

In order to allocate more funding per title I student to local education agencies, or LEAs, with higher concentrations of poverty, the funding formula weighs the count of eligible students in an LEA. However, the formulas have the perverse effect of directing funds away from all smaller school districts, both urban and rural, towards larger LEAs, regardless of the poverty rate. The ACE Act would gradually decrease the effects of number weighting and return the focus to areas with the highest concentration of poverty, as originally intended under the law.

Mr. Speaker, I'm proud to have Representative SLAUGHTER of New York join me in introducing this important bill. I encourage my colleagues to join us in correcting this fundamental injustice.

STAND FOR SNAP

(Mrs. BEATTY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BEATTY. I stand here today in dismay and in disgust. I stand here on this same floor where we have the words, "In God we trust," where we say the Pledge of Allegiance, where my Republican colleagues dare come to this podium and use words like "train wreck" and "work in a bipartisan fashion" in the same minute, and then today we are confronted with removing SNAP dollars from the farm bill.

I came here to work on a compromise. Members of this great Congressional Black Caucus and Democratic Caucus stand together because we want America to know that we stand for poor families: Black, White, urban, suburban, and, yes, rural.

We ask you to take note today, Mr. Speaker, that Republicans dare come to this floor and tell us that we want to serve the people. Aren't our children, our mothers, and families part of the people? Yes.

We stand for SNAP.

REPEAL OBAMACARE

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, last week, the President quietly decided to delay a major part of what many media pundits consider his crowning achievement: ObamaCare. The President is telling businesses that they will be given a year reprieve from complying with ObamaCare's onerous and costly employer mandate. The President is once again picking which laws his administration enforces and which ones he chooses not to. He's also picking winners and losers again. Employers will have another year to comply with the employer mandate, but President Obama has decided that individuals—the middle class—will not be given more time to comply with the individual mandate.

Meanwhile, the economy continues to limp along with businesses, large and small, afraid to hire more workers because the cost of doing business continues to go up without a clear end in sight. High taxes, enormous tax burdens, and the specter of ObamaCare continue to hang over them like a storm cloud. For the good of our Nation, ObamaCare must be repealed and replaced.

INCLUDE NUTRITION ASSISTANCE IN THE FARM BILL

(Ms. SEWELL of Alabama asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express great disappointment in my Republican colleagues for bringing a version of the farm bill that does not include nutrition assistance.

When I joined this great, august body, I was a member of the Agriculture Committee. The Agriculture Committee, time and time again, reauthorized the farm bill. Bipartisanship was always the hallmark. And this is not the hallmark of what we as Americans stand for.

Our minister today just stood up here with us in prayer and said that we would walk justly, that we would do and love mercifully, and that we would be humbled before God. If we are to truly have those words mean something in America, we must take care of our working families, our needy families, our children, in addition to our farmers.

The farmers that I represent in Alabama do not want a farm bill that does not include nutrition assistance. We cannot provide government subsidies to farmers without providing government assistance to people in poverty. It is not what we as Americans stand for.

If we have no further business in this august body this week, we should go home.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn.

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

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 125, nays 260, not voting 49, as follows:

[Roll No. 346]

YEAS—125

Andrews	Blumenauer	Capuano
Bass	Brady (PA)	Cárdenas
Beatty	Brown (FL)	Carson (IN)
Becerra	Brownley (CA)	Cartwright
Bishop (GA)	Butterfield	Castor (FL)

