance to the disabled of 47 million people.

What kind of message are we sending with the passage of this bill? We are telling our Nation’s hungry that Congress is willing to turn a blind eye and that food is an extraneous concern of the Congress.

Mr. Sessions. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlelady from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. Christensen) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to this farm bill. It hurts children and families in our country.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlelady from Florida (Ms. Frankel) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. FRANKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to this farm bill rule and underlying bill because it cruelly takes food away from poor children, the elderly, and the disabled.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts’ time will be charged.

Mr. McGovern. I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. Crowley) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to the farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it increases hunger in our country.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts’ time will be charged.

Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Cartwright) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strong opposition to this farm bill rule and the underlying bill because it increases hunger in America, and it punishes all of
those who rely on the SNAP program in this country.

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Symbol, I object. I can’t agree to a unanimous consent request, and that this increases hunger in America. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is not recognized for remarks.

Mr. WATT. Would the Speaker explain to the House why that is the case. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Any request is denied by remarks that are in the nature of debate is charged, not the unanimous consent request itself, but the remarks that follow the unanimous consent request that is accompanied by remarks that are in the nature of debate.

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania's request was heard.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts’ time has been charged.

Mr. WATT. Mr. Speaker, I object to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts to restore the time to the gentleman from Texas, and there were—yeas 138, nays 1.

Mr. WATT. Mr. Speaker, I object to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts for unavoidable reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted 'no.'

Mr. GINGRASS. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, July 11, 2013, I was unavoidable absent. Had I been present, I would have voted 'nay.'

Mr. GOHAN. Mrs. McAdams. Mrs. MURPHY, Mrs. YARMUTH, and Mr. LOWEY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay." So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against: Mr.トンKO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 348 I was unavoidably absent. Had I been present, I would have voted "no.

Mr. BILIRIAN. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, July 11, 2013, I was unavoidably absent, and I demand a yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered. The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 138, nays 265, not voting 31, as follows: