

away, the program either gets reauthorized or it goes away. But that isn't what happens, Mr. Chairman.

The purpose of this program is to force Congress to justify the continued existence of these programs through regular reauthorization efforts. Mr. Chairman, it forces us to do our jobs.

If these programs and subsidies are left unchallenged, they will continue to consume taxpayer dollars forever without being approved explicitly by the Members of Congress. As our national debt approaches \$17 trillion, we can't afford to put all these programs on autopilot.

This commonsense amendment would require Congress to explicitly revive expired programs at the end of the authorization period and prevent the covert continuance of sometimes wasteful, ineffective, and duplicative programs. Ultimately, this amendment will prompt Congress—and the public—to reexamine thoughtfully these programs when the farm bill's authorization expires.

Finally, this amendment will send a strong message to stakeholders, lobbyists, and special interests that many of these Federal programs have an expiration date.

Let me hasten to add, this commonsense amendment would not eliminate or undermine the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, SNAP, and would not apply to the FARRM Bill's mandatory spending provisions.

I hope my colleagues will support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment before us.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Chairman, before I state my opposition, I'd like to first thank Chairman FRANK LUCAS for the hard work that he and his committee staff have done today and throughout this year and last year in trying to put together not one, but two farm bills for the consideration of the House and for America's heartland, and thank Ranking Member COLLIN PETERSON and his staff for the hard work that they have done as well.

These are never easy, but as both the chairman and the ranking member like to remind us, and I think it's an important underlying point, the farm bill that we reauthorize every 4 years is among the most bipartisan efforts that we ever do. And both the chair and the ranking member and their staff are to be commended.

As it relates to this measure before us, this amendment, we believe that it uses a meat cleaver approach to the legislation. Like sequester, it doesn't discriminate among programs. It's blind between those programs which deserve longer authorization periods and those that could use trimming, and clearly we understand the author's intent.

The whole purpose of the farm bill, though, is to review programs under

our jurisdiction to determine whether or not they should continue, whether they should be changed, or whether they should be eliminated. And, once again, to commend the chair and the ranking member, we have done a very good job on that oversight on determining what areas ought to be trimmed, what programs ought to be consolidated, and which should be eliminated. Our bill already does that. Actually, as the chair has indicated and the ranking member, it terminates hundreds of programs and consolidates, and the committee did the work in a thoughtful and careful manner.

So we can't support the amendment that undoes the careful work that the committee has pursued. I urge my colleagues to reject this haphazard approach—or shotgun approach, we might say back home—and vote "no" on this amendment.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, let me add my thanks to the chairman also for his good work. I know that he has worked very, very hard on getting a bill here to us to vote on, and I commend him and the staff for doing that. I was negligent in not saying that in the beginning of my remarks. So I thank the gentleman from California for his remarks and for reminding me that I should have done that.

I want to say that this amendment does not limit in any way the ability of Congress to reauthorize an expired program. Congress is Congress and can pass any laws it wants, in accordance with the Constitution, of course. But this amendment would require Congress to explicitly revive expired programs at the end of the authorization period.

What we are trying to prevent is the covert continuance of programs that have not been authorized. We should hold ourselves to a high standard here, Mr. Chairman. We shouldn't be funding programs that aren't authorized. It's just saying we should abide by the laws we pass, and that's what this does. We need to ensure that Congress and the public will thoughtfully reexamine these programs and revive them where they need to be.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield to the chairman of the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

First, let me state the persuasive powers of the gentlelady are to be much respected and appreciated, occasionally even feared. While perhaps not every syllable of her amendments in their present form do I necessarily agree with, I am supportive. I believe she is on the right vein, and we will work together to accomplish the ultimate goal.

That said, though, I must also express my appreciation to all my colleagues, to the professional staff of both the majority and the professional staff of the minority.

□ 2350

When we started this process earlier, I noted to all of you that I felt like if

we would work this in regular order, if we would have discussion and amendment and great debate, we could achieve consensus.

Now, we have approximately five more amendments to go tomorrow. We will conclude this experience on time—hurray—and I believe in a fashion that is appropriate for this august body, which means I think we'll pass the bill, but we shall see tomorrow.

That said, thank you all. This is the way the process is supposed to work.

Mr. COSTA. I think we've conducted the people's work today and this evening.

I yield back the balance of my time and thank the chair and, again, all those involved in this process. Hopefully, tomorrow we can conclude our work.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. Foxx).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 61 printed in part B of House Report 113-117.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. FOXX) having assumed the chair, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Acting 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. 1947) 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, had come to no resolution thereon.

—

HOURLY OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

—

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 20, 2013, at 9 a.m.

—

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1907. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final priority—National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation