The CHAIR. The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BOST) assumed the chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Lasky, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a Joint Resolution of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 52. Joint Resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Federal Communications Commission relating to ''Restoring Internet Freedom''.

The CHAIR. The Committee will resume its sitting.

AGRICULTURE AND NUTRITION ACT OF 2018

The Committee resumed its sitting.

□ 1715

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM).

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I came to Congress to solve problems and create economic opportunities for New Mexico, which is still struggling with one of the highest unemployment and poverty rates in the Nation.

Now, we had a chance in this farm bill to do just that, and I have worked for years on an array of bipartisan initiatives in this bill, including creating a first-ever broadband grant program to increase internet access in rural communities; expediting the adoption of innovative conservation and water management technologies; and finally banning the heinous practice of lunch shaming.

Unfortunately, the bill the majority brought to the floor today not only jeopardizes all of that bipartisan work, it also includes provisions that will cause so much pain to so many people in my State.

This bill creates new restrictions on SNAP eligibility and a massive unfunded mandate on State bureaucracies which will further destabilize an already broken SNAP system in New Mexico.

I have spent years working to hold my State accountable for their mismanagement of SNAP and for illegally denying thousands of individuals their benefits. Under this bill, those mistakes will become much more common. Millions of Americans will be needlessly kicked off SNAP, and more children and families will go hungry.

Mr. Chairman, it may be politically expedient to bring this partisan bill to the floor that destroys SNAP as we know it, but passing a partisan bill that will undoubtedly die in the Senate does nothing for the Americans who wait for Congress to do their jobs.

This bill is the perfect reflection of what is wrong with Washington: that politics will always take priority over progress. I urge my colleagues to recommit to the bipartisan collaborative work that is desperately needed by farms, ranchers, and vulnerable Americans in every single one of our districts. This is the only way we will pass a farm bill and fulfill our commitment to the constituents we have a duty to serve.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ROUZER).

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Chairman, America's farm families have had to weather a 5-year recession with depressed prices resulting in a 52-percent drop in net farm income. Two-thirds of our farming operations today are in economic trouble, and chapter 12 bankruptcies have risen by 33 percent in just 2 years. So it is no secret that our Nation's farmers and ranchers are struggling.

I hear all this talk during the past month about a free market, how everything would be so much better without farm programs. ''We want a complete, total free market,'' they say. From an intellectual and philosophical standpoint, I would love that. We all would. But here is the problem: that isn't the real world.

There is no free market when you have countries all around the world subsidizing their agriculture production to the hilt. For example, Communist China agreed to a subsidy limit as part of their accession to the WTO in 2001. But what do they do? They exceed that subsidy limit by $100 billion on just three crops alone in 1 year. That is no free market.

Farm programs account for 0.24 percent of the total Federal budget, and in return, every individual and family in this country is guaranteed an abundant, affordable food supply, and the very best nutritious food at an exceptionally affordable price. That is, quite frankly, a huge return on a relatively small investment, not to mention what agriculture means to our rural economies and our trade balance with the rest of the world.

American agriculture is more than just being the best producers in the business and feeding the world. It is about food security and national security. Once a farm is gone, it isn't coming back. It is not like your local hardware store that goes out of business; it is not like that space isn't going to be replaced by another business; it will. Farms, on the other hand, are replaced by developments taking some of our very best farmland out of production.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from North Carolina an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Chairman, we have lost 44 million acres of farmland during the past 30 years.

Mr. Chairman, passage of this farm bill is absolutely critical to the livelihood and success of our farm families and food supply. I encourage and hope that every one of us will vote for this bill.

This farm bill strengthens the farm safety net while making other vital improvements to current law that will benefit our farm families, rural communities, and animal agriculture sector—such as the establishment of a new U.S.-only vaccine bank to prevent Foot-and-Mouth disease, authorizing $1.1 billion to provide broadband service to harder-to-serve rural areas, and providing the Secretary of Agriculture with tools necessary to help combat the ongoing opioid crises which is hitting rural America especially hard.

Additionally, this farm bill makes common sense changes to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program to encourage work and provide for job training.

The vast majority of Americans would agree that if you work you should be better off than if you don't work. Under this bill, we simply ask that those who are of working age and are perfectly capable, work 20 hours a week. And, if one can't find work we will pay for their job training so that everyone can attain the skills necessary to get the job they want.

The unfortunate reality is that we have too many SNAP recipients stuck in the program with no pathway to upward mobility. Why? Because current SNAP requirements are outdated and riddled with loopholes that incentivize the status quo and fail to support those who need it most. In fact, more than 2/3 of work-capable adults on SNAP are not currently employed.

Today unemployment numbers are at 3.9 percent. In the year 2000, the last time unemployment was this low, there were 17 million people on SNAP. Today, we have more than 41 million people on SNAP yet the unemployment is exactly the same. Mr. Speaker, if that doesn't illustrate the problem, I don't know what does.

We must do better.

This farm bill puts this country on the path to do just that. It makes much needed reforms to ensure that recipients of these benefits—those who are perfectly capable of work—have a pathway to upward mobility, can get good jobs, and ultimately use their God-given talents to achieve a rewarding career.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), who is the chairman of the House Democratic Caucus.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

We need to talk about what is really happening with this bill. Just months after giving massive tax cuts to corporations and the wealthiest individuals through their tax scam, Republicans are now penalizing the most vulnerable among us by cutting one of the most proven and valuable programs that ensures that kids, seniors, and working Americans don't go hungry.

