

Bilirakis	Hanabusa	Pelosi
Bishop (GA)	Hastings (FL)	Perlmutter
Bishop (NY)	Heck (NV)	Perry
Blumenauer	Heck (WA)	Peters (CA)
Bonamici	Hensarling	Pingree (ME)
Brady (PA)	Higgins	Pittenger
Brady (TX)	Himes	Pitts
Bridenstine	Hinojosa	Pocan
Brown (GA)	Holt	Polis
Brown (FL)	Horsford	Pompeo
Butterfield	Hoyer	Posey
Capps	Huelskamp	Price (GA)
Capuano	Huffman	Price (NC)
Cárdenas	Hurt	Quigley
Carney	Israel	Radel
Carson (IN)	Jackson Lee	Rangel
Cartwright	Jeffries	Richmond
Castor (FL)	Johnson (GA)	Rigell
Castro (TX)	Johnson, E. B.	Rohrabacher
Chabot	Jones	Rothfus
Chu	Jordan	Roybal-Allard
Cicilline	Kaptur	Royce
Clarke	Keating	Ruiz
Clay	Kelly (IL)	Ruppersberger
Cleaver	Kennedy	Rush
Clyburn	Kildee	Ryan (OH)
Coffman	Kilmer	Ryan (WI)
Cohen	Kind	Salmon
Collins (GA)	Kirkpatrick	Sánchez, Linda
Connolly	Kuster	T.
Conyers	Labrador	Sanchez, Loretta
Cook	Lamborn	Sanford
Cooper	Lance	Sarbanes
Cotton	Langevin	Scalise
Courtney	Larson (CT)	Schakowsky
Crowley	Lee (CA)	Schiff
Culberson	Levin	Schneider
Cummings	Lewis	Schwartz
Davis (CA)	Lipinski	Schweikert
Davis, Danny	LoBiondo	Scott (VA)
DeFazio	Lofgren	Scott, David
DeGette	Lowenthal	Sensenbrenner
Delaney	Lowe	Serrano
DeLauro	Lujan Grisham	Sewell (AL)
DeBene	(NM)	Shea-Porter
DeSantis	Luján, Ben Ray	Sherman
Deutch	(NM)	Shuster
Dingell	Lynch	Sires
Doggett	Maffei	Smith (NJ)
Doyle	Maloney,	Smith (WA)
Duckworth	Carolyn	Speier
Duncan (SC)	Maloney, Sean	Stockman
Duncan (TN)	Massie	Stutzman
Edwards	Matheson	Swalwell (CA)
Ellison	Matsui	Takano
Engel	McClintock	Thompson (CA)
Eshoo	McCollum	Thompson (MS)
Eshoo	Esty	Tierney
Fattah	McDermott	Titus
Fleming	McGovern	Tonko
Foster	Meehan	Tsongas
Frankel (FL)	Meeks	Van Hollen
Frank (AZ)	Meng	Vargas
Fudge	Michaud	Veasey
Gabbard	Miller (FL)	Velázquez
Gallego	Miller, George	Vislosky
Garrett	Moore	Wasserman
Garrett	Moran	Schultz
Gingrey (GA)	Mulvaney	Waters
Gohmert	Nadler	Watt
Goodlatte	Napolitano	Waxman
Gowdy	Neal	Welch
Graves (GA)	Negrete McLeod	Wenstrup
Grayson	Nolan	Wilson (FL)
Green, Al	O'Rourke	Wolf
Green, Gene	Pallone	Yarmuth
Grijalva	Pascrell	Young (FL)
Gutiérrez	Pastor (AZ)	
Hahn	Payne	

NOT VOTING—6

Honda	Markey	Miller, Gary
Larsen (WA)	McCarthy (NY)	Slaughter

□ 1354

Messrs. COFFMAN and SHUSTER changed their vote from “aye” to “no.” So the bill was not passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on

agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. CLARKE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was unavoidably detained at a meeting and missed the first votes of the day.

Had I been present, I would have voted “no” on rollcall No. 254, the motion on ordering the previous question on the rule; and “no” on rollcall No. 253, H. Res. 271, the rule providing for further consideration of H.R. 1947, Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 475. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to include vaccines against seasonal influenza within the definition of taxable vaccines.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 23. An act to designate as wilderness certain land and inland water within the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore in the State of Michigan, and for other purposes.