Castro (TX)	Hoyer	Pocan
Chu	Israel	Polis
Clarke	Jackson Lee	Price (NC)
Cleaver	Johnson (GA)	Quigley
Clyburn	Johnson, E. B.	Richmond
Cohen	Kelly (IL)	Roybal-Allard
Connolly	Kennedy	Ruiz
Cooper	Kildee	Ruppersberger
Costa	Kirkpatrick	Rush
Crowley	Larson (CT)	Sánchez, Linda
Cuellar	Lee (CA)	T.
Cummings	Levin	Schakowsky
Davis (CA)	Lewis	Schrader
Davis, Danny	Lipinski	Schwartz
DeFazio	Lofgren	Scott (VA)
Delaney	Lowenthal	Scott, David
DeLauro	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Serrano
DelBene	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Sewell (AL)
Doggett	Maloney	Shea-Porter
Doyle	Carolyn	Sires
Edwards	Matsui	Slaughter
Ellison	McDermott	Smith (WA)
Engel	McGovern	Speier
Eshoo	McNerney	Swalwell (CA)
Fattah	Meeks	Takano
Foster	Meng	Thompson (MS)
Frankel (FL)	Miller, George	Tsongas
Fudge	Moore	Van Hollen
Garamendi	Neal	Vargas
Grayson	Nolan	Veasey
Green, Al	O'Rourke	Velázquez
Grijalva	Pallone	Walz
Gutiérrez	Payne	Wasserman
Hahn	Pelosi	Schultz
Hanabusa	Perlmutter	Waters
Hastings (FL)	Peterson	Watt
Heck (WA)	Pingree (ME)	Wilson (FL)
Higgins		
Himes		

NAYS—260

Aderholt	DeSantis	Jordan
Alexander	DesJarlais	Joyce
Amash	Duckworth	Keating
Amodei	Duffy	Kelly (PA)
Bachmann	Duncan (SC)	Kilmer
Bachus	Duncan (TN)	Kind
Barber	Enyart	King (IA)
Barletta	Esty	King (NY)
Barr	Farenthold	Kingston
Barrow (GA)	Fincher	Kline
Benishek	Fitzpatrick	Kuster
Bentivolio	Fleischmann	Labrador
Bera (CA)	Fleming	LaMalfa
Bilirakis	Flores	Lamborn
Bishop (NY)	Forbes	Lance
Bishop (UT)	Fortenberry	Lankford
Black	Foxo	Latham
Blackburn	Franks (AZ)	Latta
Bonamici	Frelinghuysen	LoBiondo
Boustany	Gabbard	Loebsack
Brady (TX)	Garcia	Long
Braley (IA)	Gardner	Lowey
Bridenstine	Garrett	Lucas
Brooks (AL)	Gerlach	Luetkemeyer
Brooks (IN)	Gibbs	Lummis
Broun (GA)	Gibson	Lynch
Buchanan	Gingrey (GA)	Maloney, Sean
Bucshon	Gohmert	Marchant
Burgess	Goodlatte	Marino
Bustos	Gosar	Matheson
Calvert	Gowdy	McCarthy (CA)
Camp	Granger	McCaul
Cantor	Graves (GA)	McClintock
Capito	Green, Gene	McCollum
Capps	Griffin (AR)	McHenry
Carney	Griffith (VA)	McIntyre
Carter	Guthrie	McKeon
Cassidy	Hall	McKinley
Chabot	Hanna	McMorris
Chaffetz	Harper	Rodgers
Cicilline	Harris	Meadows
Coble	Hartzler	Meehan
Coffman	Hastings (WA)	Mica
Cole	Heck (NV)	Michaud
Collins (GA)	Hensarling	Miller (FL)
Collins (NY)	Holding	Miller (MI)
Conaway	Honda	Miller, Gary
Conyers	Hudson	Moran
Cook	Huelskamp	Mullin
Cotton	Huffman	Mulvaney
Courtney	Huizenga (MI)	Murphy (PA)
Cramer	Hultgren	Napolitano
Crawford	Hurt	Neugebauer
Crenshaw	Issa	Noem
Daines	Jenkins	Nugent
Davis, Rodney	Johnson (OH)	Nunes
Denham	Johnson, Sam	Nunnelee
Dent	Jones	Olson