If my Republican colleagues looked at the facts, they would see that SNAP—or food stamps—actually work. They would see that a worker is more likely to keep a job if they can put food

on the table and at the same time afford to commute to and from work; that a child is likely to do better in school if they have a full stomach to start the school day with; that calling struggling Americans complacent and lazy doesn't help America's poverty crisis, but programs like SNAP do help.

If they could see all that, then we wouldn't be here debating a partisan bill that is bad for families, bad for farmers, and bad for our country.

Mr. Chairman, the problem isn't food stamp recipients. The problem isn't food stamps. The problem is those who claim they want to help American families, and then do everything in their power to hurt them by passing this partisan bill. I will not vote for it.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO), who is a valued member of the committee.

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

Only two times each decade do we in Congress have the privilege to effect productive, meaningful change for America's farmers and ranchers—those same citizens who help feed and clothe the entire world.

Let us not forget that America's farmers and ranchers make up only 1 percent of our Nation's population, yet they make sure that dinner tables across the country have food on them. In fact, one farm feeds 165 people in the U.S. and abroad. As such, U.S. farm policy is now a target due to its own success.

Politically driven think tanks and antifarmer groups believe that there is no longer a point to have a farm policy in the United States. They fail to realize that America's farmers and ranchers do business with foreign competitors who do not share the free market values our country adopted at its founding, placing them at a disadvantage; therefore, we have to properly equip our producers to compete with countries that directly subsidize and own the means of production. It is, indeed, an issue of national security.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Florida an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. YOHO. Support this farm bill. Defeat all antifarmer amendments that hurt American farm families only to enrich multinational soda and candy makers for more profits. Let us ensure the farmers and ranchers of this great country continue to plant the seeds and raise the herds that secure our national abundance, high quality, and least costly food prices in the world and support the bill.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN).

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to remind my colleagues of the simple truth that process matters. If the process fails, the outcome fails. That is exactly what has happened with this farm bill.

Instead of following regular order, as we have done in the past—and I was there personally to be a part of it and witness it—by taking this kind of legislation up through the subcommittees with open rules, giving all the members an opportunity to offer their amendments and their ideas and consider them and have the opportunity to write this bill through the subcommittees, instead, it has come from behind closed doors for the simple purpose of partisan positioning.

In fact, members of the committee weren't even allowed to see this bill for weeks leading up to the consideration, nor were stakeholders and affected parties given the opportunity to review and express their thoughts. The result is a missed opportunity and an abandonment of a bipartisan, collaborative tradition that has worked so well for the farmers and the consumers in this country. It is a mean-spirited, bad bill—the result of a failed process—and it should be defeated.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER).

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Chairman, in my home State of Minnesota, agriculture is one of the primary drivers of our economy. Right now, farmers, ranchers, and agricultural workers across the country are looking to Congress for a strong farm bill that improves the farm safety net and brings certainty to producers in uncertain times because life on the farm isn't what it used to be.

Today, farmers are suffering some of the worst rates of suicide in the country. General social isolation, downturn of the markets, low farm income, regulatory strains, and a lack of treatment options all make it hard for farmers to get the help they need.

That is why I introduced the STRESS Act to boost resources specifically for farmers' mental health. With the support of Chairman CONAWAY and the House Agriculture Committee, I am proud to see it included in this year's farm bill.

Our farmers who feed the world are feeling the weight of the world on their shoulders. It is time we get them the help and care they deserve.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BUSTOS).

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Chairman, passing a farm bill that delivers a better deal to our growers could have and should have been a bipartisan process. But when Democrats arrived ready to work, the doors were shackled shut. Instead of coming together to help our producers struggling with a downturn in the agricultural economy, this hyperpartisan bill hurts everyone from pasture to plate.

It cuts $23 billion from a program that feeds children, seniors, and veterans in addition to eliminating mandatory funding for rural development programs which are proven job creators in rural America. This bill also strips farmers, who are facing tightening market conditions, of crop insurance options.

This ''harm'' bill is another step in the wrong direction for rural America. At a time when farmers are already feeling the pain of President Trump's impulsive trade war and Secretary Pruitt's attack on ethanol, I urge my colleagues: abandon this ''harm'' bill and work together on a farm bill that will strengthen rural America.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time remains on each side.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas has 14¾ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Minnesota has 18 minutes remaining.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 2, the Agriculture and Nutrition Act of 2018.

I have the great honor of representing Georgia's 12th District where agriculture is the number one industry. As a member of the House Agriculture Committee, my colleagues and I have worked diligently to craft a farm bill that works for our farmers and provides them the ability to provide a safe, secure, and economic food supply to this Nation.

H.R. 2 improves the current farm safety net structure and offers farmers the choice between PLC and ARC for each covered commodity under title I to combat the downturn in the farm economy. It also makes strides in getting Americans back to work by helping those on Supplemental Nutrition Assistance.

I am the son of a farmer. I spent 35 years in the business community creating jobs. The greatest joy of my life is to give folks the dignity and respect they deserve to have a good job.

How could we deny folks this opportunity?

This bill gives them that opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote ''yes'' for this important bill. Our farmers and our people need us.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), who is the ranking member of the Education and Workforce Committee.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, there is a lot wrong with this bill, but as ranking member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, I am particularly concerned about its impact on students.