S. 25. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal features of the electric distribution system to the South Utah Valley Electric Service District and for other purposes.

S. 26. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to facilitate the development of hydroelectric power on the Diamond Fork System of the Central Utah Project.

S. 112. An act to expand the Alpine Lakes Wilderness in the State of Washington, to designate the Middle Fork Snoqualmie River and Pratt River as wild and scenic rivers, and for other purposes.

S. 130. An act to require the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal land to the Powell Recreation District in the State of Wyoming.

S. 157. An act to provide for certain improvements to the Denali National Park and Preserve in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes.

S. 230. An act to authorize the Peace Corps Commemorative Foundation to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes.

S. 244. An act to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to modify the Pilot Project offices of the Federal Permit Streamlining Pilot Project.

S. 276. An act to reinstate and extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project involving the American Falls Reservoir.

S. 304. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the State of Mississippi 2 parcels of surplus land within the boundary of the Natchez Trace Parkway, and for other purposes.

S. 352. An act to provide for the designation of the Devil's Staircase Wilderness Area in the State of Oregon, to designate segments of Wasson and Franklin Creeks in the State of Oregon as wild rivers, and for other purposes.

S. 383. An act to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate a segment of Illabot Creek in Skagit County, Washington, as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

S. 393. An act to designate additional segments and tributaries of White Clay Creek, in the States of Delaware and Pennsylvania, as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

S. 459. An act to modify the boundary of the Minuteman Missile National Historic Site in the State of South Dakota, and for other purposes.

S. 579. An act to direct the Secretary of State to develop a strategy to obtain observer status for Taiwan at the triennial International Civil Aviation Organization Assembly, and for other purposes.

□ 1400

REAPPOINTMENT AS MEMBER TO ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE RECORDS OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLEISCHMANN). The Chair announces the Speaker's reappointment, pursuant to 44 U.S.C. 2702 and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, of the following individual on the part of the House to the Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress, effective June 24, 2013:

Mr. Jeffrey W. Thomas, Columbus, Ohio

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia, the majority leader, for the purpose of inquiring about the schedule for the week to come.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman from Maryland, the Democratic whip, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet in pro forma session at 11 a.m.; no votes are expected. On Tuesday, the House will meet at noon for morning-hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business; votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour and noon for legislative business. On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a few bills under suspension of the rules, a complete list of which will be announced by close of business tomorrow.

In addition, I expect the House to take up and pass two bills from the Natural Resources Committee: H.R. 2231, the Offshore Energy and Jobs Act, authored by Chairman DOC HASTINGS; and H.R. 1613, the Outer Continental Shelf Transboundary Hydrocarbon

Agreements Authorization Act, sponsored by Representative JEFF DUNCAN of South Carolina. These two bills continue our efforts to increase domestic energy production to foster an environment of economic growth and lower energy costs for working families.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I anticipate bringing to the floor H.R. 2410, the Agriculture appropriations bill authored by Representative ROBERT ADERHOLT of Alabama.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

I would ask him a couple of questions about bills that are not on the announcement. The gentleman and I had a colloquy last week about student loans, that there's no action on those on the calendar for next week, if I'm correct.

Knowing, as we know, that student loan rates will double in July from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent, and in light of our discussion last week, can the gentleman tell me whether there is any thought that there will be some action taken by us prior to the July 4 break?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman knows that the House has acted, that the position of the House is one very close to where the President's public position on student loans has been. We don't want to see student loan rates double. We also want a long-term solution to the problem on the fiscal end while helping students.

And if the gentleman witnesses what just happened on the floor, it just seems that on bills where there are solutions and bipartisan indications of support, there seems to be a decision by the part of his leadership, perhaps himself, to say, Hey, we're not going to go along with bipartisan work and success, and maybe we're just going to make this a partisan issue. I'm fearful the same is at work on the student loan issue, Mr. Speaker.

I hope that that is not the case, because I know the gentleman shares with me a desire not to allow students to be put in the position of facing a doubling of interest rates if they decide to incur additional student loans.

