

Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)

NOT VOTING—6

Butterfield
Herrera Beutler

□ 1113

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

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 221, noes 207, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 374]

AYES—221

Aderholt
Alexander
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boehner
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney

Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt

Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—6

Negrete McLeod
Pallone

□ 1113

Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam

NOES—207

Amash
Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Lance
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLay
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Gohmert
Graves (MO)
Grayson

Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—6

Butterfield
Herrera Beutler

Horsford
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod
Pallone

□ 1119

So the bill was 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.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 5, STUDENT SUCCESS ACT

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, in the engrossment of H.R. 5, the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers, punctuation, and cross-references, and to make such other technical and conforming changes as may be necessary to reflect the actions of the House in amending the bill, including the changes now at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COTTON). The Clerk will report the changes.

The Clerk read as follows:

In amendment numbered 1, insert "the first place it appears" after "programs," in the instruction regarding page 366, line 6.

In amendment numbered 17, strike "Page 315, after line 15" and insert "Page 311, after line 15".

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

There was no objection.

□ 1130

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purposes of inquiring of the majority leader the schedule for the week to come, and I yield to my friend, the majority leader, Mr. CANTOR.

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

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, 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 Tuesday and Wednesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour and noon for legislative business.

On Thursday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m.

On Friday, no votes are expected.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a few suspensions next week, a complete list of which will be announced by close of business today.

In addition, the House will consider H.R. 2397, the Department of Defense appropriations bill, authored by Representative BILL YOUNG. This bill provides the resources necessary for our men and women in the armed services to carry out their vital mission.

There are also a number of bills the Appropriations Committee has reported which may come to the floor in the near future.

Furthermore, the House may consider two energy bills out of the Energy and Commerce Committee. The first bill, H.R. 2218, the Coal Residuals Reuse and Management Act, authored by Representative DAVID MCKINLEY, would create an enforceable minimum standard for the regulation of coal ash by the States, allowing their use in a safe manner that protects jobs.

The second bill, H.R. 1582, the Energy Consumers Relief Act, sponsored by Representative BILL CASSIDY, will require the EPA, before finalizing any energy-related rule costing more than \$1 billion, to report to Congress on specific energy price and job impacts.

Both of these bills, Mr. Speaker, foster an environment of economic growth and lower energy costs for American families and businesses.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, as you know, the House acted last month to prevent the doubling of the student loan interest rate. Should the Senate send us legislation, the House may act as soon as next week.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his information with respect to the legislation for next week.

I note that there was not on the notice for next week—the Senate has now voted to go to conference on the farm bill. Clearly, that is a matter that I think both sides, or certainly our side, I think your side as well, feels is a priority item. Does the gentleman have any plans to move to go to conference now that the Senate has asked for a conference next week on the farm bill?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I'd respond to the gentleman by saying that we are committed to acting with urgency to bring to the floor a bill under the nutrition title of what was formerly the farm bill, which that title married up with the agricultural provisions.

It is our hope that we can get a nutrition bill to the floor, because we believe strongly that the programs under those titles, providing a safety net to the country's most vulnerable, are something important that we maintain and we implement the kind of reforms to those programs that have long been called for by the GAO and others so that we can make sure of the efficient flow of dollars to those beneficiaries who most need it.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that comment; however, I'm somewhat perplexed, Mr. Leader.

You and I had a relatively animated colloquy some, I think, 2 or 3 weeks ago, at which point in time you said that we passed the farm bill that, of course, we didn't like and none of us voted for, that we passed the farm bill so that, in fact, we could follow regular order and go to conference. We passed that farm bill.

The Senate has now voted to go to conference, but what I hear the gentleman saying is, like the budget bill, we're not going to go to conference unless something else happens; in the case of the budget, until Mr. RYAN apparently gets Ms. Murray to agree on—I don't want to characterize it too heavily, but to agreeing with him as opposed to compromise.

But I'm a little, as I said, perplexed, because a few weeks ago you told me that the reason we passed that farm bill without the provision for nutrition, which had been in there for half a century, was so that we could go to conference. Well, now we're there, but there's no motion to go to conference. I'm perplexed, and I would appreciate if the gentleman—because we now have the opportunity to follow regular order. We now have the Senate who has voted to go to conference, acted on our bill that we sent there, substituted their bill for ours, and now have asked for a conference on the same. That is regular order.

Can the gentleman tell me: Are we now making a condition, as we lawyers say, precedent—that is, something's got to happen—before we go to conference? Because, very frankly, Mr. Leader, you and I both know that the nutrition bill is what made the farm bill apparently fall on the rocks, which is why you dropped it in order to pass the farm bill. It was a totally partisan bill, but now we need to get to agreement.