SNAP eligibility is tied to eligibility for other vital Federal programs, so the proposed cuts in SNAP eligibility will also cut access to free school meals for 265,000 children.

□ 1730

Research has consistently shown that students struggling with hunger have

lower grades, are less able to focus, and more likely to miss school. This bill would undermine the ability of hundreds of thousands of students to reach their full potential by cutting SNAP benefits for the family and reducing school benefits for children.

In the wake of a $1.5 trillion tax cut for corporations in the top 1 percent, it is a shameful statement of priorities when you try to pay for these tax cuts by reducing food assistance programs for low-income students.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Mrs. ROBY).

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer my strongest support for H.R. 2, the Agriculture and Nutrition Act of 2018, commonly known as the farm bill.

I am proud to serve Alabama's Second District, where agriculture is the largest employer, responsible for more than 93,000 jobs and more than $11 billion in economic impact.

So, Mr. Chair, I know how critically important it is that Congress deliver agricultural policy that actually works for the farmers throughout Alabama, and our country, and makes their important work easier, not harder.

That is why I am proud the new farm bill addresses many of the challenges farmers face every day, including streamlining and reducing burdensome Federal pesticide regulations, creating a program to address our Nation's feral hog problem, and strengthening the existing crop insurance program.

In addition to this, the new farm bill makes several needed improvements to our country's nutrition assistance program by implementing strict work requirements and closing loopholes that allow for abuses of the system.

I am proud that the new farm bill maintains vital nutrition for our most vulnerable Americans when they truly need it, while making a commitment to helping these individuals improve their circumstances.

I support the legislation.

Mr. Chair, I have always believed that we should incentivize able-bodied Americans to work instead of encourage them to remain dependent on the government, so I'm proud that the new farm bill reflects our conservative principles.

I am pleased that this legislation provides a commitment to our nation's farmers while taking important steps towards reforming our food stamps program.

I will continue to advocate for policies that give fair treatment to our Alabama commodities like cotton, peanuts, timber, poultry, soybeans, and catfish. I'm eager to cast my vote in favor of the new farm bill, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER).

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 2 and to express my profound disappointment in the process that has led us to where we are today.

As the first New Hampshire Representative to serve on the Agriculture Committee in decades, I am humbled by the responsibility to fight for New Hampshire's small family farms.

When we last considered the farm bill in 2014, I supported the legislation because, while not perfect, that bill provided long-term certitude to our Nation's farmers and represented a compromise between Republicans and Democrats.

The farm bill has always been a bipartisan piece of legislation, but the bill we vote on this week represents a complete departure from that bipartisan process. Democrats were pushed away from the negotiating table by an extreme ideological agenda that would increase food insecurity for millions of Americans, slash mandatory spending on critical rural development and conservation programs, and lead to 265,000 children losing access to free and reduced school lunch.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Commodity Exchanges, Energy, and Credit.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to urge support for H.R. 2, the Agriculture and Nutrition Act of 2018, also known as the farm bill.

Rural America needs our support. Farm income has fallen approximately 50 percent since 2013. That is one of the steepest drops since the Great Depression. The costs of production have steadily declined, while commodity prices have fallen. Unfair trade practices, like the dumping of specialty crops into our markets from Mexico, are hurting our U.S. producers. The digital divide caused by inadequate or a lack of broadband services has held back innovation, job growth, and education in rural America. Crises like the opioid epidemic have stricken rural communities across America, just as it has our cities.

Mr. Chairman, the farm bill addresses all of these challenges while also taking the first major step in this Congress toward the President's vision of meaningful welfare reform. This is our opportunity to provide the needed certainty and support for our farmers and producers, while also providing commonsense reforms that will support the President's agenda of achieving prosperity in our rural communities. Passing a strong farm bill on time is key to this goal.

I ask that my colleagues join me in supporting this important piece of legislation and oppose those amendments that will hamper its ability to aid rural America and keep our producers feeding not only America, but the world. This bill provides certainty to one of America's largest job sectors, while also standing for our conservative principles.

Mr. Chair, I ask that my colleagues join me in support of H.R. 2, the Agriculture and Nutrition Act of 2018, the farm bill.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA), the ranking member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, I oppose the farm bill. It would hurt low- and middle-income families, take breakfast and lunch from children across this country, and fail hardworking farmers.

It also undermines one of the Nation's most successful and popular conservation laws, the Endangered Species Act, by removing the requirement for EPA to consult with expert wildlife agencies on the impact of pesticides to imperiled wildlife.

Pesticides are known to have been the cause of the dramatic decline of many species and a threat to public health. It should not be dispensed with in this legislation.

The provisions in this legislation that are anti-environment, anti-public health, anti-nutrition, and anti-working families are cause for opposition. I urge a ''no'' vote.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD), the chairman of the General Farm Commodities and Risk Management Subcommittee.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chair, I thank the chairman for his leadership on this issue.

Let me start by saying that it is not very often that we talk about agriculture in the context of national security. I believe it is next week we are going to be taking up the NDAA reauthorization. While that is very important to our national security, I think it is equally important to consider how vital our agriculture producers are to our national security. A country that can't feed itself is a country that is not secure. It is inviting danger and peril. All you have to do is look around the globe and see those nations that are in that situation. Most notably in our hemisphere, Venezuela can't feed themselves. You can see the turmoil that has ensued as a result.