□ 1410

So I would say to the gentleman, his question, we will stand ready to work in a bipartisan fashion—I've indicated so to the White House. The Senate doesn't seem to be able to produce anything. The House is the only one that produced something—very close to what the President's position is—to make student rates variable, to allow for those rates to be capped so the exposure is not what it would be otherwise. Unfortunately, no movement yet. We stand ready to work though.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Very frankly, I wasn't going to mention what happened on the floor today, but the gentleman has brought it up.

The gentleman is correct; the committee passed out a bipartisan bill. A

lot of Democrats voted for that bill. The problem, of course, is that 62 Republicans voted against the bill as it was amended, notwithstanding the fact they voted for the last amendment that was adopted, which we think was a draconian amendment that would have hurt the poorest citizens in our country very badly.

So we turned a bipartisan bill into a partisan bill. I will tell my friend, very frankly, you did the same thing—not you personally, but your side of the aisle did the same thing with respect to the Homeland Security bill, which was reported out on a voice vote from the Appropriations Committee, that we would have voted for on a bipartisan basis, except an amendment was adopted with your side voting overwhelmingly for it, knowing full well that our side could not support that.

So I tell you, with all due respect, Mr. Majority Leader, I wasn't going to bring up what happened today. But what happened today is you turned a bipartisan bill—necessary for our farmers, necessary for our consumers, necessary for the people of America—that many of us would have supported and you turned it into a partisan bill.

Very frankly, 58 of the 62 Republicans who voted against your bill voted for the last amendment, which made the bill even more egregious—we disagreed with the \$20 billion cut. And you upped the—not you personally, but your side upped the ante.

So I will tell you, my friend, we're prepared to work in a bipartisan fashion. Very frankly, with respect to the student loan bill, it was very close to the President's bill. And we would have supported it had it been even closer to the President's bill.

What your bill does, as you know, puts those taking out a student loan at risk of having their interest rates substantially increased in the future. The President suggested, yes, let's get a variable rate that reflects market rates, but then when you take out the loan, just like you do with your house loan, you know what your interest rate is going to be. So we have a difference on that. I think it's a good faith disagreement on that.

But I will say to you that, yes, I have been concerned about the inability to take a bill reported out of the committee that is bipartisan in nature and not turn it into a partisan bill. That's what happened on this floor today. It was unfortunate, as I say, for farmers; it was unfortunate for consumers; and it was unfortunate for our country.

If the gentleman wants to pursue that, I will yield to him.

Mr. CANTOR. I appreciate the gentleman, Mr. Speaker. And allow me to just to respond.

The Southerland amendment to which the gentleman speaks is an amendment that had been discussed for some time with the ranking member, with the chairman—the gentleman himself, I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, was aware of Mr. SOUTHERLAND's amendment.

Mr. SOUTHERLAND's amendment reflects what many of us believe is a successful formula to apply to a program that has, in the eyes of the GAO, in the eyes of the independent auditors who look at these programs, a program that is in dire need of improvement because of the error rates and the waste and the other things that are occurring in this program.

In addition to that, it reflects our strong belief that able-bodied people should have the opportunity and should go in and be a productive citizen. That's what this amendment says. It gives States an option. It was a pilot project because it reflects a winning formula from the welfare reform program back in 1996 that was put into place, with unequivocal success—able-bodied people going back to work, working families beginning to have productive income, not just taking a check from the government.

There was never an intention at all for our side to say we want to take away the safety net of the food stamp program, absolutely not. This was a pilot project, that was it. It was up to the States whether they wanted to participate to see if they could get more people back to work. Again, consistent with what the GAO reports have said over and over again, these programs are in need of reform.

Again, it was not as if this amendment came out of thin air. The gentleman, the ranking member, the entire leadership on the minority side knew this amendment was there. And the gentleman forever is on this floor, Mr. Speaker, talking about regular order, talking about the need for us to have open process, perhaps to let the will of the House be worked and then go to conference. That was what the goal here was, let the will of the House allowed to be seen through, work its will, and then go to conference. And then we would try and participate in a robust discussion with the other side of the Capitol to see if we could see clear on some reform measures to a bill and a program that is in desperate need of that.

