

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.

The government and its lawmakers should do everything in their power to cultivate an ideal environment for small businesses to grow and prosper by removing roadblocks to growth and by building economic certainty. We need to keep the focus on the American worker and on small businesses. We need to remember that every week is small business week.

THE FARM BILL—A PARTISAN PRODUCT

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

Mr. GALLEGO. I rise reluctantly to express my disappointment in today's proceedings. I am one of those Democrats who voted for a bipartisan product coming out of committee; but unfortunately, today, the bill that we saw come out of committee became an extremely partisan product towards the end.

One of the challenges for me was that I am a firm believer in the SNAP program. It's an anti-hunger safety net that serves vulnerable children and seniors across our country. The average benefit is \$4.50 a day. That's a lifeline. That's not a luxury. In 2010, SNAP helped more than 3.6 million people in Texas afford food. It's critical to children and seniors. In the 23rd Congressional District, there are 36,000 households receiving SNAP. The vast majority is of households with working class families and working class families with young kids.

Today was a disappointment. I was perfectly prepared to work for a product that we could get to conference—I had my card to vote green—but it seemed, in watching the debate here and the finger-pointing immediately—the blame of who did what to whom—was just so frustrating.

The truth is that we've got to get somewhere in the middle. When you continually offer these amendments that move us further and further off the middle and that move us further and further and further to the right, it makes it increasingly difficult to support what should be a bipartisan product.

DON'T TAKE FOOD FROM ME

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Most of America would ask the question: What happened here today?

I can probably say that what happened here today is a little hand of a hungry child that was raised up, and the child said: What about me?

You can talk about farms—little ones and big ones. I am a big supporter of our agricultural production in this Nation—it is from the soil—but I am very glad that we stood up for the children who are faced and confronted with \$20

billion in cuts from something that stamps out hunger. Households with children receive about 75 percent of all food stamp benefits.

Mr. Speaker, we didn't want to just stop there.

We didn't want to just take food from 200,000 hungry children. We wanted to make sure that, if you are a disabled parent with a young child—and if you don't have child care and if you can't find a job—your SNAP money would not be given to you by the State, and the State would be able to keep it. We didn't just want to take food out of a hungry child's mouth. We wanted to slap him down. We wanted to make sure that the State would be grinning by saying, Ha, ha, ha, not only do you not get food, but—in the same breath—we get to keep the money.

We are better than this as America. We can do better. This bill was defeated because the hand of a hungry child was able to be heard on the floor of this House. I am glad that I stood with the hungry child and stamped out hunger in that child's heart, stomach and mind. Today, a child's voice, as sweet and quiet as it is, Mr. Speaker, was loud and clear: don't take food from me.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Sherman Williams, one of his secretaries.

□ 1440

JUNETEENTH AND SNAP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, it's not often that one is able to come back to the podium as soon as I have, and I thank the gentleman for his courtesy.

I started to speak about unfinished business, but first I want to celebrate and acknowledge a day this week that many of us commemorate. In fact, it is moving to become nationally recognized. It's something that is called "Juneteenth."

Today is June 20. So yesterday, June 19, was Juneteenth. I didn't get a chance to explain what Juneteenth meant on the floor of the House, and I wanted to do so.

In 1865, the captain of a Union army arose and arrived on the shores of Galveston, Texas, to let the then slaves who had not been notified, who had not been freed in 1863, on January 1 when President Lincoln signed the Emancipation Proclamation, finally the Union came to our shores in Texas and let a whole swath of slaves who were still working and toiling unpaid in conditions that were obviously unsatisfactory, because no one should hold

slaves. Finally, in 1865, on June 19, those in Texas and places to the west were freed. So it is a day of freedom.

When I talk to children about Juneteenth, I say it is living freedom. It is accepting the values of this great Nation that has turned, I hope, forever against the idea of holding others as slaves. And it moved this Nation forward, even in difficulty, with women not being able to vote and African Americans moving from Reconstruction into Jim Crowism and the terrible times of the 1900s and, as well, moving into the time of second-class citizenship all the way through World War II as President Truman integrated the United States military. But it moved the country to a lust and a desire for freedom and opportunity.

So Juneteenth is a day of jubilation. It is a day when families gather together. But it is a very important historic time. It is a historic time, if you will, to be able to, in fact, acknowledge that what has been wrong can be fixed. It wasn't a pleasant time to, in essence, work as a slave, to be held as a slave, to be captured as a slave some 18 months to almost 2 years after the Emancipation Proclamation.

I say that because I wanted to explain further why something that had traditionally been bipartisan—we love the farm life for those who have experienced it, those who read about it. Often in my tenure here in the United States Congress, urban Members and rural Members came together to pass a bill that generated not only food for America but food for the world. Let it be very clear that we took pride today to vote "no," because sometimes you have to listen and understand that there are things greater than your own interests.

I don't know what reason caused the implementation or the addition of a \$20 billion cut to the SNAP program. Who had to be satisfied to put that gigantic, unsympathetic, cruel taking of food from the plates of Americans on the floor? SNAP has no region, it has no racial identity, it has no age identity. It is, frankly, Americans who are in need.

Let me share with you some numbers. Households with children receive about 75 percent of all food stamp benefits. That immediately quashes the stereotype that deadbeats get food stamps. Twenty-three percent of households include a disabled person. Eighteen percent of households include an elderly person. The food stamp program increases household spending. The increase is greater than would occur with an equal benefit in cash. These people are not asking for cash. They're asking for you to allow them to be able to buy decent food so there is nutrition and nourishment.

But again, what motivated a \$20 billion cut that had never been implemented in an agricultural bill that many of us voted on in a bipartisan manner? Did anybody listen to the chairman of the Federal Reserve? The