But there are other countries around the world. One of the big ones that we don't talk about very often and, quite frankly, we should, and that is China can't feed themselves. They have 1.4 billion people.

What we should be doing is taking every effort during this debate to thank farmers across the country for what they do and for the security they provide to this Nation, recognizing that, without them, the nutrition programs that we are fighting over couldn't exist.

Let's get a little different perspective, if we can, and recognize that, first and foremost, we have got to have the food produced, not only to provide a level of security in this Nation, but to be able to feed the 300 million-plus that call this country home.

Second, we have to be about trying to secure that food source and making sure that farmers are in a competitive marketplace that gives them equal opportunities to sell their commodities.

Certainly, the nutrition part of this is paramount. But I think most Americans across the country—and I think

there are polls that bear this out—some 75 percent of Americans say, yes, we probably should encourage folks to work and/or get educated as a component of receiving nutrition benefits. That is all we are saying. We are not trying to compromise anyone's nutrition or threaten a single calorie.

One thing I think we need to clarify, too, is the Agriculture Committee has no jurisdiction over school nutrition programs.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I just remind the gentleman that the nutrition program is permanently authorized. It doesn't even need to be in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS).

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Chair, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I rise today to voice my strong opposition to the 2018 Republican farm bill.

As a member of the House Committee on Agriculture, I have participated in countless hearings about the needs of our Nation's farmers and families that depend on SNAP to fight hunger.

Tragically, this bill doesn't reflect any of that testimony. It is a short-sighted, partisan bill that will have a detrimental impact on communities like mine. I cannot support it.

In my home county of Mecklenburg, North Carolina, more than 55,000 households depend on SNAP to eat every day. This bill would rob them of access to quality nutrition programs. In North Carolina, it is estimated that more than 133,000 people will lose their SNAP benefits if this bill passes, including over 51,000 children. Nationwide, 2 million people would be kicked off the program and an estimated 265,000 children would lose access to free or reduced meals at school. No eating at home. No eating at school.

Adding new work requirements through an unfunded, untested mandate will bankrupt States and force more needy people out of the program. Let's scrap this flawed partisan farm bill and let's work together in regular order to draft a bill that helps America's farmers and families who depend on nutrition assistance.

Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD a letter from Mecklenburg County, North Carolina, opposing H.R. 2 because of the detrimental effects and impact that it will have on our children and families there.

MECKLENBURG COUNTY,
Charlotte, North Carolina, April 17, 2018.

Congresswoman ALMA ADAMS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN ALMA ADAMS: As you mark-up of the Farm Bill reauthorization, H.R. 2 this week, I write to you in support of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) funding, formerly known as Food Stamps, which has historically made up a significant part of this legislation. This vital program offers nutrition assistance to millions of eligible, low-income individuals and families and provides economic benefits to communities. In total, more than 40 million low-income people depend upon this program to keep their families fed.

The Agriculture and Nutrition Act of 2018 (H.R. 2) is the legislative vehicle for reauthorizing and reforming the programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023. The last enacted Farm Bill (PL 113–79) is set to expire on September 30. The proposed reauthorization bill is scheduled for markup with the House Agriculture Committee this Wednesday, April 18. It contains several provisions and budget cuts that are troubling and could detrimentally impact our community.

The bill includes provisions that expand work requirements and punish the least fortunate members of our community who are often times unable to find employment. Specifically, the bill makes it mandatory that recipients of SNAP, who are able-bodied adults, ages 18 to 59, are either employed or are participating in state-run employment or job-training programs. Participants could be denied benefits for not meeting the new work requirements. The first suspension of benefits would be for 12 months, while a second suspension of benefits would be up to 36 months. Under current law, the SNAP program already has work requirements for able-bodied adults aged 18 to 49. Additionally, the new Farm Bill would include spending cuts, which would make fewer people eligible for benefits and directly harm working-poor families. Mecklenburg County has real concern that these proposed changes in H.R. 2 would negatively impact some of our poorest citizens and cause serious difficulties for our community's most vulnerable populations.

Mecklenburg has 55,472 households that rely on SNAP to help provide sustenance. The County also has specific concerns with language in H.R. 2 that reduces spending by $5 billion over 10 years through the ending of a broad-based categorical eligibility that allows states to consider working poor beneficiaries with higher incomes that put them above 130 percent of the federal poverty level.

We look forward to working with you on this important effort. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

DENA R. DIORIO,
Mecklenburg County Manager.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, how much time is remaining on each side.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas has 9 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Minnesota has 13¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. O'HALLERAN), a member of the committee.

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my strong opposition to H.R. 2. Some may call this a farm bill, but for my district, this is a ''harm'' bill.

Unfortunately, this year's farm bill is deeply flawed. This bill lacks a significant commitment to the needs of rural communities, with no guaranteed funding for the rural development title.

It is unclear to me how members of the committee say they understand the need of investment in rural America, but decided to cut $517 million from rural development programs.

As we work to help communities build stronger economies, we must ensure that we have a plan in place that lends a helping hand to those who need it. In Arizona, this bill will take food out of the mouths of tens of thousands of children and veterans. It is a sad day in America when we are debating a proposal that would make children go hungry.

I hope for a robust debate on how we could promote rural economic development and how to improve the business climate for rural communities and work to address resource concerns by improving conservation programs like EQIP.