Mr. Speaker, again, what we saw today was a Democratic leadership in the House that was insistent to undo years and years of bipartisan work on an issue like a farm bill and decide to make it a partisan issue.

Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that that is the case, I do agree with the gentleman. But I hope that we can see our way to working on other issues where there is potential agreement. Yes, we have fundamental disagreements on many things, but we're all human beings, representing the 740-some thousand people that put us here and expect us to begin to learn to set aside those disagreements and find ways we can work together.

Today was an example. The other side, Mr. Speaker, did not think that was their goal, did not think that was an appropriate mission, and instead decided to emphasize where they perhaps

differed when we wanted to reform in a certain area.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman. We clearly have a profound disagreement.

When we were in the majority, we got no help on your side, Mr. Majority Leader—you remember that, zero, one, two, three, four—on programs that we felt very strongly about. There was no opportunity to have bipartisan dialogue. There was no opportunity to have bipartisan agreement.

The gentleman refers to regular order. Very frankly, the person who talks about regular order most is your Speaker. And you talk about regular order. We ought to pass a bill, and then we ought to go and have an agreement.

Some 90 days ago, I believe, we passed a budget. At your insistence, the Senate passed a budget. Good for them. We have not gone to conference. You have not provided an opportunity to go to conference. You haven't appointed conferees. That's regular order. The gentleman wants it on one bill but apparently not all bills.

I tell my friend we want regular order. We want to go to conference. We want to undo the breaking of an agreement that we made in the Budget Control Act, which said there would be a firewall between domestic and defense. You have eliminated that firewall.

You have assumed sequester is in place. Sequester is bad for this country. You and I tend to agree on that, I think. But the fact is there's no legislation to undo that sequester—except the legislation you talked about passing in the last Congress, which is dead, gone and buried. Yes, we want regular order.

The reason the bill lost today is because 62 of your Members rejected Mr. LUCAS' plea—which I thought was a very eloquent plea—in which he said: I know some of you don't think there's enough reform in this bill, and some of you think there's too much reform. But Mr. PETERSON and I brought out a bill that was a bipartisan bill, supported by the majority of Democrats and the majority of—I think all Republicans, maybe, on the committee; I'm not sure of that, Mr. Leader. But the fact of the matter is it was a bipartisan bill—just as Homeland Security was a bipartisan bill—and it was turned into a partisan bill.

You respond that the Southland amendment was for reforms. That's exactly what Mr. LUCAS was talking about. He was saying some people don't think we went far enough and some people think we went too far. Mr. SOUTHERLAND thought we hadn't gone far enough. And 58 Republicans voted for SOUTHERLAND and then turned around and voted against the bill, the very reforms you're talking about.

So don't blame Democrats for the loss today. You didn't bring up the farm bill when it was reported out on a bipartisan basis. Last year you didn't even bring it to the floor because your party couldn't come together supporting their chairman's bill.

□ 1420

So that's where we find ourselves, Mr. Speaker. I wasn't going to bring up that bill at all. What happened, happened.

Very frankly, when we lost on the floor, it was because we lost on the floor when we were in the majority. We produced 218 votes for almost everything we put on this floor. Don't blame Democrats for the failure to bring 218 Republicans to your bipartisan Lucas-supported and Peterson-supported piece of legislation on the floor. We believe that that loss, that partisanship on this bill, hurt farmers, hurt consumers, hurt our country.

Let's bring that bill back to the floor and have a vote on it as it was reported out on a bipartisan basis. I think it would pass. Maybe not because of your votes. That's been your problem all along.

Don't blame Democrats for the loss of that bill. Don't blame Democrats for being partisan.

We knew about those amendments, Mr. Leader, just as you knew about them. You knew we were very much opposed to some of those amendments, notwithstanding the fact all the leadership, I believe—I haven't looked at the record—voted for those amendments just as they voted for the King amendment on Homeland Security.

Yeah, you pushed my button.

I'm prepared to work in a bipartisan fashion, but I'm not prepared to work in a bipartisan fashion when it's said, This is what we agree on—meaning your side—so you better take it if we're going to have any agreement. That's not the way it works. It never worked that way in America. That's not what America is about. America is about expecting us to work together.