I tell you, we're running out of time, Mr. Leader, and I think we need to get this farm bill done; and I would hope that we could go to conference, as the gentleman said we were going to do, with the Senate on the House-passed bill.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

And I know that the gentleman, in his call for regular order, also knows that the House has its prerogatives, as does the other body. We believe strongly that marriage of the two constituencies of the old farm bill was a marriage that began some 40 years ago. And, frankly, it is the sense of the majority in the House that that marriage makes little sense and that, instead, if we could, as a House, opt to be transparent and look at the policies on the agricultural side the way that we did and then look at the policies under the nutrition title in the same deliberative fashion, that we can actually make for a better product.

Now, the gentleman says that the farm bill that was passed was a partisan bill. Certainly, no member of the

minority voted for the bill, but I would, and not to rehash colloquy from several weeks ago, say that the same attitude was taken with the old farm bill by the minority saying it was too partisan.

We intend to proceed deliberately, looking at policies that make sense in reforming these programs in the vein of trying to get to those most vulnerable the relief they need, at the same time paying cognizance to the fact that we have fiscal challenges we must deal with.

We're trying to be about truth in legislating, Mr. Speaker, and that is making sure that the purpose of agricultural policy is adequately addressed, as well as the purpose of the nutrition title and providing relief to our country's most vulnerable.

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

The truth in legislating is that we are not legislating. We are putting forth the positions of your party in this House, not shared by the Senate, not shared by the President of the United States, also elected by the people of the United States; and absent agreement by those two entities, coequal branches of the Congress and a coequal branch of the government, the executive, absent their agreeing with your party's perspective, we're not legislating. That's the problem, Mr. Leader.

And again, I express to you, you said—and I don't have the words in front of me exactly, but we can pull them out. But I am perplexed because you said, when we passed the farm bill without the nutrition program in it—which had been done for a half a century. They had been paired by Republican Congresses and Democratic Congresses, signed by Republican Presidents and Democratic Presidents. It's only this last 2 years that we have been unable to come to grips with bipartisan agreement on the farm bill. It's only in the past 2 years that we've been unable to get a bill that was bipartisan in fashion to the floor and, ultimately, voted on final passage.

The bipartisan bills that came out of committee both in the last Congress and this Congress were turned into—the first one, of course, in the last Congress didn't come to the floor, as the gentleman knows. He didn't bring it to the floor at all, notwithstanding the fact it had bipartisan support in the committee. And notwithstanding the fact that the bill that was brought to the floor had bipartisan support and the support of the ranking member, Mr. PETERSON, notwithstanding he didn't agree with some portions that were adopted, for instance, on milk, he was, nevertheless, prepared to adopt it until three very partisan, we thought very harmful, amendments to people without means were adopted.

You knew that was the case. You then had told me—and I repeat, I know, and reiterate. But the simple representation you made was that we did that—and Mr. SESSIONS made that and said,

by the way, that the nutrition part of the program, getting support for people who needed food, was extraneous to the bill. That's not our perspective over here, but that was the perspective that the chairman of the Rules Committee laid out when we considered the rule.

But you then said, in that colloquy, that the reason we did that was because you wanted to get a bill through. And, frankly, that's the only way you could pick up the overwhelming majority of the 62 of your Republicans who voted against it. I can only conclude that because you got the majority to do it, failing the first time because 62 Republicans decided they didn't like the bill and they voted against it. When you dropped the nutrition part of the bill, which had been in there for 50 years, then you got the majority on your side. That's when you got zero of us. You had 24 the first time.

So I'm perplexed that now that we have done what you said we were going to do, not about budgets, not about—you and I agree we need to get a handle on it. That's not what this issue is about. This issue is about whether or not we're going to have a farm bill and whether we're going to have such in a timely way. I'm going to talk a little bit about the CR.

But we have 17 days left to go between now and September 30, and we think it's timely to move. I don't know. Your nutrition bill is not on the program here. We'll have 1 week after next week.

□ 1145

We're not sure because we haven't seen a nutrition bill that you have. We don't know what's going to be in that. But we have passed a farm bill. The Senate wants to go to conference. The Senate wants to go to conference—at least the Democrats do—on the budget. And we're not doing it, Mr. Leader. And we need to do it.

Mr. CANTOR. Again, not to belabor the point but just to correct the facts and make sure that the record reflects what I did say before and what I represented, I said it was our intention to act with dispatch to bring to the floor a bill dealing with the SNAP program, that portion of which was traditionally the farm bill, and that we intend to be bringing that vehicle to the floor at some time in the near future. I did not say, Mr. Speaker, what it was the gentleman indicated.