Sadly, this bill was written in a back room and kept secret until the last possible moment. We owe the American people something better.

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

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, but also for his tremendous leadership on this bill and so many other issues.

I rise in strong opposition to this disastrous farm bill. This bill cuts the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program by $23 billion, taking food out of the mouths of 2 million Americans. Over 265,000 children will lose benefits.

Why in the world do congressional Republicans want more Americans to go hungry?

This is immoral and it is wrong.

These so-called work requirements won't help anyone work. They punish struggling families who are not getting enough hours at work or decent wages to help feed their families.

Nutrition assistance helps 40 million people put food on the table. More than 80 percent of SNAP households work the year before or after receiving aid. The majority of people receiving SNAP benefits are children, disabled, and seniors.

When I was young, I was a single mom raising two little boys. I relied on food stamps to help my family during a very difficult time in my life. It was a bridge over troubled waters. I want families to have this bridge over troubled waters now.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to clarify the RECORD.

Of the 265,000 children that have been mentioned a couple of times, 95 percent of them would in fact maintain access to reduced lunch prices because their families make too much money to qualify for the free lunch, but 5 percent of that 265,000 would in fact maintain the free lunch program as it currently exists.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS), chairman of the Subcommittee on Biotechnology, Horticulture, and Research.

□ 1745

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I have a district that relies on a strong farm bill. Illinois is a leading producer of soybeans, corn, and swine. Our economy relies on a farm bill that supports agriculture. Although we all eat, I realize there are many districts whose Members may not be as enthusiastic as I am about the farm bill. That is why there is something in this bill for every district.

For those concerned about the deficit, I have good news. The last farm bill was the single largest cut in mandatory spending that we made in the entire 113th Congress. We built on these sound policy reforms in this bill.

If you are a Member who wants to address the cycle of poverty that too many of our constituents are trapped in, this bill is for you. H.R. 2 reforms the system and invests historic amounts in workforce training.

Despite our growing economy, we have 9 million more people on SNAP today than we did at the height of the recession when jobs were scarce and unemployment was in the double digits. This isn't progress. This isn't helping to end the cycle of poverty.

In my home State of Illinois, 67 percent of work-capable adults on SNAP are without work. A long recession left Americans disheartened, people dropping out of the labor force because they lost their job and, after months and months of searching, couldn't find another one. H.R. 2 makes investments to give many of those same people hope in finding a job again.

Four years ago I was a freshman, and the farm bill was my first opportunity to be part of a conference committee and see firsthand our democracy at work, Democrats and Republicans sparring over policy differences. But at least there was a debate. I am incredibly disappointed by my friends on the other side of the aisle who didn't offer any amendments in committee.

Work requirements are not new. They were done in 1996 by a Republican-led Congress and Democratic President during a similar time of economic growth.

When do the politics end and the serious policy discussions begin?

Let's put politics aside, pass this important bill for our farmers, for our taxpayers, and for too many Americans trapped in poverty. Let's show the American people we can govern together.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the leader of the Democratic Caucus.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I especially thank him for his exceptional leadership over the years to honor the historic collaboration that has always existed in our country between urban and rural America that is in all of our interests that our farm countries succeed, and that is in all of our interests that the American people are not food insecure. So I thank you, Mr. Ranking Member, for your outstanding leadership on behalf of America's farmers and hungry families.

Mr. Chair, this bill is just a mystery to me because we have tried so hard over the years to work in a bipartisan way, to come together to write a farm bill that does honor that historic collaboration—urban, rural—meeting the nutritional needs of the American people, and encouraging the economic growth in farm country. This legislation does not do that, and I have some questions as to why.

Some of the questions came to mind last week when I was on a farm in Iowa listening to hardworking men and women talk about their challenges with this farm bill: that it does not bolster or preserve the farmer safety net; that the bill reduces investments in agriculture research, conservation, and rural development; and that it cuts nutrition assistance that so many there, even in farm country, and in our country rely upon.

When I was in Iowa, as I said, last week, I had the privilege of meeting a wonderful woman named Julia Slocum. Julia works two jobs. She is a third-generation farmer and a part-time librarian. Over the years, she has relied on the lifeline of SNAP to put food on the table during difficult times, a farmer relying on SNAP to put food on the table.

I challenge House Republicans to explain to Julia why they are abandoning hardworking people like her, abandoning her twice by gutting the farmer safety net and by cutting SNAP.

This bad bill steals food off the tables of children, seniors, students. 1.5 million of our veterans rely on the nutrition provision of this bill.

It is not just our veterans. That would be reason alone to be concerned, 1.5 million. But 23,000 of the families of Active-Duty servicemembers need to have food stamps because they are food insecure—and they are hurt by this legislation—individuals with disabilities, working families, our seniors, students, children. Children.

Democrats have always supported work initiatives for those who can work. Let's be clear: This is not a jobs bill. SNAP returns money to farmers, to our economy, and to the Treasury, creating $1.79 for every $1 in benefits, and supports more than 560,000 jobs across the country, including 50,000 in agriculture.

Republicans are contending that they are investing in jobs. They are not investing in jobs. They are creating a bureaucracy and ignoring initiatives already in place to measure what really works in relating food to jobs. And they are wasting billions on new bureaucracies that would take decades to implement and that would increase hunger and poverty across the country.