This bill was reported out overwhelmingly on a bipartisan basis. It could have been passed on a very large bipartisan vote, and was precluded by the actions taken through these amendments on the floor, most of which we did not support. You knew we did not—not only you. Your party knew that we did not support.

So I'm surprised when you talk to me about regular order and there's nothing—nothing—to do on the budget conference that you wanted the Senate to pass a budget. They did. You have just told me that you wanted regular order and that we should have passed the farm bill so we could work together.

You're assuming, of course, that the Senate would have gone to conference. I hope they would have, and I think they would have, because I talked to the chair. She would have wanted to go to conference, assuming we got votes on the Republican side of the aisle.

But we also wanted to go to conference in regular order on the budget to solve the stark differences between the two parties. That's the only way you are going to get from where we are to where you need to be, by having a conference and trying to come to an agreement.

My own premise is, Mr. Leader, that you don't have a conference because there is nothing to which PATTY MURRAY could agree, that Mr. RYAN could agree, that he could bring back to your caucus and get a majority of votes for, because they are for what you passed and nothing more than that. We are \$91 billion apart. If we divide it in two and just said, "Okay, we'll split the difference," you couldn't pass it on your side of the aisle, and I think you know that.

I don't know that I have any more questions that would be particularly useful, but I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would just say, as far as the budget conference is concerned, the budget is something that traditionally, as he notes, has been a partisan affair. It is a document that each House produces, reflecting the philosophy of the majority of those bodies.

The budget contains a lot of different issues, two of which I think the parties have disagreed on vehemently over the last several years: taxes and health care.

We understand, Mr. Speaker, that the other side rejects our prescription on how to fix the deficit in terms of the unfunded liabilities on the health care programs. We've said we want to work toward a balance. We think a balanced budget is a good thing.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the partisan position on the other side of the Capitol is no balance—no balance—and raise taxes. So when you know that is the situation, there is no construct in which to even begin a discussion.

Again, the budget has traditionally been that, a partisan document, whether who is in charge of which House, and then to be a guide by which you go about spending bills after that.

The farm bill, frankly, is a little different. It's for working farmers. It's for, frankly, individuals who need the benefit of the food stamp program. We believe that you need to reform the SNAP program and reduce some of the costs, because even the GAO—the independent auditors that we bring in—year in and year out say that that program is rife with error rates, waste, and others that we should be ashamed of.

So we put forward our idea through the Southerland amendment to try and reform, put in place, those reforms; but it's still in the construct of the farm bill.

Again, to the gentleman's point, we do want to work together, but it's going to have to be about setting aside differences instead of saying, as the minority leadership did today, You disagree with us on that program, we're out of here. The entire farm bill then does not have a chance to go to conference, be reconciled, hopefully reforms adopted, so we can make some progress, according to what even the independent analysts say should be done.

It really is a disappointing day. I think that the minority has been a disappointing player today, Mr. Speaker, on the part of the people. We remain ready to work with the gentleman. I'm hopeful that tomorrow, perhaps next week, will be a better week.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, the majority leader continues to want to blame the Democrats for his inability, and the Republicans' inability, to give a majority vote to their own bill.

Maybe the American people, he thinks, can be fooled. You're in charge of the House. You have 234 Members. Sixty-two of your Members voted against your bill. That's why it failed. We didn't whine, very frankly, when we were in charge, when I was the majority leader, about we didn't pass the bill. We got 218 votes for our bills, and it was pretty tough. We got zero from your side. You got 24 from our side to help you. Mr. PETERSON stuck to his deal.

Now, on the budget, you say we've got different philosophies. Yes, we do. Mr. Gingrich gave a speech on this floor about different philosophies in 1997 or '98. He was speaking to your side of the aisle. He was talking about the "perfectionist caucus." He made an agreement with President Clinton, which to some degree was responsible for having balanced budgets, but your side thought it was not a good deal. Not all of your side. In a bipartisan vote, frankly, we passed the deal, the agreement, the compromise, that was reached between Mr. Gingrich and Mr. Clinton.

A lot of your folks said, No, no. Our way or the highway.

He gave a speech that he called the "Perfectionist Caucus" speech. That's what, in my view, I'm hearing on the budget. Yes, we have differences. The American people elected a Democratic President. They elected a Democratic Senate and a Republican House. The only way America's board of directors and President will work is if we come together and compromise.