Owens	Rokita	Terry
Palazzo	Ros-Lehtinen	Thompson (CA)
Pascrell	Roskam	Thompson (PA)
Pastor (AZ)	Ross	Thornberry
Paulsen	Rothfus	Tiberi
Pearce	Royce	Tierney
Perry	Runyan	Tipton
Peters (CA)	Ryan (WI)	Tonko
Peters (MI)	Salmon	Turner
Petri	Sanford	Upton
Pittenger	Scalise	Valadao
Pitts	Schneider	Vela
Poe (TX)	Schock	Wagner
Pompeo	Schweikert	Walberg
Price (GA)	Scott, Austin	Walden
Radel	Sensenbrenner	Walorski
Rahall	Sessions	Weber (TX)
Rangel	Sherman	Welch
Reed	Shuster	Wenstrup
Reichert	Simpson	Westmoreland
Renacci	Sinema	Williams
Ribble	Smith (MO)	Wilson (SC)
Rice (SC)	Smith (NE)	Wittman
Riggell	Smith (TX)	Wolf
Roby	Southerland	Womack
Roe (TN)	Stewart	Woodall
Rogers (AL)	Stivers	Yarmuth
Rogers (KY)	Stockman	Yoder
Rohrabacher	Stutzman	Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—49

Barton	Horsford	Rooney
Bonner	Hunter	Ryan (OH)
Campbell	Jeffries	Sanchez, Loretta
Clay	Kaptur	Sarbanes
Culberson	Kinzinger (IL)	Schiff
DeGette	Langevin	Shimkus
Deutch	Larsen (WA)	Smith (NJ)
Diaz-Balart	Maffei	Titus
Dingell	Markey	Visclosky
Ellmers	Massie	Waxman
Farr	McCarthy (NY)	Webster (FL)
Galleo	Messer	Whitfield
Graves (MO)	Murphy (FL)	Yoho
Grimm	Nadler	Young (AK)
Herrera Beutler	Negrete McLeod	Young (FL)
Hinojosa	Posey	
Holt	Rogers (MI)	

□ 0945

Messrs. HALL, LUCAS and McINTYRE, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Messrs. GARCIA and KILMER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. POLIS, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, and Messrs. DEFAZIO, CROWLEY, McDERMOTT, and FATTAH changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 346, had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 346, had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

Stated against:

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 346, had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 346, had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2642, FEDERAL AGRICULTURE REFORM AND RISK MANAGEMENT ACT OF 2013

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 295 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 295

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 reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are 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 ordered on the bill and on 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. During consideration of this resolution all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 295 provides for a closed rule for consideration of H.R. 2642. However, 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, was 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.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us today is the exact same language that this body considered in June with two important considerations and exceptions. Unlike last month, this legislation contains a repeal of the 1949 backstop, which means that in the farm bill we will do away with that 1949 law as the backstop to the farm products and legislation. However, it does not include the nutrition programs from the previous bill. We will hear that today.

On the other hand, however, this bill does include the exact same language as the previous bill, including adopted amendments.

Since the House considered a farm bill last month, there has been a great deal of and many conversations, including today with Members, that have raised significant concerns with the language as it was previously drafted. The chief concern was the inclusion of a nutrition policy in the agriculture bill.

Therefore, after careful consideration of all aspects of the issue, the decision

was made to consider nutrition and agriculture policy separately. However, I want to be clear: removing the nutrition provisions from this legislation in no way seeks to marginalize the importance of the nutrition programs, nor in any effort are we trying to avoid their reauthorization. Anything that would be said on this floor contrary to that simply would not be true.

I think you would be hard-pressed to find any Member, Republican or Democrat, who does not think that these programs are vitally important, in particular, to women and children. They simply will be considered separately and not in this bill.

Now, the practicality to this, Mr. Speaker, is and was discussed last night in the Rules Committee, that is, that if it is not in this title, and it is not, and if the House does not move forward on a nutrition or SNAP program, then all of these items still go to conference with the United States Senate, and it is contained within the Senate bill and would be fully operational, debatable, and decisions can be made in that conference. In that conference, it is fully authorized and the House would simply not have taken a position.

To assume or to say that we are trying to move a bill without nutrition and to take things away would not be truthful. To say that we would show up at conference without a position of the House of Representatives would be truthful.

Republicans and Democrats, including leadership of both parties, understand and recognize that nutrition and 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 would be 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