It is no wonder that so many faith-based groups across the country view this bill as one that does not reflect the values of America. Again and again, Republicans try to ransack the lifelines of working families to pay for handouts and to enrich the already wealthy. This bill abandons America's farmers when they are in a tough spot.

The farm economy is struggling. As you know, farm prices are plummeting. More and more families are in danger of losing the farm, and that was before the Trump tariffs invited retaliation from China. Yet Republicans are creating a self-inflicted crisis farming communities can't afford and they can't control.

I challenge House Republicans to explain to farmers and ranchers why they propose a bill that weakens the farmer safety net when we should be protecting family farmers—soybean, corn, wheat, pork, and specialty crop growers—from self-inflicted damage of Trump's trade brinkmanship.

Explain why this bill slashes hundreds of millions from rural development initiatives, cuts small business loan guarantees, and adds new layers of bureaucracy to high-speed broadband grants when we should be investing in self-sufficiency for small towns.

Explain, my Republican colleagues, why this bill eliminates funding for on-farm energy initiatives and biofuels when we should be embracing the American farmer's role in making America sustainable and energy independent.

Explain, my colleagues, why this bill creates new loopholes for millionaires, multimillionaires, and billionaires to receive farm subsidies when we should be investing in the next generation of farmers and ranchers.

For the sake of our children, families, and hardworking Americans such as Julia, for our veterans, for our servicemen and -women, Americans with disabilities, we must return to the table and craft a balanced, robust, bipartisan farm bill as we have done in the past and the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture knows is possible.

We must return to the historic, decades-long bipartisan solution that weds our farmers and our hungry families together. Republicans must put aside politics and honor our responsibilities to 16 million men and women of agriculture and the nearly 41 million Americans who are food insecure. That is why I urge a ''no'' on this dangerous bill.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA).

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chair, as I have told you, it is an absolute honor to serve on the Committee on Agriculture, under the leadership of the chairman as well as the ranking member. There is no doubt about that. But I mainly say that based on the work that this committee does, the work that this committee does to serve those in agriculture and what that

service can do for the backbone industry of our country.

However, as a Representative on this committee and as a Representative of the salad bowl of the world on the central coast of California, my country and, yes, my community expected more out of this farm bill.

Look, in my area, with its flourishing specialty crop industry, we wanted more funding for the specialty crop research initiative. Because of our specialty crops, we have a labor shortage because of the people who are needed to pick those crops. Therefore, we needed stronger language in the bill for mechanization to help with our labor issues and to bridge that gap from the Salinas Valley into the Silicon Valley.

With our burgeoning organic industry, we needed more funding and less cuts for the Organic Certification Cost Share Program so that we can properly invest in beginning producers.

In addition to this, the majority is trying to implement an untested and unproven change to title IV of the SNAP provision. Such a change threatens to remove over a million people from the program and deeply affects the 74,000 people who are recipients of SNAP living and working in my community.

We can do better by our farmers. We can do better by the families across our country by getting back to our bipartisan roots. That is how we help our agriculture. That is how we help our country.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 2, the Agriculture and Nutrition Act of 2018. Included in this great bill are two bills I introduced: the WATER Act and the STRESS Act, which was introduced with other colleagues as well.

The WATER Act improves water quality by easing access to the Conservation Innovation Grant program and reducing red tape. Iowans expect and deserve clean water, and this bill will help do that.

The STRESS Act will help address the farmer suicide crisis gripping our Nation. By opening the Farm and Ranch Stress Assistance Network, farmers facing tough times can get the help that they need. Our farmers feed, fuel, and sustain the world. It is only right we take steps to help them.

I was also pleased—and I thank the chairman—that in the farm bill there are positive steps to address the food waste that is out there in our country. Our country wastes 40 percent of our food supply. As a cofounder of the Food Waste Caucus, I am committed to reducing food waste to combat hunger, as well as are many of my colleagues.

Mr. Chair, I thank Chairman CONAWAY as well for his leadership by putting in the bill the Food Loss and Waste Reduction Liaison at the USDA so we can take another step to reduce food waste by 50 percent by 2030.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chair, may I inquire how much time we have on our side.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Minnesota has 9¼ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chair, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Delaware (Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER).

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Mr. Chairman, it is with deep disappointment that I stand in opposition to the partisan farm bill. I joined the House Committee on Agriculture because of its reputation of being bipartisan. I represent an entire State—urban, rural, and suburban. The farm bill is vital. That is why I was so disappointed to see this breakdown.

The goal of creating a thriving economy and moving people out of poverty is a goal we all share, and throughout my career I have worked to connect people with jobs. As Delaware's former secretary of labor and deputy secretary of health and social services, I have overseen both workforce development and economic safety net programs.

I believe in work. We believe in work. However, the majority's proposal would essentially force individuals off SNAP to pay for an unproven, untested, severely underfunded program.

What happens if your child gets sick or your car breaks down? Should that mean you and your child go hungry for up to a year if you are sanctioned?

What makes this even more troubling is that the 10 pilot programs designed to give us best practices in providing employment and training services to SNAP recipients, one of which is in my home State of Delaware, have not been completed or evaluated and won't be until at least 2019.

Why are we putting the cart before the horse? If the majority is really concerned with getting the policy right, why not wait until we have the evidence and the data to make good use of taxpayer dollars?