The place to compromise under regular order is in a conference with our ideas and their ideas meeting in conference. The most central document that we need to do every year is to do a budget. But you're not going to conference. Your side will not appoint conferees. Your side will not move to go to conference. PATTY MURRAY wants to go to conference. Senator REID wants to go to conference. Your side over on the Senate won't go to conference, in my view, largely because they know you don't want to go to conference and they don't want to make a deal, they don't want to compromise on what their position is.

We will take no blame for the failure of the FARRM Bill—none, zero. As much as you try to say it, you can't get away from the statistic. Sixty-two, otherwise known as 25 percent, of your party voted against a bill, which is why we didn't bring it to the floor last year

when it was also reported out in a bipartisan fashion.

I know you are going to continue and your side is going to continue to blame us that you couldn't get the votes on your side for your bill because you took a bipartisan bill. That's what Mr. LUCAS was saying—I thought he was very articulate, I thought he was compelling—in pleading with your side: Join us, join us. It doesn't go as far as you would like.

And on reform, you talk about reform, and that's a good thing to talk about, like we're against reform.

□ 1430

The Senate bill has reform in it, Mr. Leader. The Senate bill has reform in it. Now, it's not in terms of dollars cutting poor people as much as this bill does, but it cuts. It has reform in it. What some of them want—what apparently your side wants—is your reform, not compromised reform. Mr. LUCAS brought to the floor \$20 billion and couched it as reform and said on the floor it may not be enough for some and it may be too much for others, but it is a compromise. He was right, but it was rejected by 25 percent of your party—they rejected the chairman—and that's why this bill failed.

Unless the gentleman wants to say something further, I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JUNE 24, 2013

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 11 a.m. on Monday, June 24, 2013.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOHMERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia? There was no objection.

FARM BILL

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, politics trumped good government today in the U.S. House of Representatives. The Members of this body demonstrated a failure to lead by voting down the farm bill.

The Federal Government currently operates a costly maze of duplicative and outdated agriculture spending programs. The farm bill crafted by the House reflected a fiscally responsible plan that would have ended the abuses of food stamps, ended wasteful agriculture spending programs and, achieved a level of efficiency for existing programs that should be replicated in all areas of government.

The farm bill would have eliminated automatic enrollment in food stamps and prevented fraudulent benefit payments by requiring States to verify eligibility for the program. The farm bill

would have ended the economically disruptive policies that have worked to further destabilize our dairy markets. The bill transitioned to a more free market approach that's better for farmers and taxpayers alike.

In the absence of this comprehensive reform package, the overspending and taxpayer waste will now continue.

DENHAM-SCHRADER AMENDMENT

(Mr. CÁRDENAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Ladies and gentlemen, what we have here today is a failure to communicate.

I am truly disappointed in this House because the farm bill that we just voted on and that did not pass was not ready because it was not balanced and it did not follow the rules as it should have.

\$20 billion from the mouths of the poorest children and families in America—that's one of the reasons I voted "no" on that bill. I also voted against the bill, in part, because we did not even debate an amendment that I also endorsed, which was the Denham-Schrader amendment. That would have been the appropriate thing to do, the proper order. We didn't take the proper order.

I think it's very important for all of us to understand that what we witnessed here today wasn't a failure of government; it was a failure of some individuals to do the right thing and to even follow the rules that they say they want to follow. That's why we don't have a farm bill that passed. Hopefully, we can get back on track, follow the rules and pass a farm bill very soon.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESS WEEK

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. This week marks the 50th anniversary of National Small Business Week.

Each year, we devote one week to recognize the importance of small businesses and to honor their successes. While it is admirable to devote a week to small businesses, what we have to remember is that every week is small business week and that the family farm, which we discussed here on the floor today, was, in fact, the original small business. Small businesses are the backbone of our economy and the engines of job creation. Over half of Americans own or are employed by a small business.

Mr. Speaker, there are 30 million small businesses in the United States, and they create seven out of every 10 new American jobs each and every year. Small businesses are the key to economic prosperity. The government does not create jobs; American small businesses create jobs.