We would like to say to all of our colleagues that we want to work together on a nutrition title. The gentleman heard what I said before. The marriage of those two bills and policies was done in an arbitrary fashion 50 years ago, as he indicated. There is no policy reason for that to be done. And we're trying to get down to what policy works and the reform of making sure that we pay attention to the efficacy of the programs, getting the dollars to the people who need it, and doing so in an efficient manner takes some deliberative ap-

proach. That is why Members on the majority side of the aisle felt very strongly that we should act in the way we did. And we intend to bring a nutrition title to the floor. We're working with the chairman of the Agriculture Committee to get that policy right.

So I hope that the gentleman, in his spirit of bipartisanship, will work with us to do that.

Mr. HOYER. It takes two to be bipartisan, Mr. Leader. You know that and I know that. I've got a pretty long record of working in a bipartisan fashion. But I will tell you, I disagree with the majority leader, respectfully, that there aren't the votes on this floor to pass the SNAP program and the agriculture program.

We agree on this side that there's a relationship between those who produce food and those who eat food. We think there's a direct relationship, which is why for half a century these have been related, so that the folks in the city would understand that those on the farm are very important people and we need to make sure that we have a partnership with them. Very frankly, it's worked for half a century. Unfortunately, it didn't work this year.

I will say to my friend, you are accurate in saying there are a majority of people on this floor—not in our party—but a majority on this floor, including Mr. LUCAS, who twice has reported out a bill with bipartisan support and argued for it on the floor. He argued for it and pleaded with your party to support the farm bill, even though from both parties' standpoint it wasn't a perfect bill. But 62 of your Members rejected his plea. And my view is Mr. LUCAS is still in that position of where he sees the rationale of having those together. He's the Republican chairman of the committee. I respect Mr. LUCAS for his comments both times the bill was considered on the floor.

I will move on. But allowing the farm bill to languish is dangerous for this country, for the farm community, and for others. It undermines our economy. Moving with dispatch is in the best interest of our country.

Now, let me ask you something. As I said, we have 17 days left to go until September 30. This Congress has not passed an appropriation bill. We've passed three appropriation bills. The Senate is going to consider one, apparently, next week. We won't be here on September 30. We're only here 2 weeks in September. There are holidays and Labor Day. So we're only going to be here 2 weeks.

I want to ask my friend if he or the majority or the Budget Committee or the Appropriations Committee and the leadership in concert has a plan for what we might do to assure stability in government and in our country's confidence that the government will be operating on October 1.

Mr. CANTOR. I would say to the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, that, yes, we are looking forward to the legislative activity for the remainder of this month,

as I said earlier, to include appropriations bills. We also look towards the prospect of the other body perhaps beginning to act, as the gentleman indicated, at all on appropriations bills.

It does take two to be bicameral. We need that body to act as well. I look forward to seeing how we resolve differences on spending levels and policy differences as we approach the end of the fiscal year, very well aware that we have challenges ahead, and look to find resolution to those, yes, in a bipartisan way and necessarily in a bicameral way.

Mr. HOYER. There's a way to do that, of course. It is called regular order, as we've discussed. The conference committee is where you do that. But not withstanding that fact, we have for over 100 days now seen languishing the Senate-passed budget and our budget, and an attempt by the leader in the Senate, Mr. REID, to go to conference, but no effort to go to conference to, as you say, in a bicameral, bipartisan way to resolve differences. They're very substantial. But everybody is sitting in their corner.

PATY MURRAY wants to come to the midpoint to have a conference. I've talked to her. She's the chairman of the Budget Committee. But we have not moved, unlike the Senate—and they haven't succeeded because of Republican opposition—but they have tried to go to conference. We have not made any effort to go to conference, Mr. Leader, and you can't have a bicameral resolution and compromise and bipartisanship if you don't sit down and talk to one another in conference.

Mr. RYAN asking Senator MURRAY, Do it my way, is not going to get us there. A conference may. I don't think it's guaranteed, but it may. And I would hope we could go to conference and follow regular order on the budget. We should have adopted a budget 4 months ago. We need to adopt a funding resolution by September 30 in some form or fashion. The failure to go to conference is undermining our ability to do that.

Mr. CANTOR. The gentleman knows that he speaks of two different things when it comes to spending and when it comes to the budget blueprint.

The gentleman and I, Mr. Speaker, have had this discussion several times in these colloquies about why it is that Chairman RYAN has taken the position he has, as has our Speaker and our leadership, in that we don't want to go into a discussion if the prerequisite is you have to raise taxes. That's the bottom line. It's not process. It's substance. It is one of those issues that continues to make the divide between the parties.

Frankly, if one thinks that Washington spends tax dollars well, that we should go ahead and ask the hard-working taxpayers to pay more. Our side doesn't believe in that approach. Until we get beyond that, I'm not so sure there's going to be resolution as to a budget conference.