To understand the impact on Delaware, I traveled across my State and met with farmers, emergency food providers, supermarket owners, and State agencies. But the conversation that surprised me the most was one I had recently with a father. He shared how, years ago, SNAP and public housing allowed him and his wife to raise three healthy daughters. Because of support, he was the first in his family to graduate from high school and college and, ultimately, to move out of poverty.

He paid that debt back in multiple ways through service. He went on to become a social worker, a school administrator, and, subsequently, was elected city council president.

The value of service was then passed down. One daughter went to work in the White House and is now a professor of social work at Rutgers University. The second daughter became an engineer and worked for the U.S. Army, protecting our troops. And his oldest daughter grew up to be a Congresswoman. That dad is my dad.

Colleagues, we still have a chance to go back to the drawing board. The hopes, the dreams, the aspirations of 42 million people are in our hands. Let's not let them down.

□ 1800

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS), the former chairman of the committee.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, it is hard to believe, but almost 5 years ago, COLLIN, MIKE, we were on the floor of this very Chamber when we took up the previous farm bill, a farm bill that was well crafted and well intended. And on that day, if you remember, folks of good principle on both extremes of the perspective together managed to bring the bill down.

Now, why do I bring that up? Because I simply want to remind all my colleagues, no farm bill is ever simple. They are all hard. Circumstances change from cycle to cycle, crop to crop, but it is always hard to do a farm bill.

So why are we here? Why do we keep going through this process? Because, ultimately, we need to pass a comprehensive piece of legislation that will make sure we have the ability to raise the food and fiber that our neighbors need; that we can sell into the world markets to meet their needs; and, yes, that we provide the ability, through this same piece of legislation, so that our neighbors, who, through tough times, through, most often, circumstances beyond their control, have the ability to access enough of that food to meet their needs.

So, yes, we have to have a farm bill. We have to have a farm bill. I would say to all my colleagues, this is a step in the long march to ultimately creating a final document that involves the other body and requires a signature by the Chief Executive of this country.

Let's debate and argue and fight out amendments tonight and tomorrow and the next day. Let's avoid what happened 5 years ago by doing things that would try to kill the process. Let's keep the process moving forward. Let's refine. Let's perfect. Let's pass a comprehensive farm bill so the people who feed and clothe us have the ability to do it, so those who need help in receiving the resources they need have the ability to do it.

We have no less option: Good faith. Do what you need to do, but let's get it done. There are people depending on us everywhere and around the world today.

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

Mr. Chairman, as I spoke earlier on the drawbacks of H.R. 2, I may not have mentioned, before I reserved, that I am very frustrated by the breakdown in this process that has got us to where we are.

Now, Mr. LUCAS is right, we do have to have a farm bill, but let's understand what we need to do that actually is required. Title 1 needs a farm bill. Title 2 needs a farm bill. Other titles need a farm bill because they are only authorized for 5 years.

SNAP is permanently authorized. If we didn't do anything, SNAP would go on like it is. Crop insurance is permanently authorized. If we didn't do anything, crop insurance would go on just like it is. So the part of the bill that we are worried about are these other parts that will expire on the end of September 30.

Now, what happens if we don't get it done? We go back to permanent law. Some of my constituents think that is a good idea because it goes back to 100 percent of parity. Most people in America probably know what I am talking about when I talk about 100 percent of parity, but a lot of old timers in my district know very much what that is. And, you know, it is $9 corn. They would love to have $9 corn.

So the permanent law is not an option. So we need to get something done. But my point is that we don't need to do some of the things that we are doing in these areas that are not required to do anything because they are permanently authorized.

So, as I speak today, you know, I refused to give legitimacy to what has been, in my view, an illegitimate process. The chairman said we tried to work on a bipartisan basis. You know, we didn't raise any issues at the time because he said he didn't have any money and we were going along with the system. And that is till we got into the situation where this SNAP stuff came forward, you know, and I told you this was not going to fly in our caucus. And you can see over here the feelings that you have engendered with this proposal, you know, and it is breaking apart what we have had here in this country for a long time.

I have been here for four farm bills. I have been here as a member, as a chairman, and as a ranking member. Now, as Frank said, each of these bills has had their share of headaches, and they have all, at the end of the day, though, had more common ground than opposition. And in the end, the Agriculture Committee has always produced a product that we could be proud of because we knew we delivered the best deal possible, given the circumstances that we were dealing with.

We have always been able to work together for the mutual benefit of farmers, rural advocates, and consumers. Prior to my time here, Senator Dole and McGovern carried the medal—Hubert Humphrey from my State, George Aiken before that. These weren't ideologues, but they weren't pushovers either. Each knew where their party stood. Each also knew the value making sure the length between people who grow the food and the people who buy food and make sure that that link was strong.

So let me be as clear as I can be. In my opinion, breaking up that coalition, ruining a partnership that predates all of us is a huge mistake. More than that, the closed- and one-sided nature of this process that we have been through is something that I have to call out. It does not bode well for farm and food legislation to come.

No party can do this alone. It is too big of a job. So, as ranking member on the House Agriculture Committee, I want you to know that I am willing to come back to the table but only when the majority has the ability to sit down and figure this out together.

I was told on this SNAP stuff by the chairman that he could not negotiate it—it was nonnegotiable. That is what got us into this problem. So, when we get to the point where we can actually start talking about negotiation, I am willing to come back to the table and try to get back to a bipartisan situation.

Folks want to do welfare reform. I was there in 1996. I was part of the deal at that time. It should be done as a comprehensive review of all of the programs, not just the farm bill.

I just think it is a huge mistake for us to be trying to tell people that, somehow or another, putting work requirements and these other things into the farm bill is going to overhaul the welfare system. That is just not true. Most people don't get enough money out of the Food Stamp program to make a difference one way or the other. It is not food stamps that are causing people to be on welfare. It is not food stamps that are causing people not to work, you know, and that is my big objection to this.

It is just ideology run amuck, and it is screwing up the process here, and I hope that we don't do so much damage that we can't pull this back together at the end of the day and get this done.

So I am going to vote against H.R. 2, and I urge all my colleagues to do as well, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, I, too, am saddened by the loss of the bipartisan work that we have typically done on this committee. I have bragged about being one of the few bipartisan committees in Congress back home a lot, and it is sad.

Just as the ranking member just said, that his side refused to negotiate any changes to SNAP, I simply said: Work requirements—strengthening the work requirements is going to have to be a part of what we do. And that was where we are with respect to that.

What I heard over and over and over again on the other side is that the non-SNAP portions of the farm bill, while maybe less than they would like to have, are nevertheless essential and vital, and I am looking forward to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle working as diligently as they can to defeat all of those poison pill amendments that will have to be offered over the next several days so that we can maintain that safety net for production in agriculture that they need and deserve without the legislative history of a loss on this floor that is totally unnecessary. So I am hopeful that my colleagues over there will be a part of that.

Mr. Chairman, the entire State of California is under a work waiver so that no one in California has to work to be able to stay on food stamps. That doesn't make any sense to me when you have got an unemployment rate of 4 percent across this country. So something has to change in that regard.

What I have heard over and over, not only today but throughout this debate, is folks from the other side, they are full out, full throttle in favor of work requirements, couldn't be more supportive of work requirements—just not these.

Over and over and over, they are full out in favor. We have got a legislative history of all of my colleagues on the other side talking about how important it is for job training, for education, for getting folks the skills and tools they need to be able to have meaningful work—just not these. Got it.

My ranking member had a letter from his folks that said not to negotiate on SNAP. I took him at his word on that in regard. It is disappointing that we have reached this point.

But we are at that point. We now have a bill before us that does make meaningful reforms to the work requirements under food stamps, that does not touch the working poor. Folks who are willing to work 20 hours a week, no matter how long they are in that circumstance, we are going to be shoulder to shoulder with them to try to get the support they need.

We are also trying to create a State-based State-run program in which the Federal taxpayer pays for work that the States can do on job training. There is no better spot to locate that than there because we cannot create a one-size-fits-all training program here in the United States House of Representatives. I trust our States to be able to do that. Those States have the capacity. They have the bandwidth to make that happen. Comments to the contrary are really misplaced.

So, as we move forward through the rest of the debate, I would encourage my colleagues to join me in opposing all of those poison pill amendments that have been presented that would harm the non-SNAP portion of the farm bill and support the work that we have done so that, as my good colleague from Oklahoma just said, we can continue to move this process forward, understand what the Senate gets done, move to conference, and move a bill to the President's desk by September 30 so that farmers and ranchers across this country, who we are the most keen to support, have that certainty of what the next 5-year support system looks like.

Right, wrong, or indifferent, they deserve that kind of assurance, that kind of confidence that they will have the farm program to back them up and their bankers are supported in that regard as well. So I am asking my colleagues to support H.R. 2 and fend off those poison pill amendments.

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

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

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. COLLINS of Georgia) having assumed the chair, Mr. MITCHELL, 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Passage of H.R. 5698;

Passage of S. 2372; and

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

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

PROTECT AND SERVE ACT OF 2018

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on passage of the bill (H.R. 5698) to amend title 18, United States Code, to punish criminal offenses targeting law enforcement officers, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 382, nays 35, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 188]

YEAS—382

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Curtis
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
Denham
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Ellison
Emmer
Engel
Eshoo
Espaillat
Estes (KS)
Esty (CT)
Evans
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (TX)
Goodlatte
Gottheimer
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lesko
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (MN)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Mast
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Panetta
Pascrell
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce (CA)
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Rutherford
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Soto
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Titus
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Weber (TX)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NAYS—35

Amash
Barragán
Bass
Biggs
Blumenauer
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Davidson
DeSaulnier
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Garrett
Gosar
Grothman
Hastings
Jayapal
Johnson, E. B.
Jordan
Lee
Massie
Moore
Pallone
Payne
Perry
Pocan
Polis
Sanford
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Smith (WA)
Tonko
Velázquez
Visclosky
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman

NOT VOTING—10

Beyer
Brown (MD)
DeGette
Gabbard
Gomez
Labrador
Richmond
Rogers (KY)
Webster (FL)
Wilson (FL)

□ 1835

Messrs. GARRETT, JORDAN, PERRY, HASTINGS, and GROTHMAN changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. TAKANO and SIRES changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 188.

VETERANS CEMETERY BENEFIT CORRECTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the passage of the bill (S. 2372) to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide outer burial receptacles for remains buried in National Parks, and for other purposes, on which further a recorded vote was ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

RECORDED VOTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 347, noes 70, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 189]

AYES—347

Abraham
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barragán
Barton
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blunt Rochester